

Asuka SANGO

Buddhist Debate and the Production and Transmission of *Shōgyō* in Medieval Japan

Medieval scholar-monks produced and transmitted a massive body of texts known as sacred works or *shōgyō*. This article focuses on the Tōdaiji monk Sōshō (1202–1278), who produced almost five hundred texts. How and for what purposes did a scholar-monk come to generate such a massive body of texts? First, Sōshō produced most of his texts in the process of preparing for and participating in state-sponsored debate rituals (*rongie*). Since scholar-monks' participation in these rituals guaranteed their promotion, they produced their *shōgyō* first and foremost for advancing their positions in the ecclesiastical community. In addition, copying *shōgyō* was the main method of learning and advancing doctrinal studies. The transmission of *shōgyō* also contributed to a significant institutional change in temple society in medieval Japan—the development of cloisters (*inge*). This article reveals the undeniable importance of liturgical tradition and the resultant production of *shōgyō* in medieval Japan.

KEYWORDS: Buddhist debate (*rongi*)—scholar-monks (*gakushō*)—Sōshō—Tōdaiji—*shōgyō*—cloisters (*inge*)

Asuka SANGO is an assistant professor of religion in the Religion Department at Carleton College.

IN MEDIEVAL Japan (roughly from the twelfth to the early-sixteenth century), scholar-monks (*gakuryo* 学侶 or *gakushō* 学生) produced and transmitted various texts (*shōgyō* 聖教)¹ as part of their efforts to establish the authenticity of their doctrinal knowledge, ritual techniques, and cloisters (*inge* 院家).² In this article, I analyze this process by examining texts that the Tōdaiji 東大寺 monk Sōshō 宗性 (1202–1278) produced to prepare for participating in Buddhist debate rituals (*rongie* 論義会) sponsored by the state.³ Unlike one-time polemical debate, these state-sponsored debate rituals were held annually and provided an elite scholar-monk such as Sōshō with opportunities to gain knowledge of Buddhist doctrines and to build his credentials as a scholar. A monk's successful debate performance in state-organized debate rituals not only increased his fame, but also guaranteed his promotion to a high position in the ecclesiastical office of *sōgō* 僧綱. In order to prepare for debate, Sōshō copied, edited, or compiled vast amounts of *shōgyō*, and he later transmitted these texts to his disciples who also were to attend debate rituals. Furthermore, the transmission of *shōgyō* contributed not only to the education of his disciples but also to his lifelong ambition of reinvigorating Kegon 華嚴 studies at his cloister within Tōdaiji.

Despite the voluminous corps of texts that he left and the significance of his pedagogical and scholarly achievements, Sōshō has not attracted major scholarly interest, especially in the English-speaking world, for several reasons. First, there are certain technical difficulties; most of Sōshō's *shōgyō* texts have not been published, and still remain in the form of handwritten manu-

1. In Buddhist canonical literature, the term *shōgyō* usually means the teachings of the Buddha or the three pitakas—sutra, *vinaya*, and *śāstra* (NAKAMURA 2001, vol. 1, 726b, and MOCHIZUKI Shinkō 1954, vol. 3, 2568). However, in medieval Japanese society, this term was used to refer to various texts that monks produced by copying or editing the texts written by Japanese monks such as ritual manuals (*giki* 儀軌), commentaries (*shoshaku* 疏釈), and their excerpts (*shōmotsu* 抄物). This article uses the term *shōgyō* in the latter sense. For a definition of *shōgyō*, see NAGAMURA 2000, 168–69 and TAKAYAMA 1997, 124.

2. A cloister is the smallest constituent unit of a temple and was developed in the latter half of the Heian period. It was a religious institution that consisted of a group of buildings and had its own organizational structure. As such, it provided a residential space for its members, provided them with education and training, and sponsored its own rituals for them. In the medieval period, a monk belonged to both a cloister and a temple. For more discussion of this, see KAMIKAWA 2007, 291–336 and NAGAMURA 1989, 151–98.

3. Although Buddhist debate was not a uniquely Japanese development, this article focuses on its reception in Japan. Also, note that although I focus on state-sponsored debate rituals, there were debate rituals sponsored by major temples such as Kōfukuji and Enryakuji.

scripts. In addition, Sōshō usually copied these texts very quickly; therefore, he used a rather peculiar shorthand style, which is not easily decipherable to the untrained eye.⁴ Finally, Sōshō was more interested in copying, editing, and commenting on what others had written than authoring his own work. A Tōdaiji monk once half-jokingly said to me that Sōshō was a mere “copyist” (*kopī man*). This view, however, is premised on the modern notion of authorship, which is not always applicable to premodern texts.⁵ In this article, I show that the act of copying, and its products—the texts themselves—facilitated a scholar-monk’s desire for academic accomplishment, salvific attainment, and political empowerment.

In addition, scholarly paradigms in the field of premodern Japanese religions that are currently dominant tend to neglect or obscure the intellectual and social activities of elite scholar-monks of Nanto⁶ temples such as Sōshō—especially Kuroda Toshio’s characterization of esoteric and exoteric Buddhism (*kenmitsu* 顯密). Kuroda largely equates “exoteric” with doctrinal learning—what

4. Even in Japan, Hiraoka Jōkai’s work has been the only substantial scholarship on Sōshō (HIRAOKA 1958). In this three-volume work, he collected texts that illuminate Sōshō’s scholarly and religious activities (mostly colophons of the *shōgyō* texts that Sōshō produced). Also, the *Dai Nihon shiryō* series, a collection of primary sources published by the Shiryō Hensanjo (Historiographical Institute) at Tokyo University contain some of Sōshō’s *shōgyō* texts. More recently, NAGAMURA Makoto (2000) and MINOWA Kenryō (2009) have analyzed Sōshō’s texts. That said, many of Sōshō’s *shōgyō* still remain unpublished and unstudied. I had the privilege of participating in Minowa Kenryō’s graduate seminar at Tokyo University, in which we transcribed, annotated, and analyzed some of Sōshō’s texts. I am deeply grateful to him for including me in his seminar and sharing his expertise in Buddhist doctrinal studies—especially Buddhist debate—in our conversations.

5. This also reflects a uniquely modern notion of “tradition.” As José Cabazón points out in his study of Indo-Tibetan scholasticism, Buddhist scholasticism (especially its commentarial tradition) is “ultimately unconcerned with questions of originality.” However, the modern mind is accustomed to “equating vitality with novelty,” and therefore, “Whether consciously or not, our tendency in encountering a tradition that seems relatively unconcerned with questions of originality and creativity is to consider it to be stagnant or, worse yet, dead” (CABAZÓN 1994, 83). This article demonstrates that Cabazón’s discussion applies to Japanese Buddhist scholasticism represented by the scholar-monk Sōshō.

6. Nanto Buddhism (*nanto Bukkyō* 南都仏教) has traditionally been characterized as “old” and an elite form of Buddhism of the Heian period (794–1185), replaced by “new” and popular forms of Buddhism of the Kamakura period (1192–1333). Attempts by scholars to challenge this view and understand Nanto Buddhism on its own terms began in the late 1960s (ISHIDA 1967; KAMATA 1971). In the 1970s, Kuroda Toshio radically challenged the view described above by showing that the Kamakura New Buddhist schools remained marginal movements in their own time, and the “old” Buddhism, which he terms *kenmitsu* (exoteric-esoteric) Buddhism, remained dominant (KURODA 1996). Because of Kuroda’s pioneering work, a sizable body of scholarship on Nanto Buddhism has developed, represented by HIRAOKA (1981), HORIKE (1980–1982), MINOWA (1999), NAGAMURA (1989), and OISHIO (1995 and 2006), among others.

elite scholar-monks of Nanto temples devoted their life to—while contrasting it with “esoteric” Buddhism that focused on thaumaturgical rites (*shuhō* 修法) performed for this-worldly, private purposes.⁷ Kuroda argues that in the ninth and tenth centuries, esotericism became the predominant discourse for the Japanese religious milieu at large, and the proliferation of esoteric rites, he claims, caused a decline in exoteric doctrinal studies (KURODA 1994, 60–65).⁸ A corollary of Kuroda’s model is the idea of esoteric lineages distinguishable by their differing ritual techniques. Hayami Tasuku, one of the pioneers in studying esoteric rites and their social roles, represents this view well. He argues that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, because of the growing popularity of esoteric rites in court society, monks of esoteric schools vigorously competed with one another for aristocratic patronage and sought to claim the uniqueness of their own rites while concealing them from outsiders (HAYAMI 1975).⁹ Through this process, *shōgyō* were passed down from a master to his disciple(s) and contributed to the creation of esoteric lineages.¹⁰

However, by focusing almost exclusively on esoteric rites, Hayami and Kuroda alike overlooked the corresponding development on the “exoteric” side: the performance of “exoteric” rites—in this case, debate rituals—similarly contributed to producing a large body of *shōgyō* and served to construct and solidify master-disciple lineages in this period. I emphasize what largely escaped Kuroda and Hayami’s attention, focusing on the roles of textual and oral transmission in “exoteric” traditions, and hope to complicate the established scholarly categories of “exoteric” and “esoteric.” Specifically, this article examines the *shōgyō* texts that the Tōdaiji monk Sōshō generated in connection with Buddhist debate, and demonstrates that the practice of transmitting one’s knowledge concerning ritual performance through *shōgyō* was not unique to esoteric lineages but was equally important in the exoteric tradition.

It is my conviction that in order to do justice to the multifarious nature of text production and usage exemplified by Sōshō, one must balance and bring together hermeneutic and non-hermeneutic approaches to texts (RAMBELLI

7. While the terms “exoteric” (*ken* 顯) and “esoteric” (*mitsu* 密) were themselves part of the lexicon of Heian Buddhism, it was KURODA (1996) who first employed them as analytical categories. However, as Sueki Fumihiko has noted, Kuroda’s use of the term “esotericism” (*mikkyō* 密教) is often ambiguous (SUEKI 1996).

8. For more on Kuroda’s theory of the exoteric-esoteric system see ABE (1999, 399–428); DOBBINS (1998); and STONE (2006). Stone has questioned the validity of the claim that doctrinal studies in the Tendai school had declined by the late Heian period (STONE 1999, 153–89).

9. For more discussion on the development of esoteric lineages and the culture of secret transmission see STONE (1999, 97–152).

10. According to NAGAMURA (2000, 200), in the Shingon school of Buddhism, *shōgyō* usually refers to ritual manuals (*shidai* 次第) or seals of transmission (*injin* 印信).

2007, 88–128).¹¹ Therefore, I describe the material and social conditions in which texts were produced and used as well as their contents and cognitive and communicative functions. In so doing, I will illustrate the central (but often neglected) roles that the exoteric *shōgyō* played in individual scholar-monks' careers, especially in their acquisition of doctrinal knowledge and gaining promotion and scholarly prestige. In addition, I will situate the production and transmission of *shōgyō* in its broader historical and institutional contexts, and argue that the production and transmission of the *shōgyō* contributed to a significant institutional development in the Buddhist community of the early Kamakura period (1192–1333), that is, the development of cloisters.

