

顧問委員會 *Advisory Board*

Professor Peter K. BOL 包弼德教授
Harvard University

Professor CAI Zongqi 蔡宗齊教授
Lingnan University

Professor Rey CHOW 周蕾教授
Duke University

Professor DENG Xiaonan 鄧小南教授
Peking University

Professor Ronald EGAN 艾朗諾教授
Stanford University

Professor GE Zhaoguang 葛兆光教授
Fudan University

Professor Margaret HILLENBRAND
Oxford University

Professor Michel HOCKX 賀麥曉教授
University of Notre Dame

Professor Ronnie Po-chia HSIA 夏伯嘉教授
Pennsylvania State University

Professor V.H. MAIR 梅維恆教授
University of Pennsylvania

Professor Andrea RIEMENSCHNITTER
University of Zurich

Professor SIN Chow Yiu 單周堯教授
The University of Hong Kong

Professor Nicolas STANDAERT 鐘鳴旦教授
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Professor David Der-wei WANG 王德威教授
Harvard University

Professor WANG Ning 王寧教授
Shanghai Jiaotong University

Professor Hilde DE WEERDT
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Professor YIM Chi Hung 嚴志雄教授
Chinese University of Hong Kong

Professor ZHANG Longxi 張隆溪教授
Hunan Normal University & Peking University

Professor ZHANG Xiping 張西平教授
Beijing Foreign Studies University

Professor ZOU Zhenhuan 鄒振環教授
Fudan University

HKU JOURNAL OF CHINESE STUDIES

香港大學中文學報

《香港大學中文學報》(前《東方文化》)創刊於1954年，為中英文雙語半年刊，主要刊載關於中國和華語語系的語言、文學、歷史、哲學、宗教、翻譯學等人文學科論文及書評，尤其重視跨學科、新領域、新方法研究成果的發表，力求增強與大中華地區漢語學術界的連接。每期刊載論文約6至8篇，專題欄目範圍包括中國語言、文學、史學、宗教、翻譯、性別研究、香港研究、中西交流研究、名家演講錄、書評及學術動態等。所刊載論文均經過匿名評審。詳細格式請參考本刊稿例。

本刊海外地區訂費為港幣五百元(美金六十四元)，港澳台地區及中國內地訂費為港幣四百元(美金五十一元)，已包含郵費。

來稿、訂閱及一般業務查詢請聯絡本刊編輯部：

地址： 香港薄扶林香港大學中文學院
百周年校園逸夫教學樓 801 室

電話： (852) 3917 7292

傳真： (852) 2858 1334

電郵： jcs1@hku.hk

網址： www.hkujcs.hku.hk

HKU JOURNAL OF CHINESE STUDIES

香港大學中文學報

HKU Journal of Chinese Studies (formerly *Journal of Oriental Studies*) was established in 1954 as a bilingual semi-annual academic journal in the field of Chinese and Sinophone studies involving such humanistic areas as Chinese language, literature, history, philosophy, religion, and translation. In recent years, the *Journal* aims to further enhance its connections with Chinese academia in Greater China by publishing more up-to-date research results esp. from interdisciplinary approaches. The *Journal* adopts a multi-column pattern, with 6 to 8 articles in each issue. The columns include Chinese language, literature, history, religion, translation studies, gender studies, Hong Kong studies, China-West studies, distinguished lecture series, and reviews and research news. All articles published in the JOS are peer-reviewed. Prospective authors should follow the style sheet of the *Journal*.

The *Journal's* annual subscription rate (including 2 issues per year) is US\$64.00 (HK\$500.00) for order from overseas and US\$51.00 (HK\$400.00) for order from local Hong Kong / Taiwan / Macau / Mainland China, which includes postage.

Please refer to the following contact information for queries about submission, subscription and general business correspondence:

Address: School of Chinese
Rm 801, Run Run Shaw Tower, Centennial Campus
The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong
Tel: (852) 3917 7292
Fax: (852) 2858 1334
Email: jcs1@hku.hk
Website: www.hkujcs.hku.hk

目次 CONTENTS

名家演講錄 LECTURES BY DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARS

- Longxi ZHANG Chinese Literature in the Age of World Literature 1
張隆溪 處於世界文學時代的中國文學

古代文學研究 CLASSICAL CHINESE LITERATURE

- Linda Rui FENG Improvising upon Regimes of Knowledge: A Contextualized 15
馮令晏 Reading of a Ninth-century Tale on Wheat, Alchemy, and Sea
Treasure
知識體系的“遊戲成分”與文學想象：解析一篇晚唐小說關於小
麥、煉丹與胡人識寶的提示

宋史研究 SONG HISTORY

- 何冠環 北宋真定常山高氏外戚將門之興衰——以新出土墓誌〈宋故東頭 35
Koon Wan HO 供奉官閣門祇候高君墓誌銘並序〉為中心的考察
The Rise and Decline of the Zhending Gao Family of Military
Officers and Imperial-in-laws in the Northern Song: An Analysis
of the Newly Excavated Epitaph of Gao Weizheng

