

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南 (1866-1934) and Chinese Historiography

Joshua A. Fogel
University of California, Santa Barbara

Keywords:

Chinese Historiography, China, Japan, Naitō Konan

Abstract:

Naitō Konan (1866-1934) was one of towering figures of twentieth-century Sinology, in Japan, China, and elsewhere. His theories concerning Chinese history continue to influence us all, often through secondary or tertiary means. Among his many books and articles is a large volume entitled *Shina shigaku shi* (History of Chinese historiography), arguably the first such comprehensive work in any language and still unsurpassed to this day, roughly eighty years after the chapters which comprise it were first delivered as lectures in Kyoto.

Naitō argued that Chinese historical writing was divided, as we all know now, into two traditions: the comprehensive style (*tongshi*) launched by Sima Qian and the single-period style (*duandai shi*) begun somewhat later by Ban Gu. Naitō himself always favored the former, and he showed a marked predilection for the major historical works over the centuries by Chinese with the character *tong* in their titles: such as Liu Zhiji's *Tong shi*, Du You's *Tong zhi* (about which he lectured before the Japanese emperor in 1931), Ma Duanlin's *Wenxian tongkao*, and most notably Zhang Xuecheng's *Wenshi tongyi*. He did not disregard or disrespect the *duandai shi* approach, but he did believe that by cutting off chunks of history one could not get a proper sense of the

long-term forces at work in the historical process, what the great French historians later would call *la longue durée*.

關鍵詞

中國史學，中國，日本，內藤湖南

摘要

不論是在日本、中國或其他地方，內藤湖南（1866～1934）都是二十世紀漢學界的鉅子之一。他關於中國史的理論，仍常常經過第二種或第三種途徑影響著我們。在內藤眾多的專書和論文裡，《支那史學史》這部洋洋巨帙——其中若干章係他約在八十年前於京都首度以講義形式提出——無疑仍是用任何語言寫就的同質著作中，涵括最廣泛的第一部，而至今人尚無可比擬者。

如我們所知，內藤論證中國的史學著作時，將它區分為兩個大傳統：司馬遷開創的通史，以及稍後由班固發凡的斷代史。內藤本人向來偏愛於前者，而且他對千百年來那些書名裡有「通」字的著作，表示了特別的偏愛態度，如劉知幾的《史通》，杜佑的《通志》（一九三一年時，他在日本天皇御前講解過此書），馬端臨的《文獻通考》，至於他對章學誠的《文史通義》則尤三致意焉。當然，他也沒有因此忽略或輕視斷代史的傳統。只是他相信，但取某一時段的歷史而觀之，我們恐怕無法恰當地理解那些在歷史過程中發揮作用的長程動力（後來的法國史學巨匠稱之曰「長波」）的真正意義。

在其大著及其他的論文裡，內藤展示了自己的學術風格愈發傾向於清代的考證學。因此，他毫不吝惜於頌揚那些十七到十九世紀初期採取考證學派或以類似的研究取向來進行歷史研究的學者。正是這樣的傾向，也使他在二十世紀初時「再發現」了偉大的十八世紀學者章學誠。這個努力成果由胡適及其弟子繼續，和更由他本人後來繼續下去。自彼時起，章學誠即被奉為他那個時代裡最重要的史學思想家——也許不是最優秀的史學家，但至少可以承認他對歷史的哲學思考最臻上乘。

有趣的是，在內藤討論明代史學的著述裡，亦高度頌揚反偶像崇拜的李贄。然而，直到二十世紀初期，李贄則是普受輕詈的人物。但內

藤仍以為李贄是甚有鑒察力的史學家。

本文嘗試展現當代這一位研究中國史學的偉大學者的根據、影響與基本理論，期望能鼓動吾人持續開展此後的研究工作。

In his long book and in many other essays, Naitō also displayed a striking inclination for the style of scholarship that has become inexorably linked to the Qing period, that of *kaozhengxue* or textual criticism. He thus lavished praise on the great seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth scholars associated with that school or approach to the study of history (in all of its manifestations). It was this proclivity that also led him to the “rediscovery” of the eminent eighteenth century scholar Zhang Xuecheng in the early twentieth century, an effort continued by Hu Shi and his students, and continued further still by Naitō. Zhang has since been hailed by many as the most important historical thinker of his day – perhaps not the best historian, but arguably the finest mind concerning matters of historical philosophy.

