

Buddhist Studies Program

Subject: Lam Rim Chen Mo Module 3

Teacher: Geshe Tashi Tsering

Interpreter: Ven. Lozang Zopa

Number of the teachings: 1

Date of the teaching: 19th October 2004

Generally, when we talk about the stages of the path, what does this actually mean? It seems that the stages of the path need to be understood as the development of experiences. When we talk about the stages of the path we are talking about it in terms of the need to develop experiences. If we need to develop or produce certain experiences, Lama Tsong Khapa has provided us with about 500 pages in the Tibetan and 900 pages in the English translation. It is quite difficult to develop the experiences of all that isn't it? It could be that, in the beginning, we study very broadly and extensively, but are not very clear about the basis, the very experiences that we are supposed to be developing experiences on. We really must give this issue some thought. How is it that we develop the experiences that are the whole purpose of the stages of the path?

We covered the entire section related to the stages of the path shared by a person of small capacity. We covered the entire section related to the stages of the path shared by a person of medium capacity as well. Now when you get time, go back and read through these sections try to work out what, amongst all this material, are the main things we are meant to be developing experience of, and what are branch supports for developing those experiences. Think about that.

Now, here we are dealing with the stages of the path of a person of great capacity and the fundamental outline for this section deals with;

- 1. Showing that developing the spirit of enlightenment is the only entrance to the Mahayana.*
- 2 How to develop the spirit of enlightenment*
- 3. How to train in the bodhisattva deeds, after having developed the mind of enlightenment .*

We are actually into this third section on how to actually train in the bodhisattva deeds. We have got three sections, where in these three sections is the actual foundations that we are meant to be practicing, that we are meant to be developing experiences of, where in these three sections can that be found? You would have to say that it is found in the second section, *How to develop the mind of enlightenment*.

The first section deals with *developing the spirit of enlightenment is the only entrance to the Mahayana*. In that section the precious lord essentially shows us how without the practice of the mind of enlightenment, whatever you are doing cannot be considered mahayana dharma and that without developing the mind of enlightenment you cannot achieve mahayana paths. Essentially what he is dealing with in this section is the benefits of developing the mind. In talking about this in this way we can develop some joy for practicing the mind of enlightenment and then going on to develop it. That is basically what the first section is about, telling us the benefits of developing the mind so that we enjoy practicing it.

In the second section on developing the mind of enlightenment there are three parts;

- 1. How the spirit of enlightenment depends on certain causes to arise*
 - 2. The stages of training in the spirit of enlightenment*
 - 3. The measure of the production of the spirit of enlightenment*
- [note: the text actually lists four here, the fourth being: 4. How to adopt the spirit of enlightenment through its ritual]*

In the first section, *How the spirit of enlightenment depends on certain causes to arise* you can develop the mind of enlightenment dependent on the four conditions, the 4 causes and so forth. Those conditions

Then you look at the stages of actually training in the mind of enlightenment where you have two parts. One focuses on the tradition that comes down to us from the great elder Atisha and the other deals with the tradition that comes to us from the great Arya Shantideva.

So things to develop experience about are these two, these sections on

- 1. The training based on the seven cause-and-effect personal instructions.*
- 2. The training based on equalising or exchanging self and others.*

That is the real area in which we need to develop experience.

Now how many pages does it take Lama Tsong Khapa to discuss this? He deals with this in great detail. So in reading over this we are bound to develop certain doubts, or have certain questions. In order to dispel those doubts then we really need to become quite certain about the material that is found in here. For instance, when you train your mind in the seven-fold instructions on cause and effect, then you start to wonder about how that is done and what is required in doing so? All sorts of different questions arise. So to address those questions you must consult the text, read over it from time to time, to become more certain about the way in which this is actually done. As we become more certain about the text we eliminate more and more of our doubts about these topics, which are about the real basis for our developing the experiences we need. Geshela left one bit out and that is that in addressing these doubts we would be using analytical meditation, because as we bring up certain doubts then we use the text and logic to address those doubts.

As for the way that we meditate on these subjects we must be sure that we don't mess with the order, or that we add anything to the number of topics that are covered. You don't need to add anything. In meditating on these subjects do not fool around with the order, or disturb the order you might say. Make sure that you don't add any topics, or omit any topics from the subjects that you are meant to be covering. If you meditate in this way then it ought to turn out well.

In practicing analytical meditation you must stop laxity and excitement. If you are meditating on something like 'all sentient beings have been your mother,' then you think about all sorts of different reasons that support that conclusion. If something occurs to you and it is a good reason that supports what you are meditating on, fantastic! But if it draws you away from the topic at hand and you begin to lose sight of the fact that you are supposed to be meditating on the topic of developing the recognition 'all sentient beings have been your mother' then you must stop it. That is an obstacle to meditation. Even in analytical meditation you must stop laxity and excitement, because if you allow yourself to get sidetracked by these other types of thoughts then your mind will become distracted.

When we practice analytical meditation you hold to a single topic, to a single basis or root. Then in order to clarify that, you use recourse to all sorts of different reasons, you refer to other reasons. If in referring to other things you lose the foundation or root of your meditation, you are not meditating analytically properly. So analytical meditation holds to a single topic that uses different reasons in order to clarify that.

The third section deals with the measure of producing the mind of enlightenment. Basically, once the mind with the two aspirations becomes uncontrived, you have developed the uncontrived mind of enlightenment. If you develop the two aspirations in a contrived way, then you have developed the contrived mind of enlightenment. We probably have to posit two different measures.

Lama Tsong Khapa seems to present it in terms of the measure for developing the uncontrived mind of enlightenment, but we need to consider how you develop the contrived mind of enlightenment as well.

So basically, once you develop the two aspirations your mind becomes a mind of enlightenment, contrived as it may be, it is a mind of enlightenment.

We have the main material in these three sections. They are not the most fundamental outline of the stages of the path of a person of great capacity, but they contain some of the main material. So the last section deals with the measure of having developed the mind of enlightenment. The first section deals with the benefits of having done so or doing so, and then the middle section deals with what you are actually meant to be developing experiences of, the real basis for the practice.

You cannot achieve Buddhahood by simply developing the mind of enlightenment. We will not achieve our final aims through the mind of enlightenment alone and that is why we need to go on and train in the bodhisattva deeds. Which is the topic of the next section, ‘How to train in the bodhisattva deeds.’ In other words the stages of doing so.

In the section ‘how to train in the bodhisattva deeds’ you have a section dealing with ‘the reasons why you must learn the trainings after developing the mind of enlightenment.’ Then you have a section, ‘demonstrating that you will not become a Buddha by learning method or wisdom separately.’ Thirdly you have a section, ‘explaining the process of learning the precepts.’ Focus on the first two for the moment. We need to know why we must train in the deeds after developing the mind of enlightenment and we need to know why we will not become Buddhas by training in either method or wisdom alone.

You must train in the deeds after having developed the mind of enlightenment because you cannot achieve buddhahood by developing the mind of enlightenment alone. After all we are trying to attain buddhahood, which involves achieving both the form bodies and the dharma bodies, the rupakayas and the dharmakayas and you cannot attain those through developing the mind alone, hence you must train in the deeds.

Let us make sure the reasons are not confused here. You must train in the deeds because you will not achieve buddhahood without training in the deeds, only through developing the mind of enlightenment alone, let us be certain about that. Would you like me to say it again? You must train in the deeds because you will not achieve buddha-hood without training in the deeds or simply through developing the mind of enlightenment alone.

If you have doubts about that, read through this section of the Precious Lord’s text. He gives many reasons why you must train in the deeds. It should become clear after you read through that section.

Demonstrating that you will not become a Buddha by learning either method or wisdom separately. It is in this section that certain doubts are put forward. Certain doubts about whether you can achieve buddhahood by training in either method or wisdom separately. These doubts must be addressed and hence, the second section. Do we understand the misconceptions? The misconception that we deal with, does it involve the thought that you can achieve buddhahood by method alone or does it involve the thought that you can achieve Buddhahood by wisdom alone? Which of the two is it?

Student: Wisdom.

Geshela: Excellent! Excellent, it is wisdom.

Some people think the actual method for achieving buddha-hood is emptiness. As for the relative phenomena, well they are not really methods for achieving buddha-hood because in employing or making use of relative phenomena, conception or conceptual thought enters the picture, and conceptual thought is an actual obstacle to attaining buddha-hood. So the misconception that we deal with in this section is the idea that you can achieve buddha-hood through wisdom alone.

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only
Then when we look at the stages that you go through when you train in the deeds, you look at how you must train in the perfection of generosity, how you train in ethics, which we have already covered. That brings us to the section on how to train in patience, where we will pick up today.

What is more, you have a section on ‘how to train in the deeds in general’ and ‘how to train in the final two perfections in particular.’ We are still dealing with the deeds in general.

On page 155 of the English translation it says the ‘explanation of how to train in the perfection of patience’ has five parts;

1. *What patience is*
2. *How to begin the cultivation of patience*
3. *The divisions of patience*
4. *How to practice*
5. *A summary*

Geshela’s explanation is just going to follow the presentation Lama Tsong Kapa gives here.

What patience is

Patience is (1) disregarding harm done to you, (2) accepting the suffering arising in your mind-stream, and (3) being certain about the teachings and firmly maintaining belief in them.

There are three sets of factors incompatible with these. For the first - hostility, for the second - hostility and loss of courage and for the third - disbelief and dislike. These are the opposite of the three types of patience just mentioned.

Look at the first one, patience means ‘*disregarding harm done to you.*’ So if there is harm done to you, disregard it, you do not retaliate or seek to return that harm. If you are trying to return the harm done to you then hostility is going to enter. Hostility is the opposite of the patience that disregards the harm that is done to you.

The second type of patience is ‘*accepting the suffering arising in your mind-stream.*’ Sometimes when you suffer you can become angry. When you suffer you might become discouraged, your mind becomes deflated and you lose courage. So you have these two types. But remember that from time to time we meditate on giving and taking. When suffering occurs you can think, ‘Well, what is happening to me now is just like what I meditated on in giving and taking.’

Of course it is not that easy, but you can at least think that way. So accepting the suffering arising in your mind-stream. The opposite of that would be developing hostility and becoming discouraged.

Number 3. ‘being certain about the teachings and firmly maintaining belief in them.’

Sometimes when we study the dharma we can become tired, or sick of it you might say. You might think, ‘I don’t understand this, I am not capable of understanding this.’ But this loss, what is translated here as a loss of belief is like a loss of affinity, or even appreciation. When we study we must remember we are engaged in a virtuous action and think, ‘I don’t want to get sick of it and develop this dislike which is based on the thought that I can’t understand this, I’m not capable of understanding this material.’ That would be disbelief and dislike. So we need to be certain about the teachings and firmly maintain our belief, our appreciation, our affinity with them.

We posit pseudo reasons, this is why Geshela says we must study the types of reasons, types of logic. Actually the reasons that we give are contradictory reasons, [just for simplicity’s sake], because our

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only
reasons for saying we don't want to study is that we don't understand it. But that is a contradictory reason. You must study because you don't understand it. You don't want to study because you don't understand it, is turning it completely on its head. It is contradictory.

If someone were to say, 'Take sound, it is permanent because it disintegrates from moment to moment.' This is a contradictory reason. I am not going to study because I don't understand, same principle.

These are the reasons we need to be employing the patience of being certain about the teachings and firmly maintaining belief in them. If you don't understand something then you must definitely study and you will come to understand it a bit. The more you study about it, the more you come to understand and your level of understanding grows and grows, until you have a pretty good understanding. So to overcome disbelief we must be certain about the teachings and firmly maintain appreciation or affinity with them. Study is the cause of understanding, not studying is the cause of not understanding. So don't go positing these pseudo reasons, these incorrect reasons.

Perfecting patience means that you simply complete your conditioning to a state of mind wherein you have stopped your anger and the like. It is not contingent upon all living beings becoming free from undisciplined conduct because you would not be able to bring this about, and because you accomplish your purpose just by disciplining your own mind

Notice that the Precious Lord's presentation here is the same as he was giving with the previous perfections. There we have the Precious Lord's explanation. What follows is a quote from Shantideva's *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds*.

It says:

*Undisciplined persons are as limitless as space;
You could never overcome them.
If you conquer the single mental state of anger
It is like vanquishing all your enemies.*

*Where could you get enough leather
To cover the entire surface of the earth?
Wearing just the leather of your sandals
Is like covering all the earth.*

*Similarly, I cannot change
External things, but
I can change my state of mind;
Why change anything else?*

We don't have a single statement identifying what the nature of patience is. Usually, when asked what is the definition of patience we reply, 'blah blah blah.' That is not the case here because the Precious Lord says there are three types of patience. You have the patience that disregards harm done to you, the patience that accepts the suffering arising in your mind-stream, and the patience that is certain about the teachings about the dharma. So there are three types of patience. We do not have a unified presentation of the nature of patience as we have in other cases.

Disregarding the harm that is done to you, take that, it follows that it is patience. Is that a consciousness? If it is patience it must be a consciousness.

Actually this is a point that could be debated. But maybe it is better if we don't debate it. Or, is it better if we do debate it? *Disregarding harm done to you*, not thinking that you will harm someone, thinking

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only
that I am not going to return the harm done to me. That is consciousness. That is the first kind of patience.

The second type of patience is a patience of accepting suffering. So when suffering of any type arises, you think about how that came to be, think about what the causes of this suffering are, think that in experiencing this suffering the fruits of negative karmas are being exhausted. With these types of thoughts, accept the suffering that you are experiencing.

Then you have the patience that is certain about the teaching. You think that I am going to study come what may, I am going to study if things go well, if things go badly or I get tired and sick of it, I am going to continue.

Shantideva gives an analogy that Lama Tsong Khapa doesn't comment on. First of all, why do we need to practice patience to begin with? We need to establish virtue in our own continuum and having established virtue we need to protect that virtue. We need something to help us protect that virtue we established, otherwise negativities like anger might come along and snatch it away from us, or hijack it, steal it like a bandit, destroy our virtues. That is why we need patience, because patience is the indispensable technique, it allows us to protect our virtues so they are not carried away by negativity, so they are not destroyed by anger.

Generally there are many benefits to patience that could be discussed, but the main ones deal with patience's ability to guard our roots of virtue, roots of virtue that you accumulate through practicing generosity or ethics or joyous effort, the virtues that are included within the collection of merit. We talked a great deal about this when we were dealing with the section on karma.

So you have these virtues that are included within the collection of merit that need to be protected, lest they be destroyed by anger. They talk about the merit that you accumulate in making a prostration to a stupa which contains the relics of a Buddha, for instance. They say that your body covers a certain amount of ground and that actually from your body all the way down to the golden disc, or the golden basis which acts as the foundation of the world, all the way down to that. Of course these days if you bring that type of thing up, the inevitable question would be, "Well, how many kilometres do you think that would be from my body to the golden disc which is the basis of the world?" Geshela says, "I don't know, I can't give you an answer to that." But they say in the texts that for as many particles as there are between your body and this golden ground which is the foundation of the world, then you accumulate that many karmas for being reborn as a universal emperor. That is how much merit you get from simply making a prostration to a stupa containing the relics, so you need to guard these and the way to guard them is with patience, because if you don't guard them they can be destroyed and taken away.

We have the seeds that will project rebirth as a human in our continuums. We must protect these, otherwise if these seeds were destroyed that would be quite something, really very disappointing. These types of things, those seeds of karma that project rebirth as a human would be like those things included within the collection of merit, so we must guard them.

So these are important points and perhaps we can return to them later.

Now, section two deals with:

(b') How to begin the cultivation of patience

It says:

Although there are many ways to cultivate patience, to begin I will explain the meditation on the benefits of patience and the faults of not being patient.

The benefits (of practicing patience) are set forth in the Bodhisattva Levels:

Initially, bodhisattvas consider the benefits of patience. They think, “Persons who have patience will not have many enemies later on and will not have many separations from those to whom they are close. They will have much happiness and contentment. They will have no regret at the time of death, and upon the disintegration of their bodies they will also be reborn among the deities in the happy realms of high status.” By looking at such benefits, they too are patient. They engage others in upholding patience, and they also praise patience. When they see patient persons, they are delighted and full of joy.

This quote from the *Bodhisattva Levels* mentions that we ought to practice patience ourselves and also do things so that others engage in patience, praise it for instance.

The Compendium of the Perfections says:

*It is said, “Patience is the best approach
For dealing with the inclination to disregard others’ welfare”;
Patience against the fault of anger protects
All that is excellent in this world.*

*Patience is the best ornament of the powerful,
The greatest strength for those who practice asceticism,
And a stream of water on the wildfire of malice.
Patience clears away much harm in this and future lives.*

*The arrows of undisciplined people’s words
Are dulled by a superior being’s armour of patience;
These unruly people then give pleasant flowers of praise
Which become attractive garlands of fame.*

Geshela was just commenting on the Tibetan in the first verse. Given that it is in verse form it is quite terse, so there is the possibility that you misread it, thinking that it is saying for those inclined to disregard others’ welfare then patience is great. But given that it is verse and there is room for interpretation then clearly that is not what it is saying. The idea is that patience is the best approach for dealing with the inclination to disregard others’ welfare. It is clear in English though, the confusion is perhaps limited to the Tibetan. Then later in the next verse it mentions that *patience is the greatest strength for those who practice asceticism*. There are all sorts of different ways to practice asceticism, different forms of hardship that you might endure, for instance by doing a Nyung Nay. Patience it says here is the greatest strength, the supreme strength for those who are engaged in acts of hardship. There are many difficulties that you encounter in practicing dharma. Accepting those difficulties is what we call dealing with hardship.