漢學研究：傳教士與易學 SINOLOGY: MISSIONARIES AND YIJING STUDIES

- 張西平、賈海燕 白晉《易經》研究的緣起 53
Xiping ZHANG & Haiyan JIA The Origins of Joachim Bouvet's Study of the *Yijing*
黎子鵬、胡獻皿 索隱遺珠：呂立本《易經本旨》的抄本考略與跨語境詮釋 73
John Tsz Pang LAI The Lost Pearl of Figurism: A Critical Study of the Manuscripts and
& Jochebed Hin Cross-Context Interpretation of Lü Liben's *Yijing benzhi* (Original
Ming WU Meaning of the *Yijing*)

近代史研究 MODERN HISTORY

- 余一泓 法後王：《柳文指要》述論 119
Yihong YU Following the Latter King: On Zhang Shizhao's *Outline of Liu
Zongyuan's Writings*

翻譯研究 TRANSLATION STUDIES

- Chenlin WEI 魏琛琳 Western Dissemination of Li Yu's *Mustard Seed Garden Manual of Painting*—With a Focus on Sze Mai-mai and *The Tao of Painting* 《芥子園畫傳》西傳簡史——以施蘊珍及其英譯本《繪畫之道》為重點 139

電影研究 FILM STUDIES

- 曾繁裕 Gabriel F. Y. TSANG 跋涉留情：論魏時煜紀錄片的歷史建構 171
Fallen in Diaspora with Romance: The Historical Constitution of Louisa Wei's Documentary

書評 REVIEWS


- Rens KRIJGSMAN 武致知 *Spring and Autumn Historiography: Form and Hierarchy in Ancient Chinese Annals* (2023) by Newell Ann VAN AUKEN 193
- Jiangying LIU 劉江英 *The Cornucopian Stage: Performing Commerce in Early Modern China* (2023) by Ariel FOX 199
- Keith MCMAHON 馬克夢 吳存存著《戲外之戲：清中晚期京城的戲園文化與梨園私寓制》(2017) (Drama Beyond the Drama: The Private Apartment System and Beijing Theatre Culture, 1790-1911) 203
- Charlie Yi ZHANG 張毅 *The Cosmopolitan Dream: Transnational Chinese Masculinities in a Global Age* (2018) by Derek HIRD & Geng SONG (eds.) 207

CHINESE LITERATURE IN THE AGE OF WORLD LITERATURE

LONGXI ZHANG *

ABSTRACT In the last twenty some years, world literature has risen to be the powerful new current in literary studies of the twenty-first century. The concept of *Weltliteratur* called for by Wolfgang von Goethe at the beginning of the nineteenth century was not clearly defined, but it has been redefined by David Damrosch as encompassing all the literary works that circulate beyond their culture of origin. Such a redefined concept reduces the too vague idea and the too huge number of literary works that made *Weltliteratur* impracticable, but the concept of circulation has its own limitations, because works currently circulating in the world are basically the canonical works of major Western literary traditions, such as English, French, and German literatures, while non-Western literatures, including Chinese literature and even “minor” European literatures, are not circulating in the world beyond their culture of origin. At the same time, world literature today offers a great opportunity for Chinese literature to transcend its linguistic and cultural boundaries and become part of the widely circulating world literature. How does world literature rise up in the twenty-first century? What important roles does literary translation play in world literature? How to introduce the canonical works of Chinese literature to the outside world in a widely circulating language and render them a part of world literature in the true sense? These are all questions worthy of our attention and exploration.

KEYWORDS *Weltliteratur*, circulation, canon, European literature, non-Western literature, Chinese literature

* Longxi Zhang  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9268-6641>
Chair Professor Emeritus of Comparative Literature and Translation at the City University of Hong Kong, Xiaoxiang Chair Professor of Comparative Literature at Hunan Normal University, Lide Chair Professor at the Yenching Academy of Peking University

In the last twenty some years, world literature has risen to be a powerful new current in literary studies of our time. “No other approach to literary studies has known as spectacular a success in the new millennium as that which goes by the name of ‘world literature,’” as Theo D’haen observes.¹ World literature first became noticeable in the early nineteenth century when the German poet Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832) talked about it on several occasions, and from the very beginning, Goethe’s idea of *Weltliteratur* has a special, if fortuitous, relationship with Chinese literature. Though Goethe spoke of *Weltliteratur* on several occasions, the most well-known and often quoted one is his conversation with his young secretary Johann Peter Eckermann (1792–1854) on January 31, 1827, when he told Eckermann that he was reading a Chinese novel, and it was that reading experience of a non-European work that had convinced him that “National literature is now rather an unmeaning term; the epoch of World-literature is at hand.”² Goethe did not, however, clearly define the term and his interest in non-European literature, his reading of a Chinese novel, his admiration of the Indian poet Kālidāsa’s play *Shakuntala* and the Persian poet Hafez’s *divan*, proved to be way ahead of his time. The discipline of literary studies developed in the nineteenth century beyond the limitations of national literature and the correlative monolingualism was comparative literature, but comparative literature was in itself limited within European languages and literatures only. In the nineteenth century, the century of Western expansion, colonialism and imperialism, Goethe’s cosmopolitan idea of *Weltliteratur* did not get much response and was largely neglected, whereas comparative literature remained Eurocentric or West-centered in much of its disciplinary history from the nineteenth till the late twentieth century.

