



RŪPIYAVĀDAVINICCHAYA

The Pāli-Tiṭṭaka Based Disciplinary
Decisions Related to Discussions
About the Buddha's Rules
That Prohibit Monks Accept and Use Money

Compiled and explained by ASHIN SARANA

Rūpiyavādavinicchaya

The Pāḷi-Tiṭṭaka Based Disciplinary Decisions
Related to Discussions About the Buddha's Rules
That Prohibit Monks Accept and Use Money

*Compiled and explained by
Ashin Saraṇa*



Attribution 4.0 International

This book is registered under the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 International License. Share and copy this book as much as you like. See more details here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© 2023 Ashin Saraṇa
Vietnam, Hanoi

Printed Edition:
ISBN: 979-8-9871016-0-5

Ebook Edition:
ISBN: 979-8-9871016-1-2

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Acknowledgments	4
Introduction	8
Who is monks' steward/assistant (kappiya)?	9
Why should all monks, nuns, and laypeople talk, share, teach, and learn about the Buddha's rule that monks must not accept and use money?	11
(1) Monks who accept money are not monks	17
Who should be called <i>samaṇa</i> (ascetics, monks).	21
Asakyaputtiya	22
(2) Monks Who Accept Money Are Even Worse than Devadatta	26
(3) There is No Bigger Danger in the Monastic Discipline (Vinaya) than Accepting Money	38
(4) All monks who accept money are destroyers of the Dispensation (Sāsana)	43
(5) Monks who accept money are not Theravāda, they are Mahāyana	48
(6) Monks who accept money will fall into hell	49
(7) Do the Laypeople Incur a Bad Deed (Demerit) if They Offer Money to Monks?	56
(8) Solutions and Suggestions for Monks Who Accept Money	59

(9) Instructions for Laymen and Laywomen Who Respect and Adore The Buddha's Dispensation.....	79
(10) The 108 Wrong Assumptions of Monks Who Accept Money.....	96
a) Paṭiggahaṇakaṇḍa (a portion related to accepting money).....	96
b) Puggalapaññattikaṇḍa (a portion related to a person's status).....	99
c) Paribhogakaṇḍa (a portion related to necessities).....	102
d) Parahitakaṇḍa (a portion related to the desire to help others).....	102
e) Sāmaṇerakaṇḍa (a portion related to novices)	103
f) Sallāpakakaṇḍa (a portion related to discussion and talking)	104
g) Desanākaṇḍa (a portion related to teaching Dhamma)	105
h) Āpattivaddhanakaṇḍa (a portion related to increasing offenses)	105
i) Himśākaṇḍa (a portion related to violence)....	107
j) Adhammakakaṇḍa (a portion related to unrighteous, unfair decisions)	108
k) Maggakaṇḍa (a portion on the Path to Nibbāna)	109
l) Saṃsayakaṇḍa (a portion related to doubts) .	110
References	112

Acknowledgments

Although the main text and explanations were written by me and therefore I alone am responsible for any errors and inaccuracies, many important citations and details found their way into this little book thanks to a lot of good people. Most importantly, I am thankful to the Dhamma Master (Dhammācariya) Venerable Kavidhaja of Mahāvihāra, for his valuable corrections and further references. I am also most thankful to my devotees in Facebook and many monks, who reminded me of my errors and helped me get more accurate in my understanding of the monastic Discipline. Furthermore, I am thankful to my Vietnamese supporters, such as Mrs. Phuong Tu, ven. Vaṃsañāṇī (Hasu Tran), and Simon (Nguyen Thanh Son) who helped me finalize the first version of this book. Ven. Vaṃsañāṇī, Mrs. Thanh An, and Mrs. Vinh Nhi proofread the text and provided valuable suggestions for clarification. I am also most thankful to Mr. Min Htet Naing for painting the cover picture. My special thanks go to Mrs. Tran Thi Ngoc Phuong for designing the final appearance of the cover and text and the printing company Gia Long Greeting Card Co., Ltd located in Ho Chi Minh City for printing the first 300 books within a few days.

May all beings be happy and healthy!

May all beings soon attain the eternal bliss of Nibbāna!

Ashin Saraṇa,

April 13, 2023

*Duppaṭipanno hi sāsanaṃ bhindanto satthu
dhammasarīre pahāraṃ deti nāma (Udāna Aṭṭhakathā, p.
87).*

“Whoever practices in a wrong way, they harm the Buddha’s Dispensation (Sāsana) and harm the Dhamma-body of the Buddha (that consists of the Nine Supramundane Attainments).” (Tr. according to Myanmar Udāna Nissaya vol. 1 p. 239.)

*Puna caparaṃ, upāli, bhikkhu avinayaṃ vinayoti dīpeti...
vinayaṃ avinayoti dīpeti... "ayaṃ dhammo, ayaṃ vinayo,
idaṃ satthusāsanaṃ, imaṃ gaṇhatha, imaṃ rocethā"ti.
Ayampi kho, upāli, saṃghabhedako āpāyiko, neyiko,
kappaṭṭho, atekiccho"ti (Vinaya Piṭaka Cūḷavaggapāli, p.
370).*

“Upāli, another type is when a monk explains what is not Discipline (Vinaya) as the Discipline, (or) the Discipline as what is not the Discipline ... ‘This is the Truth, this is the Discipline, this is the Buddha’s instruction. Accept this instruction, appreciate this instruction.’ Upāli, even this monk, who splits the Community of Monks (Saṅgha) is one who will fall into a world of perdition, one who will fall into hell, stay there for a whole one lifespan, one who cannot purify their evil deed.” (Tr. according to the Myanmar Vinaya Piṭaka Cūḷavagga Pāli, PDF p. 413.)

*“Tayo me bhikkhave dhamme appahāya abhabbo
assaddhiyaṃ pahātuṃ, avadaññutaṃ pahātuṃ, kosajjaṃ
pahātuṃ. Katame tayo - anādariyaṃ appahāya,
dovacassataṃ appahāya, pāpamittataṃ appahāya. Ime*

*kho bhikkhave tayo dhamme appahāya abhabbo
assaddhiyaṃ pahātum, avadaññutaṃ pahātum, kosajjaṃ
pahātum" (Aṅguttara Nikāya, vol. 3, p. 372).*

"Monks, without removing these three things, it is not possible to remove disbelief, it is not possible to remove blameworthiness, it is not possible to remove laziness. Which three things? - Disrespect, stubbornness, friendship with an evil person. Monks, without removing these three things, it is not possible to remove disbelief, it is not possible to remove blameworthiness, it is not possible to remove laziness." (Tr. according to the Myanmar Aṅguttara Nikāya Dasakanipāṭa, PDF p. 120.)

*"Tatra tumhehi bhūtaṃ bhūtato paṭijānitabbaṃ -
"itipetaṃ bhūtaṃ, itipetaṃ tacchaṃ, atthi cetāṃ amhesu,
saṃvijjati ca panetaṃ amhesū"ti" (Dīgha Nikāya, vol. 1, p.
3).*

"Then you should accept what is true as that what is true:
'These words are indeed true because of these reasons,
and these reasons are also true. Indeed, [this we accept
this as true], this quality is clear to us.'" (Tr. according to
the Myanmar Dīgha Nikāya Sīlakkhandhavagga Pāḷi, PDF p.
11.)

*"Tīhaṅgehi samannāgatena bhikkhunā vinayo na
pucchitabbo – alajjī ca hoti, bālo ca, apakatatto ca.
Tīhaṅgehi samannāgatassa bhikkhuno vinayo na
vissajjetabbo – alajjī ca hoti, bālo ca, apakatatto ca"
(Vinaya Piṭaka Parivārapāḷi, p. 222).*

“Shameless, foolish, undisciplined monk - a monk complete with these three characteristics should not ask about Discipline. Shameless, foolish, undisciplined monk - a monk complete with these three characteristics should not answer (matters related to) the Discipline.” (Tr. according to the Myanmar Vinaya Piṭaka Parivārapāḷi, p. 309)

Monks who intentionally break Vinaya rules should not examine or ask about rules from a monk who follows all Vinaya rules. If monks who intentionally break Vinaya rules ask a monk who follows all Vinaya rules, the monk who follows all Vinaya rules should not reply to them. However, monks who follow all Vinaya rules should examine and ask about rules from a monk who follows all Vinaya rules.

Introduction

If a monk accepts donated money himself or by another person, thinking that it is his money, he is guilty of an offence that requires complete abandoning (relinquishing) the unallowable donation (*nissaggiya*) and confession at another monk who follows this rule (*pācittiya*). Dismissing this rule as a rule that only requires confession (*pācittiya*) is not acceptable in Theravāda Buddhism.

*“Yo pana bhikkhu jātarūparajataṃ uggaṇheyya vā
uggaṇhāpeyya vā upanikkhattaṃ vā sādiyeyya,
nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ”*

(Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikapāḷi, p. 345).

An offense of relinquishing and confession (*nissaggiya pācittiya*) cannot be purified by confession alone. According to the Buddha’s decision in the Rūpiya rule, the Community of Monks (Saṅgha) must gather, and the money must be submitted in the midst of the Community. The money is not relinquished for the benefit of Saṅgha, it is not relinquished for another person. The money then must be thrown away outside of the monastery by a monk who was selected by the Community. That monk must not look where the money falls as he throws it away (**Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikapāḷi, p. 345**). The idea that a monk who accepted money as his possession can resolve this offense by confession alone is not accepted anywhere in the Pāḷi text.

Even if a monk accepts money even just for the benefit of another person (e.g., for charity, for poor

children, for poor people, or for anyone else or any other purpose), it is also an offense:

*"Tattha nissaggiyavattum attano vā
saṅghagaṇapuggalacetiyānaṃ vā atthāya
sampaṭicchitum na vaṭṭati. Attano atthāya
sampaṭicchato nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ hoti, sesānaṃ
atthāya dukkaṭaṃ" (Pārājika Aṭṭhakathā -
Nissaggiyakaṇḍa - Rūpiyasikkhāpadavaṇṇā, Vinaya
Piṭaka Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 2, p. 269).*

It is a merit even to rejoice in another person's merit, "pattānumodanā". It is a bad deed when one supports a bad deed (*akusala*). Therefore, it is a bad deed when one supports monks in breaking their disciplinary (Vinaya) rules. According to the Pāli book Peṭakopadesa, it is a bad deed if one gives a monk an unallowable donation, such as money.

*"Yo ca akappiyassa paribhogena sīlavantesu deti, na
tassa puññaṃ pavaḍḍhatīti so cetam dānaṃ akusalena
deti" (Peṭakopadesa, p. 325).*

"Whoever gives an unallowable donation to the virtuous, merit will not grow in him (in the donor), and the donation is moreover given as an evil deed (*akusala*)."

Who is monks' steward/assistant (kappiya)?

Let me first explain the word "kappiya." Monks must not accept money themselves, they must not own it, and a kappiya also must not accept money for monks. The donors *entrust* their money at a kappiya, and the kappiya then takes responsibility for the donors' money.

The kappiya then provides the monk with whatever the monk needs. Until the monk receives allowable items, the money is owned by the donors alone. It is not owned by the kappiya, it is not owned by the monk. Until the monk receives the allowable food, robes, place to stay, medicine, etc., the donors do not get any merit of donation by entrusting their money at a kappiya. The donors get only merit of their meritorious intention. If the kappiya steals the money, and uses it for his/her purposes, the kappiya has stolen or misused the money of the donors. There is no loss for the monk.

So, who is a kappiya? Who can become a kappiya? Kappiya is simply someone who provides a monk with allowable items. Therefore, any layman, any laywoman, is a monk's assistant. It is not that they "can" become or "should" become a monk's assistant. In fact, all laymen and laywomen are right now kappiyas of monks. Do they provide monks with their needs right now? Or will they do so later? Are they closeby? Are they far away? Those are the only differences. However, they are all called kappiyas, whether they are Buddhists or non-Buddhists. Whoever provides monks with anything that is allowable for monks, be they humans, gods, or animals, are all kappiyas.

Why should all monks, nuns, and laypeople talk, share, teach, and learn about the Buddha's rule that monks must not accept and use money?

The Buddha explained in three Kimila discourses that disrespecting the Discipline is one of the reasons why the Buddha's Dispensation will disappear.

(Aṅguttara Nikāya, vol. 2, p. 215, 298, 360).

"Idha kimila tathāgate parinibbute bhikkhū bhikkhuniyo upāsakā upāsikāyo... sikkhāya agāravā viharanti appatissā... ayaṃ kho kimila hetu ayaṃ paccayo yena tathāgate parinibbute saddhammo na ciraṭṭhitiko hoti"
(Aṅguttara Nikāya, vol.2, p.215).

"Here, Kimila, when the Buddha has attained the Final Cessation, the monks, nuns, laymen, and laywomen,... will live without respect, without reverence to the Discipline,... that is, Kimila, the reason, that is the cause why the True Teachings will not stay for a long time after the Buddha has attained the Final Cessation."

The Commentary for this text explains: *"sikkham aparipūrento sikkhāya agāravo nāma"* **(Aṅguttara Nikāya Commentary vol. 3, p. 76)**. Suppose that a monk says that if there is a reason, it is alright to accept money; he then accepts the money, buys materials for building a monastery, and buys land. Every time the monk uses money, every time he buys something, and every time he uses whatever he bought, it is breaking the rules; it is his disrespect towards the Discipline. The Buddha has explained in various discourses to various audiences that when monks disrespect the training by

intentionally breaking rules, the Buddha's Teachings will disappear. According to the Parinibbāna Sutta (The Discourse on the Buddha's Final Cessation)

"Ime ca subhadda, bhikkhū sammā vihareyyuṃ, asuñño loko arahantehi assāti" (Dīgha Nikāya, vol.2, p.124).

"Subhadda, if these noble "monks" (12 persons: monks, nuns, laymen, laywomen who meditate; those four who have achieved spiritual Path, i.e., are on the way; and those four who achieved spiritual Fruit, i.e., are Enlightened) correctly live (gradually teaching the precepts, concentration, wisdom, based on their attainments on the Path towards Liberation), the world will not be void of Arahants (Tr. according to the Myanmar Dīgha Nikāya Mahāvaggapāḷi, PDF p. 159).

"Vinayo hi sāsanaṃ āyu, tasmim̐ tite sāsanaṃ titaṃ hoti" (Theragāthā Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 1, p. 476).

"Vinaya rules are the lifespan of the (Buddha's) Dispensation; until the Discipline persists, the (Buddha's) Dispensation will persist." (Tr. according to "ရဟန်းကျင့်ဖွယ် နှစ်ရာနှစ်ဆယ် ခုနစ်သွယ်" [Monk's 227 Rules], p. 4).

These times, the monks who accept money teach their disciples also to accept money and cause various troubles to the monks who do not accept money and follow all Vinaya rules, thus decreasing the life-span of the Buddha's Dispensation. In order that the lifespan of the Buddha's Dispensation does not decrease, the monks who follow all Vinaya rules should admonish the monks who break the precepts. According

to the twelfth Saṅghādisesa rule, if a monk reminds another monk about the Vinaya rules, the latter should follow accordingly, without making excuses. A monk must not refuse to follow a rule that is included in the Pātimokkha (the list of the basic 227 rules of monks).

*"Bhikkhu paneva dubbacajātiko hoti
uddesapariyāpannesu sikkhāpadesu bhikkhūhi
sahadhammikaṃ vuccamāno attānaṃ avacanīyaṃ
karoti - 'mā māṃ āyasmanto kiñci avacuttha kalyāṇaṃ
vā pāpakaṃ vā, ahaṃpāyasmante na kiñci vakkhāmi
kalyāṇaṃ vā pāpakaṃ vā, viramathāyasmanto mama
vacanāyā'ti, so bhikkhu bhikkhūhi evamassa vacanīyo
'māyasmā avacanīyaṃ akāsi, vacanīyamevāyasmā
attānaṃ karotu, āyasmāpi bhikkhū vadetu
sahadhammena, bhikkhūpi āyasmantaṃ vakkhanti
sahadhammena. Evaṃ saṃvaddhā hi tassa bhagavato
parisā yadidaṃ aññamaññavacanena
aññamaññavutṭhāpanenāti" (Vinaya Piṭaka
Pārājikapāli, p. 271).*

"A monk is difficult to be admonished to follow a rule that is included in the Pātimokkha. When monks admonish (him) by a rule included in Pātimokkha, he makes himself unadmonishable: "Venerable sirs, do not tell me if I do something good or if I do something not good; I also will not tell you, venerable sirs, if you do something good or if you do something not good. Venerable sirs, refrain from admonishing me." Monks should tell that monk: "Venerable sir, do not make yourself unadmonishable. Venerable sir, make yourself only admonishable. Venerable sir, admonish monks according to the Truth; monks will also tell you, the venerable sir, according to the Truth. This way it is

possible, by admonishing each other, by raising each other when the other fell into an offense, to achieve growth in the Community of the Noble Buddha.” (Tr. according to the Myanmar Pārājikapāḷi, PDF p. 312).

Monks who accept money do not like to listen to and take seriously monks who remind them not to accept money. When those who accept money are told not to accept them, they just search for excuses. Therefore, disrespecting the training, these monks are decreasing the lifespan of the Buddha’s Dispensation. These monks, who hinder the Truth so they achieve gain, commit yet another offense:

“Tatra ce eko bhikkhu "nayidaṃ kappatī"ti paṭikkhipati, upāsako ca "yadi na kappati, mayhameva bhavissatī"ti gacchati. So bhikkhu "tayā saṃghassa lābhantarāyo kato"ti na kenaci kiñci vattabbo. Yo hi taṃ codeti, sveva sāpattiko hoti, tena pana bahū anāpattikā katā”
(Vinaya Piṭaka Aṭṭhakathā vol. 2, p. 257).

"There one monk, during a donation to the Community of Monks, refuses: ‘money is not allowable.’ The donor says: ‘If it is not suitable, may it be (remain being) just mine,’ and departs. No monk then should tell this monk, ‘You have caused a detriment to the gain of the Monastic Community.’ If, indeed, a monk blames the monk who denied the money (donation), the monk who blames is guilty of an offense because the one who denied (the money donation) made many monks free from offense" (Tr. according to Pārājika Bhāsāṭikā vol. 4 of Ashin Janakābhivaṃsa, p. 303-304).

“... sacepi koci jātārūparajataṃ ānetvā “idaṃ saṃghassa dammi, ārāmaṃ vā karotha cetiyaṃ vā

*bhojanasālādīnaṃ vā aññatara''nti vadati, idampi
sampaṭicchitum na vaṭṭati. Assa kassaci hi
aññassatthāya sampaṭicchantassa dukkaṭaṃ hotīti
mahāpaccariyaṃ vuttaṃ'' (Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikakaṇḍa
Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 2, p. 256).*

“If someone brings money and then gives it to the Community of Monks and says: ‘Build a monastery, build a pagoda (cetiya), build a refectory (dining hall).’ That money should not be accepted (by monks). If a monk accepts (money) for the benefit of another (monk), he will be guilty of the *dukkatā* offense, according to the Mahāpaccariya text.” (Tr. according to Pārājika Bhāsāṭikā vol. 4 of Ashin Janakābhivaṃsa, p. 302).

The monks who defend accepting money may say, in accordance with the Commentary to Aṅguttara Nikāya’s Dutiyapamāḍavagga: “*Yāva tiṭṭhanti suttantā, vinayo yāva dippati, tāva dakkhanti ālokaṃ ...*” (Aṅguttara Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 1, p. 71). But even this verse says that the light of Wisdom will be available only until the Buddha’s discourses are available and the Discipline shines. Therefore, just learning the Buddha’s discourses is not enough to protect the Buddha’s Dispensation. This message is, however, even clearer from the Kimila Suttas and the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta mentioned above.

