

**Transcript of the teachings by Khen Rinpoche Geshe Chonyi on
*Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds, 2014***

Root text: *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds* by Shantideva, translated by Toh Sze Gee. Copyright: Toh Sze Gee, 2006; Revised edition, 2014.

Lesson 35**19 June 2014****CHAPTER SIX: VERSES 6.50 - 6.61.**

1. Being patient with those who would create suffering for you
 - C. Cultivating the patience that pays no heed to those who cause harm
 3. Reflecting on unwanted occurrences being due to one's own faults
 - B. Abandoning objections (V. 6.50 – V. 6. 51)
2. Being patient with those who would belittle you and so forth
 - A. Despising and belittling one does not harm one's body (V. 6.52 – V. 6.53)
 - B. It is unreasonable for one to be furious with a person who is in a rage (V. 6.54)
 - C. It is unreasonable to be furious because material gain has been obstructed (V. 6.55 – V. 61)

Student: I refer to your question as to whether at the time of death a person can accumulate projecting karma and whether that projecting karma can become actualising karma or not.

I think that if a person were to realise emptiness before the dying process starts, it is possible for the projecting karma that is created before the time of death to immediately become an actualising karma at the time of death. This will affect the next rebirth due to the heaviness of the karma, i.e., whatever karma is weightiest will ripen first.

Khen Rinpoche: Are you asking a question or are you answering it? Are you just saying your own idea or what?

I am asking you to ask me a question but you are answering my question? So what was the question I asked? Answer me now.

Student: Your question was this: At the time of death, i.e., the last moment of breath, whether a projecting karma can be accumulated and then immediately nourished by craving and grasping to become an actualising karma that will throw one to the next rebirth?

Khen Rinpoche: The question is correct. So what is your answer?

Student: My answer is no. At the time of death, the mind dissolves from a gross mind into a subtler mind. This is in accordance to sutric and not tantric teachings.

At the stage of the gross mind, the factor of discrimination is already disintegrating; hence the mind is unable to recognise an object clearly and therefore is not able to create a very strong karma. At the stage of the subtler level of mind, the mind is neutral so this mind cannot create projecting karma either. Hence my answer is that at the time of death, the mind cannot create projecting karma.

Khen Rinpoche: No, no. very long. What I want to know is this. You said that at the time of the death, you cannot create projecting karma. Why? Give your answer in one sentence.

Student: At the time of death, the function of the mind is to recognise either a virtuous karma or a non-virtuous karma and then nourish it to become the actualising karma so as to project the next rebirth. If that is the case, then in one moment of mind, it cannot have two objects so...

Khen Rinpoche: I don't know what you are talking about. (Laughs).

*Why is it that we cannot create projecting karma at the time of the death?
Because ...*

Student: Because projecting karma has to be the karma that is created before the time of death ...

Khen Rinpoche: Why? Whatever you are saying, the question is still there. We are going around in circles. Why (does projecting karma have to be created) before (the time of) death? Why not (at the) time of the death?

Student: Because at the time of death, the object of the mind is the projecting karma. The function of the mind at the time of death is to nourish that projecting karma that was previously created to become an actualising karma that will project one to the next rebirth. Therefore the projecting karma has to be something that is created earlier on.

Khen Rinpoche: You are not getting the question. You are not answering the question!

At the time of death, can't a very strong virtuous mind arise? In that instance, projecting karma is created, is it not?

Student: Sorry, but this projecting karma can only be nourished in the next life, right? It cannot be nourished at the same moment.

Khen Rinpoche: At the time of the death, a very strong virtuous mind can arise. Possible?

Student: Yes.

Khen Rinpoche: Would that not leave positive imprints in your mind? So that means you can create projecting karma at the time of the death, yes or no?

So the question is: At the time of the death, can you create projecting karma or not?

Student: Yes.

Khen Rinpoche: So that is the question: At the time of death, whether you create projecting karma or not? Now your answer is yes. Earlier on you said no because of the (various) reasons (you gave). Just now you said that projecting karma must be created before the time of death, not at the time of death.

Student: My disagreement is this: at the time of death, the mind cannot create projecting karma that is *immediately* nourished to become actualising karma ...

Khen Rinpoche: Projecting karma (can be created). You already accepted that part, right? At the time of the death, you can create projecting karma.

Student: Yes, it is possible for projecting karma to be created at the time of death but that projecting karma cannot be *immediately* nourished to become the actualizing karma because this projecting karma can only be nourished in the next life.