Even in the mid-twentieth century, Goethe’s idea was thought to be too vague. Claudio Guillén (1924–2007), an eminent comparatist and a promoter of East-West studies, found Goethe’s *Weltliteratur* “a wild idea, unattainable in practice, worthy not of an actual reader but of a deluded keeper of archives who is also a multimillionaire.”³ The huge amount of literary works produced in the world makes it impossible for world literature to become a meaningful object of study, and *Weltliteratur* must be redefined to make it a workable concept. There are simply far too many books to read and no matter how many or how fast one can read, nobody can read world literature in a quantitative sense. “Reading ‘more’ seems hardly to be the solution,” as Franco Moretti says. “It has to be different. The *categories* have to be different.”⁴ That is indeed the significance of David Damrosch’s work. “I take world

1 Theo D’haen, *The Routledge Concise History of World Literature* (London: Routledge, 2012), 1.

2 Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, “Conversations with Eckermann on *Weltliteratur* (1827),” trans. John Oxenford, in *World Literature in Theory*, ed. David Damrosch (Chichester, England: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 19.

3 Claudio Guillén, *The Challenge of Comparative Literature*, trans. Cola Franzen (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993), 38.

4 Franco Moretti, “Conjectures on World Literature (2000) and More Conjectures (2003),” in *World Literature in Theory*, ed. David Damrosch (Chichester, England: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 160.

literature to encompass all literary works that circulate beyond their culture of origin, either in translation or in their original language (Virgil was long read in Latin in Europe),” says Damrosch.⁵ Such a redefined concept reduces the too huge an amount of literary works that made *Weltliteratur* impracticable because literary works must circulate beyond their original linguistic and cultural environment to become works of world literature, but much of the world’s literatures does not have such global circulation. Most works are known in their own tradition, but however well-known and famous, they are only the canonical works of a national literature, not part of world literature. Damrosch’s redefinition makes perfect sense, but it also excludes numerous works that are only known and circulating within limits of their culture of origin. In fact, most non-Western literary works are in that situation.

Chinese literature is a case in point. Even though Chinese is a language with more speakers than any other and Chinese literature has a long history of three millennia and numerous works with high literary values, the great Chinese poets and writers are mostly known within limits of Chinese-speaking communities and almost unknown outside those communities. Damrosch’s redefinition has been instrumental in making world literature a new wave in literary studies in the last two decades, but why world literature? What has made world literature the powerful new wave in literary studies today? What about Chinese literature and its position in the rise of world literature?

Nothing rises without motion or motivation, and in my view, there are two main reasons for the rise of world literature in the new millennium. One is the external condition of globalization that has made everyone aware of the connectedness of different countries and peoples in the world. Global connectedness is a fact in contemporary life, and its effect is not only felt in world economy and geopolitics, but also increasingly visible in culture and tradition. The critique of Eurocentrism is first of all the result of social, political, and intellectual developments in Europe and North America in an age of globalization, which makes it possible for scholars to assume a global perspective far beyond the parochialism of Eurocentric views. Without the critique of Eurocentrism and the awareness of global cultural diversity, world literature would not have the chance to arise. Theo D’haen even sees the rise of world literature as an indication of the significant changes taking place in the world today, in which “America is losing the position of political, military, economic, and cultural hegemon it has held since WWII.”⁶ He also looks at Chinese literature and anticipates the possibility of its becoming a major part of world literature. “Among future—indeed, already present—major literatures undoubtedly feature Chinese literature,” he argues. “China’s increasingly profiling itself as a major, perhaps in future *the*, world power, leads to a rethinking in China of world literature in line with China’s commercial and political ambitions.”⁷ This may have overstated

5 David Damrosch, *What Is World Literature?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), 4.

6 Theo D’haen, *World Literature in an Age of Geopolitics* (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 35.

7 D’haen, *World Literature in an Age of Geopolitics*, 36.

the case, but it certainly depicts the world today as multipolar and pluralistic, which gives rise to a more expansive outlook on the world and its culture and literature.

There is another important reason for the rise of world literature, which is more directly related to the internal development of literary studies in the late twentieth century. Literary theory was the strong moving force in literary studies for much of the twentieth century. Beginning in the 1950s, American New Criticism, Russian formalism, Czech and French structuralism, linguistics, semiotics, anthropology, psychoanalysis, sociology, and philosophy all provided stimulation, theoretical frameworks, and innovative approaches to the study of literature. Then, poststructuralism, postmodernism, postcolonialism, Marxism, feminism, gender studies, gay and lesbian studies, and many other theoretical approaches brought socially committed positions and concerns to literature. During the 1970s and the 1980s, literary theory was making the study of literature exciting and productive, but by the late 1980s and beyond, much of literary studies became so overly dominated by theories that literary criticism was turned into a jargon-ridden discourse with a lot of critical theory but very little literature. Reading literature, particularly reading for aesthetic values and pleasure, became a problem, and literary study was gradually and partially supplanted by highly politicized cultural studies. This became a serious problem acknowledged in the American Comparative Literature Association's state-of-the-field report almost a decade ago. "To be a linguist these days, you do not have to know a lot of languages," Haun Saussy wrote in that report, "at moments in the last few decades, it has seemed possible to make a career in literary studies without making sustained reference to works of literature."⁸ That was indeed a serious problem for the study of literature, which many students of literature found deeply troubling and unsatisfying. In my view, the rise of world literature is responding to that problem and offering a solution by simply returning to the reading of literature, to reading with aesthetic pleasure, and more importantly, to reading not just European or Western literature, but world literature beyond Eurocentrism or any other ethnocentrism.

