

## **Transcript of teachings by Khen Rinpoche Geshe Chonyi on the Modes of Mind and Mental Factors**

**Lesson No: 26**

**Date: 25<sup>th</sup> September 2012**

**Root text:** *A Necklace for Those of Clear Awareness Clearly Revealing the Modes of Minds and Mental Factors* by Ye-she Gyeltsen, translated by Toh Sze Gee; January 2006 edition. Copyright: Toh Sze Gee & FPMT, Inc. September 2003.

All page references refer to the root text, unless otherwise stated.

### **The Six Root Afflictions**

The six root afflictions are:

- (1) attachment
- (2) anger
- (3) pride
- (4) ignorance
- (5) doubt
- (6) afflicted views (Page 53)

Among the six root afflictions, we have completed looking at attachment, anger, pride, ignorance, and doubt.

- Attachment is a mind that is desirous of or attached to a particular object.
- Anger is malice towards sentient beings and the sources of sufferings.
- Pride is the puffing up of the mind in dependence upon the view of the transitory collection.
- Ignorance, in accordance with the higher and lower Abhidharma, is a mind that does not know its object.

Today we will look at the afflicted views.

### **(6) Afflicted views**

Afflicted views are of five types:

- (1) view of the transitory collection
- (2) view holding to an extreme
- (3) conception of a [bad] view as supreme
- (4) conception of [bad] ethics and modes of conduct as supreme
- (5) wrong view

#### **(1) View of the transitory collection**

Regarding the view of the transitory collection, the *Compendium of Knowledge* says:

QUESTION: What is the view of the transitory collection?

RESPONSE: It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view which views the five appropriated aggregates as a real I and mine. It has the function of acting as a support for all views (Pages 61 – 62).

What is the entity of the view of the transitory collection?

Just as it has been said above, it is an afflicted wisdom that observes the appropriated aggregates and apprehends them to be a real I and mine. What is the reason for calling this view the "view of the transitory collection"? It is just as it has been said in the *Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path*:

Regarding this, since the "transitory" is impermanent and a "collection" is manifold, the basis which it views is simply phenomena that are impermanent and manifold. However, one designates the name "view of the transitory collection" in order to indicate that "a permanent and unitary person does not exist" (Page 62).

The object of observation of the view of the transitory collection is the aggregates that are within one's continuum. By observing our contaminated or appropriated aggregates, the sense of "I" arises. One apprehends this "I" to be self-sufficient substantially existent.

When we talk about the "I," person, or self<sup>1</sup>, obviously the "I" exists. The question is how does the "I" exist? There are many views regarding the existence of the "I."

Is the "I" permanent or impermanent? I think all philosophical traditions assert that there is an "I." While all philosophical systems agree that an "I" exists, when you look at the majority of non-Buddhist philosophical systems, while they assert that there is a self or an "I," they conceive that "I" to be permanent, unitary, and independent, i.e., the soul. While they assert the existence of such a soul, they have differing opinions as to whether this soul or "I" has a beginning or end.

Most of the non-Buddhist philosophical systems assert that the "I" is different from one's body and mind. This "I" or the soul is permanent, unitary, and independent. From the time we are born up to the present moment, our body has undergone numerous changes. But when we look at ourselves, we feel that we are the same unchanging person from birth till now.

Based on this feeling, the majority of non-Buddhist philosophical systems assert that there is an "I" that is separate and different from the body and mind. One's body and mind may change but the "I" is always the same—permanent, unitary, and independent. This is the position of the majority of the non-Buddhist philosophical systems.

The position of the Buddhists is radically different. For Buddhists, there is an "I," but that "I" is not permanent, not unitary, and not independent. The Buddhist position is that a self or soul that is permanent, unitary, and independent does not exist whatsoever.

In this context, when we talk about the lack of self or selflessness, the self that does not exist is the self or "I" that is self-sufficient substantially existent. Selflessness refers to the lack of the self-sufficient substantially existent self.

