

Heresy and Heresiology in Shingon Buddhism: Reading the Catalogues of “Perverse Texts”

Gaétan Rappo

Citer ce document / Cite this document :

Rappo Gaétan. Heresy and Heresiology in Shingon Buddhism: Reading the Catalogues of “Perverse Texts”. In: Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie, vol. 26, 2017. Droit et Bouddhisme. Principe et pratique dans le Tibet prémoderne / *Law and Buddhism. Principle and Practice in Pre-modern Tibet* pp. 137-152;

doi : <https://doi.org/10.3406/asia.2017.1494>

https://www.persee.fr/doc/asia_0766-1177_2017_num_26_1_1494

Fichier pdf généré le 18/03/2019

HERESY AND HERESIOLOGY IN SHINGON BUDDHISM: READING THE CATALOGUES OF “PERVERSE TEXTS”

Gaétan RAPPO*

Catalogues or indexes occupy an important place in the Buddhist canon. One volume of the Taishō (55) and the first two of the well-known collection of Japanese Buddhist texts *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書 (DNBZ) are in fact dedicated exclusively to them. Buddhist catalogues contain texts listing either works from one specific school, or major titles from every one of them. In Japan, the Edo period saw the production of quite a large number of such catalogues. A good example of the latter can be found in the revised edition of *Shoshū shōshoroku* 諸宗章疏錄 (Catalog of the Texts and Commentaries of Each School), which was compiled by the Shingon monk Kenjun 謙順 (1740–1820) in 1789.¹ It essentially lists the most important works—and especially earlier catalogues—of each school, starting with Kegon. The structure is always roughly the same: first the works are divided by schools or by large subjects, like *inmyō* 因明 (logic). Then, lists of texts written by major monks of the school are also provided.

In the third volume of the *Shoshū shōshoroku*, we find an extremely large section dedicated to Shingon. For example, the part describing Kūkai 空海 (774–835) not only records his main works, but also a series of catalogues said to have been compiled by the master. The aim of these works was, of course, to define the canon of each school—a process that became even more crucial during the Edo period, when a much stronger emphasis was put on sectarian differences than in the Middle Ages. However, this is not the only function of these texts.

In fact, upon closer inspection, one finds commentaries by the author below some of the titles. This is the case with the *Sokushin jōbutsugi* 即身成仏義 (Meaning of the Realization of Buddhahood in One's Own Body), a text written by Kūkai.² Kenjun mentions the many versions of the text that had circulated at least since the Middle Ages. Other examples go beyond discussing the various versions of a given work. A few pages later, in the section dedicated to the Daigoji 醍醐寺 monk Shōkaku 勝覺 (1058–1129), Kenjun clearly examines the authenticity of one of the items in the list.³ He says that the *Sangenshō* 三肝鈔 (Essence of the Teachings of the Three Masters)⁴ is listed as an apocryphon in another work. This is probably the *Gishoron* 偽書論 (Treatise on Apocrypha) by the Shingon monk Kyōi 恭畏

* This lecture was organized by the Italian School of East Asian Studies and the *École française d'Extrême-Orient*. It was held at the EFEO Kyoto center the 14th of September 2018.

1. *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* (DNBZ; 1913 edition), vol. 1, 91–194.

2. DNBZ, v. 1, 154.

3. DNBZ, v. 1, 176.

4. The three masters are the Shingon monks Gihan 義範 (1023–88), Hanjun 範俊 (1038–1112), and Jōgen 定賢 (1024–1100).

(1565–1630), a 1629 text which can be found in the Taishō canon.⁵ This text gives us more details, explaining that the *Sangenshō* was not written by Shōkaku.

Such comments suggest the other major function of catalogues. They were also used to distinguish right from wrong, or truth from falsehood. This very activity has a long tradition⁶—especially in Japanese Shingon Buddhism—and it even gave birth to a dedicated expression: *haja kenshō* 破邪顯正 (destroying the wrong and revealing the right). As we will see, this can mean either to distinguish true works from apocrypha, or to attack texts deemed heretical, in the sense that they contain false or perverted views.

In fact, Kenjun even mentions a text he attributed in part to Kūkai, and which was written for the same purpose: the *Jashō shōgyōroku* 邪正聖教錄 (Catalog of Correct and Perverse Sacred Texts).⁷ Since I was unable to find a trace of this particular catalogue in either Kūkai's work or the major collection of Shingon texts, it was probably ascribed to the founder of the Shingon school in order to show both the importance and the antiquity of this very practice which we may tentatively call “heresiology.”

A Quick Overview of Shingon Heresiology

Indeed, heresiology had a long tradition in Shingon, of which catalogues such as the *Gishoron* can be considered as very late examples. In his research on the subject, the pre-war Shingon monk Mizuhara Gyōei provided a list of these catalogues, but most of them were in his private collection, which is inaccessible today.⁸ We also find editions of these texts in the work of another Shingon monk: Moriyama Shōshin.⁹

These documents should not be taken at face value, as they reflect power struggles and political problems inside the Shingon school more than actual “evil” practices.¹⁰ In fact, we still have access to the most influential, and—as we will see—probably

5. Taishō 2509, v. 78, 915. The reason given is the discrepancy between Gihan's title in the colophon and other sources. On this see Shibata Kenryū 柴田賢龍, *Nihon-mikkyō jinbutsu jiten: Daigo sōden tanbō* 日本密教人物事典——醍醐僧伝探訪, *jōkan* 上卷 (Tōkyō: Kokusho kankōkai, 2010), 85.

6. The oldest catalogue, the *Compilation of Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka* (*Chusanjang jiji* 出三藏記集 T. 2145), was compiled in China in 515. This text also deals with suspicious sūtras.

7. DNBZ, v. 1, 154.

8. Mizuhara Gyōei 水原堯榮, “Tachikawa-ryū seiten mokuroku to genson shōgyō no naiyō ni tsuite” 立川流聖典目録と現存聖教の内容に就て, *Mikkyō bunka* 密教文化 4 (1920): 71–104. A similar list can be found in Mizuhara Gyōei, *Jakyō Tachikawa-ryū no kenkyū* 邪教立川流の研究 (Kyōto: Zensei-sha Shosekibu, 1923; repr., quoted here, in *Mizuhara Gyōei zenshū* 水原堯榮全集, vol. 1, Kyōto: Dōhōsha shuppan, 1981), 187–88.