Damrosch's redefinition has made it possible to study world literature beyond Eurocentric limitations, but that redefinition is not without its own problems. He singles out circulation as the most important defining factor and says nothing about the literary quality or value of a work, but the most widely circulating works may not be the most valuable literary works. In American universities in the postmodern age, however, it has become almost impossible to speak of values and value judgment, and the idea of canon or classic is all but abandoned. Damrosch makes circulation the differentiating mechanism when he says that "world literature is not an infinite, ungraspable canon of works but rather a mode of circulation and of reading, a mode that is as applicable to individual works as to bodies of materials, available

8 Haun Saussy, "Exquisite Cadavers Stitched from Fresh Nightmares: Of Memes, Hives, and Selfish Genes," in *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*, ed. Saussy (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 12.

for reading established classics and new discoveries alike."⁹ Such a concept is generously open and flexible, but if the problem with the vague idea of *Weltliteratur* is that nobody can have the time to read all the literary works produced in the world, and if circulation becomes meaningful and influential in redefining world literature precisely by effectively reducing the impossibly huge amount of literary works to a manageable number, then to open up the redefined concept of world literature to all sorts of texts without differentiation would defeat the purpose of redefinition. Circulation is mainly a descriptive sociological idea related to market economy rather than literary criticism. "Circulation was the domain of publishing houses' sales departments, part and parcel of their marketing strategies," as Fabio Akcelrud Durão argues. "At best it provided information for historians by offering a perspective external to the literary experience, which did not differentiate significantly between novels and soft drinks, and remained distanced from what ultimately could be seen to justify the existence of literature as something without use, lacking a utilitarian purpose."¹⁰ Galin Tihanov also criticizes the concept of circulation for eventually "eroding the foundations of the liberal imagination: the hermeneutic horizon retreats, the aesthetic becomes but a subsidiary ingredient of marketability." Tihanov continues:

In the regime of free circulation, speed, ease, and profit are vital; the crown achievement here, in the language of the sociological study of world literature, is success. It is perhaps not by chance that the current foregrounding of circulation has been going hand in hand with the necessary downplaying of the set of criteria we have traditionally referred to as aesthetic. "World Literature", which as a discourse is generally far removed from classic literary theory, based as the latter often was (up to and even including Deconstruction) on close reading of texts, displays here an important proximity to the value-neutral approach taken, for example, by Structuralist semiotics that would examine Balzac's novels with the same devotion it would extend to low-brow literature or the study of commercials and company slogans. The emphasis on circulation, I argue, is the methodological expression of this value-neutral approach, which sees literature as generating profit and success rather than aesthetic value, the latter being an uncomfortably contestable entity.¹¹

9 Damrosch, *What Is World Literature?*, 5.

10 Fabio Akcelrud Durão, "Circulation as Constitutive Principle," in *Literary and Cultural Circulation*, ed. José Luís Jobim (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2017), 56.



11 Galin Tihanov, "Beyond Circulation," in *Universal Localities: The Languages of World Literature*, ed. Tihanov (Berlin: J. B. Metzler, 2022), 236.

THE ORIGINS OF JOACHIM BOUVET'S STUDY OF THE *YIJING*

XIPING ZHANG & HAIYAN JIA *

ABSTRACT Joachim Bouvet's study of the *Yijing* (*Book of Changes*) extends the Jesuit missionaries' continual interest in Chinese classics. On one hand, he authored a significant amount of research on the *Yijing* in Chinese. On the other hand, he conveyed the process and outcomes of his studies to the Western world in European languages. While continuing the figurative approach initiated by Matteo Ricci, Bouvet made further steps in the studies of Chinese classics. Moreover, his study of the *Yijing* was a result of the "Chinese Rites Controversy", manifesting the internal conflict within the Society of Jesus, and meanwhile related to the *Yijing* scholarship at the Qing imperial court in line with the Kangxi Emperor's personal interest. With the support of the Kangxi Emperor, Bouvet absorbed the early Qing achievements in the *Yijing* studies, leaving behind a rich legacy in the history of Sino-Western cultural exchanges.

KEYWORDS Joachim Bouvet, the *Yijing*, Chinese Rites Controversy, Figurists

* **Xiping Zhang**  <http://orcid.org/0009-0007-6024-6300>
Distinguished Professor at Beijing Language and Culture University
Haiyan Jia  <http://orcid.org/0009-0003-2113-9888>
Associate Professor in College of Arts at Ningxia University

索隱遺珠：呂立本《易經本旨》的抄本考略與跨語境詮釋¹

黎子鵬、胡獻皿*

摘要 《易經本旨》乃河東晉邑（今山西太原）信徒呂立本於乾隆三十九年（1774）所著的《易經》注本。《易經本旨》原稿已佚失，現存七份抄本均是殘卷，存於上海徐家匯藏書樓。2013年，鐘鳴旦、杜鼎克、王仁芳三位學者將其中一份抄本複印，收錄在《徐家匯藏書樓明清天主教文獻續編》中。台灣師範大學賴貴三教授曾對該文本初步加以整理和分析，但至今未見有學者作更具體深入的研究。