---

<sup>1</sup> "I," self, person, and being are synonymous. (*Handout No. 3 dated 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2012*)

- A self-sufficient substantially existent person does not exist.
- There isn't a self whose existence does not depend on the body and mind, which is separate from the body and mind. There isn't a self or person that is self-instituting, i.e., able to stand on its own without depending on the body and mind.
- There isn't a self who is like an owner or controller of the body and mind.

Such a self does not exist whatsoever.

How then does the "I" exist? The "I" is that which is imputed in dependence upon any of the five aggregates. That is what the "I" or person is and how the "I" exists. There cannot be an "I" that is self-instituting and able to stand on its own feet without depending on the body and mind. Such an "I" does not exist. Therefore it is selfless.

### **Summary:**

What then is the view of the transitory collection?

- The view of the transitory collection observes the aggregates, the body and mind.
- Based on observing the body and mind, the sense of "I" arises.
- The view of the transitory collection apprehends this "I" and conceives this "I" to be self-sufficient substantially existent. This is the view of the transitory collection.

This is the meaning of self-sufficient substantially existent: When we talk about the self-sufficient substantially existent person who does not exist, self-sufficient means:

- It is able to stand on its own, independent of the body and mind.
- It can exist on its own power without depending on the body and mind.
- It is separate from the body and mind and so can act as a controller or owner of the body and mind.

Such a self does not exist.

When you look at most of the non-Buddhist philosophical views, they assert that the soul or "I" is permanent, unitary, and independent. But according to Buddhists, such a soul or self does not exist. This self that does not exist is referred to as "selfless."

The Buddhist position is that one can never posit an "I" that is permanent, unitary, and independent. Buddhists can only talk about the "I" in relation to the body and mind, not an "I" that is completely separate from and unrelated with the body and mind.

When we focus on our contaminated body and mind, the sense of "I" arises. We then conceive ourselves or the "I" to be self-sufficient substantially existent. This conception is called the view of the transitory collection. In this context, the view of the transitory collection is apprehending the "I" to be self-sufficient substantially existent.

What is the function of the view of the transitory collection? It has the function of acting as a support for all views and is the basis for the arising of all other afflictions. Due to holding on to the self-sufficient substantially existent “I,” one’s concepts of “I” and others become very strong. Because of that, we become attached to people who are on our side and we get upset or angry with those who are against us. That is how holding on to the self-sufficient substantially existent “I” induces the arising of the other afflictions.

The view of the transitory collection can be divided into two: (1) the conception of the “I” and (2) the conception of “mine.” When we hold on to the “I” to be self-sufficient substantially existent, the view of the transitory collection is the conception of “I.” Based on that, we then have the conception of “mine.”

When this view of the transitory collection is divided, there are twenty types of view of the transitory collection:

- (1) view of forms as a self
- (2) view of the self as possessing forms
- (3) view of forms as mine
- (4) view of the self as abiding in forms

Similarly, due to the divisions into four each with respect to feelings, discriminations, compositional factors, and consciousness [i.e., the remaining four of the five aggregates], there are twenty views [altogether].

[i.e.,

- (5) view of feelings as a self
- (6) view of the self as possessing feelings
- (7) view of feelings as mine
- (8) view of the self as abiding in feelings
- (9) view of discriminations as a self
- (10) view of the self as possessing discriminations
- (11) view of discriminations as mine
- (12) view of the self as abiding in discriminations
- (13) view of compositional factors as a self
- (14) view of the self as possessing compositional factors
- (15) view of compositional factors as mine
- (16) view of the self as abiding in compositional factors
- (17) view of consciousness as a self
- (18) view of the self as possessing consciousness
- (19) view of consciousness as mine
- (20) view of the self as abiding in consciousness](Pages 62 – 63)

- “View of forms as a self,” means that while the form aggregate is not the self, one apprehends that form aggregate to be the self.
- While the self does not possess form, there is a “view of the self as possessing forms.” When we talk about the self as possessing forms, we are talking about the self possessing forms by its nature.
- While the self does not abide in forms, there is a “view of the self as abiding in forms.” Here abiding in forms refers to abiding in form by its nature.

