

Lotus Sutra, Lecture No. III-7

Third Lotus Sutra Series
Friday Evening, November 7, 1969
Zen Mountain Center

In this sutra in Chapter II, “Skillful Means,”¹ he is correcting our misunderstanding about the vehicle of *shravakas* and the vehicle of *pratyekas*. The reason why we call the *pratyeka* vehicle or *shravaka's* vehicle “Small Vehicle” is because their understanding is not right. When you understand those teachings as skillful means of Buddha, to suggest the only Great Vehicle, which is the so-called perfect teaching or teaching which Buddha had in his own mind before he explained it, that is the teaching which is complete. And this development of Buddhist thought is always concentrated on this point: how to approach the perfect teaching. The Mahayana Buddhist tried to treat the Buddha's teaching which was told by him, so that we can understand what he actually meant. But as Zen students say, all those teachings are a finger to point at the moon. And what will be the perfect teaching is the problem which we have had since Buddha.

It may be better to explain it a more complete way. Although it is difficult to explain, so accordingly for you it may be difficult to [laughs] understand what I say. This is not only teaching but also the understanding of life and reality. When they think this is the final teaching, or when they think, “I understood completely what Buddha said,” or when they think they attained the final stage, which is the arhatship, then that is not the final stage—just because they think it is the final stage. If they don't think in that way, and if they are continuously striving for the final stage, they are said to be good disciples of Buddha. But when they say, “I attained arhatship,” or when they think this is the complete teaching—when they listen to the four noble truths or eight holy paths, then that is already a mistake.

And this is also true with Mahayana Buddhists. A Mahayana Buddhist thinks—all the teaching is, in one word, emptiness. The teaching of emptiness is the true teaching. But if you think that way, that is also wrong. Then what is the real teaching? The real teaching could be verbal teaching, and could be the teaching of emptiness, which is not just verbal teaching, and which is not just the teaching of emptiness. That is real teaching [laughs]. You already studied, “Form is emptiness, and emptiness is form, and form is form, and emptiness is emptiness.” That is real teaching.

Here is a book, and this is verbal teaching, and this side is teaching of emptiness. So if you think teaching of emptiness is wrong, and teaching of this side is right, then neither are perfect teaching. Both people just sticking to a one-sided view: emptiness or form.

Real emptiness or middle way is not here [gesturing]. The middle way is observing this side and this side from quite different levels. The middle way is right here. If this viewpoint is wrong, this point is also wrong. And if this side is right, the other side should be right. Real teaching of emptiness is not on this level. It may be like this. All those sides are verbal teaching. And when

we say “emptiness,” it is like this. So this kind of teaching cannot be compared with the teaching which is a completely different teaching. So if you extend your usual understanding without giving up thinking mind, you cannot understand the teaching of emptiness in its true sense.

The teaching of emptiness is a teaching which could be understood when you give up thinking mind. And when you actually start to practice our way, and as long as you are going on, practice after practice, then you will understand the real teaching of emptiness. This is the point this sutra puts emphasis on.

So if you start this kind of practice, you will be sure to be a buddha. That is so-called *juki*.² According to this sutra you will be a buddha at a certain time, at a certain place, and at that time your name will be so-and-so. It means that. But only when you continue your practice—that is an important condition to understand what is real teaching.

The other day, someone asked me about some difficult term like “five pollutions.” I don't remember what this translation says “five...”

Student: Defilements.

SR: Defilements? They may not be so important, but it is interesting to know what are the five defilements [laughs, laughter].³

Which is the first one? The order is sometimes different. Starting from *kalpa*—*kalpa*—not “defilement”—“pollution” is a more adequate word: *gojoku*, we say *gojoku akusei*.⁴ You know—*akusei*—“bad world,” where there are five pollutions or like polluted air in a city [laughs].

The first one is *kalpa* pollution. According to the [laughs] time when *kalpa* people live, there is a big difference in the degree of pollution. When our human world was very pure, we had very long lives. Eight million years of life—each one of us could survive eight million years. That was because the air was not so [laughs, laughter]—bad. But now in our days we can live at most 100 years. And in this way, air pollution will become [laughs, laughter] worse and worse, and pollution will get heavier and heavier until we can live just three years [laughs, laughter]. All of us will die out at the age of three or two or one [laughs]. This is the kind of idea they had.

So maybe defilements is a more advanced interpretation of it. In China instead of saying five, they said two defilements. That is a more psychological version of it. The one is defilements caused by wrong thinking, wrong understanding, wrong viewpoint. The other is more emotional defilements.

