
Shantideva's Bodhisattvacharyavatara

༄༅། །བྱང་ཆུབ་སེམས་དཔའི་རྒྱུད་པ་ལ་འཇུག་པ་བརྒྱལ་སོ།།

Commentary by the Venerable Geshe Doga

Translated by the Venerable Michael Lobsang Yeshe

21 February 2017

Based on the motivation we generated during the refuge and bodhicitta prayers, we can now engage in our regular meditation practice. [*Meditation*]

We can now generate the bodhicitta motivation for receiving the teachings along these lines: "For the sake of all mother sentient beings, I need to achieve enlightenment. So, for that purpose, I'll engage in listening to the Mahayana teachings, and then put them into practice well."

As I've mentioned previously, the meditation practice we engaged in earlier – the *tong-len*, or giving and taking practice – is a core bodhisattva practice that particularly encompasses the practice of the superior intention stage of the sevenfold cause and effect sequence for developing bodhicitta.

Therefore, we need to really keep this practice in our heart, not only during meditation times, but throughout our lives, as a way to further encourage our development of love and compassion.

We all have the potential to develop love and compassion. Not only do we have this potential, but we also have an understanding from the teachings of how important it is to develop love and compassion.

If we put this understanding aside and start questioning what kind of practice or meditation we are meant to be doing, then we are completely missing the point. We need to actually engage in the practices for developing love and compassion. Although we may not develop these qualities right away, through familiarity, we can definitely achieve significant results. Through familiarity with practices such as the *tong-len*, we will see a transformation taking place. It is important that we keep this in mind.

2.3.2. Explaining extensively the reasoning that establishes the selflessness of phenomena

2.3.2.1. EXPLAINING THE SELFLESSNESS OF PHENOMENA BY WAY OF THE FOUR CLOSE PLACEMENTS BY MINDFULNESS (CONT.)

2.3.2.1.3. The close placement by mindfulness on the mind

Under the major heading of the four close contemplations, we have covered the close contemplation on the body and the close contemplation on feelings. Now we will cover the close contemplation on the mind.

The earlier subdivisions analysed, firstly, the close contemplation on the non-inherent existence of the body, and secondly, the close contemplation on the non-inherent existence of feelings. Similarly, here, the close contemplation on mind is the close contemplation of the non-inherent existence of the mind.

This section is further subdivided into two:

2.3.2.1.3.1. Showing that mental consciousness does not exist inherently

2.3.2.1.3.2. Showing that preceding sense consciousness does not exist inherently

Although I've explained this previously I will give a brief explanation of what 'mind' is according to the texts. In the texts on mind and awareness, the Tibetan terms *sem*, *yi* and *nam-shay* which translate in English as 'mind', 'intellect' and 'consciousness', are said to be synonymous and refer to the same entity.

There are six primary (or main) minds or consciousnesses. They are called 'primary' in relation to their functionality. The mental factors are referred to as secondary minds; again, the term 'secondary' is in relation to their functionality. A primary mind or consciousness, serves as the primary factor that cognises the object on which it is focused; it does the primary engagement with the object. The accompanying mental factors or secondary minds, on the other hand, relate to the particular characteristics of the perceived object.

The analogy of the different functionalities or roles of a king and his ministers are used in the teachings to illustrate the difference between the primary mind and the mental factors. In this country, we might use the analogy of the roles of Prime Minister and the ministers. The main point of the analogy is to illustrate how a primary mind or consciousness perceives the mere identity of the object, while the mental factors perceive the particular characteristics of the object – such as the colour, shape and size of a visual object.

There is further explanation on how the primary minds and mental factors are synonymous and arise at the same time. Particular mental factors, such as the omnipresent mental factors, arise at the same time as the primary minds. The difference however is that when the mental factors perceive an object, they don't do so out of their own power. They can only perceive an object in relation to a primary mind, but not from their own accord or by their [needs to be checked as it appears it is referring to the object's own power, not the secondary mind's. Was this intended?] own power. On the other hand primary consciousnesses perceive an object through their own power. So, that is another feature to understand about the mind.

I've explained all of this in detail previously, particularly when we went through the text on Buddhist tenets.

We should note here that the Vaibhashika Buddhist school asserts that main minds and mental factors – or secondary minds – arise simultaneously. The Vaibhashikas assert a unique presentation of a simultaneous arising of cause and effect. While causes and effects are not generally simultaneous, the Vaibhashikas assert that mind and mental factors are simultaneous as well as being causes and effects. So they have this unique presentation of mind and mental factors.

