

Karaniya Mettā Sutta

Abridged Sixth Discourse

Loku Hamuduruwo: *Satta*, a being, means there is attachment. We attach to *bhava*, becoming, in various ways. Sometimes, we attach to the wholesome side, *kusala*, and sometimes we attach to the unwholesome side, *akusala*. We tend to attach to both sides. There are some who attach to formless *jhānas*.

In wholesomeness, you can include:

- *Kāmā-vacara* - sense sphere wholesomeness
- *Rūpa-vacara* - fine material sphere wholesomeness
- *Lokuttara* - supra mundane wholesomeness

Wholesomeness as well as unwholesomeness, *kusala* and *akusala*, means causes. Their accompanying merit and de-merit, *puñña* and *apuñña*, means effects. Wholesomeness is followed by merit. Unwholesomeness is followed by demerit. To be a *satta*, a being, means attaching in one of these two ways, always:

- When the cause is wholesome, *kusala*,
 - the effect is the meritorious formation, *puññābhi saṅkhāra*
- When the cause is unwholesome, *akusala*,
 - The effect is the de-meritorious formation, *apuññābhi saṅkhāra*

For the meritorious formation, *puññābhi saṅkhāra*, the effects are visible. This meritorious formation is the pleasure generated by wholesome action. Similarly, for the de-meritorious formation, *apuññābhi saṅkhāra*, the effects are visible. Except for *arahats*, all types of beings entertain and enjoy pleasurable effects of wholesome actions. Even other *ariyans* ~ *anāgāmīs*, *sakadagāmīs*, *sotāpannas* ~ entertain and enjoy the effects of wholesome actions.

David: What about meditators?

If the mind of a strong meditator is only directed towards the immaterial sphere, the imperturbable formation will arise as the effect. Imperturbable formation, *āneñjābhi saṅkhāra*, means only causes. No visible effects. Only the causes, the *hetu*, flow. While experiencing the imperturbable, the meditator doesn't have a visible effect.

Only those who have the *arahat* fruit never entertain and never enjoy the effects. *Arahats* are excluded from this particular relationship between causes and effects. And I can only explain the nature of an *arahat* up to certain extent. It is not possible for me to explain the mental processes of an *arahat* completely because these mental processes are uniquely neutral and inoperative. They're called *kriyā citta*. An *arahat's* functional mental processes do not fall within our understanding of fruits of wholesome and unwholesome actions.

Kammically neutral?

Beyond wholesome and unwholesome.

Does it create any *kamma*?

No. It doesn't create *kamma*. It's *abyākata*, which means not explained, or not proclaimed.¹ What I am saying applies to a person who attained *arahata phalla*, *arahat* fruit. Other than the *arahat*, all others we count under this *satta* or being. Humans, dogs, cats, worms ~ all are *satta*. All are forms of being because all are attached to form, feeling, perception, formations and consciousness. All of them have this glue of attachment to form, feeling, perception, formations and consciousness. All of us here have this attachment. We're clinging.

To review, we looked at three kinds of formations, *saṅkhāras*:

- *Puññābhi saṅkhāra* - meritorious formation
- *Apuññābhi saṅkhāra* - de-meritorious formation
- *Āneñjābhi saṅkhāra* - imperturbable formation

Whatever form the being is attached to, it is only a change in *bhava*. When a person dies while in the formless *jhāna*, he gives up his body. That's all. His, or her, rebirth is the same as his or her mind in the previous birth. Only the body is given up. We need not worry, because nobody here at our centre has these formless *jhānas*! There is one person, who has these formless *jhānas*. Some days he is here at our centre, and some days he disappears. This man only thinks he has these formless *jhānas*. I don't think so. This elderly white haired gentleman told me, "I have the *arūpa jhānas* and *magga phalla*. I am developing the *bojjhaṅgas*." I told him, "Very good, then!" Yet, he says that sweeping is an obstacle for his *jhāna* practice. One day, I suggested he at least pick flowers for Buddha-Pūja. He got angry. I ask you. What kind of *jhānas* are these, if he gets angry like that?