Interestingly, in his work on Ming-period historical scholarship, Naitō offered high praise for the iconoclast Li Zhi, a man all but universally scorned until the early years of the twentieth century. Naitō nonetheless found in Li a profoundly discerning historian.

This essay represents an effort to lay out the foundations, influences, and basic theories of one of the greatest scholars of Chinese historical research in our time. More work remains to be done. When I was doing the research for my book on Naitō Konan, *Politics and Sinology: The Case of Naitō Konan (1866-1934)*,¹ I devoted a considerable amount of time to reading his history of Chinese historiography, *Shina shigaku shi* 支那史學史, prepared over eighty years ago.² This extraordinary book in over 500 pages was not only the first of its kind in any language; it has to date still not been superseded. Unfortunately, though, as the writing of my book unfolded I was unable to use any of that research in it. Now, some seventeen years later, I return to “finish my dissertation” once and for all.

As becomes clear to the reader at once, in the 1910s when Naitō set out to prepare his lectures for his Kyoto Imperial University students, there were no easy cribs, no secondary surveys of Chinese historiography, not even a variety of modern articles from which to pull the lectures together. But what is even

¹ Fogel 1984.

² Originally given as lectures in 1919-21 and 1925, published in 1949, and reprinted in Naitō 1976, vol. 11. Naitō's study was recently reprinted in the Tōyō Bunko series in two volumes: Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1992.

more remarkable is the simple fact that there were no libraries with easy access to all the major works of Chinese historiography. For what we now tend to take for granted, Naitō was effectively creating a field of study. Of course, as he would have readily admitted, there were hundreds of Chinese writings over the centuries either in or on the field of historiography. It was the countless primary texts and especially the studies of the great Qing-period textual critics, which form the backbone of his work.

This essay will examine Naitō's views on the origins of historical writing in China and on several of the major debates and issues, which defined the production of historical texts over the centuries. In addition to investigating his views in historical studies, I would also like to see how these views accord with his writings in parallel disciplines, such as the history of Chinese bibliographic sciences (*muluxue* 目錄學). Such an approach will unavoidably force me to ignore much of the material in the *Shina shigaku shi*, but that just means the great excitement of encountering that material firsthand remains for most scholars to experience.

Historiography for Naitō began in China from the point at which we can now identify the origins of historical records and chronicles. He links their emergence with the appearance of *shiguan* 史官, officials whose job it was to record events. In a common Chinese practice, subsequent eras even accorded the Yellow Emperor his own *shiguan* by the names of Cang Jie 倉頡 and Ju Song 沮誦. Although clearly legend, still one can see that from early on that the Chinese linked the job of *shiguan* with the keeping of records – indeed, Ju Song's given name (meaning to recite or chant) implies this very function.

When Naitō was writing nearly a century ago, research on the Shang oracle bones was still in its infancy. His friend and famed epigrapher, Luo Zhenyu 羅振玉 (1866-1940), claimed to have found the character *shi* 史 on the oracle bones, but Naitō was unwilling to venture an educated guess at that point concerning its meaning for the Shang era. He had definite ideas about its meaning in the Zhou, however, as it appears on bronze vessels and inscriptional material. Naitō supported a view on the ancient meaning of this character which has fewer adherents now that it once mustered. He believed that it was linked to the character *zhong* 中 'hitting a target squarely.' He argued that it had to do with archery, and his friend Wang Guowei 王國維 (1877-1927) apparently confirmed his view, as there was apparently an

official in the Zhouli 周禮 (Rites of Zhou) who figured the number of arrows which hit the center of a target. Thus, at this early stage the character shi implied a calculating device for archery and had a military connotation; here, though, he parted company with Wang who already identified shi with shu 書 (documents).³

