

# 書 評

## Reviews

《荀子禮治思想的淵源與戰國諸子之研究》，佐藤將之著，臺北：臺大出版中心，二〇一三年。三六八頁。

張子立，華東師範大學思勉人文高等研究院青年研究員

《荀子禮治思想的淵源與戰國諸子之研究》一書，主旨在：「闡明《荀子》中的多樣禮概念如何發揮其綜合功能，以及此綜合性之思想意義。」藉以「了解其如何統整當時在戰國思想家之間所展開的各種主張」（頁4）。本書特別凸顯出《荀子》中「禮」概念之重要性，並將其禮治論的整體性特質歸納為以下兩點：第一，當戰國時代中晚期的齊國稷下思想家在探討「治亂」問題，包括宇宙秩序中「禮」的角色等問題之思想環境下，《荀子》將「禮」概念以「治」概念為媒介，間接地與「道」概念作連結，建立了「禮」就是秩序本身的觀點。第二，荀子深感發揮「禮」功能之關鍵處並不在於宇宙或本體論上的領域，而是在相對於天地的「人」之領域。而且，《荀子》的「人」並不是指居住在某個地區或構成某一國的具體人群，而是能組成社會乃至國家的總體人類。《荀子》的「禮」在宇宙論的結構中界定出人類的生存條件和目標，同時也賦予人類將其倫理化的可能性。作者強調，經過《荀子》的禮治論，「禮」概念便具有「在天地宇宙中貫統整個人類、構成理想生存方式之準則」的意涵（頁273）。本書涉及層面廣泛，內容中進入與《荀子》比較視野的思想家或典籍，包括《墨子》、《莊子》、《管子》、《呂氏春秋》與《韓非子》。在此書中，作者並針對一些其所認為在《荀子》研究上廣被學界接受的觀點表示質疑，而欲提出新論點以代之。例如作者強調「禮」概念相較於「性惡」與「天人之分」而言，實更為

重要（頁 2-3），並對「荀子的禮治思想是孔子禮思想的發展」的觀點提出異議（頁 15-16）。就荀子與韓非人性論之相互關係，指出「韓非較有可能直接整合了所謂『前期法家』及稷下學者的人性觀（及自私本性），因而並不屬於《荀子》的人性論」（頁 24）等等。以下茲就筆者閱讀本書所得，提出一些個人觀點及論題，以就教於本書作者與讀者。

## 壹、「天人之分」的儒道面向

作者在分析荀子與莊子對「道德」論述之異同時，點出為何雙方皆用「道德」一詞，而荀子卻仍批評莊子為「蔽於天而不知人」的原因是：荀子藉由引進「禮」和「禮義」的概念，將莊子原來要追求「天」之方法——「道德」，轉化為實現「天地之間」理想人倫秩序之最好又具體可行的方法。如此一來，「道德」第一意義上就可被視為如傳統儒學脈絡中的「修身之最高境界」或「理想的統治」之代名詞。《荀子》「學至乎禮而止矣，夫是之謂道德之極」的命題，意謂「禮」就是達成「道德」的最關鍵方法。同時，對荀子而言，達成這樣境界的人，一方面具備傳統儒學系統富有倫理涵義之「德」，又兼能顯現《老子》和《莊子》系統中「道德」所含有「生成萬物的力量」（頁 103-104）。此析述頗具啟發性，對《荀子》所謂「天人之分」的涵義，做出較以往研究更豐富而細緻之解讀。例如徐復觀在討論荀子天人分途的思想傾向時，指出荀子與道家所說之「天」，皆為自然性質之天，代表一種自然科學意味的法則，而有別於孔、孟所強調道德意味法則的道德性之天。但道家講天另有一種與形上層面的「無」合而觀之的意涵，而使得法自然或體道的工夫仍與「天」密不可分。這層形上意味的天在荀子方面則已完全退出<sup>1</sup>。徐氏之分析在說明荀子對「天」的看法與道家及儒家孔、孟之異；本書之成果則除了探討荀子與道家的同異之外，另以禮義概念的分析，補充說明《荀子》「天人之分」概念中所具有的儒家成分，仍是要由「天」再回到「人」，以建立理想的人間秩序，使其意涵更顯完整。

<sup>1</sup> 徐復觀：《中國人性論史—先秦篇》（臺北：臺灣商務印書館，1994年），頁 226-229。

## 貳、《荀子》「性惡論」與「禮」概念之定位

作者認為在《荀子》思想中，「禮」概念相較於「性惡」與「天人之分」而言，實更為重要。其所提理由為：一、「禮」字在《荀子》書中出現了三四二次，並作為許多章節的主題。「性惡」與「天人之分」兩概念出現之次數與篇章則遠少於此。二、其「禮論」涉及許多議題，包括修身論、資源分配論、人事論等等，而且「禮」概念的多樣性，允許它貫通全書中各種不同的主張，發揮了綜合各種不同論述的連結作用（頁2-3）。以此觀之，作者指出：「就《荀子》的價值取向而言，對『禮』之重要性之提倡，遠遠超過『性惡』。」（頁16）

關於作者上述說法，其中實有幾個面向有待澄清。第一個要指出的是，「性惡」作為概括整體論點特色之語詞，與「性善」作為單一概念語詞，是兩個不同層面的用法，因而也是不同脈絡下的問題。作者的判準適用於探討「性惡」作為單一概念語詞時，在上下文中所具有的各種義涵，卻不適用於決定「性善」是否能夠作為概括整體論點特色之語詞。後一個問題涉及的是理論定位問題，乃基於對某思想家或學派理論的整體了解，依照其特性，而給予某個名稱。那麼就不能僅以此名稱概念出現之次數多寡，斷定其是否為某特定理論之主軸。「性善」一詞在《孟子》書中也出現不多，但不礙「性善」作為孟子思想之主軸。「內聖外王」一語甚至只出現在《莊子·天下篇》，而非儒者著作中，但無人對其作為儒學宗旨或特質之表述致疑。康德對實踐理性的說明被視為一種倫理學的義務論 (deontology)，但康德本人卻從未使用該語詞表述其道德學說，類似例子在中西哲學家身上實不勝枚舉。可知一個概念語詞出現次數之多寡，與其是否代表某思想家理論之主軸，兩者間並無必然的對應關係。

再來，我們也必須對概念的涵蓋性與奠基性作出區分。「性惡」概念的重要在於其奠基性，而有別於「禮」之涵蓋性。進一步來看，荀子對人之性惡的觀點，其實正為其主張「禮義法正」必要性之基礎，亦即：《荀子》之禮治論事實上是性惡論為前提。而此奠基關係有兩個層面：首先，禮之重要性在於能「化性起偽」，而之所以須「化性起偽」，正立基於荀子對「性惡」之判斷。也就是說：因為「性惡」，所以要「化性起偽」，而能「化性起偽」的利器，正是「禮制」。