The word *bodhisatta* means those who are attached to the *bodhi*, the *Buddhahood*. They are attached to *Buddhahood*, and that's why they are called *bodhisattas*. These *bodhisattas* are not much attached to *saṃsāra* or *bhava*, but to the *bodhi* or *Buddhahood*. Even yogis, those who meditate in order to attain *arahathood*, they are also suitable to identify as *bodhisattas*.

Buddhas, we can divide into four:

- *Sammā sambuddha*
- *Paccekabuddha*
- *Arahatbuddha*
- *Sutabuddha*

Sutabuddha means having great *Dhamma* knowledge. *Suta* means listening. They have listened to a lot of *Dhamma* and are attached to that knowledge. Thus, we call them *Sutabuddhas*.

And *bodhisattas*, we can divide into two:

- *Mahā bodhisatta*
- *Paccekabodhisatta*

Mahā bodhisatta is one who practises to attain *Sammā Sambuddhahood*. *Paccekabodhisatta* is someone who practises for the *Paccekabuddhahood*.

¹ <https://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/an/an07/an07.051.than.html>

Now, does everyone understand the meaning of the word *satta*? Being? The word *satta* means there's becoming, attached to the *bhava*. Whatever the attachment. It might mean attached to power. Maybe attached to the aggregates. Some beings are attached to wholesome actions. However, the majority of beings are attached to unwholesome actions.

The Fourth & Fifth Verse

Whatever living beings there may be — feeble or strong (or the seekers and the attained) long, stout, or of medium size, short, small, large.

Those seen or those unseen, those dwelling far or near, those who are born as well as those yet to be born — may all beings have happy minds.²

*Ye keci pāṇabhūt' atthi, tasā vā thāvarā vā anavasesā
Dīgha vā ye mahantā vā, majjhimā rassakā aṇukathulā*

*Diṭṭhā vā ye vā addiṭṭhā, ye ca dūre vasanti avidūre
Bhūtā vā sambhavesī vā, sabbe sattā bhavantu sukhittā³*

We will start at the end of these two verses, and work our way back to the beginning. *Sabbe sattā bhavantu sukhittā* means, May all the beings be in comfort. *Bhavantu* means, May happen to them. *Sukhittā* means comfort, happiness. Painlessness. One with *mettā* has the volition, May all beings be in comfort. There is no division, judgement, differentiation, such as high beings, low beings, *bodhisattas* or ants. For all beings, the one with *mettā* has the volition that all of them be in comfort.

Sukhittā, this state of comfort and painlessness, can be divided further. Let's say there is a hungry person. Another person is sick. There is a poor person, and an illiterate person. Another is jobless. One person suffers because of defilements. So, when saying, May all beings be in comfort and painless, we mean all of the people on this list. May they *all* be rid of their suffering.

What I am going to say now will confuse you. Everybody, except George, will have doubts about what I am about to say. There is a drug addict. To make this drug addict painless, we have to give him drugs. When considering such a person, we wonder how we can make him a painless one. We might think, “No. No. No. I don't want to do anything for him. I am doing my *mettā bhāvanā*. I can't otherwise help him beyond that.”

How do you think we can help this drug addict?

Štěpán: Provide support to rid his clinging to the drug.

This is an extreme case. He is severely addicted to a strong drug. Today or tomorrow, he can die without these drugs. So, how to make him get rid of his addiction?

Štěpán: To give him the drug he needs is the only way. And then he won't suffer. Perhaps, if he is a heroin addict, methadone may be substituted.

² <https://www.accesstosight.org/tipitaka/kn/snp/snp.1.08.piya.html>

³ <https://docs.google.com/document/edit?id=1Qx7034JHizoZm31JZOnjo-QA2sFho2VmnOlw95SctqU&hl=en>

George: Very unsatisfying solution. Rather than giving this drug, because the body in any case is secondary, there must be a better solution. We can't think of a solution at this moment. Nonetheless, this is no reason to abandon the problem.

True. I saw this in my village when I was a child. There was a very old man addicted to what's called locally *abbin*, a form of opium. *Abbin* is a strong drug, and he took a small amount of it every day. One day, he couldn't get this drug because he didn't have the money to buy it. He was in a lot of pain, and fell down. Seemed he was going to die. Seeing this man lying on the ground and how he was suffering, my father decided to help. Father poured a little water into the bottle where the man had been keeping his drugs, and mixed the water with the drug residue. Father then gave this water to the man to drink, and the man immediately revived. He regained his life. This old man worshiped my father, "May you be as the Buddha." Since father's volition was to help the old man, not intoxicate him, there was no unwholesomeness. Only *mettā*. This was a wholesome action.