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, he was an unabashed advocate of the former and of the great Chinese historians who adopted it in their work. Thus, after 100 pages analyzing every known pre-Han text and fragment for its historical content and every known commentary on them, it is with the Shi ji 史記 (Records of the Grand Historian) of Sima Qian 司馬遷 (135 ?-93 BCE) that Naitō identified the emergence of conscious historical writing. After the perceived disorder of the Warring States era, there was a general tendency in the Han toward the unification of thought, and Naitō saw the Shi ji as the result of efforts to unify the historical records that had accumulated theretofore. Unlike his father, Sima Tan 司馬談 (d. 110 BCE), from whom he inherited the work of compiling the Shi ji, Sima Qian fell heavily under the influence of Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (179 ?-104 ? BCE) and the Gongyang 公羊 tradition. Naitō interestingly argued that, while the Shi ji 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; it was not born simply out of the “demands of the times” but out of Sima Qian's great genius.⁴

Such an evaluation might seem a bit jejeune in our presently hypercritical age, but what did Naitō identify as Sima Qian's “genius?” First and foremost, the use of a comprehensive approach to history 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. History was a process involving change over the longest of

³ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 15-19. Also dealt with in detail in Naitō 1915.

⁴ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 106-108.

longues durées. Unlike his father who was influenced by Daoism, Sima Qian saw himself, perhaps exaggeratedly, as the heir to a *daotong* 道統 or “orthodox lineage” from the Duke of Zhou through Confucius to himself.⁵ Like his father, though, Sima Qian believed that the historian’s task was a hereditary commitment to speak the truth and thus to explain how history had culminated in the Han dynasty.

Naitō felt that the *Shi ji* had not been appreciated in its day, largely because it was followed by the *Han shu* 漢書 (History of the Former Han dynasty) of Ban Gu 班固 (32-92), a single-era history that set the mold for much of the history writing that ensued. Only at a much later date were the contributions of the *Shi ji* recognized. Naitō reserved special praise for Shao Jinhan’s 邵晉涵 (1743-96) penetrating analysis of the text; Shao’s work was prepared for the *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries, a massive book-collecting project aimed at assembling a complete imperial library) project but rejected by Ji Yun 紀昀 (1724-1805) who disagreed with its content. Shao showed that, while the narrative style of the *Shi ji* followed the general line of the *Zuo zhuan* 左傳 (Zuo commentary [on the Spring and Autumn Annals]), its fundamental understanding of history differed greatly. Naitō agreed with Shao that Sima Qian believed in and trusted the ancient text editions of the classics while taking his general principles of what to chronicle from the *Gongyang zhuan* 公羊傳 (Gongyang commentary).⁶

Whereas Sima Qian admitted that there were certainly chronicles and writings before his work, they tended to represent the views of one school or family. His work aimed at inclusiveness and unity, looking at the entirety of history to find cause and effect. One thing Naitō took Sima Qian to task 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. Still, he argued that Sima Qian was China’s first synthetic, comprehensive historian and that he was not fully appreciated until much later in history. In assessing how Sima Qian compiled the various sections of his *magnum opus*, Naitō strongly endorsed the positive views of the Qing-period scholar Fang

⁵ This particular theme has been analyzed in great detail by Steven Durrant 1995 in his somewhat psychoanalytical biography of Sima Qian.

⁶ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 110-112.

Bao 方苞 (1668-1749). It was Zhang Xuecheng 章學誠 (1738-1801), though, who first understood the great importance of Sima Qian's work as a whole, and it was Naitō Konan who brought Zhang and his writings out of oblivion in the early twentieth century.⁷

A number of scholars did appreciate the *Shi ji* and sought to continue it beyond the reign of Han Wudi 漢武帝 (r. 140-86 BCE), the point at which Sima Qian had stopped. The Later Han 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 *Shi ji* but with the – for Naitō – all-important difference that his work no longer encompassed the full run of history. It was to be the history of a single era. Upon his death, his son Ban Gu completed the lion's share of the work. 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 (1104-62) of the Song levelled a vitriolic attack on it for precisely the same reason. Zheng argued that Ban Gu, despite his claim of admiration for the *Shi ji*, clearly could not have understood its central message that only a complete history from antiquity through the present could capture the complexity of causation in the historical process.⁸

This was generally Naitō's position as well. Though he is far from dismissive of the work of the Bans, he nonetheless can barely hide his profound enthusiasm for later Chinese historians who clearly identified Sima Qian's greatness in his adoption of a *tong* 通 or comprehensive approach to history from *gu* 古 to *jin* 近 (from antiquity to more recent times). Thus, he frequently cites writings in praise of the *Shi ji* by Fang Bao, Zhang Xuecheng, and others; the Tang-period stylist Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (773-819) is credited with dubbing Sima Qian's style *jie* 潔, meaning precise and clear in describing events, unlike the more confused Ban Gu.⁹

⁷ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 113, 115-116, 124-129, 131-133. Having come upon Zhang's work in the late 1910s, Naitō prepared a chronological biography of him which spurred further work by Hu Shi 胡適 (1891-1962) and others. See Naitō 1920. I have discussed this whole complex Sino-Japanese revival of interest in Zhang in Fogel 1979: 230-233.

