

CHAPTER 28

Distinctions in the 2nd Ground's Courses of Karmic Action

XXVIII. CH. 28: DISTINCTIONS IN THE 2ND GROUND'S KARMIC ACTIONS

A. THE TEN RESOLUTE INTENTIONS NECESSARY FOR ENTERING THE 2ND GROUND

The bodhisattva who has already succeeded in the complete fulfillment of the first ground and then wishes to reach the second ground should bring forth ten types of resolute intentions.⁴⁶¹

Those bodhisattvas who have already reached the first ground, the Ground of Joyfulness, next bring forth ten types of resolute intentions for the sake of reaching the second ground. It is because of these ten kinds of resolute intentions that one is able to reach the second ground. This is comparable to when someone wishes to go up to an upper-story balcony and must rely on the stairs to do so.

Question: What then are these ten kinds of resolute intentions that serve as means for reaching the second ground?

Response:

The straight mind, the capable mind, the pliant, the restrained, and the quiescent minds, the truly sublime, the unmixed, and the non-covetous minds, the happy mind, and magnanimous mind make ten in all.

The bodhisattva who has already completely fulfilled the practices of the first ground and now wishes to reach the second ground proceeds to develop these ten kinds of resolute intentions as the appropriate means, namely:⁴⁶²

- 1) The straight mind;
- 2) The capable mind;
- 3) The pliant mind;
- 4) The restrained mind;
- 5) The quiescent mind;
- 6) The truly sublime mind;
- 7) The unmixed mind;
- 8) The unattached mind;
- 9) The expansively happy mind;
- 10) The magnanimous mind.

1. THE STRAIGHT MIND AND THE PLIANT MIND

Now, as for the straight mind, this is one that has abandoned flattery and deviousness. Because the mind has abandoned flattery and deviousness, it becomes characterized by pliancy. Pliancy refers to not being unyielding or gruff and ill-mannered. The bodhisattva who acquires this pliant mind develops many different *dhyāna* absorptions and also cultivates all good dharmas.

2. THE CAPABLE MIND

Once one has contemplated the true character of all dharmas, his mind then becomes capable. Because the mind has become capable, one develops the restrained mind.

3. THE RESTRAINED MIND

The restrained mind is one that is well able to restrain the eye and the other sense faculties. This is as stated in the sutras: "What is it that comprises the path of goodness? It is one wherein the bhikshu restrains his eye sense faculty and so forth until we come to his restraining of the mind faculty." It is due to restraint of the six sense faculties that we refer to "the restrained mind."

4. THE QUIESCENT MIND

Once the mind has become restrained, it is then easy to bring forth the quiescent mind. Now, as for the quiescent mind, this refers to being able to extinguish greed, hatred, delusion, and the other afflictions. Having first restrained the mind, one is able to block [the arising of those afflictions] and bring about a state of quiescence.

There are others who claim that acquisition of the *dhyāna* absorptions that itself constitutes the quiescent mind. This is as described in the sutras where it says, "If a person thoroughly knows the characteristic features of the *dhyāna* absorptions, then he will not desire the delectability [of their pleasurable meditative states]. This then is what is meant by the quiescent mind."

5. THE TRULY SUBLIME MIND

Once one has acquired the quiescent mind, he will then definitely bring forth the truly sublime mind. "The truly sublime mind" is a state in which, whatever one wishes to accomplish in the *dhyāna* absorptions and spiritual powers, one will be able to put them to use in a manner that conforms to one's wishes. This is like having real gold that one is able to use however one wishes.

6. THE UNMIXED MIND

Once the practitioner has acquired these types of mind from the straight mind on through to the truly sublime mind, in order to preserve and

protect these kinds of mind, he delights in bringing forth the unmixed mind. The unmixed mind is one in which one abstains from getting involved with either householders or monastics. This practitioner has this thought:

Acquiring these types of mind depends entirely on the power of the *dhyāna* absorptions. It is by means of these types of mind that one acquires the measureless benefits of the second ground. If I allow [these types of mind] to become admixed with the affairs of these many other people, then I will lose these benefits.

And why would this be so? If one allows his practice to become admixed with the affairs of other people, then, because of the eye faculty and the rest of the six sense faculties, one may sometimes then revert to the production of unwholesome dharmas. Why? Because, when one draws close to dharmas able to provoke lust, hatred, or delusion, [the sensations experienced through] the sense faculties may stir up the fires of the afflictions. It would be due to having ignited the fires of the afflictions that one would then lose these benefits.

It is because of having perceived these sorts of faults that one then develops the unmixed mind and realizes that he should not allow his practice to become admixed with the affairs of householders or other monastics.

7. THE UNATTACHED MIND

Having already developed this unmixed mind, this practitioner next develops the unattached mind. The unattached mind is that through which one does not become attached to any householders or monastics, including even one's father, one's mother, one's older or younger brother, one's preceptors, one's teachers, or one's elders. One reflects thus:

If I become attached to householders or monastics, then this will surely involve the interactions involved with going thither and exchanging mutual greetings. In such circumstances, how could I possibly avoid the arising of mixed mind states? Therefore, if I wish to ensure that the benefits of the *dhyāna* absorptions continue to abide, doing so through preservation of the unmixed mind, then I should relinquish any thoughts of attachment for either householders or monastics.

a. Q: DOESN'T AN UNATTACHED MIND CONTRADICT THE BODHISATTVA VOW?

Question: The dharma of the bodhisattva prescribes that one should not forsake beings and should not entertain any thought of forsaking them. This is as stated in the *Bodhisambhāra* [*Treatise*]:

From the very beginning, the bodhisattva exerts vigor in the power of every form of skillful means through which he should influence all beings to abide in the Great Vehicle.

Even were one to teach beings as numerous as the sands of the Ganges to abide in arhatship, that would not equal [the merit of] instructing even one person to abide in the Great Vehicle, for this would be the superior deed.

If one encounters someone possessed of only lesser strength who is thus incapable of bringing forth Great Vehicle resolve, one should, as a secondary priority, teach them to abide instead in the *śrāvaka* disciple or *pratyekabuddha* vehicles.

If they find themselves incapable of abiding in either *śrāvaka* disciple or *pratyekabuddha* vehicles, then one should instruct such beings in a way that causes them to cultivate the causal bases of merit.

If, however, they cannot take on any of the Three Vehicles and cannot take on [causal bases] for human or celestial bliss, either, then one should always resort to present-world endeavors to benefit them in a manner corresponding to the situation.

If, even then, there happen to be those beings who cannot accept benefit as offered by the bodhisattva, one must still refrain from forsaking these beings, but should bring forth great kindness and compassion for them.⁴⁶³

Also, why is it that you claim that the bodhisattva takes on the unmixed mind and brings forth the unattached mind? If the bodhisattva has no attachment to other beings, then that just amounts to abandoning them. How then could he liberate them?

b. A: NO, ONE MUST ACCORD WITH THE MIND OF EQUANIMITY

Response: One should accord with the practice of the mind of equanimity as prescribed by the bodhisattva path. And why? It is because of the mind of equanimity that this person then develops the expansively happy mind. Thus, one reflects:

If I relinquish these many sorts of disturbances, then I will be able to acquire the *dhyāna* absorptions and it is because of the *dhyāna* absorptions that I will bring forth that sublime dharma of expansive happiness. Once I have acquired this dharma, I will then be able to benefit beings in ways that are ten million times more beneficial than what I can do right now.

Consequently, in order to bring about far greater benefit for other beings, one temporarily uses the mind of equanimity to provisionally

abandon the many disturbances so that one can then acquire the *dhyāna* absorptions, the five spiritual powers, and the associated qualities with which one can benefit beings.

So, why is it that the bodhisattva engages in these sorts of skillful means? In order to acquire the magnanimous mind, the bodhisattva reflects:

Because the great man delights in providing great benefit, he does not settle for providing merely minor benefit. Therefore I should now seek to acquire the dharmas of great men and then cultivate the corresponding course of training. I should then pursue just such a diligent application of vigor for the sake of being able to provide such great benefit, namely by acquiring the *dhyāna* absorptions, the spiritual powers, the extinguishing of the sufferings, the liberations, and so forth.

