

書 評

Reviews

Just a Song: Chinese Lyrics from the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries. By Stephen Owen. Cambridge (Massachusetts) and London: Harvard University Press, 2019. Pp. ix + 420.

ZHANG Chen (章琛), Research Assistant Professor, Department of Chinese Language and Culture, Hong Kong Baptist University

I. What is New

At one point the *ci* lyric was “just a song.” Few scholars could – or would – dispute the designation “song,” but the indefinite article “a” is a little disorienting, as it unmoors the song from its determinate interpretative context (the specific autobiographical and historical frames of reference duly assigned in the long course of its reception) and sets it adrift, undifferentiated from others in the song family – not just the ones that somehow survived, but also the large number that we know from extant sources to have existed but are now lost to the processes of historical selection. The diminutive “just” finishes the job, canceling what special consequence the song may have acquired with its place in the *literary* canon, and reminds us of the original purpose for which it was created – only a song that one pauses just long enough to enjoy before moving on (perhaps back to the busy scheduled life, perhaps to other songs).

“Just a song” gestures back to a world where song lyric delineated a separate and protected space – a discourse of sensibility. The performance of song creates an enclosure – both temporary and repeatable – where the burdens of officialdom ceased to matter. It was a space one could enter and leave by choice, attractive both for the representation of intense feeling, and also for being militantly closed against the claims and constraints of the male public world. Authorship *kind* of mattered, but not in the same way it did for classical poetry or in the later print editions of *ci*. “Author”

functioned more as an attribute for a text rather than an emblem for its authoritative origin or authorial intent. Texts circulated in manuscripts before they were “gathered together” to form collections, and even then with a good deal of drift in attribution. This world of “dreamlike disorientation” (p. 4) is where Owen the scholar of literature meets up with the object of his investigation, ironically before it acquired the degree of stability in text and authorship that was the hallmark of it being legitimized as “literature.” His stated objective is to “follow the story of the lyric through the eleventh century into the early twelfth century, as it went from a performance practice ... to a fully literary form” (p. 4) – or to put it simply, from “just a song” to “no longer just a song.”

The story is not entirely new. Those of us who have had any textbook introduction to *ci* know about the genre’s ascendant course to legitimacy from a status dismissively referred to as “small stuff” (*xiaodao* 小道). We are familiar with the normative scenario of its early production – a literary gentleman dashes something off at a banquet and hands it to a singer to perform, often with a fair amount of liberty to improvise. We also know something of the huge mess of its drifting texts and attributions, of which a significant portion of lyrics simultaneously attributed to Yan Shu, Ouyang Xiu, and Feng Yansi is only the most salient symptom. What is new here is confronting head-on the challenges that this knowledge puts to our current understanding of the genre – its authors, its history, and its extant works. For the current account we have of the genre’s history is built around “an order of authors” – a neat lineup of authors and texts that present a continuous story of evolution from the genre’s reputed origins in the Tang and into the Song. But once we examine what scanty sources we have and the nature of these sources, we find, as Owen states, “the histories and anthologies that give us a continuous story of song lyric from the Tang through the Five Dynasties into the Song are on exceedingly fragile ground” (p. 51).

Again, the sources about the early transmission of *ci* from which Owen draws his conclusion are hardly new; the issue is what we have done with them. Do we acknowledge them with a nod and continue to study *ci* up through the Northern Song within the framework of the order of authors in ways that tacitly affirm it? Here I think of the new *biannian* editions published in the last few decades that present the works of individual lyricists in chronological order (with varying degrees of reliability in the dating), as well as the studies that these editions make convenient, the ones that study a lyricist’s style in light of their “thought” and/or its evolution through the different stages of their life. Or do we bracket the issue of transmission and treat it as a separate problem? There is a wealth of scholarship in Chinese providing meticulous collation of early sources and editions. Daniel Bryant’s study on the textual genealogy of *Nan Tang er zhu ci* also falls into this category. The third approach has been to treat the idea of “author” with a great deal of caution, making the necessary distinction between the historical person to whom the lyrics are attributed and the persona presented in the lyrics. Without taking “the author” for granted, we assess the reliability of what biographical and historical information we have and weigh it against the internal

evidence in the lyrics. This approach presents much more nuanced and historically accurate readings of the authors and their works, and provides new perspectives on the current narrative. Ronald Egan's works on Ouyang Xiu and Li Qingzhao are fine examples of this.

The fourth approach, not attempted until Owen's book, is to seek an alternative order, to develop a framework that is consistent with what we know of the nature of our sources, from which we may then reassess the very concepts that we use to understand the genre. *Just a Song* presents the story of *ci* in this alternative order – “an order of books” – which to my mind is its most important contribution and what makes it a groundbreaking study. His methodology may be summed up in the following: what do the extant books – the time of their appearance, the nature of their sources, and the way they were compiled – tell us about how the genre was understood, and how does such analysis change our understanding of the works and authors that they were supposed to represent? By this, Owen proceeds to demonstrate that, “once we think of the history of song lyric as a history of its books...rather than of authors, our understanding of the history of the genre changes” (p.6).

II. An Order of Books

Owen presents his story in “an order of books.” An introduction is duly included, which looked clear and useful enough as a roadmap on my first read through. But looking at it again after having followed every thread to the end, I find that it failed to do the book justice. If anything, it takes the edge off of many of his arguments. The “real” introduction in my opinion is Part I, comprised of the first two chapters. Here he asks the core questions, outlines the general issues, and lays the framework for discussion for the entire book. Owen identifies the core problem of *ci* as the gap between the moment a lyric leaves the author's brush and the time it enters a collection. He devotes the first chapter to “tracing the route of a song from its composition to a book we can now access” (p. 21) based on his reading of prefaces, colophons, anecdotal accounts, and comparing early *ci* anthologies. A lyric may pass through the following moments on this route:

- a) circulating as “singles”;
- b) enters a personal repertoire (of a singer or an aficionado);
- c) gathered into a collection representing a particular lyricist;
- d) enters anthologies or compendia; and
- e) beyond: expanded editions, recovered manuscripts and reprints in the Ming and the Qing.

The route from a) to d) may be cumulative, or it may overlap or skip steps – we do not know for certain. Owen's point is precisely this: there are large gaps in what the extant sources can tell us of *how* a lyric gets from a) to d), and that we cannot assume it to remain unchanged in the process. In fact, what the sources do reveal is that these are the moments when words and attributions shift and change.

Moments a) to d) are also song lyric's modes of transmission. Single sheets and small repertoires were the norm before the appearance of early collections. Owen identifies some time markers for when things were changing. Two periods are worth highlighting here. The first is a three-decade timeframe from 1058 to 1089, the greater part of which overlaps with "the age of Su Shi" (he comes back to these "stabilizing dates" throughout the book, see esp. Chapter Seven). The upshot is that we see lyricists exercising more control over their own collections toward the end of this time window, whereas before the age of Su Shi, collections were made by editors gathering what is available from existing repertoires (采獲所存), rather than working from an authoritative base text. This means that "we have a world of shifting texts and authorship intervening between the moment of composition and the early collections of a lyricist's works" (p. 25). The second period of transformation is the mid-twelfth century (roughly 1140s and 1150s) as song lyric was beginning to enter print culture. Again Owen draws attention to the difference between the textual base that the early Southern Song editors were likely working with as they compiled books of Northern Song lyrics, and what we now assume to have been their sources from the expanded editions that came later.

The timeline aligns with Qian Xisheng's division of early *ci* transmission into the "age of performance scripts," "the age of manuscript editions," and "the age of print editions," but Owen makes some important inferences that would inform his reading throughout the book. He allots a much larger role to the singers not only as performers and transmitters of song lyric, but also as possible *authors*. Considering in the early stages of transmission a lack of concern for the scholarly accuracy of the attributions (it's "just a song" after all), he introduces the idea of "author magnetism" – the phenomenon that a famous name gets attributed lyrics by, for example, singers in the likely scenario of being asked "who wrote it?" It leads him to infer that, "The fact that we commonly have the same lyrics appearing under two or more famous names in extant collections does not mean that those are the *only* lyrics that may not be by the author assigned in a particular collection" (p. 33). The implication of this concerns the body of lyrics with hitherto *uncontested* authorship, on which we have based with a comfortable sense of certainty our understanding of famous lyricists such as Ouyang Xiu, Liu Yong, and so on. Owen suggests that singers may have composed some of the lyrics now attributed to a famous lyricist, "the lyrics composed by singers – where did they go?" (p. 33) If we accept that an unknown portion of famous lyrics from the Northern Song were composed or revised by singers, and given that singers were normally women, then it becomes necessary to revise the basic assumption in the current gender discourse about song lyric – that the genre is associated with feminine values and feminine space, but mostly composed by men.

Owen acknowledges that sources are scant, and that his idea of the "normative scenario" of how early collections were made is based Yan Jidao's account in the preface to *Yuefu buwang*. However, there is circumstantial evidence to support his inferences but none to refute them. The greater role Owen allots to singers also informs

the bold hypothesis he proposes in Chapter Two. Arguably the most provocative part of the book, it states that the origin of *ci* as a textual genre “may be none other than a change in transcription practice.” I will treat the hypothesis in a separate section, as there are too many layers to get into here.

If there is more material to work with for the mid-twelfth century, the situation is no less opaque as to how lyrics from the Northern Song were circulating. One important observation Owen makes is that even as song lyric entered print, manuscript still played a significant role in its textual transmission. Our knowledge of the stability of the manuscript versions, as well as their relation to print, is very much incomplete. Owen observes that lyrics were generally circulating in selections rather than “complete” collections, many without the author’s name attached. In other words, the degree of drift in text and attribution is much greater than is commonly assumed.

The case of song lyric from the eleventh through the mid-twelfth centuries presents a singular problem in writing genre history: as the new genre matured from performance text into literature, its changing modes of transmission occurred in the context of a broader shift from manuscript to print in literary culture. The neat taxonomy of authors through which we tell the genre’s early history is an anachronism, founded on a sense of certainty and stability in text and authorship that only came at a later stage. By directing the focus of his inquiry at the early lyric collections and the nature of their sources, Owen’s exercise reveals complex processes at work in determining what gets read and preserved. It serves as a reminder of the cost of attrition in the genre’s legitimization and canon formation – in the vast body of drifting texts whose reality is only partially and obliquely reflected in the specific arrangement of texts and authors that shape common perceptions of the genre.

The exercise seeks to break free from the old order of authors, but it is essentially a constructive argument in the sense that it resituates texts in relation with the author and to each other. Every lyric has a creator – even if by “creating” Owen sometimes means adapting or amplifying an older text – but the author’s relevance varies according to the amount of control he exercised over the text we are now able to see. Su Shi, whom Owen infuriatingly labels “the dynasty’s largest ego,” is an exceptional case in giving us the first large set of lyrics in a determinate relationship with the historical author. In most cases the relationship is indeterminate. Owen takes a book-oriented approach, treating “author” as a function of the texts they may have produced, and certainly of those with which they came to be associated. The perceived image of an author may acquire a vague contour, as in the case of Ouyang Xiu, which in turn would serve as the principle for selection and exclusion. The author’s “magnetism” would also draw anecdotal accounts in association with his lyrics, as in the examples of Liu Yong, Qin Guan, and He Zhu.

In Chapter 13, Owen makes a useful distinction between a genre’s past and its history: “A sense of a genre’s history is not just a body of texts with attributed authors who can be dated; it involves thinking of the genre as a sequence, comprised of differences and changes” (p. 344). If the writing of literary history involves organizing

texts into a system that tells a story of “change,” Owen is suggesting a different way of organizing extant lyrics by the manner they survived, stabilized around notable names, and entered the textual tradition. Freed from the presumptions that come with a superimposed taxonomy of authors, we see texts relate to each other in new ways. It allows us to think about individual style and period developments in song lyric in ways that reflect the reality of its transmission. When Owen observes an “authorial quirk,” or notes the basis for judging an earlier or later lyric, or discusses the variations on a motif among an author cluster – such as among Yan Shu, Yan Jidao, and Feng Yansi – the referential “norm” by which he judges these differences is historically-specific and changing. It is none other than the body of texts in the immediate genre family at a given time, and extending outwards to include the contexts and conditions in which they survived.

Underlying Owen’s exercise is the awareness that as modern readers and scholars of literature, we remain on the opposite side of a historical barrier from the texts we study. Texts were created under a different set of conditions and understood by a different set of rules. Indeed it is an overarching theme in Owen’s scholarship on traditional Chinese literature to imaginatively recreate the conditions and rules of reading. In *Just a Song*, that awareness is expressed with a mixture of wonder and appreciation: “Interesting and messy processes intervene and control what we now see. Somehow, through it all, works of rare beauty survive” (p. 18).

III. The Discourse of Sensibility

The main story comes in three parts: “Part II. The Early and Mid-Eleventh Century”; “Part III. The Age of Su Shi”; and “Part IV. Into the Twelfth Century.” It is told in a sequence of chapters each focusing on one or a group of lyricist(s) active around the same time. Owen justifies this arrangement by author as follows: “the full textualization of song lyric came as people searched for lyrics by famous authors, and the texts have survived for us in conjunction with these names” (p. 10). Organizing the chapters in this way does have the advantage of highlighting the problem of the relation between books and authors. Owen explores these dynamics in the chapters on Liu Yong (Ch. 3) and Ouyang Xiu (Ch. 5), and to a lesser extent in his discussion of Qin Guan (Ch. 10), He Zhu (Ch. 11), and Zhou Bangyan (Ch. 12).

However, this arrangement somewhat obscures the other half of the storyline: the changes in song lyric as a discourse of sensibility *while* it passed from performance practice to literature. In fact, the rationale in using the loaded term “sensibility” is not fully explained until Chapter Ten. Owen proceeds from a simple spin on the idea of *ci* being “separate” – circulating separately from the author’s literary works and separate from his “serious” commitments (being *just* a song) – and treats the genre’s segregation as a protected space within the larger world of Song discursive culture. He explores the themes, the representation, and the gender and social dynamics both within the enclosure of song lyric’s discursive sphere, and also in terms of the values and

positions that it rejects and excludes from the larger world that contained it. He argues that “the tradition of song lyric was essentially a discursive counter-culture in the Song world of public values that were becoming increasingly restrictive in the second half of the eleventh century” (p. 222), characterizing the song lyric as “an attempt to speak all the possible ways that human experience does not belong to the public world or the rational world or the conventionally moralistic world” (p. 267). He evokes the usage of “sensibility” in eighteenth-century Europe to situate song lyric as a discourse of fine feeling that was both an alternative to, as well as a function of, the larger cultural world that increasingly valued rationality and moral restraint.

The reader may disagree with Owen’s characterization of the eleventh century as “rational, practical, and philosophically moralistic” (p. 267), or may point to its difference with eighteenth-century Europe, but his point is not to draw cross-cultural parallels but to take a broader view of the discourse of the song lyric – not as a self-contained world in a timeless vacuum, but in a relationship of oppositional symbiosis between culture and counter-culture. This perspective allows Owen to present a remarkably nuanced picture of the changes happening in the genre. The reader may discern a few “plotlines” in the story – for example, going from direct representations of love in earlier lyrics to its figurative displacement beyond a barrier; or in the presence or absence of women in treating the theme of separation (p. 284).

But to my mind, a more important implication of Owen’s argument is that it problematizes the act of interpreting early song lyric as “literature” or “poetry” before it was legitimized as such. For classical poetry, the canonical statement of its genre identity also serves as its interpretative paradigm – we are told to read for the author’s “resolve.” There is no comparable thing to start with for the *ci* lyric. The Song critics from the late eleventh century onward were anxious to establish the genre’s difference from classical poetry. Their focus, however, was mostly on its history, musicality, and compositional techniques. Until the couple of slim treatises from the late thirteenth century, we have scattered contemporary opinion on how the representations of romantic love, longing, and attractive women should be taken once they enter the realm of “literature.” If the branding of Liu Yong as “vulgar” is any indication, the genre’s legitimization came at the cost of de-privileging certain themes for being less than comfortable for the reading community. Though to be clear, in the Song, those themes have verged on the morally reprehensible even for classical poetry. People eventually got around to it in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with various “schools” prescribing different reading paradigms grafted from classical poetry, the *Chuci* tradition, and even the later dramatic genres. Of the interpretative approaches commonly seen in today’s scholarship from the gender, biographical, and generic perspectives, the latter two still draw extensively from the Qing reading practices.