9. Moriyama Shōshin 守山聖真, *Tachikawa-jakyō to sono shakaiteki-haikei no kenkyū* 立川邪教とその社会的背景の研究 (Tōkyō: Rokuyaon, 1965).

10. On this problem, see Iyanaga Nobumi 彌永信美, “Secrecy, Sex and Apocrypha: Remarks on Some Paradoxical Phenomena,” in *The Culture of Secrecy in Japanese Religion*, ed. Bernhard Scheid and Mark Teeuwen (London: Routledge, 2006), 217.

the most problematic such catalogue. It is the *Tachikawa shōgyō mokuroku* 立川聖教目録 (Catalogue of Sacred Texts of the Tachikawa Lineage), a work compiled by the Kōyasan 高野山 monk Yūkai 宥快 (1345–1416) in 1375.¹¹ Found as an appendix to the printed edition of 1657 of his *Hōkyōshō* 宝鏡鈔 (Compendium of the Precious Mirror) (which was also edited by Moriyama), the *Tachikawa shōgyō mokuroku* consists of a long list of so-called perverted—or as I would say, heretical—texts.¹²

The main argument of the text is to give the readers a list of works belonging to the so-called Tachikawa lineage (*Tachikawa-ryū* 立川流), a branch of the Shingon school that would become a synonym for sexualized heretical teachings. The term branch must not be taken as a vague term describing an open group operating within the Shingon school. In fact, before going further, I will provide some contextual information to reach a better understanding what the very specific notion of monastic lineages means—and it was crucial to my topic. So, monastic lineages are subdivisions of the esoteric schools. To be more specific they take the form of long lines of succession between master and disciple. They derive from the traditional way of transmitting doctrinal or ritual knowledge in esoteric Buddhism. The master initiates his disciple through a combination of oral and written teachings. The process culminates with a consecration through which the disciple officially enters the lineage. Lineage divisions—a frequent phenomenon—can be explained either by subtle differences, mostly in ritual practice, or by the fact that masters often took several disciples. Since only one of them could become the main heir (*shōchaku* 正嫡), disputes could occur, and sometimes, new lineages were created by rival disciples.

The Tachikawa Lineage

One of these lineages was the Tachikawa lineage. This group has been fairly well studied in recent years. According to Yūkai, it stems from a 12th century Shingon monk called Ninkan 仁寛 (?–1144), who was exiled for political reasons to Tachikawa, in Izu 伊豆. There, according to Yūkai, he met a master of Yin and Yang (*onmyōji* 陰陽師), and together they established a heretical lineage whose main teaching was the following: the sexual act, which is found metaphorically in many Shingon texts, should actually be performed within a ritual context to attain Enlightenment. This division between discourse and the actual practice of sexual acts seems to represent the main argument of Shingon texts criticizing the Tachikawa lineage.

This does not necessarily mean that such practices were common inside the said lineage. In fact, almost all Yūkai and his followers' discourse can be described as a form of textual manipulation. Yūkai's description of the Tachikawa lineage is mostly based on a 13th-century text called the *Juhō yōjinshū* 受法用心集 (Collection

11. First edition in Moriyama, *Tachikawa-jakyō*, 582–98.

12. On the meaning of *Ja* 邪, see Gaétan Rappo, *Rhétoriques de l'hérésie dans le Japon médiéval et moderne: Le moine Monkan (1278–1357) et sa réputation posthume* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2017), 76–80.

of Precepts for Receiving the Dharma).¹³ Written by the monk Shinjō 心定 (1215–68 and later), this text describes the initiation the author received to a lineage which practiced a strange ritual in order to make an idol out of a human skull and by a complex ritual process involving performing sexual acts on top of it. While the text does not originally state that this ritual belongs to the Tachikawa lineage, later sources make this link.¹⁴

The problem is that the Tachikawa lineage—starting with Ninkan—did exist and it left some documents.¹⁵ Their contents are not consistent at all with what we find in sources that depict its members as heretics. In fact, the real Tachikawa lineage does not differ in any way from other, more prominent lineages of the Shingon school.

The existence of sexual heresy in Shingon Buddhism is thus an issue that could be discussed almost endlessly. Why say heresiology? Recent studies on western heresy have shown that quite a gap exists between the common perception of heresy and what you find out when you study such phenomena seriously.¹⁶ In Japan, I think a similar process is at work. One would think that later sources expanded on Yūkai and Shinjō's shocking descriptions of sexual rituals. The Edo period *Sangai issbinki* 三界一心記 (The Three Worlds within the One Mind), a text commonly associated with the Tachikawa lineage, would be a good example of this (Fig. 1).¹⁷ However, they did not really insist on this aspect and operated on a rather different level. This is what I will show through an analysis of an important part of this type of literature: the catalogues of heretical texts.

13. On this text, see Iyanaga Nobumi, “Tachikawa-ryū to Shinjō *Juhō yōjinshū* wo megutte” 立川流と心定『受法用心集』をめぐって, *Nihon-bukkyō sōgō kenkyū* 日本仏教総合研究 2 (2003): 13–31. A partial English translation can be found in James H. Sanford, “The Abominable Tachikawa Skull Ritual,” *Monumenta Nipponica* 46, no. 1 (1991): 1–20.

14. Iyanaga Nobumi, “Mikkyō-girei to ‘Nenzuru chikara’: *Hōkyōshō* no hihan-teki kentō, oyobi *Juhō yōjinshū* no ‘Dokuro-honzon girei’ wo chūshin toshite,” 密教儀礼と「念ずる力」——『宝鏡鈔』の批判的検討および『受法用心集』の「髑髏本尊儀礼」を中心として, in *Girei no chikara: Chūsei shūkyō no jissen-sekai* 儀礼の力——中世宗教の実践世界, ed. Lucia Dolce and Matsumoto Ikuyo 松本郁代 (Kyōto: Hōzōkan, 2010), 127–58.

15. See the texts edited in *Kanazawa bunko komonjo* 金沢文庫古文書, vol. 8, *Butsuji-ben* 佛事篇, ge 下 (Yokohama: Kanazawa bunko: 1956).