It is good to relate to such explanations as a way of sharpening our reasoning. The reason why the Vaibhashikas say that secondary minds are the effects of a primary mind is that there has to be a primary factor which comes first. They assert that the primary mind

comes first, followed by the secondary mind. This is asserted as cause and effect.

However, mind and mental factors are also said to be simultaneous in relation to the five omnipresent mental factors. The latter are secondary minds that are always present with the primary minds, and thus arise at the same time as the primary mind when it perceives an object.

The Tibetan term for a secondary mind is *sem-jhung* and the Vaibhashikas seem to take that term literally. The literal connotation of *sem-jhung* is 'arising or originating from the mind'. When you take literal meaning of the term in that way, then it implies that a secondary mind arises or originates from a mind that previously existed.

Again, I will not spend too much time on this, as it has already been presented previously and you can do your own research. Understanding mind and mental factors is an essential aspect of Buddhist psychology, as it is a way to understand the function of our mind.

The five omnipresent mental factors – feeling, intention, contact, attention and discrimination – are said to be always present whenever a main mind functions. There is always an associated feeling when an object is perceived by a primary mind, as well as an intention and so forth. Many of you would be aware from previous teachings that the actual definition of karma is intention. We create karma based on the intention at the time of an action. Whenever we engage an object, it is the intention that drives us towards that engagement. When we talk about creating karma, what part of us actually creates it? It is our intention. This has how we need to understand karma on a deeper level.

In relation to omnipresent mental factors, whenever we perceive an object, there is a feeling that arises simultaneously in relation to perceiving that object. As we engage with the object, we are also creating karma, and whether the karma is virtuous or non-virtuous depends on the intention. So, whenever we engage in any object, karma is involved. Discrimination, which perceives the particular characteristics of an object, along with attention and the other omnipresent mental factors, all occur at the same time.

These are important topics to really remember and understand well. Thanks to Margie for remembering the list of the five omnipresent mental factors. That goes to show you've kept them in mind. I'm hoping Margie was speaking on behalf of others who have already studied it. Although Margie doesn't assume an air of knowing much, she actually does remember things well. Whereas there might be others who presume they know a great deal, but I'm not sure how much they would actually remember!

2.3.2.1.3.1. Showing that mental consciousness does not exist inherently

102. *Mind does not abide in the sense powers,
Not on form, and also not in-between,
There is also no mind inside or outside,
And it is also not found elsewhere.*
103. *It is not the body; it does not exist separately,
It does not mix and it also does not stand
alone.*

*Because of not existing in the slightest,
therefore
Sentient beings are naturally gone beyond
misery.*

The commentary presents the meaning of these verses as follows:

Mind does not exist inherently because it does not abide inherently on the six sense powers; it does not abide inherently on the six objects of form, sound, scents, tastes, tactile sensations and objects of mental consciousness, and it also does not abide in between these two or on the collection of these two. Remember the seven-fold analysis of the chariot as explained in the *Introduction to the Middle Way*.

The mind also does not abide inherently in the internally elaborated

person labelled by the non-Buddhists, not on the outer hands and other limbs, and it cannot be found to abide inherently in another way apart from the inside and outside. It is not the body or truly something else other than the body, the mind is not mixed with the body, and it also does not abide as some inherent object apart from the body. Because it does not exist inherently in the slightest way, the emptiness of inherent existence of the mind is naturally gone beyond sorrow.

The explanation starts with the statement *mind does not exist inherently*, followed by the reason. One needs to remember that this does not mean that the mind does not exist at all. Of course the mind, intellect or consciousness does exist, but the point being emphasised here is that it does not exist inherently.

According to the Prasangika Madhyamika or Middle Way School, the mind does not exist inherently, truly or substantially. While some lower Buddhist schools will not assert a truly existent mind, all lower Buddhist schools accept that the mind does exist inherently. So, the unique feature of the Prasangika system is the assertion that mind does not exist inherently.

According to the Prasangika, the main reason for the lack of inherent existence of the mind is that the mind does not exist without depending on an imputation; it does not exist in and of itself, independently, without depending on a label.

By contrast, the lower Buddhist schools would say that if you investigate and don't find anything through your investigation, then that would imply the object does not exist at all. So according to them since it can be found through investigation, it exists inherently.