The question boils down to this: “how should we take the words in the song?” In fact Owen has posed a similar question in an earlier article, “Meaning the Words:

The Genuine as a Value in the Tradition of the Song Lyric,”¹ where he discusses the ways in which a performed text could voice genuine feeling (or not). There are moments throughout the book where he seems to be responding to and expanding on the earlier argument. Whereas the article limits to textual analysis, *Just a Song* situates the analysis in the sociocultural environment of the eleventh century, granting song lyric its immediate discursive context in which we may read and interpret its words. His readings address, directly or indirectly, the common questions asked in today’s academic discourse concerning gender codes and gender opposition, the representation of emotions and interiority, and the genre’s “difference” to classical poetry.

In asking what a song “means,” scholars of literature may seek a different set of determinations than the listener in the eleventh century. Owen observes such disjunction in the debate over the speaker’s gender in Zhang Xian’s “Pusa man:”

Since such an argument cannot be decided, it will continue until we remind the parties in the dispute that they are in the wrong “discourse” – an academic discourse that requires decision when writing, say, an “appreciation” that paraphrases the situation (or an English translation). This is “just a song”; the lovers are in a gender limbo due to conflicting gender codes, with the gender of the speaker to be determined as the listener prefers – if the listener cares to make that determination (p. 109). 〈菩薩蠻·夜深不至春蟾見〉

“Pusa man” typifies the difficulty in performing gender analysis on song lyrics, when the discussion of gender roles, voice, space, and the speaker’s image often rests on making the female vs. male determination. Owen draws the line differently around the genre’s negative unity. The fascination of song lyric, he argues, lies in what is being excluded from representation – the norms and constraints of the male *public* world:

When we enter the discourse of longing and desire, however, the *society* of males virtually disappears from representation (even though it is the intended audience); there are only two people, a man and a woman. It extends beyond that to a larger discourse of sensibility, defined against the male *public* world. (p. 103)

The argument invites us to reflect on the appropriateness of conceptualizing song lyrics’ discursive space as feminine. The space and its values were often associated with the feminine by the male writing community, but it was open to male and female authors alike, to be entered and left on occasion. The gender dynamics within the song lyric – in the representations of courtship, love, separation, and so on – may be understood as an attractive alternative to the social dynamics in the male-dominated cultural world. The argument presents an important perspective into the study of female lyricists from later eras, specifically the possibility and problems of a “female voice” while writing in the language of the male elite. Though only one major recognized female author falls within the book’s timeframe, it is useful to remember here Owen’s

¹ Published in *Voices of the Song Lyric in China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 31-70.

emphasis on the role of singers (usually female) as the real professionals in the world of song lyric. In other words, female professionals may have created or reworked many of the famous lyrics as we know them.

“Discourse of sensibility” speaks to a line of argument in Chinese scholarship that characterizes song lyric as “the literature of feeling” (情緒文學). The argument may be traced back to the traditional critics’ efforts to define song lyric’s generic difference against classical poetry by its emotive content. Wang Guowei offered the most quoted articulation of them all: “song lyric can speak what cannot be spoken in *shi* poetry, while it cannot exhaustively speak what can be spoken in *shi* poetry.” A kind of sensibility imagined as specific to the song lyric is the nexus for many critical concepts and judgments made about song lyric “proper” (*zheng* 正) and its “deviations” (*bian* 變). The most obvious difference in Owen’s argument is that it does not seek an essentialist characterization of the genre, but structures “sensibility” in the sociocultural context of the eleventh century. It addresses the fascination of the intimate interior space of feeling presented in song lyric – often intense but completely indeterminate – from a historical perspective, as opposed to an essentialist understanding of the genre’s “difference.” As a discursive sphere, song lyric can accommodate widely different values and positions that are not reducible to a common property. Understood in this sense, Owen is able to make his assessment of Su Shi outside of the *shi* vs. *ci*, or the *wanyue* vs. *haofang* binaries, arguing that the discourse allows a space for Su Shi’s lyrics as a singular possibility, rather than an opposition” (p. 267).

Owen’s story of *ci* as a discourse of sensibility speaks to traditional criticism and current scholarship on many different levels, but he has the gift of bringing them all together in beautiful textual analyses of individual lyrics. The following reading of Qin Guan’s “Manting fang” is, in my opinion, an example of Owen at his best:

His little boat moves along in the night, and the aficionado of song lyric would think this was a standard “travel by boat scene,” until that forward motion is arrested by the tiniest, almost motionless point of a fishing line in the still water, creating faint ripples as it is reeled in, which seem to pull in the reflection of stars... We might recall Ouyang Xiu’s comment on the mirroring surface of West Lake in Yingzhou, that in the lake was another heaven, another world. Here attention is focused on the line moving through the mirroring surface. Through it we enter the idyllic world of the second stanza, in which the speaker is not simply fishing but has become “the fisherman.” The outside world enters negatively, as the lyricist disdains the laughter of others and refuses to “listen to” what goes on in the outside world. (p. 281)

The world of idyll hardly falls within the bounds of *wanyue*, but it is functionally the same in the way it positions itself militantly against the claims of public life (p. 279).

IV. The Hypothesis

Owen frames his hypothesis about the origin of *ci* in a very specific way, “I am here treating the ‘origins’ of song lyric not as the historical background of Song dynasty lyric, but rather as a body of texts – of different degrees of credibility – entering the history of Song dynasty lyric as it matured toward the turn of the twelfth century and looked to find a past for the genre (51).” He specifies that it concerns the origin of *ci* “as a textual genre.” In light of this book’s thesis, I confess to have initially found this divorce of song text from song practice rather baffling. It became clear, however, that it is not only necessary but even crucial to his argument. The following paragraphs result from an endeavor to clarify to myself the phenomenon that this hypothesis aims to explain as well as its quarrel with the existing explanations. I will then attempt to tease out its implications and test its limits.

It seems to me that the mystery Owen tries to explain is this: what is the origin of the heterometric form that came to be the song lyric’s differentiating feature against classical *shi* poetry? The standard explanation traces it back to the now lost musical settings of the lyrics. The account goes that isometric verses could not be directly set to the new banquet music (*yanyue* 燕樂) in the Tang, which was a combination of “pure music” (*qingyue* 清樂) of the past courts and Central Asian influences. Choruses (*hesheng* 和聲) or refrains were added as functional space-fillers when adapting them to musical settings. The functional parts were then incorporated and conventionalized into *ci* tune patterns as we know them. There are recent attempts to trace the origin to another kind of music, but the basic premise of seeking the origin of *ci* tune patterns in music has remained unchallenged.

What Owen finds problematic in the standard account is not in viewing the *practice* of adapting verses to music as the historical background of *ci*, but specifically with taking *ci* as a textual genre in the Song and seeking the origin of its metric patterns in Tang music. This is not merely a matter of technicalities as it is an important part of the genre’s “identity” and serves as the basis for a continuous history from as early as Li Bai, traditionally hailed as the ancestor of song lyric, through the Five Dynasties and into the Song. As he points out with Ren Bantang’s seminal work on sung poems (*shengshi*) from the Tang, one needs to presume a great amount of stability and continuity over time in order for this explanation to work. It presumes the stability of melodies from the Tang, as well as the identity of the words sung and the transcribed text. Owen views the latter as “potentially the most serious anachronism” about early *ci*, being the assumption made when song lyric reaches the age of scholarship and high literature beginning in the mid-twelfth century (p. 52).

Owen makes the distinction between the practice of song, which was continuous from the Tang into the eleventh century, and its transcription and textual transmission, which may or may not accurately reflect song practice. He suggests that the half-century “hiatus” in song lyric history after the founding of the Song dynasty may be an issue of textual transmission. He also poses the question whether a song was

always transcribed in the same way. Proceeding from the notion that “the written text and the text as sung were not expected to be identical,” the hypothesis states that “what we call ‘song lyric’ (*ci*) is a change in transcription practice, writing out the words as they were sung or as the author wanted them sung.” In other words, the difference between the base text and the song may have always been there; the “change” is in whether to transcribe the song as an isometric poem or to write out the words as they were sung.

Owen argues from the extant adaptations of Wang Wei’s poem, “Sending Off Mr. Yuan to Anxi” 送元二使安西, that it is easy to “pad out” an isometric poem for any melody, since all that was necessary was for people to recognize the primary text. The “padding” involves quoting and framing phrases from the poem, a practice he describes with the term *yinkuo* 纒括. The practice may have been continuous long before it became visible in the textual records – invisible because it was taken for granted as “a way to sing the poem” (p. 59). He suggests that even though “Lay of Yang Pass” is an exception in the textual records, it may have been “one norm of song practice” (p. 57). He cites no evidence for this, but there are accounts, such as an entry from Shen Gua’s 沈括 *Mengxi bitan* 夢溪筆談, to support this interpretation (quoted below).

The merit of this hypothesis is that it opens up a whole new perspective to think about early song lyric’s relation to music. The issues he raises with the standard account are valid; and when we look back from this perspective on the poems classified as “*ci*” in the last twelve fascicles of *Quan Tang shi*, we find that the line separating them from *yuefu* and quatrains is in fact extremely tenuous. There is no fundamental structural difference between them: it is easy to take an early tune and rewrite it into an isometric text, which may very well be the reversal of the process in song practice. The verses in the “Song Lyrics in Recent Eras” (近代曲辭) section of *Yuefu shiji* 樂府詩集, mostly transcribed as isometric poems, are also strong supporting evidence. It thus becomes necessary to revise the notion that early lyricists were writing to “tune patterns” dictated by musical settings or with a consciousness of a separate “*ci* aesthetic” founded on the presumed structural difference.

A second set of implications has to do with the class argument. The three-tier classification introduced in the early twentieth century still informs a widely accepted account of *ci* as having evolved from the bottom up: from the “lyrics of the common people” (民間詞) to the “musician’s lyrics” (伶工詞) and finally to the “lyrics of the literary men” (文人 / 士大夫詞). Since one provision to the hypothesis is the greater role allotted to the singers as creators of the lyric, it effectively breaks down the old classification.

In the way it is presented, however, the hypothesis needs a good deal of clarification. To treat song lyric’s origin as “a body of texts...entering the history of Song dynasty lyric as it matured toward the turn of the twelfth century and looked to find a past for the genre” is not based on an intuitive understanding of “origin.” One usually expects a moment of takeoff. Owen identifies two moments: “In the Dunhuang

manuscripts we seem to have scribes writing down songs as they were actually sung. In the *Huajian ji* we have a second moment: contemporary literary men writing down songs as they *wanted* them sung, perhaps emboldened by the Tang precedent of Wen Tingyun” (p. 57). Is he arguing that the origin is the change in transcription practice as we can infer from these texts, and that while the practice continued through the eleventh century, the moment of change had occurred long before? Or does he have in mind a perceived or reconstructed origin as the genre matured? If the latter is the case, the critics in the eleventh and twelfth centuries actually gave a completely different account.

Owen needs to put his hypothesis in perspective with the existing explanations about the origin of song lyric’s metric form. He cites the *Cai Kuanfu shihua* 蔡寬夫詩話 about using “added phrases” (*hesheng* 和聲) to fill in the tune; Shen Gua provides the earlier account in more detail:

Old *yuefu* songs all had both sounds and lyrics, which are transcribed together. For example, “ha ha ha” or “hua hua hua” are all ‘choruses’ [to be sung in response to the main lyrics]. The refrain chords in today’s wind and string music are a vestige of this practice. But in the Tang people started to write lyrics to fit the tunes, no longer using added phrases. It is said that this practice began with Wang Yai, but in fact it was already prevalent in the Zhenyuan (785-805) and Yuanhe (806-820) reign eras, with some occurring before him.

古樂府皆有聲有詞，連屬書之。如曰賀賀賀、何何何之類，皆和聲也。今管絃之中纏聲，亦其遺法也。唐人乃以詞填入曲中，不復用和聲。此格雖云自玉涯始，然貞元、元和之間，爲之者已多，亦有在涯之前者。²

Hesheng turns out to be a confusingly versatile phrase: here Shen Gua is referring to choruses; it is sometimes confused with refrains (preserved in some extant tunes, such as “Yi Qin’e” 憶秦娥) and padding words (*chenzi* 襯字). Owen does not question the validity of these accounts, only pointing out that there may be other ways in which a poem may be sung – such as *yinkuo*. And yet, these same accounts have also been cited in recent scholarship on the relationship between music and song lyric, all of them building on the works of Ren Bantang and Yang Yinliu, to arrive at a different conclusion, namely the heterometric lines resulted from turning functional space-fillers into content phrases. The question is how far we can push Owen’s hypothesis about *yinkuo* and the change in transcription practice to distinguish it from the current explanation, and how it would change our reading of early song lyric.

As far as I can understand, there are two layers to the question. As a way of adapting a poem to song, what Owen means by *yinkuo* is not substantially different than the other methods we find in the Song accounts. The key difference is in how one views the relationship between a voiced poem (*shengshi*) and a song lyric. The prevailing explanations postulate a period in the Tang when *shengshi* and song

² Shen Gua, *Mengxi bitan* (Shanghai: Shanghai shudian, 1934), 5.86.

lyric were two main co-existing song practices;³ then *shengshi* declined in the Five Dynasties, to be replaced by *ci* lyric in the Song. Owen seems to be arguing that there is no real difference between the two, with both continuing well into the eleventh century, and that the change is actually a change in records and transmission. If this is the case, then Owen needs to clarify what portion of the extant lyrics his hypothesis accounts for: does it make a difference in the way we read, say, lyrics from the early to mid-eleventh century? Should we see them as the product of original composition or of adaptation? Are we to imagine some isometric primary text with which a lyric may be associated but did not survive in the records? In making that judgment, should we make distinctions between *xiaoling* and *manci*, and between different types of *xiaoling* patterns?

The core issue here is how we think about song lyric's "identity" in terms of its formal integrity – whether such integrity existed at all and when was it acquired. The current explanations, which take the heterometric form as a function of musical settings, would point to the *Huajian ji*, with a handful of patterns continuing from as early as the ninth century. Owen convincingly demonstrates the fallacy of these arguments; his own take on the "gift of form" is very different, treating it as a sort of liberating force from classical poetry in the way it breaks free from the latter's strict, architectural order and imitates the motions of speech (p. 91). Hence his unusual idea of "origin" as a process of different texts entering into the tradition all the way to the end of the eleventh century.

There is, however, a third way to think about the lyric form that makes it neither an ancillary to music nor negatively defined as liberation from classical poetry. The attraction in the form's irregularity is not only that it "naturalizes" artifice; the flipside is equally true – it enables a more sophisticated form of artifice that is not possible with classical poetry's linear symmetry. The delight in crafting, moreover, could be indulged and celebrated to a degree not usually seen in classical poetry. The image of a bamboo mat of twining pattern, from Yan Jidao's "Die lian hua" 蝶戀花⁴, gives us a metaphor for this sort of artifice:

初捻霜紵生悵望。	She starts to finger her fan of frosty silk, producing a sad gaze.
隔葉鶯聲， 似學秦娥唱。	Beyond the leaves the orioles seem to mimic Qin'e song.
午睡醒來慵一餉。	Waking from midday nap leaves her languid for a while –
雙紋翠簾鋪寒浪。	The twin-weave kingfisher mat a spread of cold waves.

³ How the two practices differ is also a matter of debate. However, the old opposition between adapting poems to music (*shengshi*) vs. composing lyrics to song tunes (*ci*) is largely debunked. See Ye Jiaying's discussion of the issue in "Lun ci de qi yuan" (論詞的起源), in Miao Yue and Ye Jiaying, *Lingxi cishuo* (靈谿詞說) (Taipei: Zhengzhong, 1993), pp. 11-18.

⁴ Zhang Caoren, ed., *Er Yan ci jianzhu* (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2008), p. 287.