《易經本旨》標誌着清代禁教時期耶穌會士撤退後，本土的信仰群體為保教所作出的努力，可謂索隱易學的遺珠。清廷禁教令本土信徒與西方教會之間聯繫的紐帶出現斷裂，驅使呂立本在自身的宗教及文化遺產中屬找靈性的啟發。從呂立本的解易手法可見，他並非被動地套用耶穌會士索隱派的學說，而是在該基礎上加以闡發，借助《易經》文本的開放性和多樣性，融會貫通宋明兩代的解易傳統，結合不同本土宗教的元素，以跨語境的視角重新構建、鞏固逐漸消逝的宗教記憶與想象，進而豐富天主教信仰的內涵。例如呂立本吸收了本土女神崇拜的特點，強調聖母的角色，其慈母的形象為失去牧者的信徒帶來精神上的慰藉和指引；同時巧妙地順應民間以《易經》算命的風俗，運用卦數推算禁教結束、聖教大通的年期，為正在遭受迫害的信徒帶來脫離苦難的盼望。

* **黎子鵬**  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8853-6923>

香港中文大學文化及宗教研究系教授

胡獻皿  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2821-4778>

香港中文大學宗教研究哲學碩士畢業生

1 本文的研究，承蒙香港研究資助局（Research Grants Council of Hong Kong）“人文學及社會科學傑出學者計劃”（Humanities and Social Sciences Prestigious Fellowship Scheme）對“寰宇易經：《易經》的跨文化翻譯以及在西方宗教與文學中的跨國接受”研究項目（項目編號：CUHK 34000223）的資助，謹此致謝。另外，筆者衷心感謝兩位匿名審查人提供的寶貴意見。

本文旨在補足在華天主教史以傳教士或教會建制為敘事中心的缺失，立體呈現本土信徒在教會權威失效下，如何建構與神聖互動的關係及象徵空間 (symbolic space)，從而刻劃這些個體在大敘事 (grand narrative) 下失落的足跡。這批彌足珍貴文獻的探析，不僅能讓學界進一步發掘其重要的史料價值，更能推進天主教易學、中西文化交流史、宗教對話等研究，具重大而深遠的學術價值。

關鍵詞 《易經》 呂立本 《易經本旨》 中國天主教 索隱易學 跨語境詮釋

一、前言

隱逸於商圈喧囂中的上海徐家匯藏書樓，歷經戰火煙硝和時局變遷，保存着數百年來中西文化交融與天主教在華扎根的歷史軌跡。這座不起眼的樓房收藏了大批自明末清初來華耶穌會士的藏書，以及中西方天主教學者們研究的手稿或印本。而在眾多珍稀的文獻中，呂立本《易經本旨》可謂其中一顆被埋沒的滄海遺珠。此文本不單是一個獨立思想流派的重要遺產，更是本土信徒堅守實踐信仰的見證，為天主教在華發展史補上不可或缺的一筆。

徐宗澤乃最早發現這部作品的學者之一，其編著的《明清間耶穌會士譯著提要》(1946)對藏書樓的藏書作了一次系統性的編目，把《易經本旨》列入“真教辯護類”，並附上其序文。²然而，該介紹並未為這部作品引來更多的關注。直到2013年，鐘鳴旦、杜鼎克、王仁芳三位學者着手彙編藏書樓鮮為人知的手稿或刊本，把《易經本旨》其中一份抄本複印，收錄在《徐家匯藏書樓明清天主教文獻續編》內。³此套叢書的出版在學術界為《易經本旨》泛起了小小的漣漪。台灣師範大學賴貴三教授於2019至2020年間對該複印本進行了相關的研究計劃，對《易經本旨》內容初步加以整理和分析。⁴中國社會科學院民族學與人類學研究所助理研究員楊園章早前亦撰文介紹並分析這部著作。⁵儘管如此，學者的研究力度並不足以揭開這部未刊本及其作者的神秘面紗——呂立本到底是誰？他的寫作背景和目的是甚麼？作品的書寫又有何歷史價值和意義？這些問題都有待進一步解答。

按序文的署名，呂立本乃河東晉邑(今山西太原)人，於乾隆三十九年(1774)寫成《易經本旨》。可惜序文並未就他的生平、學術背景與信仰經驗提供任何信息。從成稿的年份推斷，《易經本旨》乃清代天主教禁教時期的作品。自雍正元年(1723)禁教令生效起，大批西方傳教士被逐出中土。⁶乾隆年間(1736-1796)，禁教政策愈發苛嚴，先後於十一年(1746)和四十九年(1784)發生兩起大規模教案，引發全國性的查

2 徐宗澤：《明清間耶穌會士譯著提要》(上海：中華書局，1946年)，頁133-34。

3 呂立本：《易經本旨》，載鐘鳴旦(Nicolas Standaert)、杜鼎克(Adrian Dudink)、王仁芳編：《徐家匯藏書樓明清天主教文獻續編》1-2冊(台北：利氏學社，2013年影印徐匯館藏213000·94441-94444B本)。