此外，從「化性起偽」之必要，又可推導出《荀子》性惡論與「禮」的另

一層重要奠基關係，此即涉及「化性起偽」之可能性問題。試想：荀子主張藉「禮」以「化性起偽」，但既然人本性屬惡，又如何可能化除此惡性而以人為的努力予以改變呢？

此問題的答案在於，荀子在說明性惡論時，其實往往是以其廣義的人性論為背景。所以性惡之觀點不能單獨孤立地看，必須放在《荀子》整體人性論中觀之，才能理解其實意。《荀子》書中論性其實有三層意義，分別指涉三種人之所生而有，無待而然的「天之就」之特性。一是指飢而欲食、寒而欲暖、勞而欲息、好利而惡害的生理本能；二是能辨別聲音、顏色、味道、觸覺的耳目口鼻之官能的能力；第三種，也是荀子講性最常為人所忽略的一種意義，即是其所謂可以為堯、禹，可以為桀、跖，可以為工匠，可以為農賈等「可與如此，可與如彼」的人格及能力之可塑性<sup>2</sup>。至於荀子對「性惡」之斷定，是就第一層的生理本能而言。因為其指出，若隨順生理本能而不加節制或轉化時，就會有各種罪惡產生：

人之性惡，其善者偽也。今人之性，生而有好利焉；順是，故爭奪生而辭讓亡焉。生而有疾惡焉；順是，故殘賊生而忠信亡焉。生而有耳目之欲，有好聲色焉；順是，故淫亂生而禮義文理亡焉。然則從人之性，順人之情，必出於爭奪，合於犯分，亂理而歸於暴。故必將有師法之化，禮義之道，然後出於辭讓，合於文理，而歸於治。用此觀之，然則，人之性惡明矣。其善者偽也。<sup>3</sup>

生理慾望本身是價值中立的，無善惡之分。其之所以為「惡」，乃在於人沉溺於其中而不加節制。亦即引文中「順是」一語。徐復觀對《荀子》此說的解釋是：官能慾望的本身不可謂之惡，不過惡是從慾望這裏引發出來的。問題全出在「順是」兩個字上；這與《孟子》「物交物，則引之而已矣」的說法，實際沒有多大出入<sup>4</sup>。

然而「化性起偽」之可能，也正在於性之第三種意義：人格之可塑性。因為荀子認為「性者本始材朴也，偽者文理隆盛也」，兩者之關係是：「無性，則偽之無所加；無偽，則性不能自美。」<sup>5</sup>因人具有可塑性，所以經由「師法之化」，

<sup>2</sup> 王先謙：《荀子集解》（北京：中華書局，1988年），卷2〈榮辱篇〉，頁63。

<sup>3</sup> 同前註，卷17〈性惡篇〉，頁434-435。

<sup>4</sup> 徐復觀：《中國人性論史—先秦篇》，頁238。

<sup>5</sup> 王先謙：《荀子集解》，卷13〈禮論篇〉，頁366。

禮義之道」，就能使人「出於辭讓，合於文理，而歸於治」。此人格之可塑性亦即荀子所謂「可以能仁義法正之具」，所以能夠藉由仁義法正之偽，而逐漸向善，此亦被荀子用來說明其「塗之人可以為禹」之理論基礎<sup>6</sup>。

綜上所述，在《荀子》的理論架構中，其以性惡為特色的人性論一方面解釋了為何需要「禮」，另一方面又提供了「禮」之所以能夠發揮「化性起偽」作用的說明。如果少了此人性面向的解釋，荀子對「禮」的論述即缺乏理論上的連貫性與嚴整性。就此看來，「性惡」論點實同樣具有代表性，在《荀子》一書中之重要性也並不亞於禮制論，難以證明作者「就《荀子》的價值取向而言，對『禮』之重要性之提倡，遠遠超過『性惡』」的主張。對禮制的重視與闡發自然是《荀子》思想之重大特色與貢獻，但強調「禮」之重要性，不必以淡化荀子思想中其它成素的核心地位為代價。如此非但無益於其理論價值，反而有損其理論效力。

### 叁、孔子與荀子禮思想之關係

作者指出，本書之寫成乃是進行《荀子》研究的奠基作業（頁 xii）。而其相較於過去的相關研究之特色為：「能讓讀者進一步以『多』（諸子思想）對『一』（荀子）的比較方式，綜合理解《荀子》在先秦思想的各種脈絡中的定位和意義。」（頁 xiii）進一步來看，作者對此奠基作業及其特色的具體表現為：對《荀子》與孔門思想的傳承問題採取忽略態度，而質疑「荀子的禮治思想是孔子禮思想的發展」之理路（頁 15）。其反對理由是：

主張「荀子的禮治思想是孔子禮思想的發展」之理路，往往忽略在孔子到荀子的兩百多年中間，「禮」思想也可能經過許多演變與發展。當我們在評估《荀子》「禮」概念時：應該是將《荀子》看作孔子「禮」思想的小部分繼承者，還是將之視為戰國時期各種「禮論」的綜合者，甚至是集大成者呢？我們是不是要考慮「禮」的思想，其實是在經過荀子的理論工夫之後，才提升到可視為哲學理論之水準的可能性？（頁 15-16）

關於作者此主張，首先值得注意的是一個邏輯問題。強調荀子作為戰國時期各種「禮論」的綜合者或集大成者，與「荀子的禮治思想是孔子禮思想的發展」兩個

<sup>6</sup> 同前註，卷17〈性惡篇〉，頁 442-444。

命題，並非處於互不相容而須在二者之間擇一的 either/or 關係。除非作者已預先論證，孔子思想有礙於荀子從事統整諸子百家的思想工作，否則荀子在繼承與發展孔子禮思想的同時，也同樣可將戰國時期諸子之說予以吸收綜合，進而納為己用。凸顯荀子的集大成地位，不必抹殺其繼承孔子禮思想的傳承貢獻。

其次，既然作者認為《荀子》「禮論」具有以上之重大理論貢獻，而且作者又指出，荀子是否能稱上儒家？是否為從儒家正宗之歧出等問題，乃當前大陸與臺灣學界研究荀子思想淵源之重大議題（頁 2）。一本以此為主題並作出上述論斷的專著，就必須對此提出相應的分析與探討。而其議題至少須包含：對孔子及其弟子與荀子思想之傳承與同異之討論（例如學界經常論及的與子夏、仲弓及子游思想之關係），與戰國時期諸子相關思想之對比，最後還須交代：《荀子》書中所呈現之「禮論」，若從哲學理論效力來看，有哪些是孔子與其弟子，乃至戰國時期諸子所缺乏而能發前人所未發之處。這方面的說明涉及的不只是《荀子》提出了哪些論點，還有這些論點在相關哲學領域中所進於前人之處。以此檢視本書的內容，作者僅集中在《荀子》與戰國時期諸子相關思想問題之探討，對於另外兩個問題卻完全帶過，並未做出任何解釋。如此實難以支持作者為反駁荀子禮治思想是孔子禮思想的發展，所提出之上述論斷與說明。