It is true that the Great Master Tipiṭakadhara Mingun Sayadaw suggested that “reliable” monks can accept money. However, the *sutabuddha* (Buddha by knowledge) Venerable Tipiṭakadhara Mingun Sayadaw’s decision cannot be accepted, even considering the

Buddha's permission given in the Parinibbāna Sutta, that monks can remove some of the smaller rules. That is because, during the First Buddhist Council, the Arahant Tipiṭakadhara *sutabuddha* Venerable Ānanda, as well as the 499 Arahants headed by the Arahant Venerable Mahākassapa agreed that none of the Buddha's rules should ever be removed because the Buddha did not explain which rules can be removed. By never removing a rule, we are sure that an important rule is never removed. Therefore, we cannot accept the permission of the Tipiṭakadhara Mingun Sayadaw to accept money because it is contrary to the decision of the 500 Arahants, direct disciples of the Sammā Sambuddha.

(1) Monks who accept money are not monks.

The first time I heard this statement was when a Burmese master who memorized the twenty books of Abhidhamma Piṭaka (of the Burmese edition) and soon after that, the three books of Dīgha Nikāya told it to me. I did not carefully check the reference he told me, and, very happy, simply accepted it and used it when I gave Dhamma talks. Although the venerable monk is not willing to officially accept that he told me this statement, I do remember very clearly that he did. On that occasion, I asked the venerable monk about this sentence two times for confirmation, and he confirmed it to me two times. And still, at that time, he did not take back his statement at that time. Anyway, you could say that I probably do not remember what happened well, and I accept that my memory has its weaknesses. Therefore, I do not blame the venerable monk that he does not publicly accept what he previously taught me.

If we look at the Pāḷi scriptures, we will find some support for this idea that monks who accept money are not monks. In **Saḷāyatanaṅgaṭṭhapaḷi, Mañicūḷaka Sutta**, the Buddha says:

"Yassa kho, gāmaṇi, jātārūparajataṃ kappati, pañcapi tassa kāmaguṇā kappanti. Yassa pañca kāmaguṇā kappanti, ekaṃsenetaṃ, gāmaṇi, dhāreyyāsi asamaṇadhammo asakyaputtiyadhammo" (**Samyutta Nikāya, vol. 2, p. 509**).

"Village headman, the one who can accept money, can also enjoy the pleasures of the five senses. Remember, that the one who can enjoy the pleasures of the five

senses,¹ in reality, does not have the nature of a monk,
he does not have the nature of a Sakyan prince,² who is
a disciple of the Noble Buddha [the Buddha's Dhamma
family]." (Tr. according to Myanmar Saṃyutta Nikāya
Saḷāyatanavaggasaṃyuttapāḷi, PDF p. 331).

When the lay people of Vesāli heard these
teachings from the mouth of the Arahant Venerable
Yasa Kākaṇḍaputta, who explained to them that monks
should not accept money after an event where they
tried to donate money to monks, they surely
understood the Buddha's Pāḷi words of
"*asamaṇadhammo asakyaputtiyadhammo*" correctly.

¹ Seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching; usually refers to sexual intercourse.

² Here "Sakyan prince" is the exact translation of the Burmese
tharkee-win minn thar (သာကြီးဝင်းမင်းသား). The Buddha

explains in **Udāna - 5. Soṇavaggo - 5. Uposatha Suttaṃ**
(Udānapāḷi p. 142) that monks abandon all their lineage and
cast names and all are then called "monks; and sons of
Sakyans:" "*khattiyā, brāhmaṇā, vessā, suddā te*
tathāgatappavedite dhammavinaye agārasmā anagāriyaṃ
pabbajitvā [pabbajitā (ka. sī.)] jahanti purimāni nāmagottāni,
'samaṇā sakyaputtiyā' tveva saṅkhaṃ gacchanti." The
Theragāthā Commentary to Dutiyavaggo - 8.
Kimilattheragāthāvaṇṇanā (ThgA 1.350) explains:
"*Sakyaputtāti anuruddhattherādayo sakyarājakumārā.*" (Sons
of Sakyans are the Sakyan princes such as the Elder
Anuruddha). It seems the Burmese took this explanation for
granted and use it whenever they translate Sakyaputta. We
can understand it as a symbolic reminder to the Buddha's
disciples that as monks they are not just spiritual offspring of
the Buddha, but rather full-fledged members of the Buddha's
family, both spiritually and in all other respects. In other
words, monks need to follow the Buddha's instructions as if
they came from their most beloved true father and follow them
everywhere, every time, throughout their life.

This incident was recorded by the venerable Arahants who attended the Second Buddhist Council:

"Evaṃ vutte vesālikā upāsakā āyasamantaṃ yasaṃ kākāṇḍaputtaṃ etadavocuṃ- 'ekova bhante, ayyo yaso kākāṇḍaputto samaṇo sakyaputtiyo. Sabbevime asamaṇā asakyaputtiyā" (Vinaya Piṭaka Cūlavaggaṇḍapāḷi, p. 495).

"When (ven. Yasa, son of the Brahmin Kākāṇḍa) spoke this (the Mañicūḷaka Sutta), the laypeople citizens of Vesālī told to the Venerable Yasa, son of the Brahmin Kākāṇḍa: 'Venerable Yasa, son of the Brahmin Kākāṇḍa, (you) alone are a Sakyan prince, a monk from the Buddha's lineage. All these (other) monks (who accept money) are not monks; they are not Sakyan princes of the Buddha's lineage.'" (Tr. according to Myanmar Vinaya Piṭaka Cūlavaggaṇḍapāḷi, PDF p. 546).

The laypeople who lived in Vesālī understood the words *asamaṇa asakyaputtiya* when they were told by the Venerable Yasa, the son of Brahmin Kākāṇḍa, who just recited to them the Buddha's Teachings. The Commentaries do not explain this incident. The Arahant Venerable Yasa, the son of Brahmin Kākāṇḍa, did not reject the reaction (understanding) of the laypeople. Because laypeople today do not understand Pāḷi, it is not possible to teach the Buddha's words directly. However, it is correct to teach the Buddha's teachings in the way that the Buddha's teachings were understood by laypeople in the Buddha's time so that the laypeople of modern times understand in the same way.

If we look at the meaning of the Pāḷi word "*asamaṇa asakyaputtiya*" in the Vinaya Piṭaka's Pārājikapāḷi, we learn that it is used for monks who have

broken one of the four major rules (*pārājika*), namely having sexual intercourse, stealing a valuable property, killing a human being, or telling lies about one's spiritual attainments. The scriptures do not mention that the inhabitants of Vesālī accused monks who accepted money of committing one of the four major rules. When I say that monks accept money, they are not monks, I also do not mean to say that monks who accept money have committed one or more of the four major rules. My intention is only to provide a symbolic reminder so they do not accept money and to teach laypeople that they should encourage monks to follow the rules of Discipline and never give money to monks. For example, if a mother tells her son: "you are not my son," her son does not become a dog (or any non-human) because of that statement. Nor is it the intention of the child's mother that the child becomes a non-human. Nor does she say it because her son has already become a non-human. Instead, she admonishes her son with a symbolic reminder. This is the attitude with which I use the various symbolic reminders for laypeople and monks who believe it is good for monks to accept money to explain that it is never possible for monks to accept money.

In another paragraph of the Mañicūḷaka Sutta, the Buddha explains to the village headman that if someone is a monk, they do not accept money.

*"Na hi, gāmaṇi, kappati samaṇānaṃ sakyaputtiyānaṃ
jātarūparajataṃ, na sādhiyanti samaṇā sakyaputtiyā
jātarūparajataṃ, nappaṭiggaṇhanti samaṇā
sakyaputtiyā jātarūparajataṃ, nikkhittamaṇisuvaṇṇā
samaṇā sakyaputtiyā apetajātarūparajataṃ" (Saṃyutta
Nikāya's Mañicūḷaka Sutta, vol. 2, p. 510).*

“Village headman, money is not allowable for Sakyan princes, who are monks and disciples of the Noble Buddha, the Sakyan princes who are monks and disciples of the Noble Buddha do not welcome³ money, the Sakyan princes do not accept money, the Sakyan princes who are monks and disciples of the Noble Buddha have rejected money, (they) are devoid of money.” (Tr. according to Myanmar Saṃyutta Nikāya Saḷāyatanavaggasaṃyuttapāḷi, PDF p. 330.)

In the Ote-Pho Sayadaw’s “Purification and Maintenance of the Dispensation” (သာသနာသန့်ရှင်းတည်တံ့ရေး), published in 1982, we find a detailed explanation on *asamana asakyaputtiya*:

Who should be called *samaṇa* (ascetics, monks)

The conventional concept and word *samaṇa* comes from the etymological verb to starve and quiet mental defilements by training in morality. Therefore, it is certain that *samaṇa* should be called only a monk who is virtuous based on the etymological root of starving and quieting mental defilements. For a monk who does not have this base (of morality; starving, and quieting mental defilements), it is possible to use the word *samaṇa* only because of his proximity to the customary (word) usage. However, in reality, such a monk is not called *samaṇa*. In fact, a monk who does

³ *Sādiyati* is translated in Pāḷi-Burmese dictionary as to accept (ခံယူ) and to delight in (နှစ်သက်). Hence I use the word “welcome” to accommodate both meanings.

not starve and quiet his mental defilement, that shameless (*alajjī*) person of bad morals (*dussīla*) should be called *asamaṇa* (non-ascetic, non-monk).

*"Na muṇḍakena samaṇo, abbato alikaṃ bhaṇaṃ.
icchālobhasamāpanno, samaṇo kiṃ bhavissati"*

(Dhammapada 264).

Samaṇo - a monk; *na hoti* - is not; *muṇḍakena* - (whoever is) bald, of shaven beard and hair; *abbato* - immoral; *bhaṇaṃ* - talking; *alikaṃ* - idle chatter. *Kiṃ* - How can; *puggalo* - a person; *icchālobhasamāpanno* - who has craving and greed for the six sense-objects [pleasant objects of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching, thinking], *bhavissati* - be; *samaṇo* - a monk?

It is not yet possible to know just by this statement from Dhammapadapāḷi whether a person who is shameless and immoral should be called a non-monk (*asamaṇa*), a non-Sakyan (*asakyaputtiya*). In the **Vinaya Piṭaka's Cūḷavagga - Saṅgītikhandhaka** it is directly stated: *"sabbepime asamaṇā asakyaputtiyā."* *Sabbepi* - all; *ime bhikkhū* - these monks, sons of Vajjians of Vesālī, who practice the ten things such as accepting money that are not in accordance with Dhamma (*adhamma*); *asamaṇā* - are not monks; *asakyaputtiyā* - are not Sakyan princes, sons of the Buddha.

Asakyaputtiya

Just like it is normal to call a father's son who does not fulfill his responsibilities a "non-son," one who becomes a monk in relation to the Buddha and does not fulfill the duties of a monk should be called an *asamaṇa* [non-monk], *asakyaputtiya* [non-Sakyan] (based on the

failure in fulfillment). A monk who falls into the heinous crime,⁴ because he is void of monkhood forever, should be called “*ekanta asamana asakyaputtiya*” [“totally non-monk and non-Sakyan”]. Here [in the case of a monk who has not yet transgressed one of the four major heinous crimes of monastic discipline], the letter “a” removes the quality of being praiseworthy and gets the meaning of rebuke. It is a temporary statement that (the person) is not a monk, not a son of the Buddha.

“*Assamaṇo samaṇapaṭiñṇo abrahmacārī*

brahmacārīpaṭiñṇo’ti ca

taṃsambhāvanīyaguṇanivattiyaṃ. Garahāhi idha

ñāyati.”⁵ (Aṅguttara Nikāya Tīkā - Ekakanipāta, vol. 1 p.

101). Based on this Pāḷi text, it is very clear that if only the four major rules of defeat (*pārājika*) are followed, but the other rules are broken, the person should be called *asamaṇa asakyaputtiya*” (pp. 122-123).

⁴ I.e., one of the four major offenses, namely sexual intercourse, stealing a valuable property, killing a human being, or telling a lie about one’s spiritual attainments.

⁵ Literally “‘Non-monk (*assamaṇa*) means one who claims he is a monk; non-holy living (*abrahmacārī*) means one who claims he is living a holy life.’ It is the absence of (“removing”) the qualities which are praiseworthy. It means a rebuke.” For example, saying that someone is *asamaṇa* or *abrahmacārī* does not mean that they are no longer a monk or living a holy life. It means that they do not fulfill their responsibilities completely and this is just a reminder that they should change their wrong ways and fulfill their responsibilities.

I believe that by saying that monks who accept money, I never ever meant that they are not real monks, that they are fake monks. A real and fake monk is the difference between having a preceptor and not having one (just taking up robes without the ordination ceremony to avoid all responsibilities). I am very clear about the difference between ordaining with a proper ceremony and thus becoming a real monk vs. ordaining without any ceremony and thus becoming a fake monk, and I have never criticized or elaborated on this point. Those who think I have done so should show me evidence of it. Even if I ever did say so, it would still just be a way of saying that the monks who accept money are *moghapurisā* (men unable to achieve Enlightenment), a designation used for monks who accept money by the Buddha Himself (monks who take up robes without a preceptor and proper ordination ceremony are fake monks, also unable to achieve Enlightenment - although unlike those who just accept money, fake monks are doomed for whole their life):

“Kathañhi nāma tvaṃ, moghapurisa, rūpiyaṃ paṭiggahessasi! Netam, moghapurisa appasannānaṃ vā pasādāya, pasannānaṃ vā bhiyyobhāvāya; atha khvetam, moghapurisa, appasannānañceva appasādāya, pasannānañca ekaccānaṃ aññathattāyā’ti” (Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikapāḷi, p. 345 and p. 23).

“(The Buddha rebuked him thus:) ‘Man unable to achieve Enlightenment (*magga-phala*)! Why did you accept money? Man unable to achieve Enlightenment, this (what you did) indeed will not lead to faith in those who do not yet have faith; it will not lead to an increase in faith in those who already have faith. Man unable to

achieve Enlightenment, indeed, what you have done leads to the absence of faith in those who do not have faith yet and loss of faith in some who already have faith.” (Tr. according to Myanmar Pārājikapāḷi, p. 365).

One layperson further explains: “In the sphere of metaphor, we have a habit of saying about a person who has done an action that the majority cannot approve of: “You are not a human.” Saying so, the man doesn’t become a dog by doing that action. It is said so only because the man had broken a suitable conduct. When Ashin Sarana says that monks who accept money, if they die, will fall into hell, he means this if they die unable to purify themselves (by proper purification ceremony) before death. His intention is that those who have transgressed should correct themselves. And when Ashin Sarana says that by accepting money, the monk has joined the Mahāyāna Community, some do not like that. Even though some do not like that, it is simply true. In Mahāyāna, Discipline is not the lifespan of the Buddha’s Dispensation; hence there is no need to follow the rules [strictly].” (In <https://bit.ly/3UjQKY8>, the article “သာသနာ့ အာချာနီ ဘုန်းငွေခင်တွေ,” written by အလင်း ရောင်).

(2) Monks Who Accept Money Are Even Worse than Devadatta

Here I should explain first the word *alajjī*. In the Pāli-Myanmar dictionary “*alajjī*” (“shameless”) refers to a monk who is shameless (enough to break a rule intentionally).

“Sañcicca āpattiṃ āpajjati, āpattiṃ parigūhati; agatigamanañca gacchati, ediso vuccati alajjīpuggalo”ti
(Vinaya Piṭaka Parivārapāḷi, p. 279).

“Intentionally falls into an offense, hides an offense, and commits what is inappropriate. A person of this nature is correctly called *alajjī*.” (Tr. according to Myanmar Parivārapāḷi, p. 374).

In order to become an *alajjī*, it is enough to break a rule deliberately. In fact, someone who intentionally falls into an offense but does not keep it secret does not become a *lajjī* (virtuous) person. In order to become a *lajjī* (a monk who is shy to break a rule) it is necessary to avoid intentionally falling into an offense:

“Sañcicca āpattiṃ nāpajjati, āpattiṃ na parigūhati; agatigamaṇaṃ na gacchati, ediso vuccati lajjīpuggalo”ti
(Vinaya Piṭaka Parivārapāḷi, p. 279).

“Does not fall into an offense knowingly, does not hide an offense, does not commit what is inappropriate. A person of this nature is correctly called *lajjī* (virtuous).”
(Tr. according to Myanmar Parivārapāḷi, p. 375).

“Kathaṃ alajjitāya āpattiṃ āpajjati? Akappiyabhāvaṃ jānantoyeva madditvā vītikkamaṃ karoti” **(Vinaya Piṭaka Pācittiya Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 2, p. 141).**

“How does one fall into shamelessness shamelessly?
Aware of what is not proper, indeed, (he) suppresses
(shame) and commits the transgression.” (Tr. according
to Pācittiya Bhāsāṭīkā vol. 2 of Ashin Janakābhivamsa, p.
47).

*“Tathā hi katasikkhāpadavītikkamā alajjipuggalā ...
niggahetabbā ... yadi hi te evaṃ na niggahitā siyuṃ,
saṃghe kalahādiṃ vaḍḍhetvā
uposathādisāmaggīkammaṇṇapaṭibāhanādinā pesalānaṃ
aphāsuṃ katvā kamena te devadattavajjiputtakādayo
viya parisāṃ vaḍḍhetvā attano vippaṭipattiṃ
dhammato vinayato dīpentā saṃghabhedādimpi katvā
nacirasseva sāsanaṃ antaradhāpeyyuṃ, tesu pana
saṃghato bahikaraṇādivasena niggahitesu sabbopāyaṃ
upaddavo na hoti” (Vimativinodanīṭīkā, vol. 1, p. 340;
Vinayālaṅkāraṭīkā, vol. 1, p. 152).*

"Therefore, it is suitable to suppress... the shameless
persons... who break rules. Indeed, if those shameless
(monks without shame) are not suppressed, quarrels
and so on will happen in the Monastic Community, the
events of gathering for Uposatha (reciting monastic
rules) and so on may be prohibited, the virtuous will be
made uncomfortable (by the shameless monks) and
gradually those shameless (monks) will grow in
followers like Devadatta, like the monks who were sons
of Vajjians; they will present their wrong behavior as the
Sutta (discourses), Abhidhamma (the deeper Dhamma),
and Vinaya (Discipline), split the Monastic Community
and commit other such things and within a short time
make the Buddha's Dispensation disappear. However,
by the power of removing these shameless (monks)
from the Monastic Community, none of these

catastrophes will happen.” (Tr. according to Vimativinodanīṭikā Nissaya, vol. 1, pp. 733-734).

Whenever I explained anything related to Vinaya, there was no intention to blame the Monastic Community. My teaching was only an encouragement to monks who accept money that they abandon all their money forever, they also abandon all things that they bought with their money (or thoroughly give them to their parents, blood-related relatives, or a monastery worker and then request them back), confess to a monk who has not transgressed this rule, and become *lajjī* (virtuous) and *pesalā* (cherishing virtue) monks. I also intended to encourage laypeople to help monks follow the rules of Discipline and discourage them from making it more difficult.