Given the above, the challenge that you have presented here is wrongly conceived.

c. Q: WHY MUST THE BODHISATTVA AGAIN DEVELOP THE STRAIGHT MIND, ETC.?

Question: One already possesses the straight mind and other such dharmas on the first ground. Why then do you yet again state that the bodhisattva wishing to gain the second ground must develop these ten types of mind?

d. A: NOW, ON THE 2ND GROUND, THESE MINDS BECOME SOLIDLY ESTABLISHED

Response: Although one has already come into possession of these dharmas on the first ground, one still does not deeply delight in them and still has not yet solidly established them. One's mind is always joyous on this ground. One then becomes ever more solidly established [in these dharmas] and then develops the capacity to put them to use. Therefore, this challenge of yours is wrong.

e. Q: WHAT IS THE RESULT OF DEEP DELIGHT AND SOLID ESTABLISHMENT?

Question: In the case of those who deeply delight in these dharmas and become ever more solidly established in them, what sorts of circumstances result from this?⁴⁶⁴

f. A: THESE TYPES OF MIND WILL FOREVER AFTER BE EFFORTLESSLY INVOKED

Response:

If this person succeeds even one time in acquiring deep delight and solid establishment in these types of mind, then he will never again have to apply further effort in this, for they will then become like servants who always follow after him.

They will become like a servant that, from the time of his birth, then always follows along after his master. So too, once the bodhisattva has

acquired deep delight in and solid establishment of these [ten types of] minds, they will immediately and always accompany him and never again require the application of special effort to cause them to arise. Thereafter, it requires only the most minor sort of causal circumstance for them to come forth yet again. Why is this so? It is because the roots [of goodness associated with these types of mind] have penetrated down so deeply that stems and branches continuously push forth [forever after].

g. Q: WHAT ARE THE FRUITS OF ACQUIRING THESE TEN TYPES OF MIND?

Question: If the bodhisattva succeeds in acquiring these ten types of mind, what sorts of fruits will he gain?

h. A: HE WILL ATTAIN THE SECOND GROUND AND A THREEFOLD STAINLESSNESS

Response:

If one acquires these types of mind,
then one will abide directly on the second ground
and will become completely equipped with a threefold stainlessness:
[Nominal]; in terms of bad karma; and in terms of the afflictions.

If the bodhisattva succeeds in acquiring these ten types of mind consisting of the straight mind as well as the others, he will then immediately qualify as abiding on the second bodhisattva ground.

The first type of stainlessness is the name of this ground, [i.e. the "stainlessness" ground]. The second type of stainlessness refers to the abandonment on this ground of the defilements associated with the karmic transgressions occurring in the ten courses of bad karmic action. The third type of stainlessness refers to abandonment of the defilements associated with greed, hatred, and the other sorts of afflictions.

It is for these reasons that this is called "the Ground of Stainlessness." Furthermore, regarding the meaning of "stainlessness":

B. THE 2ND GROUND BODHISATTVA'S TEN COURSES OF GOOD KARMIC ACTION

The bodhisattva abiding on this ground
naturally abstains from engaging in bad actions.
Because he deeply delights in good dharmas,
he naturally practices the courses of good karmic action.

1. Q: HOW MANY ARE PHYSICAL, HOW MANY VERBAL & HOW MANY MENTAL?

Question: Given that [this bodhisattva] naturally abstains from the ten courses of bad karmic action and naturally engages in the ten courses of good karmic action, how many of the actions comprising these two classes of courses of karmic action are physical, how many are verbal, and how many are mental?

2. A: PHYSICAL AND MENTAL ARE THREEFOLD AND VERBAL ARE FOURFOLD

Response:

The [bad] physical and mental actions are each of three types and the [bad] verbal actions are fourfold. So too with good actions.

The brief explanation then is of this sort.

This is a subject that should be distinguished [further].

There are three types of bad physical karmic actions, namely killing, stealing, and sexual misconduct. There are four types of bad verbal karmic actions, namely false speech, divisive speech, harsh speech, and scattered or inappropriate speech. There are three types of bad mental karmic actions, namely covetousness, ill will, and wrong views.

There are also three types of good physical karmic actions, namely abandoning killing, stealing, and sexual misconduct. The good verbal karmic actions are also fourfold, namely abandoning false speech, divisive speech, harsh speech, and scattered or inappropriate speech. There are three types of good mental karmic actions, namely non-covetousness, refraining from ill will, and right views.

Whether the physical, verbal, or mental courses of karmic action are good or bad is a topic requiring further discussion so as to cause people to clearly understand such matters.

C. DEFINITIONS OF EACH OF THE TEN COURSES OF GOOD & BAD KARMIC ACTION

1. KILLING

First, "killing" as a course of bad karmic action involves the following factors:

The existence of another being;

The knowledge that there is this being;

The deliberate infliction of physical injury;

The loss of life due to this infliction of physical injury.

If one brings forth these physical karmic actions, this is what is known as "killing," the first of the courses of bad karmic action. It is the abandoning of these factors that defines the good karmic action of refraining from killing.

2. STEALING

As for "stealing," it involves the following factors:

There is something belonging to someone else;

One knows that this thing belongs to someone else;

One produces a thought intent on stealing it;

One's hand grasps this thing, picks it up, and then moves it away from its current location;

Whether one openly robs or surreptitiously steals the object, one then reckons, "This is my possession" and thinks, "This is mine."

These are the factors defining the act of stealing. It is the abandoning of these factors that defines the good karmic action of refraining from stealing.

3. SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

As for "sexual misconduct," [it involves the following factors]:

There is some woman,⁴⁶⁵

She is under the protection of parents, under the protection of her clan, under the protection of her caste, under the protection of worldly convention or law, or under the protection of the moral precepts;

In the case of another man's wife, one may even know of the potential for such obstacles as being whipped, beaten with clubs, tormented, or afflicted with bodily injury;

Even in the midst of any of these circumstances, one nonetheless produces thoughts of lust and then actually commits one of the types of offending physical karmic actions.

In circumstances involving one's own wife, [the following factors constitute transgressions of this precept]:

She may have formally taken a [temporarily restricting] moral precept;

She may be pregnant;

She may still be nursing an infant;

The act may involve a restricted orifice.⁴⁶⁶

These are the factors defining the act of sexual misconduct. It is the abandonment of these factors that defines the good karmic action [of refraining from sexual misconduct].

4. FALSE SPEECH

As for "false speech," [it involves the following factors]:

There is some deceptive sign;

There is the mental intent to deceive;

There is the perception that this action would constitute a deceptive falsehood;

There is the acquiescence in some circumstance constituting a deceptive falsehood;

There is the desire to deceive;

There is the knowledge that the circumstances are of this sort and yet one describes them as being otherwise.

These are the factors defining the action of false speech. It is the abandonment of these factors that defines the good karmic action of abstaining from false speech.

5. DIVISIVE SPEECH

As for “divisive speech,” [it involves the following factors]:

One wishes to cause others to separate;

One says something about this person to that person or says something about that person to this person in order to cause them to separate;

Those who previously were close are then caused to separate;

If they become separated, one is subsequently happy that they have separated, rejoices that they have separated, or is pleased that they have separated.

Factors such as these define an act of divisive speech. It is the abandonment of these factors that defines the good karmic action of abstaining from divisive speech.

6. HARSH SPEECH

As for “harsh speech,” this is inclusive of all of the types of worldly speech that are inclined to cause anger or torment in others such as:

Harsh speech;

Injurious speech;

Bitter speech;

Coarse speech;

Abusive speech.

Factors such as these define an act of harsh speech. It is the abandonment of these factors that defines the good karmic action of abstaining from harsh speech.

