Naitō Konan and Hunan Studies

LIU Yuebing*

Introduction

In China in the twentieth century, scholarly interest in research on Naitō Konan was limited to a few "fragmentary bits of knowledge" by individual scholars.[1] But in the twenty-first century, after the publication of Qian 2004,[2] Naitō's main works were successively translated into Chinese and published,[3] an increasing number of various studies of Naitō appeared, and the newest Japanese research results have been quickly translated and published in China.[4]

In recent years there have appeared two distinct trends in Chinese studies of Naitō. The first is that with the greater scholarly interaction between China and Japan, some Chinese scholars are studying in Japan and then returning to China. As a result, their scholarly ways of thinking and their methods of research are heavily influenced by the Japanese academic world, and they strongly respect and identify with the Japanese view of how to carry out research. In the field of Naitō studies, Naitō Konan Kenkyūkai 2005 is a typical example. All the authors of this work, members of the Naitō Konan

---

* Liu Yuebing is a professor at the Institute of Japan Studies of Nankai University. He specializes in the history of Japanese thought and the history of Sino-Japanese intellectual and cultural interaction.

1 Yan Shaodang, in the Forward to Qian 2004.

2 In the Forward to Qian 2004, Yan Shaodang gives the following positive assessment of the significance of this work: "This book is the first work by a Chinese scholar to thoroughly examine the scholarship of a Japanese scholar having considerable authority in the Japanese field of China studies and, at nearly the same level of scholarship, to state his judgment of the cultural legacy of Naitō's substantive and fair-minded scholarship.

3 These translations include Naitō 2005 (his history of Chinese painting), Naitō 2007 (his travel description of China), Naitō 2008 (his history of Chinese historiography), Naitō 2012 (his studies in the history of Japanese culture), and Naitō 2009 (a collection of his Chinese poetry and essays).

4 For example, in 2005 Sanqin Chubanshe published Naitō 2005.

Kenkyūkai, greatly admire his scholarship, and according to Tanigawa Michio (in the Preface to the Chinese translation), all the translators of this work are "scholars influenced by the Kyoto School, initiated by Naitō Konan himself. One of the translators, Hu Baohua, in his introduction of this work, describes in detail the postwar criticism of Naitō's "China thesis" and the reaction of Tanigawa in his 2001 essay. After explicitly pointing out that criticisms of Naitō were mostly biased, superficial remarks and that Naitō was not an advocate of Japan's invasion of China, Hu asserts that this book was an inevitable product of Japan's punctilious academic environment, and that Naitō's methodology is still influential in twenty-first-century historical research.[5] Moreover, in his preface written specifically for the Chinese edition of this book, Tanigawa stresses that the originality of Naitō's thesis on Chinese history springs from his high evaluation of Chinese culture, and he points out that "Naitō's suggestions, because they arise from this perspective, may seem like advice to China, though from today's vantage point they may not seem advantageous to China."[6] Tanigawa thus strongly defends Naitō against charges of advocating a thesis contrary to China's interests.

In contrast to this trend, another trend is to criticize Naitō's views on China as intellectually fomenting a fascist Japanese desire to invade China. An example of this view is Yang Dongliang 2012. This essay takes the view that Naitō's China thesis, at its core, supported Japan's mission in China with such proposals as division of the Chinese nation, international control of China, and abandonment of its national defense, along with such contentions as its stimulation by another race, a change in the center of culture from China to Japan, and the outside development of its economy. The essay stresses that the striking features, as well as fatal flaws, of Naitō's China thesis are not only that it denigrated China but also, on the whole, that it underestimated the abilities and potentials of the Chinese people, and that it fed the colonial ambitions of the Western powers and Japan. In its conclusion, the essay states, "Naitō Konan was an accomplished Sinologist, but when he degenerated into the 'wise man' in favor of Japan's prewar national policy of invading China, his intuitive sense of right and wrong appropriate to a gentleman and scholar was swallowed up by narrow racial interests, and his extensive knowledge became a tool for justifying Japan's expansion in China. As a great prewar Japanese scholar, Naitō, through his knowledge and statements about China, had an influence on the Japanese government and public that was mostly negative. This bitter lesson is well worth remembering."[7]

5 Hu Baohua 2006.
6 Naitō Konan Kenkyūkai 2005, p. 4.
7 Yang Dongliang 2012.

These criticisms strike at the Achilles heel of Naitō's relevant views, but if we can clarify the inherent connections between Naitō's "negative" views and the whole of his historiography, these criticisms will perhaps be more persuasive. For this project, the writings of Matsubuchi Tatsuo and Tao Demin are highly worth consulting.[8]

I selected the topic "Naitō Konan and Hunan Studies" not only because of my interest in "modern Hunan Studies and Japan,"[9] but also because Hunan Studies 湘学 began as a school of Neo-Confucianism in the Song (960–1279) and Ming (1368–1644) dynasties called the Hunan School 湖湘学. But with the passage of time, "Hunan Studies" came to have different meanings. Broadly construed, "Hunan Studies" refers to the study of the Hunan region and of individuals born in the Hunan region who came under the influence of Hunan Studies.[10] Though Naitō laid the foundations for the Kyoto school of Japanese Sinology, it is also possible to place him in the eclectic school of traditional Japanese Sinology.[11] Hence, I wish to study the connection between Naitō and Hunan Studies, not just to deepen our understanding of him, his associations, and the influence he had on other areas of study, but also to reacquaint ourselves with the origins of Hunan Studies.

1 Naitō's Interest in Hunan Studies and His Avid Purchases of Works by Hunan Scholars

Scholars like Tao Demin and Qian Wanyue have already done considerable research on Naitō's associations with Chinese literati. Tao (2009) has given us many important leads for discovering Naitō's associations with Chinese literati. Among the items listed are a poem autographed by Wang Kaiyun 王闓運 and a hanging-scroll painting painted by Ye Dehui 葉德輝, which Tao explained as follows:

> Around the time of the 1911 Revolution, Naitō, for a time, had a great interest in Hunan Simple Learning [樸學, a Qing school of exegetical study of the Confucian classics], especially that of Wang Kaiyun and Ye Dehui. For Wang Kaiyun's *Xiangjun zhi* 湘軍志 (Annals of the Hunan Army), Naitō had these words of high praise: "His writing excels. In the last 500 years, one can say, no one has exhibited comparable literary

8 Matsubuchi Tatsuo 1983 and Tao Demin 2007. Qian Wanyue, in his 2008 review, introduces and evaluates the major arguments and historical contribution of the latter book under such headings as "Repaying One's Mentors," "Annotations and Supplementations," and "Stages and Schools."