However, the Prasangika go further, arguing that the lack of inherent existence is not only dependent on whether or not you find the object through investigation, but whether or not it exists independently, without it being labelled or imputed by the mind.

The commentary reasons that mind does not exist inherently *because it does not abide inherently on the six sense powers*. If the question is, 'does the mind exist?', then the answer is 'yes, it definitely does exist'. We cannot deny the fact that the mind exists: our own experience proves it. However, the point here is that while the mind depends on the six sense powers, it does not abide inherently on these six powers.

The eye consciousness, for example, does abide in dependence on the eye sense power. However, the eye consciousness does not abide inherently on the eye sense power. Likewise, the nose consciousness depends on the nose sense power but does not abide on it inherently.

If we go through all of the six sense consciousnesses, we find that none of them abide inherently on the six sense powers. As explained in the commentary, *it does not abide inherently on the six sense objects of form, sound, scents, tastes, tactile sensations and objects of mental consciousness.*

Here again you can refresh your memory. The six primary consciousnesses depend upon the six sense spheres, referred to here as the six sense powers. There are six corresponding types of object perceived by the six consciousnesses – forms by the eye consciousness, sounds by the ear consciousness, tastes by taste consciousness, and so forth.

The point here is that the six primary consciousnesses do abide in dependence on the six sense powers, as well as the six sense objects. Although not specifically mentioned here, when we extend this reasoning, we can see that if the consciousnesses were to exist inherently or independently, they would not have to abide in dependence upon the six sense powers and the six sense objects. The fact that they do depend on these shows that each sense consciousness cannot exist inherently, independently in and of itself.

As the commentary further explains, *it also does not abide in between these two*, i.e. the six sense powers and the six sense objects, *or the collection of these two*. If mind does not abide inherently on the six sense powers and the six sense objects individually, there's no way it could abide on the collection of the sense powers and objects, because a collection is none other than the sum of its individual parts.

The commentary continues: *Remember the seven-fold analysis of the chariot as explained in the Introduction to the Middle Way.*

When I presented this in the teachings on the Middle Way, those of you who attended will recall the reasoning referred to here: the chariot does not exist inherently on its individual parts, such as the wheel, hubs or spokes; and it also does not exist on the shape of the chariot, the collection of all the parts and so forth. Therefore, through this analysis, we come to the conclusion that the chariot cannot exist inherently.

The mind also does not abide inherently in the internally elaborated person labelled by the non-Buddhists... This refers to the different organs within our body, like the liver, gall bladder, intestines, and so forth. So the mind does not abide internally on these organs.

And, as further explained, *...not on the outer hands and other limbs, and it cannot be found to abide inherently in another way, apart from the inside and outside. It is not the body or truly something else other than the body, the mind is not mixed with the body, and it also does not abide as some inherent object apart or separate from the body.*

So, in every instance of what is labelled by some as the person – the very body itself – the mind cannot be found to exist inherently either inside, on the internal organs, or

outside, on the limbs and so forth, or in between, or even outside of the body. This, then, exhausts every possibility for the mind to exist inherently. When the mind cannot be found inside, or outside, or mixed with the body, and does not abide as some inherent object separate from the body, then that exhausts all the possibilities of finding an inherently existent mind.

As the commentary concludes: *Because it does not exist inherently in the slightest way, the emptiness of inherent existence of the mind is naturally gone beyond sorrow.* Having exhausted all possibilities for the mind to exist inherently, the emptiness of inherent existence of the mind within sentient beings is referred to as that which has naturally gone beyond sorrow. Emptiness itself would not be called liberation, but is referred to as an entity that has naturally gone beyond sorrow.

2.3.2.1.3.2. Showing that the preceding sense consciousness does not exist inherently¹

104. *If consciousness exists before the object of knowledge,*

In reference to which object is it generated?

If consciousness and the object of knowledge are simultaneous,

In reference to which object is it generated?

105ab *However, if it exists subsequently to the object,*

At that time what is consciousness generated from?

The commentary explains:

If the sense consciousness exists before the object of knowledge as it is not preceded by a focal condition, in reference to which focal object is it generated? If the consciousness and the object of knowledge are simultaneous, then in reference to which object is it generated? When the sense consciousness is not generated, the focal condition is not generated, so it cannot be generated, and once the focal condition is generated the consciousness is also generated and does not need a generator anymore.