But originally it was more interesting. They had a more interesting understanding or version of it. “Pollution of air is created by human beings because of passion and evil desires. Because human beings have so many and such strong passions and evil desires, the air will be polluted

more and more. And this is divided in two: one is a more sociological version of pollution, like when people don't know their father and mother well, don't know much about their father's life or mother's life. Or, who is a priest or who is a Brahman, or no sense of seniority. Then at that time, the air will be polluted more. [Sounds like it's supporting the caste system]

And no idea of obligation, or no justice, or no duty. And when people do not behave. And when people are not afraid of the result of bad conduct. When people have no wisdom to see things as it is. And when people have not much virtue. And when people do not observe precepts so much, like eight precepts: no taking life, no stealing, no sex, no deceiving, no intoxicant materials, no perfume [laughs, laughter], no dancing, no theater [laughs], no television, maybe [laughs, laughter]. No [laughs, laughter] people don't use chair or bed. No eating after noon [laughs, laughter]. If people do not observe those pure precepts, then the air will be polluted [laughs].

And then we will have—this more subjective—those [above] are a more sociological version of it.

And *bonno-joku*—pollution by our passion. This is—if we have strong evil desires or passion. And if we like to keep a sword or weapon—if we are involved in a juridical case or fight, in this way our air would be polluted.

And we count already *kalpa* pollution, and sentient beings pollution, and pollution by evil passions. One, two, three. The fourth one is to have various erroneous views of life and society, like capitalism or communism [laughs]. Those imperfect views of life will cause pollution. In one word, various heretical teachings. We count 62 heresies—heretical understandings of life. It may be interesting, but so complicated. Sixty-two. Those are pollution in our understanding of life—wrong view of life.

And those things will cause because of the pollution—our life will not be so long. So this is so-called pollution—a short life caused by pollution. Those are five pollutions.

The more Mahayana way of understanding those pollutions is when we come to the *kalpa* where many bad events take place, that is *kalpa* pollution. And pollution by sentient beings or people, when we have not many good people, that is pollution by human beings. And when we have become greedy, or when we have anger, greed, and ignorance, and other passions—because of this we cannot follow the right path. Then that is called pollution by passion.

And when we cannot understand the Buddha's teaching because of a wrong view of life, that is pollution by view of life. And when we had more than eight million years of life, there was no Buddha's teaching, or Buddha's teaching was not necessary. But when our age came to six million years—Kuruson Buddha⁵ appeared and started Buddha's teaching. And when Shakyamuni Buddha appeared, some people could live one hundred and twenty years. But our teaching will end when we live just three years. That is from the commentary to the Vimalakirti

Sutra.

So it is interesting to see the commentary of the scriptures. Then you will see how understanding of Buddha's teaching developed. Actually, this Lotus Sutra is good material to know how understanding of Buddha's teaching developed and became deeper and deeper.

I think if you have a question, please ask me. It may be better to have question-and-answer time. Hai.

Student A: Where Kern translates "supreme perfect enlightenment, or knowledge of the all-knowing," Hurvitz, I think, translates "knowledge of all modes."

SR: Mm-hmm.

Student A: Could you explain that difference— what it means, "knowledge of all modes"?

SR: Knowledge of all modes. If I explain it literally, it is very difficult. So it may be better to explain it more referring to our practice. The supreme perfect teaching—we say as if there is some teaching which you can understand, or as if there is some stage where you can understand everything. But actually it is not so. What it means is back-and-forth. We are discussing about what is perfect knowledge, or what is buddha-knowledge. Although we don't know what it is, there is some way to have best use of it [laughs]. Although we don't know what it is, we can have a taste of it [laughs]. "What is it?" "Oh, this is very sweet." [Laughs.] "This is very good something. I don't know what it is, and this taste is always the same." Although it is always the same, we have always different feeling from it. We have always a different taste from it. You know, someone may say, "Let me try. Oh, this is good." [Laughs.] "What kind of taste did you taste?" "Anyway, it was very good. Anyway, I like it very much. What kind of experience did you have?" And, you know, each one of us will explain what kind of taste it was. It looks different, and looks like the same, and it is always an encouraging taste and very refreshing. Always fresh.

By practice when we give up all preconceived ideas, or when we do not rely on any particular teaching, and when we become just like a child, and when our mind is very soft and flexible, we will have that kind of taste through our everyday life. That is something which we are always talking about. Hai.