This article greatly benefits from the recent discovery and study of the massive body of *shōgyō* in Japan. In an effort to question the previous scholarship that overemphasized the socioeconomic roles of medieval temples as the major estate holders (*shōen ryōshu* 荘園領主), recent scholarship attempts to reveal the multiple facets of temple society not limited to economic activities. Specifically, scholars began to pay special attention to the ritual and scholarly activities that took place at temples, namely monks' ritual performances and doctrinal studies (*hōe* 法会 and *kyōgaku* 教学). With this shift in interest came the recent discovery or rediscovery of various temple documents, *shōgyō*, which can illuminate the ritual and scholarly activities of temples.¹² This article provides a case study focusing on Sōshō and examines the *shōgyō* that he produced in the process of preparing for and participating in debate rituals.¹³

11. Rambelli draws our attention to the heretofore neglected non-hermeneutic dimension of sacred texts in premodern Japanese Buddhism; he attempts to “deal systematically with texts as objects and material entities, in which their materiality is not a secondary effect of their being ‘reading matter’ but rather their primary characteristic” (RAMBELLI 2007, 89).

12. TAKEUCHI Rizō's scholarship (1942) represents the study of the socioeconomic roles of medieval temples as the major estate holders. This tendency in the studies of medieval temples drastically changed during the 1970s and 1980s. In this period, Japanese historians began to criticize prior scholarship for overemphasizing the sociopolitical perspective and illuminated the previously overlooked cultural and intellectual contributions that Buddhist temples made to medieval Japanese society. This type of approach is represented by, but not limited to, the scholarship of Kuroda Toshio and Amino Yoshihiko. For a thorough discussion of the trajectory of the studies of medieval temples, see HISANO 1999, 3–72.

13. For more discussion of this issue, see NAGAMURA 2000, 1–32. This new type of scholarship based on a thorough investigation of temple documents is represented by Nagamura Makoto, Inaba Nobumichi, and Hosokawa Ryōichi, to name a few. Note that they do not necessarily exclude the socioeconomic functions of temples but instead try to show the interactions between temples' social and economic functions and ritual activities that took place at temples.

Buddhist Debate in Medieval Japan: Its Format and History

Before discussing Sōshō's *shōgyō* texts, a brief overview of the format and the history of Japanese Buddhist debate (*rongi* 論義) will prove useful because Japanese Buddhist debate is not widely known outside of Japan.¹⁴ How did monks conduct debate? How and when did Buddhist debate become important for a monk's promotion? Buddhist debate was basically an oral exchange of questions and answers between two monks concerning Buddhist doctrinal issues. Although there were different types of Buddhist debate, this article focuses on debate *rituals* conducted as annual events following a fixed procedure. According to the ritual manuals and diaries written by aristocrats and monks, Buddhist debate, as developed and practiced in medieval Japan, had several different formats. Two major formats were the examination debate (*ryūgi rōgi* 堅義論義) and the lecture-and-question debate (*kōmon rōgi* 講問論義).¹⁵ First, the examination debate functioned as an oral exam, by which a debater's performance was examined and graded by his senior monks. The main officiants included the Questioner (*monja* 問者), who prepared and raised questions initiating debate, the Candidate (*rissha* 堅者 or *ryūgi* 堅義), the examinee who answered the questions, and the Examiner (*shōgi* 精義 or 證義),¹⁶ who evaluated and graded the Candidate's debate performance. Thus the examination debate focused on oral exchanges between the Candidate and the Questioner. The examination debate served as a social debut for a young scholar-monk serving as Candidate. The other officiants were more senior, more experienced, and higher ranking than the Candidate.

If the examination debate could be compared to an oral exam, the lecture-and-question debate was more akin to a public lecture with a question and answer session. Instead of the Candidate, the Lecture Master (*kōji* 講師) took

14. The topic of Japanese Buddhist debate is just beginning to draw serious attention in English-language scholarship because of the pioneering work of Paul GRONER (2002) and Mikael BAUER, who recently analyzed the Yuima-e at Kōfukuji (2011). I have also discussed the development of state-sponsored debate rituals elsewhere. For more discussion on the history and format of Buddhist debate as well as the previous Japanese scholarship on this topic, see SANGO 2011.

15. Although there were several different debate formats, due to space limitations I introduce only these two. *Kōmon* literally means "lecture and question," while *ryūgi* means "establishing the meaning."

16. Variant spellings were used to refer to this position: *shōgi* 精義, *shōjō* 証誠, and so forth. The specific tasks, which a monk in this position was expected to perform, varied depending on different debate rituals. For example, in the examination debate at the Yuima-e, a monk in this position was responsible for evaluating the quality of debate. Therefore, in his examination of the Yuima-e, Paul Groner translates this title as "Examiner" (GRONER 2002, 132). However, in a lecture-and-question debate such as the Saishōkō, which will be examined, a monk in this position did not grade a debate performance; rather, he functioned as a presider. Also, for this debate ritual, this position was usually spelled as *shōgi* 證義. To avoid confusion, I use the term "Examiner" to refer to all of these different spellings.

center stage. First, the Lecture Master gave a lecture on a Buddhist sutra, and responded to the Questioner's question. Unlike the Candidate in the examination debate, the Lecture Master's social status was much higher than that of the Questioner's. The debate between the Lecture Master and the Questioner was presided over by the Examiner. The Examiner in the lecture-and-question debate did not officially grade a debater's performance, but he sometimes intervened to provide comments, to correct mistakes, or to stop discussion when it was inappropriate.¹⁷

A debate ritual contained multiple debate sessions, and it utilized one or both of the two formats described above. The number of officiants varied, depending on the format or the number of sessions. For example, the Saishōkō 最勝講, or the lecture on and debate about the *Golden Light Sutra* (T no. 665, 16; Jp. *Konkōmyō saishō ō kyō* 金光明最勝王經; Sk. *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*), was conducted as a lecture-and-question debate for a total of ten sessions held over the course of five days. It required the attendance of two dozen or more monks: one to three monks serving as Examiners, ten monks serving as Questioners, and ten monks serving as Lecture Masters (there were also other officiants, but I will not discuss them here owing to space limitations).

Where was a debate ritual held? State-organized debate rituals were held in the imperial palace or a major Buddhist temple. Exactly what was discussed at these debate rituals? The content of the debates will be examined later using one of Sōshō's *shōgyō* texts as an example.

When and how did Buddhist debate become important for a scholar-monk's promotion? An examination of the state's decrees suggests that in the early Heian period (794–1185), Emperor Kanmu and the Council of State (*dajōkan* 太政官) officially instituted Buddhist debate rituals and defined the participation in these rituals as requirements for a monk's promotion.¹⁸ This was meant to be a meritocratic system in that, regardless of his temple affiliation or family background, a monk was required to attend a series of debate rituals in order to be promoted in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Among these rituals, the most important were the last three stages, collectively called the Three Nara Assemblies (*nankyō san'e* 南京三會)—the Yuima-e 維摩會 at Kōfukuji 興福寺, the Saishōe 最勝會 at Yakushiji 藥師寺, and the Misaie 御齋會 in the imperial palace.¹⁹ A

17. I have found the records of such instances in Kujō Kanezane's 九条兼実 (1149–1207) diary *Gyokuyō* 玉葉, and plan to write a separate article on this issue.

18. I have discussed this issue at great length in a different article—see SANGO (2011).

19. The Yuima-e focused on lectures and discussions of the *Vimalakīrti Sutra* (*Yuimakitsu shosetsu kyō* 維摩詰所說經; T no. 475, 14) and the Saishōe and the Misaie, and on the lecture and discussions on the *Golden Light Sutra*. These rituals had independent beginnings but were later combined to constitute the ritual triad of the Three Nara Assemblies.

scholar-monk who participated in these state-organized debate rituals was guaranteed a post in the ecclesiastical office of *sōgō*. The competition was very harsh: state-sponsored debate rituals were usually held no more than once a year, and only a limited number of monks were allowed to attend them. Therefore, to be recommended, a monk first needed to compete with his fellow monks in demonstrating his scholarly credentials in smaller-scale debate rituals held within his own temple (*jinai hōe* 寺内法会). However, once a monk surpassed his rivals both within his temple and those without, completed the program, and entered the *sōgō* office, he could exercise significant control over other monks' careers by granting (or not granting) permission for them to attend debate rituals.

Thus in the early Heian period, the state instituted a system of promotion based on Buddhist debate rituals. The establishment of this system politicized doctrinal knowledge and debate techniques as the currency needed for clerical promotion, and made debate rituals into fiercely competitive struggles for power and influence.²⁰ This system continued to grow in size and social significance during the Heian period, leading to the birth of many new debate rituals. For example, in the late Heian period, a new version of the three assemblies developed—the Three Heian Assemblies (*hokkyō san'e* 北京三会). This new ceremonial triad was created during the reign of Emperor Gosanjō 御三条 (1034–1073; r. 1068–1072) because the older one—the Three Nara Assemblies—had come to be dominated by Hossō 法相 monks, and monks of other schools, especially those of the Tendai 天台 school, had difficulties advancing their positions through this route. The Three Heian Assemblies was created mainly to facilitate the promotion of Tendai monks. In addition, another set of three debate rituals was added as a promotion route for scholar-monks—the Three Lectures (*sankō* 三講).²¹ The increase in the number of debate rituals further intensified the competition among scholar-monks striving to establish themselves academically and socially in the ecclesiastical community. The system of promotion based on debate rituals continued to function in the subsequent Kamakura period during which the monk Sōshō lived.

How Did a Scholar-Monk Gain Promotion through Buddhist Debate? The Case of Sōshō

Let us illustrate this intimate connection between Buddhist debate and clerical promotion by examining Sōshō's ecclesiastical career. He was born into the Fuji-

20. It also solidified sectarian boundaries among Buddhist schools, which distinguished themselves from one another by specializing in particular kinds of doctrinal knowledge. Scholarly consensus holds that Buddhist schools were both doctrinally and institutionally less sectarian and exclusive than they later came to be in the Heian period.

21. For discussion of promotion routes for exoteric monks, see *Shakke kanpanki* 釈家官班記 by Son'en Hosshinnō 尊円法親王 (1298–1356) in GR 18, especially 48–53.

wara family in 1202, and entered Tōdaiji at age fourteen. He first resided in the Chūin 中院 cloister, the center for the study of the *Abhidharmakośa śāstra* (Jp. *Abidatsuma kusharon* 阿毘達磨俱舍論; T no. 1558, 29). Four years later, Sōshō participated in the Thirty Lectures on the *Abhidharmakośa śāstra* (*Kusha sanjikkō* 俱舍三十講; hereafter Thirty Lectures). The Thirty Lectures constituted one of the debate rituals held within Tōdaiji for the purpose of improving and testing young Tōdaiji monks' mastery of doctrinal knowledge and debate techniques. When Sōshō attended this debate ritual in 1218, senior monks were impressed by his debate performance; as a result, they appointed him as Candidate for the examination debate in the Yuima-e to be held the following year. This suggests that debate rituals held at temples, such as the Thirty Lectures, served not only as a place to learn Buddhist doctrines and debate but also as a way to screen candidates for state-sponsored debate rituals such as the Yuima-e.²² In the Yuima-e held in the next year, the eighteen-year-old Sōshō successfully passed the examination debate, thereby embarking on his monastic career. About twenty years later, having served as Lecture Master in all of the Three Nara Assemblies, Sōshō entered the *sōgō* office at age forty.