While that is about “the view of the self as abiding in forms,” we can also talk about the view of forms depending on the self. While form does not

abide in or depend on the “I,” there is a view seeing form as dependent on or abiding in the “I” or self.

We have to look at these four views in terms of whether they possess forms by their nature or abide in form by their nature.

The self and the aggregates are different but they are not different in nature. Likewise, you apply that understanding to what we have just talked about; for example, the view of the self as possessing forms. It should be seen that the self possesses form by its nature.

Remember the teachings on selflessness? We said then that the self is not truly existent because it is not truly one with the aggregates or truly different from the aggregates.

Let me summarise this again.

What is the view of the transitory collection? It is a mind that apprehends the self or “I” to be self-sufficient substantially existent, while it is not so. There is a view of the transitory collection that is the conception of an “I” and there is a view of the transitory collection that is the conception of “mine.”

Don’t we all think of ourselves as essentially different from our body and mind? We feel that the “I” is a different and separate entity from the body and mind, that it is independent of, and acts like a controller of the body and mind. Don’t we all feel this way?

When we think of “my body”—the “I” that possess the body—we have the strong feeling that there is something which is separate from the body, that is of a different entity from the body. We have the strong feeling of an “I” that is the owner of this body and mind. This owner is separate from the body and mind that it controls.

We definitely operate in this way, thinking, “I am completely separate from and independent of my body and mind. I own my body and mind.” This mind is the view of the transitory collection and is an afflicted view. It is not a wisdom because it holds on to and believes in something that does not exist. While this view of the transitory collection is referred to as an “intelligence” and “wisdom,” it is not the *correct* intelligence or wisdom.

*Question:* The view of the transitory collection observes the aggregates, then the sense of “I” arises. Does the view of the transitory collection apprehend this “I” to be self-sufficient substantially existent or does it only apprehend the aggregates to be self-sufficient substantially existent?

*Answer:* The self or “I” *definitely* exists. The question is not whether it exists or not but the question is *how* the “I” exists.

- The Buddhist position is that the “I” is imputed in dependence upon any of the five aggregates.
- Buddhists do not know how to explain an “I” that exists *without* depending on the aggregates.
- The Buddhist position is that the self and the aggregates are *one* entity. They are not separate entities. The Buddhist position is that it is wrong to conceive of the self and aggregates to be different in the same way that we would conceive of a vase and pillar to be different. The vase and the pillar are different entities. If you think that the self and the aggregates that are related to one another are different entities, then you are wrong.

Why is the self and the aggregates one entity? If the self and the aggregates are different entities, when we eliminate the aggregates one by one, we should be able to find a self that is apart from the aggregates. If we were to eliminate form, feeling, discrimination, compositional factors, and consciousness one after another, if at the end we can find the “I,” then we can say that the self and the aggregates are different entities. But we would not be able to find such a self because in reality, the self and the aggregates are one entity. We will not be able to point to a self that is of a separate entity from the aggregates.

The view of the transitory collection refers to this conception of an “I” that is completely and distinctly different from the aggregates, that it is a separate entity from the aggregates. That “I” does not exist but there is a mind that believes such an “I” exist. This mind is called the view of the transitory collection. The view of the transitory collection apprehends such an “I.” It does not apprehend the aggregates.

The aggregates are the objects of observation of the view of the transitory collection. Based on observing the aggregates, one conceives of an “I” and the sense of “I” arises. The view of the transitory collection apprehends this “I” to be self-sufficient substantially existent, i.e., as completely separate and of a different entity from the body and mind.

The text says that the view of the transitory collection “is an afflicted wisdom that observes the appropriated aggregates and apprehends them to be a real I and mine.” It seems to be saying that the view of the transitory collection is apprehending the aggregates to be the self-sufficient substantially existent person. While it seems to be saying that, it is difficult to posit that to be the case.

*Question:* What is the object of engagement of the view of the transitory collection?