Khen Rinpoche: Again the question is why? Why is it that that projecting karma cannot be nourished (immediately as you are asserting)? Give me the reason why.

Student: In one moment of mind, the mind can only have one function so at the point of death, the function of the mind is to nourish the projecting karma that will project one to the next rebirth. Since at this moment I am nourishing the projecting karma, that projecting karma has to be created prior to this moment, right?

Khen Rinpoche: A moment doesn't have to be 10 years, 20 years, right? Can't a moment last for just ten seconds? A moment doesn't have to be 10 years or one lifetime, does it? A moment can be one second, ten seconds and so forth.

The time of the death is not only a short period. At the time of death, there is some time gap there. So my question is since there is some time there, you can create projecting karma. (That being the case) why then is it not possible for that karma to produce a result? That is the question.

Student: So you are talking about the time when the factor of discrimination is still functioning and able to recognise its object clearly, at that time, the mind is able to create projecting karma. Then towards the end, the mind then nourishes that projecting karma to project another rebirth

Khen Rinpoche: You are still not getting what I'm asking.

Student: Sorry, I will go and think about it some more.

In the last lesson, we saw how the enemy or harm-doer must exist as a condition for us to practise patience. In dependence on that person acting as a condition for us to practise patience, if we cultivate patience, then we accumulate the collections and purify our negativities. In that sense, that person is not a harm-doer. Instead that person is our benefactor, somebody who is helping us.

~~~~~

If we get upset with that person and retaliate, that person gets upset and become angry in return. As a result of being angry with and retaliating against us, she will accumulate non-virtue, the karma that will send her to the lower realms where she will have to suffer for a long time. In that sense, for that person, we have become the harm-doer instead.

That person is our benefactor but in return we have become the harm-doer to that person. As such, the teachings tell us that, for those reasons, it is completely inappropriate to hold on to that person as an enemy and to be upset with her.

When we are facing such a person in our lives, it is good to think about what we have learnt here in these teachings and analyse whether that enemy, the person who is harming us, is the actual harm-doer or whether we are the harm-doer. We should ask ourselves, “Is that harm- doer in fact our benefactor? Or are we in fact the actual harm-doer?” This is what the teachings are telling us to do. In reality, we have become the harm-doer.

Having said this, of course we will raise objections against such a line of reasoning that says that our enemy is our benefactor and that we are the real harm-doer. We will think, “How can that be? How can the harm-doer actually be my benefactor? That is not possible.”

The line of reasoning is that that person exists to help us practise patience. If we practise patience, we will get all the benefits of this practice. So instead of being harmed, the enemy is actually our benefactor.

But we may think in this way, “How could that be the case? Because of him harming me, I got angry. When I get angry, I am throwing myself into the lower realms. Without that person harming me, I won’t go to the hells. So how can that person be my benefactor? He is in fact the condition for me to go to the hells.”

### **C. CULTIVATING THE PATIENCE THAT PAYS NO HEED TO THOSE WHO CAUSE HARM (cont’d)**

#### *3. Reflecting on unwanted occurrences being due one’s own faults*

##### *B. Abandoning objections*

##### *1. Rejecting that it is invalid for others to do something that benefits us*

Verse 6.50 a, b

If I have the excellent quality of thought,  
I will not go to hell.

Although our existence is a condition for that person to go to hell, it doesn’t necessarily mean that therefore we ourselves will also go to hell. Although we may be a condition for that person to create negativities and to go to hell, it doesn’t mean that we will go to hell.

We will not go to hell if we have the excellent quality of patience, i.e., if we practise patience. Whatever the situation may be, from our side, if we practise patience, we will not go to hell. We don't create the cause to do so.

But if we don't cultivate patience and we get upset and angry, we will go to hell.

Here we are refuting the argument that it is incorrect to think of our enemies as our benefactors.

Next is refuting that it is incorrect to harm others.

### *2. Rejecting that it is invalid for us to bring harm upon others*

Verse 6.50 c, d

If I am protecting myself,  
How will they accrue merit here?

We may think in this way, "If we say that the other person is our benefactor, then he is helping us. If he is helping us, then of course he won't go to hell. How will he go to hell?"

The third and fourth lines of verse 6.50 are the answer to the thought, "If I practise patience, I am guarding myself, but how does that protect the harm-doer?"

Yes, if we practise patience, we protect ourselves. We stop accumulating negativities. As such, we don't have to go to the lower realms so we are guarding ourselves from the lower realms.

But our practice of patience doesn't save others from going to hell. As such, if it doesn't save the other person from going to hell, in reality, we are still the harm-doer.

We may also think that if the person who is harming us is actually our benefactor, then we should also be considered benefactors to others. Therefore it is also right for us to harm others because we are benefiting them!

*Khen Rinpoche: Everyone wants to be a benefactor. We are all benefactors of anger. Sometimes when people get angry, they say, "I am teaching you patience." But actually they are not teaching us patience. In order to teach others patience, they themselves must be patient. They are not really teaching patience. They are practising un-patience, not teaching patience.*

*Sometimes I see that in many people. A husband and wife will saying nasty and bad things to one another. Then they say, "I am teaching you patience," but actually they are not really doing that.*