Thus Sōshō's career presents a case of a successful elite scholar-monk in the Kamakura period who advanced his position through participating in a series of debate rituals (both those sponsored by his temple and those sponsored by the state). However, it is important to note that in the late Heian and Kamakura periods, the meritocratic principle in the system of promotion based on debate rituals was often compromised by another important factor for monastic promotion—one's family background. In this period, increasing numbers of sons of the imperial family (*kishu* 貴種, literally "royal seed") and those of the highest-ranking aristocrats (*ryōke* 良家, literally "good family") joined the monastic community, and they usually advanced themselves much faster than ordinary monks (*bonjin* 凡人 or *bonsō* 凡僧). According to ecclesiastical appointment records such as the *Appointments to the Sōgō Office* (*Sōgō bunin* 僧綱補任), most ordinary monks entered the *sōgō* office in their early fifties, and some in their sixties, seventies, or even eighties, while monks of the imperial and aristocratic families joined the office in their twenties, thirties, or even their teens.²³

As mentioned earlier, Sōshō himself was from the Fujiwara aristocratic family. On the one hand, Sōshō's aristocratic birth undoubtedly enabled him to start participating in state-organized debate rituals at the relatively young age of eighteen. On the other hand, however, completing the program at age forty was not an extraordinarily fast promotion by the standards of that time. This suggests

22. For more discussion on this issue, see HIRAOKA 1981, 345–84.

23. *Sōgō bunin*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, 123, 61–288. This text records more than two thousand appointments to the position of Prelate from 624 to 1142.

that Sōshō's success as a scholar-monk owed at least as much to his successful performance of debate as to his aristocratic birth. Furthermore, he owed his successful performance of debate, in turn, to the *shōgyō* texts that he produced.

Buddhist Debate and Shōgyō Production

Sōshō produced almost five hundred texts, which included his own writings as well as the copies he made of the original texts written by other authors (NAGAMURA 2000, 170). How and for what purposes did an exoteric monk come to generate such a massive body of texts? To answer this question, first let us examine Sōshō's *shōgyō* texts, not by focusing on their content, but by placing them in the contexts of their original production processes, that is, monks' doctrinal studies and preparation for debate rituals.

As was the case with the exoteric *shōgyō* in general, Sōshō's *shōgyō* can be categorized into the following five types: 1. notations and commentaries on sutra, *vinaya*, and *sāstra* (*shoshaku* 疏釈); 2. debate scripts (*rongisō* 論義草); 3. records of debate performance (*mondōki* 問答記); 4. excerpts (*shōmotsu* or *shōmono* 抄物); and 5. written records of oral transmission (*kikigaki* 聞書) (NAGAMURA 2000, 56). By placing these different genres of texts in the contexts of their production, one can gain a fairly comprehensive picture of how monks in the medieval period trained themselves (or their disciples) for Buddhist debate.

Let us illustrate how these different genres of *shōgyō* were produced by examining the *shōgyō* that Sōshō wrote in order to prepare for the Yuima-e. Sōshō attended this assembly a total of seventeen times during his career. He first participated in this assembly as Candidate (in 1219) and successfully passed the examination debate. Consequently, he served as Questioner, Lecture Master, and Examiner in this assembly. Serving in these important positions in the Yuima-e as many as seventeen times was surely the highest level of scholarly achievement. Clearly, Sōshō was recognized as one of the most distinguished scholar-monks of the time.

Sometime after Sōshō passed the examination debate in the Yuima-e, he started studying Buddhist logic (*inmyō* 因明) under the tutelage of the Kōfukuji monk Jōkei 貞慶 (1155–1213) and his disciples Kakuben 覺遍 (ca. thirteenth century) and Ryōben 良遍 (ca. thirteenth century). Buddhist logic refers both to the study of inferences, usually based on the three-part syllogism (*sanshi sahō* 三支作法), as well as to that of epistemological issues in Buddhist doctrines. Buddhist logic was central to Japanese Buddhist debate, especially the Yuima-e. In each debate session of the Yuima-e, two questions were discussed; one question concerned doctrinal points of Buddhist sutras (*naimyō* 内明) and the other, Buddhist logic. Sōshō sought the guidance of the Kōfukuji monks such as Jōkei because Hossō monks in general, and these Kōfukuji monks in particular, were

known for their expertise in Buddhist logic. While studying with them, Sōshō began to produce *shōgyō* in order to serve as Lecture Master in the Yuima-e. For example, in 1228 Sōshō created the record of debates conducted at the Yuima-e (*Yuima-e mondōki* 維摩會問答記) for this purpose.

His strenuous study of Buddhist logic bore fruit in the tenth month of 1238 when he was appointed as Lecture Master of the Yuima-e to be held in the following year. Sōshō immediately started extra training (*kegyō* 加行) specifically at this debate ritual. In the second month of 1239, he temporarily moved to the Shōgan'in 勝願院 cloister in Kōfukuji temple where his teacher Ryōben resided, and received the oral transmission (*denju* 伝授) of the *Commentary on the Correct Theories of Buddhist Logic* (*Inmyō nisshō riron sho* 因明入正理論疏) from him (T no. 1840, 44: 91b–143a).²⁴ For forty days, Sōshō read aloud this entire text to Ryōben. Whenever Sōshō made mistakes or found points that he did not understand, Ryōben would correct him or provide explanations. After receiving the oral transmission, Sōshō stated, “Surprisingly I found some points here and there that were not clear. I should make sure to write these down later” (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 2, 10). Consequently, Sōshō created a written record of oral transmission (*Sanyō gidan hōshō zangishō* 纂要義斷宝勝殘義抄) (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 2, 9–11). Furthermore, Sōshō also created the excerpts of the commentary that he orally received from his teacher (*Inmyō daisho shō* 因明大疏抄; T no. 2271, 68).

In addition, there were some genres of *shōgyō* that Sōshō or his fellow monks most likely produced but that have been lost. For example, a debate question was often written down on a wooden tablet (*tanzaku* 短尺), which a monk would read out during a debate. After the performance of the debate, these tablets were collected (and were often edited) to formulate a debate script. During the ritual, a monk serving as Recorder (*chūki* 注記 or *rongigaki* 論義書) also wrote down the ritual proceedings, which eventually became the record of debate performance.

Finally, all of these texts—excerpts, written records of oral transmission, debate scripts, and records of debate performance—could be shown or transmitted (whether orally or not) to his disciples, who were appointed to attend the same debate ritual in which his teacher had participated. The disciples, in turn, would copy or create excerpts of their teacher's *shōgyō* texts. The disciples' texts, of course, would be used by their disciples in the future. In this manner, the exoteric *shōgyō* proliferated in medieval temples such as Tōdaiji. A monk's desire to participate in state-sponsored debate rituals to gain promotion was a major motivation for producing *shōgyō*.

24. The *Inmyō nisshō riron sho* is the Chinese Hossō master Ki's 基 (Ch. Ji; 632–682) commentary on the *Inmyō nisshō riron* 因明入正理論 (Sk. *Nyāyapraveśa-śāstra*; Ch. *Yinming ruzheng lilun*), written by Śaṅkarasvāmin (T no. 1630, 32.11–13).

Shōgyō Transmission and Lineage Construction

Thus far, this article has illuminated the intimate connection among a monk's promotion, his participation in debate rituals, and his *shōgyō* production. There was yet another equally important motivation for *shōgyō* production in medieval Japan—the transmission of *shōgyō* from a teacher to his disciple for the purpose of constructing or solidifying a lineage. Master–disciple succession (*shishi sōjō* 師資相承) was the dominant principle of social formation in medieval temple society.²⁵ The master–disciple succession ensured that the master could pass down to chosen disciple(s) his private property—both material and immaterial—that he had inherited from his teacher(s) and/or had himself earned during his career. The material property included the master's residential quarters and the landholdings associated with it, as well as *shōgyō* texts. Transmitted along with such material property was the immaterial property—cultural and social resources such as the master's doctrinal knowledge and ritual techniques, as well as his network of influence and support.

The principle of master–disciple succession began to be institutionalized in the Buddhist community of the late Heian period where lineages (*monryū* 門流) and cloisters were emerging.²⁶ A lineage was formulated and maintained through a single line of succession from a master to his disciple, and had its institutional base in one or more cloisters, the smallest constituent units of a temple (*jike* 寺家). In many cases, the members of a cloister included not only the master's disciples but also his kin and other unordained individuals. Together, they formed what Nishiguchi calls “a quasi-family institution” (*giseiteki ie* 擬制的家) or “monastic family” (*sō no ie* 僧の家; NISHIGUCHI 1987, 201).²⁷ As such,

25. For studies on master–disciple succession in medieval temple society in general, see KAMIKAWA 2007, 291–336; KURODA 1995, 205–24; NISHIGUCHI 1987, 183–218; TAKESHIMA 1936, 457–515; TANAKA 1976; and TSUJI 1979. For studies on master–disciple succession in specific temples, see TSUCHIYA 2001, 12–39; TAKAYAMA 2010; and YASUDA 2001. Tsuchiya discusses the cases of master–disciple succession at Daigoji temple, and Takayama and Yasuda, those at Kōfukuji temple.

26. According to Kamikawa Michio, master–disciple succession first developed in the ninth and tenth centuries in the Shingon tradition primarily to transmit the master's doctrinal knowledge and ritual techniques to his disciple. However, in the late eleventh century, material property also began to be transmitted (KAMIKAWA 2007, 291–336). Also, while Kuroda Toshio uses the terms “lineage” and “cloister” almost interchangeably, Kamikawa emphasizes that the two should be clearly differentiated (KAMIKAWA 2007, 325, note 2).

27. Many scholars have called attention to striking similarities between master–disciple succession in ecclesiastical society and father–son succession in the *ie* 家 institution, namely, the system of patrilineal descent through which not only a material estate (such as land and/or mansions) but also the nonmaterial legacy of a family was passed down to the next generation. Nishiguchi, for example, argues that certain temple positions were usually passed down hereditarily, and concludes that the temple community of the late Heian period saw the formation

a cloister had many important functions for monks: it was a place for living, teaching, learning, and training. Furthermore, those who succeeded in gaining the master's trust and respect by successfully carrying out these activities within their cloister would be appointed to important positions in Buddhist rituals held by their temple or the state and therefore would be presented with more opportunities for promotion (KAMIKAWA 2007, 299).²⁸ In this way, master-disciple succession facilitated not only the transmission of a lineage but also the career advancement of monks. Against this backdrop, *shōgyō* increased in number and significance as one of the principal items of succession property.