9 See Liu Yuebing 2010.

10 See Fang Keli and Chen Daixiang 2007.

11 Aoe Shunjirō 1966, pp. 339–340.

> skill" (letter to Inaba Iwakichi dated December 11, 1908, Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 14, p. 457). "From the time when the style of *Wenxuan* 文選 entered the Western Han, Wang Kaiyun is the author whose style best exemplifies that of Jia Yi 賈誼 [200–169 BCE] and Sima Qian 司馬遷 [145 or 135–86 BCE]. Also, his scale is grander than that of Wang Zhong 汪中 [1745–1794]. Indeed, he is the best in all of Qing China" (letter to Inaba Iwakichi dated June 2, 1909, Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 14, p. 462). "Recently, the collected poetry and essays of Wang Kaiyun is popular in Kyoto. His essays are just like those of the Western Han" (letter to Inaba Iwakichi dated July 10, 1909, Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 14, pp. 463–464). Hence, in 1910 he bought books by Wang and Ye through Ye Dehui's student, Matsuzaki Tsuruo 松崎鶴雄, who lived in Changsha (letters to Matsuzaki Tsuruo dated July 25, 1910; November 21, 1910, July 27, 1911; and August 1, 1911, Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 14, pp. 474, 480, 483, 484). And from Mizuno Baigyō 水野梅曉 he acquired pictures of Wang Kaiyun and Wang Xianqian 王先謙 (letter to Inaba Iwakichi dated July 1, 1911, Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 14, p. 482). Naitō never met Wang Kaiyun or Ye Dehui. All of his exchanges with these two scholars were conducted through Mizuno Baigyō and Matsuzaki Tsuruo.[12]

When we read Naitō's letters to Matsuzaki Tsuruo in detail, we can see how enthusiastic he was about buying the works of Hunan scholars. In a letter of July 27, 1911, he wrote, "I already received the book you sent, *Yantie lun jiaokan ji* 鹽鐵論校勘記 (An Account of the Collation of *Discourses on Salt and Iron* [81 BCE]), by Mr. Wang. I am still not clear on how many works there are by Pi Xirui 皮錫瑞 [1850–1908]. For the time being, I am sending ten yen. Please buy them all. If this is not enough money, please ask for help from the new consul Mr. Okobira. Please also find some way to purchase Wang Kaiyun's *Lisao zhu* 离騷注 (Qu Yuan's *Li sao*, with Notes) and all of Ye Dehui's printed works.[13] In a letter dated August 1, 1911, he wrote, "I received three small packages. I got the 62 volumes in the collection by Mr. Ye and the 19 works by Pi Xirui. I cannot thank you enough! Pi Xirui's study of the Gongyang commentary on the *Spring and Autumn Annals* 春秋公羊傳 is quite interesting. Please purchase the rest of the books as well…. I am again sending ten yuan. The remaining books that I want you to buy are *Jinwen Shangshu shuzheng* 今文尚書疏證 (The Modern-Script *Book of History*, with Commentary), *Hanbei zheng jing* 漢碑徵經 (Principles of Evidence for

12 Tao Demin 2009, pp. 84–85.
13 Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 14, p. 483.

Han Stelae), *Xiaojing Zheng zhushu* 孝經鄭註疏 (Classic of Filial Piety, Annotated in the Henan Style), *Chunqiu jiangyi* 春秋講義 (Spring and Autumn Annals Explained), and *Shifutang pianwen shi* 師伏堂駢文詩 (Parallel Poetry of Pi Xirui). In addition, I must also trouble you to buy Wang Kaiyun's *Lisao zhu*. If the money is not enough, as I said before, please ask for help from the consul Mr. Okobira…. Recently, I find myself most interested in Hunan Simple Learning, and I want to do as much as I can to do a thorough study of it."[14] In a letter to Inaba Iwakichi dated February 25, 1913, he wrote, "The version of *Shengwu ji* 聖武記 [a military history of the Qing dynasty] that I got from the bookstore Bunkyūdō is indeed the first edition. I thus have all three editions [there were two versions of the third edition]. All three editions differ on certain points, so I could not give up trying to acquire the first edition."[15] On October 20, 1917, he wrote in a letter to Matsuzaki Tsuruo, "I asked Mr. Kuhara's research assistant, Yoshimura Heizō, to seek out a collection of Pi Xirui's poetry, and he readily favored me with a copy. Later, he also gave me a copy of Ye Dehui's *Liushu guwei* 六書古微 (Old Subtleties of the Six Classics). Every time, I am the recipient of unstinting munificence. I am most grateful…. I thought that I would like to travel in Hunan. I followed up on your introductions, but unfortunately could not realize my desire."[16] From these quotes, one can see that Naitō in the 1910s consistently maintained a deep interest in the works of Hunan Studies scholars such as Wei Yuan 魏源, Wang Kaiyun, Ye Dehui, and Pi Xirui.

At this time Naitō expressed his opinion of the general characteristics of Hunan Studies, that is, the Hunan School of exegesis. In the lecture "Shina gakumon no kinjō" 支那學問の近狀 (The Present State of Sinology), delivered in Hiroshima on August 8, 1911, he positively appraised the rapid development of studies in China during the last three centuries, and said that Japanese Sinology is a century behind China.[17] He presented a table dividing studies in China into the following several schools: the Western Zhejiang School 浙西學派 (which can be subdivided into the Wu School 吳派 and the Anhui School 皖派), the Eastern Zhejiang School 浙東學派, the Changzhou School 常州學派 (known for its studies of the Gongyang commentary on the *Spring and Autumn Annals*), the Yan Yuan and Li Gong School 顏李學派, and the Hunan School 湖南學派. He listed Wang Fuzhi 王夫之 and Zeng Guofan 曾國藩 as belonging to the Hunan School, but Wei Yuan, Wang Kaiyun, and Pi Xirui he listed as belonging to the Changzhou School. He evaluated the

14 Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 14, p. 484.
15 Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 14, p. 499.
16 Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 14, p. 516.
17 "Shina gakumon no kinjō" 支那学問の近状, in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 6, p. 53.

Hunan School as follows: "Though this school does not have all the trappings of a formal school, there was a scholar named Wang Fuzhi in Changsha, Hunan, from the late Ming to early Qing period. At first his works were not transmitted for a time and were not popular, but after Zeng Guofan put down the Taiping rebels and the leaders of Hunan reestablished civil order, Hunan Studies, which had already foreshadowed a return to prosperity, underwent much development. Hunan thinkers naturally followed the style of thought of the local scholar Wang Fuzhi. Hunan scholars coming after Zeng Guofan included such notables as Wang Kaiyun and Wang Xianqian, and they all esteemed Wang Fuzhi. Hence, his school of thought gradually became quite influential."[18]

Volume 14 of Naitō 1969–1976 contains a letter that Naitō wrote for Count Ōtani Kōzui 大谷光瑞 to Minister Qu Hongji,[19] and the Naitō Collection of Kansai University Library has drafts 1 to 4 of this letter. In this letter he wrote, "A certain gentleman [1–4: Kōzui] heard that Hunan has beautiful scenery, rich land, and healthy people. Recently, lesser civil and military leaders—Wang Kaiyun and Wang Xianqian [1–4 also listed Ye Dehui]—were previously active uniting followers.[20] Now that your excellency, with farsighted vision and renown reputation, is in a position of leadership, is there any doubt that the people of the region will again prosper? Formerly, you set the great agenda and gathered around you capable men, and all flocked to the cause. As a result, there are young men again in Hunan. Hence, the benefits flowing from your excellency's staff are great indeed!"[21] One can thus see

18 Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 6, p. 63.