從書名來看，作者實已表達出欲將論述焦點放在戰國諸子之用心。如此就須意識到其構思的範圍設定問題，避免討論議題之設定溢出其論據所及之處。在方法上，本書是部分地從《荀子》書中挑選某些概念，而與戰國諸子思想比較與連結。是以作者自承「本書尚未能釐清《荀子》思想的整體特色」（頁 xii），而且也避開了荀子與孔子及其弟子思想傳承關係之討論；然而在成果上，又欲藉此以綜合理解《荀子》在先秦思想各種脈絡中的定位和意義，並對《荀子》思想的整體特性做出各種論斷。這樣是否能達到作者所預期的成效，就令人難以樂觀。

#### 肆、荀子是否為漢代禮治國家藍圖之創制者

在結論中，作者另提出一個新見解，亦即：荀子應為漢代禮治國家藍圖之創制者。其立論依據為，如果《史記·禮書》的內容能代表漢朝禮治的理論依據，漢朝禮治的原理就是來自於《荀子》的禮論。此乃基於司馬遷《史記·禮書》中三分之二的篇幅說明禮的意義與內容，而這部分的論述竟幾乎都可在《荀子》

文本中找到（頁 262-263）。

以上論點之問題在於，就算我們承認《史記·禮書》的內容代表漢朝禮治的理論依據，其與荀子的理論傳承關係卻並未從作者的論述中得以建立。首先，也是最重要的原因，就是司馬遷本人並未將漢代的禮治制度與規章推源至荀子，而是孔子。作者也指出：「司馬遷在整篇〈禮書〉中皆未提及荀子，反而是以早荀子兩百多年的孔子話語，來總結整個禮治論。」（頁 274）可見就作者司馬遷的主觀認定而言，漢代的禮治制度規章應上溯至孔子，荀子的論點則並未進入其視野中。

再就客觀論據來看，作者並未實際列舉司馬遷《史記·禮書》中說明禮的意義與內容之部分，有哪些話可在《荀子》文本中找到。唯一提出的文本證據，只有司馬遷《史記·禮書》中「人道經緯萬端，規矩無所不貫，誘進以仁義，束縛以刑罰，故德厚者位尊，祿重者寵榮，所以總一海內而整齊萬民也」此段話，指出其內容幾乎就是《荀子》禮治論的提要（頁 274）。

問題在於，司馬遷此段話不但可視之為《荀子》禮治論的提要，就作者在本書中的討論而言，此段話亦可視之為對《管子》禮論的提要。因為作者指出，《管子》中有著相當完整的禮治思想，為《荀子》禮治思想的主要來源，或甚至可能是一種「原型」(proto-type)（頁 148）。兩者的具體共識有：「禮」就管子而言，「是約束社會全體的規範」（頁 153），「由『禮』達到的秩序不僅是人間社會，而且是『萬物』世界」（頁 154），而且《管子》與《荀子》同樣以「德」、「義禮」等概念強調君王在「教化」方面的關鍵角色（頁 162-163）。這都符合司馬遷《史記·禮書》中作者視為《荀子》禮治論提要的那段話。如此一來，我們是否也可據以指出，漢朝禮治的原理其實來自於《管子》的禮論？作者在其它相關論述中也出現了同樣問題。例如作者強調《荀子》禮治論的特質在於：不只是治理某一個國家抽象的形上、宇宙秩序，而是為了達成整體人類社會的秩序所提出來的論述。並且，此人間的秩序須以倫理的準則（即「義」），和人類特有的文明特質（即「文理」）來建立，這也是《荀子》的禮治論常被表述為禮義論的理由（頁 273）。從這段說明來看，我們又可設問：此《荀子》禮治論的表述，與孔子對禮儀的功能與特性之看法又有何不同？若未對荀子與孔子之異另作解釋，此段說明亦可視為對孔子禮論的描述，反而正凸顯了司馬遷不提荀子，而將漢代的禮治制度規章上溯至孔子的合理性。

質言之，若從作者本身對《荀子》禮治論的各種特色描繪出發，我們無法看

到荀子與孔子、管子的具體差異何在，那麼就客觀論據而言，又怎能斷定司馬遷《史記·禮書》或漢代的禮治原理之淵源來自荀子，而非孔子或管子？

## 伍、收入《韓非子》人觀之討論是否必要

就作者寫作本書之目的而言，第六章有關《荀子》人性論與《韓非子》人觀的討論是否有必要納入，實值得商榷。因為依作者所言，本書的主題是：「闡明《荀子》中的多樣禮概念如何發揮其綜合功能，以及此綜合性之思想意義。」「了解其如何統整當時在戰國思想家之間所展開的各種主張。」（頁4）至於第六章探討的主題，依作者所言，乃是：「《荀子》人性論和《韓非子》的人觀之間是否必然具有理論繼承關係的問題。」（頁5）有鑑於《荀子》人性論並非本書主題，又是作者認為不如禮論思想重要者，加上作者也未明確交代此章探討的人性論，與《荀子》的禮論本身到底有何牽涉？綜觀全書，即使完全沒有此章，對作者《荀子》禮制論之探討也不致造成任何影響。那麼何以用一整章之篇幅處理此議題，則令人費解？此章是否需要收入本書中，似乎是作者可以斟酌之部分。

## 陸、總結

作者欲藉此書推翻一些其所指出的成說，突破其所認為的現今研究所遭遇之瓶頸，而在《荀子》的理論研究上取得創新性的進展。就學術研究之目的而言，自是值得鼓勵與支持之舉。此種用心實亦為學術研究得以不斷進步之真正動力。其貢獻在於：雖然荀子重禮，強調制度之重要，此自是人所皆知。但作者能較廣泛地對《荀子》「禮論」思想與戰國時期諸子百家的相關論述作出整理與比較研究，點出荀子思想中可能具有的綜合性特質，而非僅著眼於其作為一位儒家的角色，而亦同時作為有能力兼綜其他各家的集大成者，從而為儒學在理論上開闢出一番新天地。特別是作者對《荀子》與《莊子》、《管子》思想相互關係之探討，可謂豐富了以往《荀子》相關研究所較欠缺的面向。

可惜作者並未在其研究論據與預期效果之間取得平衡，以致在某些問題處理上，兩者顯現出明顯落差。書中所涉及的一些整體性論斷，諸如較之「性惡」的



人性論而言，「禮」概念對《荀子》具有更大的重要性；反對《荀子》禮治思想是孔子禮思想的發展；乃至荀子應為漢代禮治國家藍圖之創制者等等見解。不僅使得分析的涵蓋範圍太廣，超出作者論據與本書主題之範圍；牽涉理論內容亦極為複雜。相形之下，作者僅僅聚焦於《荀子》「禮論」之方法取向，除了作者自承難以照顧到《荀子》思想整體特色的缺點之外，亦無法作為證成作者此等整體性論斷之資源。此即本書一些論述缺乏有力論據支持之原因。有鑑於本書之主題並未施加作者處理此等問題的責任，作者若能將其對《荀子》理論的評價與論斷範圍，確切限定在《荀子》「禮論」思想與戰國時期諸子百家的比較研究上，而不直接涉及其它議題，將會使本書特色更形顯著，論述更為嚴謹，亦不致為其論據所未及之處拖累。