If, however, the sense consciousness exists subsequently to the object of knowledge, at that time from what condition is the sense consciousness inherently generated?

This is not valid.

If it is generated from the disintegration of the previous moment, then a sprout would also have to be generated from a burnt seed. If it is generated without the disintegration of the preceding, then is it generated with another moment in-between or not? In the first case, it becomes impossible to be generated directly. In the latter case, as there is no interval in relation to its full nature, they become mixed within the one moment. If the interval relates only to one part and not to the whole, then its true existence dissolves, and it becomes non-truly existent.

The commentary begins with the statement: *if the sense consciousness exists before the object of knowledge...*, which is clearly an absurdity. If the object of knowledge was, for

¹ Geshe-la indicated that there may have been a typo in the Tibetan text because the nga (five) here should be spelt la nga-ta nga. In Tibetan, the word could read 'five' or 'preceding' depending on the spelling. So the heading refers to 'preceding' or 'existing before' rather than the 'five' indicated in the printed commentary. This revised heading also suits the explanation of the verse.

example, a form perceived by the eye consciousness, and if you were to then say that the eye consciousness perceiving form existed before the form, then how could it be an eye consciousness perceiving form when form was not around at the moment of perception? It could not be called an eye consciousness perceiving form if it existed before the form.

The reason for the absurdity of this possibility is: *...as it is not preceded by a focal condition, in reference to which focal object is it generated?* Again, taking the example of the eye sense consciousness perceiving form, the focal condition for that eye sense consciousness perceiving form is form – that is the focal condition. So, if form itself didn't exist, because the focal condition is lacking, how could that sense consciousness perceiving form arise? This should be quite clear.

Having dealt with that absurdity, the commentary continues: *If the consciousness and the object of knowledge are simultaneous...* Having just explained that a sense consciousness could not exist before its object of knowledge, the Prasangikas proceed to refute the next possibility – that consciousness and the object of knowledge are simultaneous. A sense consciousness can only arise in relation to an object that it is perceiving. So if they were to be *...simultaneous, then in reference to which object is it generated?* This is yet another absurdity.

The commentary further argues that *when the sense consciousness is not generated, the focal condition cannot be generated; once the focal condition is generated the consciousness is also generated and does not need a generator anymore. If, however, the sense consciousness exists subsequently to the object of knowledge, from what condition is the sense consciousness inherently generated?*

Again, because the arising of a sense awareness or a consciousness requires the condition of an object, if there is no condition, then how could it be generated?

Then another hypothesis is presented: *If a sense consciousness is generated from the disintegration of the previous moment, then that implies that a sprout for example, would also have to be generated from a burnt seed.* Again, the logic is quite clear. If the sense consciousness were to arise because of the disintegration of the previous moment, then you would have to say a sprout could be generated from a burnt seed.

The commentary further argues: *If you say it is generated without the disintegration of the preceding, then is it generated with another moment in-between or not?* In other words, is the sense consciousness generated from another moment, between the two, or is it not? *In the first case, if it were generated in the moment between it would be impossible to be generated directly.* Because there is another moment in-between, you cannot say that it was directly generated from the previous moment.

In the latter case, as there is no interval in relation to its full nature, they become mixed within the one moment. This is arguing that if the interval relates only to one part and not the whole, true existence dissolves and the consciousness becomes non-truly existent.

If you were pay attention and follow the reasoning and logic, it will then become quite clear to you. It might not

become clear from just glancing at it once – you need to read it again and again.

The main point to be understood here is that if we were to simply investigate the existence of the conventional or illusory mind, then this analysis does not adhere to the mode of investigation required to find the meaning of ultimate reality. It is only when you attempt to ascertain whether an inherently existent mind exists or not that you will be adhering to an analysis that will bring you to the understanding of ultimate reality – that the lack of inherent existence of mind is the emptiness of the mind.

So, according to the Prasangika, the main point is that if our research and analysis is based on the existence of the conventional mind, we can all agree there is such a mind; rather we need to analyse and ascertain whether the mind exists inherently or not. In order to get an accurate, unmistakable understanding of the ultimate view asserted by the Prasangika, the investigation must be based upon whether a mind exists inherently or not. And, if it were to exist inherently, how does it exist? Where can you find an inherently existent mind?