Student B [Bill Shurtleff]: When Buddha began to try and show his students—

SR: Mm-hmm.

Bill: —what he understood—

SR: Mm-hmm.

Bill: —he didn't teach them the Lotus Sutra to begin with, but rather some other sutras that we call Hinayana sutras.

SR: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

Bill: Why is it that we, very much like those first students of his, begin our practice studying a sutra that he felt they could only hear after they'd been practicing for some 30 years?

SR: Why we study some teaching which was told?

Bill: Buddha waited some 30 years before teaching the Lotus Sutra. He felt that his students had to understand other things before they would be capable of understanding the Lotus Sutra.

SR: Mm-hmm. Mm-mm.

Bill: And yet we begin, as very young students, with the Lotus Sutra.

SR: Yeah.

Bill: Why is it that we don't begin in the same way that Buddha's students did?

SR: You know—you understand in that way. Actually, this sutra was told by Buddha thirty years after [he started teaching]. But it is not so, actually. This sutra was told by—no one knows who told this sutra. But historically obviously this sutra was told in 100 BC or 150 BC, not even by a direct disciple, but by a Buddhist who thought out Buddha's teaching. By experiencing various religious rituals and—by reading or practicing something—zazen, or practicing rituals, someone came to this point. So for us who are actually practicing zazen, there will be no need to read this kind of scripture. But if you think zazen practice is the only way to have the same experience as Buddha had, that is also not perfect. That is not right.

To understand what is zazen, we must understand those things. If zazen practice is good, those sutras should be good also. And if we don't feel that way, something is wrong with our practice. Our practice may be Hinayana practice, maybe [laughs]—a very primitive practice which is involved in some gaining idea or some fixed idea of practice. Whatever we do, it should be our practice. Eating is practice, sleeping is practice, whatever we do, that is practice. And whatever we read, it should be our practice. And we should know how we should read those scriptures, and we should know how to study various things besides Buddhist teaching. That is right understanding of practice—of zazen.

So, if you just—your understanding of zazen practice —[Sentence not finished. Tape turned over.].

In this way, they are under some limitation, they try to be something like Buddha by his teaching. But Buddha himself wanted to make everyone like him. Buddha wanted everyone to

be a—various buddha. So we say, “Buddha taught us in one word, but people understand in various ways.”

At that time, there were various kinds of language in India. Once Buddha's disciple asked him to speak in the Makada⁶ language, but he didn't do so. He spoke many languages according to the people. So even when he spoke according to the ability of the people, understanding of his teaching may be different. That is why we have various kinds of sutras according to the version of one teaching of Buddha. Someone must have understood this way, someone must have understood in a more limited way like *shravakas* or *pratyeka* way.

Okay? [Laughs.] This is not my own explanation. According to various scholars' study, this is true historically, and accumulating various data or information and studying a more scientific way, this is true, and how Buddhism actually developed. So right now—with this understanding, we are practicing our way. Hai.

Student C: Roshi, —a question I had—it's another one of those number questions. It says in the sutra:

To preach the Great Vehicle definitively,
This dharma of mine, in nine divisions,
I preach by matching it to the beings,
Keeping the entry into the Great Vehicle as the basis—⁷

Nine divisions he says this dharma teaching has. Do you know anything about—

SR: Nine division.

Student C: Nine divisions.

SR: Nine divisions are according to the ability of the people. There are nine kinds of worlds. So his teaching will reach nine divisions of the world.

Student C: Of the world.

SR: Uh-huh.

Student C: Uh-huh.

Student D: They are enumerated—not the worlds but the names of the scriptures which apply to each world are enumerated in a footnote in the Kern book.⁸

SR: Excuse me?

Student D: In a footnote—

SR: Uh-huh.

Student D: —in the translation by Kern, he speaks of the nine divisions, and he lists them. I think, actually, he says that there are nine divisions into which the dharma —or sutras or some holy writing fall, and they are listed [as] nine ones for Theravada, and then nine ones for Mahayana. They sound pretty much the same.

SR: Mm-hmm.

Student D: And then they're in a footnote.

SR: Footnote? In this book, you mean?

Student D: I think, yeah.

SR: Nine divisions.

Student D: Yes. Maybe—maybe his understanding of nine divisions is not the same as yours. I don't know.

SR: Just a moment. Page? I will check later. Will you give me the exact page, in this book or— which book?

