‘Jōdo Shinshū: Conceptions of the Absolute in Mahayana Buddhism and the Pure Land Way’ as found in the Essays chapter in ‘The Unhindered Path by Rev John Paraskevopoulos.

Publisher: Sophia Perennis SBN-10:1621381986 ISBN-13: 978-1621381983

SBFUK STUDY 2C Sep-Dec 2025

A perennial problem for Buddhists has always been the question of how to articulate the relationship between the absolute and relative orders of reality, i.e. between Nirv*ā*na and samsā*r*a. Although conceptions of Nirv*ā*na within the Buddhist tradition have changed over the centuries**,** it is safe to say that some of its features have remained constant throughout the doctrinal permutations of its different schools. Indeed, some modern scholars of Buddhism in the West have even questioned whether it is meaningful to speak of an Absolute in Buddhism at all, claiming that such a notion is an illegitimate transposition of certain beliefs regarding the highest reality as found in its parent tradition, Hinduism. This essay will attempt to address the question of whether one can meaningfully speak of an Absolute in Buddhism, in what such a reality consists and what its implications are for understanding the highest goal of the Buddhist path. In doing so, it will focus chiefly on the Mahāyāna tradition and, in particular, on one of its principal metaphysical texts – *The Awakening of Faith* – in which, arguably, we find one of the most comprehensive and authoritative treatments of ultimate reality in the history of Buddhism.

Early Buddhism was radically dualistic in how it perceived Nirv*ā*na and samsā*r*a – there was simply no connection between them. According to its perspective, an individual could (paradoxically) only attain Nirv*ā*na through the dissolution of this very individuality itself – hence the doctrine of *anattā* or ‘no-self’[1]. Furthermore, there was also the tendency to view Nirv*ā*na more as a state of realisation than any kind of ‘being’ given the apophatic reticence of early Buddhism to commit itself to any definitive declarations regarding this ineffable reality and, to some extent at least, its conscious desire to demarcate itself from the metaphysics of the *Upanishads*. However, to what extent the polemics between these two camps was simply an outcome of a mutual misunderstanding over the meaning and implications of the concept of *ātman* is a moot point that warrants an entire treatise in itself.

The Mahāyāna perspective

With the arising of the Mah*āy*ā*n*a (‘Great Vehicle’) as a discrete vehicle of the Dharma in its own right, one witnesses a growing tendency to universalise the concept of Buddhahood as a spiritual principle transcending the human personality of Shakyamuni Buddha, embodying a higher and permanent reality. Hence the concept of the Eternal Buddha which we see promulgated in such central scriptures as the *Lotus Sūtra* and in such fundamental doctrines as that of the *trikāya* or the ‘Three Bodies of the Buddha’, with the *Dharmakāya* (‘Dharma-Body)’ effectively becoming tantamount to the Buddhist Absolute. Other currents of thought within the Mahāyāna developed this notion further preferring to view the Buddha or Nirvāna as pervading all things, including the totality of samsāra. In time, this growing tendency of attenuating the distinction between the two realms eventually led, especially in the *Madhyāmika* school, to the full-blown identification which we find explicitly formulated in the famous dictum, ‘samsāra is Nirvāna’. From the fairly unqualified dualism of early Buddhism we now find a radical non-dualism at the apex of Mahāyāna thinking – and all this under the umbrella of Buddhism. Such a revolution in thinking clearly serves to demonstrate the complexity and controversy inherent in the tradition’s struggle to understand the reality of enlightenment.

[1] “The Buddhist doctrine of *anattā* – what is its significance but compassion, to lose oneself in others, by realising that a man is not merely a separate individual self but that he is one with others in the Great Reality and that his supreme happiness lies in helping them to attain the Great Realisation of Enlightenment from which flows the Compassion which lightens this and all other worlds.” (Beatrice Lane Suzuki, 1878-1939)

Having very briefly charted the rudimentary outlines of the transition from the early Buddhist view of Nirvāna, to the more developed and comprehensive conception of the Dharma-Body developed by the Great Vehicle, let us now delve a little deeper into the nature of this Absolute. In one of his earliest works, D.T.Suzuki quotes the following passage from the *Avatamsaka Sūtra*:[2]

