

# Anger

*"The Hot Coal"*



A Survey of the Buddha's teaching on the  
Dangers of Anger and Its Release

Created by Sutta and the City, 2021

*Note: All translations by Bhante Sujāto unless otherwise indicated.*

*Numbered Discourses 3 (Aṅguttara Nikāya 3)*

*13. Kusināra*

### **132. Etchings**

“Mendicants, these three people are found in the world. What three? A person like a line drawn in stone, a person like a line drawn in sand, and a person like a line drawn in water.

And who is the person like a line drawn in stone? It’s a person who is often angry, and their anger lingers for a long time. It’s like a line drawn in stone, which isn’t quickly worn away by wind and water, but lasts for a long time. In the same way, this person is often angry, and their anger lingers for a long time. This is called a person like a line drawn in stone.

And who is the person like a line drawn in sand? It’s a person who is often angry, but their anger doesn’t linger long. It’s like a line drawn in sand, which is quickly worn away by wind and water, and doesn’t last long. In the same way, this person is often angry, but their anger doesn’t linger long. This is called a person like a line drawn in sand.

And who is the person like a line drawn in water? It’s a person who, though spoken to by someone in a rough, harsh, and disagreeable manner, still stays in touch, interacts with, and greets them. It’s like a line drawn in water, which vanishes right away, and doesn’t last long. In the same way, this person, though spoken to by someone in a rough, harsh, and disagreeable manner, still stays in touch, interacts with, and greets them. This is called a person like a line drawn in water.

These are the three people found in the world.”

*Numbered Discourses 4 (Aṅguttara Nikāya 4)*

*11. Clouds*

### **110. Vipers**

“Mendicants, there are these four kinds of viper. What four?

1. one whose venom is fast-acting but not lethal,
2. one whose venom is lethal but not fast-acting,
3. one whose venom is both fast-acting and lethal, and
4. one whose venom is neither fast-acting nor lethal.

These are the four kinds of viper. In the same way, these four people similar to vipers are found in the world. What four?

1. one whose venom is fast-acting but not lethal,
2. one whose venom is lethal but not fast-acting,
3. one whose venom is both fast-acting and lethal, and
4. one whose venom is neither fast-acting nor lethal.

And how is a person's venom fast-acting but not lethal? It's when a person is often angry, but their anger doesn't linger long. That's how a person's venom is fast-acting but not lethal. That person is like a viper whose venom is fast-acting but not lethal.

And how is a person's venom lethal but not fast-acting? It's when a person is not often angry, but their anger lingers for a long time.

And how is a person's venom both fast-acting and lethal? It's when a person is often angry, and their anger lingers for a long time.

And how is a person's venom neither fast-acting nor lethal? It's when a person is not often angry, and their anger doesn't linger long.

These four people similar to vipers are found in the world.”

*Translated by Ven. Ānandajoti*

*Udāna 6.4*

### **The First Discourse about the Various Sectarrians**

Thus I heard: At one time the Gracious One was dwelling near Sāvathī, in Jeta's Wood, at Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Then at that time many and various sectarians, ascetics, brāhmaṇas, and wanderers were living at Sāvathī, having various views, various likings, various tendencies, subject to dependence on various views, such as:

There were some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who were of this argument, this view: “The world is eternal—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.”

But there were some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who were of this argument, this view: “The world is not eternal—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.”

There were some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who were of this argument, this view: “The world is finite—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.”

But there were some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who were of this argument, this view: “The world is infinite—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.”

There were some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who were of this argument, this view: “That which is soul, that is also the body—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.”

But there were some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who were of this argument, this view: “The soul is one thing, the body is another thing,—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.”

There were some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who were of this argument, this view: “The individual exists after death—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.”

But there were some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who were of this argument, this view: “The individual does not exist after death—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.”

There were some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who were of this argument, this view: “The individual exists and does not exist after death—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.” But there were some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who were of this argument, this view: “The individual neither exists nor does not exist after death—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.”

They lived contending, quarrelling, disputing, attacking each other with sharp tongues, saying: “Such is Dhamma, such is not Dhamma; such is not Dhamma, such is Dhamma.”

Then many monks, having dressed in the morning time, after picking up their bowl and robe, entered Sāvathī for alms. After walking for alms in Sāvathī, while returning from the alms-round after the meal, they went to the Gracious One, and after going and worshipping the Gracious One, they sat down on one side. While sat on one side those monks said this to the Gracious One:

“Here, reverend Sir, many and various sectarians, ascetics, brāhmaṇas, and wanderers are living at Sāvathī, having various views, various likings, various tendencies, subject to dependence on various views, such as:

There are some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who are of this argument, this view: ‘The world is eternal—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.’

But there are some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who are of this argument, this view: ‘The world is not eternal—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.’

There are some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who are of this argument, this view: ‘The world is finite—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.’

But there are some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who are of this argument, this view: ‘The world is infinite—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.’

There are some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who are of this argument, this view: ‘That which is soul, that is also the body—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.’

But there are some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who are of this argument, this view: ‘The soul is one thing, the body is another thing,—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.’

There are some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who are of this argument, this view: ‘The individual exists after death—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.’

But there are some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who are of this argument, this view: ‘The individual does not exist after death—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.’

There are some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who are of this argument, this view: ‘The individual exists and does not exist after death—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.’ But there are some ascetics and brāhmaṇas who are of this argument, this view: ‘The individual neither exists nor does not exist after death—this alone is the truth, all else is foolish.’

