

## **Transcript of the oral commentary by Khen Rinpoche Geshe Chonyi on Maitreya's *Sublime Continuum of the Mahayana, Chapter One: The Tathagata Essence***

**Root verses** from *The Tathagata Essence: Great Vehicle Treatise on the Sublime Continuum Differentiating the Lineage of the Three Jewels (mahayanottaratantra-ratnagotravibhanga)* by Maitreya, translation Jeffrey Hopkins and Joe B. Wilson, Draft, January 2007, © Hopkins and Wilson, with permission for use in FPMT Basic Programs.

Oral commentary based on Gyaltsab Je's Commentary to the First Chapter, translated by Gavin Kilty (*The Tathagata Essence, Commentary to the First Chapter* by Gyaltsap Darma Rinchen © FPMT, Inc. January 2007).

### **Lesson 9**

**12 March 2015**

---

Review of verse from the *Vajra Cutter Sutra*: "A star." "A visual aberration." Chapter One: *The Essence of a One Gone Thus*. Verse 21: Only the Buddha is the final object of refuge.

---

### **REVIEW OF VERSE FROM VAJRA CUTTER SUTRA**

In the last lesson, I briefly explained the meaning of the verse from the *Vajra Cutter Sutra*:

A star, a visual aberration, a flame of a lamp,  
An illusion, a drop of dew, or a bubble,  
A dream, a flash of lightning, a cloud –  
See conditioned things as such!

#### *Analogy of "a star"*

"A star" is analogous of how any chosen existing phenomenon (1) possesses the nature of emptiness and (2) is a mere appearance. These two characteristics can be found together on any one chosen basis.

- The empty nature of that phenomenon—its emptiness—is an ultimate truth.
- The phenomenon itself—its mere appearance—is a conventional truth (obscurational truth or concealer truth).

So although there are stars up in the sky in the daytime, we do not see them. What appears to us is just space or vacuity. Likewise, from the perspective of the meditative equipoise of the wisdom directly perceiving emptiness, what appears to this wisdom is this mere vacuity, the space-like emptiness. The emptiness here is the emptiness of inherent existence, inherent existence being the object of negation. So it is said that nothing else appears to such a wisdom except this emptiness.

From the perspective of the meditative equipoise of the wisdom directly realising emptiness, *only* emptiness appears and conventional phenomena do not appear and are not seen. But this is not the same as saying that this particular wisdom sees the non-existence of conventional phenomena.

In the perspective of this meditative equipoise directly realising emptiness, nothing appears except emptiness.

It is said also that such a wisdom is a mind of non-duality, a mind whereby all dualistic appearances have subsided.

- Here the subsidence of dualistic appearances means the absence or non-existence of the object of negation.
- Non-duality means that conventional phenomena do not appear.
- It also means that experientially there isn't this feeling of an object that is realised being over there and the mind realising it being over here. There isn't that sense of duality. It is said that experientially this meditative equipoise directly realising emptiness is like water mixed with water. Experientially the mind is merged in oneness with the object it realises, emptiness. There is no duality of subject and object.

*The analogy of "a visual aberration"*

The meditative equipoise directly perceiving emptiness is said to be an unmistakable mind because it is not polluted by the apprehension of true existence.

One arises from the meditative equipoise directly perceiving emptiness into the post-meditative equipoise. The wisdom of post-meditative equipoise, or more specifically, the wisdom of subsequent attainment, is said to be polluted by the apprehension of true existence.

Conventional phenomena appears to this wisdom of subsequent attainment, and because this wisdom of subsequent attainment is polluted by the apprehension of true existence, whatever appears to this wisdom appears to exist from its own side and established by its own nature.

Let us take the example of a conventional valid cogniser, this wisdom of subsequent attainment:

- Does the person appear to such a mind? Yes, the person appears to such a mind.
- How does a person appear to such a mind? The person appears to exist truly.

The person exists because the person appears to such a mind. We must be able to posit the existence of a person. This is something that we need to analyse and to think about for ourselves: There is the appearance of a person and there is the appearance of a truly existent person.

If we look at this from the perspective of the Mind Only School, in relation to their explanation of imprints or predispositions, when one arises from meditative equipoise into post-meditative equipoise, the person appears. This person appears through the force of past familiarity with the object itself, the person. That particular

imprint is responsible for the appearance of the person.