This process of analysis, of going through every possibility of finding where an inherently existent mind might exist, and then coming to the conclusion that such a mind cannot be found, leads to the understanding of the ultimate reality of the mind, which is that it does not exist inherently. Since the mind cannot be found to exist inherently anywhere, realising the lack of inherent existence of the mind, is realising the emptiness of the mind.

If we are not careful, it is easy to take a wrong turn. If we were to investigate whether a conventional mind exists or not, and came to the conclusion that a conventional mind cannot be found, then we have actually come to a completely wrong conclusion and fall into the extreme view of nihilism. If we came to the conclusion that a conventional or illusory mind cannot be found, then that would mean the conventional mind does not exist. That would be a wrong understanding.

These are really subtle points that one needs to keep in mind when embarking on process of obtaining the correct understanding of the view.

If it were the case that not finding something is understanding its ultimate reality, then quantum physicists who do research on looking for the smallest particle of an atom, would be gaining the understanding of emptiness. From what I have heard, scientists have concluded that there is no such thing as the smallest particle: they come to a point where they cannot say 'this is the smallest particle'. But have they understood emptiness because they haven't found the smallest particle? I don't think that would be the case. Right?

I think you call this particular branch of science quantum physics. His Holiness mentioned this recently in his Kalachakra teaching at Bodhgaya. Do you recall that?

2.3.2.1.4. *The meditation on the close placement by mindfulness on phenomena*²

The next two lines of the verse relates to this:

105cd. *In such a way the generation of all phenomena
Is not realised.*

The commentary explains:

In the way explained earlier the generation of all phenomena is not realised as inherently existent, because, as it is taught in the *Sutra Requested by the Superior Inexhaustible Discriminating Wisdom*, one should realise all compounded and un-compounded phenomena as non-inherently existent.

In the way explained earlier the generation of all phenomena is not realised as inherently existent. This translation here doesn't convey that the Tibetan word for Dharma, *chö*, and the term for all existent phenomena is one and the same. The definition of *chö* or phenomena in general, is 'that which holds its own identity', which can also relate to the Dharma. So, while *chö* in general would refer to all existing phenomena, when we are referring to *chö* as the practice of Dharma, then it carries the meaning 'that which holds you from falling into a lower existence'.

For example, if we hold onto something to stop us from falling into a precipice, that object or factor would be protecting us from falling. In the same way, the practice of Dharma — for example, observing ethics or morality — is the factor that protects us from falling into the lower realms. So this meaning of 'holding its own identity' can be applied here as 'holding us from falling into the lower realms'. So observing morality is what it protects you from falling into the lower realms.

This is definitely the case. It is said that if you put morality into practice, then this will definitely protect you from falling into the lower realms; you will not be reborn in the lower realms in the next life.

Another way of interpreting the meaning of 'holding its own identity' in relation to Dharma practice is to understand that Dharma holds you back from mistaken or wrong conduct. Any form of practice that involves the abiding in, and accumulation of, virtue will definitely protect you from misconduct. The practice of meditation is exactly that — it protects us from wrong views, mistaken and negative states of minds, and so forth.

Coming back to the general meaning of *chö* as 'that which it holds its own identity', I've explained previously that if we were take a glass as an example of a phenomenon, we can see that it holds its own identity. As soon as we look at the glass, we can identify it exactly and refer to it as a glass. We don't mistake it for something else — say, a book or a table — but instinctively and automatically relate to it as a glass, that is because of the functionality of the glass. It is precisely because the glass continuously holds its own identity, that we don't mistake it for something else.

The commentary continues: *In the way explained earlier the generation of all phenomena is not realised as inherently existent, because, as it is taught in the Sutra Requested by the Superior Inexhaustible Discriminating Wisdom...* In

this particular sutra, the Buddha mentioned that *one should realise all compounded and un-compounded phenomena are non-inherently existent.* So, as the Buddha himself said, all existents included in compounded and un-compounded phenomena are to be seen as non-inherently existent.

We will conclude our session for the evening, and follow with a recitation of the dedication chapter of the *Guide to the Bodhisattva's Way of Life*. This is to dedicate our merits to the late mother of Sandup Tsering who passed away recently.

Sandup himself came to visit me just last Friday with a *khatag* and an offering, informing me he was on the way to India to see his mum who was critically ill, in her last stages. So he came with the request for some prayers and made an offering. Then he went to India, and apparently soon after he arrived there, his mum passed away.