16. For a discussion of the methodological issues related to heresy in Japan, see Rappo, *Rhétoriques de l'hérésie*.

17. This text is certainly without any link to the Tachikawa lineage. For a brief description of this problem, see Iyanaga Nobumi, “Mikkyōtekishintaikan to Miki Shigeo no shisō” 密教的身体観と三木成夫の思想, *Shomotsugaku* 書物学 3 (2014): 23. An edition can be found in Yamashita Takumi 山下琢巳, “Ōsaka furitsu Naka-no-shima toshokan Ishizaki bunko shozō shahon *Sangen icchi no sho* ni tsuite: Fu honkoku” 大阪府立中之島図書館石崎文庫蔵写本『三賢一致之書』について——附翻刻, *Tōkyō seitoku tanki daigaku kiyō* 東京成徳短期大学紀要 27 (1994): 99–110. The contents are also discussed in James H. Sanford, “Wind, Waters, Stupas, Mandalas: Fetal Buddhahood in Shingon,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 24, nos. 1–2 (1997): 1–38.



Fig. 1: Image of the formation of the Yin and the Yang (sexual union) in the *Sangai issbinki*. Facsimile reprint in *Tachikawa-ryū shōgyō ruisan* 立川流聖教類纂 (Tōkyō: Rittaiasha, 1969).

In analyzing them, I will answer a few important questions that will help us better define how “heresiology” functioned in the Shingon school. Was there a specific method to it? How did monks such as Yūkai classify suspicious or heretical texts if they did at all? What were the criteria used to determine if a text was heretical or not?

The Structure of the *Tachikawa shōgyō mokuroku*

The most famous catalogue of heretical texts, the *Tachikawa shōgyō mokuroku* does not provide much help in answering this kind of question. If we follow Yūkai's arguments, this list of more than 350 texts mainly serves to prove the diffusion of such ideas, and the author does not give much detail on the way the list was composed.

The text can be divided into three main parts. The first is a catalogue of titles that are—according to Yūkai—outside of the secret records of the great master Kōbō Daishi (*Kōbō daishi hirokugai mokuroku* 弘法大師秘録外目録). Some texts quoted in this section are similar to what can be found in the *Juhō yōjinhshū*. Next follows a long quote from an earlier source, the *Shōryū jaryū to naru koto* (or *Shōryū-shō jaryū ji* 正流邪流事; On the Fact That Correct Lineages Become Perverse), written by Yūkai's master, Kaisei (快成 who died in 1367). Immediately after it the author mentions a single text, the *Enmanshō* 円満鈔, to which we will return later. The third and last part consists of a catalogue of the most profound and important matters (大事重々目録) of the Sanbō'in 三宝院, a sub-temple of Daigoji 醍醐寺 that was home to at least two prominent lineages during the Middle Ages. Ninkan himself was a disciple of an important monk of this temple, Shōkaku 勝賢, and his actual lineage descended from it.

A closer look at its components, allow us first to say that some of them do not relate to the Tachikawa lineage. Works as the *Enmanshō*—as Takahashi Yūsuke has recently shown—probably belong in fact to another lineage called the Kongō'in-ryū 金剛王院流. Concretely, the *Enmanshō*, which is mentioned right after the *Shōryū jaryū to naru koto*, is said to have been written by a disciple of Jitsugen 実賢 (1176–1249)—a prominent member of the Kongō'in lineage.¹⁸

The Kongō'in lineage is criticized in the *Shōryū jaryū to naru koto*, and is known for a certain systematization of sexual symbolism within Shingon. There are, of course, possible connections between this lineage and the Tachikawa lineage, but it is important to note that these two lineages remain distinct from each other. One link between them is represented by Shinjō himself. Shinjō was a disciple of Nyojitsu 如実 (1206–66), a member of the Kongō'in lineage, and was also initiated to the real Tachikawa lineage.¹⁹

Yūkai clearly manipulated the disparate information he found in earlier sources, and blended texts belonging to other lineages and apocrypha into one giant ensemble—the so-called Tachikawa lineage—that can be rendered as heretical. He thus mixes various works of diverse origins, without any analytical process on the texts themselves. Although he clearly defined the very category of “heretical texts” through his extremely inclusive concept of Tachikawa lineage, his successors did

18. Communication to be published in a volume based on the international symposium “Heresy in the Japanese and Western Middle Ages,” held at the University of Neuchâtel on August 26–28, 2018.

19. Takahashi Yūsuke 高橋悠介, “Den Kenjin-hen *Kanjō inmyō kuketsu* to Kūkanbō-Nyojitsu” 伝賢深編「灌頂印明口決」と空観房如実, *Shidō bunko ronshū* 斯道文庫論集 51 (2016): 208.

not necessarily share his orientations. In fact, some of them, while still influenced by Yūkai, tried to base the very process of heresiology on more concrete grounds.

The *Mōsho jabō jagi-shō mokuroku*

This was the case in the *Mōsho jabō jagi-shō mokuroku* 謀書邪法邪義抄目錄, a title that can be translated as *Catalogue of Counterfeit Works and Texts Professing Heretical Opinions and Doctrines*. In the second part of his well-known *Jakyō Tachikawa ryū no kenkyū*, Mizuhara Gyōei largely follows the argument of this *Mōsho mokuroku* and extensively quotes from it, albeit under another title.²⁰ Given the differences with the version I was able to consult at Ishiyamadera 石山寺, he probably used a different manuscript.

This text was probably written by the Ninnaji 仁和寺 monk Keshō 顯證 (1597–1678).²¹ It is still unpublished, and the manuscript I used for my edition was copied, in 1709, by the Ishiyamadera monk Sonpen 尊遍 (?–?), who claims that he relied on an original held by the Ninnaji monk Ryōshin 亮深 (?–?).

The text is divided into seven parts. I will follow them a little more in detail, as they provide an attempt at an analytical classification of problematic texts in the Shingon school. The first section is titled *Gikyō* 偽經, or apocryphal sūtras. This term describes texts that falsely pose as continental sūtras. Keshō provides the following list, without giving much information about their contents.²² The list does not contain only obscure texts. For example, the *Sokushin jōbutsu-kyō* 即身成仏經

20. Mizuhara Gyōei *zenshū*, vol. 1, 188–210. He gives the title *Gikyōmokuroku narabi ni jagi kyōron* (偽經目六并邪義經論; Catalogue of Apocryphal and Perverse Sūtras), which is found a subtitle in the *Mōsho mokuroku* (manuscript, p. 2). The text is also a major source for another important study of “heresy”: Kōda Yūun 甲田有暉, “Chū’in-ryū no jaryū wo tsutaeta hitobito” 中院流の邪流を伝えた人々, *Mikkyō bunka* 密教文化 135 (1981): 19–37.

