

THE LARGE SUTRA
ON
PERFECT WISDOM

with the divisions of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra

Translated by
EDWARD CONZE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY, LOS ANGELES, LONDON

Contents

Abbreviations	vii
Preface	ix
Chapter Headings of the Perfection of Wisdom in 18,000 Lines	xiii
Divisions of the <i>Abhisamayālaṅkāra</i>	xvii
Introduction to Chapters 1-21	1
Outline of Chapters 1-21	31
Translation of the Sutra	35
Appendix I	653
Appendix II	657
Numerical Lists	667
Index	672

University of California Press
Berkeley and Los Angeles, California

University of California Press, Ltd.
London, England

Copyright ©1975, by the Regents of the University of California

ISBN : 0-520-02240-8

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number : 71-189224

Photosetting by
Thomson Press (India) Limited, New Delhi,
and printed in the United States of America

CHAPTER 83

THE MANIFESTATION OF A
BODHISATTVA'S TRAINING¹(I. *Problems of Training.*)

Thereupon the Bodhisattva *Maitreya*, the great being, said this to the Lord: If, O Lord, all dharmas have nonexistence for own-being, how then should the Bodhisattva, who courses in the perfection of wisdom and who wants to train in the training of a Bodhisattva, train in the five skandhas, the twelve sense fields, the eighteen elements; in the sense fields of eye contact, etc. *to*: mind contact; in ignorance, etc. *to*: decay and ^dearth; in the truths of suffering, origination, stopping, and the path? How should he train in dharmas which are with or without form, definable or undefinable, resisting or nonresisting, conditioned or unconditioned, with or without outflows, with or without blemish, mean ^{or} of exalted, inward or outward, seen, heard, known, or discerned, past, future, or present, wholesome or unwholesome, determined or undetermined, associated with the world of sense desire, the world of form or the formless world, belonging to those in training, to the adepts or those who are neither in training nor adepts? How should he train in greed, aversion, pride, ignorance, wrong view, or doubt? How should he train in stinginess or giving, immorality or morality, ill will or patience, indolence or vigour, distraction or concentration, stupidity or wisdom? How should he train in discrimination or emptiness, in the sign or the signless, in wrong wishes or right wishes, in lovely or repulsive dharmas? How should he train in the defilements or their forsaking, in defiling or purification, in birth-and-death or the realm of Nirvana? How should he train in the ^sBuddhadharmas?

(II. *All things are mere words*)

The Lord: A Bodhisattva, *Maitreya*, a great being who courses in perfect wisdom, and who wants to train in the training of a Bodhisattva, should train in that 'form, etc. *to*: the Buddhadharmas are mere names'²

¹Or: "The distinctive features" (*rab-tu phye (dbye)-ba, prabhāvanā*) of a Bodhisattva's training". In the Tibetan tradition this is known as "The chapter preached at the request of *Maitreya*" (*Byams shus-kyi le'u*). For a discussion of the significance of this chapter see my edition of the Sanskrit text in *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*, 1968, on pages 230-233.

²This refers back to an earlier passage of the *Prajñāpāramitā* which was a great favourite

Maitreya: If, O Lord, this designation, i.e. 'this is form', etc. were apprehended as though it were an entity, on account of its being taken for the sign of something conditioned, how, then, could a Bodhisattva train in that 'form, etc. are mere names'? But since it is without a corresponding entity, is it not improper to say of this name even that it is a mere name, or to say of 'this is form, etc.' that it is a mere name?

The Lord: As something adventitious has that designation been added on³ to that entity which is the sign of something conditioned, i.e. when one says that 'this is form', etc. And since through that entity which is the sign of something conditioned that name, i.e. 'form', etc. is followed by⁴ the conviction, the assignment, the recognition⁵ that 'it is form', therefore one should know also by this method that as adventitious has that designation been added on to that entity which is the sign of something conditioned, i.e. 'this is form', etc. What do you think, *Maitreya*, does someone perhaps have with regard to this entity which is the sign of something conditioned a notion, concept, name, conventional expression, or (false) belief?

Maitreya: So it is.

The Lord: By this method also, *Maitreya*, you should know that as adventitious has that designation been added on to this entity which is the sign of something conditioned, i.e. 'this is form', etc.