How then do we account for the appearance of a truly existent person? That is due to the force of the seed, the apprehension of true existence.

If we talk about the person as the main object, although the person appears to the mind, the person can appear in many different ways:

- The person in question can appear to the mind to be permanent.
- The same person can also appear to the mind to be established as self-sufficient.
- The person can also appear to be truly existent.
- To some minds, the person appears just as a person; nothing more, nothing less.

So there are a whole range of possibilities as to how a person can appear to the mind. This is due to different imprints. Because of these different imprints or predispositions, therefore you have these different appearances. That factor of appearance in relation to a person means that the person exists. A person appearing as a person means that there is a person there. If there is a person, then somehow, one must be able to account for the existence of the person and posit how that is the case. This can be complicated.

If something exists in the way it appears, then that mind must be a valid cogniser. In the case of the mind to which a person appears as he is, then that mind is a valid cogniser.

But it is *not* the case that whatever appears is necessarily an accurate representation or depiction of its actual status. For example, if a person appears to be truly existent—although to the mind, there is an appearance of a truly existent person—that does not mean that the person *is* truly existent. There is a disparity between reality and appearance. So the mind that has this appearance of a truly existent person cannot be considered to be a valid cogniser.

Let's return to the wisdom of subsequent attainment or the wisdom of post-meditative equipoise. For the practitioner who has a direct perception of emptiness, when he arises from his meditative equipoise, because his wisdom of subsequent attainment or wisdom of post-meditative equipoise is polluted by the apprehension of true existence, as such, whatever appears always appears to be truly existent.

But that doesn't mean that this person who has already realised emptiness directly *believes* that things are truly existent. Yes, conventional phenomena still appears to be truly existent, but this person who has already realised emptiness directly does *not* believe that things exist truly even though they appear to exist truly. This person doesn't believe that anymore.

*Student:* I thought that the apprehension of or grasping at true existence means that even though there is the appearance of true existence, there is also a level of believing in and assenting to this appearance.

*Khen Rinpoche:* I'm not sure. I don't know so I am going to repeat again.

When the person who has realised emptiness directly arises from his meditative

equipoise, he arises into post-meditative equipoise. That mind is called the wisdom of subsequent attainment and is polluted by the predisposition of ignorance. As such, this wisdom of subsequent attainment is a mistaken consciousness. It is still a valid cogniser according to the proponents of the Consequence Middle Way School. Since most of you have already studied the topic, Mind and Awareness, there should not be any confusion that a mistaken mind can be a valid cogniser. It is like waking up.

The person appears as a person to this wisdom of subsequent attainment. This wisdom of subsequent attainment realises the person:

- If you were asked, “Does the person appear to be truly existent to this mind?” you have to say yes. The person does appear to be truly existent to this mind.
- But does this mind grasp at or apprehend that person to be truly existent? The answer is no. This mind perceives the person as illusory, i.e., like an illusion.
- Although the person appears to be truly existent to this mind, does the person exist in the way it appears, i.e., is the person truly existent? No, because the person is just mere appearance.

I think we can just leave it at that.

*Khen Rinpoche: Otherwise, there are more complications. Is it clear? If you understand the meaning, then that is OK.*

For ordinary folks like us who have yet to realise emptiness, do we realise the person? Are there minds in our continuum that realise a person? You have to say yes. This is quite straightforward because we do have valid states of mind or valid cognisers that realise food, realise a car and so forth. We have valid states of mind that realise earth, fire, wind and water.

When we think of a person, we realise the person, but in the perspective of this mind, the person appears to be truly existent, and not only that, we believe the person *is* truly existent. We have to think about this: While we say we realise a person, yet at the same time, we apprehend the person to be truly existent. These two cannot be the same mind, which means that:

- there is a mind that grasps at or apprehends the person to be truly existent
- there is a mind that realises the person as a person; nothing more, nothing less.

There is a mind that realises the person, but if this mind is also apprehending the person to be truly existent, that would make this mind ignorance, i.e. referring to the apprehension of true existence. Then it cannot be a valid cogniser.

For us ordinary folks:

- Whatever appears, including the person, appears to be truly existent.
- Not only that, we assent to that appearance, i.e., we believe that the person is truly existent and that it exists in the way it appears.

For us, it is like that.

