

Moreover, this system of tenets is mistaken in:<sup>a</sup>

- asserting that the ultimate noumenon<sup>b</sup> is like space, a mere negation of proliferations<sup>c</sup>

Döl-ḅo-bā's *Mountain Doctrine* (118): Because the un-compounded noumenon transcends the momentary, it is permanent, stable, and everlasting. It is not that it, like space, is without any of the qualities, powers, and aspects of a Buddha, and it is not like the self of persons that [non-Buddhist] Forders impute to be permanent.

Döl-ḅo-bā's *Mountain Doctrine* (470): Similarly, those who assert that in the mode of subsistence, except for exclusions and non-affirming negatives, there are not at all any inclusions, positives, and affirming negatives are extremely mistaken because I have repeatedly explained and will explain that:

- Natural exclusion, negation, and abandonment are complete in the mode of subsistence, since all flaws are naturally non-existent and non-established in the mode of subsistence.
- Natural realizations of the inclusionary, the positive, and affirming negatives are primordially complete [in the mode of subsistence], since all noumenal qualities are naturally complete in their basis.<sup>d</sup>

- saying that a Buddha's pristine wisdom and so forth are

<sup>a</sup> The first three of these are asserted in Ge-luk-bā presentations.

<sup>b</sup> *don dam chos nyid*.

<sup>c</sup> *spros pa bkag tsam*. According to the Ordinary Middle Way School, just as space is a mere negation of obstructive contact, so the ultimate noumenon is a mere negation of the proliferations of true existence. In the Great Middle Way, however, the ultimate noumenon is an affirming negative, not a mere absence or non-affirming negative, and includes positively, since ultimate Buddha-qualities of body, speech, and mind are integrally contained in the ultimate.

<sup>d</sup> See also Döl-ḅo-bā's citation of Angulimala's criticism of the position that "The Buddha is like space," in *Mountain Doctrine*, 210-213.

conventionalities and do not truly exist<sup>a</sup>

Döl-ḅo-bā's *Mountain Doctrine* (329): Whereas the partless, omnipresent pristine wisdom of the element of attributes<sup>b</sup> always abides pervading all, the extreme of non-existence is the deprecation that it does not exist and is not established and is empty of its own entity.

- asserting that even ultimate truth does not truly exist<sup>c</sup>

Döl-ḅo-bā's *Mountain Doctrine* (342):

*Objection:* Since truth does not exist in any phenomenon, the ultimately true does not occur.

*Answer:* That is not so. If something is not true conventionally, it is not suitable as a conventional truth, and hence that which is a conventional truth is conventionally true and is not ultimately true. Just so, if something is not ultimately true, it is not suitable as an ultimate truth, and hence that which is an ultimate truth is ultimately true and is not conventionally true.

and in particular, mistaken also is the Consequentialists<sup>d</sup> non-assertion of anything—this being in order to avoid others' debates—despite positing a presentation of tenets.

Ḍzong-ka-bā's *Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path*:<sup>e</sup> Nowadays some who wish to be Middle Way Consequentialists [say]:

<sup>a</sup> In Ge-luk-bā presentations all types of mind, including a Buddha's pristine wisdom, are impermanent, even though at Buddhahood pristine wisdom is uninterruptedly continual. In the Great Middle Way, however, pristine wisdom itself is ultimate and, therefore, permanent and truly existent.

<sup>b</sup> *chos kyī dbyings, dharmadhātu*.

<sup>c</sup> In the Great Middle Way, ultimate truth itself ultimately exists and is truly established.

<sup>d</sup> *thal gyur pa ruams, prāsaṅgikāh*.

<sup>e</sup> Hopkins, *Meditation on Emptiness*, 549-550; also Elizabeth Napper, *Dependent-Arising and Emptiness* (London: Wisdom Publications, 1989), 116ff.