To clarify this aspect of *shōgyō* production, I will now examine the process by which the *Essentials of Buddhist Logic* (*Myōhonshō* 明本抄), hereafter *Essentials* (T no. 2281, 69: 417–507), was passed down while focusing on its colophons (*okugaki* 奥書). These colophons were written by those who received the transmission of this text.

The *Essentials* was originally composed by the Kōfukuji monk Jōkei in his final years. As I mentioned earlier, Jōkei was an eminent scholar of the Hossō tradition whose knowledge of Buddhist logic was particularly well received among scholar-monks. The culmination of Jōkei's study of Buddhist logic was the *Essentials*, in which he examined sixty-eight of the most difficult topics in Buddhist logic. After his death, the *Essentials* quickly became known among scholar-monks studying Buddhist logic as “the most esoteric book about Buddhist logic,” as Sōshō called it (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 2, 460). Jōkei transmitted the *Essentials* to his disciple Kakuben in Kōfukuji. As I briefly mentioned earlier, Sōshō, although a Tōdaiji monk, studied Buddhist logic with both Jōkei and Kakuben, and received the transmission of the *Essentials* from Kakuben. When Sōshō copied the *Essentials*, he wrote in its colophon (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 2, 460):

When Jōkei was alive, he showed [the *Essentials*] to only a selected few disciples, and even the senior Kōfukuji scholars specializing in Buddhist debate did not get to see this book. Today, even Jōkei's grand disciples [in Kōfukuji temple] cannot see this book. As for me, I am still inexperienced and from a different lineage. However, my determination to study Buddhist logic has been exceptionally strong.... Since the tenth month of the year 1225 when I became the disciple of Kakuben, who is the one of the highest ranking monks of Kōmyōin 光明院 cloister [in Kōfukuji], I studied [Buddhist logic under his tute-

of “a quasi-family institution” or “monastic family,” as she puts it (NISHIGUCHI 1987, 186–201). However, note that a cloister was different from an *ie* because it included both kin and non-kin members.

28. I have discussed elsewhere how the master-disciple succession facilitated a monk's promotion. See “Appendix 2: Alternative Avenues of Clerical Promotion,” in SANGO 2007, 222–37.

lage]... for thirty years. My determination has proven itself... [Finally, Kakuben gave me] permission to copy all thirteen volumes [of the *Essentials*].

Sōshō took pride in his strong determination to study Buddhist logic, which eventually gained him permission to copy the *Essentials* despite his status as a Tōdaiji monk. The colophons of the hidden *shōgyō* such as the *Essentials* were not just the records of who was allowed its transmission, when, and where; rather, being able to sign one's name in the colophon of *shōgyō*, along with the specialists of Buddhist logic such as Jōkei and Kakuben, was proof of the highest scholarly achievement possible to scholar-monks (NAGAMURA 2003, 10).

In the same colophon, Sōshō also stressed the hidden nature of the *Essentials* by commanding, “Monks of my lineage [that is, Sonshōin 尊勝院 cloister] must conceal this text [from outsiders]” (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 2, 465). Furthermore, in 1255, when Sōshō received from Kakuben a copy of the *Essentials* along with its index (*mokuroku* 目錄) and a collection of diary entries about this text (*nikki* 日記), he, in return, gave Kakuben a written agreement for the transmission (*Myōhonshō sōjō keijō* 明本抄相承契狀). Here Sōshō promised that if no Tōdaiji monk could satisfy strict scholarly standards required of the transmitter of the *Essentials*, he would return the copies of these texts that he had made to Kakuben's disciple Shōyo 性譽 (ca. thirteenth century; HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 2, 478–79).²⁹ Fortunately, Sōshō found a qualified person for the transmission of the *Essentials*, Shōzen 聖禪 (b. 1202), who was allowed to copy this text in 1258.³⁰ Just as Sōshō did, Shōzen signed a written agreement pledging to return the copy of the *Essentials* to the Sonshōin cloister after his death (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 2, 479). This suggests that the *Essentials* eventually came into the possession of the Sonshōin cloister and became a secret text not accessible to outsiders.

Given that Sōshō had been the head of the Sonshōin cloister since 1246, it was most likely Sōshō who decided to limit the transmission of the *Essentials* only to the Tōdaiji monks who belonged to the Sonshōin cloister. Why did he make this decision? Sōshō himself did not provide an explanation. However, an answer to this question lies in the growth of cloisters in the early Kamakura period—the transmission of *shōgyō* contributed to this institutional development.

29. Sōshō had just such a disciple in mind—Jikkō 実弘. Although Jikkō received a copy of the *Essentials*, he unfortunately died a premature death in the next year. Also, there was one disciple who received the oral transmission of the *Essentials* from Sōshō in 1275 (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 2, 461–66).

30. It is not clear whether, strictly speaking, there was a master–disciple relationship between Sōshō and Shōzen. According to the colophons of the *Essentials*, Sōshō and Shōzen were the same age (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 2, 461–78). Also, the *Honchō kōsōden* 本朝高僧伝 describes Shōzen as a disciple of the Tōdaiji monk Songen 尊玄 (ca. thirteenth century), and not Sōshō. It states that Shōzen's expertise in the *Abhidharmakośa śāstra* was such that whenever Sōshō had a question about this sutra, he always asked Shōzen to clarify it (*Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 102, 220).

Cloisters originally developed in the mid-Heian period as monks' residential spaces. However, by the mid-Kamakura period, cloisters grew into core institutional units that were physically located within a temple but enjoyed a considerable degree of political and economic independence. It is significant that cloisters also served as the center of monks' academic activities. Each cloister was designated as the center of a specific discipline. For example, the Sonshōin cloister, which Sōshō had headed since 1246, was the center of Kegon studies. What created and maintained a cloister was the practice of transmission through which a master passed down to his disciple his teachings as well as economic resources—so-called *shishi sōjō*. Most important for our discussion here is that because Sōshō strictly limited distribution of the *Essentials* only to members of the Sonshōin cloister, this indicates that the secret transmission of *shōgyō* worked to solidify the identity of this cloister as the center of the Kegon discipline while distinguishing itself from other cloisters.

Thus in the exoteric tradition of medieval Japan, *shōgyō* production was intimately connected not only with individual monks' promotion and scholarly achievements but also with the development of cloisters. Therefore, exoteric monks treated *shōgyō* with the utmost respect and care, thereby cloaking it in an aura of sanctity. For example, Sōshō's contemporary, the monk Myōe 明恵 (1173–1232) of Kōzanji 高山寺, who strived to revive this temple as well as the Kegon tradition in the early Kamakura period, once admonished that “one should not place things like a rosary or a small bag on *shōgyō*,” or that “one should not place *shōgyō* underneath a desk.”³¹

Thus, in a circular manner, the *shōgyō* texts and those who produced or transmitted *shōgyō* legitimized one another. On the one hand, Sōshō's act of copying it and later transmitting it to his disciples as a hidden text endorsed the *Essentials* as “the most esoteric book about Buddhist logic,” or a sacred object that should never be placed underneath the desk. On the other hand, Sōshō felt validated by signing his name in the colophon of this hidden, sacred text, and associating himself with the prominent specialists of Buddhist logic such as Jōkei and Kakuben. Furthermore, a monk's scholarly or religious authority thus augmented helped him gain recognition from the senior monks in his temple or the members of the *sōgō* office who were responsible for appointing the important ritual positions in debate rituals. Finally, the secret transmission of *shōgyō* strengthened not only individual scholar-monks but also the cloisters to which they belonged. Through producing and transmitting the *Essentials*, the leading members of the Sonshōin cloister were able to establish this cloister as the center

31. *Kamakura ibun: Komonjohen*, no. 4263, 6: 338. This entry is dated the first month of the year 1232.

of the Kegon tradition that could make a unique academic contribution to the development of doctrinal studies at Tōdaiji.

Thus far, I have described sociopolitical motivations behind the production of *shōgyō*—gaining promotion, and constructing lineages and cloisters. This naturally raises a question: Were the copying of *shōgyō* and attendance at debate rituals merely a means for promotion and lineage construction? These were by no means the only motivations for a scholar-monk to generate *shōgyō*. Copying *shōgyō* and creating excerpts were the major modes of learning (*shūgaku* 修学) for monks in Sōshō's time. Their motivation to learn, I believe, came not only from rather mundane goals but also from intellectual and religious aspirations. In the colophon of the *Essentials of Buddhist Logic*, which was transmitted to Sōshō from the Kōfukuji monk Kakuben, Sōshō claimed that he “did not do this work [that is, the copying of this *shōgyō* text] to seek fame and profit [*myōri* 名利],” but rather he hoped that because of the merit of copying this text, he would “reach awakening and exit this world” (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 2, 477).

As I have discussed earlier, the *Essentials* was considered one of the most important texts on the topic of Buddhist logic. Not only Sōshō but also other monks who received the transmission of this text—either before or after Sōshō did—expressed their excitement for being able to read and copy this text by using the common expression *inmyō kechien* 因明結緣. This phrase means to make a connection (*kechien*) with Buddhist logic (*inmyō*), to achieve a future awakening or better rebirth. Especially for Sōshō, who committed himself to the worship of Maitreya, *inmyō kechien* was the way to be reborn in Maitreya's *Tuṣita* heaven and attend his assembly under the dragon-flower tree.³² Thus, although future promotion must have been the monks' most pressing concern, they were simultaneously and equally concerned with their academic and religious goals (NAGAMURA 2000, 189–91). Furthermore, it seems that in their minds, intellectual and spiritual achievements—studying Buddhist logic through copying *shōgyō* and reaching awakening—were not separable. Doctrinal learning was directly related to their spiritual salvation, and vice versa.

Buddhist Debate and Doctrinal Learning: The Case of the Saishōkō

THE FORMAT OF THE SAISHŌKŌ

The remainder of this article focuses on scholar-monks' doctrinal learning, especially its place in the production of *shōgyō* and the performance of debate. How did a debate ritual encourage monks to produce *shōgyō* and advance their doctrinal studies? To answer this question, the Saishōkō will be examined as a

32. Sōshō repeatedly mentioned rebirth in Maitreya's *Tuṣita* heaven and the dragon-flower assembly in the colophon of the *Essentials* (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 2, 455–81).

case study. First, a brief overview of the history and the format of this ritual will prove useful.³³ The Saishōkō, or the lecture on and debate about the *Golden Light Sutra*, was established during the reign of Emperor Ichijō 一条 (980–1011; r. 986–1011), and later came to be designated as one of the Three Lectures. As I have explained earlier, the participants in the Three Lectures, like those in the Three Nara Assemblies, were often later promoted to the *sōgō* office. Only monks from the four major temples (*shika daiji* 四箇大寺)—Kōfukuji, Tōdaiji, Enryakuji, and Onjōji—were invited to attend the Three Lectures. The Saishōkō was considered the highest in the triad; therefore, a monk was usually required to have attended the other two debate rituals of the Three Lectures in order to enjoy the honor of being appointed to the main positions in the Saishōkō.³⁴ Thus, only the elite of elite scholar-monks were able to attend the Saishōkō. For a list of the main officiants in the Saishōkō, please see the TABLE on the following page.