A wise person is able to understand a metaphor or a symbolic statement. Here the comparison is with the Devadatta,⁶ who blatantly split the Monastic Community. He told about his intention to split the Community to his friends as well as to the lay people:

"Samaṇo kho, āvuso, gotamo mahiddhiko mahānubhāvo. Kathaṃ mayaṃ samaṇassa gotamassa saṅghabhedam karissāma cakkabhedanti"... Mayaṃ, āvuso samaṇam gotamaṃ upasaṅkamtivā pañca vatthūni yācimhā... imāni samaṇo gotamo nānujānāti"
(Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikapāḷi, pp. 263-264).

“Dear friend, the monk Gotama has great psychic powers, (he is) very powerful. How shall we bring about

⁶ Although Devadatta was still a full-fledged monk at this time, the Pāḷi scriptures do not speak of him with the honorary title āyasmā (venerable). Here I follow the style of the Pāḷi text.

the split in the monk Gotama's Community (of Monks)? How shall we destroy the structure?" (Said friends of Devadatta). We, friend, shall approach the monk Gotama and request the five things,⁷... the monk Gotama will not agree with them."

For example, the monks who defend accepting money accept money and buy land for a monastery. The monastery will be unallowable and suitable to be abandoned. They will buy accessories, books, and food which thus (by buying them using monk's money) become unallowable and suitable to be abandoned. As they buy these things, each time of using those things results in committing an offense of *dukkaṭā*. In this connection, see *pattacattukka* in **Vinaya Piṭaka Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 2, p. 277**. In **Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī Aṭṭhakathā, p. 176** is mentioned an example where a monk buys a seed and plants it to grow a tree, but even just sitting in the shadow of that tree is not allowable for any monk - because the tree came from a seed

⁷ The five things requested by Devadatta were: "1. Monks should live only in the forest, whoever lives in a village will be guilty of an offense. 2. Monks should live only on food from alms round. Whoever accepts an invitation (to eat in a donor's house), will be guilty of an offense. 3. Monks should live on rag robes, whoever accepts (robes) from a layperson will be guilty of an offense. 4. Monks should live at a root of a tree. However, lives under a roof will be guilty of an offense. 5. Monks should not eat meat and fish. Whoever eats meat or fish will be guilty of an offense." The Buddha did not accept the first three propositions for a rule; the Buddha explained that monks are allowed to live at the root of a tree only eight months each year; the four months (of rain retreat) must be spent under a roof. Monks can eat meat and fish from animals that were not killed for a monk, i.e., the monk has not seen, heard, or suspected that the animal was killed for him.

bought by monk's money. According to **Sāratthadīpanīṭikā, vol. 2, p. 410**, whatever a monk buys, with every use of that item, is an offense of *dukkaṭā*.

Monks who accept money take accepting money as simply an offense that requires confession. They confess their transgression to another monk before they ordain a new monk; or because they inaugurate a new ordination hall (*sīma*); or before the start of the Pātimokkha recital. They do not abandon their money forever. They do not abandon the monastic buildings, land, and other things that they bought with their money. Because they did not abandon the unallowable things, the recital of Pātimokkha is not pure, it is not complete. When the monastic rules of Pātimokkha are recited, it is clearly announced:

"Pārisuddhiṃ āyasmanto ārocetha pātimokkhaṃ uddisissāmi" (**Vinaya Piṭaka Mahāvaggapāḷi, p.140**).
"Taṭṭhāyasmante pucchāmi kaccittha parisuddhā ... pārisuddhetthāyasmanto tasmā tuṇhī evametaṃ dhārayāmi" (**Dvemātikāpāḷi, p. 1**).

"Venerable sirs, confirm your purity; I shall recite the Pātimokkha."; "Thus I ask the venerable sirs, whether you are pure... The venerable sirs are pure; hence they are silent. So I understand it."

If a monk of corrupted virtue wants to ordain a new monk, this preceptor-to-be is not exemplary and actually should not even become a preceptor in the first place:

"Aparehipi, bhikkhave, pañcahaṅgehi samannāgatena bhikkhunā na upasampādetabbaṃ, na nissayo dātabbo,

na sāmaṇero upaṭṭhāpetabbo. adhisīle sīlavipanno hoti, ajjhācāre ācāravipanno hoti, atidiṭṭhiyā diṭṭhivipanno hoti, appassuto hoti, duppañño hoti - imehi kho bhikkhave, pañcahaṅgehi samannāgatena bhikkhunā na upasampādetabbaṃ, na nissayo dātabbo, na sāmaṇero upaṭṭhāpetabbo" (Vinaya Piṭaka Mahāvaggapāḷi, p. 91).

“Monks, additionally, a monk complete in (one of these) five things⁸ should not ordain (a new monk), should not accept a monk to live in dependence on him, should not take care of a novice: (a) the noble morality is broken (he is guilty of a *pārājika* or a *saṅghādisesa* offense), (b) the noble behavior is broken (he has committed any of the other offenses), (c) the noble view is broken, (d) has a little knowledge, (e) is not wise. Monks, a monk complete in (one of these) five things should not ordain (a new monk), should not accept a monk to live in dependence on him, should not take care of a novice.”

(Tr. according to Myanmar Vinaya Piṭaka Mahāvaggapāḷi, PDF p. 107.)

Most importantly, monks who do not follow all Vinaya rules do not have the same view as the monks who follow all rules; hence they should not participate in the Pātimokkha recital together, a decision that comes from the great masters of the ancient times. We learn about this from the story of the Third Buddhist

⁸ Any of the five things is enough to be ineligible for becoming a preceptor. We can recognize it already from the first point - a monk who has committed *pārājika* is not really a monk anymore, hence the other points are then irrelevant. A preceptor is the exemplary teacher of the student; hence he should have all of these five qualities.

Council. Disciplined Theravāda Buddhist monks in Thailand also follow this decision:

"Dussīlapuggale nissāya uposatho na tiṭṭhati, pavāraṇā na tiṭṭhati, saṃghakammāni nappavattanti, sāmaggī na hoti... pe... dussīlesu pana niggahitesu sabbopi ayaṃ upaddavo na hoti, tato pesalā bhikkhū phāsu viharantī"ti (**Vinaya Piṭaka Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 1, p. 188**).

"Uposatha performed in dependence on monks of bad morals is not successful, *pavāraṇā*⁹ is not successful, other official acts of the Monastic Community do not happen. The Monastic Community is no more in harmony, the monks do not have the same purpose (or they are not peaceful), they are unable to study the Pāli text, repeatedly ask about the Commentaries, meditate, and so on. However, when the monks of bad morals are suppressed, none of these catastrophes happen, and therefore the monks who cherish virtue live happily."

(Tr. according to Pārājika Bhāsāṭṭikā vol. 2 of Ashin Janakābhivaṃsa, p. 294, PDF p. 295.)

According to the author of the textbooks for Myanmar monastic educational centers, the Great Master Venerable Ashin Janakābhivaṃsa, It is not possible to disseminate the Buddha's Dispensation without following the rules of Discipline. It is only possible to make the Dispensation disappear.

"Even if a shameless person has a lot of knowledge, due to his emphasis on material gain, he corrupts the instruction of the text of Discipline (Vinaya Pāli) and

⁹ A yearly festival during which monks gather in an ordination hall and invite each other to admonish them for any fault that another monk saw, heard, or suspects (**Vinaya Piṭaka Mahāvaggapāli, p. 223**).

strays from the Dispensation by a non-Dhamma, or strays from the Vinaya by non-Dhamma, or teaches what is not Vinaya and causes a tremendous disaster in the Dispensation. They cause a split in the Community of Monks or make a deep groove or crack that may split the Community of Monks. (Ashin Janakābhivamsa's "Book no. 21, Pārājikan-Bhāsāṭikā" (အမှတ် (၂၁) ကျမ်းစာ ပါရာဇိကဏ်ဘာသာဋီကာ), vol. 2, pp. 326-327, PDF p. 327-328.)

"Tathā hi katasikkhāpadavītikkamā alajjipuggalā uposathādāsu pavīṭṭhā "tumhe kāyadvāre, vacīdvāre ca vītikkamaṃ karothā"ti ādinā bhikkhūhi vattabbā honti, yathā vinayañca atīṭṭhantā saṃghato bahikaraṇādivasena suṭṭhu niggahetabbā, tathā akatvā tehi saha saṃvasantāpi alajjinova honti "ekopi alajjī alajjīsataṃpi karotī"ti adivacanato" (**Vimativinodanīṭikā, vol.1, p. 340. Vinayālaṅkāraṭikā, vol. 1, p. 152).**

"And just because of that, the shameless monks (*alajjī*) who (intentionally) broke a rule and entered a place for performing the Uposatha ceremony or other such place should be told: "You have committed a transgression by the body or by speech." Those monks should be told in these ways. But if they do not establish themselves in that discipline, they should be suppressed (or removed) away from the Monastic Community (gathering). If this is not done, the monks who befriend these shameless monks (*alajjī*) will also become shameless. How? As is said, a shameless monk will make a hundred monks shameless." (Tr. according to Vimativinodanīṭikā Nissaya, vol. 1, pp. 733-734.)

The monks who defend accepting money do not allow the monks who follow the Discipline to inaugurate ordination halls in the township (a case reportedly present until today in the Hlegu Township of Myanmar, where the great master Pa Auk Sayadaw is still facing unnecessary obstacles in inaugurating an ordination hall). Monks who defended accepting money beat with a stick and caused an injury on the head of a monk who followed the Discipline (for example, in the Kalay Region of Myanmar). Other monks who defended accepting money threatened to kill (such as when they threatened the Venerable Asin Obhāsa of Naypyidaw in Myanmar). Monks who defended accepting money gathered and in a gang assaulted a monk who taught laypeople that monks should not accept money (this happened in the Ayeyarwady Region of Myanmar to the Ote-Pho Sayadaw). I was invited to a monastery in Hlegu Township of Myanmar to stay there and teach Dhamma. But the chief monk of the monastery had to cancel the invitation because his superior who was responsible for the monastic affairs in the region several times prohibited the chief monk from accepting me for fear that I may teach Vinaya to the laypeople there. It is not in accordance with Dhamma, that monks who devotedly follow Vinaya rules would be prohibited to stay in a monastery where they are wholeheartedly invited and welcomed by the chief monk.

The monks who follow Vinaya rules do not like to enter the monasteries of monks who accept money for fear that they may break a rule by using something that is bought in such a monastery. Monks who do not accept money do not want to perform the Uposatha ceremony together with monks who accept money.

They do not want to be in contact with each other. The monks who accept money do not like to provide a residence in their monasteries to monks who follow the Discipline. Both groups are happier when they stay apart. Monks who follow the Discipline send their students only to monasteries where monks follow rules because they believe the monasteries where monks accept money are not suitable for their students and admonish them accordingly.

Monks who do not want to live in accordance with the Buddha's Discipline, monks who do not want to live in accordance with the rules and therefore follow different or contradicting rules, monks who do not seriously take certain rules and intentionally behave in a different way than admonished by the Buddha, teach their students to do the same and thus split the Saṅgha. Unlike Devadatta, who was very clear about his intentions, the monks who accept money are not ready to openly admit that they do not want to follow the Buddha's admonishment, that they do not admonish their students to follow it, that they do not live in accordance with the Buddha's Teachings, that they live in a different way. That is why I have said that monks who accept money are worse than Devadatta, by using an appropriate metaphor, an appropriate symbol.

It is not possible to consider monks, who do not want to follow the Buddha's Teachings, who do not admonish their students and novices to follow it, who follow different rules than those declared by the Buddha, as protectors of the Buddha's Theravāda Dispensation. This is also the reason why I have labeled

them by the symbolic term of Mahāyāna.¹⁰ If the monks want to protect the Theravāda Dispensation, they should train only in accordance with the Buddha's admonishment and admonish their student monks and student novices to follow accordingly as well. The wise men will surely understand my statement that the monks who do not follow the decisions of the First, Second, and Third Buddhist Council are Mahāyāna monks. Splitting the Community of Monks, the monks who want to accept money have come to a great danger:

“Garuko kho, devadatta, saṅghabhedo. Yo kho, devadatta, samaggaṃ saṅghaṃ bhindati, kappatthikaṃ kibbisam pasavati, kappam nirayamhi paccati, yo ca kho, devadatta, bhinnaṃ saṅghaṃ samaggaṃ karoti, brahmaṃ puññaṃ pasavati, kappam saggamhi modati”’ti (Cūḷavagga, p. 343) Evamādikaṃ anekappakāraṃ devadattassa ca bhikkhūnañca tadanucchavikaṃ tadanulomikaṃ dhammiṃ kathaṃ katvā” (Vinaya Piṭaka Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 2, p. 192).

“It is serious, Devadatta, when someone splits the harmonious Community of Monks. He causes a dire bad

¹⁰ I have very high respect for all Mahāyāna monks who genuinely follow the discipline as it is described in their scriptures. The term “Mahāyāna” here does not refer to Mahāyāna monks of modern times. It refers to the historical community of monks, which is believed to have separated from the Buddha's original monastic community either already short time after the Buddha's Final Cessation (*parinibbāna*) during the First Buddhist Council by holding their own Buddhist council; or to those monks who separated later from the mainstream monastic community for views that were not in accordance with the conservative teachings of Vibhajjavāda (today known as Theravāda).

deed that bears results for a whole period of a lifespan. For a period of a whole lifespan (he) will be cooked in hell. However, Devadatta, if someone unites a split Community of Monks so they live in harmony, (he) makes a noble merit. For a whole lifespan (he) will rejoice in heaven.” (Tr. according to Pārājika Bhāsāṭikā vol. 4 of Ashin Janakābhivaṃsa, p. 303-304.)

The monks who accept money split the Community of Monks into two parts, the Community of Monks who do not accept money and the Community of Monks who accept money, and thus make a serious demerit. However, if monks who accept money forever abandon all money they own and give away all of the things that they bought with their money, if they make allowable the monasteries that they built and lands that they bought with help of monks who follow all Vinaya rules, by becoming monks who do not accept money, by becoming monks who follow all rules of Discipline, they thus unite the Community of Monks and thereby make an enormously huge merit.

(3) There is No Bigger Danger in the Monastic Discipline (Vinaya) than Accepting Money¹¹

Here, I am talking about the danger to the Buddha's Dispensation. It is surely clear from the explanations above. The monks who accept money split the Community of Monks even without realizing it. Even without realizing it, they corrupt the lay people by showing them that it is good to offer monks money; they are also an inspiration to their student monks and student novices by their accepting money - as they accept money, they also ask other monastics to accept them.

Accepting money is not like the other precepts, which cause danger only to oneself. Accepting money causes danger to the whole of Buddha's Dispensation. Accepting money and buying land, a monastic building, etc., the monks grow in unallowable possessions to such an extent that the monk who accepts money doesn't have to do anything at all, and just by being, he is breaking rule after rule (because he uses things and lives in places that were bought by monk's money). The monks who are related to this one who accepts money also unknowingly break rules.

When monks who accept money say that accepting money is "just a rule of abandoning"

¹¹ In this chapter I am repeating some of the main points that I have already stated in the previous chapters, because they are relevant to the chapter's heading, the leading statement of decision.

(*nissaggiya*), they are not afraid, they do not see the drawback. Then, because they accepted money, they split the Community of Monks. They do not see their fault when they cause suffering to the monks who are virtuous (*lajjī*) and cherish virtue (*pesalā*). They beat with a stick a monk that teaches others not to offer money to monks, and I even heard of a case when they hired a layman to kill a monk. The layman then killed a virtuous monk by stabbing him with a spear. Monks who follow rules, however, never ever harmed any monk, regardless of whether they followed rules or not.

When monks teach lay people that monks should not commit the serious offenses of *pārājika* or *saṅghādisesa*, the monks who have committed those offenses are never angry. They do not harm the monks who follow rules. They do not subpoena virtuous monks to monastic courts. When monks who follow the rules of Discipline teach that monks should not accept money, that laypeople should not give it in the hands of monks, either directly or in an envelope, or for medicine, or for transport, or for the monks' charitable intentions, that laypeople should only entrust money to an assistant (*kappiya*) and, explain what the money should be used for, also requesting the monk to ask if he needs anything to tell his assistant, the monks who accept money want to subpoena the virtuous monk to a monastic court, they want to gather and beat the monk who teaches Discipline, they threaten with murder, they complicate building of ordination halls for virtuous monks, they prohibit chief monks from accepting virtuous monks into their monasteries.

The offenses of *pārājika* and *saṅghādisesa* usually pose danger only to the monk who transgresses them. Accepting money, however, is more serious, because it causes danger to the whole Buddha's Dispensation. Monks who accept money should not ordain a new novice and they also should not ordain a new monk.

"Thaṅgehi samannāgatena bhikkhunā na upasampādetabbaṃ na nissayo dātabbo na sāmaṇero upaṭṭhāpetabbo – alajjī ca hoti, bālo ca, apakatatto ca"
(Vinaya Piṭaka Parivārapāli, p. 222).

"Monk ordination, a dependence (of a new monk on a senior monk), (and) taking care of a novice should not be done by monk who is complete in (one of these) three respects - he is shameless (*alajjī*), foolish, and breaking rules."

Accepting money is especially dangerous for a monk who carefully avoids sensual pleasures. The Buddha never taught any other such rule, of which breaking can inconspicuously lead to breaking other rules. Therefore, the Buddha said:

"Yassa kho, gāmaṇi, jātarūparajataṃ kappati, pañcapi tassa kāmaguṇā kappanti. Yassa pañca kāmaguṇā kappanti, ekaṃsenetaṃ, gāmaṇi, dhāreyyāsi asamaṇadhammo asakyaputtiyadhammo" **(Saṃyutta Nikāya, vol. 2, p. 509).**

"Village headman, the one who can accept money, can also enjoy the pleasures of the five senses. Remember, that the one who can enjoy the pleasures of the five senses, in reality, does not have the nature of a monk,

he does not have the nature of a Sakyan prince, who is a disciple of the Noble Buddha [the Buddha's Dhamma family]." (Tr. according to Myanmar Saṃyutta Nikāya Saḷāyatanavaggasaṃyuttapāḷi, PDF p. 331).

The Great Master Mahābodhimyaing said, "From the moment when a (new) monk leaves the ordination hall, he has not committed any offense and thus is as pure as an Arahant. Then...

- (a) The lay people who live in the forest spread their hair at the entrance to the ordination hall.¹²
- (b) The lay people who live in the city come right to the entrance to the ordination hall and make the monk accept money. In both of these customs:
 - (i) In case of treading over (ladies') hair, due to the rule of bodily contact (*kāyasamsagga sikkhāpada*) and has to deal with the offense of Saṅghādisesa.
 - (ii) In case of accepting money, due to the rule about money (*jātarūparajata sikkhāpada*), the monk has committed the offense that requires abandoning and confession (*nissaggiya pācittiya*).

¹² This is traditionally done in some monasteries, with the erroneous belief that the monk's treading over the (ladies') hair will make the ladies healthy and happy. However, if the monk does that knowingly and with lust, he transgresses a serious rule called Saṅghādisesa.

Both of those customs defile the new monk's pure mind and, therefore, should be reconsidered.