19 Qu Hongji 瞿鴻禨 (1850–1918), from Shanhua (now Changsha) in Hunan, had the courtesy name Zijiu 子玖 and the sobriquet Zhian 止盦. A presented scholar during the Tongzhi period (1862–1874). He successively held the positions of Academician Expositor-in-Waiting; Academician of the Grand Secretariat; and Provincial Education Commissioner of Henan, Zhejiang, Sichuan, and Jiangsu. In 1900 during the Eight-Nation Alliance's occupation of Beijing, he fled with the imperial court to Xi'an. Having gained the emperor's trust, he served as Minister of Public Works and Grand Minister of State. He also participated in the work of drafting a constitution. After the Revolution of 1911, he served in the Upper House of Parliament in Yuan Shikai's government. His published works include *Shiyu riji* 使豫日記 (Henan Diary) and *Zhian shiwen ji* 止盦詩文集 (The Collected Poetry and Prose of Qu Hongji).

20 Naitō, in his literary Chinese original, used courtesy names. Wang Kaiyun's courtesy name was Renqiu 壬秋, Wang Xianqian's courtesy name was Yiwu 益吾, and Ye Dehui's courtesy name was Huanbin 奐彬. It is not known why Ye Dehui was dropped from the version of the letter appearing in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 14.

21 Letter to Minister Qu, for Count Ōtani Kōzui, Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 14, p. 256.

how, in certain regards, Naitō had high expectations for the development of Hunan Studies.

2 Why Was Naitō Interested in Hunan Studies?

As mentioned above, the reason that Naitō was interested in the published works of Hunan scholars and wanted to thoroughly study them was that Hunan Studies had the characteristics of Simple Learning and Simple Learning was precisely the sort of learning that Naitō advocated.

In terms of his scholastic heritage, Naitō, as stated above, belongs to the eclectic school of traditional Japanese Sinology. This eclectic school has been described as "not partial to Zhu Xi 朱熹, Wang Yangming 王陽明, or the exegesis of ancient Chinese words. Rather, it selected among early Chinese commentary and the philosophical theories of Song and Ming thinkers, studied the legacy of past sages, and corrected the shortcomings of prior learning."[22] Naitō himself thought to make Simple Learning into a paradigm for scholarship, and he began to see this task as an important issue regarding the quality of national scholarship at Kyoto Imperial University. In 1901 he published in the Osaka Asahi Shimbun the essay "Kyōto Daigaku to bokugaku no shi" 京都大学と朴学の士 (Kyoto University and Scholars of Simple Learning), in which he identified true scholars as "adherents of Simple Learning."[23] Drawing a contrast with politicians and bureaucrats, he asserted, "All scholars are adherents of Simple Learning." Taking the Qing scholarship that he revered as an example, he said, "During over two centuries of Qing rule, adherents of Simple Learning have appeared in droves. This is something rarely seen in history. From Gu Yanwu 顧炎武 [1613–1682] of Kunshan and Huang Zongxi 黄宗羲 [1610–1695] of Yuyao, who as holdovers from the Ming dynasty lived in retirement without serving and pursued their noble attainments, to Yan Ruoqu 閻若璩 [1636–1704] of Taiyuan, Hui Dong 惠棟 [1697–1758] of Wu District, Jiang Yong 江永 [1681–1762] of Maoyuan, Dai Zhen 戴震 [1724–1777] of Xiuning, Wang Zhong 汪中 [1745–1794] of Jiangdu, and the more recent Chen Li 陳澧 [1810–1882] of Panyu—all of these scholars excelled at studying the classics, maintaining the tradition, and glossing ancient works because they were adherents of Simple Learning. Carrying out the technical research of the West requires intensive study by experts and thus precludes an ambitious individual from pursuing more than one field. Hence, scholars [engaged in the humanities] are adherents of Simple Learning." Naitō though that in the new age, training scholars in the tradition of Simple Learning was the natural mission of Kyoto University. He

22 Aoe Shunjirō 1966, p. 339.
23 Naitō 1901a.

hoped that the faculty of the university would "maintain the spirit of research in the Simple Learning tradition, cease producing overfine studies filled with evidentiary minutia, and approach scholarship from the perspective of critiquing culture and reforming society. If we can develop the simple, austere spirit of the study of former times, then, who knows, perhaps the new modes of thought desired by the masses may arise from therein." Perhaps "the spirit of study at Kyoto University" will rise even to "the level of issues concerning the nation."

Textual criticism 校勘學 is the most basic area of study within Simple Learning, and it is an area that Naitō considered important. He wrote, "Most people think that Japanese textual criticism fell out of favor after the Tokugawa period, when the world entered the age of heroes, who did not take to textual criticism. But in fact, that is not at all what happened. During the Qing dynasty in China, He Zhuo 何焯 [1661–1722], Qian Zeng 錢曾 [1629–1701], Lu Wenzhao 盧文昭 [1717−1793], Huang Pilie 黃丕烈 [1763–1825], Qin Enfu 秦恩復 [1760–1843], and Gu Guangqi 顧廣圻 [1776–1835] established their expertise in the field of textual criticism. The renown scholar Qian Daxin 錢大昕 [1728–1824], for example, achieved success primarily through textual criticism. In Japan, Yamanoi Tei 山井**鼎** [1670–1728], Yoshida Kōton 吉田篁墩 [1745–1798], Kariya Ekisai 狩谷棭**齋** [1775–1835], Ichino Meian 市野迷庵 [1765–1826], and Matsuzaki Kōdō 松崎慊堂 [1771–1844] left an solid scholarly legacy that became the field of Sinology in the universities. Likewise for European scholarship. Most studies on Indo-European languages are efforts at textual criticism." Methodologically, he affirmed that the contribution of Japanese national studies 國學 stems from significant textual critiques in the tradition of Simple Learning. He held that "Japanese national studies from the time of Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵 [1697–1769] have a history of less than two centuries, yet its methodology is nearly as advanced as that of modern European science. One important factor, it must be said, lies in the fact that Mabuchi initiated ancient Japanese language studies, and that from Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長 [1730–1801] on, scholars engaged in extensive textual criticism. The development of national studies over the past century has greatly benefited from Motoori's great wisdom." In addition, he noted that Tominaga Nakamoto 富永仲基 [1715–1746] could develop his path-breaking ideas because he was able to benefit from textual criticism. In particular, because he did a textual critique of the sutras, he could produce *Shutsujō kōgo* 出定後語 (Emerging from Meditation)."[24]

On the balance between scholarship and politics, Naitō consistently expressed admiration of "Qing Simple Learning scholars who forsook

