

Research Notes

Naitō Konan and Naitō's Historiography: A Reconsideration in the Early Twenty-First Century*

Joshua A. Fogel

University of California, Santa Barbara

In English the term “Japanese Sinology” might be translated into Chinese as either 日本漢學 or 日本的中國研究, and it covers as much or even more than the Chinese expressions. It can mean Japanese studies of Chinese history and culture, or Japanese exegeses of the Chinese classics throughout the ages, or in fact any instance in which one examines Japanese approaches to or responses to Chinese civilization from antiquity through the present. My own work has tended to fall within the first category: Japanese studies of Chinese history, and it is to this general subject that I shall address my remarks today.

Some years ago, I spent a great deal of time studying the writings of the celebrated Japanese historian, Naitō Konan 內藤湖南 (Torajirō 虎次郎 1866–1934), and the school of Sinology he helped to build at Kyoto University early in the last century. What I soon learned—this is an obvious point—is that I could not simply read his many writings on Chinese history and culture and then write an analysis of them. Rather, I had to immerse myself in the period in which he wrote, roughly the 1880s through the years just prior to his death in the early 1930s—namely, mid-Meiji 明治 through early Shōwa 昭和 Japan. I also came to understand that I would have to read his writings on Japanese history, because the historical and cultural relationship between China and Japan were central to his entire project as a scholar.

The result was a book that I have never been entirely satisfied with: *Politics and Sinology: The Case of Naitō Konan (1866–1934)* which was translated into Japanese as: 《內藤湖南、ポリテイックスとシノロジー》. Unsatisfied for two reasons. First, there were several areas of Chinese culture to which he had devoted

* 本文初稿曾在 2003 年 11 月 7-8 日由台灣大學日文系主辦的「第二屆日本漢學國際學術研討會」上宣讀，謹向主辦單位及學報兩位評審者致謝。

considerable attention and which I was unable to find a way of addressing in the book. These would include Chinese art history and Chinese historiography; in both of these scholarly areas, he wrote eminent books and articles.

Second, in the 1970s and early 1980s, I was still writing in a defensive mode. With the exception of a handful of his most famous disciples—such as Miyazaki Ichisada 宮崎市定 (1901–1995) and Yoshikawa Kōjirō 吉川幸次郎 (1904–1980)—who continued to laud their professor, the influence of the war years was still strong when I was doing my work, and this meant that Naitō was still associated with all things Japanese in China and that meant aggression against China. If I wanted to say anything even remotely positive about his theories, I had to first try to overcome the negative image that had developed around much of the scholarship associated with him in postwar Japan.

The first postwar articles written about Naitō were highly condemnatory and found the roots of imperialism in every one of his famous theories. Thus, to give just one example, while Naitō may have argued that China entered modernity over a millenium ago at the start of the Song dynasty, that only meant in his harshest critics' eyes that he thought China had stagnated in modernity for those many centuries. I knew this was all wildly exaggerated, but I had to argue from a defensive posture, all the time knowing equally well that there were, of course, political aspects about his life and career that were tainted with Japanese imperialism.

This situation has all now happily changed. I would like in my talk today to first address reasons why the mood has changed, look at some of the newer work on Naitō that has appeared in recent years, and then take a fresh close look at one of the two areas I was unable to address in my book twenty-five years ago, his work in the field of Chinese historiography.

What Has Changed

I think the most important thing that has changed since I first began reading and writing about Naitō Konan has been unrelated to changes within Japan. Interestingly, since the death of Mao Zedong and the commencement of the Four Modernizations, Mainland Chinese authors have rediscovered Naitō on their own, as have scholars in Taiwan over the past decade or more. I say “rediscovered” because Naitō had many Chinese colleagues and associates before his death, especially during his years at Kyoto University. A number of his essays were translated into Chinese, and his views were recognized—not necessarily always agreed with, but recognized—as sufficiently significant as to warrant their

attention. In the prewar world of Sinological studies by serious scholars—as opposed to, shall we say, more popular or journalistic writers such as Liang Qichao¹—Chinese and Japanese had reached a level of interaction we are only now, once again, approaching. I would even argue that one of the reasons many of Naitō's books were never translated in Chinese was that most serious Chinese scholars could read them in the original.