The Great Master Ashin Indācariya from Mahā Thwant-Tharyar Monastery (မဟာသွံသာရဏေျာင်း), said this:

“When monks accept money, they cannot do anything. They cannot eat the food that they would buy with the money. They cannot wear a robe they would buy. They cannot take medicine bought with that money. They cannot live in a monastery they would buy. It is an offense, it’s a transgression. This offense makes it impossible to attain *jhāna* (deep level of concentration). If he meditates, it blocks him from attaining Path and Fruition (Enlightenment). He can meditate only after he purifies that offense and makes himself free from all offenses. It is not possible to just end by saying “(monks) must not accept money.” When accepting money, (the monk) has committed an offense. That is true. Does he want to be pure, purify himself from the offense? For the one who strives ardently (because he) just wants to liberate himself from the Cycle of Rebirth (Saṃsāra) and attain *jhāna*, Path, and Fruition, it (the offense) is purified.”¹³

¹³ The Venerable Ashin Indācariya here points to the problem that if a monk accepts money once, it will be very difficult for them to stop it. A monk who once accepts money not only must relinquish the money and purify themselves by confessing to another monk, but he also must make the

The Great Master Ashin Abhayālaṅkāra from Hlegu Mahāvihāra Monastery quoted the late Great Master Lay-Boo, saying: “The Great Master Lay-Boo Sayadaw said that *saṅghādisesa* offense is only suffered by oneself. It does not cause suffering to others. As for the problem of money, it creates suffering in the whole Dispensation. It is not just an offense for oneself. It is an offense that makes the whole Dispensation [the whole Community of Monks] make offenses.

(4) All monks who accept money are destroyers of the Dispensation (Sāsana)

I believe I have not taught this statement using the word “all.” It would be appreciated if someone showed me evidence that I did so. Monks who accept money do not destroy the Dispensation at the moment they accept money. However, saying that it is alright to accept money, giving various excuses to accept money, and teaching one’s novices and monks to accept money, is indeed destroying the Dispensation. As I have already explained in the introduction, according to the Kimila Suttas, disrespecting the training is one of the ways how the Buddha’s Dispensation will disappear. Their disrespect means not following. For example, a monk teacher says this to his student: “Close the window.” The student will reply: “Yes, venerable sir.” However, he will not close the window. In that case, it is not acceptable at all. When one respects the training, they

genuine determination that he wants to live as a virtuous monk in order to achieve Enlightenment.

follow all the rules of Discipline even if it has to cost one's life. Otherwise, if one acts shamelessly, he destroys the Dispensation. I have explained the way how monks who accept money destroy the Dispensation in chapters 2 and 3.

When a monk dares to accept money, he does not have any reason to refrain from telling lies. When compared to accepting money, telling lies is a small offense. From a monk who accepts money, we can get only lies.

The first Sāsana leader of the Yadanapone-Mandalay, the Great Master Ashin Jeyya, eight venerable masters of the Sudhamma monastic lineage, and also the King Mindon who organized the Fifth Buddhist Council published an announcement where they listed the characteristics of a shameless monk, provided admonishment related to Dhamma and Vinaya (the Discipline), explained that a monk who accepts money makes the Dispensation disappear, and that nothing should be donated to such monks:

“In the case of the Dispensation (Sāsana), according to the Teachings of Discipline that is available, if monks do not train well, the Dispensation withers away. When a shameless (*alajjī*) monk does not train and follow according to the Dhamma, he makes a thousand monks become shameless and thus destroys the Dispensation. The behavior of such shameless (monks) who make the Dispensation wither away, namely searching for, keeping close, accepting, or storing gold, silver, things that should be abandoned

(*nissaggiyavatthu*) called *māsaka*, *kahāpaṇa*¹⁴ [i.e., any currency of money], (that is) the nature of a shameless (monk). ... This kind of disrespect towards the rules that can make one a shameless (monk) is neglecting the golden face of the omniscient Buddha. They search for a livelihood in dependence on gain and veneration from others, while the monk's appearance and clothes (robes) are the banners of noble Arahants, but the monk's behavior and manners are foolish, a thorn to the Dispensation. Those who befriend the shameless monks that destroy the Dispensation, support them, and donate to them, also destroy the Dispensation. Here is the royal order that the shameless monks who transgress into the shamelessness are banished from the golden capital city (Mandalay) and from every district, village, and town; the shameless monks must not be worshiped by the people, and the village and town chiefs prohibit, under the threat of punishment, to the villagers and citizens to support the shameless monks. If the people already worship the shameless monks and want to worship them, may the monks

¹⁴ *Māsaka* and *kahāpaṇa* are names of carriers of monetary value in the currency of the Buddha's time. Today no country uses *māsaka* and *kahāpaṇa* money, instead, we hear of Dollars, Euros, Rupees, etc. The fact that monks are prohibited to use *all* kinds of currency is clear from the scriptures because the explanations are very broad and include any kind of currency by listing currencies of various materials: "*kahāpaṇo, lohamāsako, dārumāsako, jatumāsako, ye vohāraṃ gacchanti*" - "kahāpaṇa, bronze māsaka, wooden māsaka, māsaka made of lac, any that are used" (**Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājika Pāli, p. 345**). See **Vinaya Piṭaka Aṭṭhakathā Pārājikakaṇḍa vol. 2, p. 268**; **Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikakaṇḍa vol. 2, p. 130** for further lists the various gems and valuable materials, such as gold, silver, pearls, jewels, etc., that monks must not even touch, let alone possess.

abandon their shamelessness, purify themselves from the transgression by the appropriate disciplinary procedure, and thereafter may people always worship and support them.” (Myanmar Era 1217 (1855 CE), the tenth day of the waxing Tabodway month; a declaration accepted (“heard”) and published by Minn-Htin Yarzar Thihathu. The complete version in the original Burmese language is here: <https://bit.ly/3mnpYl8>)

From the Commentarial literature we learn that monks who accept money are thieves:

“Tattha dussīlassa paribhogo theyyaparibhogo nāma. So hi cattāro paccaye thenetvā bhuñjati” (**Majjhimanikāya Aṭṭhakathā - Majjhimaṇṇāsa - 4. Rājavaggo - (86)6, Aṅgulimālasuttavaṇṇanā, MNA vol. 3, p. 236).**

“There the use of the four requisites [food, robes, dwelling place, medicine] by a (monk) of bad morals is using them by theft. Indeed, that person who breaks rules uses the four requisites by stealing them.” (Tr. according to Majjhimaṇṇāsa Aṭṭhakathā Nissaya, p. 228).

This is further explained in the **Subcommentary to Majjhima Nikāya (Majjhima Nikāya Tīkā, vol. 2, p. 159)**: “It is said that this (using the four requisites by monks of bad morals) is using them by theft because this use (of the four requisites) is using by the owner. In the Dispensation of the Noble Buddha, the four requisites are permitted to be used only by those who follow the rules of Discipline. They are not permitted to those who break the rules. Also, laypeople donate only to those who follow the rules of Discipline. Not to those who break the rules. They (the laypeople) donate for

their (the laypeople's) benefit, for their great merit. Therefore, because the Buddha did not permit using the four requisites for those monks who do not follow the rules, and also because lay people did not intend the four requisites for monks who break the rules, using the four requisites by monks who break the rules is using them by theft."

The Dhamma Master U Htay Hlaing in his "Yahantar Hnint Pogol Htoo Myar" (ရဟန္တာရိက္ခာနိဂ္ဂဟိတသုတ္တံ)

ပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ငယ်များ), p. 135, wrote this in relation to

accepting money by monks: "Although it is true they (the monks who accept money) wish the Dispensation to thrive, donation of money (to monks) is a big weapon that destroys the Dispensation. It is strictly prohibited in the teachings of Discipline. In the Mañicūḷaka Sutta of Saḷāyatanasaṃyuttapāḷi, the Buddha says: 'Monks must not search for money in any way. If money were permitted, the five sensual pleasures would also be permitted (or if money were permitted, a wife would also be permitted).¹⁵ If (a monk) accepts the five sensual pleasures, he is no more a monk.' In the (Buddha's) Dispensation of Myanmar, in the past, there was a heavy law that could even expel (the person from the capital city) if the ministers of the King Mindon era donated money to some monks. The monks dare to

¹⁵ The expression "five sensual pleasures" is commonly used in the Pāḷi text with the meaning of sexual intercourse. Because traditionally sexual intercourse is a matter of marriage, the Dhamma Master U Htay Hlaing suggests the Buddha here means that if money were permitted to monks, monks could then get married, as monks, and enjoy sexual pleasures with their wives.

break the rules. These monks had already forgotten that just because of accepting money, resulting in the Second Buddhist Council being held to take action against such monks. When the monk has all four requisites, what else may he need? The Buddha did not like when monks had an excess of the four requisites. In the Dispensation of the present day, both monks and laypeople should very carefully reconsider donating money, they should reconsider it well. The decision of the Buddha does not provide an opportunity for excuses, it does not allow a deceptive evasion, and it is all direct and straightforward. Therefore, it is suitable to heed the Disciplinary declarations ordered by the Buddha.

(5) Monks who accept money are not Theravāda, they are Mahāyāna

Here, I compare the respect towards Discipline between the monks of Theravāda Buddhism and those of Mahāyāna Buddhism. This is not related to the precision in reading the official decisions (*kammavācā*), inaugurating an ordination hall, or teaching Dhamma. From the point of monastic ordination, the monastic ordination of Theravāda monks cannot be compared to the ordination of Mahāyāna monks. Theravāda monks cannot become Mahāyāna monks even by breaking rules. The monks who accept money disrespect the Discipline and split the Community of Monks. Therefore, monks who follow the rules of Discipline cannot live in dependence on monks who accept money and attend Uposatha ceremony with them. Similarly, monks who

follow the rules of Discipline cannot live in dependence on Mahāyāna monks or attend the Uposatha with them.

Most importantly, the difference between Theravāda monks who accept money and monks of Mahāyāna is that if the Theravāda monks who accept money forever abandon all money, give away all of their possessions they bought by any monk's money, purify themselves by the appropriate confession to a monk who does not break this rule, and decide that they will follow all rules of Discipline uninterruptedly - on that very day, if they also dedicate themselves to insight meditation (*vipassanā*), can even become the noblest Arahants.

(6) Monks who accept money will fall into hell

The fact that monks who accept money will fall into hell is quite famously shared among the monks of the Pa Auk monastic lineage.

“Sāpattikassa, bhikkhave, nirayaṃ vā vadāmi tiracchānayoṇiṃ vā’ti” (Sāratthadīpanī Tīkā, vol. 3, p. 379).

“Monks, I say for a monk who has broken a rule (*sāpattiko*), there is either hell or an animal's womb.”

This statement in the Subcommentary presented as the Buddha's direct words is apparently a clarification for monks specifically, based on a more general statement of this kind included in Aṅguttara Nikāya Dukanipāta:

“Dussīlassa, bhikkhave, dve paṭiggāhā - nirayo vā tiracchānayani vā” (Aṅguttara Nikāya, vol. 1, p. 62).

“Monks, for one of broken morals (*dussīla*), there are only two destinations: hell or an animal’s womb.”

A monk who dares to break rules intentionally may be born in hell, as an animal, and, according to the **Vinītavatthu of Vinaya Piṭaka’s Pārājikakaṇḍa - Catutthapārājika**, also as a burning ghost:

“Idhāhaṃ, āvuso, gijjhakūṭā pabbatā orohanto addasaṃ bhikkhuṃ vehāsaṃ gacchantaṃ. Tassa saṅghāṭīpi ādittā sampajjalitā sajotibhūtā, pattopi āditto sampajjalito sajotibhūto, kāyabandhanampi ādittaṃ sampajjalitaṃ sajotibhūtaṃ, kāyopi āditto sampajjalito sajotibhūto. So sudaṃ aṭṭassaraṃ karoti.” ... atha kho bhagavā bhikkhū āmantesi - ... eso, bhikkhave, bhikkhu kassapassa sammāsambuddhassa pāvacane pāpabhikkhu ahoṣi. So tassa kammaṣṣa vipākena bahūni vassāni bahūni vassasatāni bahūni vassasahassāni bahūni vassasatasahassāni niraye paccitvā tasveva kammaṣṣa vipākāvasesena evarūpaṃ attabhāvappaṭilābhaṃ paṭisaṃvedeti” (Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikapāli, p. 144, 147).

“Friend, as I descended from the Gijjhakūṭa mountain, I saw a monk going in the air. That monk’s double robe was burning bright, it was ablaze everywhere, and it was shining. (His) alms bowl was also burning bright, ablaze everywhere, and shining. (His) belt was also burning bright, ablaze everywhere, and shining. (His) body was also burning bright, ablaze everywhere, and shining. That monk was making a sound of pain ... At that time, the Noble Buddha told this to the monks:

‘Monks, that monk was a monk of broken virtue (*pāpabhikkhu*) in the Dispensation of the Noble Buddha

Kassapa. That monk, as the consequence of his actions (*kamma*), fell into hell for many years, for many hundreds of years, for many thousands of years, for many hundreds of thousands of years, and by the residue of the consequences of his actions, he must suffer this existence." (Tr. according to Myanmar Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikapāḷi, pp. 148-149, 151).

The Commentaries to this text further explain:

"Pāpabhikkhūti lāmakabhikkhu. So kira lokassa saddhādeyye cattāro paccaye paribhuñjitvā kāyavacīdvārehi asaṃ yato bhinnājīvo cittakeliṃ kīlanto vicari. Tato ekaṃ buddhantaraṃ niraye paccitvā petaloke nibbattanto bhikkhusadiseneva attabhāvena nibbatti" (Pārājikakaṇḍa Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 2, p. 100).

"An evil monk (*pāpabhikkhu*) is a blameworthy monk (*lāmakabhikkhu*). This blameworthy monk used four requisites donated by various people (or people who believe in *kamma* and its result) without restraint in bodily actions and speech, had a broken (rotten) livelihood, and enjoyed whatever he wanted to enjoy. He was not restrained in his body and speech, did not live according to the Buddha's Teachings, and enjoyed the way he wanted. Then, after that life as a monk, for the whole time between two Buddhas, he was boiled in hell and finally reappeared in the world of ghosts with an appearance of a monk." (Tr. according to Pārājika Bhāsāṭīkā vol. 3 of Ashin Janakābhivaṃsa, p. 468-469, PDF p. 469-470).

There is one more explanation of the word *pāpabhikkhu*. (It is not correct to dismiss etymologies found in other passages of the Pāḷi text. For example,

the etymology for *satipaṭṭhāna* as *sati+upaṭṭhāna* is not provided in the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta, but it is still generally accepted).

*"Pārājikaṃ anāpanno icchācāre ṭhito
khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni madditvā vicaranto
'pāpabhikkhū'ti adhippeto" (Vinaya Piṭaka
Pārājikakaṇḍa Aṭṭhakathā, p. 75).*

“Without falling into the offense of *pārājika*, living according to (his) wishes, putting aside the small offenses (*khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni*) is the meaning of “evil monk (*pāpabhikkhu*).”

*“Kuso yathā duggahito, hatthamevānukantati;
sāmaññaṃ dupparāmaṭṭhaṃ, nirayāyupakaḍḍhati”
(Sāratthadīpanītikā, vol. 3, p. 79).*

“Grasping a (blade of) Cogon grass in a wrong way, (one’s) hand gets cut; when the monk’s life is taken in a wrong way, it drags (the monk) into hell”.

It will help to remind ourselves here of the Erakanāgarājavatthu of the Dhammapada Commentary. “A young monk ordained in the Dispensation of the Buddha Kassapa, based on the lifespan of people of that time, meditated for twenty thousand years. One day he was traveling by boat over the river Ganges and grasped a blade of Elephant grass. When the boat was departing, he did not release the grass, and, still holding it, he plucked a blade of it. A monk must not cut, chop, or break grass, trees, etc. If (he) cuts, chops, or breaks (it), he commits an offense. That monk thought of that transgressed rule as a small rule and did not confess it (to another monk who did not break that rule). When he was close to death, he remembered his offense and

tried to confess. However, there was no other monk nearby who could listen to the confession. The monk died sorrowfully: “My virtue is not pure.” After his death, the monk reappeared in the river Ganges as Erakapatta, the king of snakes, as large as a skiff (“Summarized Dhammapada Stories with Illustrations” (ပုံတော်စုံ ဓမ္မပဒ ဝတ္ထုတော်ကြီး အနှစ်ချုပ်) by U Aung Nyunt Win, p. 420, PDF p. 468).

Based on this Dhammapada story, Ledi Sayadaw explains: “The monks, nuns, nuns-in-training, male novices, and female novices of broken virtue (*dussīla*) who ordained in the Dispensation of the Noble Buddha Kassapa, reappeared on the Gijjhakūṭa Mountain as ghosts with the appearance of a monk, nun, nun-in-training, male novice, or female novice. They were unable to get free (from the ghost existence) even during the period of our Noble Buddha (Gotama). These stories are available in Nidānavaggaṇṇāṇi Lakkhaṇasaṃyutta, Vinaya Piṭaka Catutthapārājika ... When a monk intentionally transgresses the six kinds of rules (any rules except *pārājika*), due to the transgression, the shameless (*alajjī*) monk who did not purify (himself from the transgression), must deal with the transgression of the declared rule throughout the time until he purifies the offense. It is an obstacle on the way towards *jhāna* (a deep level of concentration), Path, and Fruition (Enlightenment). If he dies (without purification), rebirth in a world of suffering is sure” (“Dhammadīpanī” (ဓမ္မဒီပနီ) by Ledi Sayadaw, p. 105, PDF p. 117).

If monks accept money, if they also give permission to laypeople to donate money, they destroy

the laypeople as well as the Dispensation. The Dispensation is dependent upon the Discipline. If the Dispensation should stay for a long time, the monks will have to train themselves in the Discipline and teach laypeople how to donate allowable things according to the Discipline. If the monks do not teach laypeople how to donate allowable things according to the Discipline, if instead, the monks teach people how to support monks in breaking the rules, they all destroy the Dispensation. The Pāli texts explain that causing harm to the Dispensation will lead to rebirth in hell:

"Sakiṃ pītaṃ halāhalaṃ, uparundhati jīvitaṃ, sāsanena virujjhivā, kappakoṭimhi dayhati"
(Apadānapāli, vol. 1, p. 51, v. 582).

"A poison when drunk one time, it kills life just one time. When someone acts contrary to the Dispensation, (he) will burn (in hell) for ten million world-periods." (Tr. according to Myanmar Khuddakanikāya Therāpadānapāli, PDF p. 66).

In Kodhagaru Sutta of Aṅguttara Nikāya's Catukkanipāta, the Buddha explains that if someone is afraid to be a good person out of fear that his friends could become his enemies (just because this one has become a good person), the one who therefore remains to be an evil person may keep their friends during this life, but after death, this person will fall into hell. However, if one is courageous and acts according to Dhamma regardless of what others would say or do, he/she will reap a lot of benefits:

'Kodhagaru hoti na saddhammagaru, makkhagaru hoti na saddhammagaru, lābhagaru hoti na saddhammagaru, sakkāragaru hoti na saddhammagaru

– imehi kho, bhikkhave, catūhi dhammehi samannāgato
yathābhataṃ nikkhitto evaṃ niraye. ... saddhammagaru
hoti na kodhagaru, saddhammagaru hoti na
makkhagaru, saddhammagaru hoti na lābhagaru,
saddhammagaru hoti na sakkāragaru – imehi kho,
bhikkhave, catūhi dhammehi samannāgato
yathābhataṃ nikkhitto evaṃ sagge”ti (Aṅguttara
Nikāya, vol. 1, p.396).

“Paying attention to (other’s) anger but not paying
attention to (oneself) being a good person; paying
attention to (other’s) ingratitude but not paying
attention to (oneself) being a good person; paying
attention to (one’s) gain but not paying attention to
(oneself) being a good person;
paying attention to (other’s) veneration (of oneself) but
not paying attention to (oneself) being a good person.
Monks, someone complete with (any of these) four
things, as if carrying and then dropping, in the same way
(he) falls into hell.