7. SCATTERED OR INAPPROPRIATE SPEECH

As for “scattered or inappropriate speech,”⁴⁶⁷ [it may involve the following factors]:

Speaking [of particular topics] at an inappropriate time;

Non-beneficial speech;

Speech contrary to Dharma;

[Rambling] speech having neither beginning nor end;

Unreasonable speech.

Factors such as these define the action of scattered or inappropriate speech. It is the abandonment of these factors that defines the good karmic action of “abstaining from scattered or inappropriate speech.”

8. COVETOUSNESS

As for “covetousness,” [it involves the following factors]:

There are things belonging to someone else which that person wishes to keep such as his fields, lands, or wealth;

One's mind is influenced by covetousness;
One wishes to obtain that thing.

In whichever circumstance of this sort one refrains from coveting, refrains from envy, and refrains from wishing to obtain such an object, these factors constitute the good karmic action of "non-covetousness."

9. ILL WILL

As for "ill will," [it may involve the following factors] directed toward some other being:

One produces thoughts of hatred;
Or one produces thoughts inclined toward obstructiveness;
Or one becomes angry;
Or one thinks, "Why not beat him up, tie him up, or murder him?"

Factors such as these define what is meant by "ill will." It is the abandoning of these factors that defines the good karmic action of "refraining from ill will."

10. WRONG VIEWS

As for "wrong views," this refers to claims such as these:

There is no point in practicing giving;
There is no point in repaying others for kindnesses they have bestowed;
There are no corresponding karmic effects of good or bad karmic actions;
There is no [rebirth into] the present life and no [rebirth] into future lives;
There is no need to respect one's parents;
There are no *śramaṇas* or brahmins who are able to know of [rebirth into] this life or into future lives or who personally gain utterly clear and penetrating comprehension and realizations.

Factors such as these define what is meant by "wrong views."

11. RIGHT VIEW

As for right view, this is reflected in such views as:

There is giving [that should be done];
It is right to repay others for kindnesses they have bestowed;
There are corresponding karmic effects resulting from good and bad actions;
There is [rebirth into] the present life and into future lives;
The world does indeed have *śramaṇas* and brahmins who know [of rebirth into] this life and into future lives and who personally gain utterly clear and penetrating comprehension and realizations.

Factors such as these define the good karmic action of right view. It is in this manner that this bodhisattva enters the right view course [of good karmic action].

The courses of good karmic actions and of bad karmic actions each involve twenty specific types of distinctions.
Knowledge of factors such as point of origin and such each involve twelve different types of distinctions.

D. ABHIDHARMA CATEGORIES ANALYZING THE 10 COURSES OF KARMIC ACTION

With respect to the ten courses of bad karmic action and the ten courses of good karmic action, the bodhisattva knows twenty distinctions pertaining to their many different distinguishing aspects. He also thoroughly knows twelve kinds of distinctions pertaining to each of these twenty distinctions that include their point of origin and so forth.

1. TWENTY FACTORS USED IN ABHIDHARMIC ANALYSIS OF ACTIONS

For each of these component actions within the path of the ten bad karmic actions there are twenty distinguishing factors. For instance, in not abandoning the karmic offense of taking some other being's life, we have these factors:

- First, it is an action that is not good.
- Second, it is connected with the desire realm's planes of existence.
- Third, it involves the contaminants.
- Fourth, it is not a mental dharma.
- Fifth, it is not associated with the mind.
- Sixth, it does not follow the actions of the mind.
- Seventh, it may or may not arise in conjunction with the mind.

What all is implied by "arising in conjunction with the mind"? [This involves the following]:

- There is a truly existent being;
- One knows it is a being;
- One uses some physical action to take its life.

These factors define what is meant by "arising in conjunction with the mind."

What is meant by "not arising in conjunction with the mind"? In an instance where a person [merely] wished to kill a being, grab him, pull him forth, throw him down, and pin him to the ground, but only later was able to bring about his death, this would be a case of "[killing] not arising [directly] in conjunction with the mind."

Also, it might be that the body does not move and the mouth does not speak and one only brings forth the thought, "From this day on, I

shall become someone who kills beings.” This instance of the karmic offense of killing is one wherein [the actual act of taking a life] does not take place directly in conjunction with the mind.

Also, in an instance where this [ideational] non-abandonment of taking others’ lives always accumulates habitual karmic propensities that continue to increase whether one is asleep or awake, this too qualifies as an instance where [the act of killing] does not arise in conjunction with the mind.

Eighth, it may be [an offense] involving either form or non-form.

That initial case [directly above] in which the act of killing occurred in conjunction with the mind—that is one that involved form. That second [immediately subsequent] example of the karmic offense of killing as well as the third and the fourth—these are all instances not involving form.

Ninth, it may involve performing an action or it may not involve performing an action.

That which involves form is one that does involve performing an action whereas any others do not involve the performing of an action.

Tenth, it may or may not involve the presence of objective conditions.

That involving form does involve objective conditions whereas the rest are circumstances devoid of objective conditions.

Question: Are these states of mind that are possessed of objective conditions or devoid of objective conditions?

Response: They do not necessarily involve objective conditions.

Question: If these states of mind do not necessarily involve objective conditions, and we have a case of the body not moving and the mouth not speaking wherein there is only the production of the thought, “From this day forward, I shall be one who takes the lives of beings,” how can it be that karmic offenses such as these do not involve an objective condition?

Response: If it is an instance wherein the karmic offense of killing takes place, then this mind should indeed have associated objective conditions. However, now, in truth, the karmic offense of killing is not [merely] mental. If the mind was what actually commits the karmic offense of killing, then that would itself involve a physical action. But, in truth the mind’s actions are not physical actions. Therefore, this [merely mental] karmic offense of killing beings is not defined by the presence of objective conditions. Rather, [an actual] karmic offense of killing occurs in conjunction with the mind and arises within the

physical body. It is because this [merely mental] instance does not involve any action that it is referred to as being one not involving objective conditions.

Eleventh, it may involve performing a karmic action.

Twelfth, it may not correspond to the commission of a karmic action.

Thirteenth, it may occur in a manner not in direct linkage with the commission of a karmic action.

Fourteenth, it may or may not be generated in conjunction with the commission of a given karmic action.

This is analogous to the case involving arising in conjunction with the mind and is no different than that. The only difference here is that it is not arising in conjunction with mind, but is instead arising in conjunction with volition.⁴⁶⁸

Fifteenth, it may not be a karmic result of actions carried out in previous existences.

Sixteenth, it is not to be cultivated.

Seventeenth, it is to be well understood.⁴⁶⁹

Eighteenth, it should be realized by wisdom and is not realized by the body.

Nineteenth, it can be severed.⁴⁷⁰

Twentieth, it can be known and seen.

[Now, as for the application of these factors to] the karmic offense of “not abandoning stealing,” the karmic offense of “not abandoning sexual misconduct,” and the karmic offense of “not abandoning false speech,” these are just the same as when they were applied to the karmic offense of “killing” except that these involve:⁴⁷¹

One instance that occurs in conjunction with the mind and two instances that do not occur in conjunction with the mind;

One instance that involves form and two instances that do not involve form;

One instance that involves the performance of an action and two instances that do not involve the performance of an action;

One instance that involves objective conditions and two instances that do not involve objective conditions.

As for “not abandoning divisive speech” and “not abandoning harsh speech,” [the relevant distinctions] are just the same [as with the above-discussed actions].

In the case of “not abandoning scattered or inappropriate speech,” [the relevant distinctions are as follows]:

It may be karmically bad;
 It may be karmically neutral;
 That which arises from bad intentionality is karmically bad;
 That which arises from neutral intentionality is karmically neutral;
 It may occur in connection with the desire realm;
 It may occur in connection with the form realm.

As for that which occurs in connection with the desire realm, it is scattered or inappropriate speech arising in a desire realm body and mind that occur in connection with the desire realm;

The basis for being categorized as “connected with the form realm” is similarly determined.

The remaining factors relevant to “scattered or inappropriate speech” are similar to those set forth earlier with regard to “false speech.”