When drug addicts are old, it's extremely difficult for them to break their lifelong habits, and equally difficult for us to help them to do so. In this instance, if father hadn't given the old man the water with the drug, the old man could have died. The drug at that moment became a medicine for this drug addict. After stabilizing the old man's condition, father slowly, ever so slowly, explained, "Now, understand, you are getting older and older. It's time to give up this drug. You have to let go of it." Father patiently gave him a sermon. When drug addicts are young, it is a little easier for them to break their habits, and simpler for us to support them. In either case, whether drug addicts are old or young, we have to try to help as best as we can. However, this question, how to help drug addicts, is difficult to answer. When it looked like this old drug addict was going to die, other villagers were at a loss, "What to do?" Some wanted to take him to the hospital.

George: Another solution comes to my mind. Yes! You give him a double dose, so that his clinging turns into disgust.

Štěpán: That would be bad. He could die.

David: What happens the next day?

George: There's a chance that his clinging to the drug turns into disgust because it's too much.

Štěpán: No, he would die.

When living in Colombo in 1989, I saw a beggar lying on the ground by the side of a road. He had fainted, and no one went close to him. Everyone avoided him. I stopped to look into what was wrong. He was suffering from fever. So, I took him to a pharmacy where the pharmacist advised giving a pain relief medicine as well as Panadol. I mixed these two medicines together and gave it to him. Soon, the beggar's fever went down. He recovered. Someone gave him a little money, and he immediately went to Borella junction to buy drugs.

Before long, this beggar showed up at Lanka Vipassana in Colombo, and I allowed him to stay. I told him, "Okay. Best you eat properly, bathe, and wear good clothes. At this center, you can live nicely." Supporters of Lanka Vipassana bought him new sarongs and shirts. He was eating, bathing and wearing the new clothes. He was starting to improve. Formerly, he was a beggar living on the street.

After a few days, an elderly well-dressed woman arrived at Lanka Vipassana in a big Benz. She had lots to say about this man, and asked me to chase him away. She said, "Don't allow him to stay here in the meditation centre, not even for a second." I got angry. I thought, "What right does this woman have to ask me to chase this

innocent man away?” In the evening of the same day, a young, also well-dressed, beautiful woman arrived at Lanka Vipassana in an even bigger Benz. She also asked me to chase him away. She said the older woman whom had visited earlier is the man’s mother and that she is his wife. Both mother and wife asked me to chase this man away because he had wasted much of the family’s wealth to buy drugs. His wife explained, “We have two lovely children. How can we bring them up properly?” She told me the long sorry tale, “We did everything to protect him from drug addiction. In the end, we failed, and can't do anything. Now, we are waiting for his death. His way of living is a great shame for our family.” His own mother didn't want him.

Understanding more of the story, the real situation, I took the man to a rehabilitation center. I occasionally visited him there, and asked others to visit him. He rallied somewhat. He was making progress in kicking his drug habit. Nevertheless, he eventually ran away from the rehabilitation center, and relapsed to his old ways. That was in 1989. Quite recently, I saw him lying on the ground near the Borella cemetery in Colombo. I got out of our car and briefly talked with him. The others in the car didn’t know the story of this man, and wondered, “Why is Loku Hamuduruwo talking with a beggar?”

Although I had thoughts of *mettā*, May this man be in comfort and a painless one, he remained the same. He did not become a painless one. He continued to suffer. My *mettā* didn't work. There are people and other types of beings living in situations where it is not possible to activate *mettā*. It won't happen. And when we are sure these beings will not become painless, we can only have a calm attitude towards them. Some beings will not be in comfort.

