Gaétan Rappo

"Deviant Teachings"

The Tachikawa Lineage as a Moving Concept in Japanese Buddhism

In modern studies of esoteric Buddhism in medieval Japan, the so-called Tachikawa lineage has played a central role in defining heretical or heterodox practice. Founded in the early twelfth century, this minor and local lineage of the Shingon school underwent a series of transformations, eventually becoming a model for all heresies in Japan. In medieval Japan, the term "Tachikawa" was irredeemably associated with explicit sexual practices, especially in the writings of the Mt. Kōya monk Yūkai and his successors. These polemical critiques of Tachikawa as a deviant lineage and teaching developed into a tradition of textual study that sought to establish an orthodoxy in the Shingon school. This critique was later applied beyond the Shingon sectarian context to instances of heresy in the Jōdo Shin school and, eventually, Christianity. This heresiological process gradually resulted in a multilayered, "moving concept" of Japanese heresy, which came to fruition during the nineteenth century with the introduction of the Western ideas of religion and heresy.

keywords: Tachikawa lineage—Shingon school—sexual rites—heresy—religious deviance

Gaétan Rappo is Hakubi Associate Professor at the Institute for Research in Humanities (Jinbunken), Kyoto University.

THE TACHIKAWA lineage (*Tachikawa ryū* 流) has long been a symbol of deviant practices within Shingon Buddhism. Allegedly established during the early twelfth century, this branch of the Shingon school of esoteric Buddhism was known for its dark rituals, where the sexual imagery associated with Tantric Buddhism was not simply working on a symbolic level but was supposedly practiced as a way to attain enlightenment.[1]

Since the first decade of the twenty-first century, progress has been made on the early history of this lineage—mainly through the work of Iyanaga Nobumi—which demonstrates that the "heretical" version of the Shingon tradition was almost entirely a creation of the Mt. Kōya monk Yūkai 宥快 (1345–1416) (IYANAGA 2004; 2006; 2010; 2016; 2018). The Tachikawa lineage also played a role in modern debates regarding the nature of religion in Japan. In *The Invention of Religion in Japan*, Jason Ānanda Josephson examines arguments on religious deviance, or heresy, found in texts criticizing the Tachikawa lineage that were central to a discourse on the rejection of religious differences and widely used in anti-Christian polemics from the second half of the sixteenth century (JOSEPHSON 2012, 38–39).[2] However, little has been written on the Tachikawa lineage discourse in the centuries following Yūkai and his condemnation of the lineage as heretical in the *Hōkyōshō* and debates over the meaning of religious orthodoxy in modern Japan.

Through an analysis of previously obscure sources, this article builds on recent scholarship to reveal that the Tachikawa lineage not only contributed to the perception of a radical and foreign "other" in Japan but continued to operate as an important concept in Japanese Buddhism itself. While the number of sources dealing with Tachikawa after the fourteenth century—at least, the materials that are currently available—are fewer than what previous research had led us to believe, the theme remained influential. Documents dating to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that mention the lineage are scarce and seem to

1. It should be noted that, in the sources available today, such discourses on the Tachikawa "heresy" only concern heterosexual practices. Male-male sexuality, while fairly common in Japanese monasteries, is never mentioned. In fact, in some contexts (especially the Tendai school), it was ritualized and doctrinally sanctioned (PORATH 2019).

2. As Josephson writes, Christianity was in fact called *jahō* 邪法 (evil ritual, doctrine, or, more broadly, "heresy"), a term that is used to describe the Tachikawa lineage in medieval sources such as the *Bateren tsuihō no fumi* promulgated by the Tokugawa shogunate in 1614 (NST 25: 420–421). However, I have not found sources directly linking the Tachikawa lineage to Christianity.

rely almost exclusively on Yūkai's negative depiction. However, a few members of rival Shingon lineages tried to refute his claims. Moreover, throughout the late medieval and early modern periods, Japanese monks gradually added new layers to the Tachikawa lineage construct, turning it into a malleable concept that not only encompassed false interpretations of sexual symbolism in Buddhism but also integrated an expanding network of ideas and individuals into the definition of this supposedly heterodox lineage within the Shingon school.

This amassing of layers regarding what qualifies as the Tachikawa lineage is especially apparent in catalogs of heretical texts, which was an increasingly common genre of Shingon monastic literature in the centuries following Yūkai. This style of heresiology focused not only on ideas but also on individuals and textual transmissions. In the seventeenth century, Shingon heresiology was incorporated into sectarian histories and monastic genealogies. These revisionist works added clearly dubious but highly impactful episodes to the history of the Tachikawa lineage, such as the alleged burning of Tachikawa books in the second half of the fourteenth century.

Although the Tachikawa lineage gradually became a marker of heresy in the Shingon school, this designation was not limited to sectarian writings. There is at least one allusion to the Tachikawa lineage in the Jōdo Shin school. The *Isshū gyōgishō*, an apocryphon attributed to Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1263) but probably written at least two centuries later, makes a direct reference to a member of the Tachikawa lineage when explaining the introduction of certain heresies in the Jōdo Shin school and effectively defines it as the root of heresies in Japanese Buddhism. This text was quite influential and widely diffused, and it was even reused by Shingon monks. The *Isshū gyōgishō* also inserts the Tachikawa lineage into a completely different context in which heresy was not only a problem of sexual intercourse but dealt with issues of respect—or lack thereof—for Japanese deities in pure land practice.

This multilayered construction culminates in pre-World War II Japan, when it acquired new significations as Christian concepts of religion and heresy were imported from the West. In the late nineteenth century, the topic of the Tachikawa lineage reappeared in monastic discourse and academic research— two fields with substantial overlap at the time—and even in literature, where it was treated as the epitome of heresy. Tachikawa was also invoked in response to contemporary issues. Scholar-monks in the Shingon school, whose works are still influential today, applied the alleged heresies of the Tachikawa lineage to a broader discussion of the role of women in Buddhism and clerical celibacy. Other intellectuals took an apologetic approach to the topic and defended the Shingon tradition against criticism by minimizing the influence of the "Tachikawa monks" in the history of their school. In doing so, they also added

new layers to the Tachikawa heresy, which led some publications to describe it as a Japanese equivalent to Christian heresies found in European history.

This heritage of the Tachikawa as a "moving concept"[3] had a deep impact on the perception of the actual Tachikawa lineage and on the way it was—and even still is—described in Japanese scholarship as well as in most Western-language publications (for example, Sanford 1991).[4] The "Tachikawa lineage," therefore, is not a neutral or merely descriptive term, but rather the result of several layers of meaning accumulated over centuries. The uncritical use of the phrase thus can result in a series of misconceptions that prevent a clear understanding of its original medieval context. By exploring the evolution of the discourse on the Tachikawa lineage in Japanese history, as well as its historiography, it is not my aim to merely emphasize the need for caution when using such terminology. Rather, the heresiological texts that defined and transformed this discourse deeply impacted the development of religious thought in Japan and, more specifically, the rejection of the religious "other."

The Tachikawa Lineage as a "Deviant Teaching": The Discourse on Heresy in Modern Japan

The scholarly discourse on the Tachikawa lineage as we know it today is primarily a product of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is during this period that Japanese scholars in the Shingon school began to analyze the history of the lineage through the Western (particularly Christian) notion of heresy, which applies the term to heterodox groups or sects adhering to a "deviant teaching." This can be seen in the titles of three seminal texts that continue to be cited as authoritative studies on Tachikawa: *Research into the Deviant Teachings of the Tachikawa Lineage* (*Jakyō Tachikawaryū no kenkyū*, Mizuhara 1923), *Research into the Deviant Teachings of Tachikawa and their Sociological Context* (*Tachikawa jakyō to sono shakaiteki haikei no kenkyū*, Moriyama 1965), and *Deviant Teachings and the Tachikawa Lineage* (*Jakyō, Tachikawaryū*, Manabe 1999).[5]

All of these studies use the specific word *jakyō* 邪教 to describe the Tachikawa lineage. This term was uncommon in medieval texts. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly when and why this term became parlance in modern studies of the

3. I borrow the expression "moving concept" from Christin, Barrat, and Moullier (2010) and the *Begriffsgeschichte* (history of concepts), as proposed by figures such as Reinhard Koselleck.

4. In addition to Rappo (2017a), notable exceptions to this tendency are the works of Iyanaga (2004; 2010; 2018), Köck (2000; 2009; 2016), and Quinter (2015).

5. Stefan Köck (2016, 82) has also remarked on the use of the word *jakyō* in modern studies, noting that some authors, such as Kōda Yūun, refrain from using it.

lineage, but a passage in a 1936 book on heresy, *The People Deluded by Heresy* (*Jakyō ni mayohasareta hitobito*) may offer some hints:

> While heresies (*jakyō*) were previously limited to cults to fashionable deities (*hayarigami* 流行神), a heresy later emerged as a religious institution with a supposedly menacing doctrine. This was the Tachikawa lineage, which was a part of the Shingon school.　　　　　　　　　　　　　(KŌMURA 1936, 290)

Here, the author uses the same word, *jakyō*, as it appears in the titles by Shingon scholars. However, the author merges two concepts of heresy when defining this term. The first sentence defines *jakyō* as isolated cults and practices, which was how it was frequently used in late nineteenth-century sources. The second uses this same term to describe a specific organization or group as heretics, which is similar to the European—or rather Christian—concept of heresy. Therefore, the author depicts Tachikawa as the first organized form of heresy in Japan.

There is very little evidence in premodern sources that Tachikawa was considered *jakyō*, either in the sense of an isolated cult or as an organized heresy. While Yūkai, the progenitor of the discourse on the Tachikawa lineage, had a notion of "heresy" or religious "deviance," which he tended to incorporate into his polemical category of the Tachikawa lineage, he never actually used the expression *jakyō*. In fact, the word *jakyō* never appears in his *Hōkyōshō* or the earliest collection of Tachikawa writings, the *Tachikawa shōgyō mokuroku*. It can be found in extant manuscripts of the *Juhō yōjinshū*, the alleged locus classicus for references to Tachikawa, although only a couple of times (MORIYAMA 1965, 547–548).[6] Moreover, when the term is used in medieval sources, it does not designate an organized "heresy" or a "heretical group." In Buddhist texts, *jakyō* generally refers to "bad" or "wrong teaching."[7] Such teachings led disciples into error, diverting from the path to awakening. In Japan, Kūkai 空海 (774–835) used the word in this sense in his taxonomy of teachings, the *Jūjūshinron* (T 2425, 77.304a6–28, 317b23, 320a10), and similar usage can be found in texts throughout the early medieval period. Thus, the application of the term to a particular group or lineage was clearly a modern innovation.

The transformation of *jakyō* from the Buddhist notion of misunderstanding the Buddha's teaching to its current usage broadly denoting heretical sects or lineages was a gradual process that took place over the course of centuries. As the dictionary of "moving concepts" (*des concepts nomades*) thoroughly demonstrates, the meaning of concepts and words are in flux and change over

---

6. In the Kōzanji edition of the text, *jakyō* appears three times (SUEKI 2009, 54, 62).

7. For example, the Chinese exegete Kuiji 窺基 (632–682) uses the term in regards to misconceptions of the self and causation (T 1830, 43.250b24), and Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664) chose to use this term in his translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi* when describing someone who has been taught the wrong teaching (T 1579, 30.314a8).

time and in disparate contexts (Christin, Barrat, and Moullier 2010). The first stage of the transformation of *jakyō* as a moving concept occurred in the early modern period with Japan's encounter with Christianity, when Christianity began to be referred to as *jakyō*. However, Christianity was not thought of as a distinct religion but rather as a perverse or evil "lineage" in the predominantly Buddhist framework of the period (Isomae 2014, 99). In the precise wording of anti-Christian polemicists, Christianity was also called *jashū* 邪宗 (a deviant sect), a term mimicking the division of Buddhist schools (Isomae 2012, 122–123).

The application of this term to Christianity also had a political objective, as Christianity did not fit into the social order of the Tokugawa shogunate and was thus deemed a dangerous and heretical sect that needed to be suppressed. Such usage of the term *jakyō* was not without precedent. Political control of religious movements, although rare in Japanese history, had occurred prior to the arrival of Christianity, the most notable example being the case of Hōnen 法然 (1133–1212) and his disciples. The political use of the word *jakyō* (read *xiejiao* in Chinese) was more commonplace in Ming and Qing China (1368–1912), where it described religious movements considered dangerous to the central government such as the millenarian sect of the White Lotus (Bailianjiao 白蓮教) and Christianity (Haar 1992). This notion of *jakyō*, while it had the nuance of heresy and tended to associate loose morals and sexual elements with groups branded as such, was essentially a political rather than doctrinal concept. While the category of *jakyō* existed in early modern polemics against Christianity, it was not until the late nineteenth century that the term acquired its institutional meaning. It was at this time that the term began to be used to explicitly discriminate against specific religious groups for posing heterodox views.

A factor in this evolution was the introduction of the Western notion of "religion" to Japan. Translated as *shūkyō* 宗教 in Japanese, the term for "religion" shares the character *kyō* 教 with *jakyō*. Originally, this character was used in Buddhist texts to describe teachings or doctrinal positions and not religious groups or institutions. The association of *kyō* with an organized faith or doctrine was a byproduct of a new discourse, in part, spawned by the importation of the word *shūkyō* into modern Japan (Josephson 2012; Isomae 2014). Heresy in Japan was also a component of this discourse on religion. In the 1888 edition of Hepburn's Japanese-English dictionary, *jakyō* is defined as "False religion; evil doctrine or teaching" and is listed as a synonym of *gedō* 外道 (a traditional Buddhist term for non-Buddhist traditions) and *itan* 異端, the term that became the modern Japanese translation for the Christian notion of heresy (Hepburn 1888, 218).[8]

8. The academic usage of the term has, for the most part, adhered to Hepburn's definition. For example, in the Japanese translation of James Ketelaar's *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan*, "heretics" is translated as *jakyō* (Ketelaar and Okada 2006).

In politics, *jakyō* followed a similar trajectory to this linguistic shift and took on a general notion of heresy, but this transformation also had practical consequences for how the state treated religious entities. In the process of modernization, the Meiji government sought to suppress what they labeled as the "evils of deviant teachings" (*jakyō inshi* 邪教淫祠). This category designated practices with an "excessive" sexual component, such as phallic cults (*dōsojin* 道祖神), as well as local ceremonies consisting of spirit possession and divination. In other words, the term was broadly applied to any practices considered to consist of superstition or labeled as immoral and antithetical to "civilized" religion (Iso-mae 2014, 38–39). By the 1930s when imperial fanaticism (or fascism) was at its peak, the category of *jakyō* was expanded to include religious organizations considered threats to the imperial ideology. Groups such as the Kōdō Ōmoto 皇道大本, a new religion established in the late nineteenth century and later classified as an independent Shinto sect, were targets of repression (Stalker 2008, 97–100, 183–187). Accused of lèse-majesté (*fukeizai* 不敬罪) in official government documents, the Ōmoto group was designated as a *jakyō* that spread among the uneducated masses (Kawamura 2010, 48).

Scholarship on Tachikawa as *jakyō* emerged against this backdrop of political and social strife over the meaning of religious orthodoxy. Perhaps the earliest references to Tachikawa and heresy were published in the Buddhist journal *Hansei zasshi* 反省雑誌, which was produced by Ryukoku University—a Jōdo Shin university—with the aim of spreading the strict practice of Buddhist values in society. In an 1896 article written by someone under the pseudonym Tōzan Itsunō 東山逸衲, the author discusses the presence of "heretical doctrines" (*jagi* 邪義, a term that later acquired a sexual connotation) and sexual rituals in the Shingon school based on Yūkai's description of the Tachikawa lineage in the *Hōkyōshō* (Tōzan 1896). Three months later, Ōuchi Seiran 大内青巒 (1845–1919) wrote an article in the same journal under the pseudonym of Ai'ai Koji 藹々居士 (1896), lamenting that there was a "heretic" from the Tachikawa lineage in the entourage of Emperor Go Daigo 後醍醐 (1288–1339). Himself a devout imperial loyalist, Ōuchi Seiran tried to defend the emperor, arguing that it was difficult to distinguish the true teachings from "heresy."

Although both articles highlight the alleged heresies of the Tachikawa lineage, they were also implicit critiques of the Shingon school. Thus, Shingon monks were compelled to respond. The earliest known publication by a scholar from the Shingon school on the Tachikawa problem was written in 1903 by Kojima Shōken (Masanori) 小島昌憲. Kojima published a series of articles in the journal *Rokudai shinpō* 六大新報, which was the Shingon equivalent to Ryukoku's *Hansei zasshi*. In these articles, he greatly minimizes the importance of the Tachikawa lineage in the history of the Shingon school, thus attempting to disassociate the heretical practices of Tachikawa from the Shingon school as a

whole (Kojima 1903). Similar publications can be found in the same journal over the next decade, but the most influential Shingon scholar on the topic was Mizuhara Gyōei 水原堯栄 (1890–1965), abbot of Shinnōin 親王院 on Mt. Kōya. His aforementioned book, *Research into the Deviant Teachings of the Tachikawa Lineage*, concludes a series of studies on the subject based on textual materials he had personally collected (Mizuhara 1920; 1921). While his prose can be very difficult to decipher, Mizuhara established the foundation for modern studies on the Tachikawa lineage.

Despite the fact that Mizuhara calls the Tachikawa lineage a *jakyō* in the title of his book, he does not provide a clear definition of what exactly he means by this term. In fact, the term is seldom found in the book, which relies mostly on premodern sources and their vocabulary. However, both his preface and postface provide hints that allow us to understand why he chose this very contentious term.

Mizuhara's interest in the Tachikawa lineage appears to have been in response to the persecution of religious practices labeled as the "evil of deviant teachings." As he states in his preface, his intention for writing the book was not merely out of academic curiosity. Alluding to the inherent sexual nature of human beings, he concludes that the Tachikawa lineage's original goal was to purify "man's inherent sexual desire" and use it to attain buddhahood. However, the monks who followed this path failed due to a lack of knowledge and their reliance on superstition (Mizuhara 1923, 1–3). In other words, he defends the Tachikawa lineage, while, at the same time, he admits that it was a *jakyō* whose main characteristic was the literal implementation of the sexual symbolism found in Tantric Buddhism.

The postface also refers to sexual practices and is a glimpse into the social and political issues Mizuhara faced when he wrote the book. In a discussion of the Shikoku pilgrimage (*Shikoku henro* 四国遍路), which he claims served as a form of sexual education, Mizuhara indirectly addresses prohibitions on the integration of sex and religion as mandated by the Meiji government (Mizuhara 1923, 168–169).[9] Mizuhara's emphasis on sex and *jakyō* also reflects the shifting social and legal circumstances on Mt. Kōya at the time, where prohibition against clerical marriage and women on the mountain had been lifted (Rappo 2016, 337–336).[10] Therefore, Mizuhara's scholarship on the Tachikawa lineage was, in part,

9. Mizuhara's very subtle and frequently misunderstood position drew some criticism from other monks of the Shingon school. In a review to his book originally published in the journal *Mikkyō bunka* 密教文化, he was even called an "experimenter" of the Tachikawa teachings (Mizuhara 1981–1982, 10: 578).

10. Mizuhara was in favor of female clerics in the Shingon school, while still being a proponent of strict religious discipline. His stance is best expressed in his book *Josei to Kōyasan* in which he conducts a historical survey of the presence of women on the sacred mountain, showing that the prohibition of women (*nyonin kinsei* 女人禁制) was ahistorical (Mizuhara 1924).

a response to changes in Japanese society as well as an effort to defend the reputation of the Shingon school against negative associations with sexual practices.

Building on Mizuhara's study, Moriyama Shōshin 守山聖真 (1888–1967)—a Shingon monk of the Hasedera-based Buzan branch—focused his research primarily on the figure Monkan 文観 (1278–1357), who was purported to be the most successful propagator of the Tachikawa lineage (Rappo 2019, 1052–1053). Moriyama's research seems to be a direct response to the concerns outlined by Ōuchi Seiran in his 1896 article regarding Monkan's relationship with Emperor Go Daigo during the split between the northern and southern courts (Brownlee 1997, 118–130). In contrast to Ōuchi's apologetic approach toward Go Daigo's association with the Tachikawa master, Moriyama argues that Monkan was not a part of a heretical scheme to snare the emperor but was rather a loyal servant to the royalty (kinnōsō 勤王僧) (Rappo 2017a, 32–45).

In contrast to Mizuhara, Moriyama proposes a definition of jakyō in the preface of his 1965 book. Resembling Mizuhara's views on sex and religion, Moriyama suggests that jakyō refers to a religious tradition that attempted to satiate one's natural desires (honnō manzoku 本能満足) in an effort to attain enlightenment. Like Mizuhara, he contends that sexual desire is natural, but that the practitioners of the Tachikawa lineage who "fell" into jakyō did so because they were unable to purify these desires (Moriyama 1965, 12). His analysis of texts associated with the Tachikawa lineage applies a similar logic. Regarding Monkan's commentary on the Rishukyō, a text known for its sexual symbolism, Moriyama contends that interpretations of the commentary that took such symbolism literally were mistaken and failed to grasp the more profound meaning of these teachings (Moriyama 1965, 405).[11] Moriyama's usage of jakyō, like other studies at the time, was ambiguous. However, he does not question the application of this term to the Tachikawa lineage or the texts and practices attributed to it.

Reading the works of Mizuhara and Moriyama leaves one with the impression that these scholar-monks were intentionally vague about the meaning of jakyō. Their understanding of the term seems to assume the conception of "heresy" that developed in the decades after the Meiji Restoration, which designated the practices of local cults, especially those considered to be overtly sexual in nature, as well as religious institutions or movements that were deemed unorthodox by the political authorities, as heretical. However, their use of jakyō also reflects contemporary debates among the Japanese clergy regarding the role of marriage, the presence of women at monastic centers, and changing views regarding sex in general.

Although the scholarship of Mizuhara and Moriyama was seminal to research on the Tachikawa lineage, and Shingon in general, their notion of jakyō and its

---

11. On the reception of the Rishukyō in Japan, see Astley (1987). For an edition of Monkan's commentary see ndz (31: 140–202).

relevance to medieval esoteric Buddhism was anachronistic. The use of the term to denote a broader category of heresy was the result of a longer tradition of Shingon heresiological texts written mostly after the fourteenth century and is not a reliable description of the medieval Shingon school. In such texts, the "Tachikawa lineage" became the symbol of heretical teachings and an umbrella term under which sectarian polemicists combined various "heretical" elements from diverse, and often specious, sources.

Such so-called heretical elements typically involved sexual imagery or, occasionally, sexual intercourse. However, sexual symbolism was very common in medieval writings. Defining a text as heretical on this basis imposes a set of values accepted in later periods onto historical texts from an older period that did not necessarily share these norms.[12] To tell the story of how the Tachikawa lineage became a moving concept for heresy in Japanese Buddhism, we must start with its origins and outline the historical stages of this construct.

Medieval Origins and Early Reception of the Tachikawa Lineage

According to medieval sources, the Tachikawa lineage was allegedly founded in the early twelfth century by Ninkan 仁寛 (d. 1114), a Daigoji 醍醐寺 monk who was exiled to Izu. Two main sources describe what is today known as the Tachikawa lineage. The *Juhō yōjinshū* written in 1268 by the monk Shinjō 心定 (ca. 1215–1272) is frequently cited as the earliest source describing sexual heresies in Shingon Buddhism. Iyanaga Nobumi argues that this association of sexual practices described in the *Juhō yōjinshū* with the Tachikawa lineage is a misconception.[13] The actual Tachikawa lineage starting with Ninkan left only a few documents, most of which are currently held at Kanazawa Bunko. However, these texts do not contain anything particularly out of the ordinary for a medieval esoteric lineage. Moreover, Iyanaga's close inspection of the *Juhō yōjinshū* reveals that the association of Tachikawa with sexual heresy cannot be found in the text itself, which criticizes

---

12. However, in medieval Japan, there were already voices, aside from Yūkai, criticizing certain forms of sexual symbolism. As Kameyama Takahiko (2018) has shown, some of the medieval critics of the alleged Tachikawa lineage actually distinguished appropriate sexual discourse from heresy, but did not dismiss it all together.

13. The main text of the *Juhō yōjinshū* does in fact mention a sexualized ritual in the context of a story involving a strange group of people who practiced a "certain ritual" (*ka no hō* 彼ノ法). The text describes this ritual as a sinister rite that incorporates the use of human and animal skulls and the mixing of necromancy with sexual elements. However, as Iyanaga points out, Shinjō does not explicitly link this rite to the Tachikawa lineage. Rather, this association occurred later, and the *Haja kenshōshū* seems to discuss an altogether different ritual (Iyanaga 2018, 63). While the Kōzanji manuscript was copied in 1313, it is based on an earlier version held on Mt. Kōya and written in 1281. The *Haja kenshōshū*, a text thought to have originated at Shōchiin 正智院 on Mt. Kōya, was appended to the manuscript either in 1281 or 1313 (Sueki 2020, 450).

various practices and rituals but does not directly link rites involving sexual intercourse to the Tachikawa lineage. In fact, the earliest source linking Ninkan's lineage to a sexual ritual is the *Haja kenshōshū*. This work is now lost, but a large excerpt has been added as an appendix to the newly discovered Kōzanji manuscript of the *Juhō yōjinshū* dated to 1313 (IYANAGA 2018, 61–63; SUEKI 2019; 2020, 449–450).

The source of this correlation between the sexualized rites and the lineage establishing the heretical image of Tachikawa is the *Hōkyōshō*.[14] Written by the Mt. Kōya monk Yūkai in 1375, the text describes several "deviant" teachings and "heretical" figures, the Tachikawa lineage being preeminent among them. Again, Iyanaga demonstrates that the text forcefully—and without providing a clearly stated rationale—links several distinct elements: the actual Tachikawa lineage, which probably had very little "heretical" content, the skull ritual described by Shinjō, and the writings of his political rivals, such as the Shingon monk Monkan (IYANAGA 2010). Based on recent research concerning the Kōzanji manuscript, the sexual practices outlined in the *Haja kenshōshū* should be added to this list.

In the wake of Yūkai, references to the Tachikawa lineage as a symbol of heresy spread throughout the Shingon school, especially on Mt. Kōya. Some treatises authored by Shingon monks even blended different lineages such as the Kongōōin 金剛王院—known for its sexual symbolism—into the larger category of heresy that had become referred to by the moniker of the Tachikawa lineage (TAKAHASHI 2016, 209–210). Thus, after Yūkai, the Tachikawa lineage took on the status of a heretical faction and became a symbol of deviant practices within the Shingon school. However, very few extant sources show how Yūkai's work was received over the next two centuries. Some documents discuss specific concepts typically associated with the Tachikawa lineage, such as the union of red and white liquids (*shakubyaku nitai* 赤白二渧), without explicitly labeling them as Tachikawa (IYANAGA 2018, 87–90).

The Shingon monk In'yū 印融 (1439–1515) mentions Yūkai in his *Shoinjin kuketsu*, a text compiled around 1478. In'yū alludes to Yūkai's text when discussing the authenticity of the *Gayūshi*, a work that was commonly deemed an apocryphon and a Tachikawa text (CHINEN 1997). After asserting that the text was important to the Sanbōin 三宝院 lineage, he adds the following:

> However, this text is described as an apocryphon in both the *Hōkyōshō*, which was written by Yūkai, a monk of the Hōshōin 宝性院 on Mt. Kōya, and in the *Shingishō*, a work of Shunkai 俊海 (d.u.), a monk of Sano in the Shimotsuke Province (called Yashū 野州). This claim is completely false. The *Hōkyōshō* and the *Jitsugoshō* praise the An'yōji 安養寺 lineage (the lineage Yūkai belonged to)

14. An English translation of this text was published by VANDEN BROUCKE (1992). For an updated French translation of the section regarding Monkan, see RAPPO (2017a, 403–415). On the text itself, see IYANAGA (2004; 2010).

and look down on the Sanbōin lineage. This is why they write that almost all of the texts belonging to this lineage are apocrypha. This is a clear case of attacking the other to assert one's own position (*jiritsu taha* 自立他破). Who would accept such an attitude? This can only be frowned upon. Shunkai's attachment to the idea of attacking the other to assert one's own position knows no bounds. In fact, he describes all texts for which he did not receive a transmission as forgeries. They (Yūkai and Shunkai) are the epitome of narrow-mindedness. Their work should not be used at all. Their work needs to be evaluated carefully from now on. (zsszs 25: 487; Itō 2003, 199–200)

In'yū's reaction was only natural. He was a member of the Sanbōin lineage of Daigoji, the very lineage that Yūkai attacks in his criticism of Monkan. However, despite this attack on Yūkai's methods, In'yū's opinion did not represent the majority of the Shingon school. In fact, the second work In'yū mentions, the *Shingishō*, most certainly relied on Yūkai's category of Tachikawa-related texts.[15] The *Shingishō* was just one early example of a long tradition of anti-Tachikawa rhetoric stemming from Yūkai's polemical claims in the *Hōkyōshō*.

Members of In'yū's lineage also sought to distinguish themselves from the construct that was the Tachikawa lineage, which can be seen in the *Konkōshō*, a text probably written by Kyōga 教雅 (ca. sixteenth century) or one of his contemporaries. This work describes many so-called heretical concepts that are often linked to the Tachikawa lineage, such as embryology or sexual symbolism. However, the author asserts that the teachings of his lineage should not be confused with Tachikawa: The text states:

> People such as Shingyō 真慶 of Tennōji 天王寺 and Rennen 蓮念 of Tachikawa confused the two perspectives of ordinary and of enlightened beings (*bonshō niken* 凡聖二見), and this led them to finally succumb to heretical views (*jaken* 邪見). (Fukuda 1995, 62)

The fact that he claims that the Tachikawa lineage failed to consider such practices and concepts from the two perspectives of ordinary and sagely beings—that is, deluded and enlightened or mundane and profound viewpoints—suggests that Kyōga was aware of the similarity between his lineage's teachings and the heresies criticized by Yūkai. He thus argued that the fundamental difference between members of his lineage and people such as Ninkan (here referred to as Rennen) was that his tradition understood the true meaning of these concepts, while the heretical factions took them literally. However, by using Yūkai's categories of heretical teachings, Kyōga ultimately recognizes the received view

---

15. The full text is not available, but according to Itō Satoshi, there is a copy in the Chisan Bunko 智山文庫 collection of the Chishakuin 智積院. The colophon says it was written in 1431 (Itō 2003, 228, n. 5).

of Tachikawa as heretical. Despite Kyōga's efforts, the *Konkōshō* would later be labeled as a part of the Tachikawa lineage as defined by Yūkai.[16]

In his book on Monkan and the Tachikawa lineage, Moriyama Shōshin showcases the *Jashō benbetsuki*, which he claims was written sometime after the mid-sixteenth century. The full text is unavailable, but Moriyama describes it as having been written in a dialogue style (*mondōtai* 問答体) by a monk from Mt. Tsukuba 筑波 in Jōshū 常州 (Ibaraki Prefecture).[17] The unknown author notes that he found a work called the *Fudōson gushō*, which he determined to be suspicious. This work is also known by the title *Asharagushō*, based on the transliteration of the Sanskrit name of Fudō, Acala (FUKUDA 1995, 36). Furthermore, the unknown author claims that, since ancient times, it has been confirmed that sexualized rituals were either a part of the Tachikawa lineage or directly transmitted from Monkan. The *Jashō benbetsuki* thus clearly seeks to attack the descendants of In'yū's lineage by associating them with the Tachikawa lineage (MORIYAMA 1965, 172–174, 179).

While the exact date of the composition of this text remains obscure, it may well have been written in the seventeenth century following the first-known printed version of the *Hōkyōshō* in 1657. Its existence is evidence that Yūkai's writings spread across Japan and could even be found in remote areas far from Mt. Kōya. This text also proves that the interpretation of the Tachikawa lineage as a heresy and Monkan as a heretic relied almost exclusively on Yūkai. It was with Yūkai's reading of the *Juhō yōjinshū* in the *Hōkyōshō* that we find the criteria that later would be used by his successors for judging a text, practice, or lineage to be heretical (IYANAGA 2018). Such criteria are, in fact, applied in the *Jashō benbetsuki* to classify the *Fudoson gushō* as part of the Tachikawa lineage. Therefore, the origins of the medieval and early modern discourse on the Tachikawa lineage as a heretical faction of the Shingon school can be traced to Yūkai and his polemical interpretation of the *Juhō yōjinshū*.

Catalogs of Heretical Texts and Textual Studies

In the absence of the complete text, one should not rely too much on the *Jashō benbetsuki*. However, based on catalogs of heresiological works compiled during the early modern period, we can surmise that its criteria for classifying a text or rite as heretical had become widespread in the Shingon school (RAPPO 2017b). In writing such catalogs, Shingon monks tried to assess the authenticity of

---

16. In addition to FUKUDA (1995, 62), see KAMEYAMA (forthcoming) for an analysis of this text and its criticism of Yūkai.

17. Given that the *Shingishō* was written in nearby Shimotsuke, there might have been a tradition of heresiology inherited from Yūkai in the northern Kanto region in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

suspicious texts. In doing so, they did not exclusively focus on the contents of the texts, but were more concerned with lineages and genealogies of monks. Therefore, they were motivated to identify the texts' origins as well as the individuals involved in their transmission.

Perhaps the most well-known example of such a cataloger was Kyōi 恭畏 (1564–1630), an influential figure of the Shingon school at the time and himself the author of several heresiological works (Kojima 2003, 63; zsszs 25: 353–354). In 1622, he compiled the *Misshū kechimyakushō*, a complete chronology in three volumes of the main lineages of the Shingon school. Another of his writings, the *Gishoron*, is published in the Taishō canon. This work consists of a list of texts attributed to monks in the Shingon school, which he deems to be apocrypha (Itō 2003, 228). In the first few lines, Kyōi expressly states that the purpose for making this list is to "destroy the false and reveal the correct" (*haja kenshō* 破邪顕正). He adds that misinformed people deem such texts as the truth due to the fact that they have not received initiation into the correct lineages (т 2509, 78.915b6–9). This emphasis on lineage in the *Gishoron* overlaps with the purport of his *Misshū kechimyakushō*.

Kyōi was extremely erudite and well-informed; he had an in-depth knowledge of various Shingon lineages. He also collected numerous texts, and his name can be found in the colophons of manuscripts that he personally verified (sssz 27: 310). On the whole, Kyōi's method for classification is a form of textual analysis. He is primarily concerned with the origins of the texts and the trustworthiness of their colophons, especially the dates given in them. This scrutiny over the dates leads him to propose potential authors of the apocrypha and, especially, their lineages. According to Kyōi, if an author belonged to a dubious lineage, that alone was enough to dismiss the entirety of the work. Although the *Gishoron* never directly mentions the Tachikawa lineage, some of the apocrypha listed in the work would later be associated with its heresies.

This tendency to view lineages as markers of authenticity is even stronger in later catalogs. This is precisely what happens in the *Mōsho jahō jagisho mokuroku*, a catalog of apocryphal texts that includes heretical doctrines, which was probably compiled by the Ninnaji 仁和寺 monk Kenshō 顕証 (1597–1678).[18]

---

18. A complete version of the catalog is unpublished. The manuscript consulted for this study was copied in 1709 by a Ishiyamadera 石山寺 monk named Sonpen 尊遍 (d.u.), who claims he copied it from an original held by the Ninnaji monk Ryōshin 亮深 (d.u.) (Rappo 2017b). Large portions of the text are quoted by Mizuhara Gyōei under another title, *Gikyō mokuroku narabi ni jagi kyōron* 偽経目六并邪義経論, which is a subtitle used in the manuscript (Mizuhara 1981–1982, 1: 188–210). The text is also discussed in Kōda (1981). Mizuhara mentions Kyōi (he even writes Kyōi Kenshō) as another name for the author. However, given that the *Mōsho jahō jagisho mokuroku* directly quotes and comments on the *Gishoron*, Kyōi is probably not the author of both texts. In Fact, Kenshō and Kyōi knew each other (Kimura 2015, 9).

The catalog is an analytical classification of problematic texts in the Shingon school. In the first section on apocryphal sutras, Kenshō directly quotes Kyōi regarding the legitimacy of an alleged sutra:

> This is not a true sutra. It is a deluded work made by a perverted individual, who spreads words that are not from the Buddha. Kenshō.
>
> (*Mōsho jahō jagisho mokuroku*, 3)

Kenshō closes the first section of his catalog by associating the composition of apocryphal sutras with the heretical actions of a deluded individual, reflecting the tendency in Shingon heresiology to focus on individuals and their lineages rather than specific doctrines.

This condemnation of a purported apocryphal sutra functions as Kenshō's transition into the next section of the catalog, which deals with texts that spread perverse or heretical doctrines (*jagi*). However, this part of the catalog consists entirely of a quote from the *Juhō yōjinshū* (Rappo 2017b, 144–145). Kenshō provides very little information on these heretical doctrines, but his citation of the *Juhō yōjinshū* creates a narrative of heretical literature that links the textual investigations of his predecessor Kyōi to the broader discourse on the Tachikawa lineage.

In general, Kenshō primarily focuses on individuals rather than ideas. By using the label of the Tachikawa lineage, he strives to establish a network of "heretics" closely resembling the conceptual structure of monastic genealogies. This focus on heresy as a problem of lineage or pedigree rather than doctrine is characteristic of Shingon heresiology. This tendency might be explained by the fact that it was quite difficult to prove that the targets of their criticism actually indulged in sexual practices or other reprehensible acts. In contrast, it was remarkably easier to just link their rivals to others who had already been labeled as culprits in such conduct. Thus, in the early modern period, the Tachikawa lineage had become an epithet for any lineage or members of a lineage that did not meet these catalogers' criteria of orthodoxy.

The Tachikawa Lineage in Monastic Genealogies

A similar focus on the Tachikawa as a major heretical lineage can be seen in early modern monastic genealogies. One example of a comprehensive genealogy of monks in the Shingon school is the *Dentō kōroku* authored by the Daigoji monk Yūhō 祐宝 (1656–1727) during the last years of his life. The text is organized into main and auxiliary parts, which consist of a series of monastic genealogies listed from master to disciple along with biographies for a majority of the monks. In this work, Yūhō not only repeated previous accusations against the Tachikawa

lineage but adds new elements to link different threads of heresy mentioned in previous sources or creates content not found elsewhere.

Two of the monastic genealogies specifically reference the Tachikawa lineage. The first concerns Ninkan, the alleged founder of the lineage. Here, Yūhō repeats the adage that Ninkan expounded a "heretical teaching" (*jahō*) and started his own "lineage" after being exiled to Izu (zsszs 33: 394). The second genealogy deals with Monkan. While he mostly relies on Yūkai's *Hōkyōshō*, Yūhō takes his depiction of Monkan a step further by claiming that he was a member of the Tachikawa lineage. Yūhō even states that Monkan was initiated into two branches of the Tachikawa lineage: Ninkan and Shingyō of Tennōji. According to Yūhō, Monkan received the sealed initiation certificate of Shingyō after being initiated into the Daigoji Hōon'in 報恩院 lineage. He then allegedly combined Shingyō's heretical teaching with the teachings of Ninkan that he had received on Mt. Kōya (zsszs 33: 456). He later transmitted these teachings to Emperor Go Daigo, especially the idea that male-female sexual union (*nannyo nikon wagō* 男女二根和合) was equivalent to a doctrine purported to originate in the *Rishukyō* stipulating that the five defilements of the senses are the great working of the Buddha (*gojin daibutsuji* 五塵大仏事) (т 1003, 19.212b14–15). As a reward, he was made the administrator (*bettō* 別当) of Tennōji.

The role of Tennōji is crucial in Yūhō's effort to link Monkan to the Tachikawa lineage. This claim cannot be corroborated by contemporary sources. Thus, the purpose of this reference is to provide a link between Monkan and Shingyō. Shingyō is a fairly obscure figure. He was first associated with heresy in the *Shōryū jaryū to naru koto*, a text recorded in the *Tachikawa shōgyō mokuroku* and authored by Yūkai's master Kaisei 快成 (d. 1397). Kaisei is primarily interested in identifying Shingyō's lineage and notes that "he came to possess heretical views, conduct violent acts, and broke his monastic vows at Tennōji." The text also situates monks from the Sanbōin and Richiin 理智院 lineages within Shingyō's list of descendants, thus declaring "their lineages are probably impure" (Moriyama 1965, 588).

Shingyō also appears in the auxiliary to the *Dentō kōroku* (zsszs 33: 493–494). Yūhō mostly repeats Kaisei's accusation of Shingyō's heretical lineage, but he adds the detail that the monk obtained the title of administrator of Tennōji. However, later in the text, Yūhō adds that Shingyō's teachings spread to other lineages, including Tendai, and they were used as a justification for marrying and eating meat. After lamenting the spread of such teachings, Yūhō concludes that "in order to clarify the heterodox teachings in Japan (*Nihon no gedō* 日本ノ 外道), we must examine this lineage up to and including the biography of Monkan" (zsszs 33: 494). This statement at the end of Shingyō's biography strongly suggests that the biography was actually written with Monkan in mind.

In fact, it was probably designed to further strengthen Yūhō's claim that Monkan was the intersection of two threads of heresy: Ninkan and Shingyō.

Yūhō's depiction of Monkan as a heretic is even stronger in the last part of his biography for this monk. According to Yūhō, after Emperor Go Murakami 後村上 (1328–1368) returned to Kyoto in 1351, Monkan's works were analyzed by renowned scholar-monks of the Shingon school such as Gōhō 杲宝 (1303–1362).[19] More than a thousand volumes of Monkan's texts were branded as "secret precepts of Tachikawa" (*Tachikawa ga hiketsu* 立河ガ秘訣) and were burned near Saga (ZSSZS 33: 459). In this passage, Yūhō builds on a similar claim found in Yūkai's *Hōkyōshō* (T 2456, 77.850b26–27). However, while Yūkai was just reporting a rumor that many of Monkan's works were lost when burned near Saga, Yūhō turns this scene into an inquisitive court, where the most revered experts of Shingon doctrine allegedly determined that Monkan's texts belonged to the Tachikawa lineage.

There are no other documents that prove both Yūkai's story and Yūhō's further elaboration of it.[20] In fact, book or scroll burnings were very rare in Japan, at least before the arrival of Christianity (KORNICKI 1998, 12). In telling this episode in his biography of Shingyō in the auxiliary to the *Dentō kōroku*, Yūhō accomplishes two things. First, he explicitly allocates Monkan's work to the Tachikawa lineage, a claim that Yūkai insinuates but does not make directly. Second, he associates Monkan and the Tachikawa lineage with an idea of heresy that had become commonplace in Yūhō's time, thus making the Tachikawa lineage discourse relevant to the concerns regarding heresy in the early modern period. By juxtaposing Yūkai's broad condemnation of heresy in his *Hōkyōshō* and Yūhō's situating of the Tachikawa lineage into the biographies of specific monks, the gradual transformation of the Tachikawa lineage from a small Shingon lineage located in the countryside to a catchall phrase for sexual heresies in Shingon Buddhism was complete.

Tachikawa Beyond Shingon: *The Isshū gyōgishō and the Jōdo Shin School*

Even prior to Yūhō, the association of the Tachikawa lineage with heresy had spread beyond the sectarian boundaries of the Shingon school. As a moving concept, Tachikawa was broadly applied as a polemic against religious heterodoxy in early modern Japan. Such heresies were not limited to sexualized rituals or violations of the monastic precepts but included controversial doctrines of the Jōdo Shin school as well.

19. On Gōhō, his lineage, and Tachikawa, see CHIBA (2004) and KAMEYAMA (2018).
20. SANFORD (1991, 4) mentions the burning of Tachikawa texts that happened both in Kyoto and on Mt. Kōya during the 1470s, but without providing a reference. I have been unable to find any mention of this in known sources.

In the *Isshū gyōgishō*, a Jōdo Shin text apocryphally attributed to Shinran, we find a reference to Tachikawa as a symbol of heresy.[21] The objective of this work was to criticize radical Amidism, which denotes an influential interpretation of Shinran's thought that rejected all religious practice other than the chanting of the *nenbutsu* 念仏. The reference to Tachikawa appears in the first volume, which sets the tone for the remainder of the text. In a story recounting the origins of a monk named Chorenbō 長連坊 (probably a fictional character) and his alleged disciples Zenshaku 善綽 (d. 1207) and Jūren 住蓮 (d. 1207), the *Isshū gyōgishō* asserts that he was a master of the Tachikawa lineage. According to this tale, Chōrenbō lived in Echigo Province where he spread heterodox teachings that discouraged people from revering the buddhas.[22] In an effort to propagate these teachings, his disciples moved to the capital where they encountered Hōnen, the founder of the Jōdo school. They requested that he teach them the *nenbutsu*. Although he granted their request, according to the text they misconstrued his teachings. Instead of faithfully following Hōnen's *nenbutsu* practice, they continued to preach heterodox doctrines and claimed that Hōnen instructed them that it was only necessary to venerate Amitābha Buddha in one's mind without vocalizing the name of the Buddha to attain rebirth in the Buddha's Pure Land (sst 36: 135).

As a caricature of a Tachikawa master, Chōrenbō is prominently featured in the *Isshū gyōgishō* as the main target of the author's criticism. This criticism primarily focuses on radical interpretations of Jōdo Shin doctrine, but Chōrenbō and his disciples are also accused of violating monastic precepts. Statements attributed to the fictional Tachikawa master or his disciples proclaim that it is acceptable to eat meat, marry, have sex, and generally to be in contact with impurities (Rambelli 2003, 186–188).

This link between heresies in the Jōdo Shin school and the Tachikawa lineage allows the author to create a web of associations—both explicit and implied—around the issue of sex. This was a crucial problem for the Jōdo Shin school, because the clergy were permitted to marry. Although only briefly referenced in the text, this story of Chōrenbō takes place in the context of Hōnen's exile and the execution of his disciples in 1207, which is one of the few cases of political authorities taking action against a specific religious group in medieval Japan (Brotons 2011).

21. Kuroda Toshio dates the composition of the original text to the late Kamakura period and attempts to analyze its contents within this context (Kuroda 1995, 273–276). Takayanagi Kōei mentions a possible reference to it in a source related to Rennyo (Takayanagi 1932, 145, 147, n. 9). However, the source does not clearly mention the *Isshū gyōgishō*. In fact, it may well have been composed shortly before the publication of the first known printed edition in 1647.

22. This mention of Echigo may be a reference to Shinjō, who was from nearby Echizen, and related to how he found dubious doctrines in the region (Moriyama 1965, 561–562).

Most details of the executions were recorded in the *Gukanshō* by the Tendai monk Jien 慈円 (1155–1225) in 1219, just a few years after the event. Jien notes that among the members of Hōnen's group there was a man named Anrakubō Junsai 安楽坊遵西 (d. 1207). Together with the monk Jūren, he organized a ritual called the *Rokuji raisan* 六時礼讃, which consisted of six daily praises to Amitābha Buddha. These ceremonies were extremely popular, and Anraku and Jūren were joined not only by noblemen or monks but also by nuns and noblewomen. Anraku and Jūren purportedly took advantage of this situation. Arguing that the practice of the *nenbutsu* alone was sufficient to be reborn in the Amitābha's Pure Land regardless of one's deeds during his lifetime, they preached that it was actually acceptable for monastics to indulge in eating meat and have sexual intercourse. According to Jien, the two monks used this argument to justify spending the night in the homes of several nuns and noblewomen. He concludes his account of these events by documenting that Anraku and Jūren were put to death as a consequence of these actions, while Hōnen along with his disciple Shinran and others were exiled (BROWN and ISHIDA 1979, 171–172).[23]

As some studies have shown, sexual transgression was probably not excessively important to Jien (FAURE 1998, 154–156). However, the case of Jūren and Anraku is significant as it was seen as providing concrete proof for accusations that members of the traditional Buddhist schools had been making for years: Hōnen's teaching was not only a problem on a soteriological level, but it was also a disruption to public morality. The Hossō monk Jōkei 貞慶 (1155–1212), for example, had already made this argument in his petition against Hōnen, the *Kōfukuji sōjō*, drafted in 1205. According to Jōkei, Hōnen and his disciples claimed that eating meat and having sex with women did not prevent one from being reborn in the Pure Land (MORRELL 1987, 77). The heretic Chōrenbō is thus seen as the inspiration behind these heresies, and he is portrayed in the *Isshū gyōgishō* as advocating precisely the heterodoxies for which monks such as Jōkei criticized Hōnen's disciples.

The tale of Chōrenbō and his propagation of immoral teachings in the *Isshū gyōgishō* also hints at another underlying debate over orthodoxy in medieval Japan. In the passage recounting Jūren and Zenshaku's misinterpretation of Hōnen's teaching on the *nenbutsu*, the *Isshū gyōgishō* tells of an encounter the disciples had with shrine attendants at the Gion Assembly (Gion'e 祇園会). According to this story, the two heretics questioned the value of such an event dedicated to mere "local manifestations" (*suijaku* 垂跡) of the Buddha, while the

---

23. Anraku's execution is also depicted in the illustrated scroll *Hōnen shōnin eden* 法然上人 絵伝. For an interpretation of the scene, see BIALOCK (2007, 232–233). On the execution itself, see NAKANO (1981). While Jien makes no mention of Zenshaku, this name can be found in the list of monks executed in 1207 given in the appendix to the BDK translation of the *Tannishō* (1980, 26).

"original form" (*honji* 本地) of the Buddha had been made known to them. It is in this exchange that Jūren and Zenshaku misconstrue Hōnen's teaching, telling the attendants that "it is unnecessary to even say the *nenbutsu* aloud and just reciting it in your mind is sufficient" and imploring them to "behave as you like, for prohibitions and impurities will not hinder you" (SST 36: 136).

This episode offers some details regarding the teachings that Jūren and Zenshaku may have received from Chōrenbō. Their words to the shrine attendants not only reveal that the disciples had a simple view of the *nenbutsu* and rebirth in Amitābha's Pure Land but also that they showed a profound disdain for the veneration of Japanese gods. As initiates in the Tachikawa lineage, Jūren and Zenshaku not only represented the heretical views of the lineage in their display of impropriety but also committed blasphemy by disrespecting the local deities. It was this antisocial act that ultimately led to their execution and the exile of Hōnen.

The shunning of worshiping gods at local shrines is the primary topic of critique in the *Isshū gyōgishō*. However, when and how this view became a heresy in the Jōdo Shin school is unclear. Shinran himself was ambivalent on this issue. He advocated both for disregarding the gods (*jingi fuhyō* 神祇不憑) and the idea that Japanese gods were in fact protectors of *nenbutsu* practitioners (*jingi gonen* 神祇護念) (Fukuma 1963; Nose 1989; Lee 2007, 126–128). Under the leadership of Rennyo 蓮如 (1415–1499), when the school began to develop into the institution that exists today, deity worship was generally accepted (Fukuma 1963; Blum and Yasutomi 2006, 55). Rennyo himself tended to accommodate the gods in his writings, even asserting that local deities were all encompassed within Amitābha Buddha (Weinstein 2006, 54). The fact that the condemnation of such practices is deemed a heresy in the *Isshū gyōgishō* reflects, on this particular issue, the orthodox Jōdo Shin position following Rennyo; the text, thus, also functions as a polemical tool used against exclusivist groups within the school at the time.[24]

Parallels between the Jōdō Shin school and the Tachikawa lineage can also be found in the *igishū* 異義集 (heterodox/unorthodox collections) volume of the *Shinshū taikei*. These texts were mostly considered heretical. The heterodox views and practices discussed in these works are similar to those associated with the Tachikawa lineage except for the fact that they focus specifically on *nenbutsu* practice.

One example of an *igishū* text is the *Hachimanchō no nukigaki ajikan no honmi*, another apocryphon attributed to Shinran. The author of the text poses a doctrinal argument for *nenbutsu* practice that utilizes the metaphor of hetero-

24. As Kuroda (1995, 276) points out, the *Isshū gyōgishō* itself very strongly recommends that its readers follow the cult of the gods (for example SST 36: 132–133). Some of the positions advocated by the text regarding the practice of *nenbutsu* can be seen as unorthodox, but they were, in fact, regularly followed in Rennyo's time (Takayanagi 1932, 145–147).

sexual intercourse (Rambelli 2003, 181–182). Specifically, this theory of *nenbutsu* applies masculine and feminine aspects to the formula of *Namu Amida Butsu*, which involved the generation of life through copulation. Such doctrines were typically associated with secret groups (*hiji hōmon* 秘事法門) that formed outside of the Jōdo Shin establishment, which had adopted esoteric rites and interpretations from the Shingon tradition (Sanford 2005, 184–188).[25]

Descriptions of Chōrenbō and his disciples in the *Isshū gyōgishō* were probably influenced by such texts and used as foils for explaining Jōdo Shin orthodoxy. Although the example from the *igishū* explicitly deals with sexual imagery, Chōrenbō's teachings are not limited to this heresy but it includes meat-eating and other violations of the monastic precepts. In other words, Chōrenbō and his ilk are caricatures of the "evil monks" of the Tachikawa lineage. The precedent for this negative portrayal is found in the *Taiheiki* depiction of Monkan as an arrogant, extravagant figure, who was fond of weapons and paraded with his henchmen through the capital (Rappo 2017a, 97–103). By constructing a fictional character based on the archetype of Monkan, the author of the *Isshū gyōgishō* employs a rhetoric of heresy to achieve three objectives: condemn the sexualization of the *nenbutsu* in the *igishū* texts, attribute the 1207 scandal to external elements thus exonerating Hōnen and Shinran from charges of heresy, and attack the radical fringes of the school who rejected the worship of Japanese gods.[26]

The story in the *Isshū gyōgishō*, which drew from anti-Tachikawa polemics in the Shingon school, would, in turn, be referenced in Shingon texts. This is the case of the *Mōsho jahō jagisho mokuroku*. In a section titled "On Heresy" (*Jahō no koto* 邪法事), the text extensively quotes the tale of the "Tachikawa master" Chōrenbō. This allusion suggests that its author relied on the *Isshū gyōgishō*, probably the printed 1647 version (Rappo 2017b, 148–149; *Mōsho jahō jagisho mokuroku*, 44–45). Moreover, this quote suggests that the Tachikawa lineage had become a synonym for heretical—and especially sexual—practices or teachings, even outside the Shingon school. As a result, sectarian disputes over orthodoxy in the medieval period gradually emerged as a broader discourse on religious deviance in early modern and modern Japan.

25. In general, the term "Tachikawa lineage" is used by scholars to describe a series of "materialistic" or "sexual" conceptions of ritual, embryology, or even cosmology (Rambelli 2013, 164–165). Such sexualized interpretations of the *nenbutsu* may have been influenced by the thought of Dōhan 道範 (1178–1252), another figure linked to the Tachikawa lineage, and his esoteric *nenbutsu* (Proffitt 2015; 2020). Such interpretations of *nenbutsu* can also be found in the *Gochizō hishō* (Abe, Yoneda, and Itō 2011, 34–35; Dolce 2016).

26. While the ideas found in the *Isshū gyōgishō* were already quite common in Rennyo's time, there is also a possibility that the author belonged to a heterodox sub-group of the school. In that case, the double discourse found in the text, both creating an external enemy for the school and depicting itself as a form of orthodoxy, likely had another purpose. It allowed the author and the group to which he belonged to claim a certain form of legitimacy inside the school.

Heresy and the Tachikawa Lineage: Deciphering the Layers of a Moving Concept

The notion of the Tachikawa lineage as a metonym for heresy still looms large in the popular imagination. The Tachikawa lineage became so strongly associated with sexual heresies that when a history of the town of Tachikawa was compiled in 1968 an entire chapter was dedicated to this issue. The chapter strongly stresses that this "illusionary heresy" (*maboroshi no jakyō* まぼろしの邪教) was never transmitted to temples in the region of the actual town of Tachikawa and concludes by stating that no more should be said regarding this matter (Tachikawashi Shi Hensan Iinkai 1968, 653, 658–659).

Despite the lack of a connection between the so-called Tachikawa lineage with the name of the town, the fact that the authors of this local history felt obligated to include a chapter on the subject shows how powerful the rhetoric of heresy had become. They could have simply ignored it, yet they felt that it was necessary to affirm that the heretical lineage had nothing to do with their city.

While this story regarding perceived challenges to the reputation of the town of Tachikawa is anecdotal, it actually demonstrates how far the image of the heresy of Tachikawa had spread among the general public. This enduring image has created even more acute problems for academics. For example, in the conclusion to an article on the topic, Stefan Köck notes the dangers of using the term *jakyō*: "Basically, by using the term *jakyō* one evaluates and adopts the standpoint of Yūkai from the second half of the fourteenth century. But as this article has shown, he was only one voice, and in his attempt to extinguish the school not a very reliable one" (Köck 2000, 82). The second part of this quote is especially true when we think about how In'yū and the members of his lineage tried to refute Yūkai's claims but fell into the trap of using his concept of Tachikawa in an attempt to distances themselves from this alleged heresy.

I would go even further and argue that the use of this term is not limited to Yūkai's polemical depiction. The term "Tachikawa lineage" became a symbol for heresy during the centuries that followed him. From its conception, due to Yūkai's writings on the lineage and his treatment of the *Juhō yōjinshū*, the Tachikawa lineage was considered a heretical group within the Shingon school with its own unique set of perverse teachings. Gradually, the term was expanded to include heresy in general, as is the case in the *Mōsho jahō jagisho mokuroku*. This concept was further systematized in the early modern period, especially through the writings of Yūhō. While the Tachikawa lineage began as a polemic within the Shingon school, it eventually blended with various discourses rejecting religious otherness in Japan. This would not only have an impact on depictions of Christianity, but also allowed the label of Tachikawa to be reused by other schools, such as the Jōdo Shin school. In the *Isshū gyōgishō*, the lineage is still depicted as a heresy involving sex. However, it is also used as an imaginary

antagonist to divert the blame of the execution of Hōnen's disciple in 1207 to a Tachikawa culprit and to allow the Jōdo Shin school—or, at least, the group to which its author belonged—to impose a new orthodoxy regarding the worship of local gods by turning proponents of exclusivism into extreme heretics. By calling this lineage *jakyō*, one adds yet another layer of meaning to this historical construction. In the modern context, the Tachikawa lineage has come to denote a form of organized heresy.

The Shingon monk Yūkai created the heresy of the Tachikawa lineage mainly to expand his influence within his own school. This allowed him and his successors to define themselves as Shingon orthodoxy (at least on Mt. Kōya). In doing so, they both drew on canonical sources and on older, largely diffuse images of monastic deviance such as meat-eating and, especially, sexual intercourse. Perhaps they were too successful. By declaring the Tachikawa lineage a symbol of heresy, monks like Yūkai inadvertently created a label that could be broadly applied beyond its original polemical context within the Shingon school. It also permanently tainted Shingon as the school that introduced heresy in Japan.

Heresies are always gradual constructions, and when writing about them it is necessary to clearly distinguish between the historical circumstances in which a given "heresy" emerged and the context of later interpretations. To understand the "real" Tachikawa lineage, we must be careful not to assume anachronistic definitions such as those implied by the expression "*Tachikawa jakyō*." However, this does not detract from the historical value of heresiological texts. On the contrary, we must continue to study them as products of a very specific thought process, which clearly had a major impact on the definition of the "other" in Japanese religion.

REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

NDZ   *Nihon daizōkyō* 日本大蔵経. 100 vols. Tokyo: Nihon Daizōkyō Hensankai, 1920.

NST   *Nihon shisō taikei* 日本思想体系. 67 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970.

SST   *Shinshū taikei* 真宗大系. 37 vols. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1917.

SSZS   *Shingonshū zensho* 真言宗全書. 42 vols. Kyoto: Dōhōsha Media Puran, 2004. Reprint.

T   *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大蔵経. 85 vols. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭, eds. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1932.

ZSSZS   *Zoku Shingonshū zensho* 続真言宗全書. 42 vols. Kyoto: Dōhōsha Media Puran, 2008. Reprint.

PRIMARY SOURCES

Asharagushō 阿舍羅愚抄. Alternative title for the *Fudōson gushō*.

Bateren tsuihō no fumi 伴天連追放文. Sūden 崇伝 (1569–1633). NST 25.

Dentō kōroku 伝灯広録. Yūhō 祐宝 (1656–1727). ZSSZS 33: 251–526.

Fudōson gushō 不動尊愚鈔. Manuscript held at Sugiyama Jogakuen University, http://bjvm.ci.sugiyama-u.ac.jp/vidya/worklist/category01/010569.html (accessed 18 September 2020).

Gayūshi 我友之. Manuscript of the second of two volumes held at Shippōji 七宝寺. Discussed in CHINEN 1997.

Gishoron 偽書論. Kyōi 恭畏 (1564–1630). T 2509, 78.915–917.

Gochizō hishō 五智蔵秘抄. In ABE, YONEDA, and ITŌ 2011.

Gukanshō 愚管抄. Jien 慈円 (1155–1225). In BROWN and ISHIDA 1979.

Hachimanchō no nukigaki ajikan no honmi 八万帖抜書阿字観之本味. Attributed to Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1263). SST 36: 213–216.

Haja kenshōshū 破邪顕正集. No longer extant.

Hōkyōshō 宝鏡鈔. Yūkai 宥快 (1345–1416). In MORIYAMA 1965, 572–581.

Isshū gyōgishō 一宗行儀抄. Attributed to Shinran. SST 36: 131–176.

Jashō benbetsuki 邪正弁別記. No longer extant.

Jitsugoshō 実語鈔. Yūkai. Digital collection of the National Institute of Japanese Literature.

Juhō yōjinshū 受法用心集. By Shinjō 心定 (ca. 1215–1272). In MORIYAMA 1965, 530–571.

Jūjūshinron 十住心論. Kūkai 空海 (774–835). T 2425, 77.

Kōfukuji sōjō 興福寺奏上. Jōkei 貞慶 (1155–1212). In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, vol. 123. Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai 名著普及会, 1980.

Konkōshō 根吼抄. Kyōga 教雅 (ca. sixteenth century). In FUKUDA 1995.

Misshū kechimyakushō 密宗血脈抄. Kyōi. ZSSZS 25: 295–364.

Mōsho jahō jagisho mokuroku 謀書邪法邪義書目録. Kenshō 顕証 (1597–1678). Ishiyamadera 石山寺 manuscript.

Rishukyō 理趣経. Trans. Amoghavajra (705–774). T 243, 8.

Shingishō 真偽抄. Shunkai 俊海 (d.u.). No longer extant.

Shoinjin kuketsu 諸印信口決. In'yū 印融 (1439–1515). ZSSZS 25: 419–515.

Shōryū jaryū to naru koto 正流成邪流事. Preserved in the *Tachikawa shōgyō mokuroku*. In MORIYAMA 1965, 582–598.

Tachikawa shōgyō mokuroku 立川聖教目録. Kaisei 快成 (d. 1397). In MORIYAMA 1965, 588–589.

Taiheiki 太平記. In MCCULLOUGH 1959.

Tannishō. Yuien 唯円 (d.u.). In *BDK English Tripiṭaka* 105–II, trans. Shōjun Bandō and Harold Stewart. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1980.

SECONDARY SOURCES

ABE Yasurō 阿部泰郎, YONEDA Mariko 米田真理子, and ITŌ Satoshi 伊藤 聡, eds.
2011   *Shūkyōteki shintai tekusuto shiryōshū* 宗教的身体テクスト資料集, vol. 1. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.

AI'AI KOJI 藹々居士
1896   Monkanbō Kōshin 文觀房弘眞. *Hansei zasshi* 11: 9.

ASTLEY, Ian
1987   The *Rishukyō*: A Translation and Commentary in the Light of Modern Japanese (Post-Meiji) Scholarship. PhD dissertation, University of Leeds.

BIALOCK, David T.
2007   *Eccentric Spaces, Hidden Histories: Narrative, Ritual, and Royal Authority from The Chronicles of Japan to The Tale of the Heike*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

BLUM, Mark Laurence, and Shin'ya YASUTOMI, eds.
2006   *Rennyo and the Roots of Modern Japanese Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

BROTONS, Arnaud
2011   La condamnation du moine Hônen dans le Japon du XIIIe siècle - La cour impériale pouvait-elle faire autrement? In *État, religion et répression en Asie - Chine, Corée, Japon, Vietnam (XIIIe-XXIe siècles)*. Arnaud Brotons, Yannick Bruneton, and Nathalie Kouamé, eds., 29–71. Paris: Éditions Karthala.

BROWN, Delmer Myers, and Ichirō ISHIDA, eds.
1979   *The Future and the Past: A Translation and Study of the* Gukanshō, *an Interpretative History of Japan written in 1219*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

BROWNLEE, John S.
1997   *Japanese Historians and the National Myths, 1600–1945: The Age of the Gods and Emperor Jinmu*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia; Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

CHIBA Tadashi 千葉 正
2004   Gōhō no Tachikawaryū hihan ni tsuite 杲宝の立川流批判について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 53: 50–53.

CHINEN Satoru 知念 理
1997   Sanbōin no gisho "gayūshi" ni tsuite 三宝院流の偽書「我友之」について. *Jinkai* (Hyōgo Kenritsu Rekishi Hakubutsukan) 9: 74–97.

CHRISTIN, Olivier, Raphaël BARRAT, and Igor MOULLIER, eds.
2010   *Dictionnaire des concepts nomades en sciences humaines*. Paris: Métailié.

DOLCE, Lucia
2016   The embryonic generation of the perfect body: Ritual embryology from

Japanese tantric sources. In *Transforming the Void*: *Embryological Discourse and Reproductive Imagery in East Asian Religions*, Anna Andreeva and Dominic Steavu, eds., 253–310. New York: Brill.

Faure, Bernard

1998   *The Red Thread*: *Buddhist Approaches to Sexuality*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fukuda Ryōsei 福田亮成

1995   Tachikawaryū no ichi shiryō 1: *Konkōshō* no honbun shōkai to honkoku 立川流の一資料（1）—『根吼抄』の本文紹介と翻刻. *Taishō Daigaku kenkyū kiyō, ningen gakubu, bungakubu* 80: 35–65.

Fukuma Kōchō 福間光超

1963   Kinsei Shinshū gakushō no jingikan ni tsuite 近世真宗学匠の神祇観 について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 11: 204–205 [582–583]. doi.org/10.4259/ibk.11.58

Haar, Barend J. Ter.

1992   *The White Lotus Teachings in Chinese Religious History*. Leiden: Brill.

Hepburn, James Curtis

1888   *A Japanese-English and English-Japanese Dictionary*. Tokyo: Maruya.

Isomae Jun'ichi 磯前順一

2012   *Shūkyō gainen arui wa shūkyōgaku no shi* 宗教概念あるいは宗教学の死. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.

2014   *Religious Discourse in Modern Japan*: *Religion, State, and Shintō*. Leiden: Brill. doi.org/10.1163/9789004272682

Itō Satoshi 伊藤 聡

2003   Sanbōin no gisho: Toku ni *Sekishitsu* o megutte 三宝院流の偽書—特に 『石室』を巡って. In *"Gisho" no seisei*: *Chūseiteki shikō to hyōgen* 「偽書」 の生成—中世的思考と表現, Nishiki Hitoshi 錦 仁, Ogawa Toyoo 小川豊生, and Itō Satoshi, eds., 197–232. Tokyo: Shinwasha.

Iyanaga Nobumi 彌永信美

2004   Tachikawaryū to Shinjō *Juhō yōjinshū* o megutte 立川流と心定『受法 用心集』をめぐって. *Nihon Bukkyō sōgō kenkyū* 2: 13–31.

2006   Secrecy, sex and apocrypha: Remarks on some paradoxical phenomena. In *The Culture of Secrecy in Japanese Religion*, Bernhard Scheid and Mark Teeuwen, eds., 204–228. London: Routledge. doi.org/10.4324/9780203966990

2010   Mikkyō girei to "Nenzuru chikara": *Hōkyōshō* no hihanteki kentō, oyobi *Juhō yōjinshū* no "Dokuro honzon girei" o chūshin ni shite 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「どくろ本尊 儀礼」を中心にして. In *Girei no Chikara*: *Chūsei shūkyō no jissen sekai* 儀礼 の力—中世宗教の実践世界, Lucia Dolce and Matsumoto Ikuyo 松本郁代, eds., 127–158. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

2016　"Human yellow" and magical power in Japanese medieval tantrism and culture. In *Transforming the Void: Embryological Discourse and Reproductive Imagery in East Asian Religions*, Anna Andreeva and Dominic Steavu, eds., 344–419. New York: Brill.

2018　Dai rokujū ikkai Chisan kyōgaku taikai kōen: Iwayuru "Tachikawaryū" narabi ni dokuro honzon girei o megutte 第六十一回智山教学大会講演——いわゆる「立川流」ならびに髑髏本尊儀礼をめぐって. *Chisan gakuhō* 67: 1–96.

JOSEPHSON, Jason Ānanda

2012　*The Invention of Religion in Japan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

KAMEYAMA Takahiko 亀山隆彦

2018　Chūsei Nihon mikkyō ni okeru taiseigakuteki kyōsetsu to "*jagi*" 中世日本密教における胎生学的教説と「邪義」. *Mikkyō bunka* 241: 23–43.

Forthcoming The red and white drops and "wrong views" in the *Konkō shō*: The significance of the sexual and embryological discourses in early modern Shingon Buddhism. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*.

KAWAMURA Kunimitsu 川村邦光

2010　Kyūseishu gensō no yukue: Kōdō Ōmoto to fashizumu undō 救世主幻想のゆくえ——皇道大本とファシズム運動. In *Shūkyō to fashizumu* 宗教とファシズム, ed. Takezawa Shōichirō 竹沢尚一郎, 23–62. Tokyo: Suiseisha.

KETELAAR, James Edward, and OKADA Masahiko 岡田正彦, trans.

2006　*Jakyō, junkyō no Meiji: Haibutsu kishaku to kindai Bukkyō* 邪教・殉教の明治——廃仏毀釈と近代仏教. Tokyo: Perikansha.

KIMURA Michiko 木村迪子

2015　Asai Ryōi "Mitsugon shōnin gyōjōki" ni tsuite: Tenkyo, shippitsu shisei, eikyō 浅井了意『密厳上人行状記』について——典拠・執筆姿勢・影響——. *Kinsei bungei* 101: 1–15.

KÖCK, Stefan

2000　The dissemination of the Tachikawa-ryū and the problem of orthodox and heretic teachings in Shingon Buddhism. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 7: 69–83.

2009　Das *Juhō-yōjin-shū* [Sammlung von der Wachsamkeit beim Empfangen buddhistischer Lehren] des Mönches Shinjō als Apologie der Shingon-Schule gegenüber konkurrierenden Lehren in der Provinz Echizen um 1270. PhD dissertation, Ruhr-Universität Bochum.

2016　"The original source of [all] the perverse teachings"? Misconceptions on the Tachikawa-ryū and a new paradigm of sexual imagery in medieval Japanese esoteric Buddhism. *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 39: 81–101.

Kōda Yūun 甲田宥吽

1981   Chūinryū no jaryū o tsutaeta hitobito 中院流の邪流を伝えた人々. *Mikkyō bunka* 135: 19–37.

Kojima Shōken 小島昌憲

1903   Tachikawaryū Shingonshū 立川流真言宗 1–5. *Rokudai shinpō*, August–November.

Kojima Yūko 小島裕子

2003   *Hōrinji engi* no raireki: Kanjin to kaichō no kioku『法輪寺縁起』の来歴—勧進と開帳の記憶. In *Nagoya daigaku hikakujinbungaku kenkyū nenpō 2002, Ninnaji shiryō: Daisanshū "engihen"* 名古屋大学比較人文学研究年報 2020仁和寺資料—第三集【縁起篇】, ed. Abe Yasurō, 53–72. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Hikakujinbungaku Kenkyūka.

Kōmura Harumoto 好村春基

1936   *Jakyō ni mayohasareta hitobito: Higai jitsuwa* 邪教に迷はされた人々—被害實話. Daitō Shuppansha.

Kornicki, Peter F.

1998   *The Book in Japan: A Cultural History from the Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century*. Leiden: Brill.

Kuroda Toshio 黒田俊雄

1995   *Kuroda Toshio chosakushū daiyonkan: Shinkoku Nihon to senshū nenbutsu* 黒田俊雄著作集第四巻—神国思想と専修念仏. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Lee, Kenneth Doo Young

2007   *The Prince and the Monk: Shotoku Worship in Shinran's Buddhism*. Albany: suny Press.

Manabe Shunshō 真鍋俊照

1999   *Jakyō, Tachikawaryū* 邪教・立川流. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.

McCullough, Helen C.

1959   *The Taiheiki : A Chronicle of Medieval Japan*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mizuhara Gyōei 水原堯栄

1920   Tachikawaryū 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* 4: 71–104.

1921   Gisho kyōron mokuroku no naiyō to Tachikawaryū ni tsuite 偽書経論目録の内容と立河流に就て. *Bukkyōgaku zasshi* 20: 1–9.

1923   *Jakyō Tachikawaryū no kenkyū* 邪教立川流の研究. Kyoto: Zenseisha Shosekibu.

1924   *Josei to Kōyasan* 女性と高野山. Kōya: Kobori Nangakudō.

1981–1982   *Mizuhara Gyōei zenshū* 水原堯栄全集. 11 volumes. Ed. Nakagawa Zenkyō 中川善教. Kyoto: Dōhōsha.

MORIYAMA Shōshin 守山聖真

1938   *Tachikawaryū himitsu shi Monkan shōnin no kenkyū* 立川流秘密史文観上
人之研究. Tokyo: Morie Shoten.

1965   *Tachikawa jakyō to sono shakaiteki haikei no kenkyū* 立川邪教とその社会的
背景の研究. Tokyo: Rokuyaon.

MORRELL, Robert E.

1987   *Early Kamakura Buddhism*: *A Minority Report*. Berkeley: Asian Human-
ities Press.

NAKANO Masaaki 中野正明

1981   Senshū nenbutsu sha Anrakubō Junsai no shokeinin 専修念仏者安楽房遵
西の処刑人. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 30: 152–153.
doi.org/10.4259/ibk.30.152

NOSE Eisui 野世英水

1989   Shinshū jingi kan no ichikōsatsu: Shinran ni okeru jingi gonenkan no
rikai o megutte 真宗神祇観の一考察—親鸞における神祇護念観の理解を
めぐって. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 37: 728–730.
doi.org/10.4259/ibk.37.728

PORATH, Or

2019   The Flower of Dharma Nature: Sexual Consecration and Amalgamation
in Medieval Japanese Buddhism. PhD dissertation, University of Califor-
nia, Santa Barbara.

PROFFITT, Aaron P.

2015   Mysteries of Speech and Breath: Dōhan's 道範 (1179–1252) *Himitsu Nen-
butsu Shō* 祕密念佛抄 and Esoteric Pure Land Buddhism. PhD disserta-
tion, University of Michigan.

2020   *Nenbutsu* orthodoxies in medieval Japan. *Japanese Journal of Religious
Studies* 47: 135–160.

QUINTER, David

2015   *From Outcasts to Emperors*: *Shingon Ritsu and the Mañjuśrī Cult in Medie-
val Japan*. Leiden: Brill.

RAMBELLI, Fabio

2003   "Just behave as you like: Prohibitions and impurities are not a problem":
Radical Amida cults and popular religiosity in premodern Japan. In
Approaching the Land of Bliss: *Religious Praxis in the Cult of Amitabha*,
Richard K. Payne and Kenneth K. Tanaka, eds., 169–201. Honolulu: Uni-
versity of Hawai'i Press. doi.org/10.1515/9780824842987

2013   *A Buddhist Theory of Semiotics*: *Signs, Ontology, and Salvation in Japanese
Esoteric Buddhism*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
doi.org/10.5040/9781472541840

RAPPO, Gaétan

2016   Kindai no Tachikawaryū kenkyū no tansho: Inoue Kichijirō cho *Monkan*

shōnin no tanjō no haikei o 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: 342–325.

2017a   *Rhétoriques de l'hérésie dans le Japon médiéval et moderne: Le moine Monkan (1278–1357) et sa réputation posthume. Préface de Philippe Borgeaud.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

2017b   Heresy and heresiology in Shingon Buddhism: Reading the catalogues of perverse texts. *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 26: 137–152. doi.org/10.3406/asie.2017.1494

2019   Monkan. In *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism, Volume II: Lives*, Jonathan A. Silk, Richard Bowring, Vincent Eltschinger, and Michael Radich, eds., 1047–1056. Leiden: Brill.

SANFORD, James H.

1991   The abominable Tachikawa skull ritual. *Monumenta Nipponica* 46: 1–20. doi.org/10.2307/2385144

2005   Breath of life: The esoteric *nembutsu*. In *Tantric Buddhism in East Asia*, ed. Richard K. Payne, 161–190. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications.

STALKER, Nancy K.

2008   *Prophet Motive: Deguchi Onisaburō, Oomoto, and the Rise of New Religions in Imperial Japan.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

SUEKI Fumihiko 末木文美士

2009   Kōzanji bon *Juhō yōjinshū* no honkoku kenkyū 高山寺本『受法用心集』の翻刻研究 2. In *Kōzanji tenseki monjo sōgō chōsadan kenkyū hōkokuronshū* 高山寺典籍文書綜合調査団研究報告論集, Heisei 20, 46–75. Sapporo: Kōzanji Tenseki Monjo Sōgō Chōsadan.

2019   Kōzanji bon *Juhō yōjinshū* to Tachikawaryū 高山寺本『受法用心集』と立川流. In *Kōzanji tenseki monjo sōgō chōsadan kenkyū hōkokuronshū*, Heisei 30, 22–28. Sapporo: Kōzanji Tenseki Monjo Sōgō Chōsadan.

2020   Kōzanji *Juhō yōjinshū* kaidai, honkoku 高山寺本『受法用心集』解題・翻刻. In *Kōzanji kyōzō no keisei to denshō* 高山寺経蔵の形成と伝承, ed. Kōzanji Tenseki Monjo Sōgō Chōsadan 高山寺典籍文書綜合調査団, 395–451. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin.

TACHIKAWASHI SHI HENSAN IINKAI 立川市史編纂委員会, ed.

1968   *Tachikawashi shi* 立川市史. Vol. 1. Tachikawa: Tachikawashi.

TAKAHASHI Yūsuke 高橋悠介

2016   Den Kenjin hen *Kanjō inmyō kuketsu* to Kūkanbō Nyojitsu 伝憲深編『灌頂印明口決』と空観房如実. *Shidō bunko ronshū* 51: 189–213.

TAKAYANAGI Kōei 高柳恒栄

1932   Renshi jidai ni okeru mushin shōmyō setsu 蓮師時代に於ける無信称名説. In *Rennyo Shōnin no kenkyū* 蓮如上人研究, ed. Kusaka Murin 日下蕪倫, 133–149. Tokyo: Shūgaku Kenkyūkai.

Tōzan Itsunō 東山逸衲
  1896   Tachikawaryū Shingon 立川流真言. *Hansei zasshi* 11/6: 20–23.

Vanden Broucke, Pol
  1992   *Hōkyōshō: The Compendium of the Precious Mirror of the Monk Yūkai*. Gent: Rijksuniversiteit Gent, Vakgroep Oost-Azie, Dienst Japanse Taal en Cultuur.

Weinstein, Stanley
  2006   Continuity and change in the thought of Rennyo. In *Rennyo and the Roots of Modern Japanese Buddhism*, Mark Laurence Blum and Shin'ya Yasu-tomi, eds., 49–58. New York: Oxford University Press.