As for “covetousness,” [the relevant distinctions are as follows]:⁴⁷²

It arises in connection with the desire realm;
 It is a mental dharma influenced by the contaminants;
 It is not associated with the mind;
 It does not follow the actions of the mind;
 It occurs in conjunction with the mind;
 It is formless;
 It does not involve an action;
 It does involve an objective condition;
 It does not correspond to a karmic action;
 It does not follow and correspond to karmic action;
 It does not arise in conjunction with karmic action;
 It is not itself a karmic result from actions committed in a prior existence except when it is a karmic result of a [prior] cause;⁴⁷³
 It cannot be cultivated;
 It should be thoroughly understood;
 It should be the object of wisdom-based realization;
 It may involve realizations pertaining to the body;
 It is subject to severance;
 It is subject to being perceived and understood.

As for “ill will,” [the relevant distinctions are as follows]:

It may be associated with the mind;
 It may not be associated with the mind;
 In instances where it is associated with the mind, it is included in the obsessions;

In instances where it is not associated with the mind, it is included among the latent afflictions;⁴⁷⁴

The cases are just the same with reference to its following or not following actions of the mind.

As for instances in which it occurs in conjunction with the mind or, alternatively, does not occur in conjunction with the mind, it is when it occurs in beings possessed of ideation that it occurs in conjunction with the mind and it is when it occurs in beings not possessed of ideation that it does not occur in conjunction with the mind.

Just as it is with occurrences associated with the mind, with occurrences following actions of the mind, with occurrences arising in conjunction with the mind, so too it is with occurrences associated with karmic actions, with occurrences following karmic action, and with occurrences in conjunction with the arising of karmic action.

And just as it is with occurrences unassociated with the mind, with occurrences not following actions of the mind, and with occurrences not arising in conjunction with the mind, so too it is with occurrences unassociated with karmic actions, with occurrences not following karmic action, and with occurrences not in conjunction with the arising of karmic action.

The remaining distinctions that could be made here [with regard to “ill will”] may be deduced from the earlier discussion of “covetousness.”

[The distinctions that could be made regarding] “wrong views” are just the same as those already described above with regard to “ill will.”

As for “abandonment of taking others’ lives” among the ten courses of good karmic action, [the relevant distinctions are as follows]:

It is good in nature.

It may occur in connection with the desire-realm planes of existence.

It may be unconnected to the three realms of existence.⁴⁷⁵

In instances connected to the desire realm, one abides in a desire-realm body and abandons taking other beings’ lives. This is what is meant by being “connected to the desire realm.”

In instances “unconnected to the three realms of existence,” this corresponds to actions included in the eightfold path of the Āryas engaged in by those at and beyond the stages of training who practice “right action” by abandoning the killing of beings.

It may involve the contaminants.

It may not involve the contaminants.

When it is “connected to the desire realm,” it involves the contaminants. When it is “unconnected to the three realms,” it is free of the contaminants.

- It is not a mental dharma.
- It is not a dharma associated with the mind.
- It is not [a dharma that] follows the mind.
- It may arise in conjunction with the mind.
- It may not arise in conjunction with the mind.

What all is implied by arising in conjunction with the mind? This is a circumstance like that of someone who is walking along, sees a bug, and thinks, “Through physical actions that abandon killing, I shall refrain from injuring it.” This is what is meant by a good action of abandoning killing arising in conjunction with the mind.

How is it that the good action of abandoning killing other beings does not occur in conjunction with the mind? Take an instance where there is a person whose body does not move, whose mouth does not speak, and who only thinks, “From this very day forward, I shall no longer kill beings.” This is a case in which [the action itself] does not occur in concert with the mind.

Then again, we may have a person who, from early on, has abandoned the killing of beings. Whether sleeping or awake, when his mind takes various other circumstances as objective conditions, in thought after thought, as he refrains from killing beings, his merit always increases and at the same time, this does not take place in conjunction with the mind.

This may or may not involve form. One instance involves form and two other instances do not involve form. One instance involves the performance of an action and two other instances do not involve the performance of an action. One instance involves objective conditions and two other instances do not involve objective conditions.

- It may constitute an action.
- It may not occur in conjunction with an action.
- It does not follow an action.

In instances where it may occur in conjunction with an action or may not occur in conjunction with an action, the determining factor is just the same [as in the case explained above] involving the issue of whether the action occurs in conjunction with the mind or does not occur in conjunction with the mind. The only difference is with regard to the presence of mind versus the presence of volition.

It is not itself a karmic result from actions committed in a prior [existence] except when it is a karmic result of a prior cause.

It can be cultivated.

It can be thoroughly understood.

It can be the object of physical realization or wisdom-based realization.

It may be subject to severance or may not be subject to severance.

If it is associated with the contaminants, then it may be subject to severance. If it is unassociated with the contaminants, then it is not subject to severance. So too with respect to its amenability to being known and seen.

[The relevant distinctions applicable to] “abandonment of stealing,” “abandonment of sexual misconduct,” “abandonment of false speech,” “abandonment of divisive speech,” and “abandonment of harsh speech” are all similar.

As for [the good karmic action of] “abandonment of scattered or inappropriate speech,” [the relevant distinctions are as follows]:

It may be connected to the desire realm.

It may be connected to the form realm.

It may not be connected to any of the three realms.

When connected with the form realm, it is with a desire-realm body and mind that one abandons scattered and inappropriate speech. So too, when connected with the form realm, [it is with a form-realm body and mind that one abandons scattered and inappropriate speech]. When not connected with any of the three realms, [the distinguishing factors] are as explained above in the discussion of the good karmic action of abstaining from killing.

It may be associated with the contaminants.

It may be unassociated with the contaminants.

When associated with the contaminants, it is connected [with the three realms]. When unassociated with the contaminants, it is not connected [with any of the three realms]. The other applicable distinctions are as explained in the above discussion of “abandoning false speech.”

As for [the good karmic action of] “abandonment of covetousness,” [the relevant distinctions are as follows]:

It is good in nature.

It may be connected with the desire realm.

It may not be connected to any of the three realms.

When connected to the desire realm, this may be a desire-realm common person refraining from covetousness or else this may be someone

who is a worthy or an *ārya* practicing the good karmic action of abstaining from covetousness. This is what is meant by being “connected with the desire realm.”

When not connected to any of the three realms, this is an instance of refraining from covetousness that is a good karmic action unassociated with the contaminants done by either a worthy or an *ārya*.

This may be associated with the contaminants.

It may be unassociated with the contaminants.

When it is connected with the desire realm, it is associated with the contaminants. When not connected [to any of the three realms], it is unassociated with the contaminants.

This is a mental dharma.

It is associated with the mind.

It may follow actions of the mind.

It may arise in conjunction with the mind.

It is formless.

It does not involve performance of an action.

It has objective conditions.

It is not a karmic action.

It is associated with karmic actions.

It may follow karmic actions.

It may arise in conjunction with karmic actions.

It is not itself a karmic result from actions committed in a prior [existence] except when it is a karmic result of a prior cause.

It can be cultivated.

It can be thoroughly known.

It is amenable to physical realization.

It is amenable to wisdom-based realization.

It may be subject to severance.

It may not be subject to severance.

When associated with the contaminants, it is subject to severance. When unassociated with the contaminants, it is not subject to severance. So too with the distinctions regarding amenability to being directly known and seen.

As for [the good karmic action of] “abandoning ill will,” [the relevant distinctions are as follows]:

It is good in nature.

It may be connected with the desire realm.

It may be connected with the form realm.

It may be connected to the formless realm.

It may be that it is not connected with any of the three realms.

When connected with the desire-realm, it is in a desire-realm existence with roots of goodness arising [from previous practice] of restraint from ill will. When connected with existence in either of the other two realms, the bases are just the same.

As for when it is “not connected to any of the three realms,” all other instances [aside from the above] are “not connected [to any of the three realms].”

This may be associated with the contaminants or it may be unassociated with the contaminants.