It then goes on to say that patience is like *a stream of water on the wildfire of malice*. The author is likening ill will to a fire, in that ill will burns up our roots of virtue. That is to say that having the intention to harm renders our roots of virtue incapable of producing an effect. The same is true for fire and the seed for a tree. If you place a seed for a tree in a fire it burns it up so that the seed no longer has the capacity or ability to produce a plant. Similarly ill will, or as it is translated here, malice, the intention to harm, burns up our roots of virtue rendering them incapable of producing an effect. Hence it is like a fire, yet patience is like a stream of water that puts it out.

Then it says that *the arrows of undisciplined people’s words are dulled by a superior being’s armour of patience*. Which is true, the words that people say are like arrows, they hurt us, they harm our minds. Yet patience dulls these arrows so that they don’t cause pain, which would be pretty enjoyable, would be pretty good.

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only

Geshela commented before on one of the twelve deeds of a Buddha, maybe you remember it. It is said that on the verge of attaining Buddhahood demons and all sorts of different things cast weapons at the Buddha. Yet when they came close to the Buddha they turned into flowers. Actually the meaning of that story is explained here in the final verse, this is what it is really talking about. Who knows if somebody really came along and threw a rock at the Buddha when he was about to achieve enlightenment? We can be quite certain that there were many people who were angry about that, people who thought, “I am the one and if this guy is going to come along and attain enlightenment then he is going to become famous,” so people get jealous. People cast the arrows of jealousy, the arrows of pride, the arrows of anger. But like it says here, they become attractive, pleasant flowers of praise. So here, whether or not weapons were actually thrown at the Buddha, we can be sure that these other forms of weapons, pride, envy and so forth were thrown, because it is in the nature of people. So that is the significance of that story, explained right here in the third verse.

The text continues – *And also:*

*Patience is also the craftsman that creates a buddha's embodiment of form,
Adorned with the beautiful signs of good qualities.*

In the following paragraph the earlier quotes are explained. So the commentary on the meaning of those quotes reads:

Thus, Aryasura praises patience by way of its many benefits: it stops you from turning away from others' welfare on account of living beings' misperceptions; it protects you from anger, the enemy that destroys many roots of virtue; it is a captivating ornament because it endures the harm of those of little power; it is the excellent strength of ascetics who are tormented by the afflictions; it is a stream of water that extinguishes the wildfire of malice; it is armor that cannot be pierced by the arrows of undisciplined persons' misperceptions; it is the skilled artisan who creates a fine form of golden color that captivates the eyes and minds of beings.

It's clear isn't it? If there's anything that's unclear please ask about it.

If we continue to talk about these points even though they're clear it's basically just blocking our time. So to continue on:

Furthermore, Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds states:

*Whoever works hard and overcomes anger
Is happy in this and future lives.*

When you rely on patience continually, you do not spoil your joyful attitude, so you are always happy even in this life. Moreover, patience stops miserable rebirths in future lives, gives special rebirths in happy realms, and ultimately bestows certain goodness, so you are utterly happy in this and future lives.

Here we have correct reasons for the benefits of patience. If you practice patience well, then you will be happy in this life. Does that work as a correct reason for you? That seems to be the case doesn't it. After all, all of our problems are created by anger, so if you don't get angry, if you have this continual practice of patience that stops anger from manifesting, if you don't get angry the problems that come from anger don't occur and you are going to be happier. That much we know if we reflect on our own experience. So that's the first point – that if you practice patience well you will be happier in this life.

The next point is that it stops miserable realm rebirths. For the most part these miserable realm rebirths are caused by negativities, non-virtues and those negativities are more often than not motivated by anger. If you continually practice patience you stop anger from becoming manifest, so you stop the performance of those sorts of negativities that would otherwise project rebirth in a miserable realm.

Hence patience stops miserable realm rebirths. To be specific, patience stops the miserable realm rebirths that occur through the power of anger. In which case it gives you special rebirths in happy realms. If you stop miserable realm rebirths then you get these special rebirths in the happy realms, and ultimately it bestows certain goodness so you are utterly happy in this and future lives. Certain goodness is of course referring to liberation and Buddhahood. It says then that by practicing patience continually you are happier in this life, you stop miserable realm rebirths in the future, you get these special rebirths in happy realms in the future and that finally you achieve certain goodness.

Meditate on these benefits until you gain a strong, firm certainty about the cause-and-effect relationship wherein benefits such as these arise from patience.

That is it for the benefits of practicing patience.

Now let us look at the shortcomings of anger. It says:

With respect to the faults of anger, the invisible that is, unseen faults are as follows. Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds states:

*Any good deeds, such as
Generosity and worshipping the sugatas,
You have collected over a thousand eons
Are all destroyed in one moment of anger.*

Aryasura formulated this exactly as it is presented in Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds. The Play of Mañjusri Sutra (Mañjusri-vikrīṭa-sutra) mentions the destruction of virtue accumulated over a hundred eons, and also Candrakīrti's Commentary on the "Middle Way" says that virtue accumulated over a hundred eons of conditioning to the perfections of generosity and ethical discipline is destroyed even by the generation of just a momentary angry thought.

It says here that *any good deeds, such as generosity and worshipping the sugatas, you have collected over a thousand eons are all destroyed in one moment of anger*, that is in Santideva's text *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds*. Then the *Play of Manjushri Sutra* mentions the destruction of virtue accumulated over a hundred eons. Candrakīrti's text *Introduction to the Middle Way* says that virtue accumulated over a hundred eons of conditioning to the perfections of generosity and ethical discipline is destroyed even by the generation of just a momentary angry thought. So we have three ways or types of anger destroying roots of virtue.

Concerning who or what the recipient of such destructive anger must be, some say that it must be bodhisattvas, while others assert that it is recipients in general. The former accords with the statement in the Commentary on the "Middle Way":

*Therefore, a moment's anger toward a conquerors' child
Destroys the virtue arising from generosity and ethical discipline
Accumulated over a hundred eons.*

So here we have a discussion of who is the subject of the anger that destroys that virtue. Recipient here refers to the one that you are angry with.

So Candrakīrti says in his text that *a moment's anger toward a conquerors' child destroys the virtue arising from generosity and ethical discipline accumulated over a hundred eons*. This is an instance in which anger destroys roots of virtue. The recipient referred to in Candrakīrti's text is therefore a bodhisattva.

Now what about the person who gets angry? Well:

With respect to the person who gets angry, Candrakirti's Explanation of the "Middle Way" Commentary says that if anger even by bodhisattvas destroys their roots of virtue, it goes without saying that the anger of non-bodhisattvas toward bodhisattvas does.

Then it continues:

Regardless of whether the recipient of the anger is ascertained to be a bodhisattva or whether the faults seen that cause the anger are true, the destruction of virtue is said nonetheless to be just as explained above [i.e., the virtue accumulated over a hundred eons is lost].

A person gets angry towards a bodhisattva, whether the person ascertains this is a bodhisattva or not, then the roots of virtue being destroyed are the same. The person gets angry towards this bodhisattva because they see a certain fault. Well the fault that they see, whether it is a fault that the bodhisattva actually possesses or is a fault that the bodhisattva doesn't possess, they simply think they possess it. In both cases the roots of virtue that are destroyed through that person's anger towards the bodhisattva are the same. So whether or not a person ascertains that the object of their anger is a bodhisattva, whether or not the faults that are a basis for the anger are accurate or not, the roots of virtue that are destroyed are the same in all cases.

In general, for there to be destruction of the roots of virtue it is not required that the anger be toward bodhisattvas.

That assertion is supported by the following quote from The Compendium of Trainings which relates the story Geshela mentioned earlier.

The Compendium of Trainings states:

The text of the Arya-sarvastivadins also says: "Monks, consider a monk who makes a full prostration to a stupa that contains a buddha's hair and nails and who has an attitude of faith. "So be it, Revered One."

"Monks, this monk will experience reigns as a universal monarch a thousand times the number of grains of sand eighty-four-thousand leagues under the ground his prostrate body covers—down to the disk of gold that supports the earth."

Then, the venerable Upali, bowing with hands joined respectfully from off to the side from where the Bhagavan was seated, asked, "The Bhagavan has said that this monk's roots of virtue are so great. O Bhagavan, how are those roots of virtue used up, diminished, erased, and extinguished?"

"Upali, when such a sin as malice is done to fellow practitioners, it is like a wound or maiming. I cannot see its full impact. Upali, this diminishes, erases, and extinguishes those great roots of virtue. Therefore, Upali, if you would not feel malice toward a burned stump, what need to mention feeling that way toward a body with consciousness?"

That explains how the destruction occurs. Then we must consider what it means for roots of virtue to be destroyed.

Some scholars' position: which we don't accept is that: "The meaning of destroying the roots of virtue is in destroying the capacity of previous virtues to issue their effects speedily, you delay the issuance of their effects. So anger, for instance, will give its effect first, but it is certainly not the case that the seeds of the roots of virtue will not issue effects when they later meet with the requisite conditions, because, given that no mundane path can eliminate the seeds that are to be eliminated, that is the seeds that must be abandoned it is impossible to have an elimination of the seeds of the afflictions."

The *Reply* is 'This reasoning is unsound.'

In the manuals they use in studying the Middle Way, the destruction of roots of virtue is described in the following way; to destroy the root of virtue means to render a seed of virtue incapable of producing an effect, in particular rendering it incapable of producing a pleasant effect.

Purifying a negativity is said to involve rendering that negativity incapable of producing an unpleasant effect, or an effect of suffering. So you have a similar principle involved, whether you are purifying negativities through confession and purification, or you are destroying the roots of virtue through anger, for instance.

The Precious Lord is saying that the reasoning posited by other scholars is unsound, doesn't stand up or is uncertain. The reasons are, as Geshela was just saying:

(1) even the purification wherein ordinary beings clear away nonvirtue by means of its remedy, the four powers of confession, is not an elimination of its seeds that is to say not an abandonment of its seeds; nevertheless, though the seeds of this nonvirtue may later meet with the requisite conditions, they cannot issue a fruition; (2) even virtuous and nonvirtuous karmas that are spent upon issuing their individual fruitions do not lose their seeds; nevertheless, even when the seeds of such karmas meet henceforth with the requisite conditions, it is impossible for fruitions to arise

This is a bit of an important point here. What does it mean to say that anger destroys roots of virtue? This is something we must understand.

Geshela: Chodron, what does it mean for anger to destroy roots of virtue?

Student: It destroys the seed's capacity to produce a virtuous effect

Geshela: When the question is asked what does it mean for anger to destroy the roots of virtue and you respond by saying that it destroys the capacity, it is a bit funny. So what does it mean to destroy?

Student: To render incapable.

[Interpreter: To render incapable, yeah that is what Geshela said, or at least that is how I translated it.]

Geshela: So does it have no effects? Does it have effects? Is it a functioning thing? If it is a functioning thing does it necessarily have effects? Are there things which are necessarily its effects?

OK, so take the seed of a root of virtue destroyed by anger, it follows that it has effects.

Student 2: Yes

Interpreter: So Teri says yes – you are supporting Chodron right?

Student 2: After a seed's ability to produce a virtuous effect is destroyed then it will produce suffering.

Geshela: laughing – what is the need for it to establish the effect of suffering? Where does this come from?

We are talking about how anger destroys the roots of virtue, right? So are you saying that the effects of suffering are coming from the anger.

[Geshela: This a little mixed coming.]

In a single person's continuum there are seeds of virtue and seeds of non-virtue. So when you get angry, that anger does what to the seed of virtue's ability to produce an effect?

Student 2: It destroys it.

Geshela: Yes it destroys it, and so to destroy means?

Student 2: No effect.

Geshela: Does that mean that it is not a functioning thing then, the seed of virtue? Can it still produce effects?

Student 2: I don't know.

Geshela (to Chodron) the person who was supporting you is now saying that she is not going to support you because she doesn't know. So does the seed of virtue that has been destroyed by anger have effects?

Student 3: Geshela talked about pleasant effects, didn't he?

Geshela: OK. That is right, but does it have effects?

Student3: It produces effects but not the pleasant effects.

Geshela: That is right, it produces the effect of later moments of a similar type. Thank-you Vanessa for listening. Chodron fell asleep and that is why I asked her (laughter).

That is right, they say that it renders the seed incapable of producing pleasant effects. This might also be translated as 'the effect of pleasure'. In any case, if you have a seed of barley and it is boiled, then that seed is rendered incapable of producing a sprout, but you would still refer to this thing as a seed wouldn't you? Even though it is not capable of producing a sprout.

So take this barley seed that has been boiled in water, how would you respond if you were asked, 'Does it have effects?'

It has effects because it is a functioning thing, because it is a cause.

So what has been destroyed?

Student: Its ability to sprout.

Geshela: It has been rendered incapable of producing a sprout that is the effect, or the effect of a sprout.

Even if it meets with the requisite conditions, soil and water, as Lama Tsong Khapa says here, even if it meets with these requisite conditions of soil and water it will still not produce the plant, the sprout.

Judging by how Lama Tsong Khapa explains this, it would seem that you don't lose the seed. Rather, even if you encounter the requisite conditions it will not be capable of producing a pleasant effect or the effect of pleasure. So the ability to produce that pleasant effect or that pleasure as a result has been eliminated.

We are talking about the way anger destroys roots of virtue.

With the purification of the seeds of negativities through confession and purification, makes it so that

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only
even if the seed of negativity encounters the requisite conditions, it will not be capable of producing an unpleasant effect or a result of suffering.

Don't forget that!

Geshela is being a little light hearted, there is no wind, it is hot and we have been going for along time. We have got all the conditions for falling asleep, (laughter) in fact there is no condition for falling asleep that we lack right now, so you can't really be blamed for falling asleep.

Geshela is not entirely sure whether Chodron was actually sleeping or perhaps she was meditating (laughter). She wasn't looking at her text, she was just kind of sitting there, so Geshela sort of assumed she is asleep, if in fact you were meditating he apologises.

Buddhist Studies Programme

Subject : Lam Rim Chen Mo Module 3

Teacher : Geshe Tashi Tsering

Interpreter : Ven Lozang Zopa

Number of the teaching: 2

Date of the teaching: 20th Oct 2004

In the section we covered yesterday, we looked at the way in which anger destroys the roots of virtue, and saw how a similar principle applies to the way confession and purification with the four opponent powers purifies seeds of negativities. We left off on page 159.

We were looking at other scholars' positions on what it means for anger to destroy the roots of virtue. These other scholars maintain the position that anger renders those roots of virtue incapable of quickly producing their effect. In fact they say that it's not that these roots of virtue will not issue effects when they meet with requisite conditions, but rather anger delays the issuance of their effects, or postpones the arising of the effects. Their reason for saying that is *because, given that no mundane path can eliminate the seeds that are to be eliminated, it is impossible to have an elimination of the seeds of the afflictions*. So that's their reasoning for it. The response is *this reasoning is unsound* for a number of reasons.

As for paths, you have mundane paths and supramundane paths.

The phrase 'mundane path' should be understood in a very specific way. Consider the first meditative stabilisation. You've got the actual first meditative stabilisation, and before that you have the access to the first meditative stabilisation. Then the access to the second meditative stabilisation, then the actual second meditative stabilisation, and so on and so forth. In the access to the first meditative stabilisation you destroy the opportunity for desire realm disturbing emotions to become manifest. In a sense you abandon those desire realm disturbing emotions and then go on to attain the actual first meditative stabilisation. Then in the access to the second meditative stabilisation you destroy the opportunity for the disturbing emotions related to the first meditative stabilisation from becoming manifest, and go into the actual second meditative stabilisation.

So, in this way, the certain disturbing emotions or afflictions are abandoned, but you don't abandon them with their seeds. They can still later, at some point arise. They can arise because the seeds for them still remain. These are considered mundane paths.

A similar thing happens as you move from the meditative stabilisations into the formless realms. In the access to the formless realm, you destroy the opportunity for the disturbing emotions of the meditative stabilisations from becoming manifest, and then move into the formless realm. The formless realm has four levels, doesn't it? As you go through these different stages you follow a similar process at each point. At each point you're said to abandon these disturbing emotions, although you don't abandon their seeds. They use the phrase 'abandon' here however.

It's said that these paths are not capable of abandoning the seeds because they are mundane paths. The abandonment that takes place on supramundane paths is like that of the path of seeing, or the path of meditation. These paths abandon the disturbing emotions together with their seeds, whereas the mundane paths merely destroy the opportunity for these things to become manifest.