The Dharma-Body, though manifesting itself in the world, is free from impurities and desires. It unfolds itself here, there and everywhere responding to the call of karma. It is not an individual reality or a false existence but is universal and pure. It comes from nowhere and it goes to nowhere; it does not assert itself nor is it subject to annihilation. It is forever serene and eternal. It is the One, devoid of all determinations. This body of Dharma has no boundary and no quarters but is embodied in all bodies. Its freedom or spontaneity is incomprehensible as is its spiritual presence in things corporeal. Assuming any concrete material form as required by the nature and condition of karma, it illuminates all creations. There is no place in the universe where this Body does not prevail. The universe becomes but this Body forever remains. It is free from all opposites and contraries, yet it is working in all things to lead them to Nirvāna.

At once, we see a more dynamic and all-encompassing view of ultimate reality possessed of personality, compassion and intelligence which takes the initiative in the liberation of sentient beings. This is in quite stark contrast to the earlier notion of Nirvāna which was more of a static, indifferent and dispassionate reality with no intimate connection to the world of birth-and-death. Nevertheless, both Buddhist traditions would agree that, however conceived, Nirvāna (which is none other than the experiential dimension of the Dharma-Body) remained the ultimate goal of human endeavour and the completion of human fulfillment and happiness. In any case, by personifying the Absolute and in forging a non-monastic path to its attainment, the Mahāyāna opened the gates of the Dharma to all people, especially the laity who had hitherto played a largely peripheral role in the spiritual life.

The Awakening of Faith

In many respects, the culmination of this more positive conception of the Absolute is to be found in a very short, yet profoundly influential, treatise known as the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* traditionally attributed to Asvaghosha, although only extant in Chinese. This work, which is often considered as a synthesis of the *Madhyāmika*, *Vijñānavāda* and *Tathāgata-garbha* traditions, has exercised its influence on the founders of all the major schools of the Mahāyāna who have venerated the text as an unimpeachable authority on the questions with which it deals. In that respect, it serves as a very useful and reliable compendium of Mahāyāna metaphysics containing, as it does in a small but terse compass, a range of sophisticated and subtle teaching which one would only come across elsewhere by consulting numerous other sūtras and commentaries where the same points are often made only obliquely.

The fundamental standpoint of the *Awakening of Faith* is its belief in the Absolute which it calls 'Suchness' (*Tathātā*). As we have already seen, this reality has been called by many other names according to the perspective by which it is envisaged; namely, Dharma-Body, Nirvāna, Buddha, Śūnyatā, Bodhi and so forth. Now Suchness, the supreme reality according to this text, is both transcendent and immanent. In other words, it is completely beyond anything that we

[2] D.T.Suzuki, *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism* (New York: Schocken, 1963), pp. 223-224.

can imagine or conceive in our world of relativity and yet, at the same time, it comprises the very essence of everything that exists – the 'Ultimate Source'[3] of samsāra itself. A corollary of this is to say that the Absolute, which is formless, manifests itself through forms which, although finite, are none other than the Absolute of which they are its reflections. This is one way of understanding the meaning of 'samsāra is Nirvāna'. It is not, of course, to say that they are identical but rather that they are ultimately non-dual. In this way, the world around us is then seen as an admixture of the conditioned and the unconditioned. The most illustrious master of the Hua-yen school, Fa-tsang, was a great devotee of the *Awakening of Faith* on which he wrote the most authoritative commentary. His own thought was extensively influenced by this text as is evidenced by the following passage:[4]

The very basis of Hua-yen thought seems to be a view of an Absolute which existed prior in time to a concrete world of things which it became. There it was said that any phenomenal object is a mixture of the True and the false, or the Unconditioned and conditioned (of course, the sum total of all things is this same mixture). Taking up the absolute side of things, Fa-tsang says that it itself has two aspects. First, he says, it is immutable. This is not surprising because all religions claim immutability as the nature of the Absolute. What kind of Absolute would it be which changed like the ordinary things of the world? Being immutable, the Absolute is forever unmoved, pure, eternal, still and serene. This is, in fact, a common description of the Absolute in all Mahāyāna forms of Buddhism. However, Fa-tsang next says something which not only seems to contradict this statement but which also is very unusual in Buddhism; he says that moved by certain conditions, this pure, unmoved eternal Reality changes and appears as the universe of phenomenal objects. However, like the gold which has become the ring, the immutable Absolute remains immutable. Here the picture is apparently one of the emanation of the concrete universe from an immutable Absolute with the result that things are a mixture of the Absolute and the phenomenal.