21. Mizuhara (see previous note) mentions Kyōi (he even writes Kyōi Keshō) as another name of the author. He also gives the title of another text by this Kyōi, *Gisho mokuroku narabi ni jūshoyurai* (偽書目錄並重書由來; Catalog of Apocrypha and Origins of Important Texts) as an alternative title to the *Mōsho mokuroku*. This Kyōi is probably the same as the author of the *Gishoron*. However, I was unable to find any reference to this name in the *Mōsho mokuroku* itself. While the hypothesis that Mizuhara used an alternative name for Keshō mentioned on another manuscript (or a manuscript simply giving Kyōi as the author) is possible, there are several reasons to consider the Ninnaji monk Keshō as the main author of our text. First of all, Kyōi died in 1630, and the text contains extensive quotes by Keshō which were written probably later in the 17th century (without any mention of Kyōi). Moreover, the text discusses the work of prince-monk Shūkaku, a topic which was very important for Keshō (although Kyōi also displayed some ties to Ninnaji). On this, see Abe Yasurō 阿部泰郎, *Chūsei Nihon no shūkyō-tekusuto taikei* 中世日本の宗教テキスト体系 (Nagoya: Nagoya daigaku shuppankai, 2013), 219.

22. Here is the quote from the manuscript (p. 2):

偽經目六并邪義經論

一、大日如来金口所説一行法身即心成仏經 一卷 不空訳

一、如意宝珠転輪秘密現身成仏金輪呪王經 一卷 不空訳

一、曼珠師梨虚空藏成就悉地神咒儀軌經 一卷 又名七日成就求聞持法經 不空訳

(Sūtra on the Realization of Buddhahood in One's Present Body) is fairly often quoted in sources from the Middle Ages. A manuscript of it was even discovered in the Zuishin'in 隨心院.²³

Here, the text discusses wrong attributions to famous translators of canonical texts, in this case Amoghavajra (jp. Fukū 不空), and seem to distinguish this problem from heresy, at least at first. A good example can be found in what Keshō says of the *Hōshitsujī jōbutsu daranikyō* 寶悉地成佛陀羅尼經 (Sūtra of the Dhāraṇī Bringing the Precious Success of Attaining Buddhahood), another apocryphal sūtra.²⁴ The text is hard to decipher, but it does mention Gokurakubō 極樂房—another name for the two famous Daigoji monks, Kenjin 賢深 and Seigen 成賢—as well as Kakuzen 覺禪. Keshō's conclusion is that the text is apocryphal, not because of its contents, but rather because of its dubious origin, and its absence from the catalogues of all the lineages. However, the last line does clearly draw a link between apocrypha—here *shōkyō ni arazu* 非正經—and the concept of *ja* 邪, perversion or heresy. This link was already made in Yūkai's work, and it seems to be common practice in such discourse.

In fact, the next section clearly deals with false sūtras and other canonical texts spreading perverse or heretical ideas: *jagi* 邪義. The list is entirely taken from the *Juhō yojinshū*.²⁵ Keshō probably did not have access to the texts named heretical

23. Nakayama Kazuma 中山一磨, "Sanbōin gikyō-seisei no ittan: Zuishin'in-zō *Sokushinjōbutsukyō* to sono shūhen; Fu Zuishin'in-zō *Rokugai himitsu-kyōki mokuroku*" 三寶院偽經生成の一端——隨心院藏『即身成仏經』とその周辺——附・隨心院藏『録外秘密經軌目録』, *Ono Zuishin'in-zō no mikkyōbunken, zuzō chōsa wo kiban to suru sōkanteiki, sōgōteki kenkyū to sono tankyū* 小野隨心院藏の密教文献・圖像調査を基盤とする相關的・総合的研究とその探求, (Toyonaka: Ōsaka daigaku daigaku'in bungaku kenkyūka 大阪大学大学院文学研究科, 2005), 211–50.

24. On this text, see Makino Kazuo 牧野和夫 and Takahashi Yūsuke, "Shitennōji Kokusai bukkyō daigaku toshokanzō *Hōshitsujī jōbutsu daranikyō* okugaki shikigo to Zuishin'in-zō *Dainichi nyorai konku shosetsu ichigyō hōshin sokushin jōbutsukyō* ikkan no kaidai to shōkai: Hōshu shari to Godaigo tennō no shūhen" 四天王寺国際仏教大学図書館蔵『寶悉地成佛陀羅尼經』奥書識語と隨心院藏『大日如来金口所説一行法身即身成仏經』一卷の解題と紹介——宝珠・舍利と後醍醐天皇の周辺, *Jissen joshi-daigaku bungaku-bu kiyō* 実践女子大学文学部紀要 47 (2004): 1–13. Here is the quote from the manuscript (p. 3):

一、宝悉地成佛陀羅尼經 不空訳

或記云、宝悉地成佛陀羅尼經事。師主云極樂房僧正語云覺禪阿闍梨(ハ)ニクシウツクシ善真言師也。但一心劣タル事在之。宝悉地陀羅尼經文(ヲ)、今書裏書(ニ)付之。彼經(ハ)ヴァム阿自室生堀出(ス)經(ト)云テ世間(ニ)流布故諸家目録所不載之。

此非正經是邪人所造妄述流行非仏説也。顯證

25. Manuscript, pp. 4–6:

○邪義經論目録	三經三種アリ
一、五藏皇体經 五卷	一、妙阿字經 三卷
一、真如実相經 二卷	已上三部經共一行訳
一、七甜滴变化自在タラニ經 一卷	
一、有相無究竟自在タラニ經 一卷	
一、業法術經 一卷	已上三部經共不空三藏訳
一、如意宝珠經 一卷	一、遍化經 一卷
一、無相実相經	(割中: 已上三部・共善无畏三藏訳)
一、一心内成就論 一卷	一、赤色蓮華經

here. At least for some of them, their very existence can be doubted, and Kenschō does not provide any additional information on them.