24 Naitō 1901b. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 4, p. 291.

government work for a life of scholarship." He thought that "pursuing private scholarship leads not to extravagant thoughts but to the unpretentious study of the classics and history," and that "to propagate the Way in order to maintain Confucian orthodoxy and thus to establish peace throughout the ages" is "a most noble ideal."[25] Yet at the same time, he was no ivory-tower scholastic, especially with regard to the problem of China. In an essay commenting on the appointment of Hattori Unokichi 服部宇之吉 as an instructor at Beijing University, he wrote that he hoped that Hattori "would assume his post with the intention of living in China over the long term," since "the post of instructor is the pinnacle of Qing education. The students trained there will someday occupy important positions. Such influence and such potential should not be forsaken for money or power." He encouraged Hattori to "persevere," to go "with the intention of being buried in China, in order to fulfill this great responsibility. Doing so would improve Chinese treatment of Japanese and increase Japanese influence in China to a point where Japan need no longer fear competition with other nations. This is my greatest wish for Mr. Hattori as he goes to assume his post of cultivating young Chinese. I would hope that others who work in China would do likewise. The Qing government, I hear, also wants to hire a diplomatic consultant. Not only is work in the very challenged Chinese diplomatic corps a natural fit for a Japanese scholar; a position of such responsibility would also be a great honor for such a scholar."[26] From what Naitō writes, his desire for practical benefit is readily apparent.

In his 1924 work *Shin Shina ron* 新支那論 (A New Treatise on China), Naitō distinguished high-level studies from low-level studies in Simple Learning. "High-level studies are those that have a philosophical rationale for the methodology employed, that greatly advance scholarship by means of rigorous textual criticism, and that thus clarify poorly understood aspects of traditional culture." In contrast, low-level Simple Learning studies are those that tread a well-worn path, and that "make much of trivial textual research."[27]

Naitō also critiqued Hunan scholars in terms of the above tendencies of Simple Learning and views of worldly affairs.

3 Naitō's Appraisal of Hunan Scholars

Naitō's evaluation of Hunan Studies focuses on Wang Fuzhi and later

25 Naitō 1916b; also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 4, p. 544. Naitō 1916a; also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 4, p. 532.
26 Naitō 1902. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 3, pp. 469, 470.
27 Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 5, p. 536.

scholars. In his discussion of Song historiography in *Shina shigakushi* 支那史學史 (A History of Chinese Historiography), he appraised Hu Anguo 胡安國 (1074–1138) and Hu Yin 胡寅 (1098–1156), his adopted son, as follows: "Hu Yin's *Du shi guanjian* 讀史管見 (A Reading of History) is rather harsh among historical treatises. He discusses everything from a moralistic vantage point, and this shortcoming of his has been criticized. The reason for this point of view is that historiography of the time was influenced by *Chunqiu* 春秋 (The Spring and Autumn Annals). His father, Hu Anguo, rejected the three commentaries on the *Chunqiu* and wrote his own commentary, *Chunqiu Hu-shi zhuan* 春秋胡氏傳 (The Spring and Autumn Annals, with Commentary by Mr. Hu), based on the classics. The Zhu Xi school used this commentary rather than the three traditional commentaries. The viewpoint expressed in this commentary also infected *Du shi guanjian*, which follows *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑 (A Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government), a work that presents and discusses history. Another book written with the same guiding principle, but more prudently applied, is Zhu Xi's *Tongjian gangmu* 通鑒綱目 (Outline and Digest of *A Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government*)."[28] From this quote we can see Naitō's criticism of moralistic history and also the connection between the research of Hu father and son and that of Zhu Xi. Below I will discuss relevant writings of Wang Fuzhi, Wei Yuan, Zeng Guofan, and other Hunan scholars of the late Qing and early Republican period.

3.1 Wang Fuzhi

Naitō thought that Wang Fuzhi (1619–1692) was such a respected Hunan scholar on account of his noble character and outstanding knowledge. As an illustration of his noble character, Naitō mentions an incident that occurred during the revolt of Zhang Xianzhong 張獻忠 at the end of the Ming dynasty. Because Wang refused Zhang's summons to serve, Zhang arrested Wang's father. Wang then beat himself to show contrition and asked that his father be released. Naitō thought that it was this noble act on the part of Wang that enabled both father and son to gain their freedom.

Naitō devoted a section of his *Shina shigakushi* to Wang's scholarship.[29] In it he focused primarily on the following two aspects: that Wang's views of history amounted to views of current events, and that Wang insisted on clarity in his opposition to discussing the Confucian tradition. Naitō first affirmed that "among scholars of the late Ming and early Qing period, Wang had especially strong views on history, having authored some well-known, systematic

28 Naitō 1949. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 11, p. 215.

29 Naitō 1949, chapter 12, "Qing Historiography," section 4, "Wang Fuzhi and Hu Chengnuo." Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 11, pp. 306–310.

works, to wit, *Du Tongjian lun* 讀通鑒論 (A Reading of *A Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government*) and *Song lun* 宋論 (On Song History).” Naitō thought that Wang had so many brilliant ideas on history because he was so thoroughgoing in seeking the truth. In discussing Wang Fuzhi, Naitō would often compare him to Gu Yanwu and Huang Zongxi. Naitō thought that some of Wang’s views of history “were an expression of his deep feelings about the collapse of the Ming dynasty, that he borrowed events of the past to discuss current events. Many scholars of the time—men such as Gu, Huang, and Wang—all advanced views of history arising from their strong feelings about the present. In fact, we can say that their views of history approached views of current events.” Naitō also noted, “Some of Wang Fuzhi’s other works, such as *Huang shu* 黃書 (On the Yellow Emperor) and *Emeng* 噩夢 (Nightmare), are like Huang Zongxi’s *Ming-yi daifang lu* 明夷待訪錄 (A Record of Ming Dealings with the Barbarians) in that they alluded to current policies and hence are remarkable for their insights. Huang Zongxi argued that the Ming dynasty collapsed because the emperor had too much authority, and Wang Fuzhi elaborated on Huang’s ideas from the basic perspectives of the land, people, and state. These ideas where no doubt part of the zeitgeist of the time.