Among these participants, those serving as Lecture Master and Examiner were usually members of the *sōgō* office who had delivered lectures in a series of state-sponsored debate rituals in the past (especially in the Three Nara Assemblies or the other two rituals of the Three Lectures). They were older and more advanced in their careers than were the monks fulfilling the other positions such as Questioner. To be appointed as Questioner, a monk was required to have successfully passed the examination debates in the Three Nara Assemblies. In addition, in the audience there were several monks fulfilling the other ceremonial roles such as the Recitation Master, who recited the title of a chapter of the *Golden Light Sutra*, as well as courtiers (the emperor often attended this ritual, too). In total, about twenty-five or more monks participated in the Saishōkō.

What was the format of the Saishōkō? The Saishōkō was held annually on the fifth month within the imperial palace.³⁵ This was a lecture-and-question debate, and contained ten sessions held over the course of five days (two sessions per day; that is, the morning and evening sessions). In each session, the

33. For this purpose, I draw on ritual manuals and diaries written by monks and courtiers such as the *Gōke shidai* 江家次第 (*Shintō taikai: Chōgi saishi hen* 4, 368–69), the ritual manual for court rituals written by Ōe Masafusa 大江匡房 (1041–1111); the *Chūyūki* 中右記 (*Dai Nihon kokiroku: Chūyūki* 大日本古記録—中右記 1–5), the diary written by the courtier Fujiwara Munetada 藤原宗忠 (1062–1141); and the ritual manual for the Saishōkō compiled by Imperial Prince Shukaku 守覚法親王 (1150–1202; NINNAJI KONBYŌSHI KOZŌSHI KENKYŪKAI 1995, vol. 2, 1211–29). In addition, *Unzushō* 雲図抄 (GR 5, 110–51) provides a diagram that describes how the Seiryōden Hall was used during the performance of the Saishōkō. In describing the format of this ritual, I focus on its debate component and omit the other parts because of space limitations.

34. See Son'en Hosshinnō, *Shakke kanpanki*, in GR 18.

35. The Saishōkō was originally held in Seiryōden Hall in the imperial palace. However, in the late Heian period, when the imperial palace was burned down a number of times, the Saishōkō shifted its location elsewhere (for example, to *kan'in*, a temporary imperial residence located outside the imperial palace).

TITLE	NUMBER AND QUALIFICATIONS	MAJOR ROLE
The Examiner (<i>shōgi</i> 證義 or <i>shōjō</i> 証誠)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One to three monks; appointed from the member(s) of the <i>sōgō</i> office; a monk could concurrently hold this position and the position of Lecture Master 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presiding over a debate session; making sure that participants follow the proper procedure; sometimes commenting on the content of debate
The Lecture Master (<i>kōji</i> 講師)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ten monks, appointed from those who had completed a lecture-ship in the Three Nara Assemblies (<i>ikō</i>) and become members of the <i>sōgō</i> office (<i>sōgō kōji</i> 僧綱講師); if not, they were called Lecture Masters of ordinary monks (<i>bonsō kōji</i> 凡僧講師) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lecturing on the <i>Golden Light Sutra</i> (<i>shakkyō</i> 釈教); responding to the Questioner's questioning
The Audience (<i>chōju</i> 聴衆) or the Questioner (<i>monja</i> 問者)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ten monks, appointed from those who had passed the examination debates at the Three Nara Assemblies (<i>tokugō</i> 得業); served as the audience for the Lecture Master's lecture; also served as the Questioner during debate sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparing and raising questions; conducting debates with the Lecture Master
The Recitation Master (<i>dokuji</i> 読師)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One monk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chanting the title of a chapter of the <i>Golden Light Sutra</i> at the beginning of the Lecture Master's lecture

TABLE. List of the Main Officiants in the Saishōkō.

Lecture Master's lecture on the *Golden Light Sutra* preceded a debate. Each of the ten chapters of the *Golden Light Sutra* was assigned to each session (the first chapter for the first session, and so forth). In each debate session, a monk from a Nanto temple (Kōfukuji or Tōdaiji) was paired with a monk from a Tendai temple (Enryakuji or Onjōji). In each session, a different pair of Lecture Master and Questioner debated, although the same monk(s) served as the Examiner presiding over all ten debate sessions. In the lecture-and-question debate, the Examiner did not necessarily evaluate or grade the quality of debate performance but he sometimes commented on the content of the debate. He also cautioned participants for not following proper debate procedure. The Lecture Master and the Questioner conducted two rounds of debate (*nijō* 二帖 or 二条). One round of debate usually consisted of two exchanges between the two (*nijū* 二重); the Questioner first raised a question, the Lecture Master responded, the Questioner asked a follow-up question, and the Lecture Master responded again. When this was repeated twice, a debate session ended.

THE CONTENT OF DEBATE HELD AT THE SAISHŌKŌ

What did the Lecture Master and the Questioner actually discuss? What was the level of their discussion? Sōshō's *Records of Questions and Answers Discussed at the Saishōkō* (*Saishōkō mondōki* 最勝講問答記; hereafter *Mondōki*) provides answers to these questions.³⁶ The *Mondōki* records the content of four hundred and seventy debate sessions held in the Saishōkō between 1191 and 1261 (albeit with some gaps) transcribing over nine hundred questions and responses discussed at this debate ritual.³⁷ How did Sōshō produce this massive corps of texts? When he himself attended the Saishōkō as Questioner or Lecture Master,³⁸ he recorded the content of debate by himself afterward. When he did not, he interviewed the monks who did, or borrowed a copy of the record of debate from other monks (often from the monks of Kōfukuji). While he himself usually copied the texts that he borrowed, he sometimes asked someone else to copy them for him.³⁹ He started writing the *Mondōki* in 1221 when he was twenty years old—right in the midst of the

36. This text remains largely unpublished. Hiraoka has published excerpts (the list of participants and colophons) (HIRAOKA 1958). Minowa Kenryō transcribed the record of debate that took place in the year 1191, and analyzed the first two debate sessions (MINOWA 2009, 226–43 and 299–305). The Tōdaiji Toshokan 東大寺図書館 (Tōdaiji Library) in Nara has its original copy, and the Shiryō Hensanjo at the University of Tokyo has its photographed copy. I examined the latter.

37. The *Mondōki* lacks the records of 1221–1224, 1233–1242, 1246–1248, 1250, 1252–1256, 1259–1260, and 1263–1267.

38. He attended the Saishōkō ten times in his life—first as Questioner (1225), then as Lecture Master (1243), and finally as Expert Presider (1261) (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 1, 46–107).

39. The process by which Sōshō produced the *Mondōki* is explained in its colophons (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 1, 46–107).

Jōkyū Disturbance (*jōkyū no ran* 承久の乱), which resulted from Retired Emperor Gotoba's 後鳥羽 attempt to overthrow the Hōjō 北条 family, the regental house of the Kamakura shogunate. Sōshō explained his motivation for producing this text in its colophon: "I copied this text at the Chūin cloister because I have a sincere aspiration to receive the state's invitation (*kushō* 公請) [to attend the Saishōkō], and a deep desire for academic achievement. Those who will look at this text in later years should treat it with respect" (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 1, 53). Also, he added, "Those who will look at this text in later years should recite *nenbutsu* while thinking about their next life" (HIRAOKA 1958, vol. 1, 61 and 68). Thus this colophon shows that Sōshō's social, academic, and religious concerns were all equally important motivations for him to produce *shōgyō*. His efforts bore fruit in 1225 when the twenty-four-year-old Sōshō was for the first time invited to attend the Saishōkō as Questioner. After that, he continued to write the *Mondōki* throughout his monastic career—until 1268, five years before his death at the age of seventy-six.

Now let us turn to the content of the *Mondōki* to illustrate the academic aspect of Sōshō's *shōgyō* production. For this purpose, the *Mondōki*'s description of the evening session of the second day of the Saishōkō held in 1191 will be examined. Sōshō wrote this part of the *Mondōki* in 1221 (thirty years after the actual performance of the Saishōkō took place) in order to prepare himself for his future possible participation in the Saishōkō; but he was not one of the debaters.⁴⁰ Who were the debaters that year? The Questioner was Shinkō 信弘 (ca. twelfth century), the Hossō monk of Kōfukuji, and the Lecture Master was Kōga 公雅 (b. 1155), the Tendai monk of Onjōji. Shinkō was rather an obscure figure; his name is mentioned nowhere but the *Mondōki*; also, the fact that Sōshō did not describe Shinkō's official position means that Shinkō had no position worth mentioning. However, it is clear from reading the *Mondōki* that he had done outstanding academic preparation and had a critical mind. In contrast, Kōga was a well-known monk with a high social status. In 1191 when this debate session occurred, Kōga already had a post in the *sōgō* office of the Provisional Precept Master (*gon no risshi* 權律師). In addition, throughout his career Kōga was invited to participate in many state-sponsored Buddhist rituals, including the Saishōkō. Even before 1191, he had attended the Saishōkō first in 1178 as Questioner, and later in 1187 as Lecture Master. Thus, as was usual in the lecture-and-question debate in general, the Lecture Master's social position was much higher than the Questioner's. However, as I will illustrate, this disparity in the debaters' social status did not work to compromise the quality of discussion; Shinkō does not seem to have felt intimidated by Kōga at all.

There were two rounds of debate in each session of the Saishōkō, each initiated by the Questioner raising a question. Here is the first round of debate:

40. It is not clear whether in 1221 Sōshō interviewed those who had participated in the Saishōkō in 1191 or borrowed a copy of the *Mondōki* from somebody else.

The Questioner: I ask about a sentence in the sutra [that is, the *Golden Light Sutra*].⁴¹ The founder [*shūshi* or *sōshi* 宗師; here it refers to Chigi 智顓, Ch. Zhiyi] discusses that one terminates one's afflictions [*waku* 惑] in the path of insight [*kendōi* 見道位] (Sk. *darśana marga*).⁴² Now, [according to Chigi] how does a person of dull capacity [*donkon* 鈍根]⁴³ terminate his afflictions?

The Lecture Master: I answer.⁴⁴

The Questioner: I further argue. [Chigi states in his commentary on *Yūimagyō* 維摩經] “A person of dull capacity first terminates [the affliction of] desire (*ai* 愛) and then terminates [that of] views [*ken* 見].”⁴⁵ Concerning this point, one terminates confusion about principle [*meiri* 迷理] in the path of insight. However, desire is [an affliction to be included in the category of] confusion about the phenomenal world [*meiji* 迷事]. Why did [Chigi] say that one terminates [the affliction of desire] in this path [that is, the path of insight]? Does it follow then that a person of sharp capacity [*rikon*]⁴⁶ first terminates the affliction of views?