雨罷蘋風吹碧漲。	The rain stops; water-clover wind blows the rising emerald billows.
脈脈荷花， 淚臉紅相向。	Beheld in silence the lotus flowers, tearful cheeks in pink facing each other.
斜貼綠雲新月上。	She daubs on one side green cloud makeup with the new moon rising,
彎環正是愁眉樣。	Its round arch just the shape of her sorrowful brows.

We can easily picture this lyric being performed because it opens with the normative scene of performance: the girl fingers her fan and poses herself to sing. But her song is silent, her voice being displaced to some unseen orioles. The mat's twining weave captures perfectly the dizzying arrangement of images that follow: the gaze on the girl crisscrosses with the girl's gaze over her surroundings, while contrasting markers of season and mood are interlaced between the indoor and outdoor scenes.

The majority of Yan's lyrics exhibit an outright delight in artistry of which "Die lian hua" is an extreme example. Two apparently opposite tendencies – to naturalize poetry by evoking the vernacular on the one hand, and on the other, to push the limits of poetic artifice in the text's weave-like texture – have equally formed a part of song lyric's fascination and are equally afforded by the form's asymmetry. The kind of craft involved would allow less room for improvised adaptation between forms, and would require a greater degree of compositional design that Owen's hypothesis cannot fully account for.

The affordance for a specific kind of craft was recognized very early on as the genre's distinguishing property. Even as it was appropriated in different cultural contexts, the trend was largely continuous. In the world of the *Huajian ji*, it served the taste of the Shu court for highly sophisticated craft that could rival nature's beauty. The preface to *Huajian ji* gives the earliest statement, using the metaphors "to tailor flowers and cull leaves" 裁花剪葉, "to hollow out jade and carve jaspers" 鏤玉雕瓊.⁵ It explicitly states that the purpose of the collection was so that "the belles of Southland may stop singing their Lotus Boat [folk] songs." The craft would be taken to an extreme by Zhou Bangyan in *manci*, and further by Wu Wenying in the thirteenth century.⁶

The penchant for craft afforded by the form is, of course, still short of its formal integrity. To my mind, the latter is to be found in the completeness of the two-strophe *xiaoling* – not as a function of transcription or print format, but specifically a conscious

⁵ For a full translation of the preface and discussion of crafting in the context of court culture, see Anna Shields, *Crafting a Collection: The Cultural Contexts and Poetic Practice of the "Huajian ji"* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006).

⁶ Seen in this light, the half-century hiatus in the composition of song lyric might have a different interpretation. The period coincides with the age of Yang Yi, who was crafting poems in the style of Li Shangyin among his court coterie.

recognition of the form's completeness as manifested in the composition of the lyric. I call attention to Owen's reading of Liu Yong's "Yeban yue." He writes referring to the end of the second stanza, "A two-stanza *xiaoling* could stop at this point; but this is a three-stanza *manci*; it must go on. And at this moment both the lyricist and the genre are thrown back to their past: the lost urban world that was their home, as well as the sophisticated beloved of the Entertainment Quarter." The third stanza opens on a "moment of reversal:" "going from looking ahead to memory, from the giggling girls of Yue to someone left behind in Bianjing, from a new world for song lyric back to an older, more familiar world" (pp. 92-93). The reading is brilliant, but there is an unaddressed assumption here. It assumes the structural completeness of the two-stanza *xiaoling* and the lyricist's play on it. Later generations developed a sort of intuitive sense for the two-stanza form. Did lyricists of Liu Yong's generation have it? I think so. But how early can we take it to be the case?

One of Ouyang Xiu's lyrics, to the tune "Tasuo xing" (for Owen's translation and analysis, see p. 137), provides an example. We do not have the musical setting for this tune, but I think it is safe to assume that the same (or nearly identical) melody would be repeated for both stanzas. And so the audience would hear at the opening, "Plum blossoms tattered at the guest lodge, / willows delicate by the bridge over the creek" 候館梅殘, 溪橋柳細, and again when the melody is repeated, "Every inch of her tender guts, / bright and clear, tears through powder" 寸寸柔腸, 盈盈粉淚. The listener would draw the common metaphorical association between the delicate willow branch and her "tender guts," and between the plum flowers and her tears. The lines are like mirror images; they open up to the same spring scene, functioning as different settings for the male and the female persona. We have an outdoor setting of a man on horseback, sorrowful for being parted from the woman; and an indoor one of a woman on the highest part of the building longing for the man. The "spring water" 春水 at the end of the first stanza is the boundlessly expansive counterpart to the "spring mountains" 春山 in the second. The two stanzas loop around as variations of each other.

"Tasuo xing" is a remarkable lyric: remarkable in the way it relies on the properties of the two-stanza form to stage the sorrow of parted lovers in two mirroring settings. The effect cannot be replicated in an eight-line classical poem, even though one may easily render the lyric into four rhymed couplets. There is a logical completeness to its structure that resists rewriting into a different form, such as *yuefu*, regulated poem, or stacked quatrains. The two-stanza form may be based in the practice of repeating stanzas in song (*die* 疊). It is still baffling, however, that the two-stanza form somehow became standard for *xiaoling*, while the most famous song we have on record has "three repeats."

The question is since when? We do not see this sort of staging done in *Huajian ji*. Two-stanza *xiaoling* are more common in *Yangchun ji*, and there are examples of corresponding moments between stanzas, but nowhere as clear-cut as "Tasuo xing." Neither do we have enough evidence to empirically date its contents to earlier than

the mid-eleventh century. Liu Yong utilizes the stanza division a little differently. While I do not subscribe to the Qing critics' reading of the first stanza as "scene" and the second as "emotion," because they seem to want to read every kind of poem in this way, there is a pattern in *Yuezhang ji* to contrast the "now" and "then" in the two stanzas. Thus, when Owen casually observes that "a two-stanza *xiaoling* could stop at this point" but that a three-stanza *manci* must go on, I take it as an indication that the middle of the eleventh century was already a moment removed from the origin.

Owen ends his chapter on a snarky note, "Until someone demonstrates that it is wrong or has better evidence for an alternative interpretation, it is a hypothesis worth keeping in mind" (p. 59). The evidence is simply not enough to do either and I will not be baited into trying. What I have done is to ask how much of the current material it accounts for and to push its limits. Nevertheless, in storytelling we are allowed the satisfaction of sequels, variations, and spinoffs. To the question of song lyric's formal integrity, I have offered my thoughts as a spinoff. My sense is that Owen's hypothesis may have allowed too much fluidity between forms while not giving sufficient attention to the genre's textuality, even as it was circulating primarily as songs. And so my spinoff concludes in the form of a question: was song lyric ever "just a *song*"?

Encountering China: Michael Sandel and Chinese Philosophy. By Michael J. Sandel and Paul J. D'Ambrosio. Harvard University Press, 2018. Pp. xviii+297.

張忠宏，中正大學哲學系副教授

本書以二〇一六年三月在上海華東師範大學召開的「桑德爾與中國哲學」會議論文為基礎編輯而成，共收錄海內外學者所著十篇論文，以及一篇桑德爾對這些論文的回應。

編者德博安 (Paul J. D'Ambrosio) 與桑德爾 (Michael Sandel) 本人將這十篇論文分為四大類。第一類關注桑德爾對於正義與社群的看法，論者包括南洋理工大學哲學系李晨陽、復旦大學哲學院白彤東、香港中文大學黃勇。第二類關注桑德爾對於公民品德的看法，論者包括首都師範大學哲學系朱慧玲與清華大學國學院陳來。第三類從道家哲學視角關注桑德爾對於完美 (perfection) 之追求與多元文化的看法，論者包括 Loyola Marymount University 亞太研究中心王蓉蓉 (Robin R. Wang)，華東師範大學德博安。第四類從儒家哲學視角關注桑德爾對於自我與人 (person) 的看法，論者包括北京大學人文講座安樂哲 (Roger T. Ames)、前 St. Mary's College of Maryland 大學哲學與宗教研究系羅思文 (Henry Rosemont Jr.,

1937-2017) 及德博安。

以下將簡介各篇論文要點，讓讀者快速瀏覽本書內容。至於桑德爾的回應，很能切中要點，並且展現了文化交流中該有的謙遜大度與機敏睿智。對於本書有興趣的讀者，一定不能錯過該篇回應，因此本文不予介紹，留給讀者自行閱讀與思考。此外，作為一篇書評，本文不打算討論桑德爾本人的哲學主張，從而也無意檢討本書各篇作者對於桑德爾的批評及桑德爾對於這些批評的回應。這樣的討論與檢討無疑非常具有理論上的趣味與重要性，但顯然不是一篇短文所能處理。既然本書最突出的特色是當代中國哲學研究者以古代哲學資源與當代西方政治與倫理學理論交鋒，本文在介紹完各篇論點之後，即針對這一交鋒所反映出來的中國哲學研究面貌提出一些觀察與反思，以作為理解本書各篇論文的參考架構，同時也延續本書所具有的批評精神，盼能為推進比較哲學及中國哲學本身之研究略盡綿薄。

一、正義與社群

桑德爾聲名鵲起之作，為一九八二年出版的《自由主義與正義的局限》⁷一書。在該書中，桑德爾批評受康德影響的當代自由主義者，忽略社會所繼承傳統的重要性，誤以為人可以無所負累 (unencumbered)、不受拘束地選擇自認為有價值的生活。作為當代自由主義最重要的辯護者之一，羅爾斯堅持將人得以自由選擇的自主性，看得比人們基於自主性而選擇的價值優先且重要。桑德爾認為，羅爾斯這種看法是典型的個人主義式自我觀，預設了固定不變的自我之存在。在這樣的自我觀裏，人們只能問：「我該如何選擇？」而不能問：「我是誰？」從而明顯與我們的日常經驗不符。在桑德爾看來，羅爾斯的自我觀之所以會有這種困難，是因為他誤以為充斥在我們所生活與成長的社會中的各種價值，僅僅只能在人們追求理想人生時提供選項，而不了解這些價值事實上構成了人們自我認知與自我認同。只有當人們的自我認知與認同是由這些價值所構成，才能解釋為何人們常常在價值觀混亂時追問「我是誰」這一問題。

李晨陽認為，先秦儒家會同意桑德爾對於自由主義的批評。先秦儒家以仁為

⁷ Michael Sandel, *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)。中譯本見萬俊人譯：《自由主義與正義的局限》（南京：譯林出版社，2001年）。

核心，看重社會整體的興盛繁榮，將人際關係看做構成人之身分認同的重要成分，不會接受缺乏足夠社群意識並視個人抉擇優先於社會價值的自由主義。然而，李晨陽認為，儘管桑德爾看重社群意識，但由儒家哲學的角度觀之，他的社群主義過於單薄，不足以建構穩固的社群意識。關鍵處在於：儒家早已指出「和諧」對於理想生活的重要性，但桑德爾卻從來不曾考慮過「和諧」。這一思考上的匱乏，使得桑德爾即能指出人際關係構成個人之身分認同，卻不能如同儒家一般，指出我們應該追求什麼的人際關係與什麼樣的理想社會。

白彤東也認為先秦儒家與桑德爾有許多相似點。譬如，先秦儒家與桑德爾都認為人是社會性動物，並且認為透過理想的政治制度以維繫良好的個人與社會的關係是件重要且有價值的事。同時，先秦儒家與桑德爾都充分認知，能夠維繫良好的個人與社會關係之理想政治制度，必須處理艱難的選擇。孔子討論子為父隱其攘羊，孟子討論舜父殺人，桑德爾討論兩對兄弟在情、法、理上的不同抉擇，都是很好的例子。但是，白彤東認為先秦儒家與桑德爾也有兩點明顯的分歧。首先，桑德爾具有共和主義精神的社群主義 (republican communitarianism) 主張政府有責任提升所有公民的道德與政治素養，以便他們具有充分能力參與政治的運作。但先秦儒家對此持懷疑態度，先秦儒者不認為人們能因為教育而獲得足夠的公民素養，遑論以此素養參與政治的運作。其次，桑德爾將公民社會看成一個講究向心力、休戚與共的社群，但對儒家來說，當代龐大而複雜的社會更像由陌生人構成的群體。在這個群體裏，人們可以尋求羅爾斯所說的交疊共識，但未必能追求桑德爾所看重的向心力或忠誠。換句話說，桑德爾的社群主義過於厚重，無法作為建立社會共識的基礎。

桑德爾在《正義：一場思辨之旅》⁸一書中，討論基於效益、權利及德性等三種不同進路的分配正義觀。對他來說，基於效益與權利的正義觀都有無法解決的困難，唯有基於德性的正義觀才能作為良序社會所需的政治原則。按照這種受亞里斯多德啟發的德性正義觀，資源需依其特性做最有效的分配。工匠之所以造出史特拉底瓦里名琴，目的是為演出美好的音樂，因此，正義的分配制度應該將史特拉底瓦里名琴分配給優秀的小提琴家。同理，官職之存在乃為良好之治理而存在，因此，正義的分配制度應該將政治權力分配給最有治理能力的領導人。此外，正義的分配制度也應考慮制度所具有的教育意義。若制度能使才德兼備者獲

⁸ Michael Sandel, *Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009)。中譯本見陳信宏譯：《正義：一場思辨之旅》（臺北：先覺出版社，2018年）。

得政治權力，則此分配制度可以獎勵與鼓舞那些致力於培養品德與能力的人，正向提升國家與社會；若制度只能讓有才無德之輩脫穎而出，國家與社會將向下沉淪，難稱正義的制度。

黃勇指出，桑德爾的德性正義觀與儒家一樣，都看重公民品德之培養。而且，桑德爾與儒家所欲培養的品德，不限於與政治實務運作相關的公民品德，還及於能讓每個人獲得美好生活的個人品德。因此，桑德爾與儒家同樣反對只關注公民品德的自由主義傳統。然而，黃勇認為，桑德爾的德性正義觀只關注「依德性而治之正義」(justice according to virtues)，不像儒家，除了關注「依德性而治之正義」之外，更關注「正義即德性之展現」(justice as a virtue)。內聖外王、不忍人之政等主張，不僅只是對統治者的要求，更是儒家政治理想的張本，希望有德者居於上位，由仁義而行仁義事，風行草偃，教化萬民，使人民有恥且格，自動自發遵循政治運作所立下的各種規範。因此，「道之以德，齊之以禮」的儒家，接受修復或療愈正義觀，致力於恢復人性之本善，不需要如桑德爾般，接受矯正或報復正義觀，看重「齊之以刑」或法律在德性培養中的重要性。

二、公民品德

桑德爾的《自由主義與正義的局限》開啓了自由主義與社群主義(communitarianism)間的爭論，然而，桑德爾於一九九六年出版的《民主的不滿：尋找公共哲學的美國》⁹一書卻闡發公民共和主義(civic republicanism)。《自由主義與正義的局限》於一九九八年發行第二版，在〈前言〉中，桑德爾說明自己並未改變立場，而是社群主義這一標籤容易引來誤解，不若共和主義適合描述自己的立場。他說，自由主義的問題，既不在於強調個人權利，也不在於忽視社群的重要性，但社群主義這一標籤卻容易讓人有這些聯想。在他看來，自由主義的問題在於自由主義者主張：個人權利之證成可以獨立於人們對於美好生活的理解。換句話說，自由主義主張權利優先於價值。但是，桑德爾認為，諸如信仰自由或言論自由等權利，只能以賦予這些權利能夠促進、維護或實現個人的品德及美好生活來證成；價值具有權利所無法逾越的優先性。這一想法與美國開國

⁹ Michael Sandel, *Democracy's Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1996)。中譯本見曾紀茂譯：《民主的不滿：美國在尋求一種公共哲學》（南京：江蘇人民出版社，2008年）。