⁸ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 136-38. Zheng Qiao had other criticisms of the *Han shu* as well.

⁹ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 141-142.

Despite their differences, with the *Shi ji* and *Han shu*, a foundation was established in Chinese historical writing in which chronicling the lives of individuals and families (*jizhuan* 紀傳體) was central to the task – as opposed to the earlier chronological approach to history which was structured around a given year's events (*biannian* 編年體). In the subsequent few centuries many different kinds of works would appear written in both styles, and the struggle continued for some time. The number of historical works grew so large over the next few centuries that by Tang times China's first historical critic or historiographer, Liu Zhiji, emerged to pen his famous *Shi tong* 史通 (Generalities on history). Despite his title, though, Liu favored the *Han shu* approach to history writing, and, as Naitō put it, failed to appreciate the subtleties of the *Shi ji*.¹⁰

One development to which Naitō devoted considerable attention during the Six Dynasties and into the Tang era is that of the *leishu* 類書 or encyclopedia. Although recognized in their day primarily as compendia of historical data rather than history *per se*, Naitō averred that these large works were not simply piles of historical facts. Again, these collections categorized items not by distinct historical eras, but brought together like items over the long historical haul. Two especially noteworthy efforts in this vein were the *Tong dian* 通典 (Comprehensive statutes) of Du You 杜佑 (735-812) and the *Wenxian tongkao* 文獻統考 (Comprehensive analysis of documents) of Ma Duanlin 馬端臨 (ca. 1254-ca. 1323). These two works are singled out for their attention to history in a *gu-jin* fashion.¹¹ Note the presence of the character *tong* in both titles.

Over the course of the Six Dynasties period, the hereditary nature of the historian's job went into decline, in conjunction with the decline of aristocracy generally. In the early Tang, we find the first large-scale joint, state-sponsored project in the writing of the *Jin shu* 晉書 (History of the Jin dynasty). This marks the slow evolution of the merging of politics with historical scholarship, a point with which Liu Zhiji was especially unhappy. Only the keepers of the imperial diaries (*qijuzhu* 起居注) managed to retain their

¹⁰ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 144-145, 164-165, 168-172. For a recent examination of Liu historical thinking, see Inaba 1999: 197-277.

¹¹ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 173-178. Naitō returned to the subject of Du You's work on several occasions, most fully in one of his last published works, Naitō 1932.

independence in the face of emperors' efforts to doctor the record. By the Song, the emperors could see these diaries, thus signaling a substantive change in the manner in which historical materials were compiled. "Through the Tang, it was still an aristocratic government," noted Naitō reflecting his general view of the evolution of Chinese history, "and even if a historical official was an official for a single reign period, there was still a strong sense of the need to protect his duties." As the writing of history was no longer the work of hereditary officials or scholarly lineages and had to pass the prime minister's inspection, "history came to be controlled by those who held power. We can see here that, as China moved into the era of monarchical autocracy, the writing of history changed as well."¹² Although he had not at this point fully articulated his own theory of Chinese historical periodization, he had already clearly identified the Tang-Song transition as a key breaking point in the development of Chinese history. Dubbing this a "medieval" to "modern" transition would come a few years later.¹³

One of the longest chapters in Naitō's history of Chinese historical scholarship concerns the Song dynasty, second only to that 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 (Old Tang history) and the *Xin Tang shu* 新唐書 (New Tang history). The former was written between the Later Tang and Later Jin states of the Five Dynasties era and included copious amounts of material verbatim from Tang sources. In fact, Shao Jinhan praised it in his summary for the *Siku quanshu* project as: *shan yu xiang yin* 善於相因 (excellent in its use of others' [writings]). By contrast, the latter was the work of two men, Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007-72) 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 luminaries as Gu Yanwu 顧炎武 (1613-82) and Shao Jinhan – found little of value in the *Xin Tang shu*, but others, such as Ji Yun, came to its defense. Naitō himself found things of use in the later text, though he faulted it for not being as punctilious in

¹² Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 190-193, 249, citations on p. 193.