Although the person *appears* to be truly existent, the person does *not* exist as a truly existent person. There is no truly existent person. This appearance of a truly existent

person is just a mental construct, an appearance to the mind. It is not an accurate reflection of reality, for in reality, there isn't a truly existent person. Although there is an appearance of a truly existent person but in reality, there is no truly existent person. The analogy of "a visual aberration" is used to illustrate this.

It is said that a person does not exist truly. Although whatever appears, including the person, appears to us to be truly existent, inherently existent and existing right there from its own side, such a person does not exist in reality. If in reality there is such a truly existent person, if the person exists truly in the way it appears, then it must be found by a mind distinguishing the ultimate.

The person appears to us to be truly existent. If that is an accurate depiction of reality—meaning that there is really a truly existent person and that there is no disparity between appearance and reality—this means that factor of true existence must be the final mode of abiding of the person, his ultimate and deepest nature. If it is the truth, that means there is no disparity. It exists in the way it appears. If that is the case, then true existence must be its final mode of being. If that is the case, then it must be found by the valid cogniser distinguishing the ultimate.

With regard to the analogy of "a visual aberration," the text describes this appearance of falling hairs. To a person who has a certain impairment to his eyes, he may have the vision of seeing falling hairs. The appearance of falling hairs appears to this particular mind.

In reality, is there such a thing as falling hairs? No. In reality, there is no such thing. If falling hairs are an accurate reflection of reality, everyone would be seeing them, even those people who have no problems with their eyesight. If falling hairs exist, they must be seen and realised. But most people do not see falling hairs. Only people who have problems with their eyes have such a vision. This is an analogy showing that things do not exist in the way they appear.

The analogy of "a visual aberration" is used to illustrate the point that although phenomena appear to be truly existent, truly existent phenomena do not exist at all.

*Question:* You mentioned that the mind that arises from meditative equipoise sees the person as an illusion. During meditative equipoise, the bodhisattva meditates on the space-like emptiness. Does that mean that when he arises from meditative equipoise, that emptiness also becomes an illusion in post-meditative equipoise?