元勛如傑佛遜 (Thomas Jefferson, 1743-1826) 等人的共和主義觀點吻合，因此共和主義更適於描述自己的立場。

朱慧玲認為，公民品德是桑德爾共和主義立場中最關鍵的成分。除了價值優先於權利之外，桑德爾的共和主義強調社會共善 (the common good)、積極自由與公民參與。唯有基於良好的公民品德參與民主政治的審議，公民方能在多元社會中追求共善，進而落實並維繫自己依品德自我管理的積極自由。因此，在桑德爾的共和主義裏，公民品德既是政治的起點，也是政治的終點；公民品德貫串共和主義的要旨，使之成為系統。然而，主張價值優先、反對國家中立的共和主義，常受到自由主義者質疑：所謂共善，會不會成為社會主流價值的禁臠，使得弱勢或邊緣文化受到打壓？朱慧玲批評，桑德爾對解決此一問題的論述不足，將希望寄託於公民教育，顯得過於樂觀。而且，為了避免自由主義者的質疑，桑德爾於行文之際，隱然接受自由主義者對於公領域與私領域的劃分，使自己的立場陷入兩難：共和主義不能接受公私領域的劃分，但為了避免困難，又不得不接受公私領域的劃分。

陳來同樣注意到桑德爾反對價值中立，重視公民品德，並主張價值優先於權利，他認為儒家在這些面向上與桑德爾有相似之處，因此同意桑德爾對於自由主義的批評。然而，陳來認為，桑德爾在《民主的不滿》一書中所描述的美國共和主義雖亦關注勤奮與節儉等新教品德，其焦點仍然過於圍繞在與自我管理相關的公民品德上，不像儒家那般關注個人品德之完善，因此也不能像儒家那樣提出並在政治上落實較為豐厚的德性觀。此外，陳來也簡要陳述了儒家的國家觀，認為以士大夫為主體的儒家思想看重社會責任的承擔，不將個人權利或人權視為不可違背的價值；相反的，只有當個人權利與人權能促進人民的福祉，才會被儒家認可。同樣地，為了促進人民的福祉，儒家相信，政府不能採取價值中立的立場，而應落實美好的生活方式。因此，在儒家看來，國家應該是依文化而融合的「文明之國」(civilization state)，而非西方傳統包括共和主義所假設的「民族國家」(nation state)。雖未明言，陳來的弦外之音，是儒家自有其政治傳統，能提供不比桑德爾的共和主義差，甚至有可能更好的政治哲學。

三、多元文化與完美

相較於李晨陽與陳來，王蓉蓉在東西哲學對比上採取較為溫和的立場。她不

嘗試證明儒家比共和主義優越，反而認為儒家可用來支持桑德爾對於共善的堅持，而道家與《易經》可以提供資源，補足桑德爾對於道德衝突的論述。她以劉向所編的《列女傳》為例，說明儒家看重道德教育，以故事的形式強調婦女對於國家、社會與家庭的重要性，並以之培養並形塑婦女的品德。此種道德教育雖非公民教育，但因蘊涵著儒家對於國家與社會責任的承擔，因此同樣彰顯了儒家對於共善的追求；桑德爾的共和主義立場，可謂德不孤必有鄰。此外，《周易》天地陰陽感應相與而萬物化生的思想，也反映在《烈女傳》的性別關係裏。不同於西方文化裏的性別衝突，中國文化強調陰陽互補共生，性別關係不是壓迫與順從，而是扶持與分工。更推而廣之，多元文化社會中的各種不同立場的交鋒，也可看做陰陽相生相與的互動，不必看做針鋒相對的衝突。又，按《莊子》觀點主義來看，每一種立場都是一種觀點 (perspective)，能揭露其他觀點無法揭露的知識，有其不可取代的價值。能夠協調融通不同觀點的真人，可以在充分尊重不同立場的情況下，獲得更完整的知識，尋求社會的共識。王蓉蓉指出，桑德爾的共和主義看重多元文化，並試圖解決多元文化的衝突問題，但他沒有充分說明為什麼文化的多元有其價值，也過於將歧見 (disagreements) 視為衝突。中國哲學除了能為其洞見提供跨文化的佐證，還可以提供理論資源，說明他未及說明之處，避免西方文化傳統的偏見。

德博安在中西哲學的比較上，立場與王蓉蓉相近，他在本書所收錄的兩篇文章中的第一篇，關心桑德爾在二〇〇七年出版之《反對完美》一書中反對以生化或基因工程提升能力、追求完美的論證¹⁰。過去已有學者從儒家的立場評論過此書¹¹，德博安則嘗試證明，道家哲學有更多材料可與桑德爾對話，而這些材料所包含的思考可以強化桑德爾的論證。在德博安看來，桑德爾《反對完美》一書中的主要論證，建立在「感謝恩賜」(appreciation of giftedness) 這一概念上：孩子是禮物，他們是否聰明健康不是父母可以選擇或決定的。因此，父母應遵守「節制的倫理」(ethics of restraint)，不妄圖使用科學技術來改造孩子。因為，利用科

¹⁰ Michael Sandel, *The Case against Perfection: Ethics in the Age of Genetic Engineering* (Cambridge, MA Harvard University Press, 2007)。中譯本見黃慧慧譯：《訂製完美：基因工程時代的人性思辨》（臺北：先覺出版社，2018年）。此譯本書名未忠實呈現原著，因此不採用。

¹¹ 如 Ruiping Fan, "A Confucian Reflection on Genetic Enhancement," *American Journal of Bioethics* 10.4 (Apr. 2010): 62-70. Joseph Cho Wai Chan, "Concerns Beyond the Family," *American Journal of Bioethics* 10.4 (Apr. 2010): 82-84。李澤厚：《回應桑德爾及其他》（北京：三聯書店，2014年）。

學技術來打造心目中的完美孩子，不但低估人性的價值，還受限於既定的價值觀而不知反省，傷害人與人之間的關係；如其所是地愛護孩子，感謝孩子的到來，才是正確地為人父母之道。對德博安來說，這些論點完全可以用道家的機心，知足及真知來詮釋。機心類似於海德格所批評的「計算型思考」(das rechnende Denken)，沉溺其中而不自知，將背離「物物而不物於物」的理想。知足則不受物慾左右，不需否定慾望，卻能節制慾望。真知則使人無為、任自然，安時處順，順道而行。德博安認為，明乎道、知足而免於機心、且以真知為蘄向者，自會懂得尊重自然，感謝天之所賜。這樣的人不需追求他人的認可，也不必追求自以為是的完美。從而，這樣的人自然而然地符合節制的倫理，並能對各種制度或價值保持反思所需的距離，在面對生化及基因工程的技術發展時，僅會如桑德爾所說的，將新科技運用於救人，但不用於改造下一代。

四、儒家的人觀

本論文最後一部分收錄的三篇文章，回到對於桑德爾自我觀的關注。安樂哲首先指出，桑德爾自其成名伊始，便致力於尋找有別於自由主義者無負累自我之外的人觀，為此他分別求助於亞里斯多德、黑格爾與猶太傳統，希望能發掘出一個既能兼顧個人自主性，又能保有由文化與社會價值構成自我身分的統一性人觀。儘管安樂哲非常讚賞桑德爾的工作，推崇其所從事者為「我們這一時代的哲學問題」，安樂哲認為桑德爾的探索走得不夠遠，其答案不夠徹底。既然「我們這一時代的哲學問題」病灶出自西方文明，何妨將眼光投向東方世界？安樂哲相信，古典儒家思想裏所蘊含的智慧，足以為西方文明的弊端提供藥方。他依循葛瑞漢(Angus Graham)的腳步，接受索緒爾以降的語言與文化結構主義，相信不同的語言與文化運用不同的概念或範疇來思考，因而蘊含著不同的世界觀。在葛瑞漢與安樂哲看來，《周易》「一陰一陽之謂道」，與西方看重靜態之「存有」與「個體」的宇宙觀不同，乃是一個強調動態「變化」與「歷程」的哲學。在這個歷程哲學中，「個體」與其相應而來的性質或關係，並非構成宇宙的基本成分。相反地，在時間之流中變動不息的各種雜多現象才是宇宙的根本，個體不過是從這些變動不息的雜多中抽象推導出來二階事物。基於此一歷程哲學，葛瑞漢認為古代儒家主張「敘事的人性論」，而安樂哲則進一步將此敘事的人性論擴大為「角色倫理學」(role ethics)。按角色倫理學，人不但應該依照自己在家庭與社

會中的角色來理解自己的身分、意義與價值，並依照這個理解判斷道德與倫理的是非，做出正確的抉擇，以活出理想的人生。更重要的，在角色倫理學看來，在各種角色與動態關係之外，並不存在獨立自存的自我作為角色與互動的基礎。桑德爾之所以走得不夠遠、不夠徹底，正是因為受到西方以靜態存有及個體為本的傳統影響，拘泥於獨立自存的自我之追尋。

羅思文是安樂哲的長期工作夥伴，他同樣推崇桑德爾的貢獻，也同樣主張桑德爾有未竟之功，而角色倫理學更適於矯正西方個人主義取向而導致的財富與機會不公。羅思文收錄在本書中的論文，與安樂哲之作有明確的分工：安樂哲凸顯角色倫理學背後的歷程哲學，羅思文則著力闡釋角色倫理學的蘊涵。也就是說，羅思文旨在說明以關係及家庭為核心的角色倫理學如何有別於個人主義，以及為何角色倫理學能對治西方文明的弊病。在羅思文看來，西方建立在競爭與個人主義之上的資本主義沉痾已深，局部修補錯漏的理論嘗試難有助益，非大破大立、從資本主義的根基處進行理念變革不可。因角色倫理學不認為在社會角色之外有獨立自存的自我，與個人主義的根本主張背道而馳，故能提供價值重估與排序所需的不同視域。羅思文認為，在各種人際關係裏，影響最大最深遠的，是孩提時期為人子女與後代的角色。人的成長與學習都自家庭開始，因此儒家強調「孝」的重要性。在「孝」的要求裏，人們習得「敬」與「感謝」；在與父母的互動中，學得成就他人與成就自我間不可分割的關係。進而以近取譬、推己及人，由家至國以至於天下，追求「老者安之，朋友信之，少者懷之」的理想世界。桑德爾在過往著作中，未曾對家庭的重要性多所著墨，實因受西方傳統的影響，未能看到家庭在矯正個人主義弊病上的價值。

最後，德博安收錄於本書的第二篇文章，試圖站在桑德爾的立場，考慮安樂哲與羅思文對於桑德爾的批評。德博安指出，桑德爾與安、羅兩人都意欲處理個人主義帶來的弊病，但是，與安、羅相對激進的立場相比，桑德爾較為溫和。桑德爾所反對的是「道德的個人主義」(moral individualism)，也就是將個人的自主性及幸福視為道德的核心，忽視社群與集體責任的論述。在桑德爾所構思的政治哲學與倫理學裏，個人的反省能力仍占有重要地位；他不曾也不會因為反對道德的個人主義，就連帶地反對自我的存在。因此，對於安、羅兩位的批評，桑德爾可以反問：如果自我並不存在，道德修養要在何處用功？中國哲學真的不能詮釋出反思性的自我嗎？德博安知道這些問題涉及複雜的哲學與詮釋問題，安、羅兩人未必不能就歷程哲學的立場發展出深具洞見的儒學詮釋，所以他不嘗試以這

兩個問題來評斷桑德爾與安、羅兩方間的優劣成敗，反而轉而追問兩方間的對話能帶來什麼貢獻。德博安認為，因為兩方間的差異過大、過於根本，對話目標不在追求思想上的一致，而在提供參考架構，提醒並補足各自的不足。桑德爾關於家庭價值的論述尚有不足，安、羅兩人的儒家詮釋可助一臂之力；安、羅兩人對治自由主義與當代倫理議題尚有發揮空間，桑德爾哲學可為借鏡。德博安強調，這種互補不是在理論層次上進行比較與吸收，而是在策略層次上基於矯正個人主義的共同目標各自努力發展自身的理論，分進合擊，進而期待達至殊途同歸的效果。換句話說，合作而非比較，也是中西哲學對話的重要理由與途徑。

五、中國哲學研究的時代側影

本書最後一章收錄桑德爾對上述諸篇文章的回應，如本文一開始所說，這是一篇讀者不該錯過的文章，本文不再一一介紹其論點，請有興趣的讀者自行找書來讀。本文將就上述各篇論文作一通論性的觀察與評論，敲磚引玉，盼能為此書帶來更多反應與迴響。

首先，「桑德爾與中國哲學」研討會召開之際，中國大陸的經濟發展與國際影響力仍然處於蓬勃發展階段，二〇一三年九月至十月間倡議的「一帶一路」，於二〇一五年二月正式成立推進領導小組；同年五月國務院發表「中國製造二〇二五」政策，以十年為目標，邁入製造強國行列。當時川普尚未就任美國總統，大規模的貿易摩擦以至於其後的貿易戰爭還沒發生。美國以及其他西方開發國家，一方面參與並分享中國大陸的經濟發展果實，另一方面希望透過經濟的開放與互動促成中國的民主化。大陸自身在經濟成長之餘，也逐漸獲得文化自信，承接原本用於解釋亞洲四小龍經濟奇蹟的儒家價值論，在民間掀起長達二十餘年的國學熱¹²。隨著中國的大國崛起，這股熱潮也從儒家對經濟發展的貢獻慢慢擴展

¹² 根據陳來的說法，國學熱起源於北京大學於一九九二年成立中國傳統文化研究中心，翌年創刊出版學術期刊《國學研究》之後，引發大眾媒體報導，進而拍攝「中國傳統文化系列講座」節目等一連串事件。見陳來：〈「國學熱」與傳統文化研究的問題〉，《孔子研究》1995年第2期，頁4-6。李明輝認為，除了這些重要事件外，國學熱興起的背景離不開八十年代的文化熱。中國大陸學界於八十年代翻譯引介西方思想名著與港臺新儒家，激發自由化傾向的反傳統知識分子與文化保守主義的角力，從而有利於國學甚至儒學熱之興起。見李明輝：〈解讀當前中國大陸的「儒學熱」〉，收入李明輝編：《儒家思想在現代東亞·總論篇》（臺北：中央研究院中國文哲研究所，1998年），頁81-98。李明輝說：「無論是在中共幹部還是大陸知識分子當中，均有人基於過去文革的慘痛教訓而重新體認

到儒家對於政治運作與制度的優勢探索。蔣慶與貝淡寧 (Daniel Bell) 是此一發展的重要推手¹³，本書作者群中的安樂哲、羅思文與晚近的李晨陽、白彤東皆有其貢獻¹⁴。

到傳統文化的價值與意義。這應當是『國學熱』或『儒學熱』出現的一個重要的原因。」(頁 93)

在一九九八年這篇解讀國學熱興起背景的文章裏，李明輝並未提及儒家價值論。這當然不代表李明輝不知道以儒家價值說明東亞經濟發展的學術取向。事實上，他在二〇〇一年另一篇文章裏，曾詳細討論李光耀的「亞洲價值說」。在其中，他同意李光耀以儒家價值說明東亞經濟發展有其道理，但他認為李光耀所理解的儒學僅是「通俗的儒家精神」，而完全忽略了「作為精神思想傳統的儒學」。見李明輝：〈儒家傳統與東亞的現代化——從李光耀與彭定康關於「亞洲價值」的爭論談起〉，收入劉述先編：《儒家思想在現代東亞：韓國與東南亞篇》(臺北：中央研究院中國文哲研究所，2001年)，頁 125-166。依筆者之見，李明輝之所以沒有將儒家價值列入國學熱興起的因素，是因該文寫作時間較早，當時大陸經濟發展還未蓬勃，尚未成為儒家價值說明的對象。在該文付梓數年之後，大陸經濟跳躍式成長，似乎可以印證儒家價值，加上資本興盛之處，人心需要精神慰藉，儒學成了寄託之處，以致國學繼續熱了十餘年。