They live contending, quarrelling, disputing, attacking each other with sharp tongues, saying: ‘Such is Dhamma, such is not Dhamma; such is not Dhamma, such is Dhamma.’

“Wanderers from other sects, monks, are blind, without vision, they do not know what is good, they do not know what is not good, they do not know what is Dhamma, they do not know what is not Dhamma. They, not knowing what is good, not knowing what is not good, not knowing what is Dhamma, not knowing what is not Dhamma, live contending, quarrelling, disputing, attacking each other with sharp tongues, saying: ‘Such is Dhamma, such is not Dhamma; such is not Dhamma, such is Dhamma.’

“Formerly, monks, in this Sāvathī there was a certain King. Then that King, monks, addressed a certain man, saying: ‘Please go, dear Sir, and as many of those congenitally blind as there are in Sāvathī assemble them in one place.’

“‘Yes, your Majesty’, said that man, monks, and after replying to the King, and after taking hold of all of those congenitally blind in Sāvathī, he went to the King, and after going he said this to the King: ‘As many of those congenitally blind as there are in Sāvathī, your Majesty, have assembled.’

“‘Then show an elephant, I say, to those congenitally blind.’

“‘Yes, your Majesty’, said that man, monks, and after replying to the King, he showed an elephant to those congenitally blind, saying: ‘Such is an elephant, blind men!’

“To some of those congenitally blind he showed the elephant’s head, saying: ‘Such is an elephant, blind men!’

“To some of those congenitally blind he showed the elephant’s ear, saying: ‘Such is an elephant, blind men!’

“To some of those congenitally blind he showed the elephant’s tusk, saying: ‘Such is an elephant, blind men!’

“To some of those congenitally blind he showed the elephant’s trunk, saying: ‘Such is an elephant, blind men!’

“To some of those congenitally blind he showed the elephant’s body, saying: ‘Such is an elephant, blind men!’

“To some of those congenitally blind he showed the elephant’s leg, saying: ‘Such is an elephant, blind men!’

“To some of those congenitally blind he showed the elephant’s thigh, saying: ‘Such is an elephant, blind men!’

“To some of those congenitally blind he showed the top of the elephant’s tail, saying: ‘Such is an elephant, blind men!’

“To some of those congenitally blind he showed the tip of the elephant’s tail, saying: ‘Such is an elephant, blind men!’

“Then, monks, that man, having shown the elephant to those congenitally blind, went to the King, and after going he said this to the King: ‘Those congenitally blind have seen the elephant, your Majesty, now is the time for whatever you are thinking, your Majesty.’

“Then that King, monks, went to the congenitally blind, and after going he said this to those congenitally blind: ‘Did you see the elephant, blind men?’

“‘Yes, your Majesty, we did see the elephant.’

“‘Speak, blind men, and say: “Such is an elephant.”’

“Those congenitally blind who had seen the elephant’s head, monks, said this: ‘Such is an elephant, your Majesty, he is like a pot.’

“Those congenitally blind who had seen the elephant’s ear, monks, said this: ‘Such is an elephant, your Majesty, he is like a winnowing fan.’

“Those congenitally blind who had seen the elephant’s tusk, monks, said this: ‘Such is an elephant, your Majesty, he is like a ploughshare.’

“Those congenitally blind who had seen the elephant’s trunk, monks, said this: ‘Such is an elephant, your Majesty, he is like a plough-pole.’

“Those congenitally blind who had seen the elephant’s body, monks, said this: ‘Such is an elephant, your Majesty, he is like a store-house’

“Those congenitally blind who had seen the elephant’s leg, monks, said this: ‘Such is an elephant, your Majesty, he is like a pillar.’

“Those congenitally blind who had seen the elephant’s thighs, monks, said this: ‘Such is an elephant, your Majesty, he is like a mortar.’

“Those congenitally blind who had seen the top of the elephant’s tail, monks, said this: ‘Such is an elephant, your Majesty, he is like a pestle.’

“Those congenitally blind who had seen the tip of the elephant’s tail, monks, said this: ‘Such is an elephant, your Majesty, he is like a broom.’

“And they, saying: ‘Such is an elephant, such is not an elephant; such is not an elephant, such is an elephant,’ hit each other with their fists, and with that, monks, the King was pleased.

“Just so, monks, wanderers from other sects are blind, without vision, they do not know what is good, they do not know what is not good, they do not know what is Dhamma, they do not know what is not Dhamma. They, not knowing what is good, not knowing what is not good, not knowing what is Dhamma, not knowing what is not Dhamma, live contending, quarrelling, disputing, attacking each other with sharp tongues, saying: ‘Such is Dhamma, such is not Dhamma; such is not Dhamma, such is Dhamma.’ ”

Then the Gracious One, having understood the significance of it, on that occasion uttered this exalted utterance:

“Some ascetics and brāhmaṇas, it seems, are attached to these views,  
Having grasped ahold of it, they dispute, like people who see only one side.”

*Numbered Discourses 10 (Aṅguttara Nikāya 10)*

*8. If You Want*

### **79. Grounds for Resentment**

“Mendicants, there are ten grounds for resentment. What ten? Thinking: ‘They did wrong to me,’ you harbor resentment. Thinking: ‘They are doing wrong to me’ ... ‘They will do wrong to me’ ... ‘They did wrong by someone I love’ ... ‘They are doing wrong by someone I love’ ... ‘They will do wrong by someone I love’ ... ‘They helped someone I dislike’ ... ‘They are helping someone I dislike’ ... Thinking: ‘They will help someone I dislike,’ you harbor resentment. You get angry for no reason. These are the ten grounds for resentment.”