4 賴貴三：《科技部補助專題研究計劃報告：乾隆中葉呂立本〈易經本旨〉稿本研究》。取自 <https://scholar.lib.ntnu.edu.tw/ws/portalfiles/portal/50560241/st108010235.pdf>，2023年5月26日擷取。

5 楊園章：〈清代本土天主教徒《易經》的索隱法詮釋——基於呂立本《易經本旨》的個案研究〉，《世界宗教文化》，第5期(2023年10月)，頁43-49。

6 〈雍正元年十二月禮部議覆浙閩總督覺羅滿保疏奏〉，《清實錄·清世宗皇帝實錄》7冊(北京：中華書局，1986年影印本)，卷14，頁251。

禁。⁷到了1773年，教宗克萊孟十四世（Pope Clement XIV, 1705–1774）發出通諭解散耶穌會，徹底斬斷本土教徒與歐洲教廷之間的聯繫。《易經本旨》可謂少數逃過滅教之火的倖存作品，承載着本土信仰群體的歷史記憶和宗教情感，見證了他們如何在迫害中積極謀求生存的空間，在傳教士缺席下透過書寫來建構自身信仰的身份與想象。

然而，《易經本旨》的價值並不僅於此。在序文中，呂立本說明他注《易》的緣由和目的。他認為“《易》乃古經隱義，而為開闢以來第一聖經也，真道全備”，主張《易經》的卦象爻辭均隱含了天主教贖奧跡的啟示，只因後儒掃象與臆度而“本旨愈晦”，注《易》一舉是為了恢復《易經》原旨。⁸ 他的論說顯現出一個獨特但近乎消聲匿跡的思想流派——索隱派（Figurists）——的影子。這個別樹一幟的小群體以白晉（Joachim Bouvet, 1656–1730）為首，傅聖澤（Jean-François Foucquet, 1665–1741）、馬若瑟（Joseph de Prémare, 1666–1736）、郭中傳（Jean-Alexis de Gollet, 1664–1741）、宋君榮（Antoine Gaubil, 1689–1759）等耶穌會士為輔。他們多半受到清廷皇帝的禮待，居於北京，或在宮廷供職。他們確信《易經》是天主普世啟示的遺跡之一，致力從卦象經文中解讀出《聖經》人物、情事和核心教義，以印證早在伏羲統治之初，華夏民族已掌握救恩的奧秘。他們甚至認為《易經》足以“補充”《聖經》遺漏或忽略之處。在禮儀之爭（1630–1742）愈趨白熱化的局面下，這樣的觀點引來多方的批評與排斥。在教廷的眼中，把“異教”的著述抬舉至與《聖經》並齊甚至超越的地位，無疑撼動了天主教的信仰根基，具有樹立“異端”的危險傾向。

最終在教廷的禁令下，索隱派傳教士不但被禁止以中文書寫，其著述也多半遭到銷毀，僅有部分私人殘稿獲留存至今。這造成學界早期對索隱派的誤判，認為他們的著述未獲正式出版，有關思想僅為少數清廷學者以及他們保持密切通信關係的歐洲學者所熟悉，無以為繼。一直到了1970年代，才開始出現對索隱派著作具系統性的研究專著。⁹ 隨着對索隱派耶穌會士的信札和手稿進行大量的考察和分析工作，學界對他們的評鑑愈趨正面。大部分學者均肯定索隱派的著述對促進中西文化交流，尤其歐洲的漢學發展具正面推動的作用，但認為其影響主要還是僅見於西方，未能在華開花

7 馬釗：〈乾隆朝地方高級官員與查禁天主教活動〉，《清史研究》，第4期（1998年4月），頁56。

8 呂立本：《易經本旨》，載鐘鳴旦（Nicolas Standaert）、杜鼎克（Adrian Dudink）、王仁芳編：《徐家匯藏書樓明清天主教文獻續編》1冊（台北：利氏學社，2013年影印徐匯館藏213000·94441–94444B本）卷1，頁1上（總頁3）。

9 Paul A. Rule, “K’ung-tzu or Confucius? The Jesuit Interpretation of Confucianism” (PhD diss., Australian National University, 1972), 391–461; Claudia von Collani, *Die Figuristen in der Chinamission* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1981); John W. Witek, *Controversial ideas in China and in Europe: A Biography of Jean-François Foucquet, S.J. (1665–1741)* (Roma: Institutum Historicum S.I., 1982); Knud Lundbæk, *Joseph de Prémare (1666–1736), S.J.: Chinese Philology and Figurism* (Aarhus C, Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 1991).