¹³ 蔣慶自一九九五年出版《公羊學引論》(沈陽：遼寧教育出版社)起，即致力於建構「政治儒學」。二〇〇三年出版《政治儒學：當代儒學的轉向、特質與發展》(北京：三聯書店)，高舉「王道政治」，並以禮法制度之建立做為「外王」的理想。其後提倡儒家憲政，相關論文與評論收錄於 Qing Jiang, *A Confucian Constitutional Order: How China's Ancient Past Can Shape Its Political Future* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2013) 一書。貝淡寧長期反對西方文化自以為是的優越感，認為全球政治變遷過程中，不能忽視在地智慧的重要性。他一九九五年合編 *Towards Illiberal Democracy in Pacific Asia* (New York: St. Martin's Press)，二〇〇三年合編 *Confucianism for the Modern World* (New York: Cambridge University Press)，二〇〇七年編 *Confucian Political Ethics* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press)，二〇一三年合編 *The East Asian Challenge for Democracy: Political Meritocracy in Comparative Perspective* (New York: Cambridge University Press)，都從此一視角出發，關注東亞的民主與人權論述及發展。他出版於二〇〇〇年的專書 *East Meets West: Human Rights and Democracy in East Asia* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press)，提倡中西對話，二〇〇六年出版的專書 *Beyond Liberal Democracy: Political Thinking for an East Asian Context* (Oxford: Princeton University Press) 則鼓吹儒家的賢能政治，認為集權民主是西方的自由民主之外的另一種選擇，二〇一五年出版的 *The China Model: Meritocracy and the Limits of Democracy* (Oxford: Princeton University Press) 進一步主張「基層民主、中層實驗、高層尚賢」的中國模式優於西方的自由民主。

¹⁴ 安樂哲於一九九四年出版 *The Art of Rulership: A Study of Ancient Chinese Political Thought* (New York: State University of New York Press)，與郝大維於一九九九年合著 *The Democracy of the Dead: Dewey, Confucius, and Hope for Democracy in China* (Chicago: Open Court)。羅思文於二〇一五年出版 *Against Individualism: A Confucian Rethinking of the Foundations of Morality, Politics, Family, and Religion* (Lanham: Lexington Books)。李晨陽一九九九年出版 *The Tao Encounters the West: Explorations in Comparative Philosophy* (New York: State University of New York Press)，二〇一四年出版 *The Confucian Philosophy of Harmony* (London: Routledge)。白彤東二〇〇九年出版《舊邦新命：古今中西參照下的古

以文化價值來解釋經濟發展，乃透過比較不同文化，以其間的文化差異來解釋經濟發展的差異。這一研究方法，可上溯至德國社會學家韋伯 (Max Weber, 1854-1920)。韋伯在一九〇四—一九〇五年發表《基督新教倫理與資本主義精神》¹⁵，闡述西方宗教信仰中的某種「經濟倫理」曾在資本主義的萌芽與發展中扮演重要角色。為充分理解西方理性主義的特徵，韋伯擬定「世界諸宗教之經濟倫理」計劃，陸續發表一系列比較宗教社會學著作，其中即包含《儒教與道教》¹⁶。

在韋伯看來，儒家尊崇德性，將財富與名聲視為有德者的獎賞，避免衝突而主張教化，皆是有利於資本主義發展的理性因素。然而，儒家崇拜祖先，以天命為統治合法性，理性化並不徹底。加上過於重視人倫關係與長幼階層，不利於企業結社與法治道德觀的形成，也不利於資源的有效運用與利潤的再投資。因此，儒家的理性成分，不能跟喀爾文教派的天國預定說與天職觀一樣萌生出资本主義精神，反而固守於以血緣關係為主的社會行為模式，維護既有的社會秩序，成為傳統主義最堅強的支柱。

不過，韋伯十分強調資本主義的「精神」與「形式」的區分。儒家固然不利於資本主義的萌芽，但資本主義的擴展卻是透過經營形式（包括經營管理與相關法令規章）的輸出而達成；非西方國家，包括港、臺、新加坡與中國大陸等地區，都是將資本主義的形式移植於儒家的文化土壤中，跳過播種栽培階段，直接讓資本主義的樹苗長大成蔭¹⁷。在《儒教與道教》結論章，韋伯說：「對於近代文化領域裏，在技術上與經濟上皆已獲得充分發展的資本主義，中國人大概相當有（可能比日本人更有）加以同化的能力。這顯然不是個中國人是否『沒有自然秉賦』以適合資本主義要求的問題。」¹⁸ 換句話說，韋伯也不會反對以文化價值

典儒家政治哲學》（北京：北京大學出版社）。

¹⁵ 本書最初發表於 Edgar Jaffé (1866-1921)、Werner Sombart (1863-1941) 和 Max Weber 主編的《社會科學和社會政策文庫》(*Archiv für Sozialwissenschaften und Sozialpolitik*)，後於一九二〇年收入《宗教社會學論文集》第一卷。中譯本參見康樂、簡惠美譯：《基督新教倫理與資本主義精神》（臺北：遠流出版公司，2020年）。

¹⁶ 《儒教與道教》出版於一九一五年，其後同樣於一九二〇年收入《宗教社會學論文集》第一卷。中譯本參見韋伯著，康樂、簡惠美譯：《中國的宗教：儒教與道教》（臺北：遠流出版公司，1996年）。

¹⁷ 土壤與樹苗的比喻，見顧忠華：《韋伯學說新探》（臺北：唐山出版社，1992年），頁132-133。

¹⁸ 韋伯著，簡惠美譯：《中國的宗教：儒教與道教》（臺北：遠流出版公司，1996年），頁363-364。

來解釋東亞與大陸經濟的蓬勃發展。

然而，我們必須注意到以文化價值來解釋經濟發展的複雜向度。韋伯在探討資本主義為何並未於中國萌芽時，除分析儒家之外，還廣泛地研究了中國的貨幣、租稅、行政制度、行會、氏族、城市與農村組織、巫術與異端等等政治、經濟與社會條件。他本人從未主張，一個文化所秉持的價值或理念，能直接衍生出上述與經濟及社會生活息息相關的特定形態。他宣稱：「直接支配人類行為的是物質上與精神上的利益，而不是理念。但是由『理念』所創造出來的『世界圖像』，常如鐵道上的轉軸器，決定了軌道的方向，在這軌道上，利益的動力推動著人類的行為」¹⁹。換句話說，價值與理念體現於知識階層在特定的經濟與社會條件下對於利益的追求中；離開特定的政治、經濟與社會條件，價值與理念並不能推動資本主義的發展。

以這樣的複雜面向來看東亞與大陸的經濟發展，研究者顯然不能基於單純的文化對比，輕率地將東亞與大陸的特定政治、經濟與社會脈絡置於不顧，而過度誇大儒家文化在經濟發展中所扮演的角色。享受經濟發展果實的人們，也不應基於自信的提升，盲目吹捧儒家的價值，而無視儒家在現代化過程中迭遇挑戰與顛覆。

收錄在本書中的論文，就其積極的面向來看，當然可以視為儒家以及道家學說對於西方學說的回應。自一五八三年兩廣總督郭應聘(1520-1586)同意天主教耶穌會傳教士利瑪竇(Matteo Ricci, 1552-1610)於廣東肇慶居住傳教伊始²⁰，近代西學東漸的浪潮已波濤洶湧逾四百年。四百餘年間，中西文化互動的面貌複雜多元，牽動中西兩方在歷史長河中的發展²¹。迥異於一九五八年牟宗三、徐復觀、張君勱與唐君毅聯名發表的〈為中國文化敬告世界人士宣言〉²²，承認中國文化缺乏民主制度、科學與實用技術，但要求中國人對其文化前途先有一自信，本書所收論文對於儒道兩家並不缺乏自信，面對桑德爾這樣孕育於西方的政治與倫理學說，也勇於基於此一自信批評桑德爾的主張。然而，如前文所述，因經濟發展

¹⁹ 韋伯著，康樂、簡惠美譯：《宗教與世界》（臺北：遠流出版公司，1992年），頁71。

²⁰ 見林金水：《利瑪竇與中國》（北京：中國社會科學出版社，1996年）。

²¹ 關於中西文化互動之通論，清朝以前請參見張國剛、吳莉葦：《中西文化關係史》（北京：高等教育出版社，2006年），清朝以後請參見劉登閣、周雲芳：《西學東漸與東學西漸》（北京：中國社會科學出版社，2000年）。

²² 本文最初發表於《民主評論》一月號，後以〈中國文化與世界〉為題，收入《唐君毅全集》第四卷（臺北：學生書局，1991年）。

而帶來的文化自信，其基礎並不穩固。對於桑德爾的批評，不能建立在學說差異的對比上，尤其不能在差異之外，假設歷史悠久且支撐今日榮景的中國文化有西方學說所不得不借鏡的優勢。儒道兩家是否值得借鏡，仍然取決於這兩家學說是否能發展出深刻且具洞見的政治與倫理理論。本書論文礙於性質所限，多半著墨於對比，對儒道兩家學說的闡發卻相對不足，不免令人覺得遺憾。

其次，與上述觀察密切相關但重點有別，不能不提出以供讀者思索的另一要點是：本書各篇討論桑德爾的論文完全沒有觸及包括政府、政策、法律及各種制度在政治上的合法性問題，從而，本書論文並未考慮治理權威的正當性與公民的政治義務。以詮釋的善意原則來看，各篇論文或許假設了描述性的政治正當性概念 (*descriptive concepts of political legitimacy*)，同意某些政治現實主義者的看法，認為只要國家或政府能成功地遂行統治，即具備政治上的正當性；或者，這些論文的作者們假設了韋伯的政治正當性觀點：人民接受已存在的政權、相信政府的領導者及法律²³，政治即具有權威。甚至，他們也可以接受以下這種規範性主張：國家與政府為社會帶來穩定、秩序與繁榮，其治理即具有正當性。然而，本書作者們所假設的這些對於政治正當性的觀點，真的適切而不能質疑嗎？當代不少政治哲學學者難以苟同。譬如，Allen Buchanan 便認為，民主制度是政治正當性的必要條件²⁴，而一黨專政的中國特色社會主義選舉雖然號稱人民民主專政，但其實很難稱得上民主。此外，為數眾多的憲政擁護者，更不會認為限制言論、缺乏通訊自由、法治保障不足的政權擁有正當性。於是，一些迫切而鮮明的問題是：中國古代哲學對於政治正當性到底有何看法？此一看法如何有益於社會的進步與繁榮？此一看法又將如何回應各種關於政治正當性的主張？儒家是否過於依附既有權力結構，淪於為當權者擦脂抹粉；道家是否過於消極避世，難以發展公共哲學？因為悠久文化與大國崛起的自信，不去思索這些問題，既不能深化中國哲學的研究，也難以讓中國哲學具有承載時代變遷、推動社會發展的能力。本書所收錄的論文，很可惜並未碰觸這些關鍵而核心的問題。

上述評論，並非批評本書沒有理論趣味。事實上，本書各篇論文作者儘管立場各異，但提出了不少讓桑德爾本人都覺得有意思的討論。然而，這些具有理論趣味的討論除了反映出以上兩點局限之外，還有一點不足處：為了凸顯中國哲學

²³ 見韋伯：〈政治作為一種志業〉，《學術與政治》（臺北：遠流出版公司，1991年），頁169-239。

²⁴ Allen Buchanan, "Political Legitimacy and Democracy," *Ethics* 112 (Jul. 2002): 689-719.

有值得西方哲學借鏡之處，各篇論文作者們一方面批判桑德爾的論述，另一方面則在中國古代哲學家裏尋求對比與批評的資源。這種論述策略除了不利於呈現被引用哲學家的完整樣貌，更麻煩的是，爲了適合所需，各篇作者們常將被引用的古代中國哲學家抽離歷史及自身理論脈絡，解讀出具有當代意義但未必適切於原貌的新解。這麼做的問題，當然不在於新解具有適用於當代的新意，而在於此種解讀過於自由且隨意，既不利於理解古代中國哲學，也未必真有利於解決當前時代所面對的問題。比較理想的做法，應該是盡可能地嚴格區分「文本詮釋」與「當代研究」之間的差異。「文本詮釋」將古代中國哲學家放回其從屬的歷史與理論脈絡中，目標在忠實地呈現哲學家的思考與哲學史演變；「當代研究」則引入當代的理論資源與問題意識探索古代哲學的蘊涵，目標不在追求忠實的理解，而在反省與推動哲學研究於新世代的發展。鑒於詮釋不能無中生有，必有其詮釋之關懷與前見，而對於古代文本的當代研究也不可能脫離文本詮釋而隨意地自行其是，「文本詮釋」與「當代研究」在研究者的實際操作中，未必能夠明白區分清楚。然而，相信並堅守這兩者的區別，卻是研究者應該遵守的研究規範。如若不然，則難以避免「詮釋暴力」，動輒以己意曲解文本卻振振有詞，辯之曰「客觀詮釋判準並不存在」。不接受「文本詮釋」有別於「當代研究」的規範，還會讓當代研究欲對古代哲學進行評價時，陷入無由入手或不免於「稻草人謬誤」的窘境。更有甚者，不接受此一規範，只能徒然導致混同古今的惡果，完全看不出當代研究究竟在什麼層面及什麼程度上推進了哲學研究。本書各篇論文無疑有鮮明的當代關懷，然而，在「文本詮釋」有別於「當代研究」這一規範的遵守上，並未足夠講究，不時出現帶入當代問題意識或理論資源卻自以爲從事文本詮釋的情況。就嚴格的學術標準來看，並不讓人十分滿意。

整體而言，本書具體地展現了如何運用比較哲學的研究方法，尋求中國哲學與西方哲學對話與相互理解的可能性。本書各篇作者立足於自身的文化傳統中，或質疑桑德爾的政治哲學與倫理學，或欲運用儒家或道家傳統補桑德爾哲學之不足，不論其論點是否成立，都代表現階段中國哲學研究在相關議題上的最新進展，自有其不容忽視的重要性。後繼研究者在討論相關問題時，若願意稍微考慮本文對於這些文章的時代側影所做的刻畫，或許有助於激發出不同的視角與思想火花。

《道家與古之道術》，楊儒賓著。新竹：清華大學出版社，二〇一九年。頁五〇四。

吳冠宏，東華大學中國語文系教授

一、前言

《道家與古之道術》一書集結楊儒賓教授長期以來對道家與神話的關懷，雖然該書所論有不少與作者業已出版的論著如《五行原論》、《儒門內的莊子》相互關涉，但命名為《道家與古之道術》而獨立出版，仍具足一系列的論述脈絡而自成體系，如同作者在序言反覆商榷書名般，掛上「道家」之名本是無庸置疑，然以「古之道術」取代「神話」可謂別有用心。原題為「道家與神話」本可涵具「從神話到哲學」之思想演變的理路，惟「神話」一詞畢竟是外來語，而「古之道術」乃出自於《莊子·天下》，「古」為原型所在，溯古所以創新，「道術」一詞尤可彰顯作者本源自對中國哲學的關懷而來，由是他闡之又闡地揭示「古」（本體）、「道」（言說）與「術」（實踐）之涵義，來間接勾勒撰述本書的殊旨別趣。

其實作者最見功力的本事，在對於「道家諸子」的尋幽探微，雖然僅聚焦在老子、莊子、「黃帝」三個道家人物身上，但作為思想魔法師的楊氏，三足鼎立，就可以撐起整個道家的架構。本來順此常理，讓這三人在此或混聲或獨吟，再從道家的源頭一步步帶出，便足以組合成先秦道家的多重奏了，沒想到最後他又把向來被視為文學家的「屈原」都納進來「鬥做夥」，並從神話與巫術的角度切入，將屈原變裝成思想史上不宜忽略的要角。此一納新，頗有說服力，亦可謂別具隻眼，更添增了本書會通文學與哲學的趣味。《莊》〈騷〉並列在明清之際已出現（頁 444，注 62），楊氏在此則嘗試讓屈原活出「性命之學」的另類風光，看來也只有靈活地處理傳統漢學之多重身分與複雜角色，才可以避開當今專業分科下所造成的限制與流弊，並真正發揮從古味中不斷挖掘新意的優勢，以重現中文學門本具的整合性視野。