The Apocrypha Attributed to the Prince-Monk Shūkaku

This is not the case with the next section, which deals with apocryphal writings of Japanese monks, the *gisakusho* 偽作書.²⁶ Here Kenschō is mainly concerned with two texts related to one of the most eminent monks of his temple, the prince-monk (*bossinnō* 法親王) Shūkaku 守覚 (1150–1202). A son of the Emperor Go-Shirakawa 後白河, Shūkaku was an extremely influential monk of the prestigious Ninnaji temple, located in Kyōto. He held a central role in both the political and religious world of the late 12th and early 13th centuries. He left an enormous corpus, which has been extensively studied by Abe Yasurō, dealing with most aspects of esoteric doctrine and practice.

This section deserves to be studied in greater detail here, as Kenschō's reflection—and the problems it poses—will help us understand better how and why such catalogues were compiled. The works seen as apocrypha by Kenschō are the *Kongō taizō himitsu shiki* 金剛胎藏秘密式 (Secret Procedure of the Adamantine and Womb Planes) and the *Rokugatsushō* 六月抄 (Treatise of Six Months). These texts are each part of a larger group of works called *Yaketsu* 野決 (Probably an abbreviation, meaning “Teachings of the Ono Branch”). This term designates secrets of the Sanbō'in lineage at Daigoji that were transmitted from its master, Shōken 勝賢, to the prince-monk Shūkaku.²⁷ Each of these texts seems to be included in the catalogues of *Yaketsu* texts. However, they are absent from the *Yaketsu* collection in twelve volumes found at the Ninnaji library, yet can be found in the *Yaketsu* set of the Shinpukuji 真福寺 library in Nagoya.

In fact, Kenschō had access to the manuscripts at Ninnaji, but had to borrow the *Rokugatsushō* from another place (the Mitsujō'in 密乘院). He still provides extensive quotes, as well as his own commentary on both texts. Abe Yasurō's research has shown that the *Yaketsu* set probably consists of real works transmitted to and reviewed by Shūkaku. This raises the question as to why—aside from their absence

一、白蓮華經	一、宝冠タラニ經
一、菊蘭童子經	一、推現納受經
一、房内不動經	一、變成就陀羅尼
此類十八卷在之 云々	已上誓願房(豊原寺)受法用心抄有之
方為弁徳	邪正宗黨
邪正異轍	真偽分説
	顯證

26. On this type of literature, see Nishiki Hitoshi 錦仁, Ogawa Toyoo 小川豊生, and Itō Satoshi 伊藤聡, eds, “*Gisho*” no seisei: *Chūseiteki-shikō to hyōgen* 「偽書」の生成——中世的思考と表現 (Tōkyō: Shinwasha, 2003); also see Satō Hiroo 佐藤弘夫, *Gisho no seishinshi* 偽書の精神史 (Tōkyō: Kōdansha, 2002).

27. Abe, *Chūsei Nihon no shūkyō-tekusuto taikai*, 442–45. On *Yaketsu*, also see Itō Satoshi, *Chūsei Tenshō daijin shinkō no kenkyū* 中世天照大神信仰の研究 (Kyōto: Hōzōkan, 2011), 312–16.

from the Ninnaji collections—Kenshō would see our two texts as forgeries. He actually gives his reasons.

Kenshō probably did not want to disprove the entire *Yaketsu* set. In fact, the transmission from Shōken to Shūkaku is never doubted. He even acknowledges that the authenticity of the *Kongō taizō himitsu shiki* is hard to determine, but argues that the date mentioned in the colophon is suspicious. The reason is simple. The colophon says that it is a part of the teaching on an esoteric consecration ritual that Shōken transmitted to Shūkaku in the third year of the Nin'an era, which corresponds to 1168. However, according to Kenshō, the real date is closer to the Juei era, around 1185. Kenshō concludes that this suggests that the *Kongō taizō himitsu shiki* was most certainly composed later. The final argument he gives is that it cannot be found in the catalogues of Shūkaku's texts held at the temple.²⁸

Kenshō did not simply have access to such catalogues. He was even involved in the creation of some of them,²⁹ and this part of the text is probably the result of his work in the library of his temple. This does not, however, mean that his assessment of the text's authenticity is entirely reliable. In fact, we do not know for sure when the *Yaketsu* set was transmitted. However, research by Tsuchiya Megumi has shown that Shūkaku and Shōken worked together for quite a long time, and it is not impossible that a part of it was transmitted earlier than the date given by Kenshō.³⁰

His analysis of the *Rokugatsushō* is less conclusive. While he provides extensive quotes of the text, he is unable to give a clear reason why it should be considered apocryphal.³¹ However, the answer to this enigma can be found in the *Hōkyōshō*,

28. Manuscript, p. 13 : *The authenticity of this text is difficult to determine. However, there are a few doubts regarding the colophon. Here are the details. The prince-monk Shūkaku asked Shōken and obtained his consecration during the Juei years. He obtained the consecration to the Goryū lineage in the third year of Nin'an. Here we see a discrepancy with the dates. It is thus most probably a forged text. This means that it was considered as an older text at a later date. Gam'yum.*

此書(ノ)真偽難決。但付奥書年号聊有不審。子細謂守覚法

親王謁勝賢僧正被遂灌頂事(ハ)寿永御年中也。

仁安三年(二ハ)被遂御流灌頂畢。爰知時代不同。偽

作条勿論等歟。仍之為後日勘舊記也。

29. On his work, see Abe, *Chūsei Nihon no shūkyō-tekusuto taikai*, 219.

30. Tsuchiya Megumi 土谷恵, "Chūsei shotō no Ninnaji goryū to Sanbō'in-ryū: Shūkaku hosshinnō to Shōken, Shōkyūyōhō wo megutte" 中世初頭の仁和寺御流と三宝院流——守覚法親王と勝賢、請雨經法をめぐって, in *Shūkaku Hōshinnō to Ninnaji-goryū no bunkengaku-teki kenkyū: ronbunben* 守覚法親王と仁和寺御流の文献学的研究——論文篇, ed. Abe Yasurō and Yamazaki Makoto 山崎誠 (Tōkyō: Benseisha, 1998), 195–318 (see in particular 233–34).