結果。¹⁰《易經本旨》的發現卻挑戰了這種固有的想法，為索隱易學的研究開闢另一種想象和閱讀的可能。

二、《易經本旨》抄本考略

據考察，《易經本旨》原稿已佚失，現存七份抄本，均是殘卷，存於上海徐家匯藏書樓（見表1）。

表1《易經本旨》抄本收藏情況

編號	標題	內容	抄寫員	藏書號
1	易經本旨 (徐匯本)	卷一（乾 ☰—蒙 ☶） 卷二（需 ☵—豫 ☱） 卷三（隨 ☱—大過 ☱） 卷六（漸 ☵—未濟 ☵）	方濟各 程小樓 玻爾日亞	213000·94441—94444B
2	易經本旨 (石室本)	卷一（乾 ☰—蒙 ☶）	佚名	213000·94440B
3	易經本旨 (神院本)	卷一（乾 ☰—蒙 ☶）	佚名	213000·94931—94935B
4	易經本旨 (會院本)	卷一（乾 ☰—蒙 ☶）	佚名	213000·94945B
5	易經本旨 (文院本)	卷一（乾 ☰—蒙 ☶）	佚名	213000·95644B
6	易經本旨 (伯祿本)	卷五（損 ☵—萃 ☱ 初六爻辭） 卷六（漸 ☵—未濟 ☵）	佚名	213000·95677—95678B
7	易經本旨 (呂註本)	卷二（需 ☵—豫 ☱） 卷三（隨 ☱—大過 ☱） 卷六 (漸 ☵—旅 ☷ 六五爻辭；中孚 ☱ 卦辭 — 未濟 ☵；旅 ☷ 六五象辭 — 上九象辭；巽 ☴ 至節 ☱)	佚名	213000·95679—95681B


10 David E. Mungello, “The Evolution of Jesuit Accommodation in the Figurism of Bouvet,” in *Curious Land: Jesuit Accommodation and the Origins of Sinology* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1985), 312–28；韓琦：〈白晉的《易經》研究和康熙時代的“西學中源說”〉，《漢學研究》，16卷1期（1998年6月），頁185–201；Richard J. Smith, “Jesuit Interpretations of the *Yijing* (Classic of Changes) in Historical and Comparative Perspective,” *Southeast Asian Studies* 33, No. 1 (February 2002): 147–62；張西平：〈《易經》研究：康熙和法國傳教士白晉的文化對話〉，《文化雜誌》，第54期（2005年9月），頁83–93；Claudia von Collani, “The First Encounter of The West with *The Yijing*: Introduction to and Edition of Letters and Latin Translations by French Jesuits from the 18th Century,” *Monumenta Serica: Journal of Oriental Studies* 55, No.1 (December 2007): 227–387；Pan Feng-Chuan, “Some Reflections on the Methodology of the Studies on Missionary Sinology,” *Monumenta Serica: Journal of Oriental Studies* 68, No. 2 (July 2020): 429–34.

法後王：《柳文指要》述論

余一泓*

摘要 近代聞人章士釗親歷二十世紀初中國的政治、文化巨變，也是長期保有相當地位的舊派文化人。他晚年所成的《柳文指要》，正是在藉柳宗元之文為媒，面對趨新世變調和新舊的論史之作。排比分析書中的歷史、人物評論，可幫助理解舊學在現代中國調適、自抑而尋求承認的史實。論文第一部分結合章氏的《黃帝魂》評述等文獻，探明其人尋求適應革命話語、省思自身親歷之近代世變的姿態。第二部分重構《指要》所揭出的、以柳宗元為代表的舊學的進步內容，第三部分則分析《指要》如何藉由這些內容，在劇烈的世變中尋求相對穩定的生存空間。結語判斷尋求承認的舊派學人，會在評價標準趨新、易變的共和國，提出類似的為舊學發聲的方式。此文的研究乃是探索這段思想史的初步嘗試。

關鍵詞 章士釗 柳宗元 近代儒學 革命和舊文化

* 余一泓  <http://orcid.org/0009-0004-1435-2290>

武漢大學中國傳統文化研究中心講師

一、引言

長沙章士釗(1881-1973)為近代中國政學兩界之聞人，政論文章馳名一時，而且是共和國成立之後仍保有相當地位的舊派大老之一。¹ 按照歷史學、政治學等不同學科範式對章氏所作研究，數量已經不少，² 共同的特點卻是罕言其人的共和國經歷以及“晚年定論”《柳文指要》(下文簡稱《指要》)。³ 文獻資料之匱乏，以及《指要》本身誇張的政治化修辭，⁴ 當然都在限制相關研究的推進。惟在此現狀之下，冥索錙銖之功益不可少。本文即嘗試動用相對有限的研究資源，探索章氏藉由評述柳宗元(773-819)作品，為舊學舊人曲折尋覓生存空間的努力。