本書雖然是作者長年以來積累多篇論文所集結，一些議題不乏已被中生代的

學者後出轉精²⁵，但若據此回溯重覽這些研究成果的緣起現場，我們仍不得不折服楊儒賓預流的膽識及眼光²⁶。他曾翻譯耶律亞德 (Mircea Eliade, 1907-1986) 的《宇宙與歷史：永恆回歸的神話》一書²⁷，並深受西方反啓蒙思潮的洗禮，是以所立基的神話視域，正以「先史的」、「前範疇的」、「前反省的」之自然人的存在狀態，而大別於文明階段線性歷史的思考模式，故力圖跳脫理性思維的框架，以正視前理性的價值與意義。在重新省視道家與巫教神話的關係時，亦每能掌握其間存在著「除魅」與「再魅」的弔詭，並從中掘發出繼承中有批判、批判中有繼承的旨趣。由於本來身分就曖昧難定，加以諸多問題又不易釐清，尤其是相較於先秦諸子的其他學派，道家向來缺乏明確的師承關係與學派意識，故當我們尾隨楊氏的探索之筆、揭祕之心走入這場渾沌未明、玄之又玄的原始風光，很自然地增添不少揣測的興味與想像的空間，這當是純以理性論述取勝的其他學術論著所難以抗衡的。

楊儒賓專精此道甚久，又能博雅會通各種學脈而自成一家之言，筆者面對他恢宏深刻的論著，限於個人有限的才學，也只能略盡導讀者的角色而已，在梳理本書的特色上，嘗試從「主調」與「支援」兩個面向著力，文末僅就閱讀所見所疑，提出幾點來就教楊儒賓與學界同好，以略盡評論之責。

二、兩面性是操作的主調

對於這一本道家的探源與察流之作，何以在眾多相類的研究論著中依然能站在顯赫的位置呢？其實早在六十餘年前，聞一多 (1899-1946) 即在〈道教的精神〉一文關注老莊與原始宗教的論題，但楊氏承此處理道家思想的起源問題與生命奧祕，仍值得我們細嚼慢嚥。關鍵在他一向不急於成爲定案的法官，總是讓自己宛如偵探，在冒險中尋幽探微，故每能將這種好奇心與懷疑的氣氛置入於歷史的脈絡裏，在此脈絡下，你只能一頁一頁地被捲進去，如他處理黃帝與堯舜時，就從司馬遷的困惑說起，強調他的遲疑有一歷史的縱深，亦反應漢代初期儒家與

²⁵ 相關議題在賴錫三的論著中，都有延續性的開展與縝密性的發揮，如《莊子靈光的當代詮釋》、《當代新道家：多音複調與視域融合》等等。

²⁶ 「預流」一詞，乃楊儒賓借用陳寅恪的語言作爲對屈原的判讀，筆者認爲亦相當適用在楊儒賓於學術上所扮演之領頭羊的角色。

²⁷ 耶律亞德 (Mircea Eliade) 著，楊儒賓譯：《宇宙與歷史：永恆回歸的神話》（臺北：聯經出版事業公司，2000年）。

黃老道家相爭的歷史元素，從而順勢以史家的左右為難切入這場黃帝與堯舜所主演的角力與競合戲碼，這一位道家思想的學術導演，不斷地注入令人鬼迷心竅的興奮劑，逐漸上癮的讀者自然也就停不下來了。

筆者認為本書的魅力即在作者擅長把「思辨」與「體驗」作了生動巧妙的結合，思辨之功表現在可處理對象之問題的分判上，體驗則常常是面對奧秘之微妙所召喚的臨場能量²⁸。楊氏的哲學素養與多元的知識涉獵，更使他特能一展類型學的分析能力與系譜學的重構本領，如他綜理黃帝本來面目的分歧說法為四類²⁹，歸納莊子思想與原始宗教為三個主題³⁰，這些分類的運用都能發揮層次井然的判讀效用；在其諸多分類中，又每能納入當代學科的知識類型，展現一種古今比較的對照系，如他談起諸子起源三說即為顯例：

- (1) 淮南子要略—救世說—政治學—職業說
- (2) 漢書藝文志—王官說—歷史學—周文疲弊說
- (3) 莊子天下—太一說—形上學—一心說³¹

楊儒賓將這三種起源說加以對照，從而發現《莊子·天下》之起源說的殊趣與勝義，畢竟前面兩種說法，都難以有效詮釋儒、道思想的起源問題，也唯有透過深入的比較，方能在別異的功能外，找到最具根源性的理型。諸如此類的分類判讀，在本書中可謂俯拾皆是，對於這本來相當複雜難解的對象，遂得以統整出清晰的脈絡，使後學便於掌握。如果我們要從中舉出發揮最大效用的分類，當是他為黃帝、老子、莊子三位道家宗師，所揭示三種神話類型的深層結構：

- (1) 老子大母神—天道創生—「有一無」的形上學 / 農業文明時期的土地崇拜—創生的問題
- (2) 黃帝天子神話—政治秩序—治國平天下的政治哲學 / 帝國建制時期的政治神話—秩序的問題

²⁸ 楊儒賓在援引馬賽爾 (Gabriel Marcel, 1889-1973) 所說的存在的奧秘之注解中提到：「問題與奧秘的對照是馬賽爾哲學的一組重要關鍵詞語，問題是可處理的對象物，奧秘是涉身其中的不透明的存在感。」見馬賽爾著，陸達誠譯：《是與有》（臺北：臺灣商務印書館，1983年），頁89-91。此一組重要關鍵詞語，也適用在楊儒賓處理此一問題的表述風格上。見《道家與古之道術》，頁267。

²⁹ 一為天神說，二為地祇說，三為始祖說，四為文化英雄說，此四種說法可視為黃帝的四面，詳見《道家與古之道術》，頁158-182。

³⁰ 詳見《道家與古之道術》，第柒章〈升天、變形與不懼水火：論莊子思想中與原始宗教相關的三個主題〉，頁301-352。

³¹ 見〈導論：道家的起源與神話的類型·諸子起源三說〉，同前註，頁1-7。

(3) 莊子升天神話—精神自由—精神逍遙的工夫論 / 狩獵時期的薩滿教傳統—自由的問題³²

楊儒賓一則根據這三種類型，判讀三子有各自代表的意識構造模式，分別代表古人對於創生、秩序、自由三大問題之思考及其解決之道，但又透過三者同具虛靜之術的性命之學，從精神的內涵與發展上予以串聯，此一視域正是全書定位從原始思想走向道家思想的論述發展，如第壹章〈導論〉之四的「虛靜與齋戒」、第捌章〈莊子「由巫入道」的開展〉之四的「從齋到心齋」等，這一部分是處理前道家與道家思想的重要環節；至於這三種類型之間的關係，浮出檯面有之，暗通款曲有之；更不消說，他還進一步揭露三子的雙面性格，積極哲學 / 消極哲學、拯救生命的醫神 / 摧毀生命的兵神、體制之外的異議者 / 勝義的遊方之內的哲人，讓這三位道家宗師的諸多對立面，具有謎樣般的對話張力，「『道家』源頭不只可追溯到神話，或許連『道家』一詞都像是齣神話」（頁47），思辨分析的用意即在說清楚、講明白，但面對這般吊人胃口的曖昧關係與多重面目，也只能在極盡所能外，保留它難以澄清的困惑與無法道盡的奧秘，據此便能解釋何以學派意識不強的道家，卻依然可以在歷史文化的洪流中掀起無盡的思想波瀾。

楊儒賓說：「把屈原也說成是重要的思想家，不是從概念入手」，屈原的現身在在印證本書何以不僅從概念著眼，而每能由人物形象轉出的特色，且看他如何定位屈原：

- [1] 屈原是從薩滿教文化（靈魂論）轉到心性論文化的過渡性角色。
- [2] 如果說莊子曾受巫文化啟發，但他最後走了出來，屈原卻始終沒有走出來，莊子與屈原是中國解體人格文化最後的體現者，但兩人也同樣是一種最早的修煉之道的心性論的提倡者。
- [3] 屈原在思想史上的意義，應當就是他的作品具體的呈現了他在巫、道、儒之間的徘徊復徘徊。³³

屈原的性格鮮活、作品深具特色，在文學史上自有無可撼動的地位，但在本書他卻是以另類性命之學的角色出線，不論是最後的補遺或有如終場般的壓軸，屈原的異軍突起，不僅是他足以化身為這種過渡性的關鍵角色，其徘徊於巫、道、儒之生命形象的矛盾、弔詭，也正是體現楊氏以人物形象之多元風貌及雙重性格，

³² 見《道家與古之道術》〈導論·道家三子三神話〉，同前註，頁25-36。

³³ 依序見同前註頁400、444、445。

去復活「古之道術」的最佳示例³⁴。當代對於性命之學的重要分判：如盡理與盡氣、超越的性命之學、氣化的性命之學，先天的義理之性、後天的氣質之性等等，都可以在這一條重返「魂魄」與「靈魂」的路上，找到從性命之學之原型所湧現出來的源頭活水，進而在性命之學的發展軌跡上，重現屈原待解耐尋的另類風光。

生命何等的奧妙，神學的祕密就是人學，概念總是不離框架，認知終是有極限，處理前理性的原始思想，尤賴於此，是以必須重回「人」本身，這當是楊儒賓從「人物形象」探入道家思想的研究本懷所在。對此，本書有相當精彩豐沛的展演以及深具創造力的實踐，如處理黃帝與堯舜，其運用的知識視野，已延展到人格形態的文化原型與雙面性格，更擴及心理、社會、政治與權力之間益形糾結的複雜關係，他的格局已不惟打破當今文學與思想各自為政的偏限，有如重返古之道術的洗禮之後，進一步突破了各種專業知識的界域，且見它們都據此靈活轉化，交織並濟，故得以凝聚成更大的詮釋力道，在這一條道家與神話不斷秘響旁通的路上。

本書所能提供的詮釋能量，亦擴及先秦道家與儒家、道家與法家的分判比較上。就道家與儒家而言，黃老學派的君道是「利幽不利明，利周不利宣」，與儒家「利明不利幽，利宣不利周」適相對反；但談及出自《老子》之虛靜心的概念，楊氏反而認為黃老的虛靜心近於《荀子》「虛一而靜」的大清明心，因為《荀子》的「大清明心」可謂「虛一壹一靜」與「實一多一動」的統一，實更相應於黃老之積極的政治哲學（頁 42）。就道家與法家而言，對於歷來舊解所闡發之老子為陰謀家傳統、反智、愚民的說法，楊氏亦予以深刻的反省。一方面他要澄清「源頭的本義與下流的影響是否可以等同，兩者有密切的血緣關聯，卻又是天壤之別的政治理論，為道家與法家的區別」（頁 150）、「老子的反智愚民不當從人君的統治技術著眼，而當從人的存在問題談起，道家的反智愚民不是政治理論，它為的是人的解放」；但又不得不承認：「一種沒有道德意識為體的心性論一轉手，即成了心靈技術的政治工程學」（頁 276），最後也只能以這真是

³⁴ 「屈原的遠遊就像莊子的遊一樣，最終也是心有天遊，它是意識層的超越轉化，而不是個體性的靈魂之縱浪於巫術的變形時空」（頁 438）、「如果說莊子曾受巫文化啟發，但他最後走了出來，屈原卻始終沒有走出來，莊子與屈原是中國解體人格文化最後的體現者，但兩人也同樣是一種最早的修煉之道的心性論的提倡者」（頁 444），若與走出來的莊子對照以觀，走不出來的屈原，在生命形象上似更能極盡矛盾、吊詭之能事，凸顯其周旋於巫、儒、道之間的曖昧角色與過渡性格。

學術上的一大詭譎視之：「如果我們找出距離法家『反智一愚民』說最遠的一套政治理論，那大概就是道家的『反智一愚民』說了。但這兩套理論如就史實而論，卻又有密切的血緣關聯」（頁 155），在釐清先秦諸學派之間，他既要分殊其間的大不同，又無法全然截斷其密切的關係與血緣，這當是楊氏處理偉大哲學思想的一貫作法，就是悅納異己與包容差異甚至是誤解：

即使誤解，誤解有時也是很深刻的，導正誤解不必然要一切作理性化的解釋。抹殺矛盾，有可能會抹殺掉更深層的理據，我們有必要正視矛盾的價值。我們推論老子學的神話淵源時，即可找到這種兩歧曖昧的根源，因為大母神本來即具善惡雙面。（頁 271）

除以老子為據點，分判「黃老」與「老莊」為先秦道家的兩派外，楊儒賓更進一步藉由神話的原型，找出其正負兩種能量的根源所在，是以他面對道家源頭的本義與下流的影響，這種錯綜複雜的文化現象與學術因緣，總是不以一面倒的立場力圖平反或澄清誤解，反而更能正視這種善惡詭譎同體的悖論，進一步掘發存在兩面性之衝突與矛盾的意義。

本書雖然以道家為論述的重心所在，但楊儒賓開闊的知識視野與現世關懷的格局，每使他所探觸的道家思想，得以延伸至其他思想學派乃至當代文化處境的問題，如他言及黃老思想所存在的雙面性格，便擴及人類文化史上相類的人性關懷，並據此反思文明與巫術如何銜接與衝突的問題，作為檢視當今存在困境的探照燈：

在耶教與佛教的傳統中，人性的雙面結構可發展出極深遠的思想，天臺宗的「一念無明法性心」更將理毒性惡提升到法界中重要法門的層級，……我們如能連結其雙面性可能具有的深層悖論內涵，或許可重構出一套大不同於無限心體系的另類黃老哲學……人性中的巫術性質需要好好處理，不能正視，必有災難，我們還是不能不警惕巫術思維的力量之重大，其陰暗面不見得那麼容易轉化成功……尤其黃老學派能正視政治領域中「術」的力量以及戰爭的作用，我們如能作批判的反思，這些久被忽略的負面哲學更可提供我們重思政治的基礎。但黃老背後的巫術因素太強，致命的吸引力更是需要小心在意的。黃老意象在今日中國，其角色似乎越來越吃重。一個結合強烈民族主義的聖王意象到底要完成什麼功能？它與仁說為主導的儒家價值體系到底是什麼樣的關係？在在令人好奇。我們於此重思黃老的雙面性，或許可以更深刻地體會並處理文明與巫術的銜接與衝突的種種

糾結。（頁 299-300）

他認為同具人性雙面結構的耶教與佛教亦相應於此，在此之際，我們更需要警惕面對巫術與神話之陰暗面在當代如何變身轉化的問題，此一關照亦觸及宗教領袖的魅力及其危險性所在，至今仍在社會與政治層面上持續延燒，相信讀者覽之必是於我心有感焉。楊氏進而指出，這樣的黃老哲學實大不同於無限心體系，如同他深會宋明儒學與當代新儒家的體用之學外，仍要揭露儒學另有相偶論之道德論述般（相偶論者主張性只有一種氣質之性，知也只有一種有限心靈的血氣心知），以重現儒學平凡真實又具體可行的實踐進程，這種跳脫無限心體系之籠罩的思維向度，不論在儒家或道家，楊氏都有其一貫而類似的關懷，故在處理雙面性的深層論內涵上，他一則辯證的消融孟學與荀學、調和宋儒與清儒（漢儒）、貫通體用論與相偶論³⁵，亦努力為「道家」這一齣神話，從其何以存在著隱逸修行與政治權術的互斥對撞中起疑，進而辯證地消融在善惡並具的雙面黃老身上，可以說經由本來面目的復返，尋繹出其多元面目的因由，終而使道家的內涵在訪古與探今的激揚下，釋放出與時俱進的可觀能量。

三、出土文獻與生活語言的支援

一般哲學的論述操作，每有過度倚賴理論的傾向，但楊儒賓向來立基於紮實的基礎文獻，對於相關的典籍史料亦搜羅詳實，詮釋到位，又非步步為營的文獻至上者，而總能在理論與文獻之間，取得一種難能可貴的平衡。觀其言之有據的材料不僅是傳世文獻，更積極地吸納出土文獻的研究成果，如馬王堆與郭店出土的大量簡帛文書，加上上海博物館從香港蒐購的楚簡，特別是他要處理先秦道家的兩條路線：老莊與黃老，後者的黃老在出土的《黃老帛書》中，對於老莊之外的道家面目，扮演非常關鍵的要角，他在第伍章〈黃帝與堯舜：先秦思想的兩種天子觀〉提到：「《黃帝帛書》出土，我們對黃帝的性格以及黃老學說的性質從此有了明確的認識。郭店出土儒家竹簡以及上海博物館楚簡，都帶給我們新的思想刺激，這批材料的內容很豐富，它也觸及了聖王的圖像，它所說的聖王指的即是儒家聖王的代表人物堯舜，新的堯舜圖像豐富了儒家經典中的聖人格」（頁 238），其後所指的即是「唐虞之道」，即思孟學派的一環，是以他契接當代學