...Paying attention to (oneself) being a good person
while not paying attention to (other’s anger); paying
attention to (oneself) being a good person while not
paying attention to (other’s) ingratitude; paying
attention to (oneself) being a good person while not
paying attention to (one’s) gain; paying attention to
(oneself) being a good person while not paying
attention to (other’s) veneration (of oneself). Monks,
someone complete with these four things, as if carrying
and then dropping, in the same way (he) goes to heaven
(said the Buddha).” (Tr. according to Myanmar
Aṅguttara Nikāya, vol. 1, pp. 410-411).

(7) Do the Laypeople Incur a Bad Deed (Demerit) if They Offer Money to Monks?

According to the Great Master Webu Sayadaw, when laypeople donate unallowable things to monks or if laypeople donate in a wrong way, they collect bad deeds (demerits). It is good to consider this attitude. In Parivārapāḷi, the Buddha says:

*“Pañcadānāni apuññāni puññasammatāni lokasmiṃ -
majjadānaṃ, samajjadānaṃ, atthidānaṃ,
usabhadānaṃ, cittakammadānaṃ” (Vinaya Piṭaka
Parivārapāḷi, p. 230).*

“Five kinds of donation are in the world known as a merit but (in fact) they are not a merit: donation of alcohol, donation of amusing performances, donation of a woman (sexual pleasures), donation of cattle, donation of pornographic pictures.” (Tr. according to Myanmar Parivārapāḷi, p. 353).

This list does not include a donation that would make a monk break a rule. There is an opinion that if we help another person do a bad deed, it (the help) is a bad deed for us too. According to the *Dutiyapārājika* and *Tatīyapārājika* subchapters of Vinaya Piṭaka’s Pārājikapāḷi, a monk could even fall into a major offense (*pārājika*) by helping another person in stealing, killing, or abortion. I asked about a thousand laypeople whether they knew monks were prohibited from accepting money. Eighty percent (80%) of them answered they knew it. People know they support monks in breaking the monks’ rules by giving them

money. In case of a merit, if we rejoice in another person's merit, the rejoicing itself is a merit, so called *pattānumodanā kusala*. If it is a bad deed when we rejoice in another's bad deed (*akusala*), then rejoicing in monks' breaking rules is certainly also a bad deed. According to the ancient scripture Peṭakopadesa:

"Yo ca akappiyassa paribhogena sīlavantesu deti, na tassa puññaṃ pavaḍḍhatīti so cetam dānaṃ akusalena deti" (**Peṭakopadesa, p. 325**).

"(A donor) gives an unallowable item to virtuous (monks). The donor will not accrue a merit, and he gives the donation as a demerit."

According to Majjhima Nikāya's Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅga Sutta, donating to someone of broken virtue will bring about a 1000-fold benefit (or, according to the associated Commentary, long lifespan, beauty, pleasure, power, and intelligence for the next 1000 lives):

"Puthujjanadussile dānaṃ datvā sahaṣṣaguṇā dakkhiṇā pāṭikaṅkhitabbā. ... sotāpattiphalasacchikiriyāya paṭipanne dānaṃ datvā asaṅkheyyā appameyyā dakkhiṇā pāṭikaṅkhitabbā" (**Majjhima Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 3, p. 298**).

"Donating a donation to a worldling (non-Enlightened person) of broken virtue, the benefit of that donation is 1000 times more (or 1000 lives of long lifespan, beauty, pleasure, power, and intelligence) ... Donation to a person who trains to attain the Fruition of Stream-Entry (the first level of Enlightenment) the benefit is

uncountable, incomparable." (Tr. according to Myanmar Majjhima Nikāya Uparipaṇṇāsapāli, p. 285).

It is not clear from this Dhamma teaching whether donating a donation to a person of broken virtue in order that they continue (or start to) break a rule of Discipline will also result in a 1000-fold benefit (or a 1000 lives of abundant lifespan, beauty, pleasure, power, and intelligence). Because it is a bad deed which brings the consequence of suffering, not pleasure, to support another person in a bad deed, the 1000-fold benefit mentioned in the Buddha's discourse is coming only for those, who donate in order to *discourage* the other person from a misdeed, such as donating a meal to a poor man who was just going to steal, so that he does not have a reason to steal anymore.

Donating money to monks is not only giving them a ticket to hell but also blocking them from birth as a human, a god (deity), or even the attainment of Nibbāna. If monks intentionally break a rule, until they purify themselves from it, they are in danger of being born in a world of suffering upon their death, and, moreover, they cannot achieve Enlightenment:

*"Sattapi āpattiyo sañcicca vītikkantā
saggantarāyañceva mokkhantarāyañca karontīti
antarāyikā" (Vinaya Piṭaka Parivārapāli, p. 157).*

"If a (monk) intentionally transgresses any of the 7 classes of rules, they block themselves from (next) life as a human, as a god (deity); they also block themselves from Nibbāna (Enlightenment)." (Tr. according to Parivāra Bhāsāṭikā of Ashin Janakābhivamsa, p. 50, PDF p. 51).

If a monk who accepts money abandons money forever, discards all things that were bought by a monk's money, and confesses to purify the offense, the monk can strive to achieve Enlightenment, liberation from all birth, old age, illness, and death. In such a case, donating to this monk will undeniably bring not only 1000-fold benefit, but innumerable, incomparable.

(8) Solutions and Suggestions for Monks Who Accept Money

It is good to be grateful to the Buddha. Those, who are grateful, are wise:

“Ye ca tassa ovāde patit̐thitā aveccappasādena samannāgatā honti, kenaci asaṃhāriyā tesam sambhatti samaṇena vā brāhmaṇena vā devena vā mārena vā brahmunā vā. Tathā hi te attano jīvitapariccāgepi tattha pasādaṃ na pariccajanti, tassa vā āṇaṃ daḷhabhattibhāvato. Tenevāha – “Yo ve kataññū katavedi dhīro; kalyāṇamitto daḷhabhatti ca hotī”ti. (Jātakapāḷi vol. 2, p. 10, v. 78); “Seyyathāpi, bhikkhave, mahāsamuddo t̐hitadhammo velaṃ nātivattati; evameva kho, bhikkhave, yaṃ mayā sāvakānaṃ sikkhāpadaṃ paññattaṃ, taṃ mama sāvakā jīvitahetupi nātikkamantī”ti” (Aṅguttara Nikāya vol. 3, p. 41; Udānapāḷi, p. 45; Vinaya Piṭaka Cūḷavaggapāḷi, p. 385; Itivuttaka Aṭṭhakathā p. 9).

“When a god (deity) or a human is established in the Teachings of the Virtuous Lord Buddha, they are endowed with unshakable faith, the devotion of those

beings (towards the Buddha) cannot be hindered by a monk, a Brahmin, a god (deity), a Māra, or a Brahma. Also, just because of that (their unshakable faith), they do not abandon their faith in the Lord Buddha even if they would have to abandon their own life. They also do not transgress the Noble Buddha's commandment.

Why? Because of (their) firm devotion. ... Indeed, if a wise person acknowledges another one's (the Buddha's) beneficence [i.e., if a wise person is grateful] and makes another person's (the Buddha's) beneficence known [i.e., expresses his/her thanks], they are (thus) devoted to a good person. ... Monks, like the great ocean of stable nature does not exceed its boundary, when I, the Buddha, establish a rule of training for the disciples, my disciples will not transgress that rule even to preserve their life." (Tr. according to Myanmar Itivuttaka Aṭṭhakathā Nissaya, vol. 1, pp. 23-25).

First of all, monks who have the habit of breaking the rules of Discipline should not make excuses. In fact, if a monk makes excuses to another monk (be he of younger or older seniority), this monk commits an offense. If this monk makes a lot of excuses, even in front of a Community of Monks, they may incur a serious offense of Saṅghādisesa no. 12. Therefore, monks should never make excuses. Monks, however, can ask for suggestions and advice on how to follow the rules of Discipline.

A monk who now has any money should abandon them all today itself. It is not in accordance with the Buddha's Teachings to give that money to a layperson. The monk should gather the Community of Monks in their monastery and abandon all the money in

the midst of the monks in accordance with the Rūpiyasikkhāpada of Vinaya Piṭaka's Pārājikapāḷi. Now, it is not correct to abandon the money to a layperson and suppose that it is not possible to gather the Community of Monks. In that case, the monk who has money should throw away all the money outside the monastery. After throwing them away, he should not take them back. He also should not tell anyone where did he throw the money away. Although the monk would not follow the Buddha's exact instructions this way, this procedure does not contradict the Buddha's decision. If a monk gives money to laypeople, he will break yet another rule. Only after all of the monk's money is entirely and forever abandoned will the confession of the transgression result in purification. Some monks abandon their money inside their rooms and then make a confession. That is not possible - the money must be thrown away outside the monastery. Moreover, the Buddha has decided that as the monk throws the money away, he should not look to see where the money fell.

“Saṅghamajjhe nissajjitabbam. Evañca pana, bhikkhave, nissajjitabbam – tena bhikkhunā saṅgham upasaṅkamitvā ekaṃsaṃ uttarāsaṅgaṃ karitvā vuḍḍhānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ pāde vanditvā ukkuṭikaṃ nisīditvā añjaliṃ paggaḥetvā evamassa vacaṇīyo – “Ahaṃ, bhante, rūpiyaṃ paṭiggahesiṃ. Idaṃ me nissaggiyaṃ. Imāhaṃ saṅghassa nissajjāmī”ti. Nissajjitvā āpatti desetabbā. Byattena bhikkhunā paṭibalena āpatti paṭiggahetabbā. Sace tattha āgacchatī ārāmiko vā upāsako vā so vattabbo – “Āvuso, imaṃ jānāhī”ti. Sace so Bbhaṇati – “Iminā kiṃ

āhariyyatū”ti, na vattabbo – “Imaṃ vā imaṃ vā āharā”ti. Kappiyaṃ ācikkhitabbam – sappi vā telam vā madhu vā phāṇitam vā. Sace so tena parivattetvā kappiyaṃ āharati rūpiyappaṭiggāhakaṃ ṭhapetvā sabbeheva paribhuñjitabbam. Evañcetam labhetha, iccetam kusalam; no ce labhetha, so vattabbo – “Āvuso, imaṃ chaḍḍehi”ti. Sace so chaḍḍeti, iccetam kusalam; no ce chaḍḍeti, pañcahaṅgehi samannāgato bhikkhu rūpiyachaḍḍako sammannitabbo – yo na chandāgatiṃ gaccheyya, na dosāgatiṃ gaccheyya, na mohāgatiṃ gaccheyya, na bhayāgatiṃ gaccheyya, chaḍḍitāchaḍḍitañca jāneyya. Evañca pana, bhikkhave, sammannitabbo. Paṭhamam bhikkhu yācitabbo. Yācitvā byattena bhikkhunā paṭibalena saṅgho ñāpetabbo –

“Suṇātu me, bhante, saṅgho. Yadi saṅghassa pattakallam, saṅgho itthannāmam bhikkhum rūpiyachaḍḍakam sammanneyya. Esā ñatti.

“Suṇātu me, bhante, saṅgho. Saṅgho itthannāmam bhikkhum rūpiyachaḍḍakam sammannati. Yassāyasmato khamati itthannāmassa bhikkhuno rūpiyachaḍḍakassa sammuti, so tuṇhassa; yassa nakkhamati, so bhāseyya.

“Sammato saṅghena itthannāmo bhikkhu rūpiyachaḍḍako. Khamati saṅghassa, tasmā tuṇhī, evametaṃ dhārayāmi”ti (Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikapāli, p. 346).

“(The money) must be abandoned in the midst of the Monastic Community. Monks, it should be abandoned this way. The monk who previously received (the money) will approach the Community of Monks, properly arrange (his) upper robe on his left shoulder,

worship the elder monks at their feet, squat, raise his folded hands, and say: 'Venerable sirs, I accepted money. This abandoning of my money is an official act of Discipline. I abandon this money to the Community of Monks.' After abandoning (the money), he confesses the offense (by *āpattidesanā*). A knowledgeable, competent monk has to accept the confession. Indeed, if a monastery helper or a layperson comes to that place, he should be told: 'Friend, are you aware of this (money)?' If he says, 'Where should I take this money?', he should not be told, 'Take them to such and such a place.' He should be asked for butter, honey, ghee, or another allowable item. Indeed, if he buys the allowable item and brings it, all monks except the one who accepted the money can use that.

Indeed, it is good if such a person (who will buy an allowable item for the money) is available. If (such a person) is not available, a layperson should be told: 'Layperson, throw away this money.' If the person indeed throws it away, that throwing away is good. However, if (the money) is not thrown away (this way), it is necessary to determine a monk complete in five qualities who will throw the money away. That monk must not act in accordance with desire, (he) must not act in accordance with anger, (he) must not act in accordance with delusion, (he) must not act in accordance with fear, (he) must know what is 'thrown away' and what is 'not thrown away.' Monks, (the monk who will throw the money away) should be determined this way: First, the monk must be requested. After requesting, a knowledgeable, competent monk must announce (this) to the Community of Monks:

“Venerable sirs, may the Community of Monks listen to what I say. If this is a suitable time for an official act, may the Community of Monks determine the monk of this name as the monk who will throw away money. This is the announcement.

Venerable sirs, may the Community of Monks listen to what I say. The Community of Monks determines the monk of this name as the monk who will throw away money. If a venerable sir is pleased with determining the monk of this name as the monk who will throw away money, that monk should be silent. If a venerable sir is not pleased, may he speak. The Community of Monks has determined the monk of this name as the monk who will throw away money. The Community of Monks is pleased, hence (all) are silent. Because (the Community of Monks) is thus silent, (I) should consider this as (their) being pleased.’ A monk thus determined will not select any (particular) place, (he) will throw away the money. Indeed, if (he) selects a place and throws there (the money), he incurs the offense of *dukkaṭṭhā*.” (Tr. according to Myanmar Pārājikapāḷi, pp. 393-394, PDF pp. 365-366).

If it is all done correctly, the Monastic Community should be gathered, the money should be abandoned in their midst, and the monk who accepted money will confess the transgression. After the confession, a monk who follows all rules of Discipline will take the money, go outside the monastery, and, without looking where the money falls, he throws them away. After the money is thrown away, he returns to the gathering of monks and informs them that it is

done. This would be in accordance with the Buddha's wish. However, if, after abandoning the money in the midst of the Monastic Community, there is a layperson nearby who asks what should he do with the money, the monks can ask him for allowable items such as honey. However, doing this could be an additional problem: the item received this way must never be used by the monk who accepted (and then abandoned) the money; only the other monks can use it. It is also impossible to expect a layperson to come and ask appropriately. It is also impossible to expect the monks to ask the layperson for allowable items appropriately. And finally, it is also not possible to expect that the allowable item bought and brought by the layperson will not be used by the monk who accepted (and abandoned) the money. Therefore, in order that the abandoning really happens, in order that a shameless monk truly becomes a virtuous monk, in order that there are no additionally incurred offenses, and in order that there are no confusions, the monk who accepted money abandons them all in the midst of the Monastic Community and the Community will then select a virtuous monk who will go outside the monastery and throw the money away. The selected monk will then throw the money away outside the monastery, without looking where the money fell, and then return to inform the Community that it is done. This procedure could take about 5 minutes if done by experienced monks. Without any additional complications, all monks can live happily in accordance with the Buddha's commandments.

The chief monk Great Master U Vīriya asked for and requested disciplinary decision, in the Book of

Questions (မေးမြန်းခြင်းတို့), in 1340 ME (1979 AC), on the 3rd day of waning moon Tawthalin, in Htaway City, Jeyyavatī (Zeyyawaddy) Monastery, in the Dhamma hall:

“In the modern times monks themselves accept money, build buildings such as monastic buildings, and then live there. In order to build a monastic building, bricks, cement, wood, metal, etc., are bought with the money owned by monks. If those things (materials and monastic buildings) are abandoned for the laymen and laywomen, and those things are then used to build monastic buildings, and monks live there, will those monks be free from offenses or not? Is it necessary that the venerable sir please instruct (us)?”

The Great Master Shwehinthar Ashin Paṇḍita Thera then, in the Shwehinthar Monastery of Sagaing Hills, in 1340 ME (1979 AC, on the 15th day of waning moon Tawthalin, explained:

“After a monk accepts money, the things that were bought by that money need to be abandoned for the Monastic Community, and the monk must confess the offense (*āpattidesanā*) in the midst of the Community. After abandoning the item (purchased with a monk’s money) and confessing the offense, the monk is free from the offense that requires abandoning (*nissaggiya āpatti*). With regards to using or not using the (purchased) item, remember this: if a layperson takes the item that should be abandoned, makes it his own property, and then donates an allowable item to the Community of Monks, it is alright to use it by the monk as well as the five kinds of his co-residents (monks, nuns, nuns-in-training, male novices, and

female novices). That is the decision of the Commentaries.

*“Yo pana rūpiyaṃ uggaṇhitvā tena pattaṃ kiṇāti,
ayampi patto akappiyo. Pañcannampi
sahadhammikānaṃ na kappatī”ti mahāpaccariṭaṃ
vuttaṃ. Sakkā pana kappiyo kātuṃ, so hi mūle
mūlasāmikānaṃ patte ca pattasāmikānaṃ dinne
kappiyo hoti. Kappiyabhaṇḍaṃ datvā gahetvā
paribhuñjitum vaṭṭati” (Rupiyasikkhāpadavaṇṇanā
Pārājikakaṇḍa Aṭṭhakathā, p. 277).*

“If a monk accepts money and then buys an alms bowl with that money. That alms bowl is also an unallowable alms bowl. It is also not allowed to be used by the five kinds of (his) co-residents.” This is said by the Mahāpaccariya Commentary. It is, however, possible to make it allowable. To explain, if the monk returns the money for the alms bowl to the original owner [the money donor], the alms bowl to the original owner [the seller of the alms bowl], it is allowable. If the laypeople donate the allowable item, it is indeed allowed to accept and use it.”

This explanation of the Commentary is further explained in the Sāratthadīpanī Subcommentary:

*“Na sakkā kenaci upāyena kappiyo kātunti idaṃ
pañcannaṃyeva sahadhammikānaṃ antare
parivattanaṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ, gihīhi pana gahetvā
attano santakaṃ katvā dinnaṃ sabbesaṃ kappatīti
vadanti” (Rūpiya Saṃvohārasikkhāpadavaṇṇanā,
Sāratthadīpanīṭikā, p. 423).*

“(With regards to the explanation related to the second alms bowl of *pattacattukka* case), the statement of the

Commentarial masters '*na sakkā kenaci upāyena kappiyo kātum*' [it is not possible to make (the purchased item) allowable in any way], they mean this only in case if (a monk) exchange (this alms bowl) for something else with any of his five co-residents. Nevertheless, if laypeople and donors take the item, make it their own possession, and then donate an allowable item to the Community of Monks, it is allowable for the five kinds of co-residents, including the monk who (previously) accepted the money."

The venerable sir who wrote the Subcommentary further explains in this *Sāratthadīpanī* *Ṭīkā* that if someone asked why did the Commentaries say '*na sakkā kenaci upāyena kappiyo kātum*', (we should understand that) a monk who accepted money and did not abandon the money, if he purchased an item by the money, even if the item would be allowable (if it were not bought by money), it would not be possible for the Community of Monks to use this item when abandoned in the midst of the Community.