(III. *The actual reality of named things*)

Maitreya: If this is so, is then form, etc. actually apprehended by way of own-being (as a result of taking hold of) that entity which is the sign of something conditioned and on account of which there takes place the name, notion, concept and conventional expression, 'this is form', etc.

The Lord: 'Form', etc. is a name, notion, concept, and conventional expression with regard to an entity which is the sign of something conditioned. What do you think, *Maitreya*, is also the own-being of that form, etc. merely conceptual?

with the Yogācāryins, and of which five different versions have been printed in E. Conze, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, 1960, pp. 98-100.

³This refers back to *A* ii 47 (≠ *P* 219a, p. 219 above): "The word 'being' denotes no dharma or non-dharma. It is a term that has been added on (to what is really there), as something adventitious, groundless, nothing in itself, unfounded in objective fact." *Haribhadra* p. 179 comments: 'added on' means superimposed, merely conventional.

⁴This is a possible meaning for the locative.

⁵These three terms are not very well attested in the dictionaries. Our translation of the first follows *Monier Williams*. But since the *Mahāvīryūpatti* gives *sampratīpatti* as an equivalent of *yan-dag-par rtoḡs-pa*, the meaning might also be "affirmation". For the second, *Monier Williams* does not fit, and since in the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra supratīvihāga* renders *rab-tu rtoḡs-pa*, one might also translate as "apportioning", or "distinctive attribution". For the third, the usual rendering "experience" seems unsuitable here, and we follow *Edgerton* s. v. *apratīsaṃvedanā*.

Maitreya: It is merely conceptual, merely conceptual.

The Lord: In that case you can surely not assume that the real own-being of form, etc. has actually been apprehended when one takes up that entity which is the sign of something conditioned on account of⁶ which there takes place the name, notion, concept, and conventional expression that 'this is form', etc.?

Maitreya: If form, etc. are nothing but mere names, notions, social agreements, concepts and conventional expressions, is it not so that their own-being is then actually apprehended in the sense that they are nothing but mere names, notions, social agreements, concepts, and conventional expressions?

The Lord: What do you think, Maitreya, when 'form', etc. are nothing but mere names, notions, social agreements, concepts, and conventional expressions, can one then conceive of their production or passing away, of their defiling or purification?

Maitreya: No, O Lord.

The Lord: In that case, Maitreya, you can surely not assume that the real own-being of form, etc. has actually been apprehended?

Maitreya: Do then form, etc. altogether not exist by way of their own-marks?

The Lord: That I do not teach!

Maitreya: How, then, do form, etc. exist?

The Lord: Form, etc. exist by way of worldly social agreements and conventional expressions, but not in ultimate reality.

Maitreya: As I, O Lord, understand of meaning of the Lord's teaching, the inexpressible realm⁷ exists by way of ultimate reality. But if that is so, how is it that that entity which is the sign of something conditioned and to which 'form', etc. has been added on as an adventitious designation, does not exist by way of ultimate reality? If that⁸ does not exist by way of ultimate reality,⁹ how, then, does the inexpressible realm exist? For is it not logical to equate the entity which is the sign of something conditioned with the inexpressible realm?

The Lord: I will therefore, Maitreya, question you on this, and you may answer as best you can. What do you think, Maitreya, when your wisdom becomes united with the inexpressible realm, do you then on that occasion apprehend the entity which is the sign of something conditioned and to which is added on the adventitious designation that 'this is form', etc.?

⁶*upādāya, ñe-bar bzui-nas*. DR : by taking up which

⁷i.e. the *dharmadhātu* (DR)

⁸=all dharmas (DR)

⁹If no dharmas exist, you cannot talk of nonexisting, and also not of a *dharmadhātu* (DR).

Maitreya: No, O Lord.

The Lord: In this way, also, Maitreya, you should know that that entity which is the sign of something conditioned is neither other than the inexpressible realm, nor not other.¹⁰ And why is this so?¹¹ If the inexpressible realm were not other than the entity which is the sign of something conditioned, and to which an adventitious designation, i.e. 'this is form', etc. has been added on, then even just now all the foolish common people would enter Parinirvana and would fully know the supreme enlightenment. But if the inexpressible realm were other than the entity which is the sign of something conditioned, then even just now that sign could not be apprehended through which there would be penetration into this inexpressible realm.¹² In this way also, Maitreya, you should know that the inexpressible realm is neither other nor not other than that entity which is the sign of something conditioned and to which an adventitious designation has been added on, i.e. 'this is form', etc.