*Numbered Discourses 7 (Aṅguttara Nikāya 7)*

*6. The Undeclared Points*

### **64. Irritable**

“Mendicants, these seven things that please and assist an enemy happen to an irritable woman or man. What seven?

Firstly, an enemy wishes for an enemy: ‘If only they’d become ugly!’ Why is that? Because an enemy doesn’t like to have a beautiful enemy. An irritable person, overcome and overwhelmed by anger, is ugly, even though they’re nicely bathed and anointed, with hair and beard dressed, and wearing white clothes. This is the first thing that pleases and assists an enemy which happens to an irritable woman or man.

Furthermore, an enemy wishes for an enemy: ‘If only they’d sleep badly!’ Why is that? Because an enemy doesn’t like to have an enemy who sleeps well. An irritable person, overcome and overwhelmed by anger, sleeps badly, even though they sleep on a couch spread with woolen covers—shag-piled, pure white, or embroidered with flowers—and spread with a fine deer hide, with a canopy above and red pillows at both ends. This is the second thing ...

Furthermore, an enemy wishes for an enemy: 'If only they don't get all they need!' Why is that? Because an enemy doesn't like to have an enemy who gets all they need. When an irritable person, overcome and overwhelmed by anger, gets what they don't need they think 'I've got what I need!' When they get what they need they think 'I've got what I don't need.' When an angry person gets these things that are the exact opposite of what they need, it's for their lasting harm and suffering. This is the third thing ...

Furthermore, an enemy wishes for an enemy: 'If only they weren't wealthy!' Why is that? Because an enemy doesn't like to have an enemy who is wealthy. When a person is irritable, overcome and overwhelmed by anger, the rulers seize the legitimate wealth they've earned by their efforts, built up with their own hands, gathered by the sweat of their brow. This is the fourth thing ...

Furthermore, an enemy wishes for an enemy: 'If only they weren't famous!' Why is that? Because an enemy doesn't like to have a famous enemy. When a person is irritable, overcome and overwhelmed by anger, any fame they have acquired by diligence falls to dust. This is the fifth thing ...

Furthermore, an enemy wishes for an enemy: 'If only they had no friends!' Why is that? Because an enemy doesn't like to have an enemy with friends. When a person is irritable, overcome and overwhelmed by anger, their friends and colleagues, relatives and kin avoid them from afar. This is the sixth thing ...

Furthermore, an enemy wishes for an enemy: 'If only, when their body breaks up, after death, they're reborn in a place of loss, a bad place, the underworld, hell!' Why is that? Because an enemy doesn't like to have an enemy who goes to a good place. When a person is irritable, overcome and overwhelmed by anger, they do bad things by way of body, speech, and mind. When their body breaks up, after death, they're reborn in a place of loss, a bad place, the underworld, hell. This is the seventh thing that pleases and assists an enemy which happens to an irritable woman or man.

These are the seven things that please and assist an enemy which happen to an irritable woman or man.

An irritable person is ugly  
and they sleep badly.  
When they get what they need,  
they take it to be what they don't need.

An angry person  
kills with body or speech;  
overcome with anger,  
they lose their wealth.

Mad with anger,  
they fall into disgrace.  
Relatives, friends, and loved ones  
avoid an irritable person.  
Anger creates harm;  
anger upsets the mind.

That person doesn't recognize  
the danger that arises within.  
An angry person doesn't know the good.  
An angry person doesn't see the truth.  
When a person is beset by anger,  
only blind darkness is left.

An angry person destroys with ease  
what was hard to build.  
Afterwards, when the anger is spent,  
they're tormented as if burnt by fire.  
Their look betrays their sulkiness  
like a fire's smoky plume.  
And when their anger flares up,  
they make others angry.

They have no conscience or prudence,  
nor any respectful speech.  
One overcome by anger  
has no island refuge anywhere.  
The deeds that torment a man  
are far from those that are good.

I'll explain them now;  
listen to this, for it is the truth.  
An angry person slays their father;  
their mother, too, they slay.  
An angry person slays a saint;  
a normal person, too, they slay.  
A man is raised by his mother,  
who shows him the world.

But an angry ordinary person slays  
even that good woman who gave him life.  
Like oneself, all sentient beings  
hold themselves most dear.

But angry people kill themselves all kinds of ways,  
distraught for many reasons.  
Some kill themselves with swords,  
some, distraught, take poison.

Some hang themselves with rope,  
or fling themselves down a mountain gorge.  
When they commit deeds of destroying life  
and killing themselves,  
they don't realize what they do,  
for anger leads them to ruin.  
The snare of death in the form of anger  
lies hidden in the heart.  
You should cut it out by self-control,  
by wisdom, energy, and right ideas.

An astute person should cut out  
this unskillful thing.  
And they'd train in the teaching in just the same way,  
not yielding to sulkiness.  
Free of anger, free of despair,  
free of greed, with no more longing,  
tamed, having given up anger,  
they become extinguished without defilements.”