On page 266 of *Vajirabuddhiṭīkā*, it is said that the Commentarial masters said, '*mūle mūlasāmikānaṃ ...*' [(return) the money to the original owners (money donors) ...] is a Disciplinary solution (*vinaya pariyāya*). It is not abandoning it all because it would all be unsuitable - if laypeople make it their own possession and then donate an allowable item, all monks can accept it and use it, it is allowable. So explains the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭīkā*.

Based on the text from Commentaries and Subcommentaries mentioned above, we should say that it is correct that when a monk accepts money himself,

and himself buys items such as (materials of) wood, metal, etc., if laypeople make it their own possession and give an allowable item to the Community of Monks, the five kinds of co-residents can use it. It is necessary to provide an additional disciplinary decision: the Commentaries and Subcommentaries only say this is possible. Those instructions are not given in order to encourage (monks) to accept money themselves and then follow these instructions.

“Sace pana rūpiyaṃ asampaṭicchitvā ‘therassa pattam kiṇitvā dehī’ti pahitakappiyakārakena saddhiṃ kammārakulaṃ gantvā pattam disvā ‘ayaṃ mayhaṃ ruccatī’ti vā ‘imāhaṃ gahetvāmī’ti vā vadati, kappiyakārako ca taṃ rūpiyaṃ datvā kammāraṃ saññāpeti, ayaṃ patto sabbakappiyo, buddhānampi paribhogāraho”ti (Pārājikakaṇḍa Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 2, p. 278).

“However, if (the monk) does not accept money (and says) ‘buy and give an alms bowl to the elder monk [i.e., me],’ (the monk) then goes together with the sent assistant (kappiya) to a workshop, sees an alms bowl and says ‘I like this’ or ‘I will take this,’¹⁶ the assistant

¹⁶ Note here that the monk orders the kappiya, saying “buy and give an alms bowl” but later speaks only about his wish, without ordering the kappiya. To avoid misunderstandings and uncomfortable situation, it is always better if monks do not directly give orders to their kappiyas, such as “buy this for me,” “give this to me,” “bring me this.” Monks may like to indicate what *they* (the monks) need or want by talking about themselves (“I want [this],” “I like [this],” “I need [this]”). In some cases, the kappiya may already own the desired thing and also would like to donate it to a monk without buying it at all. If the monk ordered such kappiya to *buy* the thing, it could

(kappiya) then gives the money (to the seller) and indicates (the alms bowl) to the worker (there), this alms bowl is (then) totally allowable, it is suitable for use even to the Buddhas.”

- either following this way; or also according to this instruction: “*Santi bhikkhave manussā saddhā pasannā, te kappiyakāraṇānaṃ hatte hiraññaṃ upanikkhipanti, iminā ayyassa yaṃ kappiyaṃ, taṃ dethāti, anujānāmi bhikkhave yaṃ tato kappiyaṃ, taṃ sādītum*” (Vinaya Piṭaka Mahāvagga - **Besajjakkhanda**). The Community of Monks as well as the donors will be very beneficent (to each other), and their growth of merit will be good and noble. With a blameless, pure, and noble manner, may (you) follow and train according to this way.

There is the idea that monks who accept money and buy something should abandon those things at their four requisites donors. However, here we need to be careful. If a monk gives laypeople something he owns, he becomes a destroyer of families (*kuladūsaka*). It is not alright. If it is done this way, there will be additional problems. It is alright if the item purchased with a monk’s money is abandoned for someone who cleans in the monastery or does another monastery work (as a monastery worker) and is at the same time the monk’s four requisites donor. How should this be done if a person who works in the monastery and is also a four requisites donor is not available? It is possible to ask one’s four requisites donors who are not monastery workers to do some work in the monastery. That way,

be an awkward situation or simply hindering the kappiya from an opportunity to donate.

they become a kind of a monastery worker, and therefore it is suitable to abandon the unallowable things to them.¹⁷ Because they are four requisites donors, after abandoning those items to them, it is easy to request them those things back, thus making those items allowable. If this is also not possible to do, it is very suitable to permanently throw away those unallowable things and neither buy anything with money nor accept anything that was bought by another monk ever in the future.

Some monks who accept money do not dare to throw away their money. Or they do not dare to destroy the things that a monk bought with money. If they do not dare to throw it away, other monks should come and help. When monks own unallowable things, those unallowable things should be destroyed by other monks who follow all rules of Discipline. If they destroy them, it is good. In fact, even if the monk who owns these unallowable things does not agree that they are destroyed, the monk who would destroy them anyway has not done anything wrong. So says the Commentary to Dhaniyavatthu of Pārājikakaṇḍa Aṭṭhakathā:

“Yo bhikkhu bahussuto vinayaññū aññaṃ bhikkhuṃ akappiyaṃ parikkhāraṃ gahetvā vicarantaṃ disvā taṃ chindāpeyya vā bhindāpeyya vā anupavajjo, so neva codetabbo na sāretabbo; na taṃ labbhā vattuṃ” “Mama

¹⁷ I was not able to find a Pāli reference that specifically allows monks to give four requisites to monastery workers. However, we need to assume that it is alright based on the relevant scriptural anecdotes such as the case of Migalaṇḍika Samaṇakuttaka of **Tatīyapārājika in Pārājikapāli**, who was offered robes and alms bowls by the monks in the monastery.

parikkhāro tayā nāsito, taṃ me dehī'ti (Vinaya Piṭaka
Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 1, p. 251).

“If a certain monk, who is very knowledgeable and knows the Discipline, sees a monk using an unallowable accessory and then destroys or breaks it, that monk (who destroyed the unallowable accessory) is not a blameworthy monk, he should not be criticized, he should not be found guilty of a fault. It is also not possible to tell that monk (who destroyed the unallowable property): “You have destroyed my accessory. Give me either (another such) accessory or its value.” (Tr. according to Pārājika Bhāsāṭikā of Ashin Janakābhivaṃsa, vol. 1, p. 502-503).

When monks are invited to a Dhamma discourse or for a meal (as a Community of Monks), they should not accept the donated money with their hands. If there is an assistant, laypeople can entrust the money to the assistant and request the monks to ask their assistant for what the laypeople want to donate (e.g., food, robes, dwelling place, medicine). The manner of doing this is explained in the Rājasikkhāpada of Vinaya Piṭaka:

*“Bhikkhuṃ paneva uddissa rājā vā rājabhoggo vā
brāhmaṇo vā gahapatiko vā dūtena cīvaracetāpannaṃ
pahiṇeyya – ‘Iminā cīvaracetāpannena cīvaraṃ
cetāpetvā itthannāmaṃ bhikkhuṃ cīvarenaS
acchādehī'ti. So ce dūto taṃ bhikkhuṃ upasaṅkamitvā
evaṃ vadeyya – ‘Idaṃ kho, bhante, āyasmantaṃ
uddissa cīvaracetāpannaṃ ābhaṭaṃ, paṭiggaṇhātu
āyasmā cīvaracetāpanna'nti, tena bhikkhunā so dūto
evamassa vacanīyo – ‘Na kho mayaṃ, āvuso,
cīvaracetāpannaṃ paṭiggaṇhāma. Cīvarañca kho*

*mayam paṭiggaṇhāma, kālena kappiya'nti. So ce dūto
 tam bhikkhum evam vadeyya – 'Atthi panāyasmato koci
 veyyāvaccakaro'ti, cīvaratthikena, bhikkhave, bhikkhunā
 veyyāvaccakaro niddisitaḥ ārāmiko vā upāsako vā –
 'Eso kho, āvuso, bhikkhūnam veyyāvaccakaro'ti. So ce
 dūto tam veyyāvaccakaram saññāpetvā tam bhikkhum
 upasaṅkamitvā evam vadeyya – 'Yam kho, bhante,
 āyasmā veyyāvaccakaram niddisi saññatto so mayā,
 upasaṅkamatu āyasmā kālena, cīvarena tam
 acchādessatī'ti, cīvaratthikena, bhikkhave, bhikkhunā
 veyyāvaccakaro upasaṅkamitvā dvattikkhattum
 codetaḥ sāretaḥ – 'Attho me, āvuso, cīvarena'ti.
 Dvattikkhattum codayamāno sārāyamāno tam cīvaram
 abhinipphādeyya, iccetaḥ kusalam; no ce
 abhinipphādeyya, catukkhattum pañcakkhattum
 chakkhattuparamam tuṇhībhūtena uddissa ṭhātabbam.
 Catukkhattum pañcakkhattum chakkhattuparamam
 tuṇhībhūto uddissa tiṭṭhamāno tam cīvaram
 abhinipphādeyya, iccetaḥ kusalam; tato ce uttari
 vāyamamāno tam cīvara abhinipphādeyya, nissaggiyam
 pācittiyam. No ce abhinipphādeyya, yatassa
 cīvaracetāpannam ābhatam, tattha sāmam vā
 gantabbam dūto vā pāhetabbo – 'Yam kho tumhe
 āyasmanto bhikkhum uddissa cīvaracetāpannam
 paṇiṇittha, na tam tassa bhikkhuno kiñci attham
 anubhoti, yuñjantāyasmanto sakam, mā vo sakam
 vinassā'ti, ayam tattha sāmīcī'ti (Vinaya Piṭaka
 Pārājikapāli, p. 325).*

“A king, a person made rich by the king, a
 Brahmin, or a householder sends a messenger (to a
 monk), saying: ‘Buy a robe of this value and then dress a
 monk (with it)’ and send a value of a robe with them.
 Indeed, the messenger approaches the monk and says:

Venerable sir, I have brought the value of a robe. Accept the value of a robe.’ The monk should tell the messenger: ‘Donor, we do not accept the value of a robe. We accept only an allowable robe at a suitable time.’ Indeed, the messenger tells the monk: “Venerable sir, do you have someone who takes care of your larger and smaller tasks?” Monks, a monk who is in need of a robe should point (the messenger) to a monastery helper, a layperson, or a donor who takes care of larger and smaller tasks of monks: “Donor, this person takes care of monks’ larger and smaller tasks.” When the messenger informs the person who takes care of larger and smaller tasks of monks, he approaches the monk and says: “Venerable sir, I have informed the person that you pointed (to me) who takes care of larger and smaller tasks. Venerable sir, approach (him) at a suitable time, and (he) will dress you in a robe.” Monks, a monk who is in need of a robe will approach the person who takes care of greater and smaller tasks and requests and remind two or three times: ‘Donor, I need a robe.’ If (the person) does fulfill the (task of) robe even after two or three times of requesting and reminding, it is good. If he does not fulfill it, four, five, up to six times (the monk) must (come to the person) and silently stand for the purpose. If after four, five, or up to six times silently standing for the purpose (the person) fulfills the robe, that fulfillment is good. However, if (the monk) endeavors more than (two times, three times requesting, reminding; four times, five times, six times standing) and the robe is fulfilled, (the monk) has committed an offense of abandoning and confessing (*nissaggiya pācittiya*). Indeed, if it is not fulfilled (after two times,

three times requesting, reminding; four times, five times, six times standing), (the monk) must either go himself or send a messenger to the original donors of the value of the robe (with the message): ‘Donors, the value of robe that you sent and intended for the monk was not experienced by the monk in any way. Donors request your wealth (back); may your wealth not get destroyed.’ This is the way (monks) should train in case a value of robe is sent (to monks).” (Tr. according to Myanmar Pārājikapāḷi, pp. 343-344, PDF pp. 371-372).

When laypeople have entrusted money to an assistant and request the monk to ask the kappiya for whatever the laypeople intend to donate, the monk can then tell the kappiya whenever it is suitable. If there is no kappiya, the monk should give the phone number of a layperson that is well known to the monk, and those donors will then make the layperson a kappiya. If the donor does not want to call by phone to the layperson and says he/she wants to donate right now, the monk should explain the Discipline to the donor:

“Monks do not accept money. If monks accept money, they will not live in accordance with the Buddha’s decision. If monks do not live in accordance with the Buddha’s decision, the monks will be born in worlds of suffering and the laypeople who supported monks in breaking the rules of Discipline will collect demerit. Therefore, donor, support monks in following their rules of Discipline.”

If a monk travels, it is possible to travel on foot like the Buddha and the Arahants. If laypeople invite the monk to go by a car, bus, etc., or donate a ticket to a bus or another means of transport, or if a bus-driver or

another responsible person gives the monk permission, the monk can use them. (However, a healthy monk cannot go by vehicles dragged or pushed by cows, horses, humans, or other living beings. An ill monk can.) Monks should not expect that they can travel by a car or a bus. If there is no donor, monks should be ready to go on foot or not go at all. Monks should be equanimous towards the eight vicissitudes of the world (*aṭṭhalokadhammā*).¹⁸ Similarly, the electricity bill, books, accessories, land, monastic buildings, food and drinks, requisites, and furniture, etc., should be accepted only when laypeople want to donate them. If there are no four requisites donors nearby, monks should accept the situation, equanimous towards the eight worldly vicissitudes.

It is necessary to officially announce the strict prohibition of using money to one's students - novices and monks.

The Dispensation needs to be spread especially by following the Discipline: "*Vinayo nāma buddhasāsanassa āyu.*" (**Dīgha Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 1, p. 12**). Whether monks study the scriptures (*pariyatti*), or whether they have already finished studying, intentional transgressing of the Discipline is like counting another's cows:

"Bahumpi ce saṃhita bhāsamāno, na takkaro hoti naro pamatto, gopova gāvo gaṇayaṃ paresaṃ, na bhāgavā sāmāññaṃ hoti" (**Dhammapada 19**).

¹⁸ Gain, loss, pleasure, suffering, praise, blame, fame, and disregard.

"A cowboy who counts the cows of a cow owner cannot enjoy the taste of the cow milk; similarly, (a monk) who teaches a lot the Buddha's word of the Three Piṭakas that leads towards Nibbāna but does not train himself, lives without mindfulness, is not a person who does what he should do, he shall not enjoy the taste of Nibbāna." (Tr. according to Myanmar Dhammapadapāḷi, PDF p. 16).

Unlike in the era of the Tipiṭaka Mingun Sayadaw, in the modern times there are many monastic educational centers (monasteries where monks and novices memorize the Pāḷi scriptures) where it is possible to follow all rules of the Discipline, without ever accepting money in any way, and study the Pāḷi scriptures with complete support. I have made the list of such monasteries in Myanmar here -

<https://bit.ly/43hV26O>

In Myanmar it is also possible for monks who live in a monastery where monks accept money to move to a monastery where monks do not accept money. The organization of "Theravāda Sāsanānuggaha Dhamma Friends" (ထေရဝါဒ သာသနာနုဂ္ဂဟ ဓမ္မမိတ်ဆွေမျှး)

organizes and provides such transport for monks who live in Myanmar: (1) U Khin Maung Wai (09250367414), (2) U Myint Hswe (09794493639), (3) U Myoe Hein Zaw (09250077075), (4) U Khin Zaw (09796076550), (5) U San Hsaung (09425309478), and (6) U Winn Kyaw (09403701212).

Also, it is now possible for monks who live in Myanmar to easily go buy a bus. In Myanmar, the

monks and novices who follow the rules of Discipline can receive bus tickets for free from the “Light-House Yānadāna Group” (အလင်းအိမ် ယာနဒါနအဖွဲ့): (1)

095157562, (2) 095101509, (3) 09795524496, (4) 09765033791, (5) 09250296381.

If monks need books, robes, bus tickets, and such allowable things but they do not have a four requisites donor, the ancient masters have instructed thus: The monk in the morning properly dresses his robe, takes his alms bowl, and goes into the village on alms-round. While on the alms-round, at a house where the monk arrives, he should refuse the donation if the people approach him to donate rice. He places his hand on the alms bowl and, not accepting the donated food, he should wait. The laypeople then will ask: “Venerable sir, what do you need?” By this particular sentence, the laypeople become the monk’s four requisites donors, and thereby the monk can ask them whatever he needs.

Some great masters instruct this for those who need to go by bus: “A monk wants to go by bus. He does not accept money. He can tell the driver: “Donor, monks do not have money. However, I have a spare bar of soap and toothpaste. Will that be enough for you?” Some great masters believe that fulfilling the value of transport this way is correct and going by that car or other means of transport is allowable. However, bartering monk’s accessories for service is too similar to buying those services with money. Monks weak in discipline may not be able to see the difference between bartering monk’s accessories for services and simply paying for the service with money. Therefore, it should not be done. Monks should remember that even

the Buddha did not go by taxi, so why should they? It is good to walk on foot if no donor is available. If a monk doesn't want to go on foot, as explained above, he can go on alms round with an alms bowl, refuse donations of meals, and when asked, "Venerable sir, what do you need?" he explains that he either needs a bus ticket or he needs an assistant to follow with him where the monk needs to go. Or the monk can explain that he cannot pay the taxi fee to get where he wants to go. The laypeople then must decide whether they will support the monk with a taxi fee (paying it directly to the driver), a bus ticket, or arrange an assistant for the monk. If a monk does not want to do this, cannot do this, or does not dare to do this, the monk should not travel. Following the rules of Discipline and meditation, the monk may die in peace. If a monk dies this way, there are many benefits: because he followed the rules thoroughly, he will surely be born in heaven. And then, in heaven, he may easily remember the Buddha's teachings that he learned as a human and soon achieve the first, second, third, or even the fourth level of Enlightenment (**viz. Sotānugata Sutta of Aṅguttara Nikāya Catukkanipāta**).

(9) Instructions for Laymen and Laywomen Who Respect and Adore The Buddha's Dispensation

If laypeople never donated money to monks, there would never be a monk who accepts money. Therefore, just as the laypeople started the problem of monks accepting money, laypeople can resolve this problem once and for all.

When laypeople donate money to monks, they make the monks destroy the Dispensation and split the Community of Monks while the laypeople accrue demerits. Destroying the noble life of a monk, the laypeople reduce the power of donations given to such monks with broken morals. When laypeople donate money to monks, the monks do not get any benefit, and the laypeople also do not get any benefit. Laypeople who donate, offer, give, support by, entrust, or divert money to monks only cause suffering to everyone, not happiness.

Sometimes laypeople are not able to donate the ten kinds of donation prescribed by the Buddha: food, drinks, clothes, vehicles, flowers, perfumes, ointments, beds, dwelling places, or light (**Aṅguttara Nikāya 8 - 4. Dānavaggo - 5. Dānūpapatti Sutta**). However, they want to donate them and have enough money to buy them. People believe that it would be good if they were allowed to donate money to a monk for whatever he needs. The Buddha knew the laypeople's desire. Hence He has instructed a method. When the instruction is correctly followed, the Dispensation can stay pure for a long time. It will also greatly support both monastics and laypeople on their Path to Nibbāna. If the instruction is not followed correctly, the Dispensation will disappear, and both sides will accrue a lot of demerits.

Monks who follow the rules of Discipline respectfully and are able to explain them to laypeople can explain the rules related to money only when nobody has come to donate, nobody is ready to donate, and nobody is showing a donation of money. If

someone has already come with money and said he/she wants to donate money, the monk cannot explain the related rules. The monk must reject the money and stay silent. Therefore, before laypeople entrust any money with a kappiya, the kappiya should learn the proper handling of money-related situations from the monk. The monk should also explain the rules of Discipline to the kappiya whenever suitable. It is not possible for the monk to explain that when laypeople have just come with money, either to the laypeople or even to a kappiya. When people come with the money or have already entrusted the money in the kappiya's hands, the monk should not remind the kappiya that the kappiya should take care of the monk's needs (indicating that the kappiya should request the monk to ask the kappiya whatever the monk needs); the monk should not thump the table (to remind the kappiya that the kappiya should request the monk to ask the kappiya for whatever the monk needs); the monk cannot remind the kappiya even indirectly. Why? Because when the laypeople come with money and a monk reminds the kappiya to accept the money or requests him to say, "Venerable sir, if you need anything, tell me!" the laypeople may think that the monk is greedy for money. The monk may then also have doubts about his virtue during his meditation practice. Therefore, monks should explain the rules of Discipline to their kappiyas before any donor comes with money.