Such a way of thinking is inappropriate. It is wrong. Why is that so?

### *3. Arresting ingratitude towards those who act beneficially*

Verse 6.51

Nevertheless, should I return the harm  
It will not protect them either.  
By doing so my conduct will deteriorate  
And hence this fortitude will be destroyed.

Let's say somebody harms you. Instead of accepting that, you retaliate. What will happen? If you retaliate, that harm-doer becomes more upset and disturbed. He accumulates even more negativities.

If you were to think, "Actually I'm a benefactor to that person. I'm helping that person when I retaliate," how does causing him to be more upset and disturbed and accumulating more negativities in the process be an act of helping that person? How does your retaliation help and benefit that person? In what way are you benefiting him?

There is no benefit whatsoever. When you retaliate, you don't benefit that person in any way. The person gets more disturbed and upset and accumulates more negativity. So your retaliation doesn't protect that person from his own anger and on top of that, you harm your own practice of the four wholesome virtues. These are:

1. When we are scolded, we should not retaliate in the same way.
2. When we are hit and beaten, we should not fight back.
3. If somebody exposes our faults, we should not do likewise
4. When somebody is angry with us, we should not react with anger.

Therefore it is completely wrong to think that by retaliating, you are also benefiting that person.

If you adopt the view that you have now become the benefactor of your enemy by retaliating and causing him to practise patience, you should analyse whether there is truly any benefit or not? There is no benefit because it causes the person to be more upset, angrier and as such, he accumulates even more negativities. So there is no benefit whatsoever.

On top of that, if you are a practitioner training in the cultivation of bodhicitta, then when you retaliate, it only harms your four wholesome practices. It will also harm your practice of patience.

The next two verses are basically telling us that it is appropriate to meditate on patience when we are on the receiving end of contempt, slander, criticism or unpleasant words. The teachings are saying that if we think about it carefully, such criticism, contempt, slander or harsh speech directed at us do not actually harm our body and mind in any way.

## **2. BEING PATIENT WITH THOSE WHO WOULD BELITTLE YOU AND SO FORTH<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> 2. Arresting fury towards that which brings unwanted things (V. 6.12 – V. 6.86)

A. Arresting fury towards those who wrong you (V. 6.12 – V. 6.63)

1. Being patient with those who would create suffering for you (V. 6.12 – V. 6.51)

*A. Despising and belittling one does not harm one's body*

Verse 6.52

Since my mind is not physical  
 In no way can anyone destroy it.  
 Through it strongly adhering to my body,  
 My body is harmed by suffering.

Verse 6.53

Since contempt, harsh speech,  
 And unpleasant words  
 Do not cause any harm to my body,  
 Why, mind, do you become so angry?

Our mind or consciousness is immaterial and is not physical. As such it cannot be harmed by any kind of weapons.

How do we suffer physically when our body is harmed? It is said that because we have very strong grasping to our body, holding on to it as 'mine,' therefore when the body is physically harmed, we feel pain. It is said that if we did not have that concept of the strong grasping of the body, even though somebody may do something physical to the body, we will not have the thought, "I'm being harmed. My body is being harmed."

When we face direct criticism, when somebody says something nasty to us or talks behind our back, if we look at that criticism or harsh and unpleasant words, they are only words and sounds. Can words and sounds harm our body in any way? The answer is no. They cannot harm our body in the smallest way.

If unpleasant words, criticism or harsh speech can really harm us, they must either harm our body or harm our mind. If these words or sounds cannot really harm our body in any way, then how could they ever harm the mind that is non-physical?

Since they cannot harm the body nor can they harm the mind, then there is no real reason to feel justified in being upset when we encounter those criticisms or harsh and unpleasant words.

But of course we won't accept this so easily. We come up with other reasons to justify our anger and retaliation. We argue, "The words cannot harm me physically nor can they damage my mind. But when my critics say such things and other people get to hear about them, then they will not like me. I do not like it when others dislike me. Therefore I don't like the person who is saying those things to me."

The answer to this is in verse 6.54.

*B. It is unreasonable for one to be furious with a person who is himself in a rage*


---

2. Being patient with those who would belittle you and so forth (V.52 – V.6.63)

Verse 6.54  
 If others' disliking me  
 Will not devour me  
 Either in this or in another life,  
 Why do I not want it?

We may think that the criticism, contempt, unpleasant words and harsh speech directed at us will cause others to dislike us. Therefore we feel justified in being upset. The question that we should then ask ourselves is this, "How does people disliking me harm me in this life? How does their dislike for me harm me in my future lives?"

We should then think, "It doesn't harm me in this life and it doesn't harm me in my future lives. So they can dislike me but I don't have to dislike them for disliking me."

Somebody's criticism and unpleasant words about us may act as the conditions for others to dislike us. But so what if others dislike us? If they dislike us, so be it. If they dislike us, we don't have to dislike them in return for if we were to dislike them as a result of their dislike for us, we accumulate additional unnecessary negativities.

However we still have more to say about that. Our counter-argument is this: "Yes, they dislike me but I don't have to dislike them in return. But when somebody says something nasty about me, he hurts my reputation and when others get to hear about it, other people will also dislike me and lose faith in me. That is a problem. When others lose faith in and dislike me, it will hurt my income, which I could have gained from that relationship. So I will lose out.