³⁵ 楊儒賓：《異議的意義——近世東亞的反理學思潮》（臺北：臺大出版中心，2012年），頁 37-83。第貳章〈從體用論到相偶論〉即處理此一議題。

界在出土文獻上的重大發現，不惟在黃老這一面向，而是藉由新的出土文獻，全方位地為先秦乃至更早的年代，揭開傳統文化之奧義的重重密紗。

楊儒賓除了妥善運用出土文獻的成果之外，他尤擅長以生活世界的語言，讓遠古的文化經驗，賦予感同身受的當下體驗，由是本來因為分類難免抽離具體情境的疏隔感，都隨之煙消雲散，而重現一種如在目前的親切感，且看他如何妙語如珠地出入古今、溝通聖俗，讓遙遠的古代人物與事件都不再陌生，放開步伐而舞出人性的旋律，諸如：「戰國時期大量流行的對於儒家聖王形象的詆毀，堯舜即是時常被冷槍暗射的靶」（頁 252）、「神話也是雙面夏娃，不能一味地被美化」（頁 259）、「老子這樣的形象應當是長期的詮釋過程中，不自覺地被抹黑的結果」（頁 234）、「黃老聯姻實際的結果乃是黃帝意象的神話源頭與老子的道之結合，而且這種結合並不平等，比較像搶婚，而不像自由戀愛」（頁 233）、「古往今來，政治人物改祖歸宗，總會考慮政治利益的」（頁 249）等，可見他已卸下類型與概念的界限，代之以生動的具象、訴諸生活的體驗，嘗試用這般不變的人性節奏與俗世情境的話語，去復活舊文獻檔案本具的神采，遂能為本是難解的道家研究，注入更多的活力與魅力。

四、有待繼續解密的縫隙

本書在第貳章從道與玄牝的視域談老子時，楊儒賓反省牟宗三「老莊—魏晉玄學家」為主觀境界形態之同一本質由隱至顯的發展一說，進而主張老子當是同兼客觀面之創生與主體之體證兩個面向，看來似有回應學界在老子哲學上或為客觀實有或為主觀境界的棘手問題與爭議³⁶，然在此脈絡下，老子客觀型態的創生有何特色呢？楊氏判讀老子的道不是動能，不是永遠前進的直生與廣生，而是永恆的回歸，認為萬物對於大母神，有種原始的依戀，母體沒有落實到它們身上成為創造的內在法則，是以老子的道—物的關係就像母—子的關係一樣，但這種母子是永恆的片面的依存，她的子永遠無法長大成熟，她的民永遠無法成為政治的主體³⁷。此一說法似又將老子客觀型態的創生定調在永恆回歸的創生上，我們若從老子言「德」的脈絡看來，所謂的「德」正是「道」落實於個體創造的內在法

³⁶ 袁保新：《老子哲學之詮釋與重建》（臺北：文津出版社，1991年）一書對這兩種詮釋向度，皆有深入的檢視與反省。

³⁷ 參見《道家與古之道術》第貳章〈道與玄牝〉的相關論述。

則，未必僅存在著對於原始的依戀，面對神話作者認為莊子有一批判的承繼，其實老子對於大母神神話也未嘗沒有，老子雙論有無，平觀物我，如果我們從牟先宗三對於老子的「玄」義之探，或可對此有進一步的釐清：

無有混在一起就是玄。「玄之又玄，眾妙之門」的玄就是創造萬物的根據，分開地直接地說，有是萬物的根據，無是總持說的天地之開始。因為有從無出，而且有無混一名之曰玄，玄才能恢復道的具體性，即道之具體真實的作用。停在無有任一面，道的具體性就沒有了，就不能恢復並顯出道創生天地萬物的妙用。³⁸

牟宗三對於「玄」義或乃偏就主體心境取義，但就老子本身理論的內涵而言，老子的「玄」本具有於超越界與經驗界、有與無、母與子之間不斷循環往返的旨趣，此玄義的定調，正為老子圓教之潛力所在。而楊儒賓所以將老子向「心」處、向「無」處靠攏，實與他判老子為道家的基本教義派、莊子為道家的修正者而非追隨者有關，筆者認為此一論斷固然有功於莊子，讓莊子更能與當代思潮無縫接軌，以極盡發皇之能事，對於老子的評價卻未必是公允的。他處理《儒門內的莊子》時由於強調儒、莊的同源並濟，以會通兩者思想共振的創造性詮釋，有此取舍偏重自可諒解，本書主談道家與原始信仰之關係時，老子與莊子是否猶需要付出失衡的代價，或許仍待商量。

有關老子的母與子、道與德，楊儒賓判讀老子有如依戀在大母神的懷抱中而無法長大成熟，本書第捌章〈莊子「由巫入道」的開展〉，結論處即以兩種主體的轉折，將周公制禮作樂之後的發展，視為儒家理性除魅的路線，乃道德意識與理性意識的不斷加強；而莊子卻是吸收巫的原始智慧，作為精神轉化的母胎，即批判中有承繼，兩者之分判可謂昭然若揭。但如果我們根據「德」在原始儒家的意義線索，乃指「天命」，由於「天命靡常」，故發展出「惟德是輔」、「以德配天」的概念，由是在談及儒家的形成與發展的過程中，亦不能忽略「德—禮樂」的宗教性結構以及其即宗教即人文的過渡階段，在此之際，孔子所成就的即是一以天命為根本、以人力為關鍵的天命—道德史觀，謝大寧、唐文明對此皆有深入的闡述，可以參照³⁹。是以看待原始儒家如同對治原始道家一樣，必須同時

³⁸ 牟宗三：《中國哲學十九講》（臺北：學生書局，1983年），頁101。

³⁹ 謝大寧：〈儒學的基源問題：「德」的哲學史意涵〉，《鵝湖學誌》第16期（1996年6月），頁1-51；唐文明：《與命與仁：原始儒家倫理精神與現代性問題》（保定：河北大學出版社，2002年）。

關照它們與原始信仰之間皆具有「承繼」與「開創」兩個面向，即儒家與巫史的關係亦然。

本書談及老子逆覺體證的工夫時，曾援引相關文獻予以證成，並進一步指出：

依照中國體道的傳統，除了孟子一系的儒家外，大體走的是逆覺復性的路子。（頁74）

此一對照在楊氏的體系下，固然無誤，但可謂大別於牟宗三在《才性與玄理》界定中國言性的兩種進路：(1)順氣言性；(2)逆氣言性⁴⁰，在此脈絡下，孟子乃屬於逆氣言性的系統，即在於氣上逆顯一「理」，具有以理御氣的色彩，楊氏的說法，應該是把孟子一系的儒家，視為一種承體啓用，直接擴充，以迄於盡心踐形⁴¹，即由人的四端之心，不斷推擴、盈科而後進的積極進路，遂有別於走逆覺復性之路的體道模式。其實楊氏對於氣學有「先天型氣學」（縱貫面）與「後天型氣學」（水平面）的分判，據此談氣質之性的經營，本亦迥異於牟說，而有更為多元的發展⁴²，可見他不僅高揚「氣」在儒家體道工夫上的角色，並以老子為道日損、莊子的支離工夫作為逆覺體證的重要示例，在人學的論述上可以同時兼顧儒道兩家。對照以觀，筆者認為牟宗三的人學兩系與楊儒賓的體道二說，實饒富比較之欣趣，仍有待後繼之學者加以深入探索之⁴³。

⁴⁰ 牟宗三：《才性與玄理》（臺北：學生書局，1993年），頁1。

⁴¹ 楊儒賓：〈支離與踐形——論先秦思想裏的兩種身體觀〉，收入楊儒賓編：《中國古代思想中的氣論及身體觀》（臺北：巨流出版社，1993年），頁415-449。

⁴² 可參楊儒賓：《異議的意義——近世東亞的反理學思潮》，第參章〈檢視氣學：理學史脈絡下的觀點〉與第肆章〈兩種氣學、兩種儒學〉。

⁴³ 筆者曾以〈對魏晉人學情智結構的再思考——從牟宗三《才性與玄理》的反省出發〉一文，針對牟先生的兩層人學基本架構予以檢視，所援引參照的論點即為楊儒賓的「氣論」及其對「氣質之性」的討論。（收入周大興編：《中國哲學義理的詮釋類型與論爭》〔臺北：中央研究院文哲所，2019年11月〕，頁107-142）唯拙作對照兩者時，僅偏就儒家的脈絡而言之，便又回到自己魏晉人學情智結構的問題，而牟氏與楊氏就此在比較論述上仍有很大開拓空間。

《現代性的想像：從晚清到五四》，李歐梵著。新北：聯經出版事業公司，二〇一九年。頁四四〇。

呂文翠，中央大學中國文學系教授

討論《現代性的想像：從晚清到五四》（此書主要收入李歐梵院士近期論文、演講十四篇，下文簡稱《晚清到五四》），其意義不限於一時一書，它映射著在英語和母語環境裏中國現代文學研究之文化融合的結構特徵，涉及李歐梵中國現代文學研究的學術史，演化如何在當下學術語境中進行跨文化／語言／文類研究的理論思維與人文價值取向，顯示其立足當代生活與傳統對話的獨特方式。該書寓意深廣，於洞見處給後學啓悟，不見處是來者可爲之空間。

一、華夷⁴⁴之間的「李歐梵現象」

李歐梵院士身爲華人，在美國大學名校東亞系研究教學中國現代文學，不斷地往返於漢語和西語世界作一種「中西文學的徊想」⁴⁵，立意將中國現代文學的研究導入世界文學視野，這些意圖鮮明體現於研究對象，在傳統與現代、世界多語種、多文類之間移步換形、轉身立定，心中幾十年不變的人文關懷愈加深厚，終於協商歸結爲「世界主義」。李歐梵出生在中國河南，長成於臺灣新竹，負笈美國學成而後任教於諸多名校，在哈佛大學東亞系榮休後轉回香港中文大學執教，他的英語和漢語寫作輪轉呈現，中國現代文學研究的某些領域因他而彰著，他研究的作家作品、文化文學現象關涉的歧異空間包含了中國、香港、臺灣不同時段的政經背景，他要讓原本是西方世界學術研究中的小眾對象贏得世界意義，於是不斷地開闢出多個領域並統攝於世界主義的人文目標，這個目標未始於政治卻有超越性的政治與道德功能，這個研究主體與對象之間的容涵複雜、關係特殊，在當代世界的人文研究中是現象級呈示，筆者稱之爲「李歐梵現象」。

李歐梵的中國現代文學研究是學界的一個標誌，這在國際漢學界應無爭議。中國現代文學這個教學研究對象，在臺灣與中國大陸的大學裏是中文系的主要學科，是與清末民初中國社會、現代中國革命、國家現代化的意識形態塑造不可分

⁴⁴ 借用王德威、高嘉謙、胡金倫編：《華夷風：華語語系文學讀本》（新北：聯經出版事業公司，2016年）一書題名。

⁴⁵ 李歐梵：《中西文學的徊想》（臺北：遠景出版社，1987年）。

割的語言藝術形式，在西方大學的東亞研究中則主要圍繞著漢語言文學呈顯的現代中國社會人文的認知與評價。中國境內外的現代文學研究面對的對象與問題，在李歐梵開始研究魯迅的八十年代，已開始了不同程度的互動，但提出問題、採用方法與結論歸趨卻有顯著差異。李歐梵等來自中文語境而棲身西方大學東亞系的研究中國現代文學的學者，以研究主體而論，其中國文化根性決定了在意識與潛意識中存在一股人文精神動力，使其不得不關注中國人文傳統的現代轉型與在當代世界中的位置。他們在華夷之間展開研究，處於外語學術語境裏，必須將中國發生的文學案例與世界文化、文學進行比較。在這個比較研究的過程與語境中，面對西方中心主義的慣性與局面，不可迴避地意識到自己站在世界文學乃至文化的邊緣上，所以必須在這個語境和過程中尋找有效的工具來凸顯自己的研究。用外語進行的中國現代文學研究的學術表述不能不採用多國語言資源中的理論，不僅是柏拉圖 (Plato, 427-347 B.C.)、亞里斯多德 (Aristotle, 384-322 B.C.) 的希臘古典理論脈絡與希伯來宗教源頭，更需要把握前衛的新創理論。所以，李歐梵院士等在中國文學研究中採用理論的新穎與有效，常常會在外國同行之上。他們背負著中西（華夷）兩大傳統，西方傳統中的文化又因語言和民族而多歧，二十世紀的文學理論層出不窮，研究範疇與邊界的擴張與收縮，將世界文學、文化內化，與母語的人文認同融匯，這就產生了在外語的東亞研究語境中的中國現代文學研究的能動與限制，這也是李歐梵現象的內涵與部分標識。

李歐梵的中國現代文學研究歷程中，每一次學術重心的敬側、跨向新的領域途程間的每一次驛動都對學界發生過或正產生著影響：他的五四現代作家的浪漫一代、魯迅發自鐵屋中的吶喊、中國文化文學的現代性的追求、東方都市的上海摩登、晚清文學翻譯中的現代知識及跨文化、跨語言研究，都曾經、仍然或正成為學術的風向。李歐梵是有創作才具與經驗的研究者，具有一顆和學術對象喁喁對談的文心，所以特別值得緊密關注其深入研究領域的文心驛動。這次蘇州大學季進教授代編《晚清到五四》，給學界帶來難得的機會，讓我們得以由剖析一個卓越研究者的文心驛動而洞悉這個學術領域裏的深刻的變與不變。這個論文輯本有著者新的研究成績，也有不太久遠的舊作，而舊作與現今正執行的研究計畫內在的邏輯一致顯而易見，其晚清翻譯研究中的林紓研究綿延四十多年前博士論文⁴⁶的脈絡，郁達夫 (1896-1945) 的舊體詩與林紓 (1852-1924) 古文翻譯都是回溯

⁴⁶ 後改寫為《中國現代作家的浪漫一代》(*The Romantic Generation of Modern Chinese Writers*, 1973)。

古文傳統，探究其時文化與文學的舊本新枝。無論新舊，李歐梵追究的是中國傳統人文的新生，是它與西方人文交接時的「枝枝相覆蓋，葉葉相交通」⁴⁷，是他心目中的世界文學。

二、經驗與學術史

李歐梵治中國現代文學的學術經驗與其師長輩有別。固然他的魯迅研究立意受臺大外文系老師夏濟安(1916-1965)啓發，理論方法則未必追隨。李歐梵的五十年中國現代文學研究經驗中開掘了多個新領域，《鐵屋中的吶喊》⁴⁸特立獨行，《上海摩登：一種新都市文化在中國，1930-1945》⁴⁹盤空而出，「林紓的翻譯」較錢鍾書(1910-1998)另闢蹊徑，他研究對象的轉移是學術領域的開拓，有些領域獨自深耕細作，有些領域的進入是但開風氣，有些則和年輕學人共同推展。李歐梵的著述不乏與多個問題相連的歷史脈絡，卻未見他起意專作一部文學史，這是他與夏志清(T. C. Hsia, 1921-2013)顯而易見的區別。從他的學術語境可以略窺其因由：一方面因為他的時代研究中國現代文學的人比較地多了一點，有更多的問題與討論；而夏志清無所依賴也一無束縛，能一氣寫一本《中國現代小說史》⁵⁰，且比中國小說原生土地上的人們對作家作品有更多的發掘，部分原因是他前不見古人後不見來者，並肩的同仁（除了兄長夏濟安）無人討論，要讓英語世界認識中國現代文學，必須有一個厚實全面的展示，表示這是一個西方世界中人還未具備能力正面審視與進入的宏闊領域，所以他會將小說家一個個排列出來鑒賞評斷，待到著作出版才有了來自東歐的漢學家普實克(Jaroslav Průšek, 1906-1980)的商榷。當時夏志清面臨的最大問題是英語世界對中國現代文學缺乏瞭解，李歐梵面臨解決的首要問題是中國現代文學有哪些是與西方文學具有對等