*Numbered Discourses 5 (Aṅguttara Nikāya 5)*

*17. Resentment*

### **162. Getting Rid of Resentment (2nd)**

There Venerable Sāriputta addressed the mendicants: “Reverends, mendicants!”  
“Reverend,” they replied. Sāriputta said this:

“Reverends, a mendicant should use these five methods to completely get rid of  
resentment when it has arisen toward anyone. What five?”

In the case of a person whose behavior by way of body is impure, but whose behavior by way of speech is pure, you should get rid of resentment for that kind of person.

In the case of a person whose behavior by way of speech is impure, but whose behavior by way of body is pure, ...

In the case of a person whose behavior by way of body and speech is impure, but who gets an openness and clarity of heart from time to time, ...

In the case of a person whose behavior by way of body and speech is impure, and who doesn't get an openness and clarity of heart from time to time, ...

In the case of a person whose behavior by way of body and speech is pure, and who gets an openness and clarity of heart from time to time, you should get rid of resentment for that kind of person.

How should you get rid of resentment for a person whose behavior by way of body is impure, but whose behavior by way of speech is pure? Suppose a mendicant wearing rag robes sees a rag by the side of the road. They'd hold it down with the left foot, spread it out with the right foot, tear out what was intact, and take it away with them. In the same way, at that time you should ignore that person's impure behavior by way of body and focus on their pure behavior by way of speech. That's how to get rid of resentment for that person.

How should you get rid of resentment for a person whose behavior by way of speech is impure, but whose behavior by way of body is pure? Suppose there was a lotus pond covered with moss and aquatic plants. Then along comes a person struggling in the oppressive heat, weary, thirsty, and parched. They'd plunge into the lotus pond, sweep apart the moss and aquatic plants, drink from their cupped hands, and be on their way. In the same way, at that time you should ignore that person's impure behavior by way of speech and focus on their pure behavior by way of body. That's how to get rid of resentment for that person.

How should you get rid of resentment for a person whose behavior by way of body and speech is impure, but who gets an openness and clarity of heart from time to time? Suppose there was a little water in a cow's hoofprint. Then along comes a person struggling in the oppressive heat, weary, thirsty, and parched. They might think: 'This little bit of water is in a cow's hoofprint. If I drink it with my cupped hands or a bowl, I'll stir it and disturb it, making it undrinkable. Why don't I get down on all fours and drink it up like a cow, then be on my way?' So that's what they do. In the same way, at that time you should ignore that person's impure behavior by way of speech and body, and focus on the fact that they get an openness and clarity of heart from time to time. That's how to get rid of resentment for that person.

How should you get rid of resentment for a person whose behavior by way of body and speech is impure, and who doesn't get an openness and clarity of heart from time to time? Suppose a person was traveling along a road, and they were sick, suffering,

gravely ill. And it was a long way to a village, whether ahead or behind. And they didn't have any suitable food or medicine, or a competent carer, or someone to bring them to the neighborhood of a village. Then another person traveling along the road sees them, and thinks of them with nothing but compassion, kindness, and sympathy: 'Oh, may this person get suitable food or medicine, or a competent carer, or someone to bring them to the neighborhood of a village. Why is that? So that they don't come to ruin right here.' In the same way, at that time you should ignore that person's impure behavior by way of speech and body, and the fact that they don't get an openness and clarity of heart from time to time, and think of them with nothing but compassion, kindness, and sympathy:

'Oh, may this person give up bad conduct by way of body, speech, and mind, and develop good conduct by way of body, speech, and mind. Why is that? So that, when their body breaks up, after death, they're not reborn in a place of loss, a bad place, the underworld, hell.' That's how to get rid of resentment for that person. How should you get rid of resentment for a person whose behavior by way of body and speech is pure, and who gets an openness and clarity of heart from time to time? Suppose there was a lotus pond with clear, sweet, cool water, clean, with smooth banks, delightful, and shaded by many trees. Then along comes a person struggling in the oppressive heat, weary, thirsty, and parched. They'd plunge into the lotus pond to bathe and drink. And after emerging they'd sit or lie down right there in the shade of the trees.

In the same way, at that time you should focus on that person's pure behavior by way of body and speech, and on the fact that they get an openness and clarity of heart from time to time. That's how to get rid of resentment for that person. Relying on a person who is impressive all around, the mind becomes confident.

A mendicant should use these five methods to completely get rid of resentment when it has arisen toward anyone."

*Translated by Bhikkhu Bodhi:*

*(Saṃyutta Nikāya 11)*

*Connected Discourses with Sakka*

#### **4. Vepacitti or Patience**

At Savatthī. The Blessed One said this:

"Once in the past, bhikkhus, the devas and the asuras were arrayed for battle. Then Vepacitti, lord of the asuras, addressed the asuras thus: 'Dear sirs, in the impending battle between the devas and the asuras, if the asuras win and the devas are defeated, bind Sakka, lord of the devas, by his four limbs and neck and bring him to me in the city of the asuras.' And Sakka, lord of the devas, addressed the Tavatimsa devas thus: 'Dear sirs, in the impending battle between the devas and the asuras, if the devas win and the asuras are

defeated, bind Vepacitti, lord of the asuras, by his four limbs and neck and bring him to me in the Sudhamma assembly hall.’

“In that battle, bhikkhus, the devas won and the asuras were defeated. Then the Tavatimsa devas bound Vepacitti by his four limbs and neck and brought him to Sakka in the Sudhamma assembly hall. When Sakka was entering and leaving the Sudhamma assembly hall, Vepacitti, bound by his four limbs and neck, abused and reviled him with rude, harsh words. Then, bhikkhus, Matali the charioteer addressed Sakka, lord of the devas, in verse:

“When face to face with Vepacitti  
Is it, Maghava, from fear or weakness  
That you endure him so patiently,  
Listening to his harsh words?’