Maitreya: If, O Lord, the Bodhisattva, the great being, when he proceeds in the wise observation which is in direct contact with the inexpressible realm, does not apprehend that entity which is the sign of something conditioned to which has been added on an adventitious designation, i.e. 'this is form', etc., is it not so that he apprehends neither something which exists nor something which does not exist?

The Lord: Neither existence nor nonexistence apply to that entity which is the sign of something conditioned. And why? On the occasion that you discriminate that entity which is the sign of something conditioned, on that occasion it is grasped by way of discrimination. But on the occasion that, when proceeding in the wise observation which is in direct contact with the inexpressible realm, you do not discriminate it, is it on that occasion grasped by way of nondiscrimination?

Maitreya: So it is, O Lord.

The Lord: But if that is so, is this then not mere discrimination, i.e. the entity which is the sign of something conditioned to which an adventitious designation has been added, i.e. 'this is form', etc.? When, however, somebody proceeds (in the idea) that this is mere discrimination, or in the indiscriminate realm, then, since his discriminations have departed, how can he apprehend the existence or nonexistence of that to which this adventitious designation, i.e. 'this is form', etc., has been added on?

¹⁰*Ta,b* have: 'it is not it . . . it is not other than it'.

¹¹This addition is, I think, required by the context.

¹²This statement may, or may not, be connected with what Proclus (*The Elements of Theology*, ed. E.R. Dodds, 1933, pp. 109-111, prop. 123) says, i.e. 'All that is divine is itself ineffable and unknowable by any secondary being because of its supraexistential unity, but it may be apprehended and known from the existents which participate in it'.

(IV. *The three aspects*)

Maitreya: When the Bodhisattva who courses in the perfection of wisdom proceeds in the skill in the subdivision of dharmas,¹³ by which modes should he follow up the conceptual subdivisions of form, etc.?

The Lord: By three modes, i.e. 'this is the imagined form', 'this is the discerned¹⁴ form', 'this is the dharmic nature of form'; etc.

Maitreya: Which are they?

The Lord: Imagined form, etc. is the false imagination which has the own-beingness of form, etc. for its object,¹⁵ and which is based on the name, notion, social agreement, concept, and conventional expression 'form', etc. with regard to that entity which is the sign of something conditioned. Discerned form, etc. is the definition¹⁶ of that entity which is the sign of something conditioned as in its dharmic nature mere discernment, as a verbal expression which is conditioned by discernment and to which refers this name, notion, social agreement, concept, and conventional expression, i.e. 'this is form', etc. The dharmic nature of form, etc. is that dharmic nature of dharmas which is established whether Tathagatas are produced or not, the established order of dharmas, the realm of Dharma, the absence of own-being which is characteristic eternally and through all eternity, constantly and through all time, of that discerned form because of that imagined form,¹⁷ the absence of self in dharmas, Suchness, the Reality limit.

Maitreya: Of these three kinds of form, etc. which one should be viewed as unsubstantial,¹⁸ which one as substantial, and which one as neither substantial nor unsubstantial, but as derived from¹⁹ ultimate reality?

The Lord: Imagined form, etc. should be seen as unsubstantial. Discerned form, etc. should, because of its substantiality,²⁰ be viewed as substantial, although it never occurs as an independent reality. The dharmic nature of form, etc. should be viewed as neither unsubstantial

¹³into the five skandhas, eighteen elements, etc.

¹⁴This is an attempt to find a word which covers the two meanings of *vikalpiya* intended here, i.e. (1) discriminated, (2) examined, compared, looked through to.

¹⁵Lit. Through the own-beingness; *instrumentalis*; *Tab*:-*du*. DR: Because the own-beingness of form is its object, and to be an object is one of the four kinds of cause. There is difference here between 'of' and 'by'

¹⁶A more literal translation would be 'standing' (*gnas-pa*), in the sense of 'established repute or position'.

¹⁷Lamotte II 1. p. 91 translates: En raison de cette matière imaginaire (*parikalpitarūpa*). la matière pensée (*vikalparūpa*) est éternelle et constante: c'est la vraie nature (*tathatā*), etc.—We have not understood this phrase.