Naitō also pointed out that Wang did not discuss the Confucian tradition, because he thought that the controversy over the Confucian tradition was pointless. This attitude too arose from his deep feelings over the Ming dynasty’s succumbing to the barbarians. “He did not discuss the Confucian tradition, because he thought that the Confucian tradition ended with the Song dynasty. Here his mention of the Song dynasty is actually a reference to the Ming dynasty. Publically mentioning the Ming dynasty might incur the wrath of the Qing court, so he dared to mention only up to the Song dynasty. But to say that the Confucian tradition ended with the Song dynasty was a way of obliquely saying that the Confucian tradition ended with the barbarian Qing court’s conquest of the Ming dynasty.” In addition, in *Shina shigakushi* (1949), chapter 9, “The Development of Song Historiography,” in a section devoted to the controversy over the Confucian tradition, Naitō uses Wang’s thought to sum up. Wang thought that Ming patriots were claiming an end to the Confucian tradition as a way of remaining loyal to the Ming dynasty, and he saw this maneuver as a private matter, and not as a public debate. Naitō praised Wang’s view, saying, “This is a rather open thesis rarely seen among Chinese scholars. Unfortunately, such openness is not commonly practiced among Chinese. Even with a view that one is highly suspicious of, like the extinction of the Confucian tradition at the end of the Song dynasty, in China there are restrictions on what one can say, even today. To understand Chinese

thought, it is especially important to note this point."[30]

3.2 Wei Yuan

In *Shina shigakushi*, in a section on "Northwest Geography" in the chapter on "Qing Historiography," Naitō comprehensively discussed the thought of the historian Wei Yuan (1794–1857). He evaluated Wei Yuan thus: "He has a deep interest in research. Moreover, his historiography is not limited merely to textual evidence for the facts. He can also discern the evolution of changes in the society at large. In writing geographical and historical works, he pursues his interest in the rise and fall of states." Naitō thought that Wei Yuan's *Haiguo tuzhi* 海國圖誌 (Illustrated Gazetteer of the Countries Overseas) "is not just a geography book. On the one hand, it is his considered view of how China should deal with the world. On the other hand, it is a work of history of great interest for research." Commenting on Wei Yuan's *Shengwu ji* 聖武記 (A Record of the Military Achievements of the Qing Emperors), a history of contemporary Qing history, Naitō wrote, "Wei Yuan realized that from the height of prosperity during the Qianlong period [1736–1795] to about the time of the Jiaqing [1796–1820] and Daoguang [1821–1850] periods, the Qing court, in its administration, gradually lapsed into decline, and he noticed that the military system and finances gradually took a turn for the worse. It was his great interest in historical research on this topic that led him to write this work. Yet in places the work is somewhat careless in giving textual evidence for the facts. On this point, the work does not match the precision of *Huangchao fanbu yaolüe* 皇朝藩部要略 (A Concise Overview of the Barbarian Tribes under Our August Dynasty), by Qi Yunshi 祁韻士. Yet *Huangchao fanbu yaolüe* is a work that cannot excite any interest, whereas *Shengwu ji* arouses in the reader a great interest in history." While Wei Yuan's lack of care with regard to textual evidence detracts from the scholarship of his work, he "represents an effort of the time to explore new avenues of research." In classical studies, Wei Yuan followed the Gongyang tradition of scholarship on the *Spring and Autumn Annals*. "His works, like the chapters titled 'Additional Notes on Military Affairs' in *Shengwu ji*, took an especially synoptic view of history, clearly stating the rise and decline of the Qing court. The synoptic discussions of the Ming dynasty in his writings included herein are especially brilliant, particularly where he compares the Ming and Qing dynasties." Naitō emphasized that Wei Yuan "was not only a scholar but also an expert in statecraft." Naitō saw that late in the Daoguang period, the southern Gongyang tradition thrived, while that of textual criticism was in decline. "Northwest geography studies used this opportunity to develop. No

30 Naitō 1949. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 11, p. 227.

longer content to engage in historico-geographical textual studies, it began to pay attention to the world situation, in order to develop a new field of study. Though such studies were rudimentary, the spirit of the time was noteworthy."[31] Naitō thus highly evaluated Wei Yuan's interest in the world situation, commanding grasp of the course of history, and boldness in leading public opinion.

Naitō had more to say on Wei Yuan. On December 30, 1911, Naitō added the following note to a lecture about to be published: "Among the friends of Gong Zizhen 龔自珍 was the famous historian Wei Yuan (courtesy name, Moshen 默深), who wrote *Shengwu ji*. This man was a close friend of Dingan's, and he was the most capable Gongyang scholar. But late in life he became a Buddhist. Among the books published by Jinling Kejingchu 金陵刻經處 (Jinling Buddhist Publishing House) was the Yang Wenhui 楊文會 edition of *Jingtu sijing* 淨土四經 (Four Pure Land Sutras), a collection of three Pure Land sutras together with the Huayan sutra *Puxian xing yuan pin* 普賢行願品 (The Vows of Bodhisattva Puxian [Samantabhadra]). The copyist and proofreader was none other than Wei Yuan, who wrote a preface for the collection, which he signed 'Wei Chengguan 魏承貫, disciple of the bodhisattva precepts.' (This preface is not in Wei Yuan's collected works.)"[32] From this one can see that the connection between the Gongyang tradition and Buddhism that often appeared in Chinese scholarship of the time stems in large part from the influence Wei Yuan. Naitō found it "hard to believe" that "the Gongyang school, while extremely reverential of Confucius, gradually departed from Confucius in belief."[33] One common view is that this expert in statecraft Wei Yuan, in his late years, became a Buddhist and traded a world of earthly cares for the world of meditation because he was dissatisfied with and lost hope for the secular world and sought the opiate of religion.[34] But Wei Yuan, in the introduction to *Jingtu sijing*, states, "The kingly way operates in the world, and the Buddhist way rises above the world. The narrow-minded individual sees them as different, but the broad-minded individual sees them as the same." And again: "The sages of the East" can commend "the teachings of the West [Buddhism]."[35] Thus, "the broad-minded" can comprehend the common ground of Confucianism and Buddhism.

31 Naitō 1949. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 11, pp. 408–410.
32 Naitō 1912. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 5, p. 245.
33 Naitō 1912. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 5, p. 244.
34 Li Hu 2002, pp. 82, 218.
35 Wei Yuan 2004, vol. 20, p. 315.

3.3 Zeng Guofan

We can look at Naitō's appraisal of Zeng Guofan (1811–1872) from several angles. First, as Masabuchi Tatsuo writes, Naitō scholarship is an important foundation for the study of Qing scholar-bureaucrats.[36] Both in terms of intellectual sympathies and morality, Naitō identified with late-Qing scholar-bureaucrats like Zeng Guofan, as he made clear when he expressed his views during his tour of China. In 1917 Naitō toured China with Inaba Iwakichi 稲葉岩吉 and Takahashi Motokichi 高橋本吉, and on November 23 they met Hubei Army Commander Wang Zhanyuan 王占元. When they asked about the ruins of the memorial temple to Zeng Guofan and Hu Linyi 胡林翼 near the Yellow Crane Tower in Wuchang, Wang Zhanyuan replied that young members of the Chinese Revolutionary Party thought that Messrs. Zeng and Hu sent out an expedition against the Taiping rebels to assist the Qing court and thereby delayed the progress of the Chinese revolution, and that they destroyed their memorial temple out of anger at these two men. Naitō said, "Regardless of whether it helped the other side, for them to so easily forget the relief that these two men brought to this region and its people in the past just goes to show that Chinese have no reliable sense of integrity."[37] Several days later, on November 28, upon arriving in Changsha and seeing that the temple memorializing Zeng Guofan had become a temple memorializing revolutionary martyrs, Naitō sighed and said, "It is truly surprising to see the people of Hunan forget the great efforts of Zeng Guofan in saving this region from disaster fifty years ago, even going so far as to hate him, and come to revere the likes of Huang Xing 黃興 and Cai E 蔡鍔.[38]