31. He does mention problems regarding its suspicious origins, and adds that it is transmitted as a secret text in the Hōrin'in of Tōji 東寺法輪院, but considered as fake by the Ninnaji Goryū lineage. However, he sees nothing wrong in its contents. He goes on to compare it to other texts he defines as forgeries, such as the *Tenchō injin* 天長印信 (Sealed Certificates of the Tenchō Era), a famous text attributed to Kūkai's Chinese master Huiguo 惠果. See manuscript, pp. 30–31. According to Mizuhara, the Kōyasan Shōchi'in 正智院 manuscript of the *Rokugatsushō* has the outer title *Sokushin jōbutsu hiketsu ikkan* 即身成佛秘決一卷 (Secret Teachings of the Realization of Buddhahood in One's Own Body, One Volume). See *Mizuhara Gyōei zenshū*, vol. 1, 194.

where we find a reference to the *Rokugatsushō* as a suspicious text.³² This was probably the main reason why Kenshō had reservations concerning its authenticity from the start. This means that Kenshō's claim was largely influenced by Yūkai's work, and that he was merely trying to verify the assessment of his predecessor by studying the text. His evasive conclusions seem to suggest that he was unable to find concrete proof of problematic contents, or clear reasons to see the *Rokugatsushō* as an apocryphon.

While both texts are clearly defined as probably apocryphal by the author, they are not included in the categories of heretical works. It is possible that Kenshō did not want to consign Shūkaku with the Tachikawa lineage, even if it was just to refute such links. However, the *Mōsho mokuroku* does not always clearly separate these groups, as we will see with the next series of works.

Heretical Texts in the *Mōsho mokuroku*?

After these two texts, the following section titled “Catalogue of the Persons Linked to Perverse Doctrines” (*Jahō kata'udo mokuroku* 邪法方人目六[録]). It contains a series of shorter works, which are sealed certificates (*injin* 印信)—short texts transmitted during the initiation process. Kenshō's assessment of these texts, again, does not deal directly with their content, which appears as standard for medieval sources.

From his conclusion,³³ we can understand that the main reason why he sees them as false texts is the presence of a few dubious names, associated with heresies, here either *jaken* 邪見 or *jahō* 邪法. This is especially the case of figures such as Myōchō 明澄 (13th century). Previous research has shown that they are members of an alleged heretical lineage on Mount Kōya called the Chū'in lineage 中院流.³⁴ This lineage is also linked to a major figure of medieval Shingon, Dōhan 道範 (1178–1252). I will not go too far into the details, but Dōhan, a 13th-century Kōyasan monk, is in

32. Moriyama, *Tachikawa-jakyō*, 576.

33. Manuscript, p. 40:
 [始]万治三年七月廿二日御虫弘次申出抄出之了
 件大事真偽作之所尋畢
 教真ハ龍光院附法門弟たりと雖附法流了
 源紹同雖龍光院附屬法流不存知之間闇梨
 下向受法灌頂ス。而邪流等習如之、爰道範
 アサリ附法弟子明澄
 雖習中院流源照相伝本存之間法流事
 以可存思之。御下向闇梨調源照邪法伝授シテ
 不辨邪正謀思宗骨目之此事
 覺原抄出之了仍右件血脈源紹明澄相
 承之間邪流歟能可尋決了。

34. Myōchō seems to have belonged to a sub-lineage which had little to do with “evil” or “perverse” teachings. See Kōda, “Chū'in-ryū no jaryū,” and Iyanaga, “Secrecy, Sex and Apocrypha,” 217–18.

fact mentioned in the genealogies of the Kongōō'in lineage.³⁵ He also was probably another important target of Yūkai's critique.³⁶

This conclusion by Kenshō is very interesting, as it does, again, suggest a very strong link between the apocrypha and heretical texts. It also shows that one of the main criteria to determine if a text is a heresy or not is the presence—in its transmission process—of names associated with the Tachikawa lineage.

The next two sections are directly linked to this one, as Kenshō introduces them as catalogues of heresies or perverted doctrines and ideas. The first one probably corresponds to the catalogue of heretical texts found in the table of contents *Jagi-shō mokuroku* 邪義抄目録. Here Kenshō just mentions a series of words and ritual gestures linked to the same Chūin lineage without providing doctrinal reasons as to why they should be included in the group of perverted texts.³⁷ The titles vaguely resemble what can be found in the *Tachikawa shōgyō mokuroku*, but such works were most likely taken from a different source.

Shinran and Tachikawa

The difference with the next section, titled “On Heresy” (*Jahō no koto* 邪法事), is probably that while the preceding one mentions doctrinal concepts of ritual gestures, here Kenshō deals directly with heretical texts, and clearly mentions the (heretical, not the real) Tachikawa lineage. The most interesting of them is the *Isshū gyōgishō* 一宗行儀抄 (Treatise of the Proper Conduct of the Unique School), a text attributed to Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1263). In fact, this apocryphon was actually written to criticize radical “Amidists” from the standpoint of Jōdo shinshū orthodoxy.³⁸ Here, Kenshō repeats older arguments that tried to use the Tachikawa lineage and its supposed links to certain movements inside the Pure land schools in order to criticize them.³⁹

35. Takahashi, “Den Kenjin-hen *Kanjō inmyō kuketsu*,” 209–10.

36. See below, note 37.

37. Manuscript, pp. 41–42.

38. Fabio Rambelli, “‘Just Behave as You Like’: Radical Amida Cults and Popular Religiosity in Premodern Japan,” in *Approaching the Land of Bliss: Religious Praxis in the Cult of Amitabha*, ed. Richard K. Payne and Kenneth K. Tanaka (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2004): 169–201.