When connected to any of the three realms, it is associated with the contaminants. All other instances are unassociated with the contaminants.

It is a mental dharma.

It may be associated with the mind.

It may be unassociated with the mind.

When opposing obsession, roots of goodness arising from refraining from ill will are associated with the mind. When opposing latent tendencies, roots of goodness arising from refraining from ill will are unassociated with the mind. The distinctions are the same with respect to following actions of the mind and arising in conjunction with the mind.

It is formless.

It does not involve performance of an action.

It may have objective conditions.

It may not have objective conditions.

When it is associated with the mind it has objective conditions. When it is unassociated with the mind it does not have objective conditions.

It is not a karmic action.

It may be associated with a karmic action.

Or it may not be associated with a karmic action.

It may follow the enactment of a karmic action.

Or it may not follow the enactment of a karmic action.

It may arise in conjunction with a karmic action.

Or it may not arise in conjunction with a karmic action.

[The distinctions applicable to this arising or not arising in conjunction with a karmic action] are the same as those that applied above when discussing mind.

It is not a karmic result from actions [committed in a prior existence] except when it is a karmic result of a prior cause.

It can be the object of physical realization or wisdom-based realization.

It may be subject to severance or may not be subject to severance.

When associated with the contaminants it is subject to severance. When unassociated with the contaminants, it is not subject to severance. So too with regard to its amenability to being known and seen.

As for [the good karmic action of] "right view," [the relevant distinctions are as follows]:

It is good in nature.

It may be connected with the desire realm.

It may be connected with the form realm.

It may be connected with the formless realm.

It may not be connected with any of the three realms.

When connected to the desire realm, it involves thoughts corresponding to right views produced in the desire realm by common persons, worthies, or *āryas*. When connected to the form realm and when connected to the formless realm, the circumstances are just the same.

When not connected to any of the three realms, these are right views unassociated with the contaminants as held by worthies or *āryas*.

It may be associated with the contaminants.

It may be unassociated with the contaminants.

When connected to any of the three realms, it is associated with the contaminants. When not connected to any of the three realms, it is unassociated with the contaminants.

It is a mental dharma.

It is a dharma associated with the mind.

It follows actions of the mind.

It arises in conjunction with the mind.

It is formless.

It does not involve the performance of an action.

It may have objective conditions.

It is not a karmic action.

It may be associated with a karmic action.

It may follow the enactment of a karmic action.

It may arise in conjunction with a karmic action.

It is not a karmic result from actions [committed in a prior existence] except when it is a karmic result of a prior cause.

It can be the object of physical realization or wisdom-based realization.

It may be subject to severance or may not be subject to severance.

When associated with contaminants, it is subject to severance. When unassociated with the contaminants, it is not subject to severance.

The differentiations here are the same with respect to amenability to knowing and seeing.

This [above discussion illustrates] what is meant by the application of twenty distinguishing factors such as “goodness,” and so forth [to the understanding of the ten courses of good karmic action and the ten courses of bad karmic action.]

2. THE TWELVEFOLD DISCUSSION OF ORIGINS AND SUCH

As for the twelve-fold discussion of “origins” and so forth, it is as follows:⁴⁷⁶

- 1) From what did it originate?
- 2) What does it produce?
- 3) From what cause did it originate?
- 4) For whom is it a cause?
- 5) What are the associated conditions?
- 6) For what is it a condition?
- 7) What does it take as an objective condition?
- 8) What is the benefit?⁴⁷⁷
- 9) What factors are dominant?
- 10) For whom is this dominant?
- 11) What losses does this incur?
- 12) What karmic effects does this entail?

In the case of the karmic offense of “killing,” [these discussions are as follows]:

As for “From what did it originate?,” it arises from the three types of bad karmic roots and additionally arises from wrong thought. Further, it arises from whichever thought the act of taking a being’s life next followed upon. It originated from this thought.

As for “What does it produce?,” these are all of the dharmas proximate to the karmic offense of killing whether those dharmas have already arisen, are now arising, or eventually will arise. So too with these causes and conditions.

As for “What does it take as an objective condition?,” it takes a living being as its objective condition. Additionally, whichever thought precipitated the taking of that being’s life—it also takes this thought as a condition.

As for "For what is it a condition?," all of the peripheral dharmas caused by the karmic offense of killing, whether already arisen, now arising, or eventually arising—these are all conditions associated with the karmic offense of killing.

As for "What losses does this incur?," this includes having a bad reputation in the present lifetime, being the object of others' distrust, and so forth.

As for "What karmic effects does this entail?," these include falling into the hell realm, the animal realm, the hungry-ghost realm, the *asura* realm, and other wretched destinies wherein one undergoes suffering and anguish.

As for "What factors are dominant?" and "For whom is this dominant?," these are the same as with above statement on the bases of origination.

These distinctions are the same in their application to stealing, sexual misconduct, false speech, divisive speech, harsh speech, scattered or inappropriate speech, covetousness, ill will, and wrong views. There are only differences with regard to what in each case serves as an objective condition.

For instance, in the case of stealing, it is the object that one appropriates to one's own use that serves as the objective condition. Sexual misconduct takes a being as the objective condition.

False speech, divisive speech, harsh speech, and scattered or inappropriate speech all take words as their objective condition.

Covetousness takes as its objective condition the particular object that one would appropriate to one's own use.

Ill will takes a being as the objective condition.

Wrong views take words as their objective condition.

All of the remaining distinctions are deducible from the differentiations described above.

"Refraining from killing beings" arises from the three types of good karmic roots as well as from right mindfulness. It also arises from the thought arising just prior to the act of refraining from killing a being.

As for "What does it produce?," these are all of the dharmas arising from this dharma, whether they have already arisen, are now arising, or eventually will arise. So too with the associated causes and conditions.

As for "What does it take as an objective condition?," it takes a living being as its objective condition.

As for "For what is it a condition?," all of the peripheral dharmas caused by the act of not killing whether already arisen, now arising,

or eventually arising—these are all conditions associated with the act of not killing.

As for “dominant factors,” the roots of goodness are dominant and right mindfulness is also dominant. Also whichever thought was followed by the restraint from killing a particular being—that thought was also dominant.

As for “For whom is this dominant?” this is determined by all of the dharmas peripheral to the act of not taking a being’s life, whether they have already arisen, are now arising, or will eventually arise.

As for “What is the benefit?” being opposed to the karmic offense of killing—this is the benefit.

As for “What karmic effects does this entail?” these are whichever karmic effects are opposite to those entailed by killing beings.

These distinctions are the same in their application to not stealing, to not committing sexual misconduct, to not committing false speech, to not engaging in divisive speech, to not engaging in harsh speech, to not engaging in scattered or inappropriate speech, to non-covetousness, to refraining from ill will, and to right views. There are only differences with regard to what in each case serves as an objective condition.

For instance, in the case of not stealing, it is the object that one might otherwise appropriate to one’s own use that serves as the objective condition.

Refraining from sexual misconduct takes a being [otherwise susceptible to one’s sexual misconduct] as the objective condition.

Refraining from false speech, divisive speech, harsh speech, and scattered or inappropriate speech all take words as their objective condition.

Non-covetousness takes as its objective condition the particular object that one might otherwise desire to have available to one’s own use.

Refraining from ill will takes a being as the objective condition.

Right views may take words as the objective condition or may take meaning as the objective conditions. Those associated with the contaminants take words as objective conditions. Those unassociated with the contaminants take meanings as the objective condition.

It is in this manner that this bodhisattva should distinguish and know with respect to the practice of the ten courses of good karmic actions the [twenty] analytic discussions of “goodness” and so forth as well as the twelve analytic discussions of “origination” and so forth.

In addition, he should know:

3. THE SEVEN TYPES OF BAD ACTIONS, THEIR ORIGINS, AND FOUR DISTINCTIONS

The bases for the seven types of bad karmic actions, how they may arise from greed, hatred, or delusion, and also the application of four types of distinctions of which two each are linked to karmic actions and to beings.