In the immediate postwar years, when memories of World War II were still extremely fresh, many leftwing Japanese academics returned to teaching positions at Japan's many universities. Under the American Occupation of Japan through 1952 and well after it, scholars who had supported the Japanese government or espoused rightist, imperialist ideas were removed from their posts. Thus, the entire first generation of Japanese scholars—and not only in Asian studies—were far to the left of center. In addition, a significant number had survived during the war years not by having gone into exile, as did so many leftwing and Jewish German academics, but by hiding their views from the spotlight or actually working for an agency of the Japanese government or military in China, such as one of the research organs of the South Manchurian Railway Company. In either case, they were deeply burdened with a sense of guilt for what they saw as acts of complicity with the Japanese war machine. Two of the more prominent ways these men and women worked to exorcise their demons was by virulently attacking all prewar Japanese scholarship on China for being completely compromised by the imperialist Japanese government and army, and by profoundly associating themselves with the Chinese revolution on the mainland which was nearing success soon after the war's end. A significant number later left the Japan Communist Party when it broke with the Chinese Communist Party—out of sympathy for the latter.

One example of this postwar condemnatory approach to the work of Naitō Konan was an essay by Nohara Shirō 野原四郎 published in 1946: 〈内藤湖南支那論批判〉.² Nohara took aim at Naitō's most famous work, 《支那論》, which was first published in 1914 shortly after the fall of the Qing dynasty. Despite the apparent chaos of the early Republican era, and in the face of Japanese critics claiming that disorder was both the natural culmination of modern China and a perfect excuse for international dismemberment of China, Naitō argued vehemently that republicanism (共和主義) was the historically-determined future for

1. See 桑兵, "Japan and Liang Qichao's Research in the Field of National Learning," trans. Minghui Hu and Joshua A. Fogel, *Sino-Japanese Studies* 12.1 (November 1999), pp. 5–24.

2. 野原四郎, "内藤湖南支那論批判"、《中國評論》1卷4號(1946)、頁35–42。

China—and, he strongly implied, China was the future for the East Asian region as a whole.³ That would seem like a highly positive assessment which should have earned Naitō great praise in the postwar years. However, Nohara 野原 and others like him decided that virtually every point in 《支那論》 was worthy of nothing short of abject condemnation. Where Naitō saw a grassroots basis for republicanism in China at the village level run by elders (父老) without the intercession of the central government, a process which had matured over the centuries since the Song dynasty and the end of aristocracy, Nohara 野原 found nothing but “local bullies and evil gentry” (土豪劣紳). Where Naitō argued that Chinese had transcended the age of the nation-state and no longer conceptualized the nation as such, Nohara 野原 argued that he was merely concocting an excuse for others, namely Japan, to step in and rule—thus, Nohara 野原 claimed, by identifying the elders (父老) as the kernel of Chinese society, Naitō was effectively providing Japanese imperialists with the key to conquering China. To be sure, Naitō did argue in favor of China relinquishing control of its national government to a consortium of international powers, so that the Chinese people would not be burdened with the cost of a national defense and would not have to worry about corruption at the level of the central government. Nohara 野原 claimed that this was actually core of Naitō’s argument.

Nohara’s 野原’s claims were, needless to say, very much caught up in the era in which they were written, the immediate postwar period. It should no longer take us much time to see that they were exaggerated, often wildly off the mark, and more concerned with a larger, self-cleansing process as Japanese scholars of Chinese history and culture faced the extremely difficult task of coming to terms with their own prewar heritage. Being a major figure of that prewar heritage, perhaps it is only natural that Naitō would come under attack. It is also important that Naitō was decidedly not a leftist or Marxist in any sense. Indeed, he described the principal reason for the failure of the Taiping Rebellion to be its “communism” (共產主義), namely its communitarian structure which directly conflicted with the structure of rural Chinese village life controlled by elders (父老). Hence, the Taiping leaders failed to understand the basic structure of Chinese society and were thus doomed to end in defeat. Naitō wrote admiringly of local Chinese society and his antipathy for what he called “communism” (共產主義) was just below the surface. This cannot have sat well with postwar Marxists critics of his work.

3. 内藤湖南, “支那論”, 《内藤湖南全集》(東京: 筑摩書房、1972年) 第5卷。

I have singled out one essay by Nohara Shirō 野原四郎, but there were many other similar works which found Japanese imperialism peeking out from every thesis pounded out by Naitō. The other glaring fault these critics found in his work was the putative claim that Chinese history had stagnated. As I have noted, if modernity began in the tenth or eleventh centuries, and China was still modern in the nineteenth century, then it must have stagnated. I have been unable to find any treatment of this subject in Naitō's written work, but it nonetheless became a hallmark of the postwar critique of him—even reflected faintly in Western scholarship.⁴ While still in his mid-twenties, Saeki Yūichi 佐伯有一 (b. 1932) found time, in the midst of a 1957 article on Japanese scholarship concerned with Ming-Qing economic history, to lambast Naitō for eviscerating China's historical dynamism by propounding stagnancy at the hallmark of the past millenium.⁵ Again, this was wildly exaggerated.