《「鎔鑄」與「進程」——朱熹《四書章句集注》之歷史思維》，陳逢源著，臺北：政大出版社，二〇一三年。三六八頁。

林永勝，臺灣大學中文系副教授

理學的思想與其實踐體系，型塑了近八百年來東亞世界的文化面貌，其影響不可謂不大，而在理學中，影響力最深遠的無疑是朱子學。近世東亞的儒教世界，是隨著朱子學的擴張而形成的，而朱子學之所以被廣泛的接受，與其《四書章句集注》深入各個階層，成為東亞士人理解儒家思想的主要門徑是有關的。宋、元、明、清以降，認同朱子的學者，紛紛對《四書章句集注》進行更細緻的疏解<sup>7</sup>；而欲批判朱子的思想家，也都集中對此書的結構或內容進行批判<sup>8</sup>。對於此一重要著作，當代中文學界雖然有不少單篇論文進行各方面的探討，但以專著的形式來研究《四書章句集注》的，卻如鳳毛麟角。除了本書之外，前一本以《四書章句集注》為主題的專著，也是由陳逢源先生所撰寫<sup>9</sup>。為何會有此現

<sup>7</sup> 例如：胡炳文的《四書通》、胡廣的《四書集注大全》、章一陽的《金華四先生四書正學淵源》等。

<sup>8</sup> 如王陽明考訂《大學》古本，以駁朱子對《大學》的重新編排及詮釋；或者以訓詁、考據角度批判朱子之說非《論》、《孟》本義，如：毛奇齡《論語稽求篇》，戴震《孟子字義疏證》，伊藤仁齋《論語古義》、《孟子古義》，荻生徂徠《論語微》、《大學解》、《中庸解》，傅斯年：《性命古訓辨證》等。

<sup>9</sup> 陳逢源：《朱熹與《四書章句集注》》（臺北：里仁書局，2006年）。

象？

在當代學術專業化與分工化的趨勢下，以往如錢穆先生這種將學術與思想融一爐而冶之的研究方式逐漸式微，而朝著分途的方向發展。偏向思想、哲學進路的研究者，關心的是朱子的整體思想、或朱子思想中所呈現的特定哲學論題，而《四書章句集注》作為朱子思想的呈顯，學者多會從其中揀出朱子對某一段經典的解釋，或對某關鍵字詞的定義，以此來探討朱子思想，而較少會去探討一部學術著作如《四書章句集注》的完成脈絡。而研究經學、學術史的學者，對於一部學術著作的完成及其相關學術史背景，通常會賦予較多的關注，但此種關注的焦點卻較少集中在理學家身上，這是因為理學家的經解常被認為不符古義，而是受到其理氣論或心性之學的影響，因此較缺乏系統性研究的興趣。

但事實上，朱子對《四書》的漢、唐古注其實頗為用力，他在注解《四書》之前，進行了長時間的準備工作（由《論孟精義》，再《四書或問》，繼之以《四書集注》，最後有《四書章句集注》的完成）。但朱子對於各種注解之間，為何去彼取此，其間的取捨原則為何，這與朱子的思想，其實具有互相建構的關係。本書作者陳逢源先生一方面有紮實的經學、學術史研究訓練，一方面對朱子的思想有長時間的關心，並對哲學、思想學界有關朱子思想的各主要議題皆有關注，故能兼融兩方所長，並能進一步探討朱子對整個儒學傳統的吸納與融合，以及這種融合為近世東亞世界的思想與文化所開出的新方向，正如本書的〈序論〉所言，此書是在「經學」與「理學」交融視域下的觀察所完成的。

本書為作者在二〇〇六年出版《朱熹與《四書章句集注》》，再經八年的研究累積而完成的專著。書名大致呈現出本書的內容、研究方式與企圖。所謂「鎔鑄」與「進程」，正如作者所指出，鎔鑄是「承之於前」，進程則是「新變於後」，這說明本書主要的探討內容，即朱子如何吸納此前的各個儒學傳統，並進行融合，從而使此一新的思考方向影響了近世的思想文化。書名副標題的「歷史思維」一詞，應受到余英時先生《朱熹的歷史世界》一書的影響，亦即本書的研究方法，試圖從朱子的時代背景切入，探討當時多元社群的學術競逐、主要學者的思考與爭辯焦點，以及朱子學在歷史的脈絡中之所以能夠勝出的原因，而非只是以朱子學符合統治階層利益，籠統的將此問題一筆帶過。

朱子的《四書章句集注》之所以能在近世產生如此大的影響力，並逐漸取代《五經》的地位，成為儒家的核心經典，作者認為此係朱子在宋代的學術社群競逐中，思考並鎔鑄了千餘年來有關儒門的各種分歧與爭論，並藉由《集注》對這

些爭論進行系統性的回應，從而型塑了新的儒家思想體系。作者藉由對《四書章句集注》的分析，探討了朱子所鎔鑄的各種儒門分歧與爭論，這也呈現在本書的章節順序中，如孔門弟子的分途（第一章〈穎悟與篤實〉）、戰國漢唐儒學發展方向的分歧（第二章〈治統與道統〉）、北宋儒者圍繞著《孟子》所產生的爭論（第三章〈政治與心性〉）、理學的成立與二程實踐方法的異同（第四章〈縱貫與橫攝〉）、程門後學的發展（第五章〈道南與湖湘〉）等。也正是因為朱子深入思考這些爭論與分歧的緣由，並進行系統性的解釋與回應，從而有《四書章句集注》的完成，也使此一新的儒學詮釋體系能在當時激烈的學術社群競逐中脫穎而出，並型塑了近世思想與文化的發展方向。

當然《四書》此一經典體系的成立，並非朱子一人之力所完成，而是宋代理學家對儒家思想的整體反省與經典詮釋的成果累積。古典儒家以孔子所傳述的《五經》為核心經典，其認同的聖人如周公、孔子等，則同時兼具王者的形象與地位，而儒家士人所追求的道，則是圍繞著社會參與及政治實踐所建構出的龐大實踐體系。但隨著儒家的政治理想在東漢、魏、晉的歷史現實中逐漸崩潰，而佛教則挾帶其對本體、心性與工夫的整體性討論而席捲中國，因此到南北朝時，佛教徒開始提出內、外二教的區分。如北周的釋道安在其〈二教論〉中指出：中國傳統的九流十家，內容從修身到治國，對應的是現世的問題，此係外教；而佛教探討萬有的本源與實相、萬有與自我的關連性，並提出具體的方法以體證本體，而能得到真正的解脫，此係內教。能揭示內教之內容者，方可稱之為聖人，故釋道安在〈二教論〉中也剝奪了周公、孔子的聖人地位。