Student D: In the translation of the Lotus Sutra by Kern. The first one we had—from the Sanskrit.

SR: Oh, this one.

Student D: Yeah. I'm not sure what page. But I can look it up and then tell you.

SR: Okay. Some other questions? Hai.

Student E: Could we talk about the triple worlds?

SR: Triple worlds?

Student E: Triple worlds, which is—he translates as the world of desire, and world of material, and world of immaterial.

SR: Oh. That is very old thinking. Even before Buddha. Form world, and non-form world, or some non-material world, maybe. Desire world, and form world, and non-material world. Three worlds. That is the world which we attain by practice. If we are just involved in sensual activity, that is desire world. That is the lowest one.

And when we practice zazen, we will have form world. In form world, we will attain four stages. I explained it many times, the first stage will be the stage you have clear mind. You can think in that stage. And you will have good concentration. And what you don't have is agitation and contamination of mind. And you will have the joy of conquering those—agitation or strong passion. And you will enjoy conquering those things. Drowsiness is contamination. When you are not sleepy, you feel good [laughs]. You have that kind of joy. And your mind is clear. That will be the first stage. So form world is divided in this way.

The second stage will be the stage where you have pleasure—joy of renunciation from physical joy. No, no—mental, wrong thinking—like to seek fame or material success or something like that. But you still have many physical desires.

In the third stage you have good concentration. As long as you practice zazen, you are supposed to have good concentration in the first stage, second stage, third stage, and fourth stage. But at the third stage, you have no more physical joy. Of course you already have no mental joy. And there you have good concentration, and the form world will be almost complete in the third stage.

The fourth stage is—you have no more feeling of being. You are almost non-being. That is the fourth stage. And in the fourth stage, sometimes they put more stages. But that is a different version of maybe the fourth stage. And the fourth stage will be extended. Another version of the fourth stage will be no feeling of—the ultimate fourth stage will be no feeling of being. And no feeling of no-being [laughs]. That way they added more and more like that. And that higher stage is called non-material stage. That is the stage we'll attain by practice.

But, the interesting thing is it points out what kind of difficulty we have in our practice. The most difficult one is not mental, physical is more difficult to conquer. That is opposite maybe. You may think the physical one is easier to conquer, but it is not so.

The psychological one may be divided in two—Buddhists divide psychological difficulties in two. One is wrong view, or one-sided view, are psychological difficulties we have. And this is rather easy to get out of. But, the more difficult psychological one which is difficult for us to know, what kind of mistake we have psychologically, is like habits—habitual way of thinking.

If, for instance, in case one's watch is lost, some people may always think, "Oh! Someone must have stolen it." [Laughs.] Whenever he loses something, he thinks someone must have stolen it. But it is not actually so. It may not be so. But he thinks, before he thinks even [laughs], he immediately understands in that way, even without thinking.

Because he does not think, that's his trouble [laughs]. If he has time to think before he gives some judgment, it may be all right. But, he doesn't think. But actually his mind is giving some conclusion to it. If he doesn't like someone, before he thinks [whether] he is right or wrong, he thinks he is wrong. That is a more habitual way of thinking. And it was created by some kind of

past experience. To get rid of this kind of habitual thinking is most difficult. We call it *shibakku*.⁹ *Okaibakku*¹⁰ is wrong view. *Shibakku* is more habitual, which sticks—by which your mind is always tainted or colored in some way.

So by our hard practice we should make our mind clear and purified. That is a more difficult practice. So this kind of stage—I don't think there is such a clear stage. "This is first," or "This is the second," or "This is third." But it points out what kind of difficulties we have in our right thinking or right activity. It does not mean there are such worlds: desire world, or form world, or non-material world. Okay? Hai.

Student F: In this chapter it says that—Buddha's speaking to his disciples and he says that they should evince the strength of great faith towards the dharma of the Buddha. How do you evince—

SR: How?

Student F: —how do you acquire or evince strength of faith? How do you acquire or evince strength of faith? How do you acquire faith?

SR: Acquire—how we acquire what—faith? Faith.

Student F: Trust in the teachings.

SR: Yeah. This is actually only one way. If Buddhists put emphasis on faith, you may feel strange. So I am trying not to say "faith" or [laughs] "belief." I am trying. But actually there is no other way. In this point, I think all religions will be the same. And it is that—the other day¹¹ I explained it in this way: Eyes cannot see eyes. Although eyes can see many things, eyes cannot see themselves. How eyes will know themselves is to put faith in it. And that is not to be involved in a dualistic idea. When we say, "Don't be involved in dualistic ideas," it means that "Don't be involved in an idea of object or subject." Actually, Buddhists put emphasis on this point. The difference between Hinayana teaching and Mahayana teaching is this point. The view of substantiality is to put an object in front of ourselves and to say, "Here is a book."