In the immediate postwar decades in Japan, the statement that someone had ever claimed stagnancy or backwardness in China was an incendiary one. This was not only a time when the Chinese revolution was very fresh, but it was also a time when Japanese scholars were doing everything in their power to give China back a history—a normal history—that they perceived had been taken away by the theories of prewar Japanese scholars. In Marxist terms—terms which dominated the postwar debate—that meant that China had to be fitted back onto the unilinear track toward a glorious socialist future, just like other “normal” countries. We see concerns even in the highly refined scholarship of such an exalted figure as Niida Noboru 仁井田陞 (1904-1966) who, writing in the 1950s, sought to locate and analyze in great depth a distinctive feudal period for China; in so doing, Chinese history would acquire periodization, and the engines of history would once again be chugging down their one-way tracks.⁶

Thus, despite his extraordinary contributions to the topic of periodizing

-
4. This view was even reflected in English-language writing about Japanese views of China where Naitō's name would appear as someone who, to cite one example, “popularized ‘unchanging China’ . . . [and] wrote persuasively of China's backwardness, stagnation, and corruption, and tended to create an image of a land in which any change, including a reversal to earlier, more traditional conditions would be preferable.” See Marius Jansen, “Changing Japanese Attitude Toward Modernization,” in *Changing Japanese Attitude Toward Modernization*, ed. Marius Jansen (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), pp. 83-84.
 5. 佐伯有一：〈日本の明清時代研究における商品生産評価をめぐる：その學說的展望〉、《中國史の時代區分》、鈴木俊・西嶋定生編（東京：東京大學出版會、1957年）、頁257-258。
 6. 仁井田陞、〈中國社會の封建とフューダリズム〉《東洋文化》第5號（1951年2月）、此文收入仁井田陞、《中國法制史研究・3：奴隸農奴法・家族村落法》（東京：東京大學出版會、1962年）、頁97-100。

Chinese history, his absence of comment on the topic of stagnation, and indeed his criticism of the Japanese military adventures in Manchuria in the early 1930s,⁷ Naitō and his work became the objects of severe vituperation in the first postwar decades. In the process, the baby was almost thrown out with the bathwater; that is, the “bad” parts of Naitō’s writings seemed so offensive that all of his writings became, in some quarters at least, all but taboo for a period of time. Kyoto scholars continued to admire his work; some of the older generation who had studied with him at the end of his career and the beginning of their own remembered his work fondly, but with a handful of exceptions, there were no strong rebuttals to the condemnatory mood for some time.⁸

The situation began to change in the early 1980s primarily, I believe, because Mainland Chinese scholars found so much of value in Naitō’s extremely rich body of writings. In a P.R.C. publication for internal consumption (內部), the journal 《中國史研究動態》, Professor Xia Yingyuan 夏應元, now retired but who was then at the Institute of History of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (中國社會科學院・歷史研究所), published an essay entitled: 〈內藤湖南の中國史研究〉.⁹ It was a short piece but, unlike so many essays in Japan, it curiously did not dwell on the imperialist implications of Naitō’s writings; rather, it introduced his main theories, such as his famous periodization scheme, and expressed great admiration for their author. Many years before in 1934, the year of Naitō’s death, a then young Zhou Yiliang 周一良 (1913–2001) published a longer and more erudite essay about Naitō’s scholarly work, based on his own college graduation thesis, in the journal 《史學年報》.¹⁰ When he returned to China after World War II from Harvard University, where he tutored many Americans in Japanese,¹¹ Zhou taught Japanese history to several generations of Chinese students at Beijing University. Xia’s article basically picked up this thread after nearly half a century.