Naitō praised Zeng Guofan as a politician, calling him a "gifted individual." He thought that Zeng Guofan, whose thought embraced elements of egalitarianism and democracy, offered solutions to the reform of China's political system. In his *Shina ron* 支那論 (On China), in a discussion of Zeng Guofan's life as a private secretary, Naitō noted that Zhen Guofan "led a life equal to that of his comrades in the army secretariat. This is solid evidence of equality in the army. Equally well known as Zhen Guofan at the time was the governor of Hubei, Hu Linyi. This man was even more magnanimous than Zhen Guofan. He was always humble and respectful, never claiming credit for himself, and always accepting of criticism, in carrying out the mission of subduing the Taiping rebels. Yet subduing the Taiping rebels was not something that could be accomplished by issuing decrees. Rather, it could be accomplished only with the cooperation born of democratic thinking and

36 Masabuchi Tatsuo 1983, p. 162.
37 Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 6, p. 464.
38 Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 6, p. 466.

egalitarianism. This thinking on the part of Chinese can play a large role in bringing about constitutional government, I believe."[39] Explicating such "democratic thinking and egalitarianism," Naitō went on to say, "Though [the Hunan army] has well-known men like Zeng Guofan and Hu Linyi marshalling the men under them, circumstances are not like those in the Japanese army, where higher-ranking officers command lower-ranking officers. Rather, officers are animated by a mutual spirit of cooperation. Hence, the Taiping rebels were put down not by conscientious soldiers carrying out commands, but by soldiers bravely fighting out of a commitment born of gratitude."[40] Naitō further elaborated in his 1924 *Shin Shina ron*, saying that by building on the relations of local organizations and teacher-student relationships, one could do creative things. He wrote, "Even in as militarily ill-prepared a country as China, one can develop a powerful army on the foundation of local organizations, and even in as bureaucratic a country as China, one can practice a creative politics by building on teacher-student relationships. Zhen Guofan discovered these two maxims about Chinese society, maxims that can serve as a paradigm for organizing Chinese society in the future." Naitō hoped that China could again produce such a gifted individual as Zhen Guofan, that China would not copy the politics of other countries, and that it would create a new political system best adapted to its political needs. Moreover, he believed that "if China could again produce such men as Zhen Guofan and Li Hongzhang 李鴻章, Chinese politics, both in domestic administration and foreign policy, could be greatly improved."[41] Perhaps for just this reason, Naitō listed, in his *Shomoku tōmon (shibu) hosei* 書目答問（史部）補正 (Questions and Answers on Chinese Books [History], Addendum), relevant works about Zeng Guofan: *Zeng Wenzheng gong dashi ji* 曾文正公大事記 (Major Events in the Life of Mr. Zeng Guofan), by Wang Ding'an 王定安; *Qiu Quezhai dizi ji* 求闕齋弟子記 (The Followers of Zeng Guofan), by Wang Ding'an; and *Zeng Wenzheng gong shoushu riji* 曾文正公手書日記 (Zeng Guofan's Handwritten Diary), by Zeng Guofan.[42]

Naitō was mostly positive in his evaluation of the statesman and essayist Zeng Guofan, but he was dissatisfied with the latter's approach to Song Neo-Confucianism[43] and his disregard for textual criticism. Naitō wrote,

39 Naitō 1914a. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 5, pp. 428–429.
40 Naitō 1912. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 5, p. 211.
41 Naitō 1924. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 5, pp. 517–518, 519, 520.
42 Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 12, pp. 535, 538.
43 In his 1915 lectures (Naitō 1944), in a discussion of the Daoguang (1821–1850) revival of Song Neo-Confucianism in the North by Tang Jian 唐鑒 of Hunan and the Mongolian bannerman Woren 倭仁, Naitō said, "When he heard of this development, Zeng Guofan, who was from Hunan, was very glad. Scholars of

"Generally, scholarship declined after the Taiping rebellion, especially in the Jiangnan area. At this time, Zeng Guofan, noted for his military accomplishments, sought to revive scholarship, but because he was a Hunan man from the countryside, and because he followed Song Neo-Confucianism, he never took up the excessive painstaking subtleties of textual criticism. Rather, he tried only to increase the publication of general works. Hence, most publications of the government presses of the South during the Tongzhi (1862–1874) and Guangxu (1875–1908) periods were general-interest books."[44]

3.4 Other Hunan Scholars

Above, I have already discussed Wang Kaiyun, Wang Xianqian, Ye Dehui, and Pi Xirui in talking about Naitō's purchases of Hunan scholars' books. Below, I will simply add to that discussion a little bit.

Wang Kaiyun was a superb writer and poet. In his 1915 lectures (Naitō 1944), Naitō said, "Wang Kaiyun, who is still alive and living in Hunan, and who is over eighty this year, is a literary genius. He was born with the ability to write. He combines parallel prose with the essay style to create limpid prose." "Wang Kaiyun is also a genius at poetry in the *Wenxuan* 文選 style."[45] In the field of history, Naitō highly appraised Wang Kaiyun's *Xiangjun zhi* for both its historical accuracy and its literary merit.[46]

About Wang Xianqian, Naitō was slightly critical. For example, Naitō thought that his *Hanshu buzhu* 漢書補注 (Supplemental Commentary on the History of the Han) "only uses the results of other scholars' research." And Naitō appraised his *Hejiao Shuijing zhu* 合校水經注 (Critical Edition of *Commentary on the Waterways Classic*) as "comparing all the available editions of *Commentary on the Waterways Classic*. The strong points of this work are its emendations and its conscientious comparisons, but it contains none of the author's own research." After the appearance of Donghua lu 東華錄 (Records of East China), by Jiang Liangqi 蔣良騏, Wang Xianqian "wrote

---

this school of thought think that Sinologists seemingly study trivial details, and not the great principles of morality. To study the great principles of morality, one must study Song Neo-Confucianism, that is, the philosophy of Cheng Hao 程顥, Cheng Yi 程頤, and Zhu Xi. Though Neo-Confucians like Zeng Guofan and Luo Zenan 羅澤南 have carried out such study, with the outbreak of the Taiping rebellion (1851–1864), they might better have encouraged men to apply Neo-Confucian principles to their individual characters, rather than trying to effect such principles in scholarship, for scholarship fell by the wayside" (Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 8, pp. 372–373).

44 Naitō 1949. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 11, p. 434.

45 Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 8, pp. 403, 410.