Even so, we must still develop our *mettā*. To do so, we choose one person. And using that person, we develop our *mettā* until our minds become calm. We must develop *mettā* up to the level of equanimity. And by developing *mettā*, our *karunā* will also develop and grow. *Muditā* correspondingly develops and grows, as does *upekkhā*. According to the way we practise, our minds develop *mettā*, *karunā*, *muditā*, and *upekkhā*. For those who have *mettā jhāna*, their minds are calm. They abide in equanimity.

The Fourth & Fifth Verse

Whatever living beings there may be — feeble or strong (or the seekers and the attained) long, stout, or of medium size, short, small, large.

*Those seen or those unseen, those dwelling far or near, those who are born as well as those yet to be born — may all beings have happy minds.*⁴

***Ye keci pāṇabhūṭ' atthi, tasā vā thāvarā vā anavasesā
Dīgha vā ye mahantā vā, majjhimā rassakā aṇukathulā***

***Diṭṭhā vā ye vā addiṭṭhā, ye ca dūre vasanti avidūre
Bhūṭā vā sambhavesī vā, sabbe sattā bhavantu sukhittā***⁵

Returning to the fourth verse, *ye keci pāṇa bhūtatthi*, translates as whatever beings available, and can be divided into two groups:

- *Pāṇa* - depending on this air
- *Bhūta* - not depending on this air

⁴ <https://www.accesstosight.org/tipitaka/kn/snp/snp.1.08.piya.html>

⁵ <https://docs.google.com/document/edit?id=1Qx7034JHizoZm31JZOnjo-QA2sFho2VmnOlw95SctqU&hl=en>

As right now we are depending on this air, we are in the *pāṇa* group. When in our mothers' wombs, we were in the *bhūta* group. Why? Because as fetuses, we did not breathe air. It was our mothers who transferred the necessary oxygen and nutrients to us. We were not depending on this air at that time in our lives. Beings in their eggs are also *bhūta*. *Devas* and *petas* are both *bhūtas*. There are beings deep inside the earth that don't use this air. They are also a type of *bhūta*. There are beings in the sea, at the bottom of the sea, that don't use this air. They are *bhūtas*. There are beings living inside volcanoes. Again, a type of *bhūta*. For an *arahat*, we can also use this word *bhūta*. Not according to the earlier explanation, with regards to air. He or she is *bhūta* in the way conditioned objects change for him or her. By dividing *satta* into these two, *pāṇa* and *bhūta*, we learn how the Lord Buddha thought.

David: What about killing? I try not to, but often it is impractical.

In the Outcaste Sutta, the Buddha states:

*Whoever here harms a living being, once-born or twice-born,
who has no sympathy for a living being: He should be known as 'outcaste.'*⁶

*Ekajaṃ va dvijaṃ vāpi yodha pāṇāni hiṃsati,
Yassa pāṇe dayā natthi taṃ jaññā vasalo iti.*⁷

The term *ekajaṃ* means one kind of form; *dvijaṃ* means having two kinds of form.⁸ Twice-born. Within one lifecycle the being changes form. For example, a butterfly starts its life as an egg. Its egg form is completely different than its larva form. And the larva form is different than its pupa form, which is again completely different than the adult butterfly. The same for frogs. We recognize all forms of all beings when practising the precept of not killing, *pāṇātipātā*. If we intentionally destroy any of the different forms of a being's life at all ~ say an egg or a caterpillar or a butterfly ~ doesn't matter, we are breaking that precept.

In this Buddha *Sāsana*, these two are boundless subjects of meditation:

- *Mettā*
- Buddha

Subject, *kammaṭṭhāna*.⁹ And object, *ārammaṇa*.¹⁰ *Mettā* is a boundless subject of meditation. *Mettā-bhāvanā* is more than saying, May all beings be in comfort and painless. *Mettā* is far more. Our minds are directed towards all *pāṇa* and *bhūta* beings, which are the objects of our attention, and they are unlimited in number. *Pāṇa* means those beings which inhale and exhale air. They depend on this air. *Bhūta* means beings which do not use air. When spreading *mettā* towards beings of these two all-inclusive groups, the practice moves from the everyday familiar to the subtlest of beings. *Mettā-bhāvanā* takes in an enormous range of beings. We see no end to these objects of *mettā*.