*Answer:* We do not posit an object of the mode of apprehension for this mind. For the purpose of debate, if you want to posit such an object, we do not posit the “I.” Rather we posit the self-sufficient substantially existent person, the “I” that is non-existent. The view of the transitory

collection does not simply apprehend the “I.” It apprehends the self-sufficient substantially existent person or “I” that is non-existent. But, in general, we do not posit an object of the mode of apprehension for this mind. However, if you were to ask, “What is the object of the mode of apprehension for this mind?” then that will be our answer.

*Question:* What is the subjective aspect of the view of the transitory collection?

*Answer:* The subjective aspect is the self-sufficient substantially existent “I.”

## **(2) View holding to an extreme**

Regarding the view holding to an extreme, the *Compendium of Knowledge* says:

QUESTION: What is the view holding to an extreme?

RESPONSE: It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view which views the five appropriated aggregates as being either permanent or annihilated. It has the function of hindering definite emergence by means of the middle path.

Just as it has been said above, it is an afflicted wisdom which observes the self that is held by the view of the transitory collection and apprehends it to be either permanent or annihilated. How does it hold [that self] to be either permanent or annihilated? (Page 64)

The object of observation of this view is the self that is held by the view of the transitory collection.

Does this mean the self-sufficient substantially existent person or does it just mean the “I” or self?

If we assert the object of observation to be the conventional “I,” the view holding to an extreme is the mind that focuses on the conventional “I” and holds on to it to be either permanent, i.e., unchanging, or annihilated, i.e., that it will not move on to the next life.

The *Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path* says:

The view holding to an extreme is an afflicted wisdom which, observing the self that is held by the view of the transitory collection, views it as either being permanent in the sense of being unchanging, or being annihilated in the sense of not transmigrating to a future life after this life.

Therefore, since this bad view causes one to fall to the extremes of permanence and annihilation, it is the principal obstacle to progressing on the middle path free from these extremes (Page 64).

## **(3) Conception of a [bad] view as supreme**

Regarding the conception of a [bad] view as supreme, the *Compendium of Knowledge* says:

QUESTION: What is the conception of a [bad] view as supreme?

RESPONSE: It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view which views:

- views and
- the locus of the views, that is, the five appropriated aggregates, to be supreme, to be chief, to be superior, and to be excellent. It has the function of acting as a support for strongly adhering to bad views.

Just as it has been said above, it is an afflicted wisdom that observes other bad views and the aggregates, the locus in dependence on which they arise, and holds them to be supreme (Pages 64 – 65).

Conception of a [bad] view as supreme is an afflicted wisdom that observes other bad views that are mentioned in the *Lam-Rim Chenmo*.

In this context the *Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path* says:

The conception of a [bad] view as supreme is an afflicted wisdom which observes:

- any of the three – the view of the transitory collection, the view holding to an extreme<sup>2</sup> or wrong view – and
- the aggregates of the viewer in dependence on which they [i.e., the above three views] arise, and holds them to be supreme (Page 65).

The conception of a [bad] view as supreme is observing any of these three—the view of the transitory collection, the view holding to an extreme, or wrong view—and holding them to be supreme. The object of observation is not just these bad views but also the aggregates of the person who holds these views to be supreme. So there are two conceptions with regard to the conception of a [bad] view as supreme: (1) the conception of bad views as supreme and (2) the conception of the aggregates of the person holding on to these views as supreme

#### **(4) Conception of [bad] ethics and modes of conduct as supreme**

Regarding the conception of [bad] ethics and modes of conduct as supreme, the *Compendium of Knowledge* says:

QUESTION: What is the conception of [bad] ethics and modes of conduct as supreme?

RESPONSE: It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view, which views:

- [bad] ethics and modes of conduct and
- the locus of the [bad] ethics and modes of conduct, that is, the five appropriated aggregates, to be purifying, liberating, and delivering. It has the function of acting as a support for fruitless fatigue.

Just as it has been said above, it is an afflicted wisdom that observes:

- [bad] ethics motivated by bad views,
- [bad] modes of conduct that prescribe physical and mental activities such as wearing animal skins, and
- the abode of [bad] ethics and modes of conduct – the five appropriated aggregates –to be purifying and liberating (Page 65 – 66).