7. For example: 〈滿洲國建設について〉《大阪朝日新聞》1932年3月1、5、7、8日、in《內藤湖南全集》(東京:筑摩書房、1972年)第5卷、頁170–180; 〈滿洲國今後の方針について〉《大アジア》(1933年6月)、in《內藤湖南全集》(東京:筑摩書房、1972年)第5卷、頁181–184。

8. One such exception was a useful, albeit innocuous, biography of Naitō: 三田村泰助、《內藤湖南》(東京:中央公論、1972年)。There was also an idiosyncratic biographical study of Naitō by a non-academic: 青江舜二郎、《龍の星座: 內藤湖南のアジア的生涯》(東京:朝日新聞社、1966年)。

9. 夏應元: 〈內藤湖南の中國史研究〉《中國史研究動態》2卷(1981年),頁1–16。

10. 周一良: 〈日本內藤湖南先生在中國史學上之貢獻〉《史學年報》2卷1號(1934年9月),頁155–172。

11. 周一良,《畢竟是書生》(北京:十月文藝出版社、1998年)、頁28–41;日譯:藤家禮之助監譯、《つまりは書生、周一良自傳》(東京:東海大學出版會、1995年)、頁49–71。

As with Xia's essay, notably absent from Zhou's work—and virtually ubiquitous in all Japanese writing on the subject of Naitō's work—was mention of imperialism, stagnation, and the like; and Zhou was writing only a few years after the Manchurian Incident. Indeed, when I met both men over the course of the late 1980s and early 1990s, they affirmed the view for me that, in their separate estimations, Naitō was simply a great scholar. I shall return to this theme momentarily.

Another important change leading to the resuscitation of Naitō and his ideas about Chinese history does have to do with changes within Japan. It concerns the generational change within Japanese academia since the conclusion of World War II and the paradigm shift in approaches to Chinese historical and cultural research. As the immediate postwar generation has passed on either through retirement or death, a younger generation has not been as infatuated with Marxism—or at least with the overdetermined manner in which Marxism was frequently used to emplot Chinese history, finding feudalism here and capitalism (or its “sprouts” 萌芽) there.

I would point to the early 1980s as the moment when this change was first being identified—again, this was when I was putting the finishing touches on my book about Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. In a collection of essays edited by Professor 谷川道雄 (b. 1925) entitled 《中國士大夫階級と地域社會との關係についての總合的研究》, Professor 谷川 and his colleagues made clear what Tanigawa 谷川 had been more subtly working on in his own period of expertise, Chinese history from Wei-Jin 魏晉 through Tang.¹² Namely, they were all arguing from their various places in Chinese history that there was something more basic to the fabric of Chinese history than social classes as understood by Marxism, and they called this phenomenon the local social community: sometimes “local society” (地域社會) and more frequently “local community” (共同體). This term is an expression with a long and complex history within Japanese scholarship; even its association with Japanese studies of Chinese history is complex. Professor Tanigawa 谷川 had been for many years dissatisfied by the rigid mold into which Japanese Marxist Sinologists had forced China's historical experience. He proposed several decades earlier that Sinologists move beyond class to assess local Chinese society, and he was roundly attacked by the dominant Marxist

12. 谷川道雄編、《中國士大夫階級と地域社會との關係についての總合的研究》(京都：昭和 57 年度科學研究費補助金總合研究(A)研究成果報告書(研究課題番號 00531039)研究代表者：谷川道雄、1983 年)。See my extensive review of this collective work: “A New Direction in Japanese Sinology,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 44.1 (June 1984), pp. 225–47.

establishment for his efforts.¹³ However, he never gave up, and his views have now produced many disciples and adherents over the years. His late colleague at Kyoto University, Kawakatsu Yoshio 川勝義雄 (1922-1984), was a longtime partner in moving the discussion beyond simplistic class analysis.

Fascinating for me is that Tanigawa's 谷川 concept of "local community" as a term for the structure of local Chinese society very closely resembles a concept used by Naitō: 〈郷團〉. When I suggested this relationship to Professor Tanigawa 谷川 in the mid-1980s, he was very happy that the connection had been recognized. He has since spent a great deal of time studying Naitō's works and even organizing a citizen's group of men from various occupations within the Kyoto area to read works by Naitō together. He also organized a 内藤湖南研究會 of scholars from around Japan, and they recently published under his editorship: 《内藤湖南の世界：アジア再生の思想》.¹⁴ A look through the essays in this book, which includes one Chinese author, reveals that these scholars are no longer obsessed with pigeon-holing Naitō or assessing him solely on the basis of "imperialism." Naitō has now become a figure in intellectual history with some fascinating ideas about Chinese history—some of those ideas may still work and some may not.

In other words, he is no longer being used as a "whipping boy" or a sacrificial animal onto whom all the sins of the prewar era may be put and exorcised. Perhaps, then, the time is right to take a fresh look at his extraordinary history of Chinese historical thought.