面對佛教在理論上的壓力，儒家若欲爭奪在內教領域的發言權，則必然要對儒家的道、經、聖進行新的詮釋，以說明儒家亦有性命之學的內容，且較佛教只重內教而不重外教的趨向，更有優勝之處。故自唐代的韓愈、李翱等儒學復興運動者，開始重視《孟子》，並撰〈原道〉、〈原性〉、〈復性書〉等篇章，試圖闡發儒家的性、道、教內容，以建構儒家的內教領域。這種嘗試在北宋進一步開花結果，周敦頤、張載藉由對《易傳》、《中庸》的詮釋，建構儒家的成聖之學，而二程則開始重視《大學》，並對其進行詮釋，這種新經典運動及其意義，近期也有學者對此進行較詳細的考察<sup>10</sup>。而朱子在此一運動中的重要性在於，他藉由注解《四書》的長時間準備過程，反省了戰國諸儒對於儒學方向的諸多思考與詮釋，漢、晉儒者在政治實踐上的前進與挫折，佛教、道教的工夫論體系及其

<sup>10</sup> 楊儒賓：《從《五經》到《新五經》》（臺北：臺大出版中心，2013年）。

對本體、心性之學的闡發，還有北宋理學家對於儒家心性之學的建構成果，並加以融合，放棄北宋理學家所共同重視的《易傳》，而只以《四書》為核心經典，並擬定進學的順序（先《大學》，再《論語》，繼之以《孟子》，最後則是《中庸》），然後以自身經路鑄過的整體思考對《四書》進行系統性的詮釋，從而完成此一宏大的儒家思想典範轉移工作。

朱子欲對儒家的道、經、聖等概念進行典範轉移，「道統」之說的提出，實具有關鍵的地位。當確立道統的承繼，則哪些人可被視為聖人，哪些經典更為核心，還有，從這些聖人與核心經典中所歸納出的儒家之道為何，都會產生一種新的理解。朱子如何藉由《四書章句集注》，建構出此一道統系譜，本書的第一章〈穎悟與篤實〉、第二章〈治統與道統〉有相當完整的討論。所謂道統，即是以孔子、曾子、子思、孟子此四子為儒門之正傳，而由四子所傳述的《四書》，在對儒家思想的解釋上自然具有更核心的地位。但以孔子及門弟子而論，傳統的「孔門四科」或「十哲」之說，曾子皆不與焉。在《論語》的紀錄中，孔子早期的弟子如顏回、子路、子貢，或晚期的弟子如游、張、夏等，出現的頻率更為頻繁，而孔子對曾子甚至有「參也魯」這樣的評語。到了北宋理學家處，顏回被認為是孔子之道的繼承者，故學者乃以「尋孔顏樂處」當作聖學的入門途徑，曾子的地位此時亦未受到凸顯。則如何證明曾子獨得孔子之正傳，遂成為朱子詮釋的重點。陳逢源先生在本書第一章中指出，朱子放棄以往的孔門四科這種涉及具體政治才能的分類方式，而以弟子的才性為主要分類方式，提出穎悟／篤實之分，並以此來討論其對弟子學行的影響。亦即孔子所欲傳之學，是躬行實踐之學，而博文強記則是末節，而曾子之魯是「誠篤而已」，故朱子認為曾子「以魯得之」、「才魯，故其學也確」，以此凸顯曾子之所以具有傳孔子之道的地位，並以此角度出發，對孔門其他弟子在學行上的不足之處進行評論。

在肯定曾子的地位後，孟子正統地位的確立也成為討論重點。所謂「四子相繼，軻死不得其傳」這樣的道統系譜，是由朱子完成建構的，但這種說法是如何成立的？這部分與唐、宋以來的孟子升格運動，以及北宋儒者圍繞著孟子產生的尊孟／疑孟風潮有關，本書的第二、第三章中有較詳細的討論。本書第二章〈治統與道統〉中指出，因為北宋特殊的開國環境，故聖人相傳系譜的問題常成為朝中君臣談論的重點。而孔子死後的傳道系譜，在唐代韓愈表彰孟子，而宋代儒者又表彰漢、唐儒者的背景下，在北宋的慶曆、熙寧間，遂有五賢相繼的說法，即孟子、荀子、揚雄、王通、韓愈五人，皆被賦予傳道者的地位，但此處所說的

道，其實是圍繞著政治參與及實踐而展開。孟子思想的核心被司馬遷歸結為「道性善，言必稱堯、舜」，亦即性善說與王道政治論是其理論核心，但漢、唐儒者對孟子的性善論，其實多有批評，而北宋儒者肯定孟子，並將其視為傳道者的原因，也是因為其對王道政治的提倡，甚至當時產生的尊孟（新黨）與疑孟（舊黨）的爭論，爭論的焦點也多是集中在孟子是否尊王等問題上，而未及於性善之說，此一背景在本書第三章〈政治與心性〉中，有較多討論。而經歷慶曆、熙寧變法的二程，在反省新黨士人追求事功但未有相應的德行，及其所產生的問題，故藉由對孟子性善論的詮釋以標舉心性之學，以此作為儒門之道的核心，故理學家對孟子的詮釋也開始集中於對性善之說的闡發。朱子繼承北宋以來有關對孟子的重視，儒門傳道者的系譜，尊孟疑孟的論辯，以及有關政治與心性關係的思考，而對孟子有系統性的新詮。在其以性善論為核心的視野下，只重事功而不解性善之說的戰國、漢、唐諸儒，其所傳之道則被界定為治統，也進一步證成「四子相繼，孟子之後道統不得其傳」此一說法的有效性，以及理學家繼往聖絕學的意義。而這種詮釋，一方面使學者對孟子的認識產生了翻轉，也進一步凸顯了《四書》所傳的心性之學，較《五經》所傳之政治實踐內容更為核心的原因。

在確立心性之學是儒家之道的核心，則應如何回復本性、體認天理，就會面臨工夫論的問題，也就是「聖人之學」的實踐方法為何，這正是不同理學家的思想可以被區別的關鍵所在，如周敦頤的主靜、張載的大心、大程的觀喜怒哀樂未發前氣象、小程的涵養已發之際等，而由這些工夫路徑的差異出發，在程門中又發展為道南、湖湘等學派，而這些實踐方式對於朱子有關聖人之學的思考，以及其對《四書》內容的詮釋，都有直接的影響。對於這些問題，陳逢源先生在本書第四章〈縱貫與橫攝〉，探討朱子對於二程思想的縮合，第五章〈道南與湖湘〉，則探討了朱子對於程門後學的鎔鑄。二程思想的異同之處，當然很早就受到學者的注意與討論，但本書作者使用「縱貫」與「橫攝」當作討論焦點，以此來講朱子對大程、小程思想的鎔鑄，可能會產生較多的爭論。縱貫、橫攝之說，乃是牟宗三先生為了探討理學分系的問題，所提出的區分，在牟氏的體系中，儒家的正統乃以「天道性命相貫通」為主要方向，以「逆覺體證」為方法，此是「縱貫」的系統；而小程、朱子對於逆覺、貫通之說皆抱持著較審慎的態度，故方法轉為認知的追求與後天的涵養，此即「順取之路」，或說「橫攝」的系統<sup>11</sup>。在這樣的判教視野下，程朱之學被牟氏判為別子為宗，這其實是相當嚴