This has been quoted at length to show the influence the *Awakening of Faith* had on a major school of Buddhism which, although no longer extant, continues to live through the doctrines and practices of Zen, of which it is the intellectual complement. When the passage mentions this 'very unusual' statement by Fa-tsang, it is referring to none other than the central thesis of the *Awakening of Faith* by which this eminent Hua-yen master was so greatly influenced. The important thing to note, however, is not that this perspective is unusual but rather that it has been rendered so explicitly, since it is a doctrinal position that logically follows from other fundamental tenets of the Mahāyāna.

Another distinctive feature of this text is its stress on the Absolute being both *śūnya* ('empty') and *a-śūnya* ('not empty'). Firstly, "Suchness is empty because, from the very beginning, it has never been related to any defiled states of existence, it is free from all marks of individual distinction of things and it has nothing to do with thoughts conceived by a deluded mind."[5] Considered in this way, 'emptiness' should not be considered as 'non-existent' but simply (as

[3] *The Awakening of Faith: Attributed to Asvaghosha* - translated, with commentary, by Yoshito S. Hakeda (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p.92

[4] Francis H. Cook, *Hua-yen Buddhism: The Jewel Net of Indra* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1977), p.94.

[5] Hakeda, p.34.

Yoshito Hakeda, in his commentary, notes) “devoid of a distinct, absolute, independent, permanent, individual entity or being as an irreducible component in a pluralistic world ... However, this negation does not exclude the possibility of Suchness being seen from a different viewpoint or order with which one is not accustomed. Hence, there is room to present Suchness, if it is done symbolically, as replete with attributes.”[6] Asvaghosha, after declaring that Suchness “was not brought into existence in the beginning nor will it cease to be at the end of time; it is eternal through and through” goes on to say:

From the beginning, Suchness in its nature is fully provided with all excellent qualities; namely, it is endowed with the light of great wisdom, the qualities of illuminating the entire universe, of true cognition and mind pure in its self-nature; of eternity, bliss, Self and purity; of refreshing coolness, immutability and freedom....these qualities are not independent from the essence of Suchness and are suprarational attributes of Buddhahood. Since it is endowed completely with all these and is not lacking anything, it is called the *Tathāgata-garbha* (when latent) and also the Dharmakāya of the Tathāgata … Though it has, in reality, all these excellent qualities, it does not have any characteristics of differentiation; it retains its identity and is of one flavour; Suchness is solely one … it is one without a Second.[7]

These are critical passages in helping us to understand the nature and function of Suchness. What we see is a concept of the Absolute as, not only the fountainhead of all the happiness, joy and beauty of which we only experience the pale semblances in this life, but the source of enlightenment and the saving activity of all buddhas and bodhisattvas directed towards suffering beings in samsāra. It is therefore crucial to a proper understanding of Suchness not to view it under its other synonym, namely ‘Emptiness’ or ‘the Void’, as meaning mere non-existence – this would be to fall prey to the pitfalls of nihilism which the great Mahāyāna masters always warned us against. Of course, Suchness is not the kind of existence that can be considered analogous to the realities with which we are familiar in our ephemeral world; rather, it possesses a reality far exceeding anything within the purview of our limited empirical existence.

There is a great danger, especially when one reads certain modern studies of Buddhism, in failing to recognise that the notion of emptiness about which one hears so much is not a lack of existence as is sometimes curiously supposed but an emptiness of limitations, relativity and delusion. In this respect, emptiness serves as an upāya to help rid us of misguided views concerning the highest reality rather than being some kind of comprehensive statement regarding it. One is inclined to consider the punishing dialectics of Nāgārjuna and his *Madhyāmika* system as simply a form of intellectual therapy designed to remove the obstacles to a clearer understanding of Suchness – breaking through the conventional ways in which we artificially construct what we believe to be reality and to promote a more direct and intuitive mode of awareness through *prajñā* or ‘transcendental’ wisdom. But such an exercise only stops half-way, otherwise the history of Buddhism would not have witnessed the rise of subsequent schools which endeavoured to fill the gaps, so to speak, left by the purely negative approach of the *śūnyatā* perspective.