This bodhisattva knows that seven courses of bad karmic action may arise from greed, hatred, or delusion, and thus applies these distinctions to circumstances in the world. He is also aware of four categorical distinctions applicable to these seven types of bad karmic deeds.

This karmic offense of killing may arise from greed, hatred, or from delusion. [Consider the case in which killing] arises from greed. Suppose for example that a person sees some being, produces a thought of greed, and then, due to these causes and conditions, because he wishes to enjoy the use of that being's visual forms, sounds, fragrances, tastes, or touchables, or because he wants its tusks, horns, fur, hide, sinews, flesh, bones, marrow, and such—this person then, due to having this covetous thought, takes this being's life. This is a case of the karmic offense of killing arising from greed.

In a case where someone kills a being due to hating and being displeased [with that being], this is an instance of killing arising from hatred.

In a case where someone beset by wrong views fails to realize the effects of good and bad karmic actions as they unfold in subsequent lives and then, because of that, kills some being, this is an instance of the karmic offense of killing arising from delusion. In some cases, the killer may kill due to regarding the act as productive of merit. Or he may kill out of a desire to liberate [the being he is killing] from suffering. These cases are reflective of customs in the country of Parthia in the west and other such places.

There are yet other instances of killing motivated by the idea that it may serve as a cause and condition for the acquisition of merit. Thus one may wish to achieve rebirth in the heavens through the karma of killing. This latter situation is exemplified by a practice in East India of sacrificing beings in the temple of their deva, wishing through such deeds to be reborn in the heavens. These are all cases of killing occurring because of delusion.

There are yet other individuals who, because of greed, take the possessions of others, thinking: "This is because I deserve to freely acquire whichever fine visual forms, sounds, fragrances, flavors, or touchables appeal to me." This is just a case of stealing arising from greed.

There are yet other people who, due to hatred and dislike of others steal the wealth and possessions of others, wishing thereby to cause them anguish. These are cases of stealing arising from hatred.

Then again, there are people who, holding wrong views and failing to realize the karmic retribution involved, steal the possessions of others. This is stealing arising from delusion. This is exemplified by brahmins who state, "All the wealth and treasures of the world are rightfully mine. It is only because of the relative weakness of my power that all of these inferior classes of people have been able, using methods contrary to our dharma, to take these things for their own use. If I now seize them, this is just a case of someone retrieving his own possessions. Hence there is no karmic transgression in doing this." When someone uses such rationalizations to steal the belongings of others, this too is just a matter of stealing arising from delusion.

When someone commits sexual misconduct because of desire and attachment to sexual gratification, this is an instance of sexual misconduct arising from greed.

If someone motivated by hatred and aversion toward someone else thinks, "Because this fellow violated my mother, wife, sister, or daughter, I shall get back at him by sexually defiling his mother, wife, sisters, and daughters," this is an instance of sexual misconduct arising from hatred.

In someone holding wrong views and not realizing the karmic retributions involved violates [some woman], this is an instance [of sexual misconduct] arising from delusion. This is exemplified by a man who claims, "There is really no such thing as sexual misconduct between humans. Why? All women were born for the enjoyment of men and thus are just like any other thing we exploit for our own use. Thus, if one has a need for it and therefore becomes involved in this kind of affair, then there is no karmic offense of sexual misconduct involved here." When someone relying on this sort of rationalization goes ahead and indulges his sexual desire in this way, that is a case of sexual misconduct arising from delusion.

Just as it is with the karmic offense of stealing, so too it is with false speech. When someone tells lies because of greed for wealth, then this is referred to as false speech arising from greed. When someone deceives someone else in order to cause them anguish, this is referred to as false speech arising from hatred. When someone with wrong views who does not understand the karmic retributions involved tells a lie, this is referred to as false speech arising from delusion.

Divisive speech, harsh speech, and scattered or inappropriate speech are the same [as the above discussion of "false speech"] in that

these three courses of bad karmic action also have these same foundational bases. From this, one can distinguish the arising of the karmic effects resulting from all seven physical and verbal karmic deeds.

Question: Is it or is it not the case that all instances of not abandoning killing beings constitute the karmic offense of killing? Are all instances of the karmic offense of killing necessarily instances of not abandoning killing?

Response: There are instances of not abandoning killing that constitute instances of the karmic transgression of killing beings and there are also instances of not abandoning killing that do not qualify as instances of the karmic transgression of killing beings.

This being the case, which of these instances of not abandoning killing constitute instances of the karmic transgression of killing? Taking for example a case where there is a being, one knows it is a being, one deliberately kills it, and in taking its life, one produces the associated physical karmic action—this is an instance of not abandoning killing also constituting an instance of the karmic offense of killing.

What would be an example of failure to abandon killing not qualifying as an instance of the karmic offense of killing? Take for instance a case where this person did in fact previously engage in the causes and conditions of killing but the being somehow did not die. Further, take the case in which someone makes no bodily movement and utters no words but merely thinks, “From this day on, I shall kill beings.” Both of these instances qualify as cases of failure to abandon killing that do not actually entail the karmic offense of killing. This involves two categorical distinctions through which one makes a total of four distinctions, two for each of these two subcategories of the so-called “good” and “bad.”

4. MORE SUBSIDIARY DISTINCTIONS RELATED TO THE GOOD AND BAD ACTIONS

This is not just a matter of “good” versus “bad,”
but also of two types of karma, “physical” versus “mental.”
One should also know
that there are still other distinctions.

There are other subsidiary physical actions aside from the actual killing of beings, stealing, or sexual misconduct, actions that, in the case of killing, include such abuses as beating, tying up, imprisoning, whipping, striking with staves, dragging [through the streets], and so forth. Because they fall short of actually inflicting death, these sorts of bad physical karmic actions are not subsumed under [the karmic offense of] taking life, and so forth [with the subsidiary physical actions associated with stealing and sexual misconduct].

[So too], among the actions that are good, actions such as welcoming eminences on arrival, escorting them off when they leave, pressing the palms together, bowing down in reverence, greeting with half bows, assisting with bathing, massage, and proffering of gifts, none of these good physical karmic actions are subsumed under non-killing, and so forth [with the wholesome subsidiary physical actions associated with stealing and sexual misconduct].

[So too], among the karmic actions of the mind, [the same principle applies] to all of the rest of the unwholesome [mental] dharmas aside from covetousness, ill will, and wrong views, dharmas such as not guarding or focusing the mind, the fetters, and so forth.

[So too], among the karmic actions of the mind, [the same principle applies] to all of the rest of the good [mental] dharmas aside from non-covetousness, refraining from ill will, and right views, dharmas such as guarding and focusing the mind, faith, observance of moral precepts, learning, meditative concentration, equanimity, wisdom, and so forth.

5. DISTINGUISHING “KARMIC DEEDS” VERSUS “COURSES OF KARMIC ACTION”

Seven of the karmic deeds are also courses of karmic action and three of the courses of karmic action are not karmic deeds.

These seven “karmic deeds” that consist of killing, stealing, sexual misconduct, false speech, divisive speech, harsh speech, and scattered or inappropriate speech are themselves both “karmic deeds” and “courses of karmic action.” Covetousness, ill will, and wrong views are “courses of karmic action,” but are not “karmic deeds” as such, for these three phenomena correspond to [intentional] thought, this type of [merely mental] activity.

Question: How is it that the previous seven endeavors qualify both as “karmic deeds” and “courses of karmic action”?

Response: It is due to progressively increasing habitual practice of these endeavors that one therefore arrives in the hell realm, the animal realm, and the realm of the hungry ghosts. It is because of this that they are referred to as “courses of karmic action.” Because these seven are also endeavors that one can perform, they are also referred to as “karmic deeds.”

As for the three which are “courses of karmic action” but not “karmic deeds” as such, this is because they serve as the foundation for those which do constitute bad karmic deeds. Consequently these three are referred to only as “courses of karmic action” but not as “karmic deeds.”