If my critic did not say all those nasty things about me, I would not have lost out. I need such material resources. They are important to me. If I lose them, it will become a problem for me. Therefore I have a reason and justification for feeling upset with the person who is saying all those nasty things about me."

This way of thinking is addressed in verse 6.55.

- C. It is unreasonable to be furious because material gain has been obstructed*
1. *It is unreasonable to be furious at obstructions to material gain because they quickly perish*
- Verse 6.55 a, b  
 Because it will hinder my gain,  
 I do not want this.

We use that as the reason to feel justified for being upset with the person who says nasty things about us.

The reply to that is this:

Verse 6.55 c, d  
 I shall discard my gains here  
 And my negativities will remain securely.



Let's say we retaliate because we feel justified in doing so. We think, "I need to protect my source of income. I need to protect my reputation and my material gain. So it is justifiable for me to retaliate."

Let's say we do retaliate and we are successful in stopping people from talking about us. We manage to stop people from disliking us. As the result of all that, our income or source of money will not deteriorate so we manage to get a lot of money.

But even if we manage to do all that, the day will come when we will have to leave everything behind anyway. For sure, we have to die and go on to our next life. But in the process of retaliating, striving to maintain a good reputation and having people like us so that we will be able to keep our money, we accumulate a lot of negativities, primarily through generating anger.

In that process, anger is embedding itself ever more strongly and deeply in our mind. Our anger becomes more stable every time we get angry. We are in fact enhancing and strengthening those imprints. We are accumulating more non-virtue, all of which will remain with us when we go on to our next life and they will cause us to suffer in our future lives.

Therefore it is inappropriate to feel justified in retaliating against criticism and the people who are damaging our reputation for the sake of protecting our wealth, income, material gain and so forth.

The main reason is that even if we do manage to protect our wealth or even accumulate great wealth by retaliating, all that wealth have to be left behind at the time of death. But the negativities that we accumulated in the process of retaliating in anger to protect that wealth remain securely and firmly in our mind. They will harm us in our future lives.

Having said all that, we may still object. We say, "Material gain and money are important. I need money to survive. Without money, how am I going to survive? I need to eat. I need a roof over my head. It is not unreasonable to want all these things for my survival.

So if anybody harms my source of income or takes away my money or property, then I will have a very difficult life. I may even die. Therefore it is only right and totally justifiable that I must retaliate and do something about the situation. I need to fight to get what I need. It is all right to do that. What is wrong with that? You mean I can't fight for my survival?"

Since there is always a rebuttal to whatever we may think, this appears in the next verse.

## *2. Arresting the pursuit of wrongdoing*

Verse 6.56

Thus it is better that I die today

Than live a long time through wrong livelihood.

Even if I should live a long time,  
There will be the very suffering of death.

There are people who accumulate wealth through harming others or causing problem to others motivated by their anger, jealousy, competitiveness in a negative sense and so forth. Some are able to make a good living quite successfully through harming others in the sense that they do accumulate a lot of wealth in the process. They even live for a long time.

But sustaining their livelihood through harming others actually constitutes wrong livelihood. So as such, it is better to live a short life and die early than to live a long life that is sustained by wrong livelihood. It is better to live a short life that is not sustained by wrong livelihood than to live a long life sustained by wrong livelihood.

Because if you live a long life that is sustained by wrong livelihood, you accumulate so much negativity that will harm you in your future lives. Putting aside future lives, even in this life, at the time of death, this will cause you a lot of problems.

The essential point here is that it is of no benefit to sustain one's livelihood through harming others. Even if you do manage to accumulate a lot of wealth, actually in reality, it is of no benefit. Therefore the Kadampa masters said that it is better for the evil ones, i.e., those who commit non-virtue, to die early, i.e., to have a shorter life.

*Khen Rinpoche: The meaning is the same. That is the meaning.*

Next is showing through example how it is inappropriate to crave for material gain.

3. *Establishing, by means of an example, the unreasonableness of craving material gains*

Verse 6.57

Suppose someone should awaken from a dream  
In which he experienced one hundred years of happiness,  
And suppose another should awaken from a dream  
In which he experienced just a short while of happiness,

Verse 6.58

For both of these people who have awakened  
That happiness will never return.  
Similarly, whether my life has been long or short,  
At the time of death it will be finished like that.

Here it gives an example of someone who enjoys many things in his dream. This is to illustrate that the craving for objects of desire and material gain are inappropriate and has no real meaning.

Let's say you fall asleep and have a very nice dream. In the dream, you experience the five objects of desire—form, sound, smell, taste and touch. That dream lasts for a very long time. But once you wake up, the whole experience is really just an object of

memory. There is nothing that you can hold on to from the dream, there is nothing that you can utilise.