<sup>11</sup> 牟宗三：《心體與性體》（臺北：正中書局，1996年），第1冊，頁46-60。

厲的批判。事實上，大程、小程實踐方式的異同，是否真的可用縱貫、橫攝之說來概括，當代研究理學的學者仍有許多爭論。亦即，大程、小程在工夫路徑上的區別之處當然存在，而朱子在《四書章句集注》中兼採二程之說，以求鎔鑄於一體，這種現象也確實出現，故作者討論的方向並無問題，但如果能將焦點集中在涵養察識先後、觀未發或參中和等二程工夫論上具體的差異之處，而非以現代學者建構的說法來當主題，或許更能讓學者將焦點集中在朱子試圖結合二程，所進行的嘗試。

本書最後一章之標題為「詳味與潛玩」，此二語是朱子注解《四書》時，經常出現的提點話語。此處看似與前面幾章不同，亦即不涉及對一些儒學爭論的鎔鑄，但其實不然，此處涉及的是朱子對整個儒學實踐方向的反省與鎔鑄。有學者曾指出，在東方的身心修煉傳統中，傾向於將自我、知識與文化視為迷惑、痛苦和束縛的來源，因此修煉的目標在於超越這些限制，以便與氣、本體、梵我合一，但儒家似乎是明顯的例外<sup>12</sup>。儒家對知識、文化建構抱持著積極的態度，而自我與世界更是具有互相建構、互相改造的關係，故勞思光亦以肯定世界、捨離世界與觀賞世界，當作儒、釋、道三家的區別之處。但知識具有實用性，在知識學習過程中，小則產生爭勝之心，大則產生功利思想，甚至因此混淆應然與必然的界線，這也是前述的各實踐傳統會對知識抱持著負面態度的原因。但若只講為道日損，只是默坐澄心，則只完成了「靜以直內」，但「義以方外」的面向則仍有未達，這也是理學家對二氏的主要批判焦點。則如何肯定讀書、又不會流於上述的弊病，朱子遂提倡二程「涵養須用敬，進學在致知」的工夫路徑。亦即朱子所追求的「學」，一方面必須讀書理會事理（這也是朱子對陸九淵的主要批評），但讀書並非其目的，而需將讀書所領會的道理用以涵養自身心性。故朱子在注解《四書》的過程中，並非完全站在「解經者」的立場，而是化身為「讀者」，將自己閱讀《四書》的心得，及自己長時間研讀《四書》、並以此進行踐履後所獲得的體會，與「潛在讀者」分享，指出某些字眼宜深味、潛玩，寄望潛在讀者不要只追求知識與記誦，而要靜下心來體會，以此涵養身心，並契進聖賢之道。這種針對某些字眼深味潛玩的讀書法，也可以本書第一章「穎悟與篤實」之說互相呼應，即曾子為何能以篤實的資質而得聖人之道。故本章其實是對儒家實踐方向的整體鎔鑄，一方面「進學」，一方面「涵養」，或說一方面「道問

<sup>12</sup> Herbert Fingarette, "The Problem of the Self in the *Analects*," *Philosophy East and West* 29.2 (April, 1979): 129-140.

學」，一方面「尊德行」，兩者如車之兩輪、鳥之兩翼，若能互不偏廢，即能互相建構，而體會《四書》所欲傳達的儒學之道與聖人之旨。

綜上所述，本書的書名「鎔鑄與進程」，呈現出本書的主要內容，即朱子如何吸納此前的各個儒學傳統與爭論，並進行融合，這些思考的結晶正是《四書章句集注》，而這些鎔鑄的結果也影響了近世的思想文化。從另一方面來講，「鎔鑄與進程」也可以用來概括作者對《四書章句集注》的解讀，亦即作者正是吸納了現、當代學者對《四書》的諸多思考，如錢穆的學術史研究進路，牟宗三對理學工夫論的判教，余英時的歷史思維方法，或黃俊傑的經典詮釋理論等，並進行鎔鑄，從而完成此一專著。同時，正如本書第六章的篇名「深味與潛玩」，作者同樣並非完全站在學者的立場探討學術問題，而同時也站在「讀者」的角度，將自己長期研讀朱子著作與《四書章句集注》，從中產生的各種思考與體會，與本書的「潛在讀者」分享，故本書所提供的思考，非僅止於提供知識，而對《四書章句集注》有興趣的讀者亦值得深味與潛玩。而相信在本書將原本涇渭分明的「經學」與「理學」視域進行鎔鑄的努力下，應該可以為當代人文學界有關《四書章句集注》與朱子思想的思考與理解，開拓出更為全面的發展進程。

*The Burden of Female Talent: The Poet Li Qingzhao and Her History in China.* By Ronald C. Egan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2013. Pp. ix+422.

YANG Xiaoshan (楊曉山), Associate Professor, Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, University of Notre Dame.

This book falls in two parts. The first nine chapters focus largely on Li Qingzhao's struggle for acceptance as a woman writer and the cultural process through which she eventually became canonized in the Chinese tradition. Egan problematizes received notions that have come to dominate the interpretation of her song lyrics and offers, in the second part of the book (chapters 10-11), a fresh reading of these lyrics by treating them as literary creations rather than first-person statements about her personal circumstances.

Drawing on examples of three groups of women known to have composed poems (entertaining girls, upper class ladies, and poets of repute), chapter 1 ("Women as Writers in the Song Dynasty") demonstrates that, despite the unprecedented level of literacy among women in the Song period, there was a strong and widespread bias

against women's writing, especially poetic writing, and its public circulation and that such bias generated considerable self-consciousness among women writers. The exploration of the conditions of women as writers in the Song helps to lay the ground for the historicized reappraisal of Li Qingzhao later in the book.

Chapter 2 ("Writing and the Struggle for Acceptance") starts with an analysis of the centrality of writing in Li Qingzhao's life, the hurdles she faced as a woman writer, and the strategies she employed in her writings to overcome those hurdles. Attention is then turned to her earliest critics, who mixed praise of her poetic talent with disapproval of her personal conduct. The next section highlights the masculine characteristics in both subject matter and style of Li Qingzhao's *shi* 詩 poems. Her assumption of the authorial positions and interests generally held by male writers is examined in connection with her desire to display her literary competence and to gain admittance to a realm dominated by male writers. The chapter ends with Li Qingzhao's essay "On the Song Lyric" ("Cilun" 詞論). Her assertion of her superiority as a well-bred lady over male practitioners in this genre and her iconoclastic criticism of her major predecessors (all of whom were male) are discussed in the same context as her struggle for acceptance as a writer.