46 Naitō 1949. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 11, p. 439.

a supplement with the same title that adds to the Jiang version in that it is more detailed. Indeed, the Wang version can replace the *Shilu* 實錄 (Veritable Records) for the period, but this substitution comes at a cost of losing some of the interest of the other histories."[47]

Pi Xirui, Naitō revered as "a master of research on the *Shangshu* 尚書 (Book of History)." In "Gyōten no 'ge yong yan, sheng yi yong' niku ni tsukite" 堯典の歌永言声依永二句に就きて (On "ge yong yan, sheng yi yong" [Song lengthens the words, and the pitch depends on the length of the sound] in the "Canon of Yao"), an essay on the *Book of History*, Naitō discusses Pi Xirui together with Wang Xianqian. He wrote, "The two recent works *Jinwen Shangshu kaozheng* 今文尚書考證 (Textual Criticism of the Modern-Script *Book of History*), by Pi Xirui, and *Shangshu Kong zhuan canzheng* 尚書孔傳參正 (A Critical Examination of the Kong Anguo 孔安國 version of the *Book of History*), by Wang Xianqing, are primarily comparative studies of the real ancient-script *Book of History* theory 真古文說 and the modern-script *Book of History* theory 今文說…. Messrs. Pi and Wang did a detailed analysis of the ancient-script theory and various schools of thought on the modern-script theory. But worth noting is that the recent modern-script school of thought (that is, the Gongyang school), from its founder Zhuang Cunyu 莊存與, has not excluded the forged ancient-script *Book of History* from consideration. For example, the recent master of research on the *Book of History* Pi Xirui, while explaining why the Kong version of the *Book of History* is a forgery,…. stated that if the ancient-script and modern-script versions are mutually consistent, this only shows that the forged Kong version contains assertions of the earliest modern-script version of the *Book of History*, that transmitted by Ouyang Sheng 歐陽生."[48]

Ye Dehui, as mentioned above, was referred to in the four archive versions of the letter for Count Ōtani Kōzui to Minister Qu Hongji but is missing from the final version of the letter in Naitō 1969–1976. The reason for this omission still needs to be resolved. Also as mentioned above, Naitō, in his October 20, 1917, letter to Matsuzaki Tsuruo, wrote, "I thought that I would like to travel in Hunan. I followed up on your introductions, but unfortunately could not realize my desire." But in November he did tour Hunan. At that time Wang Kaiyun and Wang Xianqian had already passed away, and only Ye Dehui was still alive. Though there is a record of Naitō's visiting the Yuelu Academy on this trip, there is no record of his meeting with Ye Dehui.

47 Naitō 1949. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 11, pp. 353, 372, 437.
48 Naitō 1914b. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 7, p. 463.

Brief Conclusion

Shortly after Naitō passed away, Zhou Yiliang wrote an article introducing his scholarly accomplishments and discussing his contributions to the field of China historiography. He pointed out that Naitō "was most impressed, among all Chinese historians, by Du You 杜佑 of the Tang dynasty and Qian Daxin 錢大昕 and Zhang Xuecheng 章學誠 of the Qing dynasty. Naitō, I believe, resembled Qian Daxin in having broad interests, and he inherited the mantle of Zhang Xuecheng in his focus on the revision of history and the history of Chinese historiography. Moreover, in his enthusiasm for visiting historic sites in the Northeast, he reflects Du You's avidly pursuing human events in his works in order that men may bring good practices to management of the state and thereby effect good government."[49] Significantly, this quote reveals the key feature of Naitō's historiography and the thread holding it together. Naitō's enthusiastic purchase of the works of Hunan scholars shows his love of study, needless to say, but it also shows the influence that outstanding contemporary Chinese scholars had on the foundations of his scholarship. Moreover, his appraisals of Hunan scholars also reveal some features of his scholarship. For example, his statement that Wei Yuan "was not only a scholar but also an expert in statecraft" also applies to Naitō himself. And his uncovering the democratic strain in Zeng Guofan's thought displays not only a certain understanding of Chinese history but also a degree of hope for China's future development. In addition, Naitō's frank criticism of some

49 Zhou Yiliang 1934. Also in Zhou Yiliang 1998, p. 468. Du You (735–812), whose courtesy name was Junqing 君卿, wrote *Tongdian* 通典 (A Comprehensive Collection of Laws and Regulations), a work that initiated a section on "books on government" in the history books. On January 26, 1931, Naitō gave a lecture to the Japanese emperor on a section of *Tongdian*. (Naitō's *Kenki shōroku* 研幾小錄 [Short Essays for Clarification] contains "Shōwa roku nen ichi gatsu nijūroku nichi Gokōsho hajime Kansho shinkō an" 昭和六年一月廿六日禦講書始漢書進講案 [Draft of a New Year's Imperial Lecture on a Chinese Book, January 26, 1931]. See Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 7.) Qian Daxin (1728–1804), whose sobriquet was Zhuting 竹汀, was widely read, knowledgeable, and especially familiar with history. Naitō once wrote, "After Qian Daxin, basic research seeking to develop Chinese history into the history of all of East Asia has not produced another scholar who can take his legacy and continue such development" (Naitō 1949; also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 11, p. 416). Zhang Xuecheng (1738–1801), whose courtesy name was Shizhai 實齋, wrote *Wenshi tongyi* 文史通義 (The General Meaning of Literature and History), his signature work. Among Naitō's writings is *Zhang Shizhai xiansheng nianpu* 章實齋先生年譜 (A Chronicle of Mr. Zhang Xuecheng's Life). In his *Zhang Xuecheng zhi shixue* 章學誠之史學 (Zhang Xuecheng's Historiography), Naitō praised him, saying, "The style of his scholarship has vitality even today" (Naitō 1949; also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 11, p. 483).

scholars without doubt serves as a useful reference on the strengths and weaknesses of Hunan scholarship. However, topics such as Wei Yuan's and Pi Xirui's studies of the classics and ancient history, or again, the influence of Gongyang scholarship on Naitō's scholarly thought, will have to await further investigation in the future.

References

Aoe Shunjirō 青江舜二郎. *Ryū no seiza: Naitō Konan no Ajia-teki shōgai* 竜の星座：内藤湖南のアジア的生涯 (The Dragon Constellation: Naitō Konan's Asian Career). Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1966.

Fang Keli 方克立 and Chen Daixiang 陈代湘, eds. *Xiangxue shi* 湘学史 (A History of Hunan Studies). 2 vols. Changsha: Hunan Renmin Chubanshe, 2007.

Hu Baohua 胡宝华. "*Naitō Konan no sekai* jieshao" 《内藤湖南の世界》简介 (An Introduction to *The World of Naitō Konan*). *Zhongguo shehui lishi pinglun* 中国社会历史评论 7 (2006).

Li Hu 李蝴. *Wei Yuan yanjiu* 魏源研究 (Studies on Wei Yuan). Beijing: Chaohua Chubanshe, 2002.

Liu Yuebing 刘岳兵. "Jindai xiangxue yu Riben: Yi Yang Changji wei li" 近代湘学与日本：以杨昌济为例 (Modern Hunan Studies and Japan: The Case of Yang Changji). In *Xiangxue* 湘学, edited by Fang Keli and Chen Daixiang, vol. 5. Xiangtan: Xiangtan Daxue Chubanshe, 2010.