Laypeople must neither give money to a monk nor give it to a layperson for a monk. Until the moment when an allowable item is purchased by the money and given to the monk, the money is entirely owned by the

donors. The kappiya is only a friend of the donors who helps the donors make an allowable item for the monk.

Therefore, let's distinguish two kinds of donation: direct donation and indirect donation. A direct donation is when laypeople themselves search, buy, come, and donate an allowable thing. An indirect donation is when laypeople entrust money to a kappiya, and when a monk needs something, the kappiya will buy whatever the monk needs and then offers it to the monk. In direct and indirect donations, laypeople only donate what is allowable to a monk. It is not possible to donate money to a monk. In the case of indirect donation, the money is owned by the laypeople only. Even when the money is entrusted to a kappiya, it is still the possession of the donors, the kappiya does not own the money.

Therefore, when laypeople entrust money to a kappiya, they should say, "Here we are entrusting money for the monk's four requisites. Buy whatever the monk needs with this money and offer it to him." Then the donors must come to the monk and inform him:

"Venerable sir, we have entrusted money [1 Dollar] to your kappiya [Mr. Green] for your four requisites. Venerable sir, whenever you need anything, please, ask your kappiya!"

There are two phrases that the laypeople need to tell the monk. One is not enough. Laypeople must say both of the phrases: (1) A clear mention of what for and who the monk should request; (2) a direct command to the monk that he should request his kappiya if the monk needs anything.

The second sentence is, however, more important. It is also necessary to say the first sentence - there, the monk will know exactly what he can ask for from the kappiya: can he ask for robes? Can he also ask for medicine? Or can he ask only for building materials? Or can the monk ask for anything he wants? The laypeople should clearly say it. However, requesting the monk directly that he (the monk) tells his kappiya if he (the monk) needs anything is more important. The request to the monk must be a direct command. "Venerable sir, it is alright to tell your kappiya if you need something" is weak and not successful. "Venerable sir, you can tell your kappiya if you need something" is also weak and not successful. It must be a direct command: "Venerable sir, whenever you need anything, please, ask your kappiya!" Only then does the monk know that the laypeople most fervently wish that the monk asks his kappiya when he needs anything.

It is hard to teach every layperson in the world to say these two sentences. Therefore, a monk is lucky if he has a kappiya who either learned these two sentences from this monk or another virtuous monk. The kappiya then either asks each donor to say these two sentences to the monk, or the kappiya can say it instead of the laypeople:

"Venerable sir, laypeople entrusted to me money [1 Dollar] for your four requisites. Venerable sir, whenever you need anything, please, ask me!"

The kappiya does not keep the monk's money. It is also wrong to think that the kappiya has just now got money. Instead, the kappiya is just taking care of the

donors' money. Because the donors neither gave the money to the monk nor did they give it to the kappiya, the money is entirely owned by the donors. Only after whatever the monk needs is bought and offered to the monk do the donors receive the merit of donation. In fact, until the kappiya donates the purchased allowable item to the monk, the donors have received only merit of intention to donate; they have not received any merit of donation. Why? Because they did not give anything to the monk yet, and they did not give anything to the kappiya. They only gave responsibility to the kappiya to take care of the donors' money.

Here we should be careful. Because the donors did not give any money to the monk and because they also did not give any money to the kappiya, the kappiya's responsibility is big. Why? Because the kappiya is not going to do something with his own money. Instead, he is responsible for another person's money and should fulfill the given task with it. Therefore, also, if the kappiya does not buy for the monk what the monk needs from the laypeople's money, if he runs away with the donors' money, if he steals the donors' money, if he uses the donors' money for whatever he, the kappiya, wants, or if the money for whatever reason disappear at the kappiya, it is a matter entirely related to the donors. The monk did not lose anything. Kappiya never takes care of a monk's money, and a monk never has and never owns money. Because the kappiya takes care only of the laypeople's money, not of any money of a monk, it is less stressful for him, and he can happily fulfill the given task. Also, because the monk does not own the money, if the kappiya runs away with it, steals it, or uses it for himself (the

kappiya), the monk must not be angry with the kappiya, the monk must not be disappointed with the kappiya, the monk must not make excuses such as “nowadays kappiyas are not reliable; hence monks must accept money themselves” and become a shameless monk.

Although the money is owned by the laypeople until the moment when it becomes an allowable item and is offered to a monk, the Buddha prescribed to monks a little responsibility regarding the money entrusted at a kappiya. If monks ask whatever they need three times from a kappiya and come and stand silently up to six times (or if monks ask up to six times)¹⁹ and the kappiya still does not provide the monks with whatever they asked for, the monks must either go themselves or send a messenger to the original donor.

*“Chakkhattuparamaṃ tuṇhībhūto uddissa
tiṭṭhamāno taṃ cīvaram abhinipphādeyya, iccetaṃ*

¹⁹ The Pāli text explains that a monk can decide to perform one asking instead of two standings. For example, a monk asks three times, stands four times, and the remaining two standings can be instead performed by one asking. A monk can ask three times and stand six times, but each asking can be instead performed by two standings and each two standings can be instead performed by one asking. So, a monk can ask three times + ask another three times instead of the six times of standing. A monk can stand six times instead of the three times asking and stand yet another six times, altogether maximum 12 times standing. **The Commentary to Pārājikapāḷi, vol. 2, p. 256,** further explains that if the monk himself does not select a kappiya but the laypeople themselves select a kappiya, the monk can then ask the kappiya selected by the donors as many times as he wants, even a thousand times. The monk is then not obliged to inform the original donors if the kappiya does not fulfill the monk’s need, but he can, if he wants.

*kusalaṃ; tato ce uttari vāyamamāno taṃ cīvara
abhinipphādeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ. No ce
abhinipphādeyya, yatassa cīvaracetāpannaṃ ābhaṭaṃ,
tattha sāmaṃ vā gantabbaṃ dūto vā pāhetabbo – ‘Yaṃ
kho tumhe āyasmanto bhikkhuṃ uddissa
cīvaracetāpannaṃ paṇiṭṭha, na taṃ tassa bhikkhuno
kiñci atthaṃ anubhoti, yuñjantāyasmanto sakaṃ, mā vo
sakaṃ vinassā’ti, ayaṃ tattha sāmīcī’ti (Vinaya Piṭaka
Pārājikapāḷi, p. 325).*

“If the robe is fulfilled after up to six times of silently standing for that purpose, that fulfillment is good. However, if (the monk) endeavors more than (three times requesting, reminding, and six times standing) and the robe is fulfilled, (the monk) has committed an offense of abandoning and confessing (*nissaggiya pācittiya*). Indeed, if it is not fulfilled (after three times requesting, reminding, and six times standing), (the monk) must either go himself or send a messenger to the original donors of the value of the robe (with the message): ‘Donors, the value of robe that you sent and intended for the monk was not experienced by the monk in any way. Donors request your wealth (back); may your wealth not get destroyed.’ This is the way (monks) should train in case a value of robe is sent (to monks).” (Tr. according to Myanmar Pārājikapāḷi, p. 344, PDF p. 372).

Actually, even if the monk tells the kappiya six times and the kappiya still does not fulfill the monk’s need, and, moreover, the monk then does not inform the original donor that the monk did not get what he needed, the monk has transgressed a rule. By

transgressing a rule, the monk is stuck on the way towards Nibbāna, Enlightenment.

“Yo pana neva sāmamaṃ gacchati, na dūtaṃ pāheti, vattabhede dukkaṭaṃ āpajjati” **(Vinaya Piṭaka Aṭṭhakathā, vol. 2, p. 254).**

“If a monk does not go himself, and if he does not even send a messenger, the monk’s duty is broken and, therefore, the monk has committed a *dukkatā* offense.”

(Tr. according to Pārājika Bhāsāṭṭikā vol. 4 of Ashin Janakābhivaṃsa, p. 297.)

Monks must be extraordinarily careful not ever to transgress a rule. Therefore, if laypeople entrust their money to a kappiya, the kappiya has a new responsibility (to fulfill the needs of a monk), and the monk also has a new responsibility (to inform the original donor in case the kappiya does not fulfill the monk’s needs).

Because of this reason, when laypeople entrust their money to a kappiya, it is suitable to entrust the money in an envelope, on which they write five details: (1) the donor’s name, (2) phone number, (3) the date of entrusting the money to the kappiya, (4) the amount of entrusted money, (5) the intended purpose of the money (robes, medicine, building materials, whatever the monk needs, etc.). The most important detail out of these five is the donor’s phone number. Kappiya will then take a photo of this envelope and send it to the monk’s phone, email, or whatever is more comfortable for both the kappiya and the monk. Then, if the kappiya does not fulfill the monk’s needs, the monk can inform the donors. My kappiyas always do it this way and there

has never been any difficulty. One time it happened that a kappiya stole a lot of money. I could then easily call the donors and inform them appropriately.

There are many additional benefits of writing these five details on the envelope. For example, if the amount of money written on the envelope is different from the amount of money inside the envelope, the kappiya can call the donors and arrange to return the excess money inserted in the envelope or inform them that there was less money in the envelope than the amount written. (In most cases, informing donors when they inserted less money than they wrote will not be necessary. However, if the kappiya worries that laypeople could blame him for stealing, he should inform them at once to avoid undue criticism). If the money in the envelope is forged, then when the kappiya is buying allowable things for the monk and gets caught by the police, he can easily point them to the donor, thanks to his knowledge of the donor's name and phone number.

The information about the purpose of the donation is very important. Because the donors write clearly what the purpose of the donation is, the kappiya, as well as the monk, can happily fulfill the wishes of the donors. Also, when the monk has received whatever he needs, the kappiya should call the donors and inform them: "The donor's merits are complete. The monk has received what he needs. May you be happy and healthy." It would be good if the kappiya could call the donors every time a monk receives something he needs.

There is one more benefit in entrusting the money at a kappiya, maintaining the ownership of the donors until the moment it becomes an allowable thing for the monk. Because the money was not given to anyone, it remained to be the possession of the donors, there is no need to pay income tax for the monk or the kappiya, even in countries where Buddhist monks are not officially freed from paying income tax. The monk receives only food, robes, monastic buildings (or lands), medicine, etc., which are donations that usually do not involve paying taxes to the government. In most countries, if an income tax has to be paid, it is paid only upon donating a certain amount of money or higher than that, not at all from a donated material property such as food, clothes, or even buildings.

Sometimes people want to give money to monks so the monks can travel. Laypeople should never give money to monks for traveling, monks should never ask for money so they can travel, and monks should never accept any money for traveling, even if they are forced to accept them. Monks should be able to travel without any money. Why? Because if the monk accepts money and dies during the trip, he will be born in a world of suffering (in hell, as an animal, or as a ghost). If the monk did not accept money and therefore traveled without money, even if he dies on the way, he may be born in heaven for following the Discipline, or at least as a human, and if he could practice insight meditation (*vipassanā*) at the moment of death, he can even attain the Final Cessation into Nibbāna. If that happens, it would all be the merit of the laypeople who refused to give money to the monk (and instead provided him with a bus ticket or arranged another means of transport). At

the time of the travel, whenever laypeople provide the monk with any food, robes, residence, or medicine, they will receive immeasurable merit because the monk's Discipline is totally pure. They will also have complete faith in the monk, even to the extent that the monk will inspire the laypeople so they are virtuous, following their five or eight precepts most ardently.

When monks live in a non-Buddhist country, they may face difficulties getting food, robes, a dwelling place, and medicine. Therefore, laypeople should hire or organize a kappiya for their monks. Giving the kappiya a monthly salary, the kappiya will fulfill the needs of the monk. Without a kappiya, monks cannot live abroad following the rules of Discipline, or they do not know how to follow them, or they do not dare to follow them. Then, if laypeople do not organize a kappiya for their monks, or cannot organize, or do not want to organize one, the monk should not live abroad. Instead, he should live only in a Buddhist country, following all rules of Discipline. Why? Because when monks accept money in a non-Buddhist country, they destroy the faith of laypeople who have it and prevent the arising of faith in people who do not have it yet. From the point of view of foreigners, a monk who accepts money is the same as a layperson. In fact, some laypeople also have bald heads and do not engage in any sexual intercourse. It is, however, impossible for laypeople to live without accepting money. That is why monks who can live in a non-Buddhist country without accepting money are easily considered nobler than laypeople. When monks accept money, laypeople in non-Buddhist countries today as well as laypeople of Buddhist countries in

ancient times cannot see the difference between monks and laypeople:

“Atha kho so puriso āyasmato upanandassa sakyaputtassa kahāpaṇaṃ datvā ujjhāyati khiyyati vipāceti – “Tattheva mayaṃ rūpiyaṃ paṭiggaṇhāma evamevime samaṇā sakyaputtiyā rūpiyaṃ paṭiggaṇhantī”ti” (Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikapāli - Rūpiyasikkhāpada, p. 344).

“Then, after the man donated a coin to the Sakyan prince Venerable Upānanda, he criticized, condemned, and blamed: “Just like we (laypeople) accept money, this Sakyan prince from the monastic lineage of the Buddha also accepts money” (Tr. according to Myanmar Pārājikapāli, p. 364, PDF p. 392).

Some monks do not directly touch money; they accept it in an envelope or in their alms bowl, take it by pincers, or accept it into their wallet. They think about how to deceive the rule of Discipline so they can do whatever they want. Whether the monk touches the money or not is not important. It is actually not relevant at all. It matters whether the monk has the power over the money as its owner. Can he use it? Can he himself decide what the money will be used for? That is important. The monk must not own money, and the monk's kappiya also must not accept donations of money for the monk. The donors alone must be the owners of the money, and either themselves provide the monk with what the monk needs or entrust the money to the kappiya, request the monk to ask the kappiya if the monk needs anything, and the kappiya can then use the donors' money to fulfill the monk's

needs. Monks must never accept money, be it for themselves or for anyone else.

When many monks come for events of donating meals or teaching Dhamma, people want to donate to them all right away. After donating food, robes, medicine, etc. They also want to donate money. Laypeople also want to donate envelopes with a lot of money to the great masters (elder monks). Doing so, they send the monks to the world of hell and themselves collect demerits. They powerfully support the disappearance of the Dispensation, and the wrong view (*micchā diṭṭhi*) grows in all of them. This is like when in India, there are sometimes large events of slaughtering cattle as a donation to gods (deities). It is easy to believe this is right because many people attend these events. However, when many people do evil, the evil does not thereby become good. If laypeople desperately want to support monks with their money during large events, the events must be organized accordingly. How should they be organized? Before the invited monks come to the event, the organizers should respectfully request the phone numbers of the monks' kappiyas or the drivers who will take the monks to the event. The organizers should carefully write a list of the names of kappiyas and how many monks, including their names, will come with each kappiya. **If laypeople want to make an indirect donation to the monks at the event, the organizers should call the kappiyas before the event and inform them:**

“Among the 20 monks who will come with you, we entrust with you 2 Dollars for the four requisites of

the Great Master U Nāga. We entrust with you 1 Dollar for the four requisites of each of the other 19 monks.”

When the monks have finished their meal at an event of donating meal, or after the Dhamma discourse, the laypeople should inform them thus:

“Venerable sir, we have entrusted 2 Dollars to your kappiya Mr. White for the four requisites of venerable sir U Nāga. Venerable sir, if you need anything, request it from Mr. White. Venerable sirs, we have entrusted 1 Dollar for the four requisites of each of you, the 19 venerable monks who came together with the venerable U Nāga. Venerable sirs, if you need anything, request it from Mr. White.”

When the organizers inform the venerable monks in this way, it takes a very short time, all laypeople can donate, and it is all in accordance with the Discipline. If the kappiyas of monks who come for the event do not want to take care of monks’ needs, the organizers should ask the monks for phone numbers of the monks’ close supporters, entrust the money to those supporters only, and then request the monks to ask their supporters if the monks need anything. It is not important whether the organizers are experienced in this. It is very suitable to ask monks who follow the Discipline. Monks who follow the rules of Discipline will explain it all in detail, they will clarify everything as best as they can, check whether the procedures are correct, and make their best efforts to help so that everything is done exactly according to all rules of Discipline.

Some monks dare to say, “Laypeople, if you do not give me money, I will disrobe and become a

layman.” At that time, we need to be careful. It is as if the monk told the laypeople: “Laypeople, if I do not have sex, I will disrobe and become a layman.” Laypeople should not support the destruction of a monk. If a monk can disrobe just because he does not get money, he would probably disrobe anyway, regardless of whether he gets money or not. He did not become a monk in order to live as a monk, he became a monk to get money. Laypeople also should not protect monk’s life by making demerits. Laypeople should protect the monk’s life only by making merits.

Some monks wonder whether it is suitable to use bank cards to directly purchase allowable items or services without withdrawing the money.²⁰ The bank card is not money on its own, and in the bank, there are people who just take care of the entrusted money. If so, some monks may wonder if they could consider the workers in the bank as their kappiya and, through the bank card, inform their kappiya about their (the monks’) needs. Monks must not own a bank card, and monks must not accept a bank card. Why? Because if a monk owns a bank card and the bank account is owned by the monk, the workers in the bank as well as the seller (who received the payment from the bank), are all clear that the money in the bank account is owned by the monk. Also, when a monk buys items directly with a bank card, he indicates the amount of money that he needs for the

²⁰ Bank cards include ATM cards, credit cards, debit cards, MAC cards, client cards, key cards, cash cards. However, here please understand not only hard cards but also electronic bank cards and any other means of accessing a bank account or a publicly available service that keeps, delivers, or in any other way fulfills any monetary needs.

item (the bank receives the exact amount to be delivered), which is also not allowed. Monks must not tell their kappiya how much the needed item costs, so that kappiyas either use the money of the donors or, if the kappiya already has the item and wants to donate it, the kappiya can therefore donate the item the kappiya already owns without using the money of the donors. Also, when a monk uses a bank card, the seller expects that the monk is the owner of the bank account (and, therefore, the card).²¹ If a monk then happens to consider the money paid by the bank card to the seller as his, he then transgresses a rule and becomes a shameless monk right on the spot.

Even if the bank card is owned by laypeople and just lent to the monk, we should be careful. When the bank card is owned by the laypeople and the monk uses the bank card, he would have to inform his donors every time he uses the bank card about his needs. If the monk goes to a developing country where bank cards are not available, he will not be able to understand why he can't use money for the same purpose for which he would directly pay with a bank card in a different

²¹ Some banks provide a service that allows several users of the single account. Several people then have their bank card and use it according to the agreement they made with each other. However, not every bank has this possibility and not every country allows direct payment. Monks in developing countries could then make excuses that in another country they could pay directly, but not here, so what is the difference between paying by money here and paying directly by bank card elsewhere? Indeed, there is no difference. Therefore, monks should never have a bank card, monks should never accept a bank card, and monks should never use a bank card in any way.

country. To avoid confusion and excuses of monks who are weak in faith, to avoid making a monk shameless whenever a little problem arises, it is necessary that monks never have, accept, or use any bank cards or any access to a bank for any purpose under any circumstances.