The position these scholars are adopting is that anger cannot eliminate the seeds of roots of virtue, just as confession complete with the four powers cannot eliminate the seeds of negativities. They say that neither of these can eliminate seeds because they resemble mundane paths. The point being that such a person has not yet attained the path of seeing.

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only
On page 159 it reads: *Some scholars' position: it is certainly not the case that the seeds of the roots of virtue will not issue effects when they later meet with the requisite conditions, because, given that no mundane path can eliminate the seeds that are to be eliminated, it is impossible to have an elimination of the seeds of the afflictions.*"

Lama Tsong Khapa replies saying this reason is an indeterminate proof, or reason.

Do we know about this indeterminate reason? When you say it's indeterminate, you're saying basically that the pervasion is not definite. You don't have a pervasion, in other words.

Reply: This reasoning is indeterminate because (1) even the purification wherein ordinary beings clear away non-virtue by means of its remedy, the four powers of confession, is not an elimination, that is, an abandonment, of its seeds; nevertheless, though the seeds of this non-virtue may later meet with the requisite conditions, they cannot issue a fruition;

Ordinary beings clear away non-virtue by means of its remedy, the four powers of confession. This is not an abandonment of its seeds: *nevertheless, though the seeds of this non-virtue may later meet with the requisite conditions, they cannot issue a fruition.*

Take a barley seed. Boil it in water. This barley seed is no longer capable of producing a barley sprout is it? Even if it meets the conditions which otherwise would produce the barley sprout, this seed cannot produce a barley sprout.

There are no farmers in this room so you probably don't understand!! We've got some gardeners though I believe. If you're thinking to grow a crop of barley or a crop of corn, don't boil the seeds!! Because if you boil the seeds they're no longer going to be able to produce the sprouts of the plants, ok?

Even if it meets with the requisite conditions, it will still not issue forth a fruition. Here it talks about the fruitional effects, doesn't it? With non-virtue, you get the fruitions of suffering and with virtue you get the fruitions of pleasure.

The precious Lord's not finished...

(2) even virtuous and nonvirtuous karmas that are spent upon issuing their individual fruitions do not lose their seeds; nevertheless, even when the seeds of such karmas meet henceforth with the requisite conditions, it is impossible for fruitions to arise;

Here we have responses given to the person who was arguing that mundane paths cannot abandon the seeds. Now Lama Tsong Khapa's giving very sharp, or pointed responses, isn't he?

(3) when you attain the peak and forbearance levels of the path of preparation, you do not eliminate the seeds of nonvirtue that cause wrong views and miserable rebirths; nevertheless, even though the seeds of this nonvirtue may meet with the requisite conditions, they cannot give rise to wrong views or a miserable rebirth.

Let's say that before achieving the peak or forbearance levels of the path of preparation, a person, through wrong views, accumulates karma for being reborn in the miserable realms. Having achieved the forbearance level, then it's no longer possible for that person to take rebirth in the miserable realm. Yet it's not the case that the seed for such a rebirth has been abandoned. After all, we're dealing with a mundane path, the path of an ordinary being, aren't we?

Generally speaking, the path of preparation is a path of an ordinary sentient being. If something is a path of preparation is it necessarily a path of an ordinary sentient being? Is there a pervasion?

Student: A hinayana arhat who has gone on to achieve the mahayana path of preparation.

Furthermore, the reasoning is unsound because, as the earlier citation says:

*As to the actions that give rise to cyclic existence,
There are those that are weighty, those that are near,
Those to which you are habituated, and those you did earliest.
Among these, the former will ripen first.*

Any virtuous or nonvirtuous action that comes to fruition does temporarily stop the opportunity for the fruition of another action; however, it is not said nor can it be established that a mere preceding fruition destroys virtue or nonvirtue.

This is something Geshela's often spoken about. We have seeds of nonvirtue and seeds of virtue in our continuum. Seeds that will project rebirth in the miserable realms on the one hand, or the happy realm on the other. Now at the time of death, if we are able to make a positive state of mind manifest then we activate a virtuous seed. If a virtuous seed is activated then the seed of a nonvirtue is not able to ripen, is it? So we then go on to take a happy realm rebirth.

So any virtuous or nonvirtuous action that comes to fruition does temporarily stop the opportunity for the fruition of another action. However, that's not enough to say that a mere preceding fruition destroys virtue or nonvirtue.

Similarly, you've got nonvirtuous seeds in your continuum. So if anger, or some other negative state of mind were to manifest and activate those nonvirtuous seeds, then the seeds of virtue don't have the opportunity to ripen, do they? But you don't say that on that basis those virtuous seeds have been destroyed. You go on to take a miserable realm rebirth and the virtuous seed cannot ripen, but you don't then say the virtuous seeds have been destroyed.

Student: If you have a virtuous thought at the time of death, does that wipe out nonvirtuous deeds or thoughts for the next life?

Geshela: That virtuous thought doesn't stop the nonvirtues from coming in the next life. Rather, that virtuous thought induces it's own effect. In this case it induces the rebirth in a happy realm. Having taken rebirth in a happy realm, then all sorts of things can come about, both virtuous and nonvirtuous.

The virtuous seed will project you into a happy realm rebirth, but then what's to say what happens in that actual rebirth, whether it's pleasant or unpleasant? So that we have a complete happy realm rebirth we must practise things like ethics and so forth. That's why Geshela has talked of the importance of practicing all six perfections, to ensure that not only will we take a happy realm rebirth, but that things will turn out well for us – that we have all the different circumstances.

We go on to address another statement they made, about how you postpone fruition. Lama Tsong Khapa says:

Nor is it appropriate for “destroying the roots of virtue” to mean the mere temporary postponement of fruition; otherwise, it would absurdly follow that all powerful nonvirtuous actions must be considered destroyers of the roots of virtue.

The destroyers of roots of virtue are said to be two in number - anger and wrong views. Those are the only destroyers of roots of virtue that are put forth, in terms of the nonvirtues that do so.

If you say that anything that postpones the fruition of a root of virtue is a destroyer of a root of virtue, then any strong nonvirtue must be considered a destroyer of roots of virtue, because a strong nonvirtue is going to come to fruition before the virtues, and therefore postpone their fruition. But that's an absurd consequence, and so therefore you would not say that anything that postpones a fruition of a root of virtue is a destroyer of a root of virtue.

Killing one's mother, one's father, an arhat. These different activities are not posited as destroyers of roots of virtue.

Therefore, concerning this the master Bhavaviveka states (as already explained) that in the case of both the purification of nonvirtue by the four powers of confession and the destruction of roots of virtue by wrong views and malice, that is anger, the seeds of the virtue or nonvirtue cannot give rise to effects even though they may later meet with the requisite conditions, just as spoiled seeds will not give rise to sprouts even though they may meet with the requisite conditions.

The precious Lord was making this statement earlier. His source for that is Bhavaviveka.

What does it mean to say that the roots of virtue are destroyed? It means that the seed of a root of virtue is rendered incapable of producing or becoming a pleasant effect, even if it meets with the requisite conditions. What does it mean to say that a negativity is purified by the four opponent powers? It means that the seed of that negativity is rendered incapable of producing or becoming an effect of suffering, even if it meets with the requisite conditions.

Other doubts are addressed below.

Moreover, as already explained, even though you cleanse your accumulation of sins through purification by the four powers, this does not contradict the fact that you are slow to produce higher paths. Accordingly, for some persons anger destroys, for instance, their resources and excellent body — the respective effects of giving gifts and safeguarding ethical discipline — but is unable to destroy their ability to easily produce roots of virtue again through giving gifts and safeguarding ethical discipline by means of the causally concordant behavioral effect of their habituation to generosity and an attitude of abstention.

Some people think 'oh, it's no big deal if you commit a negativity, because you can always purify it.' You shouldn't think in this way because there certainly is a difference in the speed with which you develop the higher paths, depending on whether you have avoided accumulating negativity altogether, from the first, or if you've accumulated negativity and then purified it. Certainly it happens more swiftly if you don't commit the negativity in the first place.

For other persons, anger destroys the continuous occurrence of a similar type of causally concordant virtuous behavior like ethical self-discipline and so on. Say that a person gets angry and that destroys the causally concordant effects which would be a later instance of ethics that belongs to a similar type as that which preceded it. So in this case the causally concordant virtuous behaviour is destroyed, but the anger is unable to destroy the occurrence of an excellent body, resources, and so forth.

Some [bodhisattvas] realize a path through which they progress to perfection within one eon, for instance, if they do not generate anger toward a bodhisattva who has obtained a prediction of his or her upcoming enlightenment (as explained earlier). If they produce a single angry thought toward such a bodhisattva, this path is not expelled from their mind-stream, but their progress on the path becomes slow for the length of an eon.

It says that: *In brief, just as in the case of the purification of nonvirtue there is no need to purify every behavioral effect, so with respect to the destruction of virtue there is no need to destroy every behavioral effect.*

Let's look at this in relation to killing. Let's say a person really enjoys fishing and they spend their entire life going out fishing. But then on the verge of death they feel very fierce and strong regret about having killed so many fish. They confess together with the four opponent powers, so it's conceivable that this person purifies the seeds of having killed so many fish. But it's possible that certain causally concordant behavioural effects will be produced in the future, so that maybe in the next lifetime when this person goes on holiday they think 'hmm, wouldn't it be nice to go fishing?!!' Something like this! They still have this predisposition towards enjoying the act of fishing. So it would seem, although they can purify certain effects, then other causally concordant behavioural effects still might remain.

In this case, the fruitional effect of a miserable realm rebirth has been purified, right? But the causally concordant behavioural effect, which is an enjoyment of, or predisposition towards fishing, remains. They were unable to purify that. This is what it seems to be saying.

Alternatively a person might practice generosity, but then they get angry and that anger destroys the roots of virtue they accumulated through generosity. It's possible that in a future life, due to their habituation or familiarity, that they enjoy giving - the practice of generosity. That also is possible, isn't it?

There are a lot of beggars in India, right? So often times what you'll see is people getting angry as they give, because there's so many beggars! Some monks kind of joke - 'either don't give, or don't get angry!' Here you are getting angry as you give because you're never going to get through all these beggars - there's so many of them! There's just no end to them! So you'd think that these people are accustoming themselves to the act of generosity - the act of giving - but as they get angry with each gesture, they're destroying the roots of virtue. So anyway, there's a case, like that.

Here's an incredibly clear explanation by the precious Lord of what it means for anger to destroy the roots of virtue and for confession complete with the four opponent powers to purify the negativities. Very, very clear, isn't it?

However, as this is important and it is critical to analyze it using the scriptures of the unique Buddha and the reasoning based on them, research the scriptures well and do an analysis. Lama Tsong Khapa's encouraging us to continue to look into this topic.

Thus, the unseen faults of anger are that it projects its own fruitions, which are extremely unpleasant, and that it prevents the arising of the measureless very pleasant fruitions of its opposite [virtue]. We were looking at different shortcomings or drawbacks of anger, weren't we? Those that can be seen and those that are unseen. That marks the end of the section on those that are unseen. The section on the unseen drawbacks of anger begins on page 157.

Then the next section talks about:

The faults of anger visible in this lifetime. And these are that you do not experience a peaceful and good mind; the joy and happiness that you had previously perish, and you cannot regain them; you cannot sleep well; and you weaken the stability wherein your mind stays calm. When you have great hatred, even those for whom you formerly cared forget your kindness and kill you; even friends and relatives will get annoyed and leave you; although you gather others with your generosity, they will not stay; and so on. These are things that we can see.

We understand these points. We need to recollect them. We need to remember that these are some of the shortcomings, or drawbacks of anger. Sometimes the relationship between a person and his mother, or her father will turn bad, and they become angry. So the manifest anger makes them forget all the kindnesses that the mother or father extended to them in the past. This is one of the faults of anger.

It's possible that the parents were not acting honestly or in a straightforward way as well. But can they

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only
be blamed? After all, they are ordinary sentient beings being controlled by disturbing emotions. So at that point we must recognise that it's not appropriate to feel angry with them, but rather we ought to remember that they are ordinary sentient beings controlled by their disturbing emotions. They are, in a sense, powerless, without self-control. The disturbing emotions make them act in this way. So actually they are objects of our compassion - not objects to get angry with.

There's actually a lot you could say to a Tibetan audience at this point, but with a group of westerners like we've got, forget about it going inside, it's probably not even going to make it passed your ears – you don't want to listen to it! We talk about the power of purification that happens by being scolded or smacked by teachers and parents. They say that being scolded very strongly or being smacked around by parents helps the children to purify a great deal. For instance, there are the forceful or wrathful mantras that can be recited, correct? They say that reciting a wrathful mantra has the potential to dispel obstacles. So they say that being scolded or being smacked around by one of these people is just the same. You can dispel or eliminate really great obstacles by being the recipient of such wrathful activity!

Geshela's heard talk about the need to recite the mantra of black Manjushri but Geshela's never encountered the mantra of black Manjushri. Some people say 'oh we need to recite the mantra of black Manjushri,' and Geshela reckons 'well, I might as well smack you around a bit, because I don't know the mantra of black Manjushri!! It'll do the same thing, right? Shall I just hit you?!!!'

So don't ask Geshela to recite the mantra of black Manjushri, or he's gonna smack you, alright!!! He doesn't know the mantra!

Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds states:

*In the grasp of the mental pains of hate,
Your mind does not experience peace,
You do not find joy or happiness,
Sleep does not come, and you become unstable.*

*Even those who depend on a master
Who cares for them with wealth and services
Will overcome and kill
A master who gets angry.*

*His anger disheartens friends.
Though he gathers people with gifts,
They will not serve him. In brief,
No angry person is happy.*

These are outer shortcomings of anger that are apparent to all of us. We can all see these.

The Garland of Birth Stories also says:

*When your complexion is spoiled by the fire of anger,
You cannot look good, though adorned with jewelry.
You may sleep on a good bed, but
Your mind suffers the sharp pains of anger.*

*You forget to achieve goals beneficial to yourself;
Tormented by anger, you take an evil path.
You ruin the achievement of your aims and your good name.
Your grandeur fades like the waning moon.*

*Though your friends love you,
You fall into an abyss of wrong.
Weakening your intelligence about what is helpful and what harmful,
You mostly transgress and your mind becomes confused.*

*Through anger you are accustomed to sinful acts,
So you suffer for a hundred years in miserable realms.
What harm greater than this could be done
Even by enemies avenging the great harm you have done?*

*This anger is the inner enemy;
I know it to be so.
Who can bear
Its proliferation?*

No matter how bad an enemy is, that enemy cannot project you into a miserable realm like that of an animal. It doesn't matter how bad an enemy is, only we ourselves can project an animal rebirth for ourselves. This is clear isn't it? This is the point they're making. It doesn't matter how bad an enemy is, it's not as bad as anger.

Due to anger we create these circumstances whereby we must suffer in a miserable realm for thousands of years.

Here we have a summary from *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds* - something we should memorise.

Meditate until you are firmly convinced that grave consequences such as these arise from anger. Thus, Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds says:

*There is no sin like hatred
And no fortitude like patience. (that is, no hardship.)
Therefore, earnestly cultivate
Patience in a variety of ways.*

This is some real advice from Shantideva.

*...earnestly cultivate
Patience in a variety of ways.*

That means use a variety of techniques to engender patience, to develop it further within yourself. This involves analytical meditation then. When you cultivate patience, you're engaging in analytical meditation. The best reasons to refer to are those found in developing the recognition that all sentient beings have been your mother, recollecting their kindness and so forth. Remembering those types of things, together with the fact that sentient beings are powerless and their existence is characterised by this lack of self-control - these types of reflections really support our meditations on patience. It is very important to keep that in mind. Use a variety of techniques while you meditate.

First, understand the benefits and faults, and then strive to cultivate patience in many ways. The reason behind the first line is set forth in Candrakirti's Explanation of the "Middle Way" Commentary:

*You cannot measure the fruitions of anger, just as you cannot measure the water in the ocean with a balance scale.
Therefore, for projecting unpleasant effects and damaging virtue, there is no sin greater than a lack of patience.*

For, although other sins result in extremely unpleasant fruitions, they are not great sins on that account alone, given that they do not destroy roots of virtue. Still, there are many wrongs other than anger that combine both production of a terrible fruition and destruction of the roots of virtue: wrong views that deny cause and effect; abandoning the sublime teachings; generating pride in relation to bodhisattvas, gurus, and the like and thus terribly belittling them; and so forth. You can know of these from the Compendium of Trainings.

In the abhidharma, the destroyers of the roots of virtue are presented as hostility and wrong views. Those are the only ones they emphasise. Hostility refers to anger, and wrong views refers to the wrong views that deny cause and effect.