---

[6] Hakeda, p.36.

[7] Hakeda, p.65.

Over time, there developed a growing need for a more affirmative conception of the ultimate reality, one that addressed the fundamental needs of both the intelligence and the will in response to which arose, firstly, the *Vijñānavāda* (also known as *Yogācāra*) followed by the *Tathāgata-garbha* schools of thought with their emphasis on the positive dimension of the Absolute. Tantric Buddhism can also be considered a response to some of the perceived limitations with the early *Madhyāmika* perspective. In any event, we now find a richer and more complex ontology which sought to integrate existence in its entirety – and at all its levels – with Suchness. No dharma or element of existence was considered to be outside its influence insofar as all reality was suffused with the presence of the Buddha – a notion unthinkable in early Buddhism which was in no real position to reconcile this world of suffering and delusion with the realm which delivered one from all such sorrow. Nevertheless, despite the perplexing nature of the Mahāyāna's preferred way of conceiving the Absolute, it felt that its more difficult perspective was thoroughly justified in view of what it considered to be a deeper awareness of the omnipresent activity of Suchness in our everyday world of samsaric existence.

The Pure Land tradition

The rise of the Pure Land school was largely contemporaneous with the flowering of the Mahāyāna itself, constituting one of its earliest manifestations. In one sense, it can be argued that the Pure Land way represented the most explicit example of the attempt to render the Buddhist Absolute as accessible as possible to ordinary people through the use of a wealth of rich and positive symbolism designed to heighten the aspiration for enlightenment. In this way, the Pure Land path can also be viewed as the best example of the *a-śūnya* view of absolute reality; that is, in contrast to the Madhyāmikan view of Suchness as 'empty' or the 'Void', it is seen in its fullness and plenitude as the inexhaustible fount of all merits, virtues, wisdom and compassion – an archetypal realm of perfection and beatitude. Hence the traditional descriptions of the Pure Land being replete with the attributes of enlightenment through the evocative symbolism of jewels, music, colours, fragrances and so forth. By employing ostensibly sensual imagery, the sūtras are attempting to convey, in terms that could be readily understood, a sense of the blissfulness of Nirvāna – in contrast, no doubt, to the sense of imperfection that dominates the ordinary world-view of the average devotee. The Pure Land patriarch, T'an-luan, claimed that what distinguished Pure Land Buddhism from other schools is that the 'Dharma-Body of Suchness' (i.e. the formless Absolute) takes the initiative towards suffering beings, manifesting itself as the 'Dharma-Body of Expediency' in the form of various buddhas, bodhisattvas and pure lands but, in particular, the pre-eminent Buddha, *Amitābha* ('Infinite Light').

The activity of Suchness

Although the Pure Land school claims the dynamic and compassionate nature of Suchness as a major advance in Mahāyāna thinking, it is possible to find the seeds of this conception in the *Awakening of Faith* itself, in its doctrine of 'permeation' (*vāsanā*). Hence we find:[8]

The essence of Suchness is, from the beginningless beginning, endowed with the perfect state of purity. It is provided with suprarational functions and the nature of manifesting itself. Because of these two reasons, it permeates perpetually into ignorance. Through the force of this

[8] Hakeda, p.59 & p.63.

permeation, it induces a man to loathe the suffering of samsāra, to seek bliss in Nirvāna and, believing that he has the principle of Suchness within him, to make up his mind to exert himself ... The buddhas and bodhisattvas desire to liberate all men, spontaneously permeating them with their spiritual influences and never forsaking them. Through the power of the wisdom which is one with Suchness, they manifest activities in response to the needs of men as they see and hear them.

This passage clearly shows the omnipresent activity of Suchness functioning as the immanent Absolute working in all things to bring them to enlightenment, to the extent that even an individual's aspiration to seek Buddhahood is brought about by the working of compassionate beings irrespective of whether the aspirant is aware of this influence or not. In this respect, the 'self-power' and 'other-power' debate can be resolved if it is recognised that there is only one power – that of the Absolute – that pervades and supports all things and that one can either accept and remain open to it (by conforming to the Dharma) or allow it to operate unnoticed (by continuing living in a state of nescience); either way, the working of Suchness, according to the Mahāyāna, will eventually bring all sentient beings to nirvanic fulfillment as there is nothing which does not comprise the Dharma-Body and thereby not immersed in its effulgent reality.