Sakka:

“It is neither through fear nor weakness  
That I am patient with Vepacitti.  
How can a wise person like me  
Engage in combat with a fool?’

Matali:

“Fools would vent their anger even more  
If no one would keep them in check.  
Hence with drastic punishment  
The wise man should restrain the fool.’

Sakka:

“I myself think this alone  
Is the way to check the fool:  
When one knows one’s foe is angry  
One mindfully maintains one’s peace.’

Matali:

“I see this fault, O Vasava,  
In practising patient endurance:  
When the fool thinks of you thus,  
“He endures me out of fear,”  
The dolt will chase you even more  
As a bull does one who flees.’

Sakka:

“Let it be whether or not he thinks,  
“He endures me out of fear,”  
Of goals that culminate in one’s own good  
None is found better than patience.

“When a person endowed with strength  
Patiently endures a weakling,  
They call that the supreme patience;  
The weakling must be patient always.

“They call that strength no strength at all—  
The strength that is the strength of folly—  
But no one can reproach a person  
Who is strong because guarded by Dhamma.

“One who repays an angry man with anger  
Thereby makes things worse for himself.  
Not repaying an angry man with anger,  
One wins a battle hard to win.

“He practises for the welfare of both,  
His own and the other’s,  
When, knowing that his foe is angry,  
He mindfully maintains his peace.

“When he achieves the cure of both—  
His own and the other’s—  
The people who consider him a fool  
Are unskilled in the Dhamma.’

“So, bhikkhus, if Sakka, lord of the devas, subsisting on the fruit of his own merit, exercising supreme sovereignty and rulership over the Tavatimsa devas, will be one who speaks in praise of patience and gentleness, then how much more would it be fitting here for you, who have gone forth in such a well-expounded Dhamma and Discipline, to be patient and gentle.”

*Numbered Discourses 9 (Aṅguttara Nikāya 9)*

2. The Lion's Roar

**11. Sāriputta's Lion's Roar**

At one time the Buddha was staying near Sāvathī in Jeta's Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery.

Then Venerable Sāriputta went up to the Buddha, bowed, sat down to one side, and said to him, "Sir, I have completed the rainy season residence at Sāvathī. I wish to depart to wander the countryside."

"Please, Sāriputta, go at your convenience." Then Sāriputta got up from his seat, bowed, and respectfully circled the Buddha, keeping him on his right, before leaving. And then, not long after Sāriputta had left, a certain monk said to the Buddha, "Sir, Venerable Sāriputta attacked me and left without saying sorry."

So the Buddha said to a certain monk, "Please, monk, in my name tell Sāriputta that the teacher summons him."

"Yes, sir," that monk replied. He went to Sāriputta and said to him, "Reverend Sāriputta, the teacher summons you."

"Yes, reverend," Sāriputta replied.

Now at that time the venerables Mahāmoggallāna and Ānanda took a key and went from dwelling to dwelling, saying: "Come forth, venerables! Come forth, venerables! Now Venerable Sāriputta will roar his lion's roar in the presence of the Buddha!"

Then Venerable Sāriputta went up to the Buddha, bowed, and sat down to one side. The Buddha said to him:

"Sāriputta, one of your spiritual companions has made this complaint: 'Venerable Sāriputta attacked me and left without saying sorry.'"

"Sir, someone who had not established mindfulness of the body might well attack one of their spiritual companions and leave without saying sorry.

Suppose they were to toss both clean and unclean things on the earth, like feces, urine, spit, pus, and blood. The earth isn't horrified, repelled, and disgusted because of this. In the same way, I live with a heart like the earth, abundant, expansive, limitless, free of enmity and ill will. Someone who had not established mindfulness of the body might well attack one of their spiritual companions and leave without saying sorry.

Suppose they were to wash both clean and unclean things in water, like feces, urine, spit, pus, and blood. The water isn't horrified, repelled, and disgusted because of this. In the same way, I live with a heart like water, abundant, expansive, limitless, free of enmity and ill will. Someone who had not established mindfulness of the body might well attack one of their spiritual companions and leave without saying sorry.

Suppose a fire was to burn both clean and unclean things, like feces, urine, spit, pus, and blood. The fire isn't horrified, repelled, and disgusted because of this. In the same way, I live with a heart like fire, abundant, expansive, limitless, free of enmity and

ill will. Someone who had not established mindfulness of the body might well attack one of their spiritual companions and leave without saying sorry.

Suppose the wind was to blow on both clean and unclean things, like feces, urine, spit, pus, and blood. The wind isn't horrified, repelled, and disgusted because of this. In the same way, I live with a heart like the wind, abundant, expansive, limitless, free of enmity and ill will. Someone who had not established mindfulness of the body might well attack one of their spiritual companions and leave without saying sorry.

Suppose a rag was to wipe up both clean and unclean things, like feces, urine, spit, pus, and blood. The rag isn't horrified, repelled, and disgusted because of this. In the same way, I live with a heart like a rag, abundant, expansive, limitless, free of enmity and ill will. Someone who had not established mindfulness of the body might well attack one of their spiritual companions and leave without saying sorry.