Using that same logic the *Compendium of Trainings* goes on to speak of other destroyers of the roots of virtue, like for instance abandoning the sublime teachings. What would be a case of abandoning the sublime teachings? Well, let's say you practice the mahayana and then you act as if the dharma of the hearers is something that ought not to be practiced, or you say 'those things are not necessary.' Alternatively you might be practicing the hinayana dharma and abandon the mahayana teachings. These would all be abandoning the sublime teachings, which is considered a very grave fault. In fact at the very beginning of the Lam Rim Chen Mo we talked about how in applying the stages of the path you automatically come to abandon great faulty behaviours like abandoning the teachings. You come to see how it all fits together so that you no longer abandon the sublime teachings. That's one of the benefits of the stages of the path, correct? This abandoning the sublime teachings is a very serious negativity and here in the *Compendium of Trainings* it's presented as something which not only produces a very terrible fruition but also destroys the roots of virtue.

In general it's difficult to say what the best dharma to practice is. The reason for that is because to determine what the best dharma to practice is you must consider yourself. You must take yourself into consideration. If a person has an affinity towards the mahayana dharma and has a wish to practice that, then clearly that should be the best dharma to practice. But maybe that person doesn't have that affinity towards the mahayana dharma and doesn't find that suitable towards his/her mind and thoughts, but they do have an affinity towards the hinayana teachings as well as feeling that it fits them. In this case the hinayana teachings would be best for them to practice. So to know what teaching is best for an individual to practice you must consider that individual. It's difficult to say what the best practice is.

We can't say that Buddhism is best, which is what His Holiness the Dalai Lama says isn't it? Maybe a person doesn't have an affinity towards Buddhism, they don't feel that it fits them, and they feel that the views and philosophical tenets of another religion, like Christianity, fits them better. So for that person Christianity is the best teaching to practice. If you were to take this person who has an affinity towards and identifies with the Christian teachings and force them to practice Buddhism, who knows if that's going to help. It might even have a bad effect on that person, because they don't feel that the view and the tenets of Buddhism help them, in which case Buddhism clearly is not best. Christianity is the best.

Also, the precepts of the bodhisattva vow explains that if a person expresses an affinity and wish to practice the mahayana teachings, then that person should be encouraged no matter how poor their intelligence, no matter what type or lineage they are of. To say to such a person 'oh the mahayana teachings are not for you, you shouldn't practice them because you're really not that intelligent and you don't really have the capacity for them' is a really serious negativity. No matter what their level of intelligence is, no matter what their type or lineage is, if this person has this affinity towards the mahayana, and the desire to practice it, they should be encouraged to practice it. It would be inappropriate to discourage them from that. Yet you should not try and force mahayana dharma onto somebody who has no faith in it. It's not appropriate to force it upon a person who does not want to practice it. The English "Don't Push" is quite appropriate. Don't try and push somebody into something, rather allow them to go along the path they please. You can introduce them to a good path,

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only
saying “look there’s this type of path.” Make sure that you introduce it well and then say “but it’s up to you which path you want to tread.” Let them go on the path that they choose.

Also with terrible belittling bodhisattvas and gurus. Let’s say there’s a lama that you want to rely upon and the lama wants you to rely upon him/her, and a lama/student relationship is established. To then belittle such a person, or to belittle a bodhisattva, would both produce terrible fruitions as well as be a destroyer of roots of virtue. This is something we must avoid, this belittling. These are all described in the *Compendium of Trainings*.

That brings us to the end of this particular section. The next section deals with the divisions of patience. We’ve covered the section of what patience is, we’ve covered the section on how to begin the cultivation of patience. Now we look at the divisions of patience, this third section.

When you go to the debate courtyard you can’t take the text. All your responses must come from memory. So you could go to the debate courtyard and ask a person “What is the nature of patience?” So what would you say? What is the nature of patience?

Student: Acceptance.

Geshela: Accepting what? Actually the answer is sort of approaching one acceptable response, but Geshela mentioned yesterday that there is no nature or short definition of patience that can be posited. The Precious Lord said that patience is disregarding the harm that is done to you, accepting suffering in your continuum and being certain about the teachings. So when asked, that’s how you should respond.

The second point deals with how to engage in the cultivation of patience. What are the methods for engaging in the cultivation of patience?

Student 1: Developing the recognition that all sentient beings have your mother.

Student 2: Contemplating the shortcomings of anger and the benefits of patience.

Geshela: This section begins on page 156. *Although there are many ways to cultivate patience, to begin I will explain the meditation on the benefits of patience and the faults of not being patient.*

If you develop a really good understanding of the shortcomings of anger then you’re not going to like anger are you? You’re going to want to practice patience. That’s quite accurate isn’t it? If in addition to that you reflect on the benefits of patience then your delight in and wish to practice patience is only going to increase. You’re going to really enjoy it. The shortcomings of anger are explained by means of the invisible or unseen shortcomings of anger and those that are seen in this lifetime.

Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds says with respect to the shortcomings of anger:

*‘There is no sin like hatred
And no fortitude (or hardship) like patience.
Therefore earnestly cultivate
Patience in a variety of ways.’*

Before the shortcomings are discussed the author discusses the benefits.

So how to begin in the cultivation of patience discusses the methods you will use so that you will begin to meditate on it or cultivate it. They involve reflecting on the benefits of patience and reflecting on the shortcomings of anger, or not being patient.

If you are asked how do you begin to cultivate patience, there are a whole lot of different answers that an individual might come up with. There are all sorts of possible answers to that question. If you're sitting an exam, then the person who is marking that exam is going to give the points to the person who responds in the way that is compatible with the text. Another person can posit an answer which might be accurate – maybe what they say is indeed one way to begin to cultivate patience – but it might also seem to the person marking the exam that they haven't really read through the text. Their response might be seen as a sign that they aren't really familiar with what's found in the text, so they're not going to get the points.

So we need to try and go right to the point. We need to try and respond in the way that the precious lord Lama Tsong Khapa does, the way he outlines the text. There is understanding to be drawn from his approach, also blessings to be had.

(c') The divisions of patience

The section on the divisions of patience has three parts:

- 1. Developing the patience of disregarding harm done to you*
- 2. Developing the patience of accepting suffering*
- 3. Developing the patience of certitude about the teachings*

These three are explained in the section on what the nature of patience is and here you also have them presented as divisions of patience. There are some slight differences, for instance if we look at the wording it says:

(1') Developing the patience of disregarding harm done to you

Developing the patience of disregarding harm done to you has two parts:

- 1. Stopping impatience with those who harm you*
- 2. Stopping both dislike for harmdoers' attainments and delight in their troubles*

The section on what patience is and the divisions of patience aren't exactly the same. For instance on page 155 it says 'patience is disregarding harm done to you' as opposed to 'disregarding harm done to you.' 'Accepting suffering arising in your mindstream' as opposed to 'accepting suffering,' and 'being certain about the teachings and firmly maintaining belief in them' as opposed to 'the patience of certitude about the teachings.' There's slightly different wording isn't there. Probably not a huge issue.

(a'') Stopping impatience with those who harm you

Stopping impatience with those who harm you has two parts:

- 1. Stopping impatience with those who prevent your happiness and with those who cause you to suffer*
- 2. Stopping impatience with those who prevent your praise, fame, or honour, and with those who have contempt for you, or say offensive or unpleasant things to you*

There is a bit in these outlines to discuss but Geshela will just introduce us to them when we come to the relevant sections.

(1'') Stopping impatience with those who prevent your happiness and with those who cause you to suffer

Stopping impatience with those who prevent your happiness and with those who cause you to suffer has two parts:

- 1. Showing that anger is unjustified*
- 2. Showing that compassion is appropriate*

Showing that anger is unjustified and showing that compassion is appropriate is classed under the section ‘stopping impatience with those who prevent your happiness and with those who cause you to suffer.’

If someone obstructs your happiness then you might become angry. That’s one way that anger occurs. Alternatively if someone does something that causes you to suffer – to harm you for instance – in that case you might also get angry.

So here we look at how anger is unjustified in both of those cases. First of all showing that anger is unjustified or illogical and showing that compassion is appropriate.

(a)) Showing that anger is unjustified

Showing that anger is unjustified has three parts:

- 1. On analysis of the object, anger is unjustified*
- 2. On analysis of the subject, anger is unjustified*
- 3. On analysis of the basis, anger is unjustified*

(1)) On analysis of the object, anger is unjustified

On analysis of the object, anger is unjustified has four parts:

The first of them deals with whether or not the object has self-control.

(a’)) On analysis of whether the object has self-control, anger is unjustified

Analyse, thinking, “What would be reasonable grounds for anger toward harmdoers?” Whereupon, you might think, “They first had the thought of wanting to harm me, prepared the method, and then either prevented my happiness or inflicted unpleasant physical or mental suffering, so my anger is justified.” Are you angry because they inflicted harm while they had the self-control not to harm you, or are you angry because they were utterly without any self-control and hurt you while helplessly impelled by something else?

We’re being advised to really analyse the situation. Actually quite strange things can come of that. Say you get angry and you really analyse a lot about the situation - you lose the whole basis of it don’t you? When you analyse and analyse and analyse, looking more and more into why it is that you’re angry, pretty soon you lose it. It’s really quite strange.

In the former case, your anger is unjustified because those who inflict harm do not have control over themselves, for, when the conditions and causes — seeds left by afflictions to which they were previously habituated, a nearby object, and erroneous conceptions — come together, they give rise to the thought to harm, even though the harmdoers do not think, “I will feel malice”; whereas if those causes and conditions are not complete, they will never produce the thought to harm.

It's not as if this person has self-control, rather this person is controlled by causes and conditions. If those causes and conditions are not complete they will never produce the thought to harm, even if the harmdoers think "I will feel malice."

These causes and conditions produce the desire to harm; this in turn produces the work of harming; and this produces suffering for someone else, so those harmdoers do not have even the slightest self-control. Moreover, they have become like servants of their afflictions, because they are under the control of others, ie., their afflictions. They are slaves to the disturbing emotions.

Ask yourself whether the object has self-control or not. Is it that you're getting angry with this person because they have self-control? In this case you should recognise that anger is unjustified because this person is powerless. This person does not have self-control.

Or are you angry because they inflicted harm on you without any self-control, and hurt you while helplessly impelled by something else. In this latter case you are angry because the harmdoers are utterly without any self-control, and being helplessly impelled by something else they hurt you. Then your anger is totally unjustified. For instance some people who have been possessed and have come under the control of demons may wish to hurt those who are helping them to get free of their demons, and thereupon beat them etc. However their helpers think 'they do this because their demons have eliminated their ability to control themselves' and do not have even the slightest anger towards them. Then they strive to the best of their ability to free them from the demons.

Likewise when bodhisattvas are hurt by others they think 'they do this because the demons of the afflictions have eliminated their ability to control themselves.' Without being even the slightest bit angry with these persons they then generate the mind of enlightenment.

We're talking about possession, when someone's possessed by a spirit or a demon. There's meant to be beings who have the ability to possess other people. So if a person is possessed by this type of spirit they might then do something harmful towards us. We don't get angry towards the person do we? We don't get angry at all because we understand that this person is possessed by a demon and that's why they're acting in that way.

Here they use the example of being possessed by demons because the disturbing emotions are sometimes referred to as being these harmful spirits. The way in which disturbing emotions disturb us is quite similar to the way in which a person is possessed by a demon. The disturbing emotions enter into our mindstream and cause disruption and harm, just as a demon or spirit enters into a person's body creating suffering and harm. Sometimes the disturbing emotions are called enemies. Sometimes they're called harmful spirits. It's an analogy.

A bodhisattva would say 'this person does not have self-control. They are controlled by the disturbing emotions.' So without getting angry, what we must do is to try and separate them from the disturbing emotions. That's the approach a bodhisattva takes.

Accordingly, Aryadeva's Four Hundred Stanzas says:

*Just as a doctor does not fight but helps
Patients who are possessed by spirits, though they get angry,
So the Sage sees that the afflictions are at fault,
Not the persons who have the afflictions.*

The master Candrakirti also states:

*"This is not living beings' fault,
Rather it is the fault of the afflictions."*

*So the learned analyze
And do not fight with others.*

This is what Geshela's always talking about - this is the attitude he is encouraging us to adopt.

We'll leave Geshela's commentary there for today.

Any questions?

Student: In the middle scope they talk about getting angry with disturbing emotions. In the great scope they're talking about accepting suffering. How do you reconcile that?

Geshela: Are you confusing disturbing emotions with suffering perhaps? Get angry with disturbing emotions. Accept suffering. Are we confusing these?

Student: But suffering comes from disturbing emotions.

Geshela: Yes, suffering comes from disturbing emotions, but suffering isn't a disturbing emotion.

So you can get annoyed with the source from which suffering arises, but you don't get angry with suffering itself. You'll have problems and make things worse if you get angry with suffering. Suffering and disturbing emotions are completely different.

Student: Does a bodhisattva – in the sense of one who has developed the uncontrived mind of enlightenment - always have loving kindness manifest in their minds? And if so, how is there room for anger to arise?

Geshela: No they do not always have loving kindness manifest.

Student: A bodhisattva always has the wish to benefit sentient beings – the intention to benefit – so if a bodhisattva always has that, how could anger arise in that person's continuum, given that this intention is uncontrived?

Geshela: It's possible to get angry even though you always have this uncontrived intention to help. How to explain it? Let's say that you are incredibly thirsty. You think 'I'm going to drink the next fluid that I come across. The next liquid that I meet I'm going to down it straight away.' Then someone comes along and offers you some urine to drink. You were sitting there just a moment ago thinking 'I need to drink some fluids, I'm really, really thirsty,' but then all of a sudden you don't want to drink the urine. Despite the great thirst it's possible that you don't want to drink *that* fluid right.

A bodhisattva does indeed always think to benefit others, each and every sentient being. Let's say this bodhisattva's doing something for the sake of another person and that this person doesn't realise that the bodhisattva is trying to help them. So they do something totally inappropriate and their response to the bodhisattva's attempt to help them is completely out of line. It's possible that the bodhisattva gets frustrated by that situation and even just for a moment gets angry at them.

There is a story about a demon, a spirit being who really disliked the dharma, who approached a bodhisattva and asked the bodhisattva to give it his right arm. So the bodhisattva chops off the right arm. He's only got the left arm remaining. So with his left arm he takes the right arm and hands it to the demon. Now generally when practising generosity you ought to give with the right hand. To give with the left hand is held to be inappropriate. Maybe this is an India custom?

Having chopped off the right arm, the bodhisattva only had the left arm to give with, at which point this spirit or demon says 'oh you faker, you fraud. You call yourself a bodhisattva, as if you respect all

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only
sentient beings, but here you are offering something with your left hand.’ At which point the bodhisattva gets angry with the demon.

It's possible that you might get a bit angry in that situation.

Student: Does that mean that the aspiration to benefit sentient beings is lost for a short moment?

Geshela: It would seem that the bodhisattva doesn't actually lose the intention to benefit even though for that moment they become angry – the anger doesn't remain for a period of time, it's just for a moment that it's possible for a bodhisattva to get angry. During that short time perhaps you would say that the intention to help exists in a dormant form. It's dormant or latent in the sense that it's not manifest.

In fact Geshela responded to your first question by saying that these beings do not need to have loving kindness and compassion manifest at all times right.

Student: So with a bodhisattva then they don't need to have the aspiration intent on other's welfare manifest at all times. Rather the one they need manifest at all times is the one that's intent on enlightenment.

Geshela: Neither of the two aspirations needs to be manifest at all times. For instance when you're sleeping, or eating, talking, etc.

They can exist in a dormant form, a dormant state. For example when an arya bodhisattva enters into the sublime wisdom of equipoise, this one-pointed equipoise upon emptiness, then these aspirations are not manifest. They are also in a dormant state at that point.

Student: So a moment of anger would not destroy the mind of enlightenment in this case?

Geshela: No it cannot destroy the mind of enlightenment. In fact much is said about that in this text. It is said that the realisation itself does not decline in the sense that it's not expelled from the person's continuum, but it becomes an obstacle to developing the higher paths. It says it quite clearly in here doesn't it.

In particular there is the danger that a beginning bodhisattva becomes angry, or that a beginning bodhisattva relinquishes the mind of enlightenment. For instance they tell stories about – Geshela thinks it's Shariputra – when he was still a trainee, a learner. He entered into the mahayana paths but then seeing how utterly rude and inappropriate sentient beings were, he thought to enter into the hinayana instead. There are those kinds of stories.

It's possible for the mind of enlightenment to decline, but in these cases the mind of enlightenment is not declining because of disturbing emotions. Rather what happens is that a bodhisattva thinks 'I can't even accomplish the welfare of a single sentient being much less countless sentient beings. How am I ever going to achieve my goal?' In this way they become discouraged and relinquish the mind of enlightenment and enter into a hinayana path.

Once you develop an uncontrived determination to be free it's impossible for that to decline. Once you develop an uncontrived mind of enlightenment it's possible that it declines. Even though the person's mind of enlightenment is uncontrived, they may relinquish it. They have requested to be excused from it. 'This mind of enlightenment, it's just not happening. Cherishing of others, it's just not working. Please excuse me from them.'