《指要》在 1966 年春寫成，此後五年續有增補，⁵ 乃是以舊瓶勉力盛入新酒的嘗試，旨在向政府領袖展示舊學舊人融入新社會的可能性以及誠意。該書所點評的人物

-
- 1 章士釗曾在毛澤東(1893-1976)之師符定一(1877-1958)去世後，於 1959 年擔任中央文史研究館第二任館長。1951 年該館成立之際，章士釗、葉恭綽(1881-1968)和柳亞子(1887-1958)是三位副館長。考慮到葉恭綽在 58 年任代理館長不到一年就被打成右派，上述經歷更能體現出章氏的地位。參見中央文史研究館編：《中央文史研究館館員傳略》(北京：中華書局，2001 年)，頁 1-13。
 - 2 郭華清：《寬容與妥協 章士釗的調和論研究》(天津：天津古籍出版社，2004 年)；森川裕貫著，袁廣泉譯：《政論家的矜持：章士釗、張東蓀政治思想研究》(北京：社會科學文獻出版社，2017 年)；Leigh K. Jenco, *Making the Political: Founding and Action in the Political Theory of Zhang Shizhao* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010)。
 - 3 前述諸書無論，資深的章士釗研究者鄒小站出版過兩部章士釗傳記，對於其人晚年情況都未做太多討論(後出一書稍多)，參見《章士釗傳》(鄭州：河南文藝出版社，1999 年)；《章士釗》(北京：團結出版社，2011 年)。這種現象反映的是，邊緣的、被放棄的思想選項重新獲得關注，需在日漸寬鬆的環境中經歷一個過程。Jenco 在其研究中已經注意到了這一點，參見 Jenco, *Making the Political*, 7, 223-24.
 - 4 文匯版《章士釗全集》在整理精度和收文範圍方面都有待提高，《柳文指要》有過數次增改，因稿本、進呈本不得而見，其中消息也無從得知。這是文獻匱乏所帶來的困難。另外，《指要》本身也讓讀者很難理性地審視該書，它作為資料書受到過重視和利用，作為著作卻被多位名家視作迎合時風之劣作，參見郭華清：〈《柳文指要》研究回眸——寫在《柳文指要》出版四十七年之際〉，《青海師範大學學報(哲學社會科學版)》第 40 卷第 2 期(2018 年 3 月)，頁 91-100。有鑒於此，郭氏對《指要》做了不少研究，所整理的《柳文指要校注》(北京：世界圖書出版公司，2016 年)也很好用。本文很受益他的研究。
 - 5 根據 1971 年的跋文可知，增補的是有特定意味的最後一卷，具體何時補上難以確定，參見章士釗，《柳文指要·再跋》，《章士釗全集》卷 10(上海：文匯出版社，2000 年)，頁 1654。下文引用簡稱《指要》，《全集》。

和思想，多與柳文無直接關聯，⁶ 其出發點包孕在章士釗的歷史體驗當中。該書論史尺度有明確的進步、落後之標籤，而從近代的進步與落後上溯，中國古代也須得有相應的進步代表和落後典型——《指要》書中，代表民主、革命思想的柳宗元，跟韓愈(768-824)等“反動”人物形成了對比。從近代中國回看柳文，又以中古故事為近現代人事之寄托，《指要》最大限度地突出舊學舊人中的進步成分，同時與落後的成分完成割席。在這個意義上講，當時跟章士釗類似的作者至少還有寫作《論六經》(1951)、《原儒》(1955)和《乾坤衍》(1961)的熊十力(1885-1968)。⁷ 後者是北京大學一級教授，地位、人脈自然不及章士釗，可是在當時的舊人裏面也算不錯。日後如能發現更多文獻，讀書界或可看到更多相關努力。⁸

着眼上述旨趣，下文選取、排比、解釋《指要》文本，會使章氏思想呈現於“近現代—古代—近現代”的條理之中。章士釗對於近代的回憶、省思，直接受到共和國政協文史資料收集工作的影響，所以下文也將首先梳理他在參與文史資料工作前後的文獻，說明其論史的姿態。

二、重訪清末

1955 年元旦，章士釗寄贈毛澤東一件滿人女子自題影像，附信有言：“按此詩為該女子自撰自書，以文字論似亦女知識份子中之佼佼者。況益以身為滿人零落，不偶之境遇乎！”⁹ 兩年之後，溥儀(1906-1967)進入了“逐步改造”的寬鬆環境，開始撰寫自傳，從該自傳初版序言可知，該作有如下寄托：與過去的罪惡歷史告別，向新社會坦承過惡，進而表達做新國民勝於做舊權貴之歡欣。¹⁰ 此書 1961 年與收錄章士釗長篇著述《疏黃帝魂》的《辛亥革命回憶錄》同時出版，都是全國政協文史資料研究委員

-
- 6 甚至柳文本身也絕不能理解成集部著作之文，而是經史子論理紀事功能無所不包的著述之文，這個定義得之於章學誠(1738-1801)的啟發，參見《指要·下編通要之部序》，《全集》卷 10，頁 998。《指要》對章學誠、王闓運(1833-1916)等人物特別友好(恐怕不單是出於同鄉同姓之故)，對文廷式(1856-1904)、湯國梨(1883-1980)等人又特別尖刻，具體原因可能需要更多文獻披露才能探知。
 - 7 撰寫《建國之路》、《中國——理性之國》的梁漱溟(1893-1988)也可以跟這兩位對比，他們寫完書之後預期的首批讀者都包括了毛澤東。這一方面是便利書稿出版，另一方面也是向政府領袖展示舊學舊人融入新社會的可能性以及誠意。惟梁氏更少依托傳統文本立論，而且十分謹慎，沒有流佈自己的文稿。曹聚仁(1900-1972)晚年有著述之意，身後亦有《中國學術思想史隨筆》結集出版，殆與《指要》同屬告別國故之作。
 - 8 例如巨贊(1908-1984)法師遺失不見的《新佛教概論》，參見朱哲：〈巨贊法師全集序〉，收入《巨贊法師全集》(北京：社會科學文獻出版社，2008 年)，頁 11。
 - 9 〈致毛澤東〉，《全集》卷 8，頁 88。
 - 10 愛新覺羅·溥儀(1906-1967)：《我的前半生(未定稿)》(北京：群眾出版社，1962 年)，頁 1。