A Fresh Look at Naitō's Work in the Field of Chinese Historiography

Several years ago, the long series of books put out by the publisher Heibonsha (平凡社) in conjunction with the Tōyō bunko (東洋文庫) reissued Naitō's extraordinary work, 《支那史學史》.¹⁵ This work was the result of lectures deliver-

13. He first raised his own doubts about labeling the Tang period as "ancient" (古代) at the annual meeting of the 歴史學研究會 in 1955. In several essays of the 1960s, he suggested that scholarly advances were being severely held back because of the stranglehold of the periodization schemes being imposed on Chinese history by orthodox Marxist theory. See 川勝義雄、〈一東洋史研究者における現實と問〉、《新しい歴史學のために》68號 (1961年)；川勝義雄、〈魏晉南北朝〉、《史學雜誌》71號 (1962年5月)、頁164-171.

14. 内藤湖南研究會編、《内藤湖南の世界：アジア再生の思想》(名古屋：河合文化教育研究所、2001年)。Although the book lists the 研究會 itself as editor, clearly this was Professor Tanigawa's work; he initially organized the group, wrote the volume's introduction, its preface, and its final substantive essay.

15. 内藤湖南、《支那史學史》(東京：平凡社、1992)、2卷。

ed at Kyoto Imperial University in the 1910s, and the reader quickly realizes something which is as true now as it was over eighty years ago when Naitō first delivered these lectures: not only was there no easy way for him to have organized the raw material for his talks, but even more astonishing is the fact that there were no libraries with easy access to all the major works of Chinese historiography. Naitō had to do all the work as he went along. This very fat book was thus not only the first of its kind in any language; it has even today not been superseded, and that is surely why Heibonsha thought it could republish the book and earn money. I would like now to briefly examine the basic arguments of this book. Not many books can still be read with profit nearly a century after they were first published. An investigation of this one may help explain why it is still such an extraordinarily valuable work.

The single most important debate which Naitō saw informing the entire history of Chinese historical writing—and one which tells us a great deal about his own sense of what was important in historical research—was between a comprehensive approach to history (*tongshi* 通史) and a single-period approach (*duandaishi* 斷代史). Although he found some merit in the latter and admired several historians who advocated it, he was an unabashed partisan of the former and of the great Chinese historians who had adopted it in their work. Thus, after 100 pages of his *《支那史學史》* analyzing every known pre-Han text and fragment then in existence for its historical content and every known commentary on them, it is with the *Shiji* 史記 of Sima Qian 司馬遷 (135?-93 BCE) that Naitō identified the true emergence of conscious history writing in China. After the disorder of the Warring States era, there was a general tendency in the Han toward the unification of thought, and Naitō saw the 史記 as the result of efforts to unify the historical records that had accumulated to that point in time. Unlike his father, Sima Tan 司馬談 (d. 110 BCE), from whom he inherited the work of compiling the 史記, 司馬遷 fell heavily under the influence of Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (179?-104? BCE) and the Gongyang tradition 公羊傳. Naitō interestingly argued that, while the 史記 is not what we might accept as history today, it is factually what we demand of history writing. It was decidedly not like its contemporaries—works which compiled events to serve a sovereign's needs; the 史記 was thus not born simply out of the “demands of the times” but out of 司馬遷's own great genius.¹⁶

Such an evaluation might seem rather quaint and certainly old-fashioned in our overly critical age, but let us momentarily give Naitō the benefit of the

16. 内藤湖南,《支那史學史》,《内藤湖南全集》(東京:筑摩書房、1976年)第11卷、頁106-108。

doubt and look at just what he identified as 司馬遷's "genius." First and foremost, it was the use of a comprehensive approach to history which implied an understanding that history did not simply begin in a given year when one sovereign ascended the throne or a new dynasty commenced and end when that ruler or regime left power. As 司馬遷 seemed to clearly understand, history was a process involving change over a long, long time span: the entirety of the known past. 司馬遷 saw himself, perhaps exaggeratedly, as the heir to a daotong 道統 that went from the Duke of Zhou 周公 through Confucius to himself.¹⁷ Like his father, though, 司馬遷 believed that the historian's task was a hereditary commitment to speak the truth—irrespective of the consequences—and thus to explain how history had culminated in the present, the Han dynasty.