The decline of this uncontrived mind of enlightenment is not referring to the decline of the mind of enlightenment that takes place due to the influence of disturbing emotions. That is not the case.

It follows then that it doesn't decline due to self-cherishing.

Geshela is not sure how you might respond to that. That is something that you might debate about. The thought that 'this practice of the mahayana and the mind of enlightenment is just not working, I think I'm just going to enter into the hinayana paths and just achieve the result of an arhat.' That kind of thought is driven by self-cherishing isn't it? So there is something to debate here.

We are quite certain though that an uncontrived determination to be free cannot possibly decline. The texts state very clearly that a path once developed does not decline.

We need to be careful not to be discouraged. If these bodhisattvas can get angry with another person then it's definitely possible for us ordinary sentient beings to become angry with others isn't it? We need to keep this in mind and really take care. Do the best not to become angry but at the same time use that to encourage yourself.

Buddhist Studies Programme

Subject: Lam Rim Chen Mo Module 3

Teacher: Geshe Tashi Tsering

Interpreter: Ven Lozang Zopa

Number of the teaching: 3

Date of the teaching: 21st October 2004

The fundamental outline for the perfection of patience has five sections:

1. What patience is.
2. How to begin the cultivation of patience,
3. The divisions of patience
4. How to practice, and
5. A summary,

These are the five parts of the basic division of the section on the perfection of patience.

Of these, we've covered the section on 'what patience is', which more literally means 'what the nature of patience is'. We've also covered the section on 'How to begin the cultivation of patience'. We're into the third section, which deals with the divisions of patience.

The divisions of patience has three parts:

1. The patience of disregarding harm done to you
2. The patience of accepting suffering, and
3. The patience of certitude about the teachings

Of these three, we're dealing with the patience that disregards the harm that's done to you.

As it stands, we generally immediately become attached to those who treat us well and immediately become angry with those who treat us badly or do bad things to us, and so if a person acts to harm us we immediately become angry with that person. Yet this is inappropriate, we should remember how this person does not have self control. How this person is controlled by the disturbing emotions or afflictions. So in fact it's not this person so much, that is doing the harm to us, as much as it is the afflictions that control that person. As it says [on page 1660:

*So the Sage sees that the afflictions are at fault,
Not the persons who have the afflictions.*

If you were to ask Buddha Shakyamuni "What is it that's doing the harm to us?" He would say that it's not the sentient being, it's the afflictions that control that sentient being: '*So the Sage sees that the afflictions are at fault, not the persons who have the afflictions*', so don't get angry with the person.

Don't get angry with the person all right!!

We really need to think about these things. These are the types of things that are readily at hand, the things that we are directly faced with. In terms of practicing the dharma, we really must be making an effort with these things. Think about this.

So continuing on; on page 166:

The master Candrakirti also states:

*"This is not living beings' fault,
Rather it is the fault of the afflictions."
So the learned analyze
And do not fight with others.*

This quote is the same as the one just above, isn't it.

Although many reasonings are set forth in Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds, it is easy to be certain of this one, and it is a very powerful remedy for anger. Also, the Bodhisattva Levels has the same meaning where it states that you can bear harm after you meditate on the idea of mere phenomena, so meditate repeatedly on this remedy until you reach certain knowledge of it.

We must meditate on these points until we develop certainty in them. So then the text continues:

If these beings had self-control, they would not have any suffering, because they would not want suffering and because they could control it. Furthermore, you should stop your anger by also thinking, "When these beings are moved by strong afflictions, they commit suicide, leap from cliffs, harm themselves with thorns, weapons, etc., and stop eating and so forth. If they do this to even their greatly cherished and dear selves, of course they will hurt others."

If these beings had self-control, then they would not suffer. Because they don't want to suffer, do they? And if they had control, then they would not allow for that suffering to occur. But they don't have control. So, as it says here, '*because they would not want suffering and because they could control it*': They wouldn't suffer if they had self-control. But in fact they don't have self control, and what's more is that these beings are, as it says, '*moved by the strong afflictions*'; by disturbing emotions. They're so moved by them that they are prepared to do things that cause harm to themselves. As it says here, they will commit suicide or leap from cliffs. They might even harm themselves with thorns or weapons and so forth. So if they are prepared to do these things that even cause harm to themselves, then it's no surprise. What need is there to say that they will do things that hurt others. So we reflect on these points so that we can stop our anger. I mean, the text is quite clear isn't it!

It's good to think about the points that we oftentimes mention such as ones that relate to the objects that we're attached to and the objects that we become angry with. Think about how the objects that we're attached to treat us well; they do good by us, don't they? But the good that they do by us, they're treating us well, is not something that they have complete control over. There's no self-control in this sense, is there, because these beings are actually powerless. They are controlled by the disturbing emotions and through their influence, act in the way that they do. Evidence for that lies in the fact that if something in this relationship between the two of us goes wrong, then they will immediately begin to harm us. Which is a sign that they have no self-control. It's a sign that they do not have power over the way that they're behaving and the good things that they do to us. The same is true with the objects that we are angry with. Once again, the harm that they do to us is not harm that's performed with full self-control; rather this is harm that is done with a lack of self-control. The evidence for that is found in the fact that if the relationship changes, then their behaviour towards us changes as well. So we need to remember that.

We talk about this when discussing the way to cultivate equanimity.

You think "Oh! Poor person! I should feel compassion for this person, because they help me". This is not a good reason for our compassion; 'because they help me'. In fact, Geshela was saying that we're not allowed to use this as a reason for our compassion. Because it doesn't apply to the other people, it only applies to this limited group. Just as when we turn to someone who harms us, we think why are we angry with them? Because they harm us, and so forth. Once again, it has limited applicability. So the thought 'because they help me' is not at all a good or valid reason for our compassion. In fact, the valid reasons for such things as loving kindness and compassion would be their lack of self-control, would be their powerless states. Because this is a reason that applies to everyone equally. Geshela introduced us to this point quite clearly when he discussed the way to cultivate equanimity.

Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds states:

*Thus, everything is dependent on something else,
And, because that in turn is dependent, it is not autonomous.
Understanding this, do not be angry
At anything, all things being like illusions.*

And also:

*Therefore, if you see an enemy or friend
Doing what is wrong, think
“This arises from certain conditions,”
And remain happy.*

*If all beings could achieve results
According to their wish, then,
Since no one wants suffering,
No one would suffer.*

And also:

*While under the control of their afflictions,
Some people will kill even their dear selves.
So how can you expect them
Not to harm the bodies of others?*

The prose explanation that Lama Tsong Khapa gave demonstrates the meaning of these verses.

The point being made is that we shouldn't become angry with sentient beings because they don't have self-control or autonomy. So we think about the lack of self-control or autonomy in order to stop our anger.

And now we move on to the next section:

(b') On analysis for either adventitiousness or inherency, anger is unjustified

The fault of doing harm to others either is or is not in the nature of living beings.....

It's either in their nature to act in that way, or it is not...

.....If it is in their nature, it is wrong to get angry, just as it is wrong to get angry at fire for being hot and burning.

This clear? It's quite nice isn't it?

If the fault of harming other sentient beings is in the very nature of a sentient being, then we shouldn't get angry with it. Because it's in their nature. I mean, given that it's in their nature, then they must do such things. Like you don't get angry with fire because it burns, the definition of fire is 'something hot and burning'. It's illogical to get angry with fire because it burns because it's in the nature of fire to do so. Just as if the fault of harming sentient beings were in the nature of sentient beings, it would be illogical to get angry with them for that. Because it's in their nature.

If you think about this type of reason when you meditate, it's quite nice isn't it! I mean it has a nice impact on the mind.

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only
Similarly, if it is adventitious, it is also wrong to be angry, just as when smoke and the like appear in the sky, it is wrong to be angry at the sky on account of these flaws of smoke and so forth. Thinking in this way, stop your anger.

It's like this; say it's winter time and you want a bit of sunlight to warm you up, but then there's a bunch of clouds in the sky and the clouds block the sunlight. You don't get angry with the sun, do you? Because the sun is sitting there shining, sending forth its warm rays. It's just that those rays are blocked by the clouds that are in the sky. It's not that the sun doesn't want to warm us up, it's simply that its rays are blocked by the clouds. So it's something like this.

Clouds are not in the very nature of the sun, are they? Rather, they are 'adventitious', that is to say we might say 'secondary' to the sun. It's a secondary or adventitious stain.

Understand? To get to the real point then, the mind that wants to harm sentient beings, or the harm that they actually do to us, are adventitious to the person. They arise adventitiously, they are not something that exist within its very nature, is it? I mean, that's the real point when you come down to it.

These two are really similar, aren't they!

Anger or the mind that wishes to harm arises adventitiously, doesn't it? Based on certain circumstances and so forth, it arises adventitiously, therefore making a person act in a particular way. It's not in that person's very nature but rather it's adventitious to it.

If the sunlight is blocked, then you really ought to be angry with the clouds.

If that's the case, then you should really be angry with the disturbing emotions; the afflictions.

It's accurate, isn't it? I mean is Lama Tsong Khapa using accurate logic or not?

Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds states:

*If doing harm to others
Is natural for the childish,
It is wrong to get angry at them,
Just as it is at fire's burning nature.*

*Still, if the fault is adventitious,
And the nature of beings is good,
My anger is wrong, just as is
Anger at smoke's appearance in the sky.*

So Lama Tsong Khapa's source for these statements is Shantideva's text; '*Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds*'.

Do we understand this clearly? We should not be angry with the person who acts to harm us. I mean, just as we don't get angry with the sun when it's blocked by the clouds, we shouldn't get angry with the person who tries to harm us. I mean, do we understand this clearly?

But understanding is not benefit is it! Then what do we need to do?

'Knowing doesn't help'. I mean that phrase applies to this type of situation. Because it's clear that in this type of situation, just knowing doesn't help. Therefore we need to do something to make sure that this is beneficial so think about what's appropriate; 'how can I make this knowledge beneficial?'

They tell the story about how this person was sitting there meditating on patience next to a stupa and someone walks along and says something to him, and they end up getting angry with the person who asked them the question; disrupting their meditation. I mean, really, it's just like this. Here it is, evidence that simply knowing is not enough.

The next section is:

(c')) On analysis of whether the harm is direct or indirect, anger is unjustified

Now we just looked through a section where you see how anger is illogical when you investigate to try and determine whether the harm people do to you is adventitious to them or in their very nature. Now let's look at how anger is illogical if you analyse it to determine whether this harm is direct or indirect. It reads, on page 168:

If you are angry at the agent of harm that directly inflicts the harm, you will have to be angry at the stick, etc., just as you are at the person. If you are angry at the harmdoer who indirectly inflicts harm, then, just as the person impels the stick and so forth to do the harm, so hostility impels the person. Therefore, get angry at the hostility. Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds says:

*The stick and so forth directly cause the harm.
But if I am angry at the one who throws it,
Then, since hostility impels them,
It is better to get angry at hostility.*

It's logical - appropriate to get angry at disturbing emotions. That's what it says here. Or rather, in particular, angry at hostility. Wait! What does it mean to say that it's appropriate to get angry at hostility? What is 'hostility' anyway?

What is the manner in which you are angry at disturbing emotions? How is it that you get angry at hostility?

Student: you become impatient with them

Geshela: what's the nature of anger? Is it not impatience?

Student: the wish to harm

Now actually, because of the different ways of phrasing and thinking about these things, it becomes a hindrance to our reflecting on this topic. We're looking at how you get angry with the disturbing emotions. How you get angry with hostility. And when asked how you get angry with hostility and disturbing emotions, you responded by saying 'being impatient'. But if you ask what it means to be angry at persons it means the wish to harm. So you give different answers. Geshela wonders perhaps they carry the same meaning in English, I would argue that they don't [translator] but anyway.

Geshela is asking the same question, isn't he!

Geshela: What is the nature of anger?

It is the wish to harm the object that you're angry with.

So you need to posit it just like that. When you're asked what it means to be angry at hostility or disturbing emotions then you say 'it means to have the wish to harm' this hostility. The wish to harm the disturbing emotions.

The wish to harm disturbing emotions and the wish to harm hostility are antidotes to disturbing emotions and anger respectively. They are not negativities. Perhaps that was said earlier in this text, or is it from a different text? In any case, the scriptures say that that is not a negativity, rather it is an antidote for disturbing emotions and anger.

Understand? Generally speaking, anger is a negativity.

Yet if you develop anger towards hostility or disturbing emotions that is not a negativity.

So it's logical to get angry at hostility. As it says in *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds*; 'Since hostility impels them, it is better to get angry at hostility'. In fact, what it says literally is that 'it's logical or appropriate to be angry with hostility'.

Student: When you've spoken of anger before, you've said that anger is necessarily a wrong consciousness that exaggerates the negative qualities of something and in the case of the afflictions then it's not possible to exaggerate their bad qualities.

Geshela: That's right.

Student: then how can you be angry [earlier we were looking at how anger is a wrong consciousness that exaggerates the unappealing qualities of it's object and we've seen how you cannot exaggerate the unappealing qualities of the disturbing emotions. So how is it that you can be angry with them?]

Geshela: That is why Geshela says that anger towards the disturbing emotions is not a proper or fully qualified form of anger.

It is said that there is no attachment to buddhas - there is no attachment focused upon buddhas.

There can be a great like for Buddhas. You can see incredible qualities; very high qualities and appealing aspects of a Buddha, but you will not be exaggerating or overestimating their appeal. You will not be attributing positive qualities above and beyond what they possess.

Back in '94 when Geshela was teaching at Tushita, Gareth Sparham was translating for him. Geshela took the position that there is no fully qualified anger directed towards disturbing emotions and there is no fully qualified attachment directed towards Buddhas. Now Geshela is not sure what Gareth Sparham actually said to the audience at that time but he obviously misunderstood as evidenced by what played out later. At that point, it was '94, he could say whatever he wanted in English, Geshela wouldn't have known any better. So anyway, Gareth Sparham who's a student at the Institute of Dialectics at that time, went back and spoke to the head teacher or director of the Institute of Dialectics; Gen Losang Gyatso. And he said to Geshe Losang Gyatso that Geshe Tashi Tsering said that there is no disturbing emotions towards Buddhas. In fact what Geshela said was that there is no fully qualified attachment directed towards Buddhas, what Gareth apparently understood and then said to Gen Losang Gyatso was that there are no disturbing emotions towards Buddhas. And Gen Losang Gyatso said 'Oh yes they say that but it's rather difficult. Gen Losang Gyatso was also confused'. Neither of them understood what Geshela was trying to say. In fact both of them misunderstood. Of course there are disturbing emotions directed towards Buddha. For instance there is the conception of self directed towards buddha, there's anger directed towards buddhas.

So Gareth rocks up the next day and speaks to Geshela and mentions to Geshela that he had spoken to Gen Losang Gyatso about Geshela's position and Geshela asked 'Oh, what did Gen Losang Gyatso have to say about it?' and he said 'Oh, Gen Losang Gyatso said Oh well, they say that but it's very difficult'. So Geshela said 'How did you phrase it? How did you say it to Gen Losang Gyatso?' He said 'Oh, I said that there's no disturbing emotions directed towards buddhas.' And Geshela said 'I didn't say that! You've got it all wrong!' Geshela was then going to make him repeat it, correct it, to the students

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only at Tushita, so Geshela says 'What did you say to the students?', and he said 'Oh, I don't think I said that to the students'. Very clever when pressed, isn't he! The next day he probably didn't remember exactly what he said but he was saying 'Oh no, no. I don't think I told the students that you don't have disturbing emotions towards buddhas'. So anyway, Geshela said 'Well whatever you said, I'm going to make you say it again'. So he made Gareth say it to the students; the correction.

The anger directed towards disturbing emotions is not a fully qualified anger yet it is referred to as 'anger' because it an intention to harm. It's not a fully qualified anger even though there is a wish to harm.

The nature of anger is this intention to harm. So that if something is anger, it necessarily is an intention to harm.

When you look at it like this then, it would seem that you would have to calculate whether there are three possibilities or four possibilities between anger and the intention to harm.

This you discuss.

As it says in *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds*; 'It is appropriate to be angry at hostility'.

If you are not angry at the stick, it is also wrong to be angry at the one who throws it; if you are angry with the one who throws it, it is correct to be angry also at the hostility. Not believing this, your mind has gone down a wrong path. Therefore, become certain about the overall sameness of the logic here and direct your mind toward not being angry at the person in the same way that you are not angry at the stick. Furthermore, use the reasonings taught earlier that negate the idea that anything has self-control in order to understand that you should not differentiate the stick and the one who throws the stick by whether they have a harmful intent.

It's clear isn't it!

Now let's move onto the fourth point:

(d') On analysis of the cause that impels the harmdoers, anger is unjustified

So it says:

The experience of suffering produced by those who harm does not occur causelessly or from discordant causes, so it occurs from concordant causes; that is to say, from nonvirtuous actions you have done in the past. Therefore, harmdoers are helplessly impelled to do harm by the power of your karma. Consequently, blame yourself, thinking, "This is my fault, and I am wrong to get angry at others," and stop your anger on all occasions.