Matsubuchi Tatsuo 增渕龙夫. *Rekishika no dōjidaishi-teki kōsatsu ni tsuite* 歴史家の同時代史的考察について (On Historians' Studies of Contemporary History). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1983.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. "Kyōto Daigaku to bokugaku no shi" 京都大学と朴学の士 (Kyoto University and Simple Learning Scholars). *Ōsaka Asahi Shimbun*, August 14–15, 1901a. Also in Naitō Konan 1969–1976, vol. 3, pp. 271–275.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. "Hyakunō go" 百衲語 (Buddhist Terminology). *Ōsaka Asahi Shimbun*, October 23, 1901b. Also in Naitō Konan 1969–1976, vol. 4.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. "Pekin Daigaku kyōtō no ōhei" 北京大學教頭の応聘 (Taking Up a Position as Instructor at Beijing University). *Ōsaka Asahi Shimbun*, August 25, 1902. Also in Naitō Konan 1969–1976, vol. 3.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. *Shinchō suibō ron* 清朝衰亡論 (On the Decline and Fall of the Qing Dynasty). Tokyo: Kōdōkan, 1912. Also in Naitō Konan 1969–1976, vol. 5.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. *Shina ron* 支那論 (On China). Tokyo: Bunkaidō Shoten, 1914a. Also in Naitō Konan 1969–1976, vol. 5.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. "Gyōten no 'ge yong yan, sheng yi yong' niku ni tsukite" 堯典の歌永言声依永二句に就きて (On "ge yong yan, sheng yi yong" [Song lengthens the words, and the pitch depends on the length of the sound] in the "Canon of Yao"). *Geibun* 藝文, September 1914b. Also in Naitō 1969–1976, vol. 7.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. "Shina shōrai no tōchi" 支那將來の統治 (The Future Rule over China). *Ōsaka Asahi Shimbun*, February 28–March 3, 1916a. Also in Naitō Konan 1969–1976, vol. 4.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. "Shina koku kore no konpongi" 支那國是の根本義 (The

Significance of China). *Chūō Kōron*, March 1916b. Also in Naitō Konan 1969–1976, vol. 4.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. *Shin Shina ron* 新支那論 (A New Treatise on China). Tokyo: Hakubundō, 1924. Also in Naitō Konan 1969–1976, vol. 5.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. *Shinchōshi tsūron* 清朝史通論 (A General Discussion of Qing History). Tokyo: Kōbundō Shobō, 1944. Also in Naitō Konan 1969–1976, vol. 8.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. *Shina shigakushi* 支那史學史 (A History of Chinese Historiography). Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1949. Also in Naitō Konan 1969–1976, vol. 11.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. Naitō Konan zenshū 内藤湖南全集 (The Complete Works of Naitō Konan). 14 vols. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1969–1976.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. *Zhongguo huihua shi* 中国**绘**画史 (A History of Chinese Painting). Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2005. A translation of *Shina ega shi* 支那絵畫史.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. *Yan shan Chu shui* 燕山楚水 (The Mountains of Yan and the Rivers of Chu). Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2007. A translation of *En zan So sui* 燕山楚水.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. *Zhongguo shixueshi* 中国史学史 (A History of Chinese Historiography). Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 2008. A translation of *Shina shigakushi* 支那史學史.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. *Neiteng Hunan hanshiwen ji* 内藤湖南**汉诗**文集 (A Collection of Naitō Konan's Chinese Poetry and Prose). Guilin: Guangxi Shifan Daxue Chubanshe, 2009.

Naitō Konan 内藤湖南. *Riben lishi yu Riben wenhua* 日本**历**史与日本文化 (Japanese History and Japanese Culture). Beijing: Shangwuyin Shuguan, 2012. A translation of *Nihon bunkashi kenkyū* 日本文化史研究 (Studies in the History of Japanese Culture).

Naitō Konan Kenkyūkai 内藤湖南研究会. *Neiteng Hunan de shijie* 内藤湖南的世界 (The World of Naitō Konan). Xi'an: Sanqin Chubanshe, 2005. A translation of *Naitō Konan no sekai* 内藤湖南の世界.

Qian Wanyue **钱**婉**约**. *Neiteng Hunan yanjiu* 内藤湖南研究 (Studies on Naitō Konan). Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2004.

Qian Wanyue **钱**婉**约**. "Dangdai Riben hanxue yanjiu de qishi" 当代日本**汉**学研究的启示 (Inspiration for the Study of Japanese Sinology of the Past). *Zhongguo tushu pinglun* 中国**图书评论**2008, no. 4.

Tanigawa Michio 谷川道雄. "Sengo no Naitō Konan hihan ni tsuite" 戦後の内藤湖南批判について (On Postwar Criticism of Naitō Konan). In *Naitō Konan no sekai* 内藤湖南の世界, edited by Naitō Konan Kenkyūkai 内藤湖南研究会. Nagoya: Kawai Bunka Kyōiku Kenkyūjo, 2001."

Tao Demin 陶德民. *Meiji no kangakusha to Chūgoku: Yasutsugu, Tenshū, Konan no gaikō ronsaku* 明治の漢学者と中国: 安繹・天囚・湖南の外交論策 (Meiji Sinologists and China: The Foreign Policy Theories of Shigeno Yasutsugu, Nishimura Tenshū, and Naitō Konan). Suita, Japan: Kansai Daigaku Shuppanbu, 2007.

Tao Demin 陶德民. *Naitō Konan to Shinjin shoga: Kansai Daigaku Toshokan Naitō Bunko shozō hinshū* 内藤湖南と清人書画: 関西大学図書館内藤文庫所蔵品集 (Naitō Konan and the Calligraphy and Paintings of Qing Artists: Works Held in the Naitō Collection of Kansai University Library). Suita, Japan: Kansai Daigaku Shuppanbu, 2009.

Wei Yuan 魏源. *Wei Yuan quanji* 魏源全集 (The Complete Works of Wei Yuan). Changsha: Yuelu Shushe, 2004.

Yang Dongliang 杨栋梁. "Minguo chuqi Neiteng Hunan de 'Zhina lun' bianxi" 民国初期内藤湖南的"支那论"辨析 (A Critique of Naitō Konan's "China Thesis" in the Early Republican Period). *Nankai xuebao* 南开学报 2012, no. 1. Also appears in vol. 1 of his *Jindai yilai Riben de Zhongguo guan* 近代以来日本的中国观. Nanjing: Jiangsu Renmin Chubanshe, 2012.

Zhou Yiliang 周一良. "Riben Neiteng Hunan xiansheng zai Zhongguo shixue shang zhi gongxian" 日本內藤湖南先生在中國史學上之貢獻 (Mr. Naitō Konan's Contributions to Historiography on China). *Shixue nianbao* 史學年報 2, no. 1 (September 1934). Also in *Zhou Yiliang ji* 周一良集, vol. 4. Shenyang: Liaoning Jiaoyu Chubanshe, 1998.