Sandup himself is like part of our family. We knew his mother quite well too. Many of the older students would have gone to her home many times, whenever we went to India, for lunch. Sandup would always make sure we were invited to his home. He would hire a small mini-bus — in Indian terms, he had to pay quite a bit to hire it — so that we could go and visit his home and his parents. So we've had many meals with his parents.

It is also good to note that both Sandup and his younger sister Namgyal took the opportunity to really serve their parents well, particularly their mum. This year, Sandup went to India earlier and spent some time with his parents, and last year he went as well. The year before last, Namgyal was there for about three months.

It is good to take note of how they really did serve their parents to the best of their capacity. For example, for Namgyal, staying there three months meant leaving her children here. While she would have had concern for her children, nevertheless she saw the importance of looking after her own mother and went to India, sacrificing her salary for three months. Also, Sandup went last year and this year spent some time with his parents.

These are good examples for us to take note of. If our parents are already deceased, then of course, whenever we do prayers and dedication practice, we dedicate our merits to them. But if we have parents who are still alive, this is a good example for us to serve our parents well, in whatever way we can. While we have the opportunity, we do the best we can.

I understand that when Sandup's mum was taken to hospital in Bangalore for tests and treatment around four years ago, it was actually the first year that His Holiness began Lam Rim teachings there. Her visit to the hospital coincided with His Holiness coming to Bangalore for a day on the way to give teachings at the monastery. So Sandup's mum was able to be brought to the reception of the place where His Holiness was staying. His Holiness stopped and actually came close to her and she had her picture with him. His Holiness advised her that it was good for her to have really good treatment and stay in the hospital for as long as she needed. And if she had any difficulty with the finances, His Holiness said he would ask his office to assist.

² In the enumeration of headings on 22 November 2016, the heading reads The Close Placement by Mindfulness on Phenomena

This again shows the incredible compassion His Holiness has, especially for destitute people. He shows great concern and extends his love and compassion to them.

As for as Sandup's mum, after having that encounter with His Holiness, she commented: "Now I have no regrets. Even if I die I have no regrets."

Sandup's offering consists of one hundred dollars to me. My intention for this is for the Study Group to host the lunch for His Holiness's birthday, as we regularly do. I want to contribute this money towards that. Maybe Margie could keep that for me? Now we can do the prayers for the dedication. *[Group recitation]*

[Serving of tea]

When we recite OM AH HUM three times in the tea offering, the **first recitation** represents purifying all the defilements, such as the bad taste and impurities of the offering, the colour and shape, and so on - all the impurities subside. The **second recitation** transforms the offering substance into uncontaminated nectar. The **third recitation** signifies that the offering, which has now been transformed into nectar, increases expansively. This expanse of nectar is then offered to the gurus and buddhas.

The actual offering occurs when one generates the thought that the offering has been accepted. Accepting these offerings generates unceasing, uncontaminated bliss in the gurus' and buddhas' minds, which is the actual offering. So this is good to keep in mind.

Then we can think about the offering syllables individually. The OM represents the indestructible body of the Buddha Vairochana. The AH is the syllable of the indestructible speech of the Buddha Amitabha. The HUM is the syllable of the indestructible mind of Akshobya.

The HUM represents purifying all the defilements or impurities of the offering substances. There is nothing that cannot be eliminated; there are no defilements or impurities that cannot be eliminated by the indestructible mind of the enlightened being. So the HUM specifically represents that which eliminates all defilements.

The AH represents the transformation of the impure substances into pure nectar. That is because of the indestructible speech of Amitabha. Because AH represents Amitabha, it has mastered all the substances; there is nothing that cannot be transformed by the speech of Amitabha.

The OM is the indestructible syllable of Vairochana, and represents the body of the enlightened being, which represents the body. It is through the enlightened body that innumerable, infinite numbers of manifestations arise and are sent forth. So the OM represents the increasing of the pure substances. To be able to satisfy all sentient beings in accordance to their particular needs – that many bodies of innumerable enlightened bodies are manifested to assist and help each of them. This is how we need to understand the enlightened activities of the buddhas.

So if we can incorporate this understanding when making offerings, it is said that our offering will become highly meaningful.

Extracts from *Entrance for the Child of the Conquerors* used with the kind permission of Ven. Fedor Stracke

Transcript prepared by Mark Emerson and Bernii Wright

Edit 1 by Mary-Lou Considine

Edit 2 by Venerable Michael Lobsang Yeshe

Edited Version

© *Tara Institute*