¹⁸or: nonsubstantial.

¹⁹*prabhāvita*; *rab-tu phye-ba*. Five possible meanings of this term have been enumerated in E. Conze's edition of the *Vajracchedikā*, 1957, pp. 98-99.

²⁰*Tab*: 'because of the substantiality of the discernment!'

nor substantial, but as derived from ultimate reality.

Maitreya: The Lord has proclaimed that to speak of 'form', etc. is to make a count of what is not-two;²¹ but since there is²² this conceptual subdivision of form, etc., with what hidden intent has the Lord then taught that 'to speak of 'form', etc. is to make a count of what is not-two'?

The Lord: What do you think, Maitreya, is form, etc. the nonsubstantiality of form, etc. or is it not?

Maitreya: It is not, O Lord.

The Lord: Is form, etc. then the fact that 'form', etc. is mere name, notion, concept, and conventional expression?

Maitreya: It is not, O Lord.

The Lord: By this method, Maitreya, you should know that what is imagined form, that is neither form nor no-form; and what is neither form nor no-form, that is nondual. It is with this hidden intent that I have taught that to speak of 'this is form', etc. is to make a count of what is not-two. What do you think, Maitreya, is the substantiality of discerned form that form on account of which there occurs the name, notion, concept, and conventional expression 'form'?

Maitreya: It is not, O Lord.

The Lord: What do you think, Maitreya, is form the own-beingness as well as the own-marks of the discerned²³ form which results from the sign of form being imagined?

Maitreya: It is not, O Lord.

The Lord: By this method, Maitreya, you should know that also what is discerned form is neither form nor no-form; and what is neither form nor no-form, that is nondual. It is with this hidden intent that I have taught that to speak of 'this is form', etc. is to make a count of what is not two. What do you think, Maitreya, is form the recognition²⁴ of form in its dharmic nature by the fact that it is devoid of a self?

Maitreya: It is not, O Lord.

The Lord: Is, then, form the dharmic nature of form as it is thus in its dharmic nature?

Maitreya: It is not, O Lord.

The Lord: By this method, Maitreya, you should know that also form in its dharmic nature is neither form nor no-form; and what is neither form nor no-form, that is nondual. It is with this hidden intent that I have taught that to speak of 'form', etc. is to make a count of what is not-two.

²¹e.g. at *A* i 27.

²²*Tab*: 'is not'.

²³S: 'imagined'. *Tab* differs and the passage is corrupt.

²⁴*prabhāvitatā*, *rab-tu phye-ba*'i. DR: The dharmic nature of form has the meaning of not-self. It means the state of being separate, that it is put or set apart (*sur-du bshag-pa*) from the other two by the fact that it is not (=that it is devoid of a self?). It is similar to (*nos 'dzin-pa*); and one recognizes that they are separate.

imagined

(V. *Comprehension, etc.*)

Maitreya: In a Bodhisattva, who courses in the perfection of wisdom, who is thus skilled in the nondual mark of form, etc. who has avoided the two extremes and who progresses on the middle way, how should the mark of his comprehension²⁵ be viewed, how that of his forsaking, realisation, and development?

The Lord: For the Bodhisattva who courses in the perfection of wisdom, who has avoided the two extremes and who progresses on the middle way, the noncomprehension as well as the non-noncomprehension of form, etc. that is his comprehension. The nonforsaking as well as the non-nonforsaking of form, etc. that is his forsaking. The nonrealisation of the forsaking of form, etc. as well as its non-nonrealization, that is his realization. The nondevelopment of the path as well as its non-nondevelopment which he carries out for the forsaking of form, etc. that is his development.

(VI. *Nirvana*)

Maitreya: What is the Nirvana of the Bodhisattva who courses in the perfection of wisdom and is thus endowed with this kind of comprehension, forsaking, realisation and development?

The Lord: Deep, Maitreya, exceedingly deep is the Nirvana of the Bodhisattvas, the great beings!

Maitreya: For what reason is it so deep, so exceedingly deep?

The Lord: It is because the Nirvana of the Bodhisattvas, the great beings, is both not Nirvana and not no-Nirvana.

Maitreya: How is that?