Naitō felt that the 史記 had not been appreciated in its day, largely because it was followed by the Han *shu* 漢書 of Ban Gu 班固 (32–92), a single-era history that set the mold for much of the history writing that followed. Only at a much later date were the contributions of the 史記 recognized. Naitō reserved special praise for Shao Jinhan's 邵晉涵 (1743–1796) penetrating analysis of the text.¹⁸ It was Zhang Xuecheng 章學誠 (1738–1801), though, who first understood the great importance of 司馬遷 work as a whole, and it was Naitō Konan who brought Zhang and his writings out of oblivion in the early twentieth century.¹⁹

One thing Naitō criticized 司馬遷 for was the latter's apparent effort to explain historical events in a rational manner but then to use rational explanation to elucidate legendary events, such as the fatherless births of the founders of the Shang and Zhou dynasties. Perhaps, this reveals the influence of the "scientific approach" to historiography not ordinarily associated with Naitō and the Kyoto School of Sinology. Still, Naitō argued that 司馬遷 was China's first comprehensive historian and he was not fully appreciated until much later in history.

A number of scholars did appreciate the 史記 and sought to continue it

17. See Steven Durrant, *The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writings of Sima Qian* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995).

18. 《內藤湖南全集》，第11卷、頁110–112。

19. 《內藤湖南全集》，第11卷、頁113，115–116，124–129，131–133. On Naitō's contribution to "rediscovering" Zhang Xuecheng and his influence on Hu Shi 胡適 (1891–1962) and others, see: 內藤湖南，〈章實齋先生年譜〉，《支那學》1卷3–4號（1920年10月），《內藤湖南全集》，第7卷、頁67–79；〈胡適之的新著章實齋年譜を讀む〉，《支那學》2卷9號（1922年5月），《內藤湖南全集》，第7卷、頁80–90；Joshua A. Fogel, "On the 'Rediscovery' of the Chinese Past: Ts'ui Shu and Related Cases," in *Perspectives on a Changing China: Essays in Honor of Professor C. Martin Wilbur on the Occasion of His Retirement*, ed. Joshua A. Fogel, and William T. Rowe, (Boulder: Westview Press, 1979), pp. 230–33.

beyond the reign of Han Wudi 漢武帝 (r. 140–86 BCE), the point at which Sima Qian had stopped. The Later Han 後漢 historian Ban Biao 班彪 (3–54) was not impressed by these sequels and decided instead to write a history of the Former Han dynasty. In form he followed the 史記, but there was the all-important difference that his work no longer encompassed the full run of history, but was to be the history of a single era which, upon his death, his son Ban Gu completed. Although later praised by such critics as Liu Zhiji 劉知幾 (661–721) of the Tang for setting the mold that subsequent dynastic histories would follow, others such as Zheng Qiao 鄭樵 (1104–1162) of the Song levelled a stinging attack on it for precisely the same reason. Zheng argued that Ban Gu, despite his claim of admiration for the 史記, clearly could simply not have understood its central message that only a complete history from antiquity through the present could ever capture the complexity of causation in the historical process.²⁰

This was effectively Naitō's position as well and thus explains his extraordinary praise for Zheng's work. Thus, he clearly identified Sima Qian's greatness in his adoption of a *tong* 通 approach to history from *gu* 古 to *jin* 近. In the subsequent few centuries many different kinds of works would appear written in various styles, and the rivalry continued for some time between 通史 and 斷代史. In fact, the number of historical works grew so large that by Tang times China's first historical critic, 劉知幾, emerged to write his famous *Shi tong* 《史通》. Despite his title, though, Liu favored the 漢書 or 斷代史 approach to history writing, and, as Naitō put it, failed to appreciate the subtleties of the 史記.²¹

Skippping ahead to an important turning point in Chinese history, we find that one of the longest chapters in Naitō's 《支那史學史》 concerns the Song dynasty, second only to his chapter covering the Qing. He argued that the change in historical compilation techniques can be seen in the differences between the *Jiu Tang shu* 《舊唐書》 and the *Xin Tang shu* 《新唐書》. The former was written between the Later Tang 後唐 and Later Jin 後晉 states of the Five Dynasties 五代 era and included copious amounts of material verbatim from Tang sources. By contrast, the latter was the work of two men, Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072) and Song Qi 宋祁 (998–1061), who rewrote the history of the Tang era in the ancient style, quoting few documents from the time at all and all but completely ignoring the *Jiu Tang shu*. Many including such scholarly lumi-

20. 內藤湖南, 《支那史學史》, 《內藤湖南全集》第11卷、頁136–138。

21. 同前註, 頁141–142, 144–145, 164–165, 168–172; for a more recent analysis of 劉知幾's historical thinking, see 稻葉一郎 (1999), 〈劉知幾の史通〉《中國の歴史思想》(東京: 創文社、1999)、頁197–277。

naries as Gu Yanwu 顧炎武 (1613-1682) and Shao Jinhan, though, found little of value in the *Xin Tang shu*, but others, such as Ji Yun 紀昀 (1724-1805), came to its defense. Naitō himself found things of use in the later text, though he faulted it for not being as punctilious in assessing historical fact as it might have been, such as in the use of fiction as a historical source.²²