The Lecture Master: [The idea of] the eighty-eight types of afflictions (*hachijū hasshi* 八十八使) to be terminated in the path of insight is [the teachings of] *Abhidharma* or Consciousness-Only philosophy [*shōzō* 性相].⁴⁷ [In these literatures, desire is supposed to be terminated at the path of cultivation

41. Here the Questioner, Shinkō, refers to the following sentence in the *Golden Light Sutra*: “[a good son] swiftly and completely eliminates afflictions to be terminated in the path of insight and the path of cultivation [*kenju no bonnō* 見修煩惱]” (T no. 665, 16: 419c).

42. This is the third of the five stages of practice (*goi* 五位), culminating in the achievement of awakening. “Five stages” is the idea used in Consciousness-Only philosophy. The path of insight corresponds to the stage of stream-enterer (*yorukō* 預流向) in the four stages of practice (*shikō shika* 四向四果). In the path of insight, one begins to acquire insight into the four truths, and as a result, terminates the affliction of [mistaken] views. In the next stage, the path of cultivation (*shudōi* 修道位; Sk. *bhāvanā mārga*), one terminates the affliction of desire.

43. Sk. *mṛdv indriya*. This is one of the three capacities (*sankon* 三根; Sk. *trīṇi indriyāṇi*): dull (*donkon*), middling (*chūkon* 中根; Sk. *madhya indriya*), and sharp (*rikon* 利根; Sk. *tīskṣṇa indriya*) capacities. These are three different capacities that Buddhist practitioners exhibit.

44. Here the Lecture Master's answer is omitted.

45. This quote is found in Chigi's *Yūimagyō gensho* (T no. 1777, 38: 526b). Chigi explains that there are two types of people in the path of insight, a person of dull capacity and a person of sharp capacity. According to Chigi, the person of dull capacity first terminates desire in the path of insight.

46. Sk. *tīskṣṇa indriya*. One of the three capacities that Buddhist practitioners exhibit.

47. When pronounced as *shōzō*, this term means “essential nature and phenomenon or manifestation” (Sk. *bhāva-lakṣaṇa*). Here it should be pronounced as *shōzō*, which is short for *shōzōgaku*, namely, the teachings of the Consciousness-Only and *Abhidharma* literatures. But here the Lecture Master Kōga seems to refer specifically to the *Abhidharmakośa śāstra*. According to the *Zō abidonshin ron* (Sk. *Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya*), a *śāstra* (treatise) on the *Abhidharmakośa*, desire is terminated not in the path of insight but at the path of cultivation (T no. 1552, 28: 900a).

[*shudōi* 修道位],⁴⁸ not in the path of insight.] Does this mean that one should not consider desire to be an affliction to be terminated in the path of insight? How about this?

The way in which the Questioner criticized [the Lecture Master] was not appropriate. This led to an embroiled discussion, which I hesitate to record in its entirety here.

For the first question, the Questioner Shinkō picked a topic from the fourth chapter of the *Golden Light Sutra*: “afflictions to be terminated in the path of insight and those to be terminated in the path of cultivation” (T no. 665, 16: 419c). The path of insight and that of cultivation are the third and fourth stages among the five stages of practice that culminate in the achievement of awakening.⁴⁹ On this topic, he asked: “Now, [according to Chigi] how does a person of dull capacity terminate his afflictions?” A person of dull capacity is one of the two types of practitioners found in the path of insight, the other being the person of sharp capacity. A person of dull capacity is unable to understand Buddhist teachings by himself, and therefore has faith in the teaching of others. In contrast, a person of sharp capacity is able to understand Buddhist teachings and puts those teachings into practice by himself.⁵⁰ Shinkō’s question concerned the Tendai master Chigi’s interpretation of the person of dull capacity.

Unfortunately, the Lecture Master Kōga’s response to this question is not recorded.⁵¹ Whatever his response would have been, Shinkō then further advanced discussion by providing a quote: “A person of dull capacity first terminates [the affliction of] desire and then terminates [that of] views.” This passage was quoted from the *Yuimagyō gensho* 維摩經玄疏 (T. no. 1777, 38: 526b), the commentary on the *Yuimagyō* written by the Chinese Tendai Master Chigi—the text with which the Lecture Master Kōga from the Tendai school was expected to be familiar.⁵²

48. Sk. *bhāvanā-mārga*. This is the fourth of the five stages culminating in the achievement of awakening, and follows the path of insight. At the path of cultivation, one terminates the affliction of desire.

49. The idea of “five stages” is discussed in both Theravāda and Mahāyāna texts, although some of the stages were known differently, for example, the *Abhidharmakośa śāstra* and *Jōyuishiki ron* 成唯識論 (Sk. *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*; T no. 1585, 31).

50. This is the view explained in the *Abhidharmakośa śāstra* 阿毘達磨俱舍論 (T. no. 1558, 29: 122b) or the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* 瑜伽師地論 (T. no. 1579, 30: 289a). Practitioners in the path of insight are categorized into two types depending on their capacities: those who practice according to their faith (*zuishingyō futogara* 隨信行補特迦羅; Sk. *śraddhā anusāripudgalah*) and those who practice according to dharma (*zuihōgyō futogara* 隨法行補特迦羅; Sk. *dharma anusāripudgalah*).

51. In the *Monōki*, Sōshō sometimes omitted the Lecture Master’s answer but it is unclear why he did so.

52. Chigi explains that there are two types of persons in the path of insight, a person of dull capacity and a person of sharp faculties, and the person of dull capacity first terminates desire in the path of insight.

Clearly Shinkō took issue with Chigi's interpretation. His criticism was that desire is confusion about the phenomenal world, and therefore it is to be terminated, not in the path of insight, but at the next stage, the path of cultivation. Here, as a Hossō monk, Shinkō simply offered a standard view on the *Abhidharma* or Consciousness-Only literatures (*yuishiki* 唯識). One terminates two different types of afflictions and delusions in the path of insight and the path of cultivation, respectively. In the path of insight, one begins to gain insight into the teachings of the four noble truths (*shitai* 四諦),⁵³ and as a result terminates afflictions or delusions of intellectual orientation—that is, afflictions of views or confusions about principle. But one has to wait until s/he reaches the next stage, the path of cultivation, to terminate the other type of afflictions and delusions—that is, afflictions of desire or confusion about the phenomenal world. However, this interpretation does not accord with Chigi's view that a person of dull capacity first terminates desire in the path of insight. Therefore, Shinkō asked, "Why did [Chigi] say that one terminates [the affliction of desire] at this path [that is, the path of insight]?"

How did the Lecture Master Kōga respond? Of course he quickly realized that Shinkō was explaining the standard view in the *Abhidharma* and Consciousness-Only philosophies, and agreed that in the context of these literatures, one should not consider desire an affliction to be terminated in the path of insight. But Kōga did not really defend Chigi against Shinkō's criticism; neither did he admit that Chigi's view is misleading.

Next, the Questioner Shinkō moved on to the second round of debate:

The Questioner: I ask about Nāgārjuna's [Jp. Ryūju 龍樹] interpretation. How did he refute a Hinayāna position that the form [*shiki* 色; color and shape]⁵⁴ of an image [*yōzō* 影像] truly exists (*jitsuu* 実有)?⁵⁵

53. Sk. *ārya satyāni*. These are the four major teachings that the Buddha explained in his first sermon given at Vārāṇas.

54. Form (Sk. *rūpa*) in a broad sense is that which is perceived, or an object of any sense perception. In a narrow sense, it refers specifically to that which is seen, an object of sight, which includes both the color (*kenjiki* 顯色) and shape (*gyōshiki* 形色) of things. Here it is used in the latter sense.

55. *Yōzō* (Sk. *pratibimba*) refers to an image that is projected within and outside of one's mind (for example, both a mental image or a projection of consciousness and shadows or reflections on the surface of water, a mirror, and so forth). *Jitsuu* (Sk. *dravyataḥ sat*) means having substance or being truly existent. Here the Questioner Shinkō apparently refers to the sixth chapter of the *Daichidoron* (T no. 1509, 25: 101c–108a). In this chapter, the author illustrates his idea of emptiness (*kū* 空; Sk. *śūnyatā*) by using ten metaphors. Among these ten metaphors, the metaphor of shadow is what the Questioner Shinkō had in mind when he created the second question (T no. 1509, 25: 104a–b). In the discussion of the metaphor of shadow, the author clearly criticizes the Sarvāstivādin school's interpretation of *Abhidharmakośa śāstra*. Therefore, by "a Hinayāna position," the Questioner is actually referring to the Sarvāstivādin school.

The Lecture Master: I answer. He refuted this position by arguing that [what truly exists] is captured by two faculties [*nikon* 二根; that is, the faculty of sight and that of touch].⁵⁶ I will explain further. If the form of an image actually exists, it is, like a jar, captured by the two faculties. However, the form of an image is captured only by the faculty of sight. Therefore, [Nāgārjuna] argued that it does not truly exist, thereby refuting [the above-mentioned Hīnayāna position].

The Questioner: Concerning this point, your interpretation may be quite off the point. That a jar is a provisional phenomenon [*kehō* 假法] is a principle that both Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna traditions admit. How can you claim that it truly exists? Furthermore, although the form, scent, taste, and tactile sensation [*shiki, kō, mi, soku* 色香味触] of the four elements [*shidaishu* 四大種] are real phenomena [*jippō* 実法],⁵⁷ they are captured by one faculty. [Although they actually exist, they are, unlike a jar, not captured by two faculties.] Thus, you should not one-sidedly presume that [Nāgārjuna] was able to refute this [that is, the “Hīnayāna position that the form—color and shape—of an image truly exists”].

As a topic of the second question Shinkō chose Nāgārjuna’s *Daichidoron* 大智度論 (Sk. *Mahā prajñā pāramitā śāstra*; T no. 1509, 25), an important text in the Tendai school, to which the Lecture Master Kōga belonged.⁵⁸ Specifically, Shinkō referred to the sixth chapter of the *Daichidoron* where Nāgārjuna states, “Material matters such as a jar are recognized by two faculties—the faculty of sight and the faculty of touch. If a shadow actually exists, it too should be recognized by two faculties. But this is not the case. Therefore, a shadow does not actually exist” (T no. 1509, 25: 104b). The *Daichidoron* is written in the format of questions and answers. In Chapter 6, Nāgārjuna uses ten metaphors including a “shadow” to illustrate his idea of emptiness, the idea that no material or immaterial existence has a substance that serves as a basis of its true existence. First, Nāgārjuna’s interlocutor claims that a shadow truly exists and supports his view by quoting the *Abhidharmakośa śāstra*. Nāgārjuna dismisses the interlocutor’s argument as one based on the position of the Sarvāstivādin

56. The faculty of sight (*genkon* 眼根) and that of touch (*shinkon* 身根) are two of the five sense faculties (Jp. *gokon* 五根; Sk. *caṅśur-indriya*).