That is the usual understanding, but it is not complete and is not real. When we say, "Here is this book," it means, "Here is my mind." [Laughs.] "My mind is here. My mind is looking at it." When you reflect on yourself, your mind is projected in the objective world and you say "This is my mind," but actually your mind is here [patting himself], not there. So your mind [patting himself] is not something which you can see, which you can understand. When you understand in that way, your mind is all over. Wherever you see something, that is your mind also. Do you understand? My mind is there. Nothing can be just objective. Things which we see as subjective and objective, my mind is always working on it. In this sense, this is so-called "essence of mind." Mind which follows—which is everywhere, and mind which creates everything. And that mind is not a particular mind to myself or to you. It is more big mind; it is not small mind because it is everywhere.

On what [laughs]—what was your question? [Laughter.] I lost your question [laughs, laughter].

Student F: It was about faith.

SR: Hmm?

Student F: It was how to—how to acquire faith.

SR: Faith, yeah—acquire faith. That kind of mind is not the mind which you can take as a faith of object. Because that mind is on everything or in everything, I don't know [laughs], but that mind is everywhere. Do you understand that mind? To understand that kind of mind is just, [laughs]—that is it. No need to explain. But because you have always thought or believed in something in terms of here or there, or great or small, right or wrong, we must say something about it. But this is the ultimate truth which we should accept.

You may say, “Even though we shut our eyes, things exist.” But that is some created idea by your mind. So whatever you do, wherever you go, that mind follows you, even though you don't figure out exactly what it is. So the only way is to put faith in it. Then you will have freedom from everything. That kind of mind is essence of mind. That kind of understanding is real understanding of emptiness.

Maybe, you don't accept [laughs] what I say right now. Maybe it takes time. Do you understand what I am saying?

This kind of teaching is not Hinayana or Mahayana. It is ultimate truth. When Lotus Sutra—knowing this point says—“you put faith in it,” it means you should know this—know this mind. This is essence of mind, or big mind. Okay? Did you understand [laughs]?

So a Buddhist doesn't accept any kind of mind, except this mind. We don't accept just objective being or subjective being. We don't say mind creates things, or things produce mind-like function, or material first, or mind first. We don't say so. Whatever it is, it is mind and materialistic—material and spiritual. And we only discuss something which is both material and spiritual. This is the golden rule of Buddhism [laughs, laughter].

Student G: What [1-2 words]—I don't understand. [Laughter.] The only thing I make out of what you say is that—in answer to Ken [Berman]'s question—is that in the West, here, when we use the word “faith” we usually mean something outside ourselves which we can depend on.

SR: Uh-huh.

Student G: Which would mean—

SR: Uh-huh.

Student G: —that if we had faith in the Lotus Sutra we could trust the Lotus Sutra and the teaching. Or if we had faith in you, we could depend on you.

SR: Yeah.

Student G: Or if we had faith in our mother, we could depend on our mother.

SR: Yeah.

Student G: But from what you say, it doesn't sound that way.

SR: No.

Student G: It has to do with the state of mind rather than trusting on something.

SR: Yeah.

Student G: But what that state of mind is is very—it's not clear.

SR: [Laughs, laughing.] Not clear. Maybe. No one can make it clear.

Student G: The word “faith” is not a good word, maybe.

SR: Hmm?

Student G: The word “faith” is maybe not a good word.

SR: No. No, not at all good. So I don't like to use that word “faith.” It seems to have something [to do with] “to put faith in it.” It is not so. All the things we see is just good means of suggesting the true ultimate reality. So not only the Small Vehicle, but all the teachings and all the beings, whatever it is, is good means of Buddha. Who is Buddha? [Laughs.] We don't know. It is not something we can describe. It is beyond description, but something we have to believe in. Without that, we cannot think, we cannot say anything, we cannot do anything. Nothing exists.

To find out that essence of mind —or how to talk about the essence of mind is good skillful means of Buddha. So he is always talking about [that] which is not possible to talk about. That is what it means by "skillful means." So for Buddhists there is no other teaching than skillful means. Whatever the teaching may be, that is just skillful means.