¹³ See Fogel 1984: chapter 5, esp. 205-210.

assessing historical fact as it might have been, such as in the use of fiction as a historical source.¹⁴

When he came to a discussion of the great *Zizhi tongjian* 自治通鑑 (Comprehensive mirror for aid in government) of Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019-89), another text with the character *tong* in its title, Naitō noted that, although intended as a kind of reference work, it was in style a chronicle (*biannian* 編年). He also 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 aristocratic to autocratic government, but he does not go into detail on this potentially fascinating topic. Like Sima Qian before him, Sima Guang effectively worked alone, used a comprehensive method, and worked on imperial order. However, the latter Sima had much more source material with which to work than his earlier namesake. And, perhaps an indication of its popularity, the *Zizhi tongjian* spawned numerous commentaries and imitators. Despite marked differences in organization, the *Zizhi tongjian* revived in a major way the *tongshi* style, searching for cause and effect over the long run of history.¹⁵

If Liu Zhiji began the Tang-Song transition in Chinese historiography, then Zheng Qiao completed it, according to Naitō. The main thrust of Zheng's introduction to his *Tong zhi* 通志 (Comprehensive treatise) 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, Zheng praised the *Shi ji* no end and lambasted the *Han shu* with equal force. The history of a single period, for all of its manageability, was doomed to failure, for long-term cause and effect transcended the rise and fall of dynasties or reign periods. Among pre-Qing historians and historical critics, Naitō considered Zheng Qiao a man of extraordinary brilliance and ranked on a par with Sima Qian. While Sima Guang in the eleventh century adopted the *biannian* style, Zheng Qiao a century later returned once again to the *jizhuan* style.¹⁶

¹⁴ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 194-201.

¹⁵ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 204-219.

¹⁶ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 228-229, 231-232.

After a thorough but somewhat dismissive discussion of Yuan-period historical work, Naitō proceeded to a much fuller examination of the Ming. From the Yuan (perhaps even the late Song) into the early Ming, there was a trend toward large-scale compilations, such as the Yongle dadian 永樂大典 (Yongle encyclopedia), a text in 22,211 juan on which 2,169 men worked. Many different historians are discussed and different trends suggested.

Surely the most extraordinary sub-section of this portion of the book is Naitō's 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 1901¹⁷ – Naitō was one of the figures centrally responsible for reviving interest in and study of Li's work, and this was the first serious examination of his historical work in any language over the previous few centuries. Naitō recognized him as an extremist both in personal inclination and scholarship, but saw his work within the general frames of his times. In his essentially biographical approach to history writing, Li, as is well known, 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. Although vilified in the early Qing, Naitō was sufficiently impressed to allocate to Li more space than to any other Ming figure in historical writing.¹⁸ As is now well known, Li Zhi paid with his life for his outré behavior and views.¹⁹

Another historian of the Ming who was not well known at the time of Naitō's lectures (nor is he that well known now) was Yang Shen 楊慎 (1488-1559), and yet Naitō devoted three pages to his work. The reason here is much simpler. Naitō saw Yang as an important Ming precursor of the textual critical movement of the Qing upon which he frequently lavished scholarly praise. Others whom he regarded as changing the field of historiography in a

¹⁷ This was a brief discussion of Li Zhi's Cang shu 藏書 (A book to be hidden away), in Naitō 1901.

¹⁸ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 265-278, with 273-278 on Li Zhi. I have examined the rediscovery and revival of Li Zhi in modern times in Fogel 1979: 233-234; see also Shimada 1970: 6-8.

¹⁹ See the fine chapter on him in Huang 1981: 189-221.

direction that the Qing period would develop to great lengths include: Wang Weijian 王惟儉 (jinshi 1595) and Chen Jiru 陳繼儒 (1558-1639).²⁰ Many other writers and texts for the Ming period are discussed by Naitō, but they all seemed to be measured, in one fashion or another, according to what would follow in the Qing. This was, to coin a phrase, a tough act to precede.