The Lord: The nonrenunciation of Samsara in the interest of others is not Nirvana. The nonrenunciation of Nirvana in one's own interest is not no-Nirvana.

Maitreya: If, O Lord, the Bodhisattva in the interest of others does not renounce Samsara, how is it that through his nonrenunciation of Samsara he has not also renounced Nirvana? If the Bodhisattva has in his own interest not (completely)²⁶ renounced Nirvana, how is it that as a result of his nonrenunciation of Nirvana he has not also²⁷ renounced Samsara?

The Lord: Here, Maitreya, the Bodhisattva, the great being who courses in perfect wisdom, neither discriminates²⁸ Samsara as Samsara, nor Nirvana as Nirvana. When he thus does not discriminate, they, i.e. Samsara and Nirvana, become exactly the same.²⁹ And why? Because,

²⁵Or: 'his comprehension of the marks?'

²⁶So the DR.

²⁷dis, by the same token, i.e. out of self-interest (DR).

²⁸discriminatingly considers as; thinks, by way of discrimination, of S. as S.

²⁹So DR explains *mñam-pas mñam-pa*. The repetition makes it emphatic.—this is the Sakyapa doctrine: 'khor 'das dbye (separate) med.

when he does not discriminate Samsara as Samsara, he does not become alarmed by Samsara; and so, when he does not discriminate Nirvana as Nirvana, he does not fall away from³⁰ Nirvana. Thus one should know that for one who is established in the indiscriminate realm there can for this reason be no renunciation of Samsara and no renunciation of Nirvana.

Maitreya: Since for the Bodhisattva, the great being who courses in perfect wisdom and who is established in the indiscriminate realm, Samsara, just as it has not been renounced, so it has not been appropriated—how is it then, O Lord, that it is something which has not been renounced? And likewise Nirvana, as it has not been renounced, so it has not been appropriated—how is it then that it is something which has not been renounced?

The Lord: It is not thus, Maitreya, that I teach liberation from³¹ Samsara or its nonappropriation, or that I teach the appropriation or nonappropriation of Nirvana. But when Bodhisattvas, great beings who course in perfect wisdom, obtain the sovereignty of thought through a cognition which has the indiscriminate realm for its object—then, on account of their exhibiting (themselves in) Samsara through skill in means in countless world systems in the world with its ten directions, I teach the nonrenunciation of Samsara on the part of the Bodhisattvas, the great beings who have reached (the Mahayanistic) Nirvana; and on account of their being established in the baseless realm of emptiness I teach their nonrenunciation of Nirvana.

Maitreya: How should one view the inherent mark of discrimination? non

The Lord: The nonduality of existence and nonexistence, as well as the absence of intellectual multiplicity with regard to dharmas, such as form, etc. and also with regard to the emptiness of form, etc. that should be viewed as the inherent mark of nondiscrimination.

(VII. *The three lineages.*)

Maitreya: Do, then, all the disciples have an absolute assurance of their establishment in Nirvana?

The Lord: No, they have not. And why? Because this world has beings of various dispositions, of manifold dispositions.³² And among sentient beings with these various dispositions one can apprehend a variety of patterns³³ with regard to their lineage.³⁴ Some beings belong

³⁰Tab: 'does not fall away from Nirvana; and likewise he does not fall away from (= fall into?) Samsara'. Tc has 'does not settle down in' (*na-abhinivīśate*) in both cases. The Sanskrit, 'does not become alarmed' gives little sense, and seems to be a scribal error.

³¹Tab: 'the appropriation off'.

³²or 'lineages': *dhātu = kula = gotra*.

³³So Tab. S: 'beginnings'.

³⁴The three 'families' (*gdul-bya rigs can*) are: Mahāyāna, Hīnayāna, *aniyāta* and therefore adaptable to either Hīnayāna or Mahāyāna.

to a lineage in which from the beginning they strive for an exalted goal, and they also reach that exalted goal. Others belong to a lineage where from the beginning they strive for a low goal, they reach just that low goal, and are quite contented with that. Others again belong to a lineage where at the beginning they strive for a low goal and reach that low goal; not contented with that, however, they further on strive for an exalted goal and reach just that exalted goal.