57. Form, scent, taste, and tactile sensations are the objects of sight, olfactory, gustatory, and tactile consciousness. A provisional phenomenon is that which temporarily exists because of a combination of conditions. It does not possess its own substance, and therefore is contrasted with real phenomenon (*jippō* 実法). The four major elements are earth, water, fire, and wind. They are fundamental elements that constitute material matters.

58. The authorship of this text has been the subject of scholarly debate; however, the Questioner and the Lecture Master did not question Nāgārjuna’s authorship. Therefore, here I refer to the author of the *Daichidoron* as Nāgārjuna.

school (*setsuissaiubu* 説一切有部).⁵⁹ The Questioner Shinkō intended to revisit Nāgārjuna’s criticism of the Sarvāstivādin school by asking, “How did he [Nāgārjuna] refute a Hīnayāna position that the form [color and shape] of an image truly exists?”

Here “an image” specifically refers to a “shadow,” the metaphor that Nāgārjuna uses in the *Daichidoron*. When the Questioner Shinkō raised the question, the Lecture Master Kōga immediately realized which part of the *Daichidoron* Shinkō was referring to. Consequently, Kōga explained how Nāgārjuna uses the example of a jar to put forth his thesis that a shadow is empty; what truly exists, such as a jar, is captured by two faculties (that is, the faculty of sight and that of touch); but a shadow is captured only by one faculty (sight); therefore, it does not truly exist. The reader may be impressed that Kōga was able to immediately recall the relevant passage from the *Daichidoron*. Yet Shinkō was not, and he quickly turned the tables on Kōga. According to Shinkō, there was a grave error in Nāgārjuna’s argument, which Kōga failed to notice—that is, a “mistake concerning that which is perceived by two faculties” (*nikonshu no ka* 二根取過; hereafter the “mistake of two faculties”).

This is a position that Vasubandhu (Seshin 世親; ca. fourth or fifth century) refuted in the *Abhidharmakośa śāstra* (T 1558, 29: 68b). In very simple terms, the *Abhidharmakośa śāstra* attempts to discern ultimate constituents that are combined to form all experiences—dharmas.⁶⁰ These ultimate constituents alone truly exist. When they are combined to form a certain object, that object only provisionally exists. There are different types of constituents such as cognitive faculties (*kon* 根), the corresponding objects (*kyō* 境), and the corresponding consciousness (*shiki* 識). For example, visual consciousness (*genshiki* 眼識; Sk. *caḥṣur vijñāna*) arises when the sense of vision (*genkon* 眼根; Sk. *caḥṣur indriya*) catches the color and shape of a form (the object of vision; *shikikyō* 色境; Sk. *rūpa viśaya*). This means that an object of a certain sense perception is captured only by the corresponding faculty of that sense perception, and nothing else. This is because a particular constituent invariably maintains its fundamental nature—in this case, visionary nature (T 1558, 29: 4b); the object of vision is always captured by the sense of vision and never by the sense of touch. If a certain object

59. Here Nāgārjuna criticizes the interlocutor for basing his argument on a wrong interpretation of the *Abhidharmakośa śāstra* by “a person of a certain school,” and quotes the *Abhidharma mahāvibhāṣa śāstra* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論, one of the major texts for the Sarvāstivādin school (T no. 1509, 25: 104b). Thus, it is clear that Nāgārjuna is attacking the Sarvāstivādin school here.

60. These constituents are usually classified into three categories of five aggregates (*goun* 五蘊; Sk. *skandha*), twelve sense fields (*jūnisho* 十二處; Sk. *āyatana*), or eighteen elements of cognition (*jūhakkai* 十八界; Sk. *dhātu*). Vasubandhu explains in *Abhidharmakośa śāstra* that he established these three categories in accordance with people’s capacities or levels of ignorance (T no. 1558, 29: 5b).

is captured by two faculties, this means that the object combines two different types of constituents and therefore does not truly exist.

Does this not contradict with what Nāgārjuna says, that a jar truly exists because it is captured by two faculties, while a shadow does not because it is captured only by one faculty? It seems to make sense that one perceives the jar's color by looking at it while perceiving its shape by touching it. How would Vasubandhu explain the fact that the two aspects of material existence (form or *shiki*) in a jar—color and shape—are captured by two different faculties (sight and touch)? He criticizes the assumption that the two aspects of material existence—color (*kenjiki* 顯色; Sk. *varṇa*) and shape (*gyōshiki* 形色; Sk. *saṃsthāna*)—are distinct from each other, and are captured by the faculty of sight and that of touch respectively. This is the “mistake of two faculties.” Instead, Vasubandhu argues that shape does not truly exist and is only provisionally established (*keryū* 仮立; Sk. *prajñāpyate*) as part of color. Therefore, he maintains that a form is still captured by one faculty—sight (T 1558, 29: 68b). Then it follows, as the Questioner Shinkō implied, that Nāgārjuna's assumption—that what truly exists, such as a jar, is captured by two faculties, while what does not, such as a shadow, is captured by one faculty—is mistaken. In this manner, Shinkō meant to point out a contradiction between Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu, which the Lecture Master Kōga failed to notice. In the end, Shinkō concluded that Kōga wrongly assumed that Nāgārjuna in the *Daichidoron* is able to refute the teaching of the Sarvāstivādin school.

The examination of the content of the *Mondōki* reveals important features of Buddhist debate in medieval Japan. First, Buddhist debate was essentially an exegetical exercise, and it revolved around quotes from Buddhist canonical texts. Debaters were of course freed of the modern scholarly practice of providing citations (which makes it extremely difficult for modern scholars to understand their arguments) because they were expected to know the major Buddhist texts more or less by heart. One's ability to recall relevant texts and passages, and how they are explained in a commentary, were necessary for a successful debate performance. For example, when the Questioner raised a question, the Lecture Master was supposed to be able to figure out to which text, and to what part of that text, the Questioner referred.

Next, it is interesting that the actual content of debate at the Saishōkō had little to do with the *Golden Light Sutra*, after which this ritual was named. Between the two questions, the first question was supposed to be based on a passage in the *Golden Light Sutra*. The Questioner Shinkō, in creating the first question, picked a quote from the fourth chapter of this sutra because this chapter was assigned to this session (it was the evening session on the second day, and therefore, was the fourth debate session). However, the subsequent discussion had nothing to do with how this topic is discussed in the *Golden Light Sutra*. Rather, it focused on a relevant passage from Chigi's commentary on the *Yuimagyō*. In comparison, the

second question was usually not related to the *Golden Light Sutra* at all—it could be about any kind of doctrinal issue—and preferably those drawn from texts in which the Lecture Master specialized. Thus, while the Lecture Master’s lecture on the *Golden Light Sutra*, which preceded a debate session, purported to elucidate the teachings of this sutra, the debate itself largely departed from the content of this sutra.⁶¹ This means that the purpose of debate was not necessarily to discuss the content of the *Golden Light Sutra* but to generate an interdisciplinary dialogue between monks of different schools about Buddhist doctrines in general.

This is why monks of different schools (Tendai, Hossō, and so on) were invited to the Saishōkō, and the Lecture Master and the Questioner in each debate session were rarely from the same school. Furthermore, what helped to create a common ground for monks of different schools to engage in discussion was the expectation that the Questioner, in creating the two questions, was supposed to pick topics from the texts that were important not in his own school but in the school of the Lecture Master. For example, as the Questioner, the Hossō monk Shinkō used quotes from the *Daichidoron* important in the Tendai school. This means that a debater, especially when serving as Questioner, was required to familiarize himself with sutras, *śāstras*, and commentaries on them used in his opponent’s school. It is most likely that Shinkō regularly studied texts used in schools other than his own. In his attempt to find a viable topic of discussion, he probably remembered that there was a passage in Chigi’s *Yuimagyō gensho* that, in his view, was problematic and worth debating. In this way, a scholar-monk of his time was expected to be truly interdisciplinary, and state-organized debate rituals endorsed and encouraged that expectation. The process of preparing for a debate ritual forced a monk to familiarize himself not only with his school’s texts but with the other schools’ texts as well. This was also evident in Sōshō’s preparation for serving as Lecture Master in the Yuima-e—which I have discussed earlier—in which he went as far as to study Buddhist logic with Kōfukuji monks.

Indeed, an examination of the *Mondōki* suggests that both the Lecture Master Kōga and the Questioner Shinkō were fully prepared. Shinkō seems to have studied various Buddhist texts very carefully—the *Golden Light Sutra*, the *Yuimagyōsho*, the *Daichidoron*, and the *Abhidharmakośa śāstra*—in preparing for this debate session. Why, then, did Sōshō state, “The way in which the Questioner criticized [the Lecture Master] was not appropriate”? Because Sōshō did not provide a further explanation, one could only surmise exactly what was wrong with Shinkō’s debate performance. Although the Questioner was one of the two main

61. Minowa Kenryō discusses the use of these two types of debate topics in the debate ritual of Hosshōji Mihakkō. He calls the first type *monrongi* 文論義 (debate about a passage from a sutra), and the second type *girongi* 義論義 (debate about a doctrinal meaning) (MINOWA 2009, 220–21).

participants in the lecture-and-question debate, his function was still secondary to the Lecture Master's. This is attested to by the disparity of the social standing of monks fulfilling these roles—the monk serving as Lecture Master was always much more advanced in his career. I speculate that the Questioner's main role was not to prove himself by aggressively nitpicking the Lecture Master's utterances but to help create a healthy environment for academic discussion in which the participants—including the Questioner himself—could learn from the Lecture Master's expertise. The Questioner Shinkō may have been fully prepared and brilliant; but from Sōshō's perspective, Shinkō certainly overstepped the line.

In this way, the purpose of the lecture-and-question debate such as the Saishōkō was not to determine who was a winner or who was a loser. This leads to a question: In the lecture-and-question debate, did the quality of debate matter at all? It is true that a debater's performance in the Saishōkō did not receive an official grade. However, it was still a public event, and a debater's scholarly abilities were put to the test. If he were to leave a good impression on the audience, it would result in his good reputation as a scholar, or more concretely, an invitation to attend another state-sponsored debate ritual, which would eventually result in his promotion. As I discussed earlier, the Lecture Master Kōga attended the Saishōkō multiple times as he steadily established himself in the ecclesiastical community. In this manner, the more debate rituals in which a monk participated, the better chance there was for social success. This was the way in which elite scholar-monks such as Sōshō and Kōga advanced their positions.