Reading and writing in the early decades of the twentieth century, the Qing period did not have the quaint sense of moderate distance at which we now hold it. Naitō had covered its political events as a journalist for the first twenty years of his adult life and then began his teaching career at Kyoto Imperial University in its last years, to say nothing of the fact that he lived over half his life during the last 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, sources, and philosophy of history. No Japanese, no Westerner, and certainly no one else could come close. Naitō's great respect for Qing-era historiography can be traced to what he perceived as its central focus on accuracy, such as establishing the correct version of given classics by devising sophisticated methods of examination. It also involved a perceived rejection of ideology riding roughshod over scholarship. All of this may sound hopelessly naïve 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 usual suspects of Qing kaozhengxue 考證學 from Gu Yanwu and Huang Zongxi 黃宗羲 (1610-95) 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, a man whose work Naitō was principally responsible for rediscovering – and Zhang was 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 (Ming history), compiled

²⁰ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 278-280, 281-282, 283, 285.

over a 60-year period in the early Qing. He seemed especially pleased by the efforts of Zhu Yizun 朱彝尊 (1629-1709) to abandon the semi-fictional *yeshi* (unofficial histories) as sources in favor of a methodology geared toward the *shilu* (veritable records) as the basis for writing the Ming dynasty's history. 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 (1619-92). Although each differed one from the next, he found admirable qualities in all of their historical writings.²¹

Much of the rest of his chapter on the Qing consists of explications of the main historical writings of countless figures from the time – some extremely famous, other all but unknown. His definition of “history” in this context is 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: Hu Chengnuo 胡承諾 (1607-1681), Yan Ruojia 閻若璩 (1636-1704), Quan Zuwang 全祖望 (1705-55), Wang Mingsheng 王鳴盛 (1722-98), Dai Zhen 戴震 (1723-77), Zhao Yi 趙翼 (1727-1814), Qian Daxin 錢大昕 (1728-1804), Cui Shu 崔述 (1740-1816), Hong Liangji 洪亮吉 (1746-1809), and many others.²² The list is so long and so rich, it simply overwhelms the (modest) reader. At the very end of the text of Naitō's history, prepared from students' notes after the fact, we find only 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, a writer who doesn't know his own intentions and writes recklessly” 梁啟超 不知其意而妄作者.²³

As taken as Naitō was with so many Chinese historians from Sima Qian on, especially those of the Qing, the work of Zhang Xuecheng held a particularly strong attraction for him. In part, this may be due to the fact that Naitō

²¹ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 294-296, 301, 298-302 (on Huang), 302-305 (on Gu), and 306-310 (on Wang). On the Ming *shilu*, see Franke 1961: 60-77.

²² Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 310-314, 321, 325-326, 334-344, 349-350, 364, 388-396, *passim*.

²³ Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 447. Naitō only met Liang once, in 1899 in Japan, and was not overly impressed.

played a central role in the rediscovery and revival of interest in Zhang,²⁴ but there was much more to it than that. Despite his own predilection for hard-nosed, kaozheng-style historical scholarship, Naitō nonetheless found Zhang's theoretical approach to historiographical 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, *Wenshi tongyi* 文史通義 (General principles of literature and history) and *Jiaochou tongyi* 校讎通義 (General principles of correcting texts for errors), in 1902 after purchasing them in Hangzhou. In the mid-1910s, Naitō obtained an uncut edition of Zhang's complete works and read them from start to finish. On this basis he wrote up a brief *nianpu* 年譜 (chronological biography) 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.²⁵

Naitō saw Zhang's scholarly roots in Liu Xiang 劉向 (77 BCE- 6 CE) and Liu Xin 劉歆 (d. 23 CE) of the Han, Liu Zhiji, and Zhang Qiao, and he developed at length a number of Zhang's more intriguing methodological theories, such as the ideas that "the six classics are all history." While Zhang's scholarly aim may have seemed in the final analysis to be philosophical, Naitō opined that it was fundamentally historiographic. Zhang was not out to record facts but to discover basic principles of the historical process. And, as he put it, all learning was historiography.²⁶ I dare say this view would strike many as perfectly appropriate even today.