Maitreya: If a person who belongs to the third kind of lineage, on having attained Arhatship, wants thereafter to eagerly strive after the supreme enlightenment, how can he (possibly) attain that without ever being reborn again? The Lord has not said anything about his rebirth which would (be necessary to) enable him to make further progress.

The Lord: I do not proclaim for him the kind of rebirth which is the effect of karmic defilements, but proclaim for the Arhat an unthinkable rebirth which allows him to advance to the beyond of Nirvana.³⁵

Maitreya: It is wonderful, O Lord, how sublime are the intentions of the Bodhisattvas, the great beings, how magnanimous are their resolutions, in that even just now they strive from the very beginning after an exalted goal, and in that they reach just that exalted goal! What, O Lord, is the state of mind of the Bodhisattvas, the great beings, which gives them their sublime intentions and their magnanimous resolutions?

The Lord: Without caring for the position of Sakra, or Brahma, of that of a world guardian, or that of a universal monarch, or any other kind of worldly achievement the Bodhisattva, the great being, because of his nonattachment to them and his complete freedom from them, dedicates his store of merit to the supreme enlightenment (of all beings); such are the Bodhisattva's sublime intentions. But that the Bodhisattva wishes to make that ease of nonattachment, that ease of freedom, that ease of the Blessed Rest common to all beings, and therefore dedicates his store of merit to the supreme enlightenment (of all beings), i.e. by his nonrenunciation of Samsara, that should be seen as his magnanimous resolution.

Maitreya: Wonderful and astonishing, O Lord, are the dharmas of a Bodhisattva! Wonderful and astonishing, O Lord, is the training of a Bodhisattva! The son or daughter of good family who wants to obtain³⁶ the wonderful and astonishing dharmas of a Bodhisattva should raise his thought to the supreme enlightenment.

³⁵The phrase can mean, "to Nirvana which is the Beyond", or "to the beyond of the (Hinayanistic) Nirvana".—Whereas ordinary people take birth as a result of their *kleśas*, Bodhisattvas appear in Samsara by virtue of their Vow. A Bodhisattva's body emanates from his spiritual cognition, and is sometimes called *jñāna-sarīra* (e.g. *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* 20, 3). For some useful remarks about the rebirth of Arhats see also Ruegg, JAOS 82, 1962, 327-8.

³⁶*Tab*: 'train in'.

APPENDIX I¹

VIII. THE REUNION WITH THE DHARMA-BODY

VIII 1. The Substantial Body.

Again, Subhuti, of those all-dharmas, which are like a dream, which are nonentities, which have nonexistence for own-being, which are empty of own-marks, which are perfectly pure through the knowledge of all modes, which are without outflows, the essential original nature, which has one mark only, i.e. no mark, should be known as the Tathagata, the Arhat, the fully Enlightened One. It is thus that the Bodhisattva, the great being, should train in perfect wisdom.

Subhuti: What again, O Lord, are those all-dharmas without outflows?

The Lord: The 37 wings of enlightenment, the holy Unlimited, the eight emancipations, . . . the four perfect purities, the ten perfections, the ten powers, the four grounds of self-confidence, the three ways in which (the Tathagata) has nothing to hide, the threefold mindful equanimity, the nature which is never bewildered, the knowledge of all modes, the knowledge of the paths, all-knowledge—these, Subhuti, are the all-dharmas without outflows. It is thus, Subhuti, that the Bodhisattva, the great being, should train in the perfection of wisdom.

VIII 2. The Enjoyment Body.

Moreover, Subhuti, when he has trained in perfect wisdom, when by the full attainment of just these dharmas he has known full enlightenment, his body always and everywhere adorned with the 32 marks of the superman and his 80 accessory characteristics, the Tathagata, the Arhat, the fully Enlightened One, demonstrates to the Bodhisattvas, the great beings, the supreme dharma of the Mahayana which brings them unsurpassed delight and joy, happiness and ease. It is thus that the Bodhisattva, the great being, should train in perfect wisdom.

VIII 3. The Transformation Body.

Moreover, having trained in perfect wisdom, having, through the full attainment of just these dharmas, known full enlightenment, the Tathagata, etc. in the ten directions, in endless and boundless world systems, during the whole of time, works the weal of all beings by means of a multi-form cloud of transformation bodies. It is thus that the Bodhi-

¹Sections of AA omitted in Ad.