39. Quoting the *Isshū gyōgishō*, Kenshō mentions a Tachikawa-ryū master called Chorenbō 長連坊 (?–?; probably a fictional character) and his alleged disciples Zenshaku 善緯 (?–1207) and Jūren 住蓮 (?–1207). The later two are found in other sources. They joined Hōnen 法然 (1133–1212) at the capital and were executed in 1207. See Rambelli, “‘Just Behave as You Like,’” 187. Manuscript, pp. 44–45: 立川流邪法由來事

一宗行儀抄 親鸞作之

正治年中越後国頸城郡岡田郷ト[ママ]長連坊トテ立川流ノ學匠アリ。此人ハ出羽國ニ高市ト云フ里ノ者ト云ヒ傳ヘタリ。彼ノ長連坊ガ外法ヲ世間ニ流布シテ傳ル人皆佛前ニ詣シテ佛ヲ曾拜ムベカラズト謂(イハ)シケル。彼長連ガ弟子ニ住蓮善緯ト云者アリ。此外法ヲ傳テ後都ニ上テ法然上人ニ詣リテ念佛聽聞仕ルベシト申間、御教ヘ

This link between Pure land movements and the Tachikawa lineage could also be seen as a continuation of the attacks against Dōhan, who was a major proponent of the esoteric practice of Nenbutsu, in order to attain rebirth in Amida's paradise.⁴⁰

We could say that we have a sort of doctrinal argument here, but again, Kenshō mainly tries to draw lines between persons rather than ideas, creating a network closely resembling the conceptual structure of monastic genealogies. This focus on heresy being more a problem of lineage or pedigree rather than real doctrine is a major characteristic of Shingon heresiology. It could be explained by the fact that it was quite difficult for Yūkai or Kenshō to prove that their targets actually indulged in sexual practices or other reprehensible acts, and it was remarkably easier to just relate such persons directly to others who had already been labeled as culprits of such acts. Since the most famous of such groups was the Tachikawa lineage, it appears quite logical that almost all the descriptions of heresy are related to it. The fact that this section ends by reminding the reader of the history of the Tachikawa lineage is another hint at the presence of such a subtext in the *Mōsho mokuroku*.

Kenshō and Monkan

This is even clearer in the last part of the text. Here, Kenshō returns to the *Rokugatsushō*, and provides what is likely the final objective of his work.⁴¹ He confirms that it was considered a part of the teachings given by Shōken to Shūkaku.⁴²

アレハ更ニ上人ノ御教ヲ承引セズ 云々
又云彼長連ガ弟子ニ住蓮善紳ト云者
アリ生國ノ佐渡ノ國ノモノ也。

The exact same text can be found in the *Isshū gyōgishō*. For an edition, see *Shinshū taikai* 真宗体系, vol. 36 (Tōkyō: Shinshū tenseki kankōkai, 1917), 135.

40. On Dōhan's doctrine and pure land, see Satō Mona 佐藤もな, "Chūsei shingon-shū ni okeru Jōdo-shisō kaishaku: Dōhan *Himitsu nenbutsu-shō* wo megutte" 中世真言宗における浄土思想解釈——道範『秘密念仏抄』をめぐって, *Indo tetsugaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド哲学仏教学研究 9 (2002): 80–92. On his links to "heresy" see Kōda Yūun, "Dōhan ajari no jagisōden ni tsuite" 道範阿闍梨の邪義相伝について, *Mikkyō gakkai-hō* 密教学会報 19–20 (1980): 66–70. On Yūkai's criticism, see Rinzan Mayuri 林山まゆり, "Yūkai-sen *Bonnō-soku-bodai gi* (*Bonnō-soku-bodai ji*) ni tsuite: Fu Honkoku" 宥快撰『煩惱即菩提義』(『煩惱即菩提事』) について——附・翻刻, *Waseda daigaku daigaku'in bungaku-kenkyūka kiyō* 早稲田大学大学院文学研究科紀要 51 (2005): 65–78, and Rappo, *Rhétoriques de l'hérésie*, 88.

41. Manuscript, p. 54:
此事本所都以无(・尤)之不足信用如此書都
鄙充満シテ令迷誤无智之人无窮。今案
種々謀書不可説々々々。今三尊合行法(モ)
此随一歟。云々 又理拳印一ヶ大事也。
安祥寺流習之。云々 此事又疑胎非一。又
有所不所印大事。如此類繁多也。能々
可思慮事歟。

42. We learn that it was called *Rokugatsushō* because of the six months which passed between the start of this process in the third month, and the end in the eighth month. See manuscript, p. 53.

However, he still concludes that this book is full of errors (without naming them) and thus, it cannot be trusted.

Here, in a very telling manner, he uses this demonstration to proceed, in a way, towards the last of his targets. The next line mentions a ritual called the Joint Ritual of the Three Deities, the *Sanzon gōgyōhō* 三尊合行法, which is seen as a prime example of dubious works such as the *Rokugatsushō*.

The *Sanzon gōgyōhō* is a ritual designed by Monk 文觀 (1278–1357), a Shingon monk, active mostly during the 14th century.⁴³ Originally a monk of Saidaiji 西大寺 in Nara, he joined Daigoji and became a major figure of Emperor Go Daigo's court. After his death, Yūkai linked him to Tachikawa “heresy” and he was gradually seen as the person who first systematized its teachings.⁴⁴ This claim is not supported by any other source, and was probably completely engineered by Yūkai, through a manipulation in the *Hōkyōshō*, a fact that has been well analyzed by Iyanaga Nobumi.⁴⁵ By Kenshō's times, this image had already been firmly established.⁴⁶

Kenshō, again, deals mainly with what was in front of him, namely Monk 文觀's manuscripts at Ninnaji. This is confirmed by the next part, taken from “a chronicle.” It provides a strange tale about Monk 文觀, designed to cast doubt upon the authenticity of his initiation to the Shingon school through his master, the Daigoji monk Dōjun. Then Kenshō discusses directly the *Goyuigō daiji* 御遺告大事 (Great Matter of the Testament), Monk 文觀's magnum opus.⁴⁷ A copy of it can be found at Ninnaji—this is probably the reason why Kenshō targeted Monk 文觀 to begin with. Again, Kenshō does not really focus on the contents of Monk 文觀's work, and when he does, he does not clearly say precisely what elements were heretical. Rather, he tries to undermine Monk 文觀's credibility, by attacking his ties to the true lineages of Daigoji. By destroying Monk 文觀's image and negating his links to the Shingon orthodoxy, Kenshō became able—like Yūkai before him—to refute all of Monk 文觀's work, no matter what its actual content was.