Suppose an outcast boy or girl, holding a pot and clad in rags, were to enter a town or village. They'd enter with a humble mind. In the same way, I live with a heart like an outcast boy or girl, abundant, limitless, measureless, free of enmity and ill will. Someone who had not established mindfulness of the body might well attack one of their spiritual companions and leave without saying sorry.

Suppose there was a bull with his horns cut, gentle, well tamed and well trained. He'd wander from street to street and square to square without hurting anyone with his feet or horns. In the same way, I live with a heart like a bull with horns cut, abundant, expansive, limitless, free of enmity and ill will. Someone who had not established mindfulness of the body might well attack one of their spiritual companions and leave without saying sorry.

Suppose there was a woman or man who was young, youthful, and fond of adornments, and had bathed their head. If the corpse of a snake or a dog or a human were hung around their neck, they'd be horrified, repelled, and disgusted. In the same way, I'm horrified, repelled, and disgusted by this rotten body. Someone who had not established mindfulness of the body might well attack one of their spiritual companions and leave without saying sorry.

Suppose someone was to carry around a bowl of fat that was leaking and oozing from holes and cracks. In the same way, I carry around this body that's leaking and oozing from holes and cracks. Someone who had not established mindfulness of the body might well attack one of their spiritual companions and leave without saying sorry.” Then that monk rose from his seat, placed his robe over one shoulder, bowed with his head at the Buddha's feet, and said, “I have made a mistake, sir. It was foolish, stupid, and unskillful of me to speak ill of Venerable Sāriputta with a false, hollow, lying, untruthful claim. Please, sir, accept my mistake for what it is, so I will restrain myself in future.”

“Indeed, monk, you made a mistake. It was foolish, stupid, and unskillful of you to act in that way. But since you have recognized your mistake for what it is, and have

dealt with it properly, I accept it. For it is growth in the training of the noble one to recognize a mistake for what it is, deal with it properly, and commit to restraint in the future.”

Then the Buddha said to Venerable Sāriputta, “Sāriputta, forgive that silly man before his head explodes into seven pieces right here.”

“I will pardon that venerable if he asks me: ‘May the venerable please pardon me too.’”

*Numbered Discourses 2 (Aṅguttara Nikāya 2)*

*2. Issues*

**# 15**

“Mendicants, in a disciplinary issue, if neither the offending mendicant nor the accusing mendicant carefully checks themselves, you can expect that issue will lead to lasting acrimony and enmity, and the mendicants won’t live comfortably. But in a disciplinary issue, if both the offending mendicant and the accusing mendicant carefully check themselves, you can expect that issue won’t lead to lasting acrimony and enmity, and the mendicants will live comfortably.

And how, mendicants, does an offending mendicant carefully check themselves? An offending mendicant reflects: ‘I have committed a certain unskillful offense with the body. That mendicant saw me do this. If I hadn’t committed that offense, they wouldn’t have seen me. But since I did commit that offense, they did see me. When they saw me, they were upset, and they voiced their unhappiness to me. Then I also got upset, so I told others. So the mistake is mine alone, like someone who owes customs duty on their goods.’ That’s how, mendicants, an offending mendicant carefully checks themselves.

And how, mendicants, does an accusing mendicant carefully check themselves? An accusing mendicant reflects: ‘This mendicant has committed a certain unskillful offense with the body. I saw them do that. If they hadn’t committed that offense, I wouldn’t have seen them. But since they did commit that offense, I did see them. When I saw them, I was upset, and I voiced my unhappiness to them. Then they also got upset, so they told others. So the mistake is mine alone, like someone who owes customs duty on their goods.’ That’s how, mendicants, an accusing mendicant carefully checks themselves.

In a disciplinary issue, if neither the offending mendicant nor the accusing mendicant carefully checks themselves, you can expect that issue will lead to lasting acrimony and enmity, and the mendicants won’t live comfortably. But in a disciplinary issue, if both the offending mendicant and the accusing mendicant carefully checks themselves, you can expect that issue won’t lead to lasting acrimony and enmity, and the mendicants will live comfortably.”

*Numbered Discourses 3 (Aṅguttara Nikāya 3)*

*7. The Great Chapter*

**67. Topics of Discussion**

“There are, mendicants, these three topics of discussion. What three? You might discuss the past: ‘That is how it was in the past.’ You might discuss the future: ‘That is how it will be in the future.’ Or you might discuss the present: ‘This is how it is at present.’

You can know whether or not a person is competent to hold a discussion by seeing how they take part in a discussion. When a person is asked a question, if it needs to be answered with a generalization and they don’t answer it generally; or if it needs analysis and they answer without analyzing it; or if it needs a counter-question and they answer without a counter-question; or if it should be set aside and they don’t set it aside, then that person is not competent to hold a discussion. When a person is asked a question, if it needs to be answered with a generalization and they answer it generally; or if it needs analysis and they answer after analyzing it; or if it needs a counter-question and they answer with a counter-question; or if it should be set aside and they set it aside, then that person is competent to hold a discussion.

You can know whether or not a person is competent to hold a discussion by seeing how they take part in a discussion. When a person is asked a question, if they’re not consistent about what their position is and what it isn’t; about what they propose; about speaking from what they know; and about the appropriate procedure, then that person is not competent to hold a discussion. When a person is asked a question, if they are consistent about what their position is and what it isn’t; about what they propose; about speaking from what they know; and about the appropriate procedure, then that person is competent to hold a discussion.