(10) The 108 Wrong Assumptions of Monks Who Accept Money

a) Paṭiggahaṇakaṇḍa (a portion related to accepting money)

1. The wrong assumption that when monks have a (good) reason, they can accept money.
2. The wrong assumption that when a monk accepts money as his possession, it is just a *dukkatā* offense.
3. The wrong assumption that when a monk accepts money as his possession, it is just a (*suddha*) *pācittiya* offense (an offense that only requires confession).
4. The wrong assumption that if laypeople come, they can keep the money nearby without determining a kappiya, and when they are gone, the monk can then go and take the money himself.
5. The wrong assumption that when a monk has a lot of robes, or too little of robes, or has a reason, or does not have a reason, it is alright to sell a robe to laypeople or monastics and thereby get money.
6. The wrong assumption that a monk can say “it is alright to keep money here” to the laypeople who

visited the monk and, without determining a kappiya, later asking a layperson to keep that money for the monk.²²

7. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money directly in his hand for a monastic land, a monastic building, or anything else he needs for himself, another person, or the Community of Monks.
8. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money inside an envelope for a monastic land, a monastic building, or anything else he needs for himself, another person, or the Community of Monks.
9. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money not specifically for a monastic land, a monastic building, or anything else he needs for himself, another person, or the Community of Monks, but as *navakamma* (for any need).

²² It is possible to show the money to a layperson, saying: “Are you aware of this?” If the layperson takes the money and says, “Venerable sir, if you need anything, tell me”, the monk can then request the layperson whenever the monk needs something. However, because laypeople have no idea they can say this and therefore will never say it, or if they do, they simply will not be able to say it exactly in these words, and the procedure will not be done correctly resulting in a shameless monk and destruction of the Dispensation. Therefore, monks should never allow laypeople to place money somewhere without clearly indicating the kappiya. Moreover, if laypeople place money near a monk without determining a kappiya, they have no reason to think that a kappiya will take them. They will be sure that they are *giving* the money to the monk and that the monk will take them whenever he needs. Thus also, the monk will become a shameless monk and destroy the Dispensation. Monks should never allow laypeople to place any money anywhere in the monastery.

10. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money that laypeople put into his alms bowl during an alms round.
11. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money either in every event or in some events, such as an event of giving Dhamma discourse, an event of opening a new monastery, or an event of meal donation in a layperson's home, or when there are many monks together, or when an ordination hall (*sīma*) is inaugurated and laypeople make donations, or during the Kathina ceremony, or any other event.
12. The wrong assumption that a monk can encourage laypeople to donate to him money that they wanted to donate to another monk, who does not accept money.
13. The wrong assumption that a monk who accepts money can encourage another monk who does not accept money to give money intended for the monk who does not accept money to the monk who accepts money.
14. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept a salary in order to disseminate the Buddha's Teachings.
15. The wrong assumption that monks can request a regular donation of money, so the monks get money every week, every month, etc.
16. The wrong assumption that a monk can ask for more money if he did not receive as much as he expected.
17. The wrong assumption that a monk can request a taxi driver for money to buy a bus ticket or accept money from him if he himself offers them.

18. The wrong assumption that a monk can ask for money or accept money at a bus station, at a train station, or at any other place where there are many laypeople, for building a monastery, or for any other purpose.

b) Puggalapaññattikaṇḍa (a portion related to a person's status)

19. The wrong assumption that a monk who disseminates Dhamma in mountains and/or forests or in non-Buddhist areas can accept money.
20. The wrong assumption that a chief monk of a monastery can accept money.
21. The wrong assumption that a monk responsible for monastics and their activities in a village or a small area can accept money.
22. The wrong assumption that a monk responsible for monastics and their activities in a township can accept money.
23. The wrong assumption that a monk responsible for monastics and their activities in an administrative region of a country or the whole country can accept money.
24. The wrong assumption that a teacher monk (who teaches to monks, novices, nuns, or laypeople) can accept money.
25. The wrong assumption that a monk who was or has been promoted can accept money.

26. The wrong assumption that a monk who has a responsibility can accept money.
27. The wrong assumption that a monk student can accept money.
28. The wrong assumption that a monk from a certain monastic lineage or a certain group, sect, denomination, organization, or type or kind of family of any of these where monks are members can accept money.
29. The wrong assumption that a monk who follows the admonishment of the Tipiṭakadhara Mingun Sayadaw can accept money.
30. The wrong assumption that if a monk touches money but follows all the other rules of Discipline, he is still very noble.^{f23}
31. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money if he accepts them out of compassion and/or loving-kindness towards laypeople.
32. The wrong assumption that a monk who is poor or of little gain can accept money.
33. The wrong assumption that a monk who has rented a plot of land in a larger monastery to another person can accept the paid monthly (or any other) rental,

²³ The rules of Discipline must be followed all, unbroken. If a monk has sex with a woman but follows all other rules, it does not help him. Similarly, if a monk accepts money but follows all other rules, he is a robber of laypeople's donations and splits the Community of Monks.

either from the monk(s) or layperson (laypeople) who stay there.

34. The wrong assumption that a monk who owns a monastic building can sell it to another person and accept money in exchange for the monastic building.
35. The wrong assumption that if other monks also accept money, this monk (me or any other monk in the world) can also accept money.
36. The wrong assumption that because a great master accepts (or any great masters accept) money, this monk (I or any other monk in the world) can also accept money.
37. The wrong assumption that when laypeople have nothing else to donate, they are in a hurry, and the situation is stressful, it is alright for a monk to accept their donation of money.
38. The wrong assumption that if another monk commands this monk (me or any other monk in the world) to accept money, I can therefore accept them out of respect or out of politeness.
39. The wrong assumption that if a monk accepts money, he can also make use of the property of oneself or other monks that were bought with a monk's money, such as monastic land, a monastic building, a book, food, drinks, accessories, or anything else.

c) Paribhogakaṇḍa (a portion related to necessities)

40. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money to pay for the medicine at least when he is seriously ill and has no one to help him.
41. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money to pay an electricity bill.
42. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money to pay for water, a phone, or any other bill or invoice.
43. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money to pay a transport fee or a ticket in a bus, train, taxi, boat, airplane, or any other means of transport.
44. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money to buy a book about Dhamma or any other book.

d) Parahitakanda (a portion related to the desire to help others)

45. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money if it is for a monastery or a monastic education center that cares for poor children or people.
46. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money for a meditation center.
47. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money for a monastic education center or its students.

48. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money to support poor people.
49. The wrong assumption that a monk can distribute money to poor children or people in a city or village.
50. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money to build a school, a hospital, a cremation furnace, or any other building that provides services to people.
51. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money for his parents, family, friends, or anyone else.
52. The wrong assumption that a monk can help his parents, family, friends, or anyone else to get money by various arrangements and decisions to profit from that help.

e) Sāmaṇerakaṇḍa (a portion related to novices)

53. The wrong assumption that a monk can ask novices to accept money.
54. The wrong assumption that a monk can give permission to novices to accept money.
55. The wrong assumption that a novice can accept money in his alms bowl during an alms round.
56. The wrong assumption that a novice can be a kappiya and, as such, take care of money entrusted

by laypeople to the novice for the needs for a monk, another person, or the Community of Monks.

- 57. The wrong assumption that novices can accept money from laypeople and buy whatever they (the novices) need.
- 58. The wrong assumption that novices who study (officially or unofficially) can accept money.
- 59. The wrong assumption that laypeople can entrust money to a novice who will then entrust (or just hand) it later to a layperson kappiya.

f) Sallāpakakaṇḍa (a portion related to discussion and talking)

- 60. The wrong assumption that a monk can ask laypeople to donate money to him.
- 61. The wrong assumption that a monk can ask laypeople to donate money for monastic land, a monastic building, or anything else he needs for himself, another person, or the Community of Monks.
- 62. The wrong assumption that a monk can stretch his open hand to receive money when laypeople are just going to donate money to the monk.
- 63. The wrong assumption that the Buddha never called a monk who accepted money “*moghapurisa*,” a man unable to achieve Enlightenment.

g) Desanākaṇḍa (a portion related to teaching Dhamma)

64. The wrong assumption that it is good if laypeople donate money to monks before, during, or after an event of teaching, sharing, or discussing Dhamma.
65. The wrong assumption that if laypeople give money to monks to support the monks' dissemination of Dhamma, it will be a merit for the laypeople.
66. The wrong assumption that if laypeople donate a lot or a little money for a certain purpose (teaching Dhamma, building a monastery, or anything else) to monks during an event of teaching Dhamma, they will thus support the Buddha's Dispensation.
67. The wrong assumption that if laypeople donate money to a monk thinking about the monk's virtue in following all rules of Discipline except accepting money and ignoring the monk's transgression of the rule regarding accepting money, their donation will be very meritorious.
68. The wrong assumption that monks should not teach the rules of Discipline (Vinaya) to laypeople.

h) Āpattivaḍḍhanakaṇḍa (a portion related to increasing offenses)

69. The wrong assumption that monks or novices who study a lot can buy a ginger salad, a noodle salad, or any other food to eat at night if laypeople themselves do not offer them to the monks or novices, based on the wrong assumption that monks

or novices who study a lot can eat a ginger salad, a noodle salad, or another kind of food at night.

70. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can tell a lie if it is related to themselves (such as saying they do not accept money even though they accept money).
71. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can tell a lie about or slander another monk or person.
72. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can buy things from shops, markets, or from any other seller.
73. The wrong assumption that if laypeople do not donate a meal, monks can go and buy food items in a shop, a market, or from any other seller.
74. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can hire a taxi and go wherever they want.
75. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can consider a young woman as the monk's own daughter and hug her.
76. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can drive a car as much as they like.²⁴

²⁴ Here the intention is to show that monks may think they must accept money so that they can drive a car. Monks should not drive a car, because driving a car requires accepting money. Therefore, wise monks who never drive a car and go only there, where they are completely invited by

77. The wrong assumption that it is alright for monks who accept money to give things that they bought, such as books, food, drinks, or anything else, to monks who do not accept money.

i) Himśākaṇḍa (a portion related to violence)

78. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can beat with stick monks who do not accept money.

79. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can throw sticks, stones, or anything else at monks who do not accept money.

80. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can threaten monks who do not accept money with death.

81. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can cause injury by a gun, a knife, or by anything else to a monk who teaches the rules of Discipline.

82. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can ask a layperson to murder a monk who does not accept money, so the monks do not kill the monk themselves, and that it is alright if the monk who does not accept money therefore dies.

laypeople, never have a problem regarding money (petrol fee, tollgate fee, car-repair fee, etc.).

j) Adhammakāṇḍa (a portion related to
unrighteous, unfair decisions)

83. The wrong assumption that it is good if monks of a certain monastic lineage, group, sect, or organization, or of any particular nature, origin, or belief, cause difficulties to certain monks in their Dhamma teaching.
84. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can obstruct monks who follow the rules of Discipline in building and inaugurating ordination halls (*sīma*).
85. The wrong assumption that monks of a certain status who accept money can prohibit a monk who follows the rules of Discipline from living in the same village or city.
86. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can prohibit monks who follow the rules of Discipline to stay in a certain monastery where the monk is invited to stay.
87. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can prohibit monks who follow the rules of Discipline from teaching the rules of Discipline.
88. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can subpoena monks who follow the rules of Discipline and teach about them.
89. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can try to prohibit or organize prohibition to teach Dhamma to monks who follow the rules of Discipline.
90. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can call to a monastery of a monk who follows the

rules of Discipline and threaten him with anything or something in particular.

91. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money can call to a monastery where lives a monk who follows the rules of Discipline and try to evict the monk from that monastery or cause him troubles.
92. The wrong assumption that monks who accept money are permitted to expel from a monastery monks who follow the rules of Discipline

k) Maggakaṇḍa (a portion on the Path to Nibbāna)

93. The wrong assumption that a monk who accepts money can also attain Nibbāna (Path and Fruition).
94. The wrong assumption that because a novice who studies the scriptures anyway won't attain Nibbāna, he (the student novice) can accept money.
95. The wrong assumption that because a monk who studies the scriptures anyway won't attain Nibbāna, he (the student monk) can accept money.
96. The wrong assumption that because a monk who teaches the scriptures anyway won't attain Nibbāna, he (the teacher monk) can accept money.
97. The wrong assumption that because a monk has been accepting money for so long, he should not even try to attain Nibbāna; instead, if he continues accepting money it is no problem.

98. The wrong assumption that when a monk has transgressed many rules, he should not even try to attain Nibbāna; he should continue breaking the rules.

I) Samsayakaṇḍa (a portion related to doubts)

99. The wrong assumption that it is not possible to study Dhamma scriptures without accepting money.
100. The wrong assumption that it is not possible to travel to distant places without accepting money.
101. The wrong assumption that it is not possible to teach and disseminate Dhamma in non-Buddhist areas (such as hills and forests) without accepting money.
102. The wrong assumption that it is not possible to teach and disseminate Dhamma in a Buddhist or a non-Buddhist country without accepting money.
103. The wrong assumption that it is not possible to take responsibility for a monastic education center or for a meditation center without accepting money.
104. The wrong assumption that it is not possible to work as a monk responsible for monastics and their activities in a village, a small area, a township, an administrative region of the country, or the whole country without accepting money.
105. The wrong assumption that it is not possible to be a chief monk of a monastery, a teacher monk, a student monk, or a student novice without accepting money.

106. The wrong assumption that without accepting money it is not possible to pay the electricity (or any other) bill or invoice, hence the monk must accept money.
107. The wrong assumption that if a monk is a member of a certain monastic lineage, group, sect, or organization, he should not live without accepting money.
108. The wrong assumption that a monk can accept money when all other monks accept money and this monk (me or any other monk in the world) does not want to become weird or disturb the other monks.

References

- Itivuttaka Aṭṭhakathā Nissaya (n.d.). *Itiwote-aṭṭhakathā-natheya*. (Vol.1).
- Janakābhivaṃsa, A. (1963). *Pārāzikanbhāthāṭṭikā* (Vol. 1-4) [Pārājikakaṇḍa-Bhāsāṭṭikā]. New Barmar Piṭakat Printing Press.
- Janakābhivaṃsa, A. (1965). *Pāseitbhāsāṭṭikā* (Vol. 2) [Pācittiya-Bhāsāṭṭikā]. New Barmar Piṭakat Printing Press.
- Ledi S. (1909). *Dhammadīpanī* [Dhamma Elucidation]. Kawi-Myet-Hman Printing Press.
- Majjhimaṇṇāsa Aṭṭhakathā Nissaya (n.d.). *Mizzhimapaṇṇātha-aṭṭhakathā-natheya* (Vol. 1).
- Ministry of Religious Affairs (1993). *Pārāzikanpālītō Myanmarpyan* [Myanmar Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikapāli]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.
- Ministry of Religious Affairs (2011). *Sūlavagpālītō Myanmarpyan* [Myanmar Vinaya Piṭaka Cūlavaggapāli]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.
- Ministry of Religious Affairs (2009). *Mahāvagpālītō Myanmarpyan* [Myanmar Vinaya Piṭaka Mahāvaggapāli]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.

Ministry of Religious Affairs (1993). *Pariwārapāḷitō Myanmarpyan* [Myanmar Vinaya Piṭaka Parivārapāḷi]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.

Ministry of Religious Affairs (1993). *Thīlakkhandhawagpāḷitō Myanmarpyan* [Myanmar Dīgha Nikāya Sīlakkhandhavaggaḷi]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.

Ministry of Religious Affairs (1997). *Mahāvagpāḷitō Myanmarpyan* [Myanmar Dīgha Nikāya Mahāvaggaḷi]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.

Ministry of Religious Affairs (1998). *Uparipaṇṇāthapāḷitō Myanmarpyan* [Myanmar Majjhima Nikāya Uparipaṇṇāsapāḷi]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.

Ministry of Religious Affairs (2009). *Thanyotepāḷitō Myanmarpyan, Khandhavag, Saḷāyatanavag* (Vol. 2) [Myanmar Saṃyutta Nikāya, Khandhavagga and Saḷāyatanavagga]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.

Ministry of Religious Affairs (1974). *Angotetorpāḷitō Myanmarpyan, Ekaka-Duka-Tika-Satokekanipat* (Vol. 1) [Myanmar Aṅguttara Nikāya, Nipāta 1-4]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.

Ministry of Religious Affairs (1977). *Angotetorpāḷitō Myanmarpyan, Pyinsaka-Shakka-Thettakanipat* (Vol. 2) [Myanmar Aṅguttara Nikāya, Nipāta 5-7]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.

- Ministry of Religious Affairs (1965). *Angotetorpālītō Myanmarpyan, Atthaka-Nawaka-Dathaka-Ekādashakanipat* (Vol. 3) [Myanmar Aṅguttara Nikāya, Nipāta 8-11]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.
- Ministry of Religious Affairs (1968). *Dhammapadapālītō Myanmarpyan* [Myanmar Dhammapadapālī]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.
- Ministry of Religious Affairs (2009). *Hterāpadānpālītō Myanmarpyan* [Myanmar Therāpadānapālī]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.
- Minn-Htin Yarzar Thihathu (1855). *Dhamma-Winaya Ameint-tō Pyan-tann-kyi* [A Royal Declaration Related to the (Buddhist) Law and Discipline]. http://phopa-dwm.blogspot.com/2011/04/blog-post_20.html#
- Ote Pho S. (1982). *Thāthanā Thant-Shin Tee-Tant-Yay* [Purification and Maintenance of the Dispensation]. Yar Kyaw Printing Press.
- Shwe Hinthar S. (1979). *May-Shauk-Sar-Pay* [Book of Questions].
- State Sangha Maha Nayaka Committee (2013). *Yahan-kyint-phway Hnit-ya-hnit-hsay Khunit-Thway* [Monk's 227 Rules]. Kabar-aye Printing Press.
- U Aung Nyunt Win (2011). *Pone-tō-sone Dhammapada Wutthutōkyi Ahnit-chote* [Summarized

Dhammapada Stories with Illustrations]. Khin
Cho Htun Publishing.

Vimativinodanīṭikā Nissaya (n.d.). *Wimatiwinodanīṭikā-nathethaya* (Vol.1).

Vipassana Research Institute (1995). *Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana Tipiṭaka* (Version 4.0.0.15) [Windows application]. <https://tipitaka.org/cst4> (The volume and page numbers always refer to the volume and page number of the Myanmar edition indicated at the bottom of the software's window that displays each book. Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka: Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikapāli; Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikakaṇḍa Aṭṭhakathā; Vinaya Piṭaka Pācittiya Aṭṭhakathā; Vinaya Piṭaka Cūḷavaggapāli; Vinaya Piṭaka Mahāvaggapāli; Vajirabuddhiṭikā; Sāratthadīpanīṭikā; Vimativinodanīṭikā; Vinayālaṅkāraṭikā; Dvemaṭikāpāli; Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī Aṭṭhakathā; Pāli Sutta Piṭaka: Dīgha Nikāya; Dīgha Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā; Majjhima Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā; Majjhima Nikāya Ṭīkā; Saṃyutta Nikāya; Aṅguttara Nikāya; Aṅguttara Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā; Aṅguttara Nikāya Ṭīkā; Dhammapada; Udānapāli; Udāna Aṭṭhakathā; Itivuttaka Aṭṭhakathā; Jātakapāli; Theragāthā Aṭṭhakathā; Apadānapāli; Peṭakopadesa.)