Here's another point you know, like we're always talking about 'Oh it's my karma' or 'It's this persons karma' or something like that. It's kind of like all this talk about 'all sentient beings'; these things are on the tip of our tongues at all times but don't really have a beneficial impact on our mind.

When we get angry with another person for harm that is done to us, we're not thinking about how this harm actually comes about through the power of our own karma. The suffering that happens when another acts to harm us; we don't think about how that is coming about due to the power of our own karma. But actually, in order to experience that suffering, we must have a substantial cause for it. Because, after all, as Geshela oftentimes says, that any functioning thing necessarily requires a substantial cause in order to arise. A substantial cause here, would be something which transforms to become the entity itself. So in the case of suffering, the substantial cause for suffering is the seed in particular, that transforms to become the entity of suffering. So if we do not have that type of seed

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only
which can become suffering within our own continuum, then the nasty words that other people say to us will not act as a substantial cause to become suffering, will they? But we don't think about this when we get angry with others so it's important that we remember that this experience of suffering is due to having the substantial cause for it within my own continuum. If we don't think about this, then all this talk about karma this, karma that, doesn't have a beneficial impact on our mind.

Understand? As it says here in the text: *'harmdoers are helplessly impelled to do harm by the power of your karma.'*

As it says here, the experience of suffering... *'occurs from concordant causes; that is to say, from nonvirtuous actions you have done in the past. Therefore, harmdoers are helplessly impelled to do harm by the power of your karma'*. When another person says something nasty or harsh to you, that acts as a condition for the arising for suffering. Why is it that the nasty words that this person says act as a condition for our suffering? because we have the seed for that suffering in our continuum. If we didn't have the seed for that suffering in our continuum, then nasty words would not act as a condition for our experience of suffering, would they?

Student: The two statements seem to be in conflict here. I mean on the one hand, we had the substantial cause for suffering in our continuum, and then on the other hand, that through the force of our karma, that others are helplessly impelled to harm us. That would seem to be in conflict.

Geshela: When you have seeds in a garden, in order to grow, those seeds require rain. So when it rains, that rain acts as a condition for the growth of these seeds. So the presence of those seeds means that the rain becomes a condition for growth. So it is in this sense that the seeds are impelling the rain, or inviting the rain, inspiring the rain. Because it's like the seeds require some method in order to grow. And the presence of those seeds means that that rain then acts as the method for the growth of seeds. So here, the word 'impelled' is more referring to the fact that the rain becomes a method for the growth of seeds due to the presence of seeds. Rather than the seeds turning and saying 'please, please rain come and pour down on me'. So it's looking at this word 'impelled' and seeing what it actually means.

Understand? It's as if these seeds are sitting there waiting for it to rain. Isn't it?

Similarly, we have harmed others in the past and as a result we have a seed within our continuum. And it's as if those seeds are sitting in our continuum just waving for someone to do us harm. It's sitting there waving for the conditions.

So that when it encounters the conditions of the harm-doer, it's as if that seed has inspired or invited, or, as the say here, 'impelled' that person.

So Geshela reckons that this is how it should be understood.

If you have a buddha or an arhat, for instance, then you wouldn't have anything to impel the harm-doer.

So with buddhas and arhats for instance, if another person tries to harm them, you don't say that those people are impelled to harm because buddhas and arhats don't have the seeds for that. So I mean actually, here 'being impelled' can't be applied to buddhas and arhats - not this usage of the term.

So it's as if those who have the seeds are impelling, sort of inviting, harm-doers.

Understand? [I was just supposing that it's a translation issue because the word in Tibetan *kul ba (bskul ba)* translated as 'impelled'. The Tibetan word means 'to inspire' or 'urge' even, someone to do something. Maybe it's not a translation issue.

Or look at it like this; let's say that at some point in the past that we have harmed somebody, and in harming that person, a seed has been placed in our mind. So due to having harmed this person in the past, we have created the karma whereby we're going to have to be harmed by them. It will be our turn later to get harmed. So perhaps it's this person's karma that impels or urges them to harm us but why is it? Because of what we have done to them in the past. Like for instance, let's say that we've killed someone, or someone kills another person in one life. That person has in their continuum the seed of having killed that person. So that in the next lifetime, it's then the victims turn to kill the killer. So why is it that there's this killing taking place in this next lifetime? Because of the actions performed by the killer of the first life. So that this person's killing in a past life impels the victim killing in the next life. Its then their turn.

In the text; *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds*, it describes it like this; we harm someone else, in return they harm us, in return we harm them, they harm us, and it happens in this cycle. So that now that I have the intelligence, I'm going to put a stop to this. That from my side, I'm going to draw a line and say 'I'm not harming again'. And this is the best approach according to Shantideva is to, from your own side, decide that you are going to stop your participation in that cycle. He says that in *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds*, he describes it as this process of you harming them, and they in return harming yourself, and this cycle of harming.

Understand? So when you think about it in these terms, can you see why the word 'impelled' or 'urged' is used?

Student: If we kill another person, will we necessarily be killed by that person in order for that seed to mature? Or could being killed by someone else mature that seed [when you say 'mature' you mean 'exhaust it', right? No! ripen]?

Geshela: Well you would probably need someone who you have already killed in the past. Are there any sentient beings that you have not killed in the past?

Geshela, through this logic, thinking that your whole perspective on this issue is that it's only this one sentient being that we've killed, or something like this.

Geshela reckons you were hatching plans to try and escape somewhere where this person that you've killed can't get to you, right? He reckoned 'Oh, if I could only get away from that person that I've killed, then I can avoid that'. Geshela recommends the moon perhaps. If you go to the moon, that person you've killed is probably not going to catch up with you there.

The American colony on the moon is literally what he said. It's a joke right? The Americans went to the moon. So the American colony on the moon - check that out.

You know, the Tibetans joke about this because the Americans were the first to make it to the moon. So they say that at that time they were joking around saying 'Oh they're just making preparations in case they lose a war that they get into. They want to make sure that they've got some place that they can go off and escape to, so they're colonising the moon.

So run off to the American colony on the moon. That person that you've killed in the past is probably not going to catch up with you there.

Student: If the person that you've killed in the past has since become a buddha, then that seed of having killed that person is not going to ripen because that buddha's not going to kill you.

Geshela: Is this the kind of logic that Alan is sitting there thinking about! Geshela reckons it is! What is he sitting there thinking about?

A person doesn't have to become a buddha. The person that you've killed doesn't have to become a buddha in order for this to happen. You can confess with the four opponent powers to purify that seed and then it will not ripen. The person that you've killed doesn't have to occupy this high position of being a buddha. .

You're looking for a real reliable kind of out. You reckon that ok if this person's obtained the state of buddha well then we can quite reliably conclude that they're not going to come back and ripen this seed, but you think well confession and purification of the four powers, hum.. perhaps not so reliable. So your logic is obviously focused on the most reliable way of avoiding a ripening of that seed.

Student: I've just got some support for Alan. If you have a non-virtue that is more weighty ripen first, then if your karmas that ripen are linked with whom you created them, then that means that a lesser karma of killing would ripen before a heavier karma of killing because of meeting that person who you killed in the past [Vasubandhu says that actions that are weightier will come to fruition first but here the idea is] ... your linking the ripening of karma with the person with respect to, you created that karma and so therefore a weightier karma wouldn't ripen earlier because the person that you've created the karma with has to be present to return it to you. [So why is there any certainty that you would encounter that person before the weightier karma ripens].. Only the karma that you created with a particular person can ripen, not the most weighty karma.

[So if the only karma that ripens was the karma that you accumulated with respect to the people around you, then weightier karmas would not necessarily ripen first which contradicts what Vasubandhu is saying]

Geshela: First of all the reasoning that in order for a karma to ripen, you must encounter the person that you accumulated it with respect to is not established.

So Geshela thinks maybe he sees the logic of Alan's statement now and it's not so bad actually. It would seem that the assumption underlying your statement was that you killed someone in the past so you have placed the seed from having killed that person which later can potentially come to fruition, later will ripen. And then the assumption is that in order for that to ripen, then this person needs to do the same back to you. But Geshela says there is no pervasion to that. It's not necessarily the case, in other words. But Geshela sees where your coming from because if that were the case then that would mean that since this person's already become a buddha, they're no longer left, and so you've kind of escaped without having that seed come to fruition. You stand to benefit because that person's no longer around.

But that doesn't seem to be the case. Geshela is saying the reason is not established?

Also he doesn't think that you would necessarily have to have that person come back and do the same thing to you in order for that seed to ripen, because its possible that another person does something to you and that acts as a condition for the ripening of that seed. What Shantideva says in Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds is that it's best if we decide from our own side to stop this process of me harming them, them harming me, me harming them, them harming me, because the idea is that through harming others then the effect of that comes back to ripen upon us and we perpetuate the cycle. Best to try and stop that cycle from your own side.

When we we're looking at the section on the stages of the path that are shared with a person of small capacity, we spoke a lot about karma. And then when we were looking at the stages of the path that are shared with persons of medium capacity, once again we spoke a lot about karma. Now even here we find that the topic of karma is quite relevant and is popping up again and again. So it is indeed an important thing for us to think about.

So we've just got this last section; *On analysis of the cause that impels the harm-doers, anger is unjustified*. So there's not much left. Let's see if we can read through it. It's on top of page 169. It says:

For example, it is similar to the way that beings produce the guardians of hell with their own bad karma, and these guardians then inflict harm on them. Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds states:

*I, at a former time, inflicted
Harm such as this on living beings.
Therefore, it is fitting that I, who hurt others,
Should receive this harm.*

And also:

*The childish do not want suffering,
Yet crave the causes of suffering.
So why should I be angry with others
When it is my own fault that I am hurt?*

*For example, just like the guardians of hell
And the Sword-leaved Forest,
I produce this harm with my own actions.
So at whom should I get angry?*

*Those who do me harm arise
Impelled by my own karma.
If thereby they go to a hell,
Have I not ruined them?*

Let's say that another person harms us. You don't have to worry if you don't get the chance to harm them in return because as a result of them having harmed you, then they will end up, for instance, taking rebirth in a hell. So due to the harm that they have done to you, they end up going to a hell so you don't need to worry if you didn't get a chance to harm them for what they did to you [laughter].

As it says:

*Those who do me harm arise
Impelled by my own karma.
If thereby they go to a hell,
Have I not ruined them?*

Also, Sha-bo-ba said, "When you say, 'I am not at fault,' it indicates that you, in fact, have not internalized even a bit of the teaching."

So we'll leave it there today on the section entitled:

(2)) On analysis of the subject, anger is unjustified

If others do things to harm us, whether it is physically or verbally we tend to get angry but we can think about these different points that are made so that we don't actually become angry with them, rather that we are patient; that we bear them. After all, we are talking about the practice of patience. So we think about all of these different things to help us not to become angry when others do things to harm us.

It's not an easy matter though. Yet we shouldn't just leave it aside thinking 'Oh, it's not easy' because nothing gets easier if we just leave it alone. You need to work at it so that it becomes easier. But to help yourself do that, think about the benefits of patience and the drawbacks of anger. So we have this description of how to begin the cultivation of patience; how to meditate and cultivate patience. So refer to those sections to help you.

It's clear to all of us that simply understanding these points doesn't help because there is really nothing in here that we don't already know, but just simply knowing it doesn't benefit.

It would seem that we need to accustom ourselves again and again to what we know.

It seems that there are realizations of experience that can be developed by doing so.

Then, finally it would seem to start to help us. That's when the benefits begin.

Student: Tsepal was referring to the quote from Vasubandhu and I thought that only referred to the order in which seeds ripen at the time of death, not just in our everyday lives.

Geshela: The manner in which the seeds ripen is the same, whether it be ripening for future lifetimes or ripening in this lifetime. You're just considering the conditions that determine the ripening of seeds in general.

You do have different types of karma. For instance, you have projecting karma and completing karma, and so forth, etc., etc. If you're dealing with projecting karma, then clearly its effect must be a fruitional effect that is established in a subsequent lifetime, but generally speaking, the manner in which seeds ripen is the same. The way in which they do so is the same.

Student: Geshela was saying that buddhas and arhats cannot be said to 'impel' others to harm them. Because they don't have the seeds for suffering in their continuum. I thought they did have the seeds for suffering in their continuum.

Geshela: They've already abandoned the seeds of suffering, haven't they! So they do not have the seeds of suffering at all.

Imprints? Well there are imprints in the continuum of an arhat though there are no imprints in the continuum of a buddha. But you don't call those seeds.

There is a slight difference between seeds and imprints.

According to the great exposition school then they probably would say that there are arhats who have suffering, so that you could say that they have the seeds of suffering. I mean there's this quote that we looked at in sutra that argued in favour of that position. So there is a position that one might adopt in relation to what you said so you don't have to think that 'Oh, my question was totally irrelevant and had absolutely no basis whatsoever. I mean you don't have to think that. There are schools that hold that position. But you shouldn't carry that position on to the middle way consequence. They wouldn't accept that.

Tencho was asking about this word *kul ba* or 'impelled'. There is a lot to think about. You could really think a lot about this notion of your own karma 'impelling' things.

Whether it be happiness or suffering, in order to have these experiences we must have a seed for experiencing that within our continuum. Then the conditions that lead to that type of experience then will be encountered. I mean you will meet with different conditions, which help to ripen these seeds so that you experience either happiness or suffering. And in so far as these conditions contribute to the experience of happiness or suffering, you say that those seeds 'impel' those conditions. So the word 'impel' is used because it's as if these seeds are impelling or 'urging' these conditions. So something like this.

Buddhist Studies Programme

Subject: Lam Rim Chen Mo Module 3

Teacher: Geshe Tashi Tsering

Interpreter: Ven Lozang Zopa

Number of the teaching: 4

Date of the teaching: 22 Oct

In terms of the outline, we are dealing with the divisions of patience. The section on patience is divided into five parts:

- (a') *What patience is*
- (b') *How to begin the cultivation of patience*
- (c') *The divisions of patience*
- (d') *How to practice*
- (e') *A summary*

We've covered the section on what patience is, the nature of patience. We've also covered the section on how to begin the cultivation of patience. So then that leaves us with the divisions of patience, the section that we're looking at now:

So the divisions of patience include

- (1') *Developing the patience of disregarding harm done to you*
- (2') *Developing the patience of accepting suffering*
- (3') *Developing the patience of certitude about the teachings*

There's three parts.

The section on developing the patience of disregarding harm done to you has two parts:

- (a'') *Stopping impatience with those who harm you*

Stopping impatience with those who harm you: there's significance in phrasing it like that. And then:

- (b'') *Stopping both dislike for harmdoers' attainments and delight in their troubles*

Here in the English translation it says "stopping dislike for harmdoers' attainments". Geshela points out that the Tibetan word (which is translated here as 'attainments') has more of the connotation of wealth and thus it would read: 'stopping dislike for the wealth (or maybe even fortune) that harmdoers have'.

This is just the outline we are looking at, at the moment. We can consider the implications of this word further when we look at the actual explanation.

Stopping impatience with those who harm you has two parts:

- (1'') *Stopping impatience with those who prevent your happiness and with those who cause you to suffer*
- (2'') *Stopping impatience with those who prevent your praise, fame, or honor, and with those who have contempt for you, or say offensive or unpleasant things to you*

So a variety of things that are all subsumed under two categories.

The two aspects of stopping impatience with those who prevent your happiness and with those who cause you to suffer, are included under one category. Then there's a second category that deals with stopping impatience with those who prevent your praise or fame etc, and with those who have contempt for you.

Harmdoers prevent our happiness. They do things to obstruct our happiness and they do things that cause us to suffer. We find these things intolerable and are impatient but we need to stop this. How can we stop this impatience with the people who do things to obstruct our happiness and who do things that cause us to suffer? We must look at how it's illogical or, as it is translated here, unjustified to become angry: that's the first part. And second we look at how it's logical or justified to feel compassionate concern towards them. In fact that's what it says here:

- (a)) *Showing that anger is unjustified*

(b)) Showing that compassion is appropriate

This is important. The Precious Lord Lama Tsong Khapa has given us many different sections to this outline. First in demonstrating that it's unjustified or illogical to become angry, there's an analysis from three perspectives: that it's illogical to feel angry or wrathful

when you investigate the object,
when you investigate the subject,
and when you investigate the basis.

Three parts.

We've covered the first section where, through investigating the object, we see how it's illogical or unjustified to become angry. Now we're dealing with how you see it's illogical or unjustified to become angry when you investigate the subject. That's where we left off yesterday.

The section on analysing the object also has different parts. Object in this sense refers to the object with which you become (or are) angry. You analyse this object to determine, first of all, whether or not it has self-control and on the basis of this analysis, conclude that anger or wrath etc is unjustified. Then you analyse the conditions that contribute to a person causing harm to you and you ask, whether these conditions are adventitious or whether it is in this person's nature to act in this harmful way towards you. By analysing whether these conditions are adventitious or natural – inherent you might say – then you see that anger is unjustified. And then you look at whether the harm is direct or indirect and finally you analyse the causes that impel the harmdoer, and on that basis see how anger is unjustified.