*Answer:* For the person who has realised emptiness directly, when he arises from that meditative equipoise, all phenomena appear as illusory, not illusions but like illusions.

~~~~~

Verse 21 says that the Buddha is, "Ultimately refuge of transmigrators" or all sentient beings. The Dharma Jewel and the Sangha Jewel are just temporary objects of refuge.

## Verse 21

Ultimately the refuge of transmigrators  
Is just the sole Buddha,  
Because the Subduer has the Body of Doctrine [and thus is the  
doctrine]  
And because [a Buddha] is the finality of the Community.

In the last lesson, we saw how all sentient beings, including the bodhisattva superior in his last moment as a sentient being, are not posited as the final objects of refuge. They have yet to become final objects of refuge because they have yet to attain the ultimate or final achievement, and for them, there is still something more to be achieved.

Having said that, this raises a qualm or doubt. Do you see what this doubt could be?

*Khen Rinpoche: Can you guess what could be the doubt?*

The last line of Verse 21 is the answer to the doubt. What then is the doubt? It says here, “And because [a Buddha] is the finality of the Community.” That is the answer to the doubt.

The question now is, “Are you all thinking?”

*Student 1:* How can the Sangha be an object of refuge at all if they are only a temporary and not the final object of refuge?

*Student 2:* The text said the Sangha community has not overcome the obscurations to omniscience so they cannot be the final objects of refuge.

*Khen Rinpoche:* There is no need to doubt what you are taking refuge in because it is posited right from the beginning that we go for refuge to the Buddha, Dharma and Sangha. When we talk about the objects of refuge, we can talk about the ultimate Buddha Jewel, the ultimate Dharma Jewel, the ultimate Sangha Jewel, the conventional Buddha Jewel, the conventional Dharma Jewel and the conventional Sangha Jewel. That is quite clear. They are all suitable to be our objects of refuge.

Having said that, we have also said that the Dharma Jewel and the Sangha Jewel are temporary objects of refuge and that only the Buddha Jewel is the final object of refuge. That is clear. So the doubt cannot pertain to this point.

*Student 2:* This is where the doubt comes in. We may as well just take refuge in the Buddha Jewel since that is the final object of refuge and we do not need to take refuge in the Three Jewels.

*Student 3:* You said that the Buddha Jewel is the final refuge and that the Sangha Jewel is a temporary refuge object. Then later you said that the Buddha is the finality of the Community, which means the Buddha Jewel is also the Sangha Jewel. So the Sangha Jewel is not a temporary refuge object. There is no pervasion to say that a Sangha Jewel is necessarily a temporary refuge object.

*Khen Rinpoche: That is true. There is no pervasion if we were to say that.*

*Student 3: I thought that was the doubt.*

In the last class, we saw how the Dharma Jewel—true paths and true cessations— is a temporary object of refuge. It is not final. We have already explained why that is the case. The arhats who are the Sangha Jewel and who have achieved the nirvana with remainder are also not the final objects of refuge. Only the Buddha is the final object of refuge.

The doubt is this: If only the Buddha is the final object of refuge, does this mean that there is no final Dharma Jewel and no final Sangha Jewel? The last line of Verse 21 is the answer. Is it not the case that the bodhisattva existing in his last moment as a sentient being all the way everyone who is below him in the level of achievement, can still achieve the dharmakaya? The meaning then is that there is a final Dharma Jewel and there is a final Sangha Jewel.

Yes, only the Buddha is the final object of refuge but there is a final Dharma Jewel and there is a final Sangha Jewel. The final Dharma Jewel is the true paths and true cessations in the continuum of a buddha superior and an example of the final Sangha Jewel is the buddha superior. In general, that is what we call the three final objects of refuge: the final Buddha Jewel, the final Dharma Jewel and the final Sangha Jewel. They are all buddhas.

If we talk about the Buddha, Dharma and Sangha in general, then of course only the Buddha is the final object of refuge, not the Dharma and not the Sangha.

If somebody were to ask you, “Is the Sangha Jewel the final object of refuge or a temporary object of refuge?” you would have to say that it is a temporary object of refuge. If somebody were to ask you a similar question relating to the Dharma Jewel, you would also have to say, “It is a temporary and not the final object of refuge.”

It depends on how the question is asked. If somebody were to ask you, “Is the Dharma Jewel necessarily a temporary object of refuge?” then what would you say? Yes or no?

(Student’s response is inaudible).

*Khen Rinpoche: Are you sure?*

Doesn’t the Dharma Jewel exist on the buddha ground?

*Khen Rinpoche: This is the second question that people will ask.*

If you say that it is a temporary object of refuge, people may say, “I see. Therefore, on the buddha ground, there is no Dharma Jewel?”

Does sentient beings exist on the buddha ground?

It depends on how the question is asked.

The Dharma Jewel encompasses many things. There is a common locus of the Dharma Jewel and a temporary object of refuge but there is also a common locus of the Dharma Jewel and an ultimate object of refuge. But if one was asked, “So is the Dharma Jewel a temporary object of refuge or an ultimate object of refuge?” what would you say? The answer is, “The Dharma Jewel is a conventional object of refuge.” You have to say that.

If we were to adopt the viewpoint of the Prasangikas, is there something that is all three objects of refuge? The three final objects of refuge obviously exist but now, the question is: Is there something that is all three final objects of refuge?