⁶ https://www.dhammadata.org/suttas/KN/StNp/StNp1_7.html#stnp_note1.7.02

⁷ https://grettil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/grettil/2_pali/1_tipit/2_sut/5_khudd/suttani.htm

⁸ Birds and reptiles count as "twice-born" in that the laying of an egg is the first birth, and the emergence of the chick or baby reptile from the egg is the second.

⁹ A subject of meditation, *kammaṭṭhāna*, can be understood as "occupations" in the sense of "things to occupy the mind" or "workplaces" in the sense of "places to focus the mind on during the work of meditation." Throughout his translation of the Visuddhimagga, Bhikkhu Nanamoli translates this term simply as "meditation subject." That working place would rather be the subject under which or on which different objects of work are being used. (Wikipedia)

¹⁰ A clear definition is seen in Ledi Sayadaw's The Patthanuddesa Dipani under the second causal condition Arammana-Paccaya. <https://mahajana.net/en/library/texts/the-patthanuddesa-dipani#Arammana>

Buddha is also a boundless subject of meditation. *Buddhānussati*. When recollecting Buddha's good qualities, the objects of our attention, it is difficult to find a stopping point. There is no limit to the depth of his good qualities.

U Jagara: Recollection of Buddha's qualities, *Buddhānussati*, is somehow also a boundless subject of meditation. I am adding "somehow" because the objects, qualities of the Buddha, are limited in number. In other words, though the depth of the Buddha's qualities is boundless and unlimited, the number of his qualities is bounded and limited.¹¹

David: Where do I start with *mettā* meditation?

In the initial stages of their practices, meditators use one of these two boundless subjects. *Mettā* or Buddha. And when properly developed, either of these will take meditators up to access level of concentration. Access level is just before entering *jhāna*. It is the necessary condition for proper *vipassanā*. For meditators who need to attain *jhānas*, are practising *samatha*, they can still do so through *mettā*. However, instead of spreading *mettā* towards a wide range of beings, these meditators must select one person right at the beginning, and on that one person develop *mettā*. They have to direct *mettā* towards only one person. Some meditators take death as a subject. *Maranānussati*. Others take the non-beautiful nature of body parts as a subject. *Asubhanussati*. *Asubha* means seeing the reality of pleasurable objects. Whichever subject or object is used by meditators, and whether they can or cannot enter *jhāna*, all subjects and objects of meditation support both *vipassanā* and *samatha*.

The Fourth & Fifth Verse

Whatever living beings there may be — feeble or strong (or the seekers and the attained) long, stout, or of medium size, short, small, large.

*Those seen or those unseen, those dwelling far or near, those who are born as well as those yet to be born — may all beings have happy minds.*¹²

***Ye keci pāṇabhūt' atthi, tasā vā thāvarā vā anavasesā
Dīgha vā ye mahantā vā, majjhimā rassakā aṇukathulā***

***Diṭṭhā vā ye vā addiṭṭhā, ye ca dūre vasanti avidūre
Bhūtā vā sambhavesī vā, sabbe sattā bhavantu sukhittā***¹³

In the utterance *tasā vā thāvarā vā*, the *pāṇa* and *bhūta* beings are again sub-divided:

- *Tasā* - subject to fear. Moveable. To be afraid.
- *Thāvara* - not subject to fear. Immoveable. No fear. It's another word for *arahat*.

Mettā meditation is developed through our physical actions, bodily actions, and mentally. We need not develop *mettā* on *arahats* because they don't have pain in their minds. Thus, there is no need to have the thought, May

¹¹ According to the traditional texts, qualities of the Buddha ~ accomplished, fully enlightened, endowed with clear vision and virtuous conduct, sublime, the knower of worlds, the incomparable leader of men to be tamed, the teacher of gods and men, enlightened, blessed.

¹² <https://www.accesstosight.org/tipitaka/kn/snp/snp.1.08.piya.html>

¹³ <https://docs.google.com/document/edit?id=1Qx7034JHizoZm31JZOnjo-QA2sFho2VmnOlw95SctqU&hl=en>

arahats be in no pain. All others have a little craziness within. To be an *arahat* means overcoming all kinds of craziness, and forms of mental illness. Even though sometimes we say we are free of weaknesses, we have our weaknesses. In *mettā* meditation, we try to understand our weaknesses.