These four sections are most important with respect to our dealing with impatience and developing patience. In that third section, where you analyse whether the harm is direct or indirect, there was the analogy of a stick: saying that if it's justified to get angry with the person, then it must be justified to get angry with the stick. And if it's justified to get angry in this way, you should also get angry with the disturbing emotions themselves that motivate the person to use the stick. Remember this analogy?

These four sections are some of the most important points in being patient with those who cause us harm. This is of course part of the section on patience that disregards the harm that is done to us and it looks at how anger is unjustified through investigating or analysing the object -- the person or thing that you become angry with.

On the top of page 169 and top of page 170 we have the next section:

(2)) On analysis of the subject, anger is unjustified

It reads:

If you get angry at a harmdoer through an inability to bear suffering, it is contradictory because, even as you are failing to bear slight suffering in the present, you are aggressively creating the cause of measureless suffering in the miserable realms.

This is clear isn't it. Another person does something to harm us and we find that intolerable. We are impatient and respond by retaliating, returning their harm. In doing so, however, we are creating the cause to encounter immeasurable suffering in the future ourselves. Thus these two are contradictory: on the one hand there is our inability to bear suffering and yet we respond with intolerance or impatience and thus do something that causes our own future suffering.

We must see how these two are contradictory, or in conflict.

Therefore, induce a sense of embarrassment, thinking, "I am very stupid," and work to contain your anger. Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds states:

If I cannot endure

*Even the slight suffering of the present,
Then why do I not stop my anger,
The cause of suffering in the hells?*

This quote is support for the earlier statement. It's very clear.

The suffering generated by harm is the effect of previous bad karma; by experiencing it, you exhaust this karma. If you bear the suffering, you do not accumulate new sins and you greatly increase your merit. Therefore, you must not consider how harmdoers ruin their virtue, but view them as kind in that it is as though they are engaged in actions for the sake of clearing away your sins.

That's clear isn't it.

This is what we're always talking about. Whenever you experience some physical illness, or some mental suffering, this is due to the fact that you have a seed of nonvirtue in your continuum and this seed has come to fruition producing this effect of suffering. In coming to fruition, or ripening, this negative karma is being exhausted. We talk about negative karma being exhausted when in actual fact, it's the seed of negative karma that is exhausted.

What is it that causes this seed to be exhausted? It's the person who does harm to us, isn't it? As that is the case, the harmdoer is very kind to us.

It follows that this harmdoer is kind because they are the ones to act so that this seed produces an effect and is thereby exhausted so that it does not cause suffering again in the future.

Although we don't often adopt this attitude, really we should think that this person is especially kind to me: this person's actions help me exhaust these seeds of nonvirtue, these seeds of suffering. The person is *especially* kind to me. In this process we don't consider how the harmdoers are ruining their virtue, rather we focus on how they are being especially kind to us in helping us to exhaust our own negativities, the seeds and so forth. As it says:

you must not consider how harmdoers ruin their virtue, but view them as kind in that it is as though they are engaged in actions for the sake of clearing away your sins.

Perhaps it is difficult to think like this and we don't often do it, but if we did, we would probably accumulate merit in the process, wouldn't we?

The Garland of Birth Stories says:

*I do not think about this person ruining his virtue
But that he is as if engaged in actions to clear away my sins;
If I am not patient even with this person,
How could I be any more unkind?*

This is reasonable. There's a logic to it isn't there?

And Candrakirti's Commentary on the "Middle Way" says:

*You want to say that you are exhausting
The effects of nonvirtuous karma done in the past;
How then can you sow the seeds of further suffering
By getting angry and harming others?*

It's as if we have a very serious illness within us, an illness that is going to require an operation. From one point of view, the doctor that performs the operation really puts us through a lot of hardship. We really have a tough time undergoing the operation and so forth. But nevertheless we think of this doctor

It is not easy though, is it? But we can adopt this attitude and it is indeed the way that we need to think about it. Which is exactly what it says just below. We have a confirmation from Lama Tsong Khapa!

Therefore, just as you tolerate bleeding or burning as a treatment to cure a severe illness, it is appropriate to bear small sufferings for the sake of preventing greater suffering.

(3)) On analysis of the basis, anger is unjustified

Basis here refers to the very person who becomes angry, thus potentially ourselves.

On analysis of the basis, anger is unjustified has two parts:

- 1. Analyzing the causes of harm and where the fault lies*
- 2. Analyzing your commitment*

(a')) Analyzing the causes of harm and where the fault lies

Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds says:

*His sword and my body
Are both causes of suffering.
He obtained the sword, I obtained the body;
At which should I be angry?*

*If, blinded by craving, I have obtained
This abscess with a human form, [Geshela laughs]
So painful that it cannot bear to be touched,
With whom should I be angry when it is hurt?*

It's true isn't it, that this body of ours is a cause of suffering.

The weapons are also causes of suffering, aren't they? So with whom should we be angry?

Thinking about this, we see that it's illogical to feel anger or hatred. We need to think about whether than anger is directed towards the harmdoers or towards the weapons. These are all, after all, causes of suffering, just as your own body is a cause of suffering. If we're going to feel hatred or anger towards the causes of suffering, we ought to be angry at *all* of the causes of suffering instead of just a select few.

And also:

*If some people, out of confusion, harm others
While others in confusion get angry with them,
Who is blameless
And who is to blame?*

Is my body to blame, or is it blameless? Is the weapon to blame, or is it blameless? Is the person who's doing the harm who is to blame, or are they blameless? Thinking about where the blame actually lies and whether it's shared and so forth, helps us to see that anger is unjustified.

If you investigate like this when you become angry, then the intensity of the anger declines. You know, when you get angry, investigate the object, investigate the subject, and investigate the basis. In doing so, it seems that your anger slowly becomes less intense. This is the point. In analysing the situation, the nature of the object, the nature of the basis etc, then you can decrease the intensity of that anger.

(b')) Analyzing your commitment

Develop the fortitude of patience [Interpreter: here, fortitude is probably accurately translated], *thinking,*

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only
“It is wrong for even hearers, who act for their own purposes alone, to be impatient and get angry. So of course it is wrong for me. I committed myself to achieving the benefit and happiness of all living beings when I generated the mind of enlightenment. I act for others’ welfare and care for all beings.”

Also, Bo-do-wa said:

The Buddha’s teaching is to commit no sin. When you fail to cultivate patience with a slight harm, you make the curse, “May this eradicate the teaching.” [Eliminate it from its very foundations.] Thereby you give up your vow, and this eradicates the teaching. We do not have the teaching as a whole; when we break our vows, we dissipate what we do have.

Here, it mentions “teachings”. Generally we divide teachings into two types: the scriptural teachings and the teachings of realisation.

The scriptural teachings refer to the three *pitakas* or baskets, sometimes called the three scriptural collections, where you have the scriptural collection of :

- Vinaya (or texts on discipline),
- Sutra (the discourses) and
- Abidharma (or knowledge).

These are considered the three baskets, the scriptural teachings.

To memorise these teachings, to practise them or to do things in order that others practise them, would be to uphold these scriptural teachings.

If at one time you were to do these things and then later stop, then, for you, the scriptural teachings would have declined. This is what it means by the decline of the scriptural teachings. At one point you practise and uphold them, and then at a later point, you do not.

The teachings of realisation are the three trainings:

- the training in ethics
- the training in concentration and
- the training in wisdom.

To work to develop these within your own continuum is to uphold the teachings of realisation.

If that were to decline, then the teachings of realisation would have declined, and hence in a sense you would be eradicating those teachings.

In this quote from Bo-do-wa, it mentions how when you make 'the curse', become angry and say: “May this eradicate the teaching” this in effect is what you do.

Thereby you give up your vow, and this eradicates the teaching. We do not have the teaching as a whole

You can’t eradicate the teachings in general, but you can eradicate the teachings that you yourself have, can’t you? So likewise, when you break your vows, you dissipate what you do have. Another person cannot make you relinquish or give up your vows, can they? But you yourself can do things so that you lose your vows. This is similar: you can do things to destroy the teachings that you have, whereas you can’t destroy the teachings in general.

The point is this: we must guard our own vows and we must guard our own teachings. Another person cannot eradicate *our* teachings and we must make sure that we don’t do anything to eradicate them ourselves. We must make sure to guard against this, to avoid this.

There are a number of different sayings of the Kadampa masters, like this one from Bo-do-wa. These are sayings that passed down through the oral lineage. They are often very difficult to understand because of the rather antiquated language that they use. There is in fact a text that Lozang Choekyi Gyaltsen composed that explains some of this antiquated terminology, but some of the words are not explained there. Of course that text was written about 300 years ago so perhaps the words weren't so old-fashioned then.

This has all been very clearly translated into English though. The translation committee [for Lam Rim Chen Mo] have conferred and on the basis on their discussions, it has been rendered into English, so that we actually have it quite clear. It's much easier to understand in the English than it would be in the Tibetan.

And also:

When a yak has been saddled up for carrying goods, if the saddle tightens around his tail, he bucks, and the saddle beats against his legs. If the saddle is loosened, the straps drop, and the yak is happy. Similarly, if you do not relax around a harmdoer, the harmdoer matches what you do, and you steadily become more unhappy.

Tibetans use yaks as pack animals. In order to load them up, they need to put a kind of a harness on them, so that they can carry the goods. This harness has straps which are meant to sit in a certain way, but if they slide down, they begin to pinch the yak's hindquarters, around the tail and so forth. This becomes very uncomfortable for them, and when that happens, they begin to buck. They start jumping around and can't stand still. If they were just to stand still without bucking, it would be alright – the straps wouldn't be such a problem. But each time they buck, they rub the straps up against their hindquarters, and it becomes more and more uncomfortable. The more they buck, the more the straps rub.

It's like this when we get angry. The more we buck up against everything, the more unpleasant it becomes. Whereas if you just calm down and don't buck, then it's not so bad, is it? It's like this.

There we have a number of really good reasons why it's illogical to get angry and feel hatred. Now we go on to:

(b)) Showing that compassion [or compassionate concern] is appropriate [or logical].

Here we're looking how it's logical or appropriate to feel compassionate concern towards the harmdoer.

Contemplate from the depths of your heart, "All living beings have been in cyclic existence since beginningless time, and there is not one who has not been my friend and relative—father, mother, etc. Being impermanent, they lose their lives and are miserable due to the three types of suffering. Crazed by the demon of the afflictions, they destroy their own welfare in this and future lives. I must generate compassion for them. How could it be right to get angry or to retaliate for harm?"

This is the second section under the heading:

Stopping impatience with those who prevent your happiness and with those who cause you to suffer.

That section on stopping impatience with those who prevent your happiness and with those who cause you to suffer has two parts:

(a)) Showing that anger is unjustified

(b)) Showing that compassion is appropriate

We're dealing with the second section here.

(2") Stopping impatience with those who prevent your praise, fame, or honor, and with those who have contempt for you, or say offensive or unpleasant things to you

This has two parts:

stopping impatience with those who prevent three things and
stopping impatience with those who do three things.

So the first section,

Stopping impatience with those who prevent three things—praise, and so forth—has three parts:

- 1. Reflection on how praise and so forth lack good qualities*
- 2. Reflection on how praise and so forth have faults*
- 3. The need to delight in those who prevent praise and so forth*

The explanation here separates the impatience that you might have to those who prevent things like praise etc that you might have otherwise received, from the impatience that you might have to those people who have contempt and so forth for you. Having distinguished these then, we first look at how to stop the impatience towards those people who do things that prevent our praise or fame or honour. And this is analysed over three parts.

(1) Reflection on how praise and so forth lack good qualities

When others praise you and spread your fame, it serves neither of two purposes: for this life it does not bring you long life, health, and the like, and for future lives it does not bring merit and so forth. Therefore, do not get attached to fame and praise, but reproach yourself by thinking, “My displeasure when my praise and fame are ruined is no different from when small children cry upon the collapse of their sand castles, which lack any of the requisites for a dwelling.”

Praise, fame, and honor: these actually don't do anything for us, whether it's in this lifetime or in future lifetimes. We like it when people praise us. We like the thought of becoming famous and well known. We would like it if people were to honour us. But actually, these things don't accomplish our purposes, whether it be right now or in the future. Therefore we don't need to worry if the praise that people give to us, our fame, or our honour, were to decline. Actually, it doesn't harm us at all when these things decline so we don't need to be bothered by it.

The text analyses exactly why praise, fame and honour do not serve a purpose in this life or the future. It says praise, fame and honour are not helpful in this life because they don't extend your lifespan or anything like that. They don't help you to avoid illness, do they, so they're not helpful in this lifetime. And as for the future: praise, fame and honour don't help you achieve a human body. So they're not helpful for the future either. You might think that of course these things are helpful in this life, because when you are praised or become famous, you enjoy it - it's pleasant! But that's not what they're talking about here. This is actually attachment anyway, isn't it? The point is not that you're not going to experience any pleasure from it, but that it doesn't do you any real good in this lifetime in the sense that it doesn't help you live a long life, it doesn't free you from illness etc.

Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds states:

*Praise, fame, and honor
Do not cause merit, nor longevity,
Nor cause strength, nor health,
Nor bring physical well-being.*

*Once I understand my own welfare,
What meaning is there for me in those?*

It doesn't bring physical wellbeing in the sense that it doesn't bring physical pleasure – but perhaps a bit

And also:

*When their sand castles collapse,
Children cry in great distress.
Likewise, my mind is childish
When my praise and fame are ruined.*

Having looked at how these things lack good qualities, now we consider how they have faults.

(2)) Reflection on how praise and so forth have faults

Develop disgust for praise and so forth, thinking, “Praise, fame, and honor distract my mind with the meaningless, destroy my disenchantment with cyclic existence, make me jealous of those with good qualities, and spoil my virtuous activities.”

This really is quite clearly the case, isn't it?

When someone tells you you're great it can begin to destroy your disenchantment with cyclic existence. You might really begin to think that you're really something special and become jealous of people who have good qualities, because of those good qualities. These faults are real faults, aren't they. Faults that actually apply.

*Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds says:
Praise and so forth distract me,
Destroy my disenchantment,
Promote my jealousy of those with good qualities,
And destroy all that is good.*

Given that that is the case, then we must delight in those who prevent our being praised and so forth and that's the next (third) section.

*(3)) The need to delight in those who prevent praise and so forth
Stop your anger and feel delight from the depths of your heart, thinking, “In that case, damage to my praise, fame, gain, and honor protects me from going to miserable realms, cuts the bonds of my attachment, and, like the Buddha's blessing, blocks the door through which I am about to enter into suffering.” Thinking like this, you should from the depths of your heart stop anger and feel happy.*

If that's clear then the following verses, which are support for that, should be clear also.

*Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds states:
Therefore, are not those involved in destroying
Praise of me and the like
Engaged in protecting me
From falling into miserable realms?*

*I diligently seek freedom
And do not need the bonds of gain and honor;
How could I get angry
With those who free me from bondage?*

*I am about to descend into suffering,
But, like the Buddha's blessing, they are*

*Giving me an opportunity to avoid it.
How could I be angry with them?*

We often talk about the eight mundane (worldly) concerns and that is basically what is being referred to here. Although the eight mundane concerns are not actually listed here, they're talking about the same sort of thing.

In order for our dharma to be pure, we need to try to make sure that any virtue we might accomplish does not fall under the influence of the mundane concerns. When we do something for praise, to become famous, or to get goods and services, then our dharma will not be pure and we will have fallen under the influence of the mundane concerns.

The next section is:

(b)) Stopping impatience with those who do three things to you—have contempt for you, or say offensive or unpleasant things to you

Prevent your unhappiness, thinking, “Since the mind is not material, it cannot be directly harmed by others. While the mind is indirectly harmed by directly harming the body, the body cannot be harmed by contempt, offensive speech, and unpleasant words. These harm neither body nor mind, so I should be delighted.” When you prevent your unhappiness, you do not give rise to hostility.

Thus Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds says:

*Since the mind is not physical,
No one can ever destroy it.
It is strongly attached to the body
And so it is harmed by physical suffering.*

*Contempt, offensive speech,
And unpleasant words
Do not harm the body,
Then why, mind, are you so angry?*

No other person is capable of harming your mind. That's what's being said here. Your mind is not material, is it? It's not tangible, nobody can touch it. We think that when other people do things, somehow they harm my mind, but that's actually just a way of thinking - our wrong attitude. Another person cannot directly harm the mind.

Similarly, when another person says something unpleasant – abuses you says something offensive, that doesn't harm the body in any way, does it?

So it doesn't harm the body, it doesn't directly harm the mind: so just forget it! No big deal! As they say in the texts on mind training: think of it as being just like an echo, because it doesn't harm your body, it doesn't harm your mind.

Now if a person were to hit you with a stick, that would really hurt the body, wouldn't it? And due to that, the mind feels hurt too. But offensive things that are said to you don't harm your body at all, so there's no need for them to harm your mind either. So just let it be.