*Khen Rinpoche: Someone come up and explain this. Whoever says yes, give an example, then explain.*

Is there something that is all three final objects of refuge? You have to posit an illustration.

*Student 4: Is it the guru, the spiritual teacher?*

*Student 5: The Buddha is all the three objects of refuge.*

*Khen Rinpoche: Your reason for saying this?*

The Buddha is a very convenient answer. It covers a lot of things. Why is the Buddha the final Buddha Jewel? Why is the Buddha the final Dharma Jewel? Why is the Buddha the final Sangha Jewel? You need to explain why and, if it exists, you must have an illustration.

Is Buddha a permanent or impermanent phenomenon?

*Student 5: Permanent.*

*Khen Rinpoche: How can something that is permanent be a Sangha Jewel?*

*Student 5: If Buddha is permanent, he cannot be the three final objects of refuge?*

*Khen Rinpoche: How could he be a Sangha Jewel?*

*Student 5: If I were to say that Buddha is impermanent, then what is the problem?*

*Khen Rinpoche: Why do you think Buddha is impermanent?*

*Student 5: A buddha has four bodies. The true paths and true cessations in the mental continuum of a buddha is the final doctrine. Therefore, it is the final Dharma Jewel. The buddha superior, being the emanation body and enjoyment body, is the final Sangha Jewel. Therefore, Buddha is the three final objects of refuge.*



*Khen Rinpoche:* Is Buddha the wisdom truth body?

*Student 5:* No.

*Khen Rinpoche:* The answer is yes because you have asserted the Buddha possesses the four bodies.

*Khen Rinpoche:* You are the one who gave the pervasion.

*Student 6:* Buddha listening to the Dharma so there is no room for deception. Buddha is the Sangha community because he has no fear. And Buddha is Buddha.

The Buddha imparted the Dharma to Buddha so there is no room for deception. He is teaching the Dharma to himself as opposed to other sentient beings. So the Dharma is the ultimate refuge

If he teaches the Dharma to sentient beings, the Dharma cannot be the ultimate refuge because there is room for sentient beings to have deception. They can misunderstand the Dharma but the Buddha himself cannot misunderstand what he is teaching.

*Khen Rinpoche:* The term, 'Buddha,' covers many things. The buddha superior— for example, our kind founder, Guru Shakyamuni Buddha who taught the Dharma— is not the Dharma Jewel.

Shakyamuni Buddha is not a Dharma Jewel. Our kind founder, Guru Shakyamuni Buddha, is a Sangha Jewel. Why is he a Sangha Jewel? Because he is a superior.

Shakyamuni Buddha is not a Dharma Jewel because, in order to be a Dharma Jewel, that would have to be either true paths or true cessations, neither of which is Shakyamuni Buddha.

- A Dharma Jewel is necessarily either true paths and/or true cessations.
- A Sangha Jewel is necessarily a superior.

So the word, 'Buddha,' encompasses many things. If we were to say, "a buddha superior like Shakyamuni Buddha," then it is clear that Shakyamuni Buddha is a Sangha Jewel, not a Dharma Jewel. There is no difference between Buddha and Buddha Jewel.

Back to my question: Is there something that is all three objects of refuge?

I think this is not the first time that this question has been raised. It was raised already a while ago. Sometimes, you may mistakenly think that you have learnt or you know something, but when you face a question like this, then your knowledge is suddenly gone and you can't answer the question.

*Question:* In terms of the functions of the final Buddha Jewel, final Dharma Jewel and final Sangha Jewel, can we say that for the final Buddha Jewel, it is blessings; for the

final Dharma Jewel, it is the attainment; and for the final Sangha Jewel, it is the enlightened activities or influences? What is the difference in terms of the function of the final Buddha Jewel and the final Sangha Jewel?

*Answer:* When we talk about being a buddha, buddhahood is often described as an existence or state that is attained when the afflictive obscurations and knowledge obscurations are abandoned.

When these two obscurations are abandoned, what is actualised or manifested? What is actualised is true paths and true cessations, the dharmakaya.

When the dharmakaya is actualised, we talk about the two purities. When we talk about the nature body, there is:

- The naturally pure nature body
- The adventitious pure nature body

These are essentially the final true cessations.

The wisdom truth body is the final true paths.

In the seven vajra topics, the fifth is enlightenment, followed by qualities and Buddha activities.

- Enlightenment here refers to Buddha.
- Qualities refer to the qualities of the factor of natural purity and factor of adventitious purity. These two factors of purity are the description and explanation of true cessations respectively.

Qualities also refer to the knowledge of the mode of phenomena and knowledge of the diversity of phenomena. These two knowledges are related to true paths.

If you think about what we have discussed so far, the essential point is that qualities here are referring to the final Dharma Jewel.

- I would think that the last vajra topic, Buddha activities, is talking about the Sangha Jewel.

Of all the Buddha's enlightened activities, the principal enlightened activity is that of his speech that reveals the teachings to sentient beings. This is done primarily through the two form bodies—the complete enjoyment body and the supreme emanation body— that are the final Sangha Jewel.

The final Dharma Jewel does not reveal the Dharma, so to speak. Qualities here relate to true paths and true cessations. When the dharmakaya is actualised, then one performs Buddha activities, i.e., primarily, revealing the teachings to sentient beings by emanating bodies such as the supreme emanation body or the complete enjoyment body.