U Jagara: You said those with no fear shall be the object of *mettā*. You also said *arahants* do not need our *mettā*, which is true. However, I think *arahants* should also be included as beings in our practices because *arahants* can still have pain in their bodies, due to hunger, sickness, etc. And so, by including them in our *mettā*, when we see them, we give them food and medicine, if needed. *Mettā* is also, to a great part, for our benefit! No one at all is left out. Mahasi Sayadaw interprets the practice of *mettā* in this way.

Beth: Can't argue with that. I've always believed that *Tasā* meant trembling. Not stable. And that *Thāvara* meant stable, and fearless, as in an *Arahant* whom is fully enlightened. Even in present day Sinhala, the word '*Sthaavara*' means stable, solid, unmoving etc. We use it in general contexts, and not only in descriptions of developed and evolved beings whom are spiritually stable and solid. Fearless.

Next word, *anavasesā*, means not any other beings remain. All the beings that are subject to fear and all the beings not subject to fear. For *all* of them, we think, May they not be in pain. Other than these two groups of beings, *tasa* and *thāvara*, there are no any other beings in the world. So, when we say *tasā vā thāvarā vā*, we are including all the beings in the world. Doesn't matter. I repeat, all the beings means *all* beings. Even if they belong to other religions that have a Creator God, as in Islam and Christianity, doesn't matter. All beings are included in this *tasā vā thāvarā vā* classification.

David: What about plant life? Trees and flowers?

Venerable Dhammarakkhita: They are not beings.

Without any remainder, we send *mettā* to all beings, whether they are subject to fear or not subject to fear.

Continuing, the next few words ~ *dīghā vā ye mahantā vā*. *Dīghā* means long and *mahantā* means big. There are long beings in the world, and there are big beings in the world. Here, the long beings are reptiles, cobras, pythons, and such. Elephants, whales, and this kind are big beings. For elephants, there are two words in *pāli*. *Haṭṭhi* refers to all kinds of elephants. And *nāga* is a colossal elephant. *Haṭṭhi-nāga* is a colossal elephant. Some elephants have tusks and some don't. Other classifications include, *majjhimā*, middle-sized beings, like oxen, cows, horses, and such. Then, *rassakānukathūlā*, where *rassaka* means short, very short beings. A monkey is a short being. *Anuka* means very small, very very small, not easy to see like ants. *Thūlā* means fat and round beings, such as pigs, turtles, and blowfish.

Next classification of beings, *diṭṭhā vā ye va addiṭṭhā*:

- *Diṭṭhā* - possible to see
- *Addiṭṭhā* - impossible to see

Then, *ye ca dūre vasanti avidūre*:

- *Dūra* - living far away
- *Avidūra* - living nearby

Yet another classification, *bhūtā vā sambhavesī vā*:

- *Sambhavesī* - will undergo a transformation

Sambhavesī means the being is going to be transformed. For example, the being inside an egg will undergo a transformation into a different form of being. And in the sense *bhūta* applies to an *arahat*, the term *sambhavesī* can apply to the person, *sekha*, who is very close to *arahatship*. He or she is going to be transformed, and thus counted also under *sambhavesī*. I say beings very close to *arahatship*, they also can be named *sambhavesī*.

Please explain.

This meaning of *sambhavesī* depends upon its context. For the beings inside eggs as well as beings inside wombs, since their sense faculties are not developed, they are *sambhavesī*. When their sense faculties are fully developed, then we call them *bhūta*. In our mothers' wombs, for the first few days of our lives, we didn't have any sense faculties. We were not developed, and were very small, shapeless masses of cells. These masses are identified as *sambhavesī*. And then we became *bhūta*, while still in our mothers' wombs. And then after our births, after leaving our mothers, with sense faculties developed, we became *pāna*. We are now *pāna*. We depend on air.

People sometimes scold one another, You dog! You ox! You mouse! In a way, it is reasonable to say so because whether it's a dog, an ox or a mouse, these are types of beings, and a human is also a being. Humans, dogs, oxen and mice are all the same.

George: It's strange, that some animals are recognized with a kind of certain quality. You know, you say, A dirty pig, or A stupid donkey. Where did it come from?