Likewise in real life, even if you were to live for a very long time, say, a hundred years, where you have every conceivable object of enjoyment, whatever you want, and you have a very good and enjoyable life but at the time of death, all those enjoyments become only objects of memory. You cannot enjoy them again as they are already in the past. All those experiences become like a dream. Whatever enjoyments you may have had in your entire life, at the time of death, you cannot experience them again. On top of that, you will never encounter the same experiences again in your future lives.

At the time of death, your highly enjoyable life is no different from the life of a person who has a shorter life. At the time of death, everyone is the same. Whether you had a long enjoyable life or a short enjoyable life, at the time of death whatever enjoyments and pleasant experiences you might have had are like a dream. They are just objects of memory, nothing more.

So this is showing through example why it is incorrect to crave for material gain.

Next is showing the reasons why it is incorrect or inappropriate to crave for material gain.

*4. The reasons why craving material gains is unreasonable*

Verse 6.59

Although I may acquire abundant gain  
And enjoy happiness for a long time,  
I shall go forth naked and empty-handed,  
Just like having been robbed.

Even if we were to spend our whole life accumulating wealth, resources, property and so forth, even if we do manage to derive some satisfaction, enjoyment and pleasure from them and even if we do live for a very long time with those enjoyments, at the time of death, we have to leave everything behind. At the time of death, we will be stripped of all of these things just as we are stripped of all our possessions by a robber. We can't bring anything to our next life.

This is similar to what is mentioned in lam-rim in the section on death and impermanence. In that outline, it says that at the time of death, nothing helps except the Dharma. The three points under this outline are that, at the time of death:

1. Our wealth and our possessions do not help us. They are of no benefit whatsoever.
2. Our friends, relatives and loved ones are of no use. They are of no benefit to us whatsoever.
3. Even our body, the thing we cherish the most, is of no benefit whatsoever.

The conclusion then is that at the time of death, nothing is of any benefit to us except the Dharma.

The points we have just mentioned are very obvious. You don't even have to think to understand them. This is the reality that we can see for ourselves. We see people dying and when they die, they can't take anything with them.

So far, the teachings are telling us that it is not right to have attachment and craving for material gain, but we have many reasons in our attempt to prove that there are situations where money is important and beneficial.

In the Buddhist circle, many people may think, "If I have a lot of money and I live a long time I can accumulate a lot of merit. I can make a lot of offerings and many holy objects. I can print texts and make stupas. I can do many wonderful things through which I can accumulate merit and purify my mind of negativities. So it is good to have money since it is so useful. Since I have money, I can do many of these things.

So in order to have money, sometimes I have no choice but to get angry. I need attachment to material gain but nevertheless it is still all right because with all that money, I can do all these wonderful things. I can accumulate a lot of merit. I can purify my mind of obscurations. So, it is not true that such craving is always bad."

*5. Refuting the reasoning behind spending one's times in material pursuits*

Verse 6.60

OPINION: If I were to live due to gain,  
Then I shall exhaust negativities and [increase] merit.

RESPONSE: If I were to get angry on account of gain,  
Will not my merit be consumed and negativities created?

Verse 6.61

If my very life were to degenerate  
For the sake of that,  
Then what will be the use of the life  
Of who commits only negativities?

*Khen Rinpoche: OK. So that is the answer!*

These verses are telling us that it is incorrect to follow after anger and attachment, in order to accumulate money so that we can use it to accumulate virtue and purify our mind. Basically such a line of reasoning is incorrect.

We may think, "In order to be able to do some of these things to accumulate merit, purify my mind and practise the Dharma, I need money and other things. In the process, sometimes it is all right to get angry and to have attachment." If we were to think in such a way, didn't we establish earlier that anger has many disadvantages? For example, if we get angry, we can destroy the roots of virtue accumulated over a thousand eons. We can deplete so much merit. We have accepted that there are so many negative consequences of anger. Wouldn't we experience all these disadvantages?

We may say that we follow after anger and attachment in order to be able to sustain our life and practise the Dharma. But we also accept the negative consequences of

getting upset and angry. When we follow after attachment and get angry, we destroy the roots of virtue accumulated over a very long period of time and we have to experience all the consequences of anger.

Would this not harm our supposed motivation of sustaining our life to practise the Dharma? On one hand, we say we want to live a long life and we need to have money to practise the Dharma. Yet we are doing the very things that will destroy that opportunity in this life. So there is a contradiction there.

We may feel justified in getting angry and having attachment to money and possession so that we can practise the Dharma, accumulate merit and purify our minds of obscuration. But doesn't getting angry lead to the destruction of the very merit that we say we are trying to accumulate? Isn't there is an internal contradiction in our position?

There is much more to come. Essentially whatever the argument may be, the point that this chapter is trying to tell us is that no matter how we think about it, we will not be able to justify our getting angry. This is what the text is trying to say. No matter what argument we may come up with, we will not be able to succeed in finding any justifiable reason for getting upset, contrary to what we may believe.

What we believe is that there are always situations, occasions and reasons for getting upset. We have many excuses. But whatever we may come up with, it is mentioned in the text and the rebuttal is given. We just have to think about what is mentioned in the text.