You can know whether or not a person is competent to hold a discussion by seeing how they take part in a discussion. When a person is asked a question, if they dodge the issue; distract the discussion with irrelevant points; or display annoyance, hate, and bitterness, then that person is not competent to hold a discussion. When a person is asked a question, if they don’t dodge the issue; distract the discussion with irrelevant points; or display annoyance, hate, and bitterness, then that person is competent to hold a discussion.

You can know whether or not a person is competent to hold a discussion by seeing how they take part in a discussion. When a person is asked a question, if they intimidate, crush, mock, or seize on trivial mistakes, then that person is not competent to hold a discussion. When a person is asked a question, if they don’t intimidate, crush, mock, or seize on trivial mistakes, then that person is competent to hold a discussion.

You can know whether or not a person has what’s required by seeing how they take part in a discussion. If they lend an ear they have what’s required; if they don’t lend an ear they don’t have what’s required. Someone who has what’s required directly knows one thing, completely understands one thing, gives up one thing, and realizes one

thing—and then they experience complete freedom. This is the purpose of discussion, consultation, the requirements, and listening well, that is, the liberation of the mind by not grasping.

Those who converse with hostility,  
too sure of themselves, arrogant,  
ignoble, attacking virtues,  
they look for flaws in each other.

They rejoice together when their opponent  
speaks poorly and makes a mistake,  
becoming confused and defeated—  
but the noble ones don't discuss like this.

If an astute person wants to hold a discussion  
connected with the teaching and its meaning—  
the kind of discussion that noble ones hold—  
then that wise one should start the discussion,

knowing when the time is right,  
neither hostile nor arrogant.  
Not over-excited,  
contemptuous, or aggressive,

or with a mind full of jealousy,  
they'd speak from what they rightly know.  
They agree with what was well spoken,  
without criticizing what was poorly said.

They'd not persist in finding faults,  
nor seize on trivial mistakes,  
neither intimidating nor crushing the other,  
nor would they speak with sly implications.

Good people consult  
for the sake of knowledge and clarity.  
That's how the noble ones consult,  
this is a noble consultation.  
Knowing this, an intelligent person  
would consult without arrogance.”

*Middle Length Discourses (Majjhima Nikāya)*

**61. Discourse on an Exhortation to Rāhula at Ambalaṭṭhikā**

*(excerpt)*

What do you think, Rāhula? What is the purpose of a mirror?”

“It’s for checking your reflection, sir.”

“In the same way, deeds of body, speech, and mind should be done only after repeated checking.

When you want to act with the body, you should check on that same deed: ‘Does this act with the body that I want to do lead to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both? Is it unskillful, with suffering as its outcome and result?’ If, while checking in this way, you know: ‘This act with the body that I want to do leads to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both. It’s unskillful, with suffering as its outcome and result.’ To the best of your ability, Rāhula, you should not do such a deed. But if, while checking in this way, you know: ‘This act with the body that I want to do doesn’t lead to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both. It’s skillful, with happiness as its outcome and result.’ Then, Rāhula, you should do such a deed.

While you are acting with the body, you should check on that same act: ‘Does this act with the body that I am doing lead to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both? Is it unskillful, with suffering as its outcome and result?’ If, while checking in this way, you know: ‘This act with the body that I am doing leads to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both. It’s unskillful, with suffering as its outcome and result.’ Then, Rāhula, you should desist from such a deed. But if, while checking in this way, you know: ‘This act with the body that I am doing doesn’t lead to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both. It’s skillful, with happiness as its outcome and result.’ Then, Rāhula, you should continue doing such a deed.

After you have acted with the body, you should check on that same act: ‘Does this act with the body that I have done lead to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both? Is it unskillful, with suffering as its outcome and result?’ If, while checking in this way, you know: ‘This act with the body that I have done leads to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both. It’s unskillful, with suffering as its outcome and result.’ Then, Rāhula, you should confess, reveal, and clarify such a deed to the Teacher or a sensible spiritual companion. And having revealed it you should restrain yourself in future. But if, while checking in this way, you know: ‘This act with the body that I have done doesn’t lead to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both. It’s skillful, with happiness as its outcome and result.’ Then, Rāhula, you should live in rapture and joy because of this, training day and night in skillful qualities.

When you want to act with speech, you should check on that same deed: ‘Does this act of speech that I want to do lead to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both?’ ...

If, while checking in this way, you know: ‘This act of speech that I have done leads to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both. It’s unskillful, with suffering as its outcome and result.’ Then, Rāhula, you should confess, reveal, and clarify such a deed to the Teacher or a sensible spiritual companion. And having revealed it you should restrain yourself in future. But if, while checking in this way, you know: ‘This act of speech that I have done doesn’t lead to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both. It’s skillful, with happiness as its outcome and result.’ Then, Rāhula, you should live in rapture and joy because of this, training day and night in skillful qualities.

When you want to act with the mind, you should check on that same deed: ‘Does this act of mind that I want to do lead to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both?’

...

If, while checking in this way, you know: ‘This act of mind that I have done leads to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both. It’s unskillful, with suffering as its outcome and result.’ Then, Rāhula, you should be horrified, repelled, and disgusted by that deed. And being repelled, you should restrain yourself in future. But if, while checking in this way, you know: ‘This act with the mind that I have done doesn’t lead to hurting myself, hurting others, or hurting both. It’s skillful, with happiness as its outcome and result.’ Then, Rāhula, you should live in rapture and joy because of this, training day and night in skillful qualities.