What did Naitō think of the *Zizhi tongjian* 《資治通鑑》 of Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019-1089), another text with the character *tong* in its title? He argued that Sima Guang's penchant for drawing lessons from the events of history was tied up with the transition underway in China over the previous century from 貴族政治 to 獨裁君主政治, but he did not go into detail on this potentially fascinating topic. Despite marked differences in organization, the 《資治通鑑》 revived in a major way the *tongshi* style, searching for cause and effect over the long run of history.²³

If 劉知幾 began the Tang-Song transition in Chinese historiography, then 鄭樵 completed it, according to Naitō. The main thrust of Zheng's *Tong zhi* 《通志》 was, simply put, that history had to be written in a comprehensive manner or it failed to capture what was the essence of historical inquiry: change over time. Thus, as we have seen, Zheng praised the 《史記》 no end and lambasted the 《漢書》 with equal force. Among pre-Qing historians and historical critics, Naitō considered 鄭樵 a man of extraordinary brilliance and ranked on a par with 司馬遷.²⁴

Surely the most extraordinary sub-section of Naitō's chapter on history writing in the Ming was his six pages on Li Zhi 李贄 (1527-1602). Although not the first mention of Li in a modern source—Naitō himself had mentioned Li's work as early as 1901²⁵—Naitō was one of the figures centrally responsible for reviving interest in and study of Li's work in both China and Japan, and this was the first serious examination of Li's historical writing in any language in several centuries. Although Li was vilified in the early Qing, Naitō was sufficiently impressed to allocate to Li more space than to any other Ming figure in historical writing.²⁶ Naitō recognized Li as an extremist both in personal inclination

22. 《內藤湖南全集》，第 11 卷、頁 194-201。

23. 同前註，頁 204-219。

24. 同前註，頁 228-229，231-232。

25. 內藤湖南，〈讀書記三則〉，《日本人》（1901年8月5日），《內藤湖南全集》第 12 卷、頁 23-30。

26. 《內藤湖南全集》，第 11 卷、頁 265-278。See also Joshua A. Fogel, "On the 'Rediscovery' of the Chinese Past," pp. 233-234; and 島田虔次，〈私の内藤湖南〉，《内藤湖南全集月報》（1970 年 6 月），頁 6-8，此文收入島田虔次，《中國の傳統思想》（東京：みすず書房、2001 年）、頁 322-328。There is a fine chapter on Li Zhi in Ray Huang, 1587, *A Year of No Importance: The Ming Dynasty in Decline* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981).

and scholarship, but saw his work within the general framework of his times. As is well known, Li adopted an essentially biographical approach to history writing, although he rejected the older good-bad (or right-wrong) dichotomy as a universal way of assessing historical personages. His contribution was to suggest that the very concepts of “good” and “bad” by which we judge figures from the past are conditioned by changes in times. Thus, we cannot properly apply the same yardstick to all people at all times.

Reading and writing in the early decades of the twentieth century, the Qing period did not have for Naitō the sense of being distant that it now holds for us. Naitō had covered its political events as a journalist for the first twenty years of his adult life, before he began his teaching career at Kyoto Imperial University in the last years of the Qing; in fact, he lived over half his life during the final Qing decades. For Naitō, it was during the Qing period when Chinese—and, for that matter, all humanity—reached the apex of historiographical expertise in methods, the use of sources, and philosophy of history. No Japanese, no Westerner, and certainly no one else could come close. Naitō's great respect for historiography of the Qing era can be traced to what he perceived as its central focus on accuracy. It also involved a perceived rejection of ideology riding roughshod over scholarship. All of this may sound distinctly naive in our own sharply critical age, but it would be ahistorical of us to dismiss it as such without investigating it first.

While Naitō did indeed lavish praise upon all the famed scholars of Qing *kaozhengxue* 考證學 from Gu Yanwu and Huang Zongxi 黃宗羲 (1610–1695) at the very start of the dynasty through figures as diverse as Sun Yirang 孫詒讓 (1848–1908) and Kang Youwei 康有為 (1858–1927) at the end, he was especially taken with the historiographical writings of the eighteenth-century scholar Zhang Xuecheng—and Zhang was actually quite critical of the *kaozheng* movement. Thus, Naitō's views are not easily characterized as simple positivism.