~~~~~

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS FOR SUNDAY, 22nd JUNE 2014

1. Explain the last two lines of Verse 84 from Chapter 5, which comes under the ethics of working for the welfare of sentient beings. What actions are the buddhas allowing?

(Khen Rinpoche: We should go deeper into this question and not just discuss it in a superficial manner. For instance, killing is said to be a natural misdeed. What does a natural misdeed mean?)

There were times when the buddhas gave permission to some individuals to engage in the ten non-virtues. We should also look at issues such as:

- Who were allowed to engage in the ten non-virtues?
- Was permission granted to engage in all or only some of the ten non-virtues?
- If only some of the ten non-virtues were permitted, what were these permitted non-virtues and what was the reason for permission being granted?
- What are the circumstances under which these non-virtues are permitted?
- Even if these non-virtues were permitted by the buddhas, do the people who were allowed to engage in them accumulate negativities or not?
- Why are some of the ten non-virtues not permitted?

These are some pointers to guide you in your discussion of this question, to look at it from various perspectives).

2. What are the faults of anger?
3. What are the causes of anger? (Khen Rinpoche: I have mentioned in class that when we elaborate on the causes of anger, we can talk about 24 situations or conditions).
4. What advice is given in the text to cultivate the patience that accepts suffering? Similarly, what advice is given in the text to cultivate the patience that is intent on Dharma? What is the difference between these two types of patience?

Interpreted by Ven. Tenzin Gyurme; transcribed by Phuah Soon Ek, Vivien Ng, Aki Yeo & Pang Mui Cheng; edited by Cecilia Tsong.