The significance of Shinran

Finally, we would like to give some brief consideration to the thought of Shinran, and his attempts to reconcile the traditional Pure Land teaching, which he had inherited, with the metaphysical perspective of the Mahāyāna which he would have doubtlessly imbibed as a Tendai monk for twenty years on Mt Hiei. The long-established view of the Pure Land school was that the principal object of devotion was not the formless Dharma-Body itself but the Buddha of Infinite Light (*Amitābha*), formerly a bodhisattva called Dharmākara ('Treasury of Dharma') who, out of compassion for the multitudes of suffering sentient beings, underwent aeons of self-sacrificing practice and austerities which enabled him to accrue sufficient merit to attain Buddhahood and establish a Pure Land, over which he presides, and that provides aspirants with an ideal environment in which to pursue the Dharma and attain enlightenment.

For a long time, Amitābha was recognised as one of many buddhas existing throughout the spiritual universe, each with their own Pure Lands generated from their practices and vows. Devotion to Amitābha, however, was considered particularly efficacious owing to the fact that his vows were intended specifically for ordinary beings with little or no spiritual capacity whereas other buddhas had established certain difficult preconditions for admission to their pure lands.

Shinran, while not explicitly repudiating this traditional view, chose rather to universalise the symbolism[9] behind the Dharmākara story by grounding it in fundamental Mahāyāna principles; partly in order to address strong criticisms by other sects which considered the Pure Land way un-buddhistic and partly, no doubt, because he had a profound awareness of a higher reality (which he often refers to as *jinen* or 'as-it-isness') that he saw as working in all things and manifesting itself through innumerable compassionate guises such as Amitābha's Vows and his

[9] "The notion of myth usually evokes a picture of traditional stories charged with a wealth of symbolism and more or less devoid of historical foundation; however, in defining myth one should not lay undue stress on this supposed lack of historical basis for the function of myth is such that, once it has been properly understood, the question of historicity ceases to have any practical importance." (Frithjof Schuon, 1907-1998)

Pure Land. For Shinran, *jinen* signifies that which is beyond form and which exceeds the domain of human calculation – it is the 'Dharma-Body as Suchness' which 'fills the hearts and minds of the ocean of all beings'.[10] In one of his famous letters, Shinran makes the following observation:[11]

The Supreme Buddha is formless and, because of being formless, is called *jinen*. When this Buddha is shown as being with form, it is not called the supreme Nirvāna (Buddha). In order to make us realise that the true Buddha is formless, it is expressly called 'Amida Buddha'; so I have been taught. Amida Buddha is the medium through which we are made to realize *jinen*.

This passage was written towards the end of Shinran's life and signals a revolutionary attitude in thinking about the Buddha within the Pure Land tradition. It is as if Shinran had stripped down the complex and rich edifice of Pure Land spirituality to its foundational principles. This, however, is not reductionism on Shinran's part but an attempt to rehabilitate the 'wisdom' aspect of the Mahāyāna that was in danger of possibly being overlooked by the rich upāyas offered by the great message of compassion which, in many ways, formed the centrepiece of the Pure Land message. One also finds in Shinran, and to a greater extent than his own illustrious teacher Hōnen, a more profound appreciation of the multifaceted nature of Nirvāna and its activity:[12]

Nirvāna has innumerable names. It is impossible to give them in detail; I will list only a few. Nirvāna is called 'extinction of passions', 'the uncreated', 'peaceful happiness', 'eternal bliss', 'true reality', 'Dharma-Body', 'Dharma-nature', 'Suchness, 'Oneness' and 'Buddha-nature'. Buddha-nature is none other than Tathāgata. This Tathāgata pervades the countless worlds; it fills the hearts and minds of the ocean of all beings. Thus, plants, trees and land all attain Buddhahood. Since it is with these hearts and minds of all sentient beings that they entrust themselves to the Vow of the Dharma-Body as 'Compassionate Means', this shinjin is none other than Buddha-nature.