Student H: Roshi, then all the teaching—the Upanishads, the Yoga sutras, the Brahma sutras—then they are all Buddhist teachings, aren't they?

SR: Yeah. If we understand in that way.

Student I: If I fell down and broke my leg, then that's also the Buddha's teaching?

SR: Yeah.

Student I: And I should have faith in it?

SR: [Laughs.] Faith? Not faith—yeah!

Student I: Well, belief in [1-2 words]—

SR: Yeah.

Student I: —feel that it's the Buddha's teaching.

SR: Uh-huh. Even though you die, there is Buddha's teaching.

Student I: When the Buddha says “have faith in the teaching,” that's a skillful means. It isn't the teaching itself, but it's a skillful means.

SR: Yes. Yes.

Student I: So when you—when you—

SR: So skillful means, in other words, is very important. Without it, we have no approach to the—[our] only approach is skillful means, because we cannot grasp that essence of mind. Only by skillful means, we can grasp it.

Student I: Is—is skillful means direct transmission?

SR: Yeah. Skillful means—to transmit—we have nothing to transmit, you know. [Laughter.] Oh, you know—

Student I: Do you not use “understanding”—in a sense, do we not use the word “understanding” instead of “faith”? You have understanding—it seems to me is the word that we use—the Buddhists use, instead of “having faith” is to “have understanding.”

SR: Understanding is necessary. This kind of talk is understanding. Although unless you understand what I am saying completely [laughs], you may not understand.

Student I: I have to believe it, though, before I can understand it. [Laughter.]

SR: Believe, yeah.

Student I: Believe.

SR: Yeah. Anyway [laughter], nothing wrong to believe in [laughs]—essence of mind. Nothing wrong with it.

Student I: If we don't understand, is that skillful means?

SR: If you don't understand, you should try to understand it. If you understand what I am saying, you will understand there is no way to understand it [laughs, laughter].

Student I: How do you feel, then, when you always ask us, “Do we understand?” [Laughter.] It always seems so tongue-in-cheek—like you don't want us to understand, and that's understanding. And it's like—something chasing its tail. And—I always try to push that out of my mind when you ask that.

SR: [Laughs, laughter.] You know [laughter], what I am saying is very logical. So I say, “Do you understand? Do you agree with me?” So far, nothing is wrong with my statement. That is what I am saying. You see? And the conclusion is you don't—it is not possible to understand the essence of mind. That is my conclusion [laughs, laughter]. And when I say, “Do you understand?” it means, “Is there any mistake in my way of thinking?”

Student I: Can we experience the essence of mind?

SR: Yeah. Yes and no. [Laughs.] Yes, but it is not possible to have full experience of it. That is why we continue our practice. And that is why we enjoy our practice, because it is an endless trip. [Laughter.] One after another you will [laughs] enjoy various things. And yet there is no end, you see? But you feel very good, and you are not fooled by anything. You have actual feeling in it—in your life. That is more our way of life.

Oh—[Probably discovers the lateness of the hour. Chant follows.]

¹ Page 25 of the handout, not the final 1976 edition.

² *juki* (Jap.): being told by the Buddha that one will attain enlightenment.

³ Traditionally, the five *gojoku* are:

(1) *kalpa-kauàya (kojoku)*—a period of war, natural disasters, and pestilence;

(2) *dçuti-kauàya (kenjoku)*—a period of heresies;

(3) *klesha-kauàya (bonno-joku)*—a period of strong passions;

(4) *sattva-kauàya (shujo-joku)*—a period in which people are physically and mentally weak; and

(5) *àyuu-kauàya (myo-joku)*—a period in which lifespans are brief.

⁴ Phonetic guess only. Spelling is not verified.

⁵ Kuruson Buddha (San. Krakucchanda-buddha): the fourth of the six buddhas before Shākyamuni.

⁶ Japanese for the Magadhi dialect of Sanskrit. Buddha is widely believed to have spoken in Magadhi on other occasions.

⁷ Hurvitz, 1976, p. 33.

⁸ Kern, 1963, p. 45: "The nine divisions ... of Scripture, are with the Southern Buddhists, Sutta, [etc.] ... to which answer in the Northern enumeration Sūtra, [etc.]"

⁹ Phonetic guess only. Spelling is not verified.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ SR-69-10-23 and SR-69-10-25.

Source: City Center original tape. Verbatim transcript by Bill Redican (7/9/01). Lightly edited for readability by Peter Ford and David Chadwick (7/30/2020).