Sha-ra-wa said:

No matter what the three geshe Kam-lung-ba, Neu-sur-ba (sNe'u-zur-pa) and Drap-ba (Grab-pa) heard, it was no different from speaking to dirt and rocks, so they remained happy. Since everyone nowadays reacts quickly to what is said, they become unhappy. When somebody whispered to Shen-dön (gShen-ston), “He said this and then that,” Shen-dön replied, “People also say things behind the king's back. You have committed divisive speech, so confess it.”

When someone said to the yogi Shay-rap-dor-jay (Shes-rab-rdo-rje), “People are talking about us and saying that our attendants are too lax,” he replied, “Well, the talk of the people will be about people; what else would they talk about?” Thereafter that person completely stopped the spread of his divisive speech.

Objection: When someone has contempt or speaks contemptuously about me for me, etc., other people will not like me, so this is why I am unhappy about it.

This is how we think. We think that if other people speak contemptuously about us then other people will not like us and so we’re concerned. Now the reply is:

This would have some truth if others’ dislike were to harm you. However, since their dislike does nothing to you, give up your unhappiness about others’ contempt. Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds says:

*Others’ dislike for me
Does not devour me
In this or other lives.
Why am I averse to it?*

Actually this is something that is quite prevalent isn’t it? We’re unhappy when we think that other people don’t like us, which is a little bit strange when you think about it. Whether they like you or not, what does it matter?

Whether they like you or not, just try and accomplish your own aims. In doing so, it is beside the point whether people like you or not. If from your side you do something bad, so that others dislike you, well then it’s your fault: you acted in this negative way. It being your fault, you should confess and purify that.

But if from your side you haven’t done anything and they dislike you, what’s the big deal, what does it matter whether they like you or not? It’s not a big deal, is it?

Who knows, maybe it’s better if people don’t like you! Then you can meditate, you’ll have time to say your prayers [laughter], you’ll really be able to do well! But if people like you, then they’re always coming around, talking “blah blah blah” [laughter]. You don’t have time to meditate or say your prayers or anything! This suffering that we experience when we think that people don’t like us is really strange.

Who knows, maybe if a person likes you, they might come along and give you some type of job. If they don’t like you then they’re not going to ask you to do the job! [laughter]

Other people liking us is really not that important. When such things become an obstacle to our practice, then that’s really difficult.

Objection: Indeed I am not harmed by their dislike, but in dependence on it I may be hindered in acquiring things from them, so I will get angry at those who have contempt for me, scorn me, or say unpleasant words to me.

OK, here’s a possible reason for this anger. This is a real reason, isn’t it. Let’s see what Lama Tsong Khapa has to say about this!

He says: *Even if you acquire things, you must leave them here, whereas the sin of your anger at them will follow you. Hence, of the two choices—dying quickly in destitution or living for a long time improperly—the former is better.*

Even if you acquire things and live for a long time, you must die since you are not liberated from death.

At the time of death, it is the same whether you have enjoyed pleasure for the previous hundred years or enjoyed it for merely one year, for both alternatives are nothing more than mere objects of memory; and at that time it makes no difference at all for your happiness or suffering. It is analogous to how in a dream the experience of pleasure for one hundred years and the experience of a mere moment's pleasure have no difference at all with respect to your happiness or unhappiness at the time of waking.

When you contemplate in this way and turn away from attachment to gain and honor, you will not become unhappy with unpleasant words and contempt. You have no interest in being special in the eyes of others, so you do not lose your contentment.

This is how it really is, isn't it.

Due to your attachment to gain and honour, you reckon that things just aren't working out and you get upset by that. But if you can turn away from this attachment to gain and honour then you will not be upset when unpleasant words or offensive things are said or when people speak contemptuously of you. The reason that you would be upset when those things happen is because you have this wish to be special in the eyes of others. We really want to *be* someone, for others to think that we are good, so special. But if you have no interest in being special in the eyes of others, then you will not lose your contentment, regardless of what other people say. You will not lose your contentment because you have no interest in being special in the eyes of others.

The last few paragraphs and the following verses carry the same meaning.

Thus, Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds states:

*While I do not like contempt and so forth
Because they interfere with my prosperity,
I leave my acquisitions here
But firmly keep my sins.*

*Better that I die today
Than live a long, improper life.
Those like me might live a long time,
But then there is only the suffering of death.*

*Someone might wake from a dream
After experiencing happiness for one hundred years;
Another might wake from a dream
After experiencing happiness for a mere moment.*

*For both persons once they awaken
Happiness does not return;
It is like this at the time of death
Whether your life was long or short.*

*After acquiring many things,
I may enjoy pleasure for a long time,
But just like one robbed by a thief
I will leave naked and empty-handed.*

That marks the end of the section on stopping impatience with those who prevent your praise, fame and honour and those who have contempt for you or say offensive and unpleasant things to you.

This brings us then to the other section referred to earlier. After having covered “stopping impatience with those who harm you”, then we look at “stopping both dislike for harmdoers’ attainments (the

(b”) Stopping both dislike for harmdoers’ attainments and delight in their troubles

Contemplate as follows, “After I have generated the mind of enlightenment for the sake of accomplishing all living beings’ benefit and happiness, I get angry at harmdoers when they obtain happiness on their own. After I have said that I want all beings to become buddhas, I get unhappy when harmdoers get even minimal prosperity or honor. This is extremely contradictory.” You must eliminate your jealousy regarding any sort of attainment by other persons and delight in it from the depths of your heart. Otherwise your mind of enlightenment and the achievement of the welfare and happiness of beings are nothing but words.

What they’re talking about here is this dislike or displeasure that we feel when things go well for someone we dislike, or when they encounter great wealth or get lots of things. We need to stop this.

Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds is quoted here as support. It says:

*Since you want all beings to be happy,
You have generated the mind of enlightenment.
Then, when beings find happiness themselves,
Why do you get angry with them?*

*If you wish to attain for living beings’ welfare
Buddhahood, which is worshipped in the three worlds,
Why are you tormented when you see
Their most paltry gain or honor?*

*When a relative finds sustenance
For those whom you should nurture—
Objects of your care and generosity—
Instead of being pleased, are you angry again?*

*If you do not wish even that for beings,
How can you wish them enlightenment?
Where is the mind of enlightenment
In someone who gets angry at others’ attainments? At others’ gains.*

*Whether your enemy gets something from someone
Or it remains in the benefactor’s house
It is never yours, so why be angry—
Whether it is given or not?*

Even your mere malicious thoughts that delight in your enemies’ troubles or that wish for their destruction do not harm your enemy; they lead only to your own suffering. Yet, if such malice were to harm them, you should stop it completely, reflecting on the drawback that this would bring ruin to yourself and others. Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds states:

*When my enemies are unhappy,
What am I pleased about?
My wishes alone
Will cause them no harm.*

*Even if I should effect their suffering with my wish,
What could I be pleased about?*

*If I say I will be satisfied,
What could be more ruinous?*

*Once I am caught by the terrible, sharp hook
Cast by the fishermen, the afflictions,
I will surely be cooked by the hell-guardians
In a kettle for the beings of hell.*

You will be unhappy if you view as absolutely undesirable the obstacles to what you and your friends want, movement in directions you do not want, and the prosperity of your enemies. If this unhappiness increases, you become hostile. If you stop your absolute dislike of these three things, you prevent unhappiness. Once you do this, you will not feel hostile. Thus, dispel your absolute dislike of these by using the reasonings previously taught. Take many approaches to stop your anger, because it is a very great fault.

Geshela often talks about how displeasure leads to anger, induces anger. That's actually what Lama Tsong Khapa is saying here. If this unhappiness increases, you become hostile. You will be unhappy if you view as absolutely undesirable the obstacles to what you and your friends want, movement in directions you do not want, and the prosperity of your enemies. If this displeasure or unhappiness (the same word in Tibetan) increases, then you become hostile, you develop hostility. If displeasure itself were anger, then you wouldn't need to say that if displeasure increases, then you become hostile. Displeasure and anger are different.

Here it says:

Once you do this, you will not feel hostile. Thus, dispel your absolute dislike of these by using the reasonings previously taught. Take many approaches to stop your anger, because it is a very great fault.

Some advice from the Precious Lord:

These instructions—the lines of reasoning of the conquerors and their children presented above—provide the techniques for defeating your greatest enemy, anger. They involve arguing with your own afflictions and looking within yourself. When you analyze well with discerning wisdom and stop anger with many lines of reasoning, you prevent many different types of anger, and you become patient in many ways. Since this is an experience engendered by penetrating understanding that uses flawless reasoning to get at the meaning of correct scriptures, it leaves an extremely stable *imprint*.

Generally speaking, this principle applies all throughout the *Lam Rim* and Lama Tsong Khapa's works, but here just to make the point, Lama Tsong Khapa says that this is not just something he's made up himself, that it's based on correct scripture. He's also not just indiscriminately quoting from any old master's works. He's quoting from *correct* scriptures, correct scriptures which get at the meaning through the use of flawless reasoning. And through this flawless reasoning based on the meaning of the correct scriptures, we can develop a penetrating or very deep understanding and from this very deep understanding we develop experience. So a profound experience can be had, can arise, from the penetrating understanding we get using flawless reasoning as displayed in the correct scriptures.

This is important. It leaves a very stable and firm imprint.

It goes on:

Those who reject meditative analysis with discerning wisdom are those who reject the whole of the great undertaking of bodhisattva deeds such as these. Understand that such rejection is the worst hindrance to using a life of leisure for the benefit of yourself and others. Get rid of it as you would poison.

This translation says 'meditative analysis', but the Tibetan says, "analytical meditation". We've already

© Chenrezig Institute Buddhist Studies Prog. - Lam Rim Chen Mo 2004 lightly edited transcripts for course participants only

dealt with the ideas that some masters of the past – both Indian and Tibetan – had about analytical meditation and its efficacy. There are some people who certain ideas about conception, how conception of any type was an obstacle to achieving buddhahood. We talked about this before. None of you probably entertain these ideas yourself, but in the past there were people that held the idea that any type of conceptual consciousness would be an obstacle or hindrance to achieving buddhahood and therefore conceptions, be they good or bad, are things to be abandoned. So these people thought. They would clearly reject analytical meditation, arguing that to achieve buddhahood, you must rely upon placement or stabilising meditation alone.

The importance of analytical meditation is stated at many different points in the text, going all the way back to the section on the proper way to rely upon a spiritual teacher. Do you remember how it was stated in looking at the proper way to rely upon a spiritual teacher – in the section “how to sustain the meditation”? This section speaks about the great importance of analytical meditation, particularly for beginners. Then later in the stages of the path shared with persons of medium capacity, a similar point is made. In the stages of the path shared with persons of great capacity, when we consider the view of the Ha-shang, also the importance of analytical meditation is emphasised. So analytical meditation is extremely important.

We should also point out that analytical meditation does not refer to just indiscriminately thinking about any number of different things. Rather, there is a proper way to engage in it. Take for instance, meditating on the seven-fold instructions on cause and effect. When you meditate on that, you want to make sure that you have the correct number of topics and that you go through them in the proper order. And as you go through them, you must stick to the topic at hand. If you begin to think, “oh, maybe it would be good to meditate on this!” or “maybe good to meditate on that”, you should not transfer your attention to another topic, but stick to the topic at hand. You use different reasoning and different points in order to clarify the main topic that you’re dealing with. Thus analytical meditation follows a certain process. It does not mean just thinking about any old thing that pops into your head.

If you’re meditating on developing the recognition that all sentient beings have been your mother, for instance, then stick to that and think about all the reasons that help you to develop that recognition. Otherwise you might find that having thought about any number of different things then you can’t remember what you were supposed to be meditating on. If that happens, it will be an obstacle to your developing the experience of the recognition that all sentient beings have been your mother.

Whatever you’re meditating on, don’t lose sight of that, and utilise whatever correct reasons help to clarify your understanding of that topic. This is called analytical meditation.

Analytical meditation and insight are quite similar to one another but they are by no means the same thing. Insight is carried out after you have achieved calm abiding, whereas analytical meditation can take place at any point prior to that. It’s only after you have achieved calm abiding that you can develop insight, so they are not the same, but they are, in many respects, similar.

Do you have any questions?

Student: As aspiring bodhisattvas, isn’t the good opinion of others, about ourselves, important? Isn’t this something that we should actually emphasise?

Geshela: Other people thinking well of us is important, just as it’s important for us to try to be good. These two are both important. But other people praising us, honouring us - this is not important. If we become attached to that, then it becomes an obstacle to our practice of the dharma.

Student: I think these are different issues. I can see how another person praising us would be harmful to us, but at the same time, as far as our capacity to help others goes, then a good reputation or people thinking highly of us is important. They’re linked but I would still argue that these are different things.

Geshela: If you read the text then it will become clear that these are indeed different issues, different situations. What does the text talk about? It talks about how praise and fame and honour etc can be problematic and cause troubles when we become attached to them. So it says, don't be attached – quite clearly, at least in the Tibetan - don't become attached to these types of things. If you do, certain problems will ensue. So we need to make sure that from our own side, we're OK, whether people praise us or not. Whether they praise us or not, whether they honour us or not – from our side, we need to be OK with that, because when we're attached to these things and they stop, that makes us become angry. And here we're talking about the need to stop anger.

Student: I don't disagree with what Geshela says, I agree. But I do feel that others' criticism of us ought to be seen as a failure on our part because in putting ourselves in a position where we can be criticised, then we have lost our influence, our ability to positively influence them.

Geshela: Geshela probably already answered this. He talked about how we can get upset or displeased when another person doesn't like us. When he commented on that, Geshela said that if we have done something from our own side to make them dislike us, then yes, we are at fault and we need to address this, do something about that. But when from our side we haven't done anything to make them dislike us, but they dislike us anyway - well, let it be.

If another person tells us we are really good, there's nothing wrong with that. Lama Tsong Khapa is not saying that people praising us is bad, is he! But if we act out of a hope that others will praise us, that is mistaken. That's what Lama Tsong Khapa is saying, because if they don't praise you, then you get angry. So don't consider whether you're praised or not as being an important thing.

Geshela just wanted to make a correction to something that he said about Chenrezig yesterday. Before he achieved buddhahood, when he first awakened the mind of enlightenment, Chenrezig made a pledge that "I will not achieve buddhahood until all sentient beings have achieved buddhahood". Of course Chenrezig went on to become a buddha and there are still sentient beings left. But that doesn't mean that what that being who became Chenrezig said at that time was a lie. That was a reflection of the power and strength of mind that Chenrezig had. This is a story that they tell about Chenrezig.

Yesterday however, Geshela was talking about relinquishing the mind of enlightenment and told this story about how a person (at that time he said it was Chenrezig) thought about the difficulty of eliminating the suffering of all sentient beings and thought, "oh I can't do this. Better that I give up the mind of enlightenment and enter into the hinayana." It was actually Shariputra who was said to have done that, relinquished the mind of enlightenment. In the Heart of Wisdom sutra there's all this back and forth between Chenrezig and Shariputra, Chenrezig and Shariputra, Chenrezig and Shariputra: and Geshela mistakenly said the name of one when actually he meant the other.

There's that story. Jampa told Geshela yesterday that he had never seen the source for it and Geshela hasn't seen the source for it either.

There are real questions surrounding this issue of bodhisattvas having anger in their continuum, which Yeshe was asking about the other day. They have the uncontrived mind of enlightenment, uncontrived intention to accomplish the welfare of all sentient beings, but then there's this prospect that for a moment they might become angry with sentient beings. It's a very interesting question - this possibility of them becoming angry for even a moment, despite the fact that they have the uncontrived mind of enlightenment. How do we deal with these issues? These are real questions that we need to think about.

On the debate courtyard, some people will adopt the position that bodhisattvas do not get angry – but if they did get angry then it would destroy this many number of eons worth of roots of virtue. So they say they don't get angry, but if they *were* to get angry then this is what would happen.

But Geshela doesn't really like that position. Because when you look at the different texts that talk about this, like *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds* or Chandrakirti's text, where they mention the possibility of bodhisattvas becoming angry, you don't really get the impression that they're talking about it in this way. But if you're comfortable with that position, you can adopt it. It is a defensible position. Geshela likes to say that bodhisattvas potentially do have anger in their continuum. [Geshela laughs]

Lama Tsong Khapa divides that section into different parts. He talks about the object, and then the basis or support. And the basis or support refers to the person who gets angry. And in that section, he mentions bodhisattvas, doesn't he? In fact he says, if a bodhisattva gets angry and were to destroy roots of virtues, then what need is there to talk about the same thing being the case for us? He says that, doesn't he? It's in the Lam Rim Chen Mo, isn't it? If it's not possible for a bodhisattva to get angry, then Lama Tsong Khapa's statement is rather strange, isn't it? It would seem to be possible for a beginning bodhisattva to get angry.

So if we say, it follows that it's not a bodhisattva because it has anger - it would seem there is no pervasion.