Shinran here is advocating a broader grasp of Nirvāna than we see in any of his Pure Land predecessors even though he was greatly influenced by them in arriving at his developed position. Amitābha, therefore, becomes the compassionate personification of Suchness itself and not simply the outcome of the innumerable practices of a particular quasi-historical individual over many aeons. Even Dharmākara himself, according to Shinran, emerges from the ocean of Suchness to make known the vows of the Buddha of Infinite Light through the sūtras of the Pure Land tradition. Furthermore, he takes the radical step of equating the true Pure Land with Nirvāna itself rather than treating it as a more favourable abode for Buddhist practice, so that to attain birth in the Pure Land is, essentially, attaining enlightenment. Similarly, in relation to the central experience of the religious life according to Shinran, i.e. *shinjin*, we no longer find just a rudimentary faith in the Buddha and his power to save but a recognition that this experience has its source in the very heart of reality itself – another way of saying that awareness of the

[10] *The Collected Works of Shinran: Volume II* (Kyoto: *Jōdo Shinshū* Hongwanji-ha, 1997), p.191.

[11] *Letters of Shinran: A Translation of Mattōshō*, Shin Buddhism Translation Series, ed. Yoshifumi Ueda (Kyoto: Hongwanji International Centre, 1978), p.30.

[12] *The Collected Works of Shinran: Volume I* (Kyoto: *Jōdo Shinshū* Hongwanji-ha, 1997), p.461.

Buddha's working through the experience of shinjin is none other than the activity of the Buddha himself in sentient beings.

Shinran was acutely conscious not to be seen as indulging in unorthodox innovations which is why he went to such pains to cite authoritative scriptures in support of his views. On the one hand, he needed to convince other Mahāyāna sects that his teaching was not a distortion of the Dharma and, on the other, he had to assure those within the Pure Land school that he was not being unfaithful to its perspective either. The extent to which he succeeded in accomplishing this challenging task is evidenced by the extraordinary flourishing of the *Jōdo Shinshū* over the past seven hundred years. One of the principal texts that Shinran used in support of his views regarding the highest reality was the famous *Nirvāna Sūtra* which he practically quotes in its entirety in his *magnum opus*, the *Kyōgyōshinshō*. In order to reinforce the point about the unanimity between Shinran and the great metaphysical insights of the Mahāyāna tradition, which he deeply venerated, some brief but important passages from the *Nirvāna Sūtra* follow below[13]. Shinran cites these with approval and they serve to demonstrate, not only that he is thoroughly faithful to this tradition in his view of ultimate reality, but that he accomplished a wonderful synthesis between the respective demands of wisdom and compassion in his propagation of the Pure Land faith:

Tathāgata is also thus: non-arising, non-perishing, unageing, undying, indestructible and incorruptible; it is not a created existence....All created things are impermanent … Buddha-nature is the uncreated; hence it is eternal.

The Tathāgatas are eternal and never changing; hence they are termed true reality.

Although sentient beings are impermanent, still their Buddha-nature is eternal and unchanging.

The Dharma-Body (of the Tathāgata) is eternity, bliss, self and purity.

Conclusion

In closing, we would like to reiterate the great importance of an adequate and satisfying conception of the Absolute as being indispensable to the Buddhist path. In a climate of increasing scepticism and reductionism, especially in many scholarly circles, it is imperative that we not lose sight of the fact that without such concepts as the Dharma-Body, Suchness, Nirvāna and Śūnyatā being grounded in a true reality that both transcends and suffuses all things, Buddhism is left without any foundations and stands on nothing, thereby losing all soteriological efficacy. In the attempt by some to make Buddhism more fashionable by denying that it has anything much in common with views of ultimate reality in other spiritual traditions, it does itself a great disservice in failing to recognise clear parallels where they exist – parallels, indeed, that should not surprise anyone. To dismiss all these terms used to depict the Absolute as merely 'symbolic', as if to downgrade their significance, is folly – of what exactly are they symbols? To be sure, these terms do not exhaust the fathomless depth of the reality to which they refer but,

[13] *Collected Works: Volume I*, p.181, p.184, p. 185 & p.188.

Publisher: Sophia Perennis SBN-10:1621381986 ISBN-13: 978-1621381983

on the other hand, neither are they cyphers created by us in order to fulfill a nostalgic but delusory quest for the Infinite, without having any basis in the true nature of things. A spiritual path that cannot secure deliverance from what is finite, imperfect and illusory, thus ensuring eternal blessedness and the end of suffering, is simply not worthy of the name.