An examination of the *Mondōki* indicated that the academic expectation for the participants in the debate was quite high. The intellectual challenge that a Buddhist debate ritual posed for its participants encouraged monks to pursue their interdisciplinary studies of Buddhist doctrines, thereby contributing to the production of *shōgyō* as well as the advancement of doctrinal studies in the community of scholar-monks.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this article has demonstrated the undeniable significance of *shōgyō* in mediating exoteric monks' promotion, transmission of lineages, and doctrinal studies during the Kamakura period, and challenged the dichotomous understanding of esoteric or exoteric tradition that the previous scholarship tended to assume. First, I placed the development of the exoteric *shōgyō* in its historical context by describing the establishment of the system of monastic promotion based on debate rituals; monks seeking promotion were required to attend a series of debate rituals. Against this backdrop of the increasing importance of debate practice, scholar-monks produced their *shōgyō* in order to prepare for debate rituals and to advance their positions in the ecclesiastical

community. In addition, the secret transmission of *shōgyō* was closely related to the development of cloisters at Tōdaiji temple in the early medieval period. At that time, cloisters were rapidly growing into core institutional units in this temple; they were not only independent of one another but were also largely independent of the bigger institutional unit, Tōdaiji, to which they technically belonged. Through transmitting their *shōgyō* as a hidden treasure while concealing it from outsiders, monks of the Sonshōin cloister differentiated themselves from other cloisters. Given its sociopolitical and academic importance, *shōgyō* naturally played the key role in establishing the unique identity of a cloister.

However, by examining the processes of producing *shōgyō*, I have argued that the exoteric *shōgyō* was not just a medium for enhancing a monk's or his cloister's social standing. The perusal of the colophon of the *Essentials* indicated that *shōgyō* also worked to generate and increase one's scholarly authority. The limitation of *shōgyō* transmission not only endowed the *shōgyō* text, the *Essentials*, with an aura of secrecy and sanctity, but also authenticated the scholarly achievements that those who received its transmission had made in Buddhist logic. In addition, copying *shōgyō* texts was the major mode of learning and advancing doctrinal studies. I have illustrated how Sōshō produced *shōgyō* in the process of preparing for participating in the Yuima-e. In addition, the *Mondōki* has revealed the high level of academic preparation that debaters demonstrated. A debate ritual provided a space for elite scholar-monks of different schools to engage in dialogue across sectarian lines. Thus debate rituals were not only a means of upward social mobility but also an academic platform for educating scholar-monks and encouraging their scholarship. Furthermore, for scholar-monks such as Sōshō, preparing for and participating in Buddhist debates were conducive to achieving awakening and a better rebirth in the next life.

Thus monks' motivations for producing *shōgyō* were manifold, to say the least. Or, more precisely, academic, religious, and political aspirations were not so clearly separated in the minds of elite scholar-monks such as Sōshō. This article has revealed the importance of liturgical tradition and the resultant production of *shōgyō* in exoteric Buddhist schools during the Kamakura period: the exoteric *shōgyō* was not only a vehicle for individual monks to advance their doctrinal learning and social positions. The transmission of *shōgyō* also contributed to a significant institutional change in temple society in medieval Japan.

* The author would like to take note of the article's inadvertent failure to address the implications of the 2008 AAR panel on *shōgyō*, organized by Brian Ruppert, to which she was invited to offer a paper and based upon which the ideas for this study were first publicly presented. The translation of *shōgyō* as "sacred works" was a creation by Ruppert, who presented and published on the medieval development of *shōgyō* in both English and Japanese as part of the most extensive archival research on medieval *shōgyō* conducted by a non-Japanese scholar.

REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

- GR *Gunsho ruijū* 群書類從. 29 vols. Ed. Hanawa Hokiichi 塙保己一 et al. Tokyo: Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1959–1960.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. 85 vols. Ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1914–1922.

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書. 161 vols. Ed. Bussho Kankōkai 仏書刊行会. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1912–1921.
- Dai Nihon kokiroku* 大日本古記録. 29 vols. Ed. Tokyo Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo 東京大学史料編纂所, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1952–.
- Dai Nihon shiryō* 大日本史料. 383 vols. Ed. Tōkyō Teikoku Daigaku 東京帝國大學, Tōkyō Teikoku Daigaku Bungakubu Shiryō Hensanjo 東京帝国大学文学部史料編纂所. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1901–.
- Kamakura ibun* 鎌倉遺文. 52 vols. Ed. Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三. Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan, 1971–1997.
- Shintō taikai: Chōgi saishi hen* 神道大系—朝儀祭祀編. 102 vols. Ed. Shintō Taikai Hensankai 神道大系編纂会 and Shintō Kōten Kenkyūjo 神道古典研究所. Tokyo: Shintō Taikai Hensankai, 1977–2006.

SECONDARY SOURCES

ABE, Ryūichi

- 1999 *Weaving of Mantra: Kūkai and the Construction of Esoteric Buddhist Discourse*. New York: Columbia University Press.

BAUER, Mikael

- 2011 The Yuima-e as theater of the state. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 38: 161–79.

CABEZÓN, José Ignacio

- 1994 *Buddhism and Language: A Study of Indo-Tibetan Scholasticism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

DOBBINS, James

- 1998 Envisioning Kamakura Buddhism. In *Re-visioning “Kamakura” Buddhism*, ed. Richard K. Payne, 24–42. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

GRONER, Paul

- 2002 *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth Century*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

HAYAMI Tasuku 速水 侑

- 1975 *Heian kizoku shakai to Bukkyō* 平安貴族社会と仏教. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

HIRAOKA Jōkai 平岡定海

- 1958 *Tōdaiji Sōshō Shōnin no kenkyū narabini shiryō* 東大寺宗性上人之研究並史料. 3 vols. Tokyo: Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai.
1981 *Nihon jīnshi no kenkyū* 日本寺院史の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

HISANO Nobuyoshi 久野修義

- 1999 *Nihon chūsei no jīn to shakai* 日本中世の寺院と社会. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō.

HORIKE Shunpō 堀池春峰

- 1980–1982 *Nanto Bukkyō shi no kenkyū* 南都仏教史の研究. 2 vols. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

ISHIDA Yoshihito 石田善人

- 1967 *Kyūbukkyō no chūsei teki tenkai* 旧仏教の中世的展開. In *Nihon Bukkyōshi* 日本仏教史 2, ed. Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀, 292–375. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

KAMATA Shigeo 鎌田茂雄

- 1971 *Nanto kyōgaku no shisōshi teki igi* 南都教学の思想史的意義. In *Nihon Shisōshi Taikai 15: Kamakura kyū Bukkyō* 日本思想史大系15—鎌倉旧仏教, Kamata Shigeo and Tanaka Hisao 田中久夫, eds., 528–69. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

KAMIKAWA Michio 上川通夫

- 2007 *Nihon chūsei Bukkyō keisei shiron* 日本中世仏教形成史論. Tokyo: Azekura Shobō.

KURODA Toshio 黒田俊雄

- 1994 *Kenmitsu taisei ron: Kuroda Toshio chosakushū 2* 顕密体制論—黒田俊雄著作集 2. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
1995 *Kenmitsu Bukkyō to jisha seiryoku: Kuroda Toshio chosakushū 3* 顕密仏教と寺社勢力—黒田俊雄著作集 3. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
1996 The development of the Kenmitsu system as Japan's medieval orthodoxy. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23: 233–69.

MINOWA Kenryō 蓑輪顕量

- 1999 *Chūsei shoki nanto kairitsu fukkō no kenkyū* 中世初期南都戒律復興の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
2009 *Nihon Bukkyō no kyōri keisei: Hōe ni okeru shōdō to rongi no kenkyū* 日本仏教の教理形成—法会における唱導と論議の研究. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.

MOCHIZUKI Shinkō 望月信亨

- 1954 *Mochizuki Bukkyō Daijiten* 望月佛教大辞典. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai.

NAGAMURA Makoto 永村 眞

- 1989 *Chūsei Tōdaiji no soshiki to keiei* 中世東大寺の組織と経営. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō.
2000 *Chūsei jiin shiryōron* 中世寺院史料論. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
2003 *Chūsei jiin ni okeru sōjō* 中世寺院における相承. *Chūsei bungaku* 48: 7–15.

NAKAMURA Hajime 中村 元

- 2001 *Kōsetsu Bukkyōgo daijiten* 広説佛教語大辞典. Tokyo: Tōkyō Shoseki.

NINNAJI KONBYŌSHI KOZŌSHI KENKYŪKAI 仁和寺紺表紙小双紙研究会

- 1995 *Shukaku Hosshinnō no girei sekai: Ninnajizō konbyōshi kozōshi no kenkyū: Kikan hōe kaidai, furoku shiryōshū, ronkō, sakuin hen* 守覚法親王の儀礼世界—仁和寺蔵紺表紙小双紙の研究—基幹法会解題・付録資料集・論考・索引篇. 3 vols. Tokyo: Benseisha.

NISHIGUCHI Junko 西口順子

- 1987 *Onna no chikara: Kodai no josei to Bukkyō* 女の力—古代の女性と仏教. Tokyo: Heibonsha.

OISHIO Chihiro 追塩千尋

- 1995 *Chūsei no nanto Bukkyō* 中世の南都仏教. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
2006 *Chūsei nanto no sōryo to jiin* 中世南都の僧侶と寺院. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

RAMBELLI, Fabio

- 2007 *Buddhist Materiality: A Cultural History of Objects in Japanese Buddhism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

SANGO, Asuka

- 2007 *In the Halo of Golden Light: Imperial Authority and Buddhist Ritual*. PhD dissertation, Princeton University.
2011 *Making debate hell: Knowledge and power in Japanese Buddhist ritual*. *History of Religions* 50: 283–314.

STONE, Jacqueline I.

- 1999 *Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
2006 *Buddhism*. In *Nanzan Guide to Japanese Religions*, Paul L. Swanson and Clark Chilson, eds., 38–64. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

SUEKI Fumihiko

- 1996 *A reexamination of the Kenmitsu Taisei theory*. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23: 449–66.

TAKAYAMA Kyōko 高山京子

- 2010 *Chūsei Kōfukuji no monzeki* 中世興福寺の門跡. Tokyo: Benseisha.

TAKAYAMA Yuki 高山有紀

- 1997 *Chūsei Kōfukuji yuima-e no kenkyū* 中世興福寺維摩会の研究. Tokyo: Benseisha.

TAKESHIMA Hiroshi 竹島 寛

1936 *Ōchō jidai kōshitsu shi no kenkyū* 王朝時代皇室史の研究. Tokyo: Yūbun Shoin.

TAKEUCHI Rizō 竹内理三

1942 *Jiryō shōen no kenkyū* 寺領荘園の研究. Tokyo: Unebi Shobō.

TANAKA Bun'ei 田中文英

1976 *Shōen sei shihai no keisei to sōdan soshiki: Kongōbuji to kanshōfushō o megutte* 荘園制支配の形成と僧団組織—金剛峯寺と官省符荘をめぐって. In *Chūsei shakai no seiritsu to tenkai* 中世社会の成立と展開, ed. Osaka Reki-shigakkai 大阪歴史学会, 225–307. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

TSUCHIYA Megumi 土谷 恵

2001 *Chūsei jiin no shakai to geinō* 中世寺院の社会と芸能. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

TSUJI Hiroyuki 辻 博之

1979 *Chūsei sanmon shūto no dōzoku ketsugō to satobō* 中世山門衆徒の同族結合と里房. *Machikaneyama ronsō* 13: 1–24.

YASUDA Tsuguo 安田次郎

2001 *Chūsei no Kōfukuji to yamato* 中世の興福寺と大和. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha.