

# Kira Kōyō's *Inmyō* Interpretations and Western Logic

MORO Shigeki

## Introduction

Kira Kōyō 雲英晃耀 (1831–1910) was a scholar priest of the Jōdo Shin Ōtani sect from the end of the Edo period to the Meiji period. He is known as the author of *Gohō sōron* 護法総論 (1869), which criticizes Christianity, as well as a researcher, educator, and popularizer of *inmyō* 因明, the East Asian transmission of Dignāgean logic. His works include introductions to *inmyō*, such as *Inmyō shoho* 因明初歩 (1881) and *Inmyō taii* 因明大意 (1881).

Although significant recent research has been conducted on modern Japanese Buddhist history, little is known about the practice of *inmyō* at that time. The only overview of Buddhist logic in the Meiji era is the work by Funayama Shin'ichi (Funayama 1998). Funayama summarizes *inmyō* studies in the context of the logical history of the Meiji era and states that Kira Kōyō, Ōnishi Hajime 大西祝 (1864–1900), and Murakami Senjō 村上專精 (1851–1929) played prominent roles as *inmyō* scholars. Murakami is famed as a modern Buddhist scholar, but his work as a Buddhist logician is not well known. Kira was Murakami's teacher in this field and influenced Murakami's *inmyō* studies. Recently, Ōnishi's works have once again gained recognition, but *Ronrigaku* (Ōnishi 1903), one of his most important works, has not been considerably investigated. Ōnishi advanced his study of logic, which includes *inmyō* studies, in discussions with Kira.

Funayama notes another feature of Kira's *inmyō* studies: He was a logician who adhered to the national sovereignty theory. He used *inmyō* to represent his political ideas and actively cultivated popularity and awareness of *inmyō* among politicians and lawyers.

This study examines the characteristics of Kira Kōyō's *inmyō* studies.

## Popularization Activities of *Inmyō*

Kira began to write *inmyō* works aggressively from 1881, when the imperial edict to establish the Imperial Diet was issued: *Inmyō nishshōriron sho hōgūroku* 因明入正理論疏方隅録, *Inmyō sanjūsanka hōgūroku* 因明三十三過方隅録, *Inmyō shoho*, and *Inmyō taii* were published in 1881, followed by *Inmyō sanjūsanka honsahō kahon* 因明三十三過本作法科本, *Inmyō shoho*, 2nd ed., *Inmyō taii*, 2nd ed., and *Inmyō katsugen* 因明活眼 in 1884. He went on to write *Inmyō sanjūsanka honsahō kōgi* 因明三十三過本作法講義 (1885), *Tōyō shinshin inmyō hakki: Ichimei Nihon katsu ronri* 東洋新々因明發揮: 一名日本活論理 (1889), and *Tōyō shinshin inmyō ippan* 東洋新々因明一斑 (1890). According to Kira et al. (1890), on December 14, 1882, he gave an *inmyō* lecture at the request of Matsuoka Yasukowa 松岡康毅, who was the president of the appellate court of Hiroshima, and started actively lecturing on *inmyō* to politicians and lawyers throughout Japan. After 1890, the year of the first general election of the members of the House of Representatives, his writing activity for promoting *inmyō* seemed to end, except for *Inmyō nishshōriron kōgi* 因明入正理論講義 (1893).

In the opening section of *Inmyō nishshōriron sho hōgūroku*, a traditional commentary of *Yinming ruzhengli lun shu* 因明入正理論疏, Kira claimed the applicability of *inmyō* to debates in parliament and courts:

Originally, *inmyō* was an Indian logic. When the proponent and the opponent confront each other to assert their own opinions, a logical sequence is needed. If [a proponent] has the logical sequence, his speech will be steady and full of spirit wherever he is, such as in the crowds of the government, the parliament, or the court, or in the presence of sages. And with fearless mind, undaunted tongue, and no waste of words, [he will make his opponent] understand [his opinion] by a simple expression, and he will carry his opinion by concise words. [*Inmyō* is] a marvelous technique for winning arguments and an essential golden rule in both the ultimate reality and the mundane truth, whether one is Buddhist or not, especially in the world of discussion, like today's. (*Inmyō nishshōriron sho hōgūroku*, 1)

It is reasonable to suppose that Kira used the words “the government, the parliament, or the court” and “the world of discussion” in the above statement, echoing the imperial edict.

Kira's beliefs, noted above, were shared not only by Murakami Senjō, who was a disciple of Kira, but also by logicians. In his autobiography, Murakami recalled that around 1877, Kira was deeply saddened that *inmyō* was being forgotten, and invited him to study

*inmyō* and introduce it to the society of open speech soon to emerge (Murakami 1914: 167–169). Asō Yoshiteru (Asō 2008) noted that the logicians in the Meiji era tended to use syllogisms to solve current problems or real issues. Asō also introduced Nishi Amane's 西周 classification of logic: the logic of *kanmon* 觀門 (gate of observation) or scholastic logic and the logic of *gyōmon* 行門 (gate of practice) or applied logic. It may be presumed that Kira's activities to popularize *inmyō* were influenced by Nishi's classification.

Kira's *inmyō* lectures were not neutral presentations, but rather, reflected his political beliefs. In *Inmyō taii* (Summary of *inmyō*), which was often used in his lectures, Kira expressed his political thought through *inmyō* while emphasizing the practical applications of *inmyō*. For instance, Kira used a three-part formula to criticize unequal treaties between Japan and Europe (*Inmyō nisshōron sho hōgūroku*, 6–7):

*Thesis*: Japan and so forth can punish a person who has broken the law, based on their own laws.

*Reason*: Because they are independent empires.

*Homologous example*: Like Russian Empire.

*Heterologous example*: Like British Empire in India.

Another example from *Inmyō katsugen* (Piercing eyes of *inmyō*) expressed opposition to the introduction of the republicanism in terms of *sonnō* 尊王 thought (a view that advocates reverence for the Emperor) (*Inmyō nisshōron sho hōgūroku*, 24).

*Thesis*: The principle of our country [namely Japan] that the imperial lineage should determine the ruler [of Japan] should not ever be changed.

*Reason*: Because it is an imperial order of an ancestor of the Emperor.

*Homologous example*: Like heaven and earth [which were apprehended as the eternal by the ancestor].

*Heterologous example*: Like the game of *go* 碁.

His *sonnō* thought is surely irrelevant to his criticism of Christianity in his early life. His thought was possibly influenced by his studying Buddhism under Kōzan'in Ryūon 香山院 龍温 (1800–1885), who wanted to enhance and teach the method of *haja kenshō* 破邪顯正 or the refutation of non-Buddhist teachings and the revelation of correct thought (Nanjō 1979). In addition, Murakami also gave examples implicating a critique of Christianity in his *inmyō* survey *Katsuyō kōjutsu inmyōgaku zensho* 活用講述因明学全書 (Murakami 1891), although he claimed to have no intention of criticizing Christianity.

To promote *inmyō*, Kira and his family established *Inmyōgaku Kyōkai* 因明学協会 (the Association for *Inmyō* Studies) at Isshiki-chō of Aichi prefecture, where his temple was located. However, he reported that it did not become widespread (Kira et al. 1890).

## Reinterpretation of *Inmyō* on the Basis of Western Logic

Another important aspect of Kira's *inmyō* studies is the reinterpretation of *inmyō* in terms of Western logic. Kira repeatedly claimed the superiority of *inmyō* over Western logic.

### Logic for Oneself or Others?

The opening verse of *Nyāyapraveśaka* states the purpose of the Buddhist logic (*Yinming ruzhengli lun shu*, T 32, 11a):

Proof (*sādhana*), refutation (*dūṣaṇa*), and pseudo [of these two] are for making others aware (*parasamvid*).

Perception (*pratyakṣa*), inference (*anumāna*), and pseudo [of these two] are for attaining insight oneself (*āmasamvid*).

Kira's criticism of Western logic was based on this verse. He regarded it as *kyūrijutsu* 究理術 or the art of seeking truth for attaining insight into oneself (*āmasamvid*), since it had no examples to demonstrate to others. On the other hand, he emphasized that the example (*dr̥ṣṭānta*) made *inmyō* the method of arguing truth with others, that is, *ronrijutsu* 論理術 (*Inmyō taii*, 4–5. See also Funayama 1998: 305–306). Therefore, he claimed that *ronri* 論理 was a mistranslation of the term “logic.” It should be clear that there is a close relationship between this understanding and his previously mentioned activities to popularize *inmyō*. Inoue Enryō 井上円了 made a similar comment in 1897 (Inoue 2003: 180–181).

### Deduction and Induction

Logic in the Meiji era was based on J. S. Mill's *A System of Logic* (1843), which includes both inductive and deductive reasoning. Kira compared *inmyō* with these two systems and discussed the correspondence between them.

The inductive method is of course the observation, because it is a method to discover the theory of nature. . . The deductive method doesn't correspond to either the observation or the experimentation. (*Tōyō shinshin inmyō hakki*, 39–40)

At first, since **the observation**, which is the most important expedient for experience in the Western

logical method, is the accurate recognition of all things, it corresponds to **the perception** (*pratyakṣa*) in the eight categories of *inmyō*. And **the experimentation** . . . corresponds to **the inference** (*anumāna*) in the eight categories of *inmyō*. . . Therefore the logic is merely the perception and inference, which are a part of the eight categories of *inmyō*. (*Tōyō shinshin inmyō hakki*, 46–47. See also Funayama 1998: 331)

Comparing deduction, induction, and *inmyō*, Kira regarded the last of these as the most comprehensive and superior logic. It is reasonable to think that such an evaluation is similar to the traditional categorization of the Buddhist teachings or *kyōsō hanjaku* 教相判釈 in East Asia. This understanding was adopted by Murakami, while scholars of Western logic criticized it. Ōnishi equally criticized these three logics and proposed to develop a new logic by critically integrating them (Ōnishi 1903). Even today, the problem of the relationship among the three logics has been passed on to present-day scholars of Buddhist logic (e.g., Katsura 1998).

### New-new *Inmyō*

Kira pointed out the similarity between the form of a syllogism and the formula for *inmyō*:

The syllogism in logic is very similar to the adaptation (*upanaya*) and the conclusion (*nigamana*), the last two parts of the five-part reasoning of the old *inmyō*. Now, I would like to demonstrate the form of the adaptation and conclusion of the old *inmyō*:

- *Adaptation*: The vase is produced. The vase is non-eternal. The sound is produced. The sound is also non-eternal.
- *Conclusion*: Therefore, the sound is non-eternal.

Next, I would like to illustrate the form of the syllogism of logic:

- *First step*: What is produced is non-eternal.
- *Second step*: A sound is produced.
- *Third step*: Therefore, the sound is non-eternal. (*Tōyō shinshin inmyō hakki*, 43–44)

Although Kira asserted the superiority of *inmyō*, in *Tōyō shinshin inmyō hakki* he stated that the simplicity of the syllogism was superior to the complexity of *inmyō*, and he suggested restructuring *inmyō* in the style of a syllogism. He called it *shin-shin inmyō* 新々因明 (new-new *inmyō*), compared with Dignāgean logic being called *shin inmyō* 新因明 (new *inmyō*). It consists of two groups of syllogism: *hyōken shiki* 表顯式 (positive syllogism) and *hanken shiki* 反顯式 (contradictory syllogism). For demonstration, he used the following political examples:

A police officer, confronting a public speaker, argues:

- *Hyōken shiki*
  - *First step*: Like a certain public speech by Kō 甲 (*homologous example*), all public speeches recognized as sedition (*reason*) should be ordered canceled and dissolved (*thesis*).
  - *Second step*: Your public speech (*thesis*) is recognized as sedition (*reason*).
  - *Third step*: Therefore, your public speech should be ordered canceled and dissolved (*whole thesis*).
- *Hanken shiki*
  - *First step*: Like a certain public speech by Otsu 乙 (*heterologous example*), all speeches that should not be ordered canceled and dissolved (*thesis*) are not public speeches recognized as sedition (*reason*).
  - *Second step*: Your public speech (*thesis*) is recognized as sedition (*reason*).
  - *Third step*: Therefore, your public speech should be ordered canceled and dissolved (*whole thesis*). (*Tōyō shinshin inmyō hakki*, 90–92)

It is reasonable to suppose that the term “public speech” alluded to *Jiyū minken undō* 自由民権運動 or the Movement for Civic Rights and Freedom in the 1880s. The *shin-shin inmyō* was criticized by Ōnishi and Murakami. Ōnishi claimed that *shin-shin inmyō* had no unique value, since there was little difference between *shin-shin inmyō* and the syllogism (Ōnishi 1889). Murakami also criticized a person who wanted to change the order of *inmyō* based on that of the syllogism, because the change would kill the feature of *inmyō* (Murakami 1891: 22). It is easy to suppose that the person was Kira.

## Conclusion

In its long history, *inmyō* has been studied as a part of Buddhist studies, although Dignāga intended to develop a logical system independent from any school of thought (Katsura 1998). It might be Kira’s contribution to remove *inmyō* from the Buddhist context, even if this was motivated by his xenophobia and nationalism. Moreover, it should be noted that his awareness of the *inmyō* problem, especially in comparison with the Western logic, has had a wide influence through the ages, although his attempts to popularize *inmyō* failed.

---

## References

- Asō Yoshiteru 麻生義輝. 2008. *Kinsei Nihon tetsugakushi: Bakumatsu kara Meiji Ishin no keimō shisō* 近世日本哲学史: 幕末から明治維新の啓蒙思想 [History of philosophy in modern Japan: Enlightenment thought from the end of Edo period to the Meiji period]. Tokyo: Shoshi Shinsui.

- Funayama Shin'ichi 船山信一. 1998. *Funayama Shin'ichi chosakushū* 船山信一著作集. Vol. 8, Tokyo: Kobushi Shobō.
- Inoue Enryō 井上円了. 2003. *Inoue Enryō, gedō tetsugaku: Kan'yaku kyōten ni yoru Indo tetsugaku kenkyū* 井上円了・外道哲学: 漢訳経典によるインド哲学研究 [Inoue Enryō's study on non-Buddhist philosophies: Study of Indian philosophies based on the Chinese Buddhist translations]. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobō.
- Katsura Shōryū 桂紹隆. 1998. *Indojin no ronrigaku* インド人の論理学 [Indian logic]. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha.
- Kira Kōyō 雲英晃耀 et al. 1890. *Inmyōgaku Kyōkai hōkoku* 因明学協会報告 [Report on the Association for *Inmyō* Studies]. Aichi: Inmyōgaku Kyōkai.
- Murakami Senjō 村上専精. 1891. *Katsuyō kōjutsu inmyōgaku zensho* 活用講述因明学全書 [Utilization guide to *inmyō*]. Tokyo: Testugaku Shoin.
- . 1914. *Rokujūichi nen* 六十一年 [61 years]. Tokyo: Heigo Shuppansha.
- Nanjō Bun'yū 南條文雄. 1979. *Kaikyūroku: Sansukuritto koto hajime* 懐旧録: サンスクリット事始め [Memoirs: Start of Sanskrit]. Tokyo: Heibonsha.
- Ōnishi Hajime 大西祝. 1889. "Inmyō ni tsukite" 因明につきて [On *inmyō*]. *Tetsugakukai zasshi* 哲学会雑誌 3-29, 31, 32.
- . 1890. "Kira Kōyō shi no doku *Tetsugakukai zasshi inmyō ron*, 雲英晃耀氏の読哲学会雑誌因明論 [On Mr. Kira Kōyō's paper on *inmyō* published in *Tetsugakukai zasshi*]." *Tetsugakukai zasshi* 哲学会雑誌 4-42, 44.
- . 1903. *Ronrigaku*. 論理学 [Logic]. Tokyo: Keiseisha.

(This research is supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) from JSPS Grant Number 25370054)

〈Key words〉 Kira Kōyō, deductive reasoning, inductive reasoning, new-new *inmyō*

(Associate Professor, Hanazono University, PhD)