There are people who believe that certain bad ethics are the causes of liberation. They adopt certain physical or verbal modes of conduct that by nature, are bad and believe them to be the causes of liberation. Such a mind is the conception of bad ethics and modes of conduct as supreme.

There are people who work very hard at all kinds of wrong activities, thinking that they are doing something wonderful to achieve liberation. In the end, they achieve nothing. These people believe that such conduct leads to liberation when they do not. There is also the view that apprehends the aggregates of body and mind of such people to be superior. That view is also considered to be a conception of bad ethics and modes of conduct as supreme.

---

<sup>2</sup> There is a typographical error in the root text where this view appears as, “the conception of a [bad] view as supreme.”

I don't think we can touch on the wrong view today. So please read the text on your own. We will start with the 20 secondary afflictions. We will be finishing the module soon.

Translated by Ven. Tenzin Gyurme

Transcribed by Phuah Soon Ek, Vivien Ng, and Patricia Lee

Edited by Cecilia Tsong

**THE SIX ROOT AFFLICTIONS**

ENTITY	OBJECT OF OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE ASPECT	FUNCTION	REMARKS
<b>(1) ATTACHMENT</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mental factor that perceives a contaminated thing to be attractive by way of its own entity and thereupon seeks it.</li> <li>It is clinging of the three realms.</li> </ul>	Beautiful and attractive internal or external object	Difficulty of separating from the object	Produces sufferings	Three types: (1) attachment of the desire realm (2) attachment of the form realm (3) attachment of the formless realm
<b>(2) ANGER</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is a malice that, upon observing the three objects of observation of anger, cannot tolerate them and wishes to harm them.</li> <li>It is a malice towards sentient beings, suffering, and phenomena that are the sources of suffering.</li> </ul>	(1) sentient beings (2) one's own sufferings (3) the sources from which these sufferings arise	Malice	Support for not abiding in contact with happiness and for misconduct	Nine causes of malice with regard to oneself, one's friend, and one's enemy in terms of the past, present, and future. Regarding <b>oneself</b> 1. I was harmed (in the past) 2. I am being harmed (in the present) 3. I will be harmed (in the future) Regarding <b>one's friend</b> : 1. They were harmed. 2. They are being harmed. 3. They will be harmed. Regarding <b>one's enemy</b> : 1. They had benefited. 2. Someone is helping and benefiting them now. 3. In future, they will benefit and be helped.
<b>(3) PRIDE</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mental factor that has the aspect of a puffing up of the mind upon observing the basis for puffing up – one's own wealth, qualities, and so forth.</li> <li>It is a puffing up of the mind in dependence on the view of the transitory collection.</li> </ul>	One's own wealth, possessions, and qualities	Puffing up of the mind	Acting as a support for disrespecting others and support for suffering in future lives.	Seven types: 1. pride 2. exceeding pride 3. pride beyond pride 4. pride of thinking "I" 5. pride of vanity 6. pride of slight inferiority 7. wrongful pride

ENTITY	OBJECT OF OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE ASPECT	FUNCTION	REMARKS
<b>(4) IGNORANCE</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mental factor of unknowing that is obscured regarding the mode of abiding of all phenomena.</li> <li>It is unknowing of the three realms.</li> </ul>	All phenomena	Unknowing	Acts as a support for the arising of wrong ascertainment, doubt, and afflictions with respect to phenomena.	Two types: 1. Obscuration with respect to actions and their results 2. Obscuration with respect to the meaning of suchness
<b>(5) DOUBT</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mental factor that wavers between two points within observation of the four truths, cause and result, and so forth.</li> <li>This is being two-minded with regard to the truths.</li> </ul>	Four noble truths & the presentation of karma and their effects	Two-pointed mind	Acts as a support for not engaging in the class of virtue.	Doubt here is the afflicted doubt that is abandoned on the path of seeing,
<b>(6) AFFLICTED VIEWS</b>				
<b>(6.1) VIEW OF THE TRANSITORY COLLECTION</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is an afflicted wisdom that observes the appropriated aggregates and apprehends them to be a real “I” and mine.</li> <li>It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view which views the five appropriated aggregates as a real “I” and mine.</li> </ul>	One’s own aggregates	Self-sufficient substantially existent “I”	Acts as a support for all views	Two types of the view of the transitory collection: (1) conception of “I” and (2) conception of “mine” When divided, there are twenty types: (1) view of forms as a self (2) view of the self as possessing forms (3) view of forms as mine (4) view of the self as abiding in forms Similar division into four each with respect to (1) feelings, (2) discrimination, (3) compositional factors, and (4) consciousness (the remaining four of the five aggregates)
<b>(6.2) VIEW HOLDING TO AN EXTREME</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An afflicted wisdom that observes</li> </ul>	Self that is held	Apprehending	Hindering definite	