43. On Monk 文觀, see Rappo, *Rhétoriques de l'hérésie*; Abe, *Chūsei Nihon no shūkyō-tekusuto taikei*; and David Quinter, *From Outcasts to Emperors: Shingon Ritsu and the Mañjuśrī Cult in Medieval Japan* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

44. He was also criticized by the 14th century epic called the *Taiheiki* 太平記 (Chronicle of the Great Peace). On this problem see Quinter, *From Outcasts to Emperors*, and especially Rappo, *Rhétoriques de l'hérésie*.

45. He basically linked Monk 文觀 indirectly to the Tachikawa lineage, by paralleling the diffusion of his texts to that of the Tachikawa lineage. See Iyanaga, “Mikkyō-girei to ‘Nenzuru chikara.’”

46. The *Himitsu zakki* (or *zōki*) 秘密雜記 (Various Records of Secrets), a text probably from the Muromachi or Edo period, which can be found in Moriyama, *Tachikawa-jakyō* (604–9), after his editions of Yūkai, mentions, for example, several of Monk 文觀's texts in a catalogue of works related to the Tachikawa lineage.

47. Quoted in Rappo, *Rhétoriques de l'hérésie*, 93–94. On the *Goyuigō daiji*, see Abe Yasurō, “Hōju no katadoru ōken: Monk 文觀-bō Kōshin no Sanzongōgyōhō shōgyō to sono zuzō” 宝珠の象る王権——文觀房弘真の三尊合行法聖教とその図像, in *Shari to hōju* 舍利と宝珠, *Nihon no bijutsu* 日本の美術 539, ed. Naitō Sakae 内藤栄 (Tōkyō: Shibundō, 2011), 80–93. An edition will be published by myself in Abe Yasurō and Gaétan Rappo, eds, *Monkan Kōshin chosakushū* 文觀弘真著作集, vol. 1, *HERITEX*, bessatsu 別冊 (Nagoya: Nagoya daigaku; Tōkyō: Bensei shuppan, 2018).

Conclusion

In this presentation, I tried to show how discourses on heresy were engineered and used, rather than effectively determine whether monks such as Monkan or Ninkan wrote or practiced heretical teachings. This question is misleading. If we want to know whether these monks were seen as “heretics” during their lives, the answer is most likely not. Monkan, for example, was a major figure of the imperial court, and he held the highest offices of his school. However, if the question is “were they seen as heretics at any point later?” then the answer changes. The reason is that the very category of “heresy” in Shingon was created by Yūkai after their deaths. However, while the justification he gives, which is the practice of sexual acts in the ritual context, does most certainly not apply to Monkan or even Ninkan, the discourses that depicted these monks as heretics are undeniable, regardless of whether or not they really were evil wizards performing sexual rituals.

As we have seen, the sexual acts themselves are in reality far from the most important part of such discourse. Rather, the importance centered on the existence of a heretical lineage: the Tachikawa-ryū. Since Yūkai, the Tachikawa lineage was gradually invented, but not simply in order to raise awareness towards the existence of a heretical group spreading falsehoods. In fact, its creation—which is a product of his efforts to create an “orthodoxy” inside his school—was a necessity, upon which all later heresiologic discourses relied, even when they actually attempted to criticize the contents of the alleged heretical works.

In this context, the catalogues of heretical texts became an extremely powerful weapon. If one’s name or works appeared in one of them, everything related to that person (including their disciples) could then be branded as heretical—even if their work displayed no such elements. Moreover, monks even expanded or strengthened classical arguments already found in Yūkai’s works. Through them, the very common medieval practice of attributing one’s work to another was finally, as Kenshō repeatedly says, considered as threading waters dangerously close to heresy.

Lastly, Kenshō’s case also shows that, while he tried to adopt a more analytical approach—probably taken from the tradition of catalogues established in the Edo period—he does not provide a critique of Yūkai or especially of Yūkai’s catalogue. The fact is that nobody did. Not even later scholars, such as Mizuhara Gyōei. In fact, in a similar way to what Kenshō did, Mizuhara tried to verify what he found in such texts rather than to question their methods and the way of thinking that supported them. In a way, Mizuhara can be seen as an inheritor of the long tradition of Shingon heresiology, and his work—as well as similar pre-war publications by Shingon monks—should be handled with extreme caution.⁴⁸

In Europe, the Church had enough authority to give a clear definition of doctrinal heresies, something that did not exist in Japan. However, recent research on

48. On this problem, also see Gaétan Rappo, “Kindai no Tachikawa-ryū kenkyū no tansho: Inoue Kichijirō-cho *Monkan shōnin* no tanjō no haikai wo Mizuhara Gyōei to no kōryū kara yomitoku” 近代の立川流研究の端緒——井上吉次郎著『文観上人』の誕生の背景を水原堯榮との交流から読み解く, *Waseda RILAS journal* 4 (2016): 325–42.

concrete cases of actions against heretics such as the Cathari and witches has shown that, even in Europe, doctrinal arguments were not the only rhetoric called upon. In fact, the descriptions of their allegedly horrible practices were mostly the creations of erudite priests.⁴⁹ In the cases of witches, their perverse practices existed only in the heads of their inquisitors. Moreover, in legal actions intended against alleged members of such groups, the accusation always tried to demonstrate the existence of an institutional, organized group lying beneath the heresy—the infamous “witches’ sabbath” is a good example of that.⁵⁰ By creating heretical lineages and expanding upon them, Shingon monks in Japan relied on strangely similar methods. While they did not have any institutional support to force their views on non-religious persons, discourses on heresy largely contributed in creating the form of orthodoxy of the modern Shingon school.

49. On this, see Robert I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250* (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1987). While the issue is still debated (for a critique of this, see Peter Biller, review of *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe*, by Robert I. Moore, *Reviews in History*, review no. 1546, <http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/1546>; also see Moore’s reply in the same journal), this part of his theory is mostly accepted and confirmed by sources.

50. For the first major study on this imaginary, see Carlo Ginzburg, *Ecstasies: Deciphering the Witches’ Sabbath* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1991). This kind of discourse is in fact very common in the sources. For an edition of an interesting corpus, see Martine Ostorero et al., eds, *L’imaginaire du sabbat: Édition critique des textes les plus anciens, 1430 c.–1440 c.* (Lausanne: Université de Lausanne, Section d’histoire, Faculté des lettres, 1999), 3 vols.