In short, Naitō most appreciated Chinese historical works of a comprehensive nature – such as the *Shi ji* – works that looked at changes over the full run of history and not just a single dynastic era. He also appreciated works and historical methodologies that were geared toward gaining a more accurate picture of the past; thus, Li Zhi of the Ming who contested received wisdom on evaluation historical personalities and especially the great Qing scholars working in history and related disciplines found great favor with him. While he greatly 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 history, the men who came up

²⁴ Described in Fogel 1979: 230-233.

²⁵ "Shō Jissai sensei nenpu," in Naitō 1976: Vol. 7, 67-79; Naitō 1922.

²⁶ Naitō 1928, in Naitō 1976: Vol. 11, 471-472, 474-476, 482-483.

with the ideas that changed the way we understand the past – first and foremost, Zhang Xuecheng.

References cited

- Fogel, Joshua A. (1979) "One 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*, Fogel, Joshua A. and Rowe, William T. ed. (1979). Boulder: Westview Press, 219-53.
- (1984), *Politics and Sinology: The Case of Naitō Konan (1866-1934)*. Cambridge/Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University; Japanese translation by Inoue Hiromasa 井上裕正 (1989), *Naitō Konan, poritikku su to shinorōjii 内藤湖南、ポリティックスとシノロジイ* (Naitō Konan, Politics and Sinology). Tokyo: Heibonsha.
- Franke, Wolfgang (1961), "The Veritable Records of the Ming Dynasty," in *Historians of China and Japan*, Beasley W. G. and Pulleyblank E. G. eds. (1961). London: Oxford University Press, 60-77.
- Durrant, Steven (1995), *The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writings of Sima Qian*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Huang, Ray (1981), *1587, A Year of No Importance: The Ming Dynasty in Decline*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Inaba Ichirō 稲葉一郎 (1999), "Ryū Chiki to Shi tsū 劉知幾の史通 (Liu Zhiji and the Shi tong)", in his *Chūgoku no rekishi shisō 中国の歴史思想* (Chinese historical thought), 197-277. Tokyo: Sōbunsha.
- Naitō Konan (1976), *Naitō Konan zenshū 内藤湖南全集* (Collected works of Naitō Konan). Tokyo: Chikuma shobō (hereafter, NKZ).
- (1901), "Dokusho ki sansoku 讀書記三則 (Notes on three books read)", in *Nihonjin 日本人* (August 5, 1901), reprinted in *Mokuto shodan 目睹書譚* (Notes on books perused) (1948), in NKZ 12: 23-30.
- (1915), "Shina ni okeru shi no kigen 支那に於ける史の起原 (The origins of history in China)", lecture of December 6, 1915, in *Kenki shōroku 研幾小録* (Short essays for clarification, 1928), reprinted NKZ 7:145-158.
- (1920), "Shō Jissai sensei nenpu 章實齋先生年譜 (Chronological biography of Zhang Shizhai)", in *Shinagaku 支那學* 1. 3-4 (October 1920), in NKZ 7:67-79.
- (1922) "Ko Tekishi no shincho Shō Jissai nenpu o yomu 胡適之の新著章實齋年譜を讀む (Reading Hu Shizhi's recent work, a chro-

nological biography of Zhang Shizhai”, in *Shinagaku* 支那學 2.9 (May 1922), in NKZ 7:80-90.

- (1928) “Shō Gakusei no shigaku 章學誠の史學 (Zhang Xuecheng’s historiography)”, lecture of October 6, 1928 at the Kaitokudō 懷德堂, reprinted in NKZ 11:471-483.
- (1932) “Shōwa rokunen ichigatsu nijūrokunichi gokōsho hajime Kansho shinkō an 昭和六年一月廿六日御講書始漢書進講案 (Draft of a lecture to the emperor concerning a Chinese text given on January 26, 1931)”, in *Shinagaku* 支那學 (April 1932), reprinted in Kenki shōroku and in NKZ 7:226-237.

Shimada Kenji 島田虔次 (1970), “Watakushi no Naitō Konan 私の内藤湖南年 (Naitō Konan for me)”, in *Naitō Konan zenshū geppō* 内藤湖南全集月報 6 (June 1970), 5-8, recently reprinted in *Chūgoku no dentō shisō* (Traditional Chinese thought). Tokyo: Misuzu shobō, 2001, 322-328.