David: Pigs are very clean, and amazingly intelligent.

George: That's why I ask. A donkey is clever and pigs are not dirty, but everybody accepts this.

People put on these labels.

George: They project this label, which is absolutely out of the air. It's without base. Everybody is confused that it's like this.

The Buddha said there is nothing as varied as the mind, and so diverse as the animal world. The cockroach is one of the cleanest insects because apparently dirt doesn't touch its body.

George: It's an animal lotus.

We have attached the idea of dirty to cockroaches.

Venerable Dhammarakkhita: Because cockroaches are associated with dirty places. Also pigs are associated with dirty areas, and that's why we think they are dirty.

So, for all these various types of beings, we wish, May they be painless. *Sabbe sattā bhavantu sukhittā*. May all the beings be in comfort. *Sukhittā* means comfort, and happiness.

The Sixth Verse

***Let him not deceive another nor despise anyone anywhere.
In anger or ill will let him not wish another ill.***¹⁴

***Na paro param nikubbetha, nātimaññetha katthacinam kañci
Vyārosanā paṭighasaññā, nāññamaññassa dukkham iccheyya***¹⁵

Na paro param nikubbetha means, May nobody cheat another. May no one deceive another. If we deceive others, even animals, our *mettā* will not develop. Not only human beings, even if we deceive any type of being, it harms the development of *mettā*. In this world of ours today, deceiving others is a big problem. For their own advantage, many say things with the intention to deceive others.

With mothers and teachers, there is another side to deception:

- prevent children and students from unwholesome and harmful activities

Since mothers and teachers have the same job, their one main job, mothers and teachers sometimes tell white lies to their children and students. It's not for their own advantage, that mothers and teachers tell these not entirely true things to their children and students. On the contrary, the volition of mothers and teachers is to prevent children and students from unwholesomeness, and harm. If you look superficially at what mothers and teachers sometimes say to children and students, you might conclude mothers are wrongly deceiving their children, and teachers are wrongly deceiving their students.

One day, my mother deceived me. On my way out of the house, she asked, "Where are you going? Today, I have to go out. Please stay home." I thought, "Mother normally doesn't tell me to stay home. She really must be going out somewhere. I should stay home." So, I was waiting and waiting for mother to go out, but she didn't go out! Later, when it was well past the time I had intended on going out, I canceled my plans. I then asked, "Mother, you said you were going out. Why didn't you go out? Why?" Mother only said, "I did not feel like going out today."

I later concluded that mother must have thought, "If my son goes out with the other boys today, he will face problems and difficulties. Possibly harm. He will surely get into trouble." By mother telling this white lie to me, I didn't get into trouble. There was no unwholesomeness in the mind of mother. There was only *mettā* in her mind. Similarly, when any mother or teacher says these near-truths to their children and students, there is no unwholesomeness in their minds. There is only *mettā*.

The Sixth Verse

***Let him not deceive another nor despise anyone anywhere.
In anger or ill will let him not wish another ill.***¹⁶

¹⁴ <https://www.accesstosight.org/tipitaka/kn/snp/snp.1.08.piya.html>

¹⁵ <https://docs.google.com/document/edit?id=1Qx7034JHizoZm31JZOnjo-QA2sFho2VmnOlw95SctqU&hl=en>

***Na paro paraṃ nikubbetha, nātimaññetha katthacinaṃ kañci
Vyārosanā paṭighasaññā, nāññamaññassa dukkham iccheyya***¹⁷

Nāti maññetha katthaci naṃ kañci means, May none look down upon another. We must think that *all* are our people. Everyone. There is none of this separation into these are my people, and those are your people. Or, they are not my people. No, we must not think in that way the least bit. *All* are our people. Wherever we go, whomever we meet, we do not look down upon others.

We will continue tomorrow.

Vyārosanā paṭighasaññā, nāññamaññassa dukkham iccheyya. Whether physically or vocally or mentally, May we never think to give pain to another.

Teruwan Saranayi

¹⁶ <https://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/kn/snp/snp.1.08.piya.html>

¹⁷ <https://docs.google.com/document/edit?id=1Qx7034JHizoZm31JZOnjo-QA2sFho2VmnOlw95SctqU&hl=en>