Chapter 3 ("Song Lyrics Preliminaries") takes up two issues which Egan believes need to be addressed before undertaking a critical explication of Li Qingzhao's song lyrics. The first concerns the integrity of the corpus of her song lyrics. Egan systematically sorts through the key events in the thorny textual history of Li Qingzhao's works and alerts us to the fact that more than half of the song lyrics attributed to her only surfaced centuries after her death. A major target of Egan's critique is the practice, prevalent among Chinese scholars, of treating all attributions as if they were of equal value or, worse yet, picking and choosing among the questionable attributions to suit one's own image and preconceptions of Li Qingzhao. Egan divides Li Qingzhao's song lyrics into four groups in accordance with their reliability and argues for the desirability of proceeding from those with the highest degree of reliability and only then moving toward those of progressively less reliability. Chronology of appearance is his main yardstick for authenticity. He cautions against the use of stylistic criteria, the validity of which is vitiated by various factors. The second issue that Egan tackles in this chapter is the convention of reading Li Qingzhao's song lyrics autobiographically, as if she and the female voice in her song lyrics were always one and the same. Egan unmasks the fallacy of this mode of reading and explores the reasons that the poetic works of women poets like Li Qingzhao have been read this way. The alternative proposed by Egan is to interpret Li Qingzhao's song lyrics as literary works, independent of what is known, or what we think is known, about her life.

Egan's original plan was to turn to Li Qingzhao's song lyrics after these preliminaries were cleared away. Instead, he describes in chapter 4 ("Widowhood, Remarriage, Divorce") the major events in the second half of her life, the most controversial of which were her brief remarriage and quick divorce (involving a court



trial and her brief imprisonment). Egan's sympathetic account calls attention to Li Qingzhao's travails in the wake of the Jurchen invasion of North China and the death of her husband and relates her remarriage to those travails; her divorce is examined against the Song legal practice and social mores. What we learn from this chapter is crucial for a critical understanding of the changing reception of Li Qingzhao in later times.

The next two chapters turn to Li Qingzhao's post-divorce writings. Chapter 5, "Writings from the Aftermath," examines her spurt of writing in relation to her efforts to re-establish herself after the humiliating experience of her marrying and then quickly divorcing her second husband. As in chapter 2, Egan interprets her writings on various subjects and in various forms (including poems on contemporary politics and a remarkable collection of writings on a board game designed as a contest of military strategy) as part of her strategy to gain acceptance as a serious writer.

The title of chapter 6 ("The 'Afterword'") refers to Li Qingzhao's famous postface to Zhao Mingcheng's notes on his collection of rubbings of ancient inscriptions. The afterword has been usually read as a nostalgic remembrance of her life with Zhao Mingcheng and serves as the main source for the idealization of their marriage in both serious scholarship and popular imagination. Stephen Owen has offered a reconsideration by scrutinizing hints of estrangement and references to the imbalance of power and authority in the marriage in the text. Egan situates the text, together with Li Qingzhao's other writings from the same period, in the context of her difficulties after the divorce and her need to regain her respectability. Such an approach yields new insight into some unstated motives of the text. For example, in analyzing Li Qingzhao's detailed enumeration of the loss of her formidable collection of cultural artifacts, Egan looks beyond her pseudo-philosophical reflection about the folly of human possessiveness and probes into the reason that she might have exaggerated her loss: given her unsettling experience with a number of characters (including the emperor, a crooked landlord, and a deceitful second husband) who had managed to or attempted to take possession of portions of the collection, it would be sensible for her as a vulnerable widow to try to fend off future opportunists by leaving the impression that little was left in the collection.

Egan distinguishes three stages in the reception history of Li Qingzhao. Chapter 7 ("The Beginnings of Li Qingzhao") covers the period from the time after her death through the Yuan dynasty. In this period, her image underwent an initial transformation. Among her earliest critics, admiring praise of her poetic talent is tempered by sniffing disapproval of her personal conduct. On the basis of her afterword, more sympathetic commentators saw in her a like-minded companion to, and devoted wife of, Zhao Mingcheng. In stories in an unofficial biography of Li Qingzhao that appeared by the fourteenth century at the latest, the Zhao-Li marriage is idealized as a match made in heaven. Song lyrics composed by male writers in imitation of Li Qingzhao projected the image of her as a lonely woman in the absence of Zhao Mingcheng. Early anthologies also tended to include only those of her song lyrics that would or could

reinforce that image.

During the Ming-Qing period, as shown in chapter 8 (“Saving the Widow, Denying the Remarriage: Reception during the Ming and Qing”), Li Qingzhao’s literary stature rose significantly as writing by women became more common and more acceptable. At the same time, serious moral condemnation of her appeared, as attitudes toward remarriage by widows turned increasingly negative. By the late Ming, Li Qingzhao’s seeming violation of the ideal of a chaste widow had become a source of dismay among critics who admired her as a poet. To resolve the conflict between her literary reputation and the prevailing cultural norms, scholars undertook the task of proving, with what now appears to be shaky evidence at best, that Song reports of Li Qingzhao’s remarriage were vicious smears. By the late Qing, Li Qingzhao had been successfully refashioned as a loving wife and a chaste widow, ever faithful to the memory of Zhao Mingcheng.

Chapter 9 (“Modernism, Revisionism, Feminism: Reception in Modern Times”) leads us from the early twentieth century to the present. In the first modern histories of Chinese literature from the May Fourth era, Li Qingzhao was commonly included as a canonical writer. Her impeccable image as a combination of poetic talent and moral probity remained intact until 1957, when the Qing denial of her remarriage was seriously challenged in two articles by a young scholar. The heated arguments that ensued between the “remarriage camp” and the “anti-remarriage camp” illustrates how literary historical revisionism serves the needs of cultural norms and how difficult it is to overcome the staying power of the well-established preconceptions about cultural icons. In the 1990s, efforts were launched to explore possible disharmony in Li Qingzhao’s (first) marriage, under the hypothesis that Zhao Mingcheng had taken one or more concubines or might have had extramarital affairs. This new line of inquiry coincided with, and was probably influenced by, the spread of feminism and women’s studies in mainland China, which provided impetus for reconsidering a range of issues in Li Qingzhao studies.

Egan’s critical treatment of Li Qingzhao’s song lyrics in chapter 10 (“Song Lyrics, Part 1”) starts with Li’s habitual rewriting of earlier poetic lines, moves on to a subset of songs about a woman’s outings into nature, and ends with the peculiar mood of the speaker in quite a number of pieces. This presentational scheme may seem somewhat odd, as the texts are grouped on the basis of disparate criteria such as technique and subgenre. Egan’s aim in structuring the chapter this way is “to discuss her best-known song lyrics as well as several usually overlooked, and also to take up, one by one, the key aspects of her corpus that make it so distinctive.” (p. 325)

In the last chapter of the book (“Song Lyrics, Part 2”), Egan examines two clusters of later attributions to Li Qingzhao. In so doing, he has two objectives. The first is to investigate the connection between the growing acceptance of these works as Li Qingzhao’s and the refashioning of her image to fit the changing cultural values of later times; the second is to show the differences between these pieces and the earlier, more reliable attributions (and thereby cast doubt on the authenticity of the later

attributions).