While he had not gone out of his way to applaud the earlier dynastic histories—largely, it appears, because he did not have faith in these government-sponsored, mass projects to be able to retain any scholarly independence—Naitō did have reason to acclaim the *Ming shi* 《明史》 of the early Qing. He seemed especially pleased by the efforts of Zhu Yizun 朱彝尊 (1629–1709) to abandon the semi-fictional *yeshi* as sources in favor of a methodology geared toward use of the *shilu* 實錄 as the basis for writing the history of the Ming. Otherwise, Naitō spent a great deal more time and space on the topic of the early Qing, discussing the historical writings of the three great scholars of the founding generation, none of whom served the new Manchu state: Gu Yanwu, Huang Zongxi, and

Wang Fuzhi 王夫之 (1619-1692). Despite great differences among them, he found admirable qualities in all of their historical writings.²⁷

Much of the rest of his chapter on the Qing consists of explications of the main historical writings of an extremely long list of figures from the time—some very famous, others all but unknown. His definition of “history” in this context was exceedingly broad, covering many subfields of science and classical studies. And, the general treatment is chronological, from early Qing to late. Among those singled out for particular praise, in addition to those mentioned above, are: 胡承諾 (1607-1681), 閻若璩 (1636-1704), 全祖望 (1705-1755), 王鳴盛 (1722-1798), 戴震 (1723-1777), 趙翼 (1727-1814), 錢大昕 (1728-1804), 崔述 (1740-1816), and 洪亮吉 (1746-1809).²⁸ The list is so long and so rich, it simply overwhelms the modern reader. Naitō’s book was first put together from student notes, and at the very end of the text, we find a few brief lines—in Chinese—of what was apparently covered in the very last lecture. The final line about a contemporary of Naitō’s reads: “Liang Qichao: Doesn’t even know what wants and proceeds to act recklessly” 「梁啓超 不知其意而妄作者」.²⁹

As taken as he was with so many Chinese historians, the work of Zhang Xuecheng held a particularly strong attraction for Naitō. Despite his own predilection for hard-nosed, *kaozheng*-style historical scholarship, Naitō nonetheless found Zhang’s theoretical approach to historical methodology profoundly inspiring. In a lecture given shortly after his retirement in 1928, Naitō revealed that he had first read Zhang’s two major works, 《文史通義》 and 《校讎通義》, in 1902 after purchasing them in Hangzhou. In the mid-1910s, Naitō obtained an uncut edition of Zhang’s complete works (《章氏遺書》) and read them from start to finish. On this basis he wrote up a brief chronological biography (*nianpu* 年譜) which inspired Hu Shi 胡適 (1891-1962) to do the same and thus Zhang’s work became known to a new generation of Chinese scholars.³⁰ While Zhang’s scholarly aim may have seemed in the final analysis to be philosophical, Naitō believed that it was fundamentally historiographic. Zhang was not out to record facts but to discover basic principles of the historical process. As Zhang had put it, all learning was historiography.³¹ I dare say this view would strike many as perfectly appropriate even today.

27. 《內藤湖南全集》，第11卷、頁294-296，301，298-310。

28. 同前註，頁310-314，321，325-326，334-344，349-350，364，388-396。

29. 同前註，頁447。Naitō only met Liang once, in 1899 in Japan, and was not impressed by him.

30. See 註18.

31. 內藤湖南，〈章學誠の史學〉(1928年10月6日在大阪懷德堂的講義)《內藤湖南全集》，第11卷、頁471-472，474-476，482-483。

In short, Naitō most appreciated Chinese historical works of a comprehensive nature, beginning with the 史記, works that looked at changes over the full run of history and not just a single dynastic era. He also appreciated scholarship and methodologies that were geared toward gaining a more accurate picture of the past; thus, Li Zhi of the Ming who contested received wisdom on evaluating historical personalities and especially the great Qing scholars working in history and related disciplines found great favor with him. While he highly valued hard work as a means toward an end, it was never an end in and of itself. Thus, he probably reserved the greatest praise for the master innovators (the paradigm-shifters) in historical studies, the men who came up with the ideas that changed the way we understand the past—first and foremost, Zhang Xuecheng.

Naitō was a Titan who lived in an era of Titans. His heroes, from Sima Qina to Zhang Xuecheng, were in turn Titans to him. In our era of debunking masquerading as scholarship, I believe that there is much more that can be gained by learning from the great scholars of the past. 臺北 and 京都 may be the last two places on earth where Chinese history is still done in this way. I thank you very much for the opportunity to share my thoughts with you today.

(Editor's note: The date of issuance of this volume is November 2004.)