So I guess the vajra topic of qualities is referring to the final Dharma Jewel and the last vajra topic, Buddha activities, is referring to the final Sangha Jewel.

I ask questions only because I assume that they are useful for you to think about. I guess the questions are useful for some people. Otherwise, I don't have to ask them.

We have already discussed the final Three Jewels. Now the question is this: Is there a buddha that is not any of the four bodies?

If you have no answer for me, then you can ask me questions. If it makes a difference for me to ask you questions, if it helps you to think, then it is well and good. Otherwise, we don't have to do this.

*Khen Rinpoche: Is it helpful for me to ask questions or not? Yes or no?*

*We are all learning. I myself am learning and so are you. Nobody is perfect. When you say something, there must be some reasons behind what you say. Also you cannot just stop there. You have to try and go three or four levels deeper.*

*Question: Is there Buddha that is not any of the four bodies?*

*Student 5: It sounds similar to the example of the subsequent cogniser that is none of the four? I just can't remember how it works.*

So this answer will be the Buddha. There is Buddha that is neither of the four.

*Khen Rinpoche: Buddha encompasses many things. Can you do better than that? We are not saying whether your answer is right or wrong.*

What about the Buddha's crown protrusion? Is the Buddha's crown protrusion Buddha? Is it the dharmakaya? Is the Buddha's hand Buddha?

It is evident that you have forgotten your tenets. Only the proponents of the Great Exposition School (GES) would say no to those questions. Everyone else says yes.

Buddha's form body is Buddha but the proponents of the GES assert that Buddha's form aggregate is not Buddha. But the Sutra School says yes. But the Sutra school is Hinayana tenets, not Mahayana tenets.

What would the Mahayana tenets say? They would say yes. The Buddha's form aggregate is Buddha. No, Prasangikas would say that the Buddha's form body is not Buddha. If that is the case, there is no doubt that Buddha's hand is Buddha. You must not think that the word 'Buddha' only refers to a specific buddha. The word 'Buddha' means many things.

The whole idea of what a buddha is can be explained by the two bodies: the truth body and the form body. As such, a buddha does not necessarily refer to a person nor does it necessarily refers to a form since you have to account for the truth bodies

So is the Buddha’s hand buddha? Can you find an example of a buddha that is not any of the four bodies? Among the four bodies, which one is the Buddha’s hand? The whole form body is only the Buddha’s hand?

| <b>A person who has the direct perception of emptiness</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| During meditative equipoise                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | In post-meditative equipoise                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To the wisdom directly realising emptiness, only emptiness appears.</li> <li>• Conventional phenomena do not appear but this does mean that this wisdom sees the non-existence of conventional phenomena.</li> <li>• This wisdom is a mind of non-duality where all dualistic appearances have subsided.</li> <li>• Experientially, it is like water mixed with water as this mind is merged in oneness with the object it realises, that is, emptiness. There is no duality of subject and object.</li> <li>• The meditative equipoise directly perceiving emptiness is an unmistakable mind because it is not polluted by the apprehension of true existence.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To the wisdom of subsequent attainment, whatever appears always appears to be truly existent because the wisdom of subsequent attainment is polluted by the apprehension of true existence.</li> <li>• However, he does not <i>believe</i> that things exist truly.</li> <li>• Although conventional phenomena appear to exist truly, they do not exist as they appear because they are mere appearances.</li> <li>• The mind is polluted by the predisposition of ignorance. As such, that mind is a mistaken consciousness.</li> </ul> |

Fourth vajra topic: Enlightenment

- Buddhahood is a state that is attained when the afflictive obscurations and knowledge obscurations are abandoned. When these two obscurations are abandoned, what is actualised is true paths and true cessations, the dharmakaya or the truth body.
- When the dharmakaya is actualised, we talk about the two purities.
- The nature body, the final true cessations, is defined as a final state endowed with the two purities:
  - The naturally pure nature body
  - The adventitious pure nature body
- The wisdom truth body is the final true paths.

Fifth vajra topic: Qualities

- Qualities refer to the qualities of the factor of natural purity and factor of adventitious purity, which are the description and explanation of true cessations.
- It also refers to the knowledge of the mode of phenomena and knowledge of the diversity of phenomena, which are related to true paths.
- Qualities refer to the final Dharma Jewel.

Sixth vajra topic: Buddha activities

Of Buddha activities, the principal enlightened activity is that of speech, revealing the teachings to sentient beings, which is done through the two form bodies—the complete enjoyment body and the supreme emanation body—which are the final Sangha Jewel.

The final Dharma Jewel does not reveal the Dharma. Qualities here relate to true paths and true cessations. When the dharmakaya is actualised, then one performs primarily the activity of revealing the teachings to sentient beings by emanating bodies like the supreme emanation body or the complete enjoyment body.

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