The same principle applies in the sphere of the “good” [courses of karmic action]. Abandonment of killing, of stealing, of sexual misconduct, of false speech, of divisive speech, of harsh speech, and of scattered or inappropriate speech are all both “karmic deeds” and “courses of karmic action.” The other three consisting of non-covetousness, refraining from ill will, and right view are all “courses of karmic action,” but are not “karmic deeds” as such, for these three phenomena correspond to [volitional] thought, this type of [merely mental] activity.⁴⁷⁸

Question: How is it that, [within the ten courses of good karmic action] the first seven are both “karmic deeds” and “courses of karmic action”?

Response: They are referred to as “courses” [of karmic action] because it is due to always practicing these endeavors that one becomes able to arrive in good circumstances within the realms of humans and devas. It is because these seven are karmic deeds amenable to being performed that they are also referred to as “karmic deeds.”

Question: How is it that, [within the ten courses of good karmic action] the remaining three are only “courses of karmic action,” but are not “karmic deeds”?

Response: These three serve as the foundation for those that do qualify as good karmic actions. It is because the practice of all good karmic deeds comes forth from within them that they are referred to as “courses of karmic action,” while not being referred to as “karmic deeds” as such.

Furthermore:

6. FOUR DISTINCTIONS: “KARMIC DEEDS” AND “COURSES OF KARMIC ACTION”

[Observances of] moral precept dharmas are karmic deeds.
karmic deeds may or may not be [observances of] moral precepts.
Qualification as a “karmic deeds” or as a “course of karmic action”
is a matter involving the application of four types of distinctions.

Physical and verbal karmic deeds may be [observances of] moral precepts. Mental actions may be karma, but they are not themselves [observances of] moral precepts.

As for the four types of categorical distinctions made with respect to qualification as either “karmic actions” or “courses of karmic action,” they are as follows:

There are “karmic deeds” that are not “courses of karmic action.”
There are “courses of karmic action” that are not “karmic deeds.”
There are “karmic deeds” that are also “courses of karmic action.”

There are [actions] that are neither “karmic deeds” nor “courses of karmic action.”

As for those “karmic deeds” that are not “courses of karmic action,” these are three types of bad physical deeds not subsumable within the sphere of “courses of karmic action,” namely the wielding of fists to strike, whips to lash, cudgels to beat, and so forth. So too in the case of the three corresponding types of good physical deeds not subsumable in one of the categories of “courses of karmic action,” namely: welcoming eminences on arrival, bowing down in reverence, and so forth. These two subcategories of good and bad deeds are not subsumable within the “courses of karmic action.”

There are those who state that [these two subcategories of good and bad deeds] *are* also “courses of karmic action.” Why? [They claim that], because these two types of deeds may have times when they lead one to [rebirth in] good or bad stations of rebirth, they are therefore “courses of karmic action.” However, because this is not a fixed matter, we do not claim here that they constitute “courses of karmic action.”

As for those that are “courses of karmic action” but which are not “karmic deeds,” because the final three bad karmic deeds [of the ten courses of bad karmic action] and the final three good karmic deeds [of the ten courses of good karmic action] are, by nature, associated with the presence [or absence of] afflictions, they are not “karmic deeds” as such. However, because they are able to instigate the production of karmic deeds, they do therefore constitute “courses of karmic action.”

[Among these], the three that are good, because they are, by nature, roots of goodness, they are not “karmic deeds” as such. But, because they are able to instigate the production of good karmic deeds, they do therefore constitute “courses of karmic action.”

As for those that are both “karmic deeds” and “courses of karmic action,” they are the seven deeds consisting of killing or not killing and the others [as well as their opposites].

As for those that are neither “karmic deeds” nor “courses of karmic action,” they are all of the dharmas [not otherwise subsumed in the first three of these four categories].

In addition:

7. THREE KINDS OF PURITY USED TO MOVE BEYOND THE FIRST GROUND

If a bodhisattva still at the border with the first ground
 uses three kinds of purity
 to abide securely in the ten courses of good karmic action,
 he will then be able to bring forth decisive resolve.

Once this bodhisattva comes to dwell on the second ground, he then distinguishes with utter clarity these ten good and bad courses of karmic action. Having come to know these matters, he applies three kinds of purity to his abiding in the ten courses of good karmic action, namely:

He does not personally kill any being;
 He does not instruct others to kill any being;
 And he does not delight in the karmic offense of killing.

In this same way, he also [applies these three kinds of purity to the rest of the courses of good karmic action] up to and including “right view.”

Question: A bodhisattva dwelling on the first ground already abides in the ten courses of good karmic action. Why is this matter being discussed yet again here [in the context of the second ground]?

Response: It is not that he does not abide in the ten courses of good karmic action when dwelling on the first ground. However, due to the application of these three kinds of purity, such practice becomes ever more superior and ever more greatly increased here [on the second ground]. Previously, when still abiding on the first ground, although he might indeed become a monarch reigning over all of Jambudvīpa, he was still unable at that point to implement these three kinds of purity. It is for this reason that we discuss the three kinds of purity here. The bodhisattva who abides here on the second ground knows these distinctions as they apply to all sorts of karmic actions and thus brings forth decisive resolve.

8. THE 10 COURSES OF GOOD AND BAD KARMA AS ARBITERS OF ONE'S DESTINY

All the world's wretched destinies
 are produced from the ten bad deeds.
 All the world's good destinies
 are produced because of the ten good deeds.

“All the world's wretched destinies” refers to:

The three types of hell-realm destinies, namely the hot hells, cold hells, and hells of blackness;

The three types of animal-realm destinies, namely the animals that live in the water, the animals that live on land, and the animals that fly through the air;

And the different types of ghost-realm destinies, namely the hungry ghosts, the ghosts who eat impure things, and those with flaming mouths, *asuras*, *yakṣas*, and so forth.

All of these arise from engaging in the ten courses of bad karmic action.

It is because of the presence of relatively superior, middling, or inferior causes and conditions that all of the world's good destinies are produced. Whether it be the deva realm or the human realm, they all arise from the practice of the ten courses of good karmic action. They are all included within the three realms of existence wherein there are the twenty-eight deva realms and, in the case of the human realm, these are all those peoples that inhabit the four continents.

9. RESOLVING TO ABIDE IN THE 10 GOOD ACTIONS & TEACH THIS TO OTHERS

Having come to definitely know such matters, [this bodhisattva] reflects, "I wish that I myself will be born within these good stations of rebirth and wish also that I may be able to influence other beings to be reborn in these good stations of rebirth."

Therefore I should abide
within the ten courses of good karmic action
while also influencing other beings
to immediately abide within these courses of good karmic action.

Whether one is reborn in the good stations of rebirth or is instead born into bad stations of rebirth, this is all due to the ten courses of good karmic action or ten courses of bad karmic action. [Hence one reflects]:

I realize that this world exists on the basis of all of the karmic causes and conditions and that there is no fixed subjective agent [involved in its creation].⁴⁷⁹ Therefore, I should first ensure that I myself have become established in the practice of the ten courses of good karmic action and then, afterward, I should influence other beings to also abide in the practice of the ten courses of good karmic action.

Question: Why is it that one must first see that he himself abides within the ten courses of good karmic action and only later influences others to abide therein as well?

Response:

It is not easy for one who engages in bad deeds
to influence others toward goodness,
for, if one does not practice goodness oneself,
others will not believe and accept [one's teaching].

If someone who is a bad person does not practice goodness himself even as he wishes to influence others to practice goodness, this will be a very difficult to accomplish. Why? If this person does not practice goodness himself, other people will not believe in or accept his instruction. This is as described in a verse:

If one is not good oneself,
one will be unable to influence others toward goodness.

If one has not reached quiescence oneself,
one will be unable to influence others to reach quiescence.

It is for this reason that you should
first practice goodness and quiescence yourself
and then afterward instruct other people
to influence them to practice goodness and reach quiescence.

It is in this way that this bodhisattva should practice good dharmas.