ENTITY	OBJECT OF OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE ASPECT	FUNCTION	REMARKS
<p>the self that is held by the view of the transitory collection and apprehends it to be either permanent or annihilated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view that views the five appropriated aggregates as being either permanent or annihilated.</li> </ul>	<p>by the view of the transitory collection</p>	<p>permanence or annihilation</p>	<p>emergence by means of the middle path</p>	
<p><b>(6.3) CONCEPTION OF A [BAD] VIEW AS SUPREME</b></p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An afflicted wisdom that observes other bad views and the aggregates, the locus in dependence on which they arise, and holds them to be supreme</li> <li>It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view which views: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>views and</li> <li>the locus of the views, that is, the five appropriated aggregates, to be supreme, to be chief, to be superior, and to be excellent.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>(1) Any of the three views holding them to be supreme—the view of the transitory collection, the view holding to an extreme, or wrong view and holding them to be supreme (2) The aggregates of the viewer in dependence on which the above three view arise</p>	<p>Holding the three views and the aggregates of the person holding these views to be supreme</p>	<p>Acting as a support for strongly adhering to bad views.</p>	
<p><b>(6.4) CONCEPTION OF [BAD] ETHICS AND MODES OF CONDUCT AS SUPREME</b></p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An afflicted wisdom that observes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[bad] ethics motivated by bad views</li> <li>[bad] modes of conduct that</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>(1) Bad ethics and modes of conduct to be purifying,</p>	<p>This is a mind that believes that something that is not the cause of</p>	<p>Acting as a support for fruitless fatigue.</p>	

ENTITY	OBJECT OF OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE ASPECT	FUNCTION	REMARKS
<p>prescribe physical and mental activities such as wearing animal skins, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the abode of [bad] ethics and modes of conduct – the five appropriated aggregates –to be purifying and liberating.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view, which views:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [bad] ethics and modes of conduct and</li> <li>○ the locus of the [bad] ethics and modes of conduct, that is, the five appropriated aggregates, to be purifying, liberating, and delivering</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>liberating, and delivering</p> <p>(2) The locus of the [bad] ethics and modes of conduct, i.e., the five appropriated aggregates, to be purifying, liberating, and delivering</p>	<p>liberation to be the cause of liberation. It is a mind that believes that something that is not a path leading to liberation to be a path leading to liberation.</p>		
<b>(6.5) WRONG VIEW</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An afflicted wisdom that views the cause and result of actions, past and future lives, and so forth as non-existent.</li> <li>• It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view that deprecates cause, result or functionality, and wrongly conceives existent disintegrating things.</li> </ul>	<p>Past and future lives, workings of cause and effect, four noble truths</p>	<p>Mind that deprecates stating that past and future lives, karma, and so forth do not exist</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acting as a support for engaging in non-virtue and not engaging in virtue.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Four</b> types:</p> <p>(1) wrong view that deprecates causes, (2) wrong view that deprecates results, (3) wrong view that deprecates functionality, and (4) wrong view that deprecates existent things.</p> <p>The wrong view that deprecates actions and their results, past and future rebirths, and so forth severs all roots of virtue and is taught to be the most serious among all wrong views.</p>