As is the case with his scholarly work in general, Egan's study of Li Qingzhao combines great learning and sensitive reading of the texts. A particularly noteworthy feature of the present book, which represents a welcome trend in the study of classical Chinese poetry in English, is its deliberate engagement with native scholarship. This can be exemplified in the discussion, in chapter 3, of one of Li Qingzhao's best known song lyrics. Commentators have interpreted the poem as her response to her separation from Zhao Mingcheng. Egan goes to considerable lengths to expose the contradictions in such interpretations before proposing the abandonment of the assumption that "any woman we find in her compositions corresponds to the historical Li Qingzhao and anything that a woman says to a beloved is a statement addressed to Zhao Mingcheng." (pp. 128–129) If the lonely lover in the poem is recognized as a conventional character in song lyrics, then efforts to locate the piece in Li Qingzhao's chronology become unnecessary and meaningless. As Egan explains, he "could have reached this point in the argument by more direct reasoning, yet that approach would have the disadvantage of failing to engage the vast native scholarship and criticism on Li Qingzhao, which, as learned and invaluable as it may be is, also often fraught with questionable claims" (p. 129).

Native scholarship is not just an object of Egan's critical scrutiny. It also helps to inspire some of his most insightful readings in the book. His penetrating analysis of Li Qingzhao's "Afterword" as motivated by her need to deter individuals with predatory intentions toward her collection, builds on Nangong Bo's 南宮博 finding that Li Qingzhao exaggerated her loss. The intriguing interpretation of the Li Balang episode in Li Qingzhao's essay "On the Song Lyric" as a veiled description of her own extraordinary poetic capability was first suggested, as Egan scrupulously acknowledges (p. 87), in an offhand remark by Li Guowen 李國文 that Li Balang's winning performance represents Li Qingzhao's success in stunning the literary world of the capital. (Li Guowen's remark comes from one of a collection of informal essays marked by their literary appeal rather than scholarly rigor.)

Egan challenges long-standing preconceptions and builds a strong case for treating Li Qingzhao's song lyrics "as literary works and not as windows onto the private life and emotions of the author." (p. 325) In reappraising and articulating the distinctive features and accomplishments of Li Qingzhao, Egan is not advocating a wholesale rejection of autobiographical reading of poetry or an absolute separation of the lyrical I and the historical author. His reservation about the viability of reading Li Qingzhao's song lyrics autobiographically is based on two particular circumstances. One is the well-established generic convention for male authors to invent fictional female personas in the song lyric. "It is condescending," Egan argues, "to assume that a woman is incapable of creating and manipulating poetic personas when we recognize that ability in male writers." (p. 323) We may want to observe here that critics who equate Li Qingzhao with the female speaker in her song lyrics certainly do not mean to be condescending to her but admire what they perceive to be the authenticity in the

thoughts and feelings expressed in her works.

The other circumstance that leads to Egan's criticism of the autobiographical reading of Li Qingzhao's song lyrics is that the paucity of her surviving writings (totaling a few dozens), coupled with lack of references to her in contemporary sources, makes it impossible to give a credible critical account of her life and works. (Her situation forms a sharp contrast with major male writers of her day such as Su Shi, Lu You, and Fan Chengda, who left behind thousands and even tens of thousands of poems and numerous writings in other forms, on the basis of which detailed biographies can be reconstructed with reasonable certainty.) The infeasibility of relating Li Qingzhao to the voice in her song lyrics with meaningful certainty also lies behind Egan's reservation about some feminist-influenced readings of her works, which are grounded in assumptions about details of her life that cannot be rigorously verified, though feminist scholarship, as he makes clear, is instrumental in his thinking on many issues in the book.

Faith in Li Qingzhao's authorship can work wonders; it can endow a mediocre work with "new power and intensity," even in the minds of the most sophisticated and learned readers, as vividly illustrated in the response by a number of luminary critics from the Ming-Qing period to a late attribution to Li Qingzhao with questionable authenticity and conventional quality. (pp. 368–369) The response of these critics, as Egan puts it, is "no longer primarily a literary approach or reaction to the poem. It is more of a pseudohistoricist or biographical reading of the work, in which the lines are perceived as being infused with the thoughts and feelings of the great woman poet." (p. 373) We should probably bear in mind here that, in the Chinese literary-critical tradition, it is not unusual for the distinction to blur between "a literary approach or reaction to a poem" and "a pseudohistoricist or biographical reading of the work;" getting to know the inner and outer worlds of the author (especially a canonical one) is one of the ultimate goals of reading his or her poetic works. Even in a genre such as the song lyric that relies heavily on the use of fictional voices, works expressing (or believed to express) the genuine sentiments of the author are generally considered far superior to works displaying mere technical ingenuity. Separating Li Qingzhao and her life from her song lyrics, as Egan readily acknowledges, comes at a price: her works may become "less effective for us, less moving and revealing." However, he argues, matters of literary effect and appreciation "need not be entangled with the issue of putting Li Qingzhao's literary work on an equal footing with that by male writers" in terms of creating and manipulating poetic personas. (p. 323)

Egan's advocacy and practice of treating Li Qingzhao's song lyrics as literary creations rather than autobiographical expressions also have far-reaching implications for the very foundation on which rests her reputation as a canonical poet. In one way or another, literary canons embody cultural ideals. Male canonical writers can figure as icons in a relatively wide range of normative values, whether it is Tao Yuanming with his high-minded withdrawal from public life or Du Fu with his noble loyalty to the sovereign and moving concern for the common people. In contrast, the cultural space

in which a woman can emerge as an exemplar is very much limited to the domain of familial relationships. As Egan's extensive discussion clearly demonstrates, Li Qingzhao's enshrinement in the pantheon of China's great writers is the outcome of a long and assiduous process through which her image is configured and reconfigured so that the poetic sentiments in her song lyrics become explicit or implicit manifestations of her loving relationship with her husband. What happens to our conception of Li Qingzhao's greatness when the lyrical expressions of her genuine sentiments in her song lyrics turn into dramatic performances of fictional voices in the interpretational process? Will the reformulation of her literary accomplishments (in the slim corpus of her surviving writings) be enough to make up for the loss of "authenticity" that has been long valorized in the commentarial tradition and to keep her safely ensconced in the Chinese canon? I am convinced that, for various reasons, Li Qingzhao will continue to hold her canonical status. However, challenges such as those posed in Egan's ground-breaking study will compel us to rethink the grounds of her canonicity.