10. ONE SHOULD LEARN THE REBIRTH RESULTS OF THE 10 GOOD & BAD ACTIONS

From the Avīci Hells
on up to the summit of existence,
one distinguishes the effects of ten courses of karmic action
as well as the places in which one undergoes their retribution.

In just this manner, one should rightly realize that, from down below
in the Avīci Hells all the way on up to the station of neither perception
nor non-perception, all of these are but places wherein one undergoes
the resulting retribution from all of the many different sorts of good
and bad karmic deeds. Among these [stations of rebirth]:

It is by habitually practicing the worst of the ten courses of bad kar-
mic action that one is reborn in the Avīci Hells;

When the extent of evil karma is somewhat less, one is reborn instead
in the Great Broiling Hell;

When somewhat less than that, one is reborn in the Lesser Broiling
Hell;

When somewhat less again, one is reborn in the Great Screaming
Hell;

When even less, one is reborn in the Lesser Screaming Hell;

When yet less than that, one is reborn in the Saṃgata Hell;

When less again, rebirth is in the Great Road Hell;

A yet lesser level brings birth in the Black Line Hell;

When lesser yet, one is reborn in the Living Hell;

Yet another increment less brings rebirth in the Sword Forest Hell
or other lesser subsidiary hells for which one should also make
ever finer distinctions [in these subcategories of hell-realm retri-
butions].

It is through practicing an intermediate level of the ten courses of bad
karmic action that one is reborn into the animal realm. One should
also make ever finer distinctions regarding [the levels of karmic retri-
bution as manifested within] the animal realm.

It is through practicing a relatively lesser level of the ten courses
of bad karmic action that one is reborn into the realm of the hungry
ghosts.

This represents only a general discussion of these matters. We should present a more expansive range of differentiating distinctions among these. There are the *asuras* and *yakṣas* born into the ghost-realms, *nāga* kings reborn into the animal-realm wherein the bliss they enjoy may be identical to that experienced by the devas. All of these beings take these rebirths because of bad karma and then, having taken such rebirths, they may also enjoy the karmic fruits of their past good karmic actions.

In the case of those who have practiced only the very lowest level of the ten courses of good karmic action, they take rebirth in Jambudvīpa within poverty-stricken low-caste clans, namely among the *caṇḍālas*, or in remote regions, or as artisans, or as people of low social stature.

With a somewhat more superior level [of practice of the ten courses of good karmic action], one may be reborn into merchant-class families. When somewhat more superior, one is reborn into brahmin clans. When more superior yet, one is reborn into a *kṣatriyan* clan. When more superior than that, one is reborn into a family of high governmental officials. When more superior yet, rebirth occurs into royal families.

When one's practice of the ten courses of good karmic action has been at a yet more superior level, one is reborn on the continent of Avara-godānīya. When more superior yet, rebirth is on the continent of Pūrva-vidēha. and when superior to that, rebirth is on the continent of Uttara-kuru.

When more superior yet, rebirth is into the abodes of the Four Heavenly Kings. At increasing levels of superiority to that, rebirth is into the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven, the Yāma Heaven, the Tuṣita Heaven, and the Nirmāṇarati Heaven. At the most superior level of practice of the ten courses of good karmic action, one is reborn in the Paranirmita Vaśavartin Heaven.

Here we should make all kinds of distinctions with regard to the minor and major differences. For instance, among humans, there are minor kings, major kings, the kings ruling over all of Jambudvīpa, and wheel-turning kings. The abode of the Four Heavenly Kings has Four Heavenly Kings. In the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven, there is Śakra, ruler of the devas. In the Yāma Heaven, there is the Suyāma Deva King. In the Tuṣita Heaven, there is the Saṃtuṣita Heaven King. In the Nirmāṇarati Heaven, there is the Skillful Transformations Heaven King. In the Paranirmita Vaśavartin Heaven, there is the Paranirmita Vaśavartin Heaven King. Beyond this, one must utilize volition associated with cultivation of the *dhyāna* absorptions to gain rebirth into the higher [celestial] realms.

Question: If in fact it is essential to utilize volition associated with the *dhyāna* absorptions, why was it just stated that, in every case, it is because of the ten courses of good karmic action that one gains every place of rebirth all the way up to the station of neither perception nor non-perception?

Response: Although one must cultivate the *dhyāna* absorptions to gain rebirth in the stations of either the form or formless realm, one must still first become solidly established in the practice of the ten courses of good karmic action. Only after this can one succeed in the cultivation of the *dhyāna* absorptions. It is for this reason that [acquisition of] those stations relies upon the great benefit provided by the ten courses of good karmic action. It is for this reason as well that it was stated here that, in every case, it is because of the ten courses of good karmic action that one attains every station of rebirth all the way up to the station of neither perception nor non-perception.

How is this so? After having first cultivated purity in the ten courses of good karmic action, by separating from sensual desire and cultivating the first *dhyāna* with relatively inferior volition, one may succeed in taking rebirth in the Brahma-kāyika Heaven. By cultivating the first *dhyāna* with relatively middling volition, one may take rebirth in the Brahma-purohita Heaven. And by cultivating the first *dhyāna* with relatively superior volition, one may succeed in taking rebirth in the Mahābrahma Heaven.

By cultivating the second *dhyāna* with relatively inferior volition, one may take rebirth in the Lesser Light Heaven. By cultivating the second *dhyāna* with relatively middling volition, one may succeed in taking rebirth in the Limitless Light Heaven. And by cultivating the second *dhyāna* with relatively superior volition, one may succeed in taking rebirth in the Sublime Light Heaven.

By cultivating the third *dhyāna* with relatively inferior volition, one may succeed in taking rebirth in the Lesser Purity Heaven. By cultivating the third *dhyāna* with relatively middling volition, one may succeed in taking rebirth in the Limitless Light Heaven. And by cultivating the third *dhyāna* with relatively superior volition, one may succeed in taking rebirth in the Universal Purity Heaven.

By cultivating the fourth *dhyāna* with relatively inferior volition, one may take rebirth in the Anabhraka Heaven. By cultivating the fourth *dhyāna* with relatively middling volition, one may take rebirth in the Puṇya-prasava Heaven. And by cultivating the fourth *dhyāna* with relatively superior volition, one may take rebirth in the Bṛhatphala Heaven.

By cultivating the non-perception absorption with relatively middling volition, one may succeed in taking rebirth in the Non-perception Heaven.

By repeated cultivation of contaminant-free concentration in the fourth *dhyāna* with relatively inferior volition, one may take rebirth in the “Non-Extensive”⁴⁸⁰ or Avṛha Heaven. By repeated cultivation of contaminant-free concentration in the fourth *dhyāna* with [more] superior volition, one may take rebirth in the “Non-Hot” or Atapās Heaven. By repeated cultivation of contaminant-free concentration in the fourth *dhyāna* with [yet more] superior volition, one may take rebirth in the “Delightful Vision” or Sudarśana Heaven. By repeated cultivation of contaminant-free concentration in the fourth *dhyāna* with [even more] superior volition, one may take rebirth in the “Sublime Vision” or Sudṛśa Heaven. By repeated cultivation of contaminant-free concentration in the fourth *dhyāna* with the most superior volition, one may take rebirth in the Akaniṣṭha Heaven.

By cultivating the concentration associated with the station of infinite space with the corresponding volition, one may take rebirth in the Infinite Space Heaven. By cultivating the concentration associated with the station of infinite consciousness with the corresponding volition, one may take rebirth in the Infinite Consciousness Heaven. By cultivating the concentration associated with the station of nothing whatsoever with the corresponding volition, one may take rebirth in the Station of Nothing Whatsoever Heaven. By cultivating the concentration associated with the station of neither perception nor non-perception with the corresponding volition, one may take rebirth in the Neither Perception Nor Non-Perception Heaven.

The above discussion shows the stations to which beings go and from which they come as they undergo birth and death in the world, [as determined by their differing levels of cultivation of either the ten courses of bad karmic action or the ten courses of good karmic action].