All the ascetics and brahmins of the past, future, and present who purify their physical, verbal, and mental actions do so after repeatedly checking. So Rāhula, you should train yourself like this: ‘I will purify my physical, verbal, and mental actions after repeatedly checking.’”

That is what the Buddha said. Satisfied, Venerable Rāhula was happy with what the Buddha said.

*Samyukta Āgama (2) 37*

*Sakka Saṃyutta*

*Translation by Marcus Bingenheimer*

**Two monks argue. The Buddha reminds them of how Sakka deals with anger.**

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvattihī in the Jeta Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Park.

At that time, early one morning, the World-honored One took his robes and his begging bowl and entered the town to beg for food. Having eaten he washed his feet, gathered his seat for meditation and went to the Andhavana forest to meditate. Having looked around for a good spot, he sat down cross-legged beneath a tree in a secluded place, for the day’s abiding.

At that time in the Jeta Vihāra there were two monks who got into an argument during a meeting. One endured in silence, the other became angry and irate. When the one who had become irate saw that he had transgressed, he went to the monk who had stayed silent, wishing to confess. However, the monk who had endured in silence did not accept the confession. When this transpired, there ensued a noisy discussion among all the monks. The Tathāgata was at that time abiding in meditation, and heard the clamor clearly with his deva-like hearing, which surpasses human hearing and can discern sounds from far away. He rose from his seat, went to the monks, and sat on the seat prepared in front of them.

The Buddha said to the monks: “This morning I took my robes and begging bowl and entered the town to beg for food. ( ... and so on ... ) went into the forest, and sitting silently, I heard monks shouting and clamoring. What is the matter?”

Then the monks told the Buddha: “World-honored One, in the Jeta Vihāra there are two monks who got into an argument during a meeting. One monk endured in silence, the other monk became irate and said a lot. The irate monk knew that he had transgressed and went to offer an honest confession. The monk that had endured silently did not accept the other’s confession, so it became a public issue and everybody started shouting.”

The Buddha told the monks: “Why be so stupid and not accept someone’s confession? Monks, know that in ancient days Sakka Devānaṃ Inda, [Sakka, Lord of the Gods] while in the Sudhamma Hall among the gods spoke this verse:

“It is like taking a vessel made from a gourd  
and filling it with butter to use as a lamp;  
the flame burning, consuming  
will burn up the gourd as well.

The angry mind is like this;  
it turns on itself and burns one’s wholesome roots.  
We should never harbor annoyance.  
Having sought out anger, disperse it.

Don’t be drawn in as if in a maelstrom,  
endlessly circling around.  
And even if there is anger, abstain from harsh speech,  
not touching on topics that others wish to avoid.

Deeply respecting others’ wish to avoid such topics,  
we will never harm them.  
Taking control of oneself  
is of great advantage to oneself.

Those without anger, without violence,  
those are noble ones.  
They are disciples of noble ones;  
those one should always befriend.

Those with anger and hatred /  
face an obstacle heavy as a mountain  
But if, when there is anger and hatred, /  
one can control oneself even a little,  
then this is called good karma /  
like the taming of an unruly horse.”

The Buddha said to the monks: “Sakka Devānaṃ Indra reigns over the gods. At ease among them, though powerful he can practice patience and praise those with patience. How could you, monks, who have gone forth, disfigured by shaving off your hair, not be patient and praise patience?”

When the Buddha had finished, the monks, having listened to what he had said, were happy and remembered it well.

***Dhammapada***

*(Verses on The Way)*

*Translated by Glenn Wallis*

Chapter 17: Anger

One should abandon anger.  
One should give up pride.  
One should throw off every fetter.  
Troubles do not befall the person  
who, possessing nothing,  
does not cling to body and mind.

The person who can restrain  
anger that has arisen  
like a reckless chariot--  
that one I call a driver.  
Other people just hold on to the reins.

Win over an angry person with poise.

Win over a mean one with kindness.  
Win over a greedy person with generosity,  
and one who speaks falsely with honesty.

One should speak truthfully;  
one should not get angry;  
when asked, one should give,  
even if there is just a little.  
With these three traits,  
one would go in the presence  
of the radiant ones.

Those gentle sages,  
constantly restrained in body,  
go to that unshakable place where,  
having gone, they do not suffer.

For those who are always watchful,  
learning day and night,  
intent on unbinding,  
the impulses come to rest.  
Atula, this is from long ago, it is not recent:  
they find fault with one who sits silently,  
they find fault with one who speaks much,  
they find fault with one who speaks but little.  
There is no one in this world who is not faulted.

There was not, nor will there be,  
and now at present no person is found  
who is wholly praised or wholly faulted.

But the wise, observing him carefully day after day,  
praise that person who is faultless in conduct,  
intelligent, and well composed in wisdom and virtue.

Like pure gold,  
who is able to find fault with that one?  
The radiant ones praise him.  
By Brahma, too, he is praised.

Guard against bodily agitation.

Be restrained in the body.

Abandoning bodily misconduct

act properly with the body.

Guard against verbal agitation.

Be restrained in speech.

Abandoning verbal misconduct,

act properly with speech.

Guard against mental agitation.

Be restrained in the mind.

Abandoning mental misconduct,

act properly with the mind.

Those wise ones, restrained in the body,

restrained as well in speech,

those wise ones, restrained in the mind,

they indeed are perfectly restrained.