⁴⁷ 語出佚名：〈孔雀東南飛〉（古詩為焦仲卿妻作，見遼欽立輯校：《先秦漢魏晉南北朝詩》〔北京：中華書局，1983年〕，上冊，頁286）。

⁴⁸ 英文原版為 *Voices from the Iron House: A Study of Lu Xun* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1987)，中文本為尹慧珉所譯，由臺北風雲時代出版社於1995年出版。

⁴⁹ 英文版 *Shanghai Modern: The Flowering of a New Urban Culture in China, 1930-1945* 於1999年由美國 Harvard University Press 出版，中文版為毛尖譯，二〇〇〇年於香港牛津大學出版社出版。

⁵⁰ 英文原版 *A History of Modern Chinese Fiction, 1917-1957* 於一九六一年由美國 Yale University Press 出版，中文版編譯者為劉紹銘，於一九七九年由臺北傳記文學社出版。

的現代藝術與精神內涵。

臺灣大學外文系的出身，李歐梵受老師夏濟安影響，有稍長同學輩白先勇等人編刊物《現代文學》，他還為刊物翻譯過德國現代小說大家湯瑪斯·曼 (Paul Thomas Mann, 1875-1955) 的作品，所以李歐梵的「世界文學」絕非從一個空泛的概念出發，他衡量中國現代小說的尺度一部分是取之於歐洲現代主義文學。即使進入到《上海摩登》文化研究的階段，他將注意力集中於都市上海的商場與街道的文化之餘，並未放棄施蛰存 (1905-2003) 小說的現代主義內涵，這和一般的文化批評從都市建築等著手異趣。季進教授將〈「怪誕」與「著魅」——重探施蛰存的小說世界〉一文編入此書，讓這個脈絡的延伸得到更多讀者矚目。李歐梵在施蛰存小說文本之外著眼，找到與他的世界主義理念款曲相通的事實：生活居住在上海愚園路的施蛰存購買外文書的個人經驗是一種特別的世界文化流通，它以事實印證、闡述了李歐梵的人文目標，注釋「世界文學」概念的內涵，此處論述書籍的流通，與《上海摩登》裏探討上海的雜誌脈絡一貫。更有意思的是，李歐梵借施蛰存小說重新調整了他對上海文化研究與中國現代小說自身的文學性的均衡，以文本細讀彌補一般文化研究方法運用於文學的相對空疏，他最著意處是跨文化轉譯之後的外來翻譯文本「變成另外的文化或文學的一部分」（頁 366）。

《晚清到五四》中所收論文，李歐梵多有對施蛰存、郁達夫、魯迅、林紓再度的迴旋進入、賦予新義，並勇於對過去在這個領域裏的研究進行自我批評，這是他個人學術史的一種展現方式，也部分地定義了中國境外的現代文學學術史。綜觀其個人學術史，與其從他的博士論文《中國現代作家的浪漫一代》而《鐵屋中的吶喊》的順時序羅列，不如提挈其研究的脈絡性。林紓領起的晚清翻譯研究的跨文化脈絡，郁達夫〈沉淪〉引來的浪漫主義脈絡，在施蛰存則稱為「新浪漫主義」，這些對象同時存在一個與傳統關係的脈絡，中國現代文學就是帶著這些脈絡進入現代與後現代文化。

所幸，季進教授的編輯方便筆者尋找這些脈絡，它是層遞進展的，卻往往以對過去的省思作為標誌。我們在《晚清到五四》中不止一次地發現李歐梵對過去研究的反省，每每對過去成果有「淺薄」、「膚淺」的評判，最重要的不是自我檢討，而是修正其研究方法與理念。他這樣表達在施蛰存研究過程中的反省與啓悟：「我們在美國研究一個作品的時候，作家的生平完全不管，而是用一種理論分析文本。可是我覺得在中國的語境裏，作家的背景與身世不能不顧，特別是

像施先生這種情況。」（頁 363）這種背景往往和他要尋找的「歷史的關節點」密切膠合。施蛰存的〈魔道〉不再止於都市人生的「疏離感」，修正的論述推進到文體實驗，討論敘述者意識如何成爲一種其他作家所未有的「意識流」表達。也許將對施蛰存研究背景的領悟移諸魯迅研究更有意思，〈「批評空間」的開創——從《申報·自由談》談起〉一文探討魯迅的《偽自由書》是否拓展了批評空間的問題，聚焦點在文體與表達方式。若可充分注意《申報》老闆史量才（1880-1934）被暗殺的「背景」，直面高壓之下無從談說新聞自由，揭示問題的方法應更具透視深度。

中國現代文學的研究史無法迴避一個「淺」字，海內外研究者無論是誰都躲不開兩個事實：其一是客觀材料的隨時更新，每有新發現輒引發今日知昨日之非的洞達；其二是研究主體對方法理論的選擇，尺有所短寸有所長，每一種理論方法的解剖刀都有其刀鋒與刀背，刀鋒之犀利輕靈與刀背的鈍重並非單獨的存在。二十世紀裏具有超卓的哲學涵養的理論家並不多，文學研究的批評活動遊弋於散在孤立的理論島礁之間，其與現代文學學術史時段與諸多交合（或可借用李歐梵所謂「偶合」），海內外學者往往都不能盡免這個「淺」。李歐梵在二〇一九年香港科技大學舉辦的「五四之後：當代人文的三個方向」國際學術研討會上，其〈漫談晚清和五四時期的「西學」和國際視野〉的主題演講表達對此的認識：「我們一直在不停地檢討，不停地論述，不停地解構和重構，衆聲喧嘩，沒有定論。我覺得是一個很好的傳統。」⁵¹ 他設定的學術生產的語境是讓「淺」與「沒有定論」互訓，又好像是在說現代文學學者的研究衝動像輪番漫上海灘的潮湧，現代文學研究的學術史及現狀都是驛動不居的過程，需要一個有情的主體的投入，方能「情生驛動」⁵²。

三、跨晚清 / 五四的架構

李歐梵的世界主義人文方向的結構性思維，在《晚清到五四》體現爲跨晚清 / 五四的知識架構和在晚清、五四兩個時段中歷史節點的設置。王德威院士爲

⁵¹ 該會議論文集結成冊，於二〇二〇年七月由香港三聯書店出版。見王德威等主編：《當代人文的三個方向：夏志清、李歐梵、劉再復》（香港：三聯書店，2020年），頁2。

⁵² 二〇一五年十二月李院士曾於中央大學與清華大學合辦的「情生驛動：從情的東亞現代性到文本跨語境行旅」國際學術研討會發表主題演講「見樹又見林：晚清小說翻譯研究方法的初步探討」。

「五四之後：當代人文的三個方向」國際學術研討會論文集《當代人文的三個方向：夏志清、李歐梵、劉再復》⁵³作序，對夏志清、李歐梵、劉再復的方向有精要評析，評述李歐梵云：

李歐梵的中英著作極多。英語世界中的四部專書各有開拓先河的意義。《中國現代作家的浪漫一代》（*The Romantic Generation of Modern Chinese Writers*, 1973）描寫五四以後作家從郁達夫到蕭紅等的歌哭行止、革命戀愛，夾議夾敘，堪稱是歐美學生進入現代中國文學領域的重要指南。《鐵屋中的吶喊》將魯迅請下神壇，以三十年代的文化政治為背景，縱觀大師的所為與所不為，有史識，也有洞見，更多同情的理解。《上海摩登》（*Shanghai Modern: The Flowering of a New Urban Culture in China, 1930-1945*, 1999）同樣是膾炙人口的作品。全書介紹上海的殖民風情與前衛文藝，是當代「上海學」大盛的關鍵著作之一。《東西之間：我的香港》（*City between Worlds: My Hong Kong*, 2008）則處理另外一座他鍾愛的城市，對香港的過去和現在有深入淺出的描寫，深情自在其中。⁵⁴

這四部英文著作的目標讀者當然是以英文母語或作為第二語言的關注中國現代文學／文化的人，也是世界主義論旨的當然選擇。王德威沒有提及李歐梵同樣傑出的其他中文／華語著述，以英文／夷言突出其「世界主義」的人文方向，於中可見這兩位大家的惺惺相惜。設想我們可以讓二人換個位置，不論王德威對李歐梵現代文學研究的肯定與推崇，而是問王德威憑什麼讓李歐梵視為學術知音？《晚清到五四》的〈自序〉認同王德威處理文學史的「晚清」和「五四」兩個歷史節點，看得出李歐梵對這一命題的闡釋與王德威「所見略同」。

《晚清到五四》的全部論文的篇幅，三分之二討論晚清，餘下的都是廣義的五四⁵⁵。他的晚清討論對象沒有滿足王德威的寬闊論域，而是集中於林紓的翻譯（此外有討論「科學小說」《夢遊二十一世紀》的論文），尤其突出英國維多利亞時期的通俗小說的翻譯，其中詳瞻深透的是〈見林又見樹——晚清小說翻譯研究方法的初步探討〉。這篇論文標題採用雙關修辭，頗似向王德威致意（王德威

⁵³ 王德威〈序言〉，見《當代人文的三個方向》。

⁵⁴ 同前註，序頁3。

⁵⁵ 中國大陸學者往往將「五四」限於一九二〇年代，李歐梵《晚清到五四》裏的五四研究則在大陸學者的「二十年代」之外延及「三十年代」與「四十年代」。大陸現代文學研究代表性的分期可參見錢理群等編述的教材《中國現代文學三十年》（該書由錢理群等著，於一九八七年由上海藝文出版社出版）。

的著作標題、關鍵字或論述的命名頗多雙關，每令人拍案叫絕⁵⁶)。筆者認為李歐梵所謂「林」和「樹」至少呈現了兩個闡釋面向：其一，既有關於維多利亞時期小說翻譯文化整體的綜合論述，對應比喻為一片「林」，又有林紓翻譯數量最多的哈葛德 (Sir Henry Rider Haggard, 1856-1925) 個案，他的哈葛德翻譯成績在一片小說翻譯的叢林中是棵大「樹」；其二，晚清小說翻譯，除了林紓，周桂笙 (1873-1936)、包天笑 (1876-1973) 與惲鐵樵 (1878-1935) 都是一時名家，周桂笙概述英國當代小說名家的文章〈英國近三十年中最著名之小說家〉一文刊載於一九〇六年的第三號《月月小說》雜誌，這個材料與印度學者 Priya Josni 所論當地流行的英國小說構成對比，成為不太喜歡考據的李歐梵文章中的一個亮點，譯家雖然林立還是掩蓋不了木秀於林的「林琴南」，至於這個「樹」字則回歸到翻譯對象維多利亞小說的本體，延伸為這個時期的「小說家族」——文化家族般的小說譜系。李歐梵賦予樹的英文詞彙 tree 以雙層意涵的延伸，就小說家家族譜系 (family tree) 而言，晚清翻譯小說男性作家譜系迭更司 (Dickens)、薩克雷 (Thackeray)、哈代 (Hardy)、司各德 (Scott)、柯南道爾 (Conan Doyle) 等，聳動 (言情) 小說女作家譜系有 Marie Corelli (高蘭麗女史)、Mrs. Henry (Ellen) Wood、Mrs. (Mary Elizabeth) Braddon 等。女性作家又帶出來女性、家庭、婚姻生命之樹的譜系，這棵樹上的枝柯則分蘖出多樣的小說文類譜系和文學史留名的文本。它還指涉論文寫法的點面結合，在面上對文本、文類、小說家的夾敘夾議之後，重點討論「言情小說」。這個重點的確定與筆者發想命名的二〇一五年國際學術會議題目「情生驛動」吻合無間，顯示出學問家李歐梵富有一顆靈動「文心」的小說家另一面。

很大程度上，是晚清翻譯的維多利亞小說的通俗 (popular) 品格與中國說書人市井表演的世俗 (secular) 的結合，才成長為後起續航的大陸文學史家范伯群 (1931-2017) 命名為「鴛鴦蝴蝶——禮拜六派」的民國通俗小說。李歐梵文中有清晰表達，鴛鴦蝴蝶派「五虎將」之一周瘦鵑 (1895-1968) 完全就是和林紓在同一翻譯脈絡上。周瘦鵑、張恨水 (1895-1967) 的通俗小說在中國大陸的現代文學研究中成為五四精英文學的對照物，其實若按王德威⁵⁷、季進為李歐梵設置的著

⁵⁶ 如王德威在《中國現代小說的史與學：向夏志清先生致敬》（臺北：聯經出版事業公司，2010年）序言所言：「後現代主義 (Post-modernism) 與後毛鄧主義 (Post-Mao-Dengism) 竟可一拍即合。」（頁2）。

⁵⁷ 王德威曾為李歐梵編過《現代性的追求》一書，於二〇一〇年由北京人民文學出版社出版。

作題目「現代性追求／想像」之邏輯，而不受「反帝反封建」的意識形態規制，周瘦鵑輩無論在知識脈絡上還是文類形式上都是另類的五四文化，那正是晚清到五四的綿延，而非文化革命的斷裂。李歐梵視晚清翻譯小說為文學史的重要節點，郁達夫等作為浪漫一代既引來歐洲英國、德國文學又擅長晚清以前的舊體文言詩歌，也是另一歷史節點，此外還有施蛰存等，依照李歐梵歷史學的理解方式，這些歷史節點無一不是王德威著述論述之外，而恰能印證晚清／五四架構命題的典型案列。且不論李歐梵是否認同王德威的歷史觀和理論出發點，就處理晚清五四的歷史架構而言，李歐梵的世界主義人文方向都是王德威命題的忠實同盟。

四、知識、傳統的重新脈絡化

世界主義人文方向需要致力新舊知識、文化傳統在特定語境裏的脈絡化。對中國與世界的溝通和知識交流，有多樣的評估方法：狹隘不過於視西方的知識文化傳播為「文化侵略」，在本土立場上積極主動地選擇是魯迅的「拿來主義」態度，汪暉《現代中國思想的興起》⁵⁸在學理較衡中考察中國近現代知識主體長時段的「格致」歷程，上個世紀二十年代學衡派的「昌明國粹，融化新知」也是走了一條哈佛大學教授白璧德 (Irving Babbitt, 1865-1933) 所啓發的世界主義的路線。

本書談到一個歷史知識的節點《新文化辭書》⁵⁹，德國漢學家瓦格納 (Rudolf G. Wagner, 1941-2019) 曾研究過它，李歐梵的研究也在進行中。他在「五四之後：當代人文的三個方向」國際學術研討會上的主題演講〈漫談晚清和五四時期的西學和國際視野〉中，再次談到這部介紹五四時代新知識和西學的《新文化辭書》。該辭書介紹了很多西方作家、藝術家、思想家、宗教家和科學家，哲學家有柏格森 (Henri Bergson, 1859-1941)、羅素 (Bertrand Russell, 1872-1970) 和杜威 (John Dewey, 1859-1952)，而德國哲學和科學的介紹份額超過胡適 (1891-1962) 介紹的英美實證主義。這個德國與英美的介紹的比較，顯示李歐梵刻意說明他的世界主義不是籠統的中西交流。他考察現代西方作家如何影響中國現代文學，細緻

⁵⁸ 汪暉：《現代中國思想的興起》（北京：三聯書店，2004年）。

⁵⁹ 該書於一九二三年由上海商務印書館發行，共計十一位編者，主編唐敬果另著有介紹西方近代思想變遷的《近代思想解詁》，可知編者心目中「新文化」等同「新知識」。

區分國別文化的差異，尤其是郁達夫所受在華茲華斯 (William Wordsworth, 1770-1850) 之外的德國文學之深刻影響。此外，李歐梵也重點關心外國小說在晚清東亞翻譯介紹時中國和日本接受影響的擇取分殊。書中有一篇奇文〈從一本小說看世界——《夢遊二十一世紀》的意義〉，這是李歐梵和日本年輕學者橋本悟合作的論文，奇特之處在「各言爾志」的形式，李歐梵介紹晚清楊德森翻譯哈亭這部科學小說的讀者反應平平；橋本悟論述近藤真琴日譯本引發的政治、軍事效應。此文合著者對日本和中國的接受反應、理解詮釋各占一半篇幅，觀其分析則符合若契。與晚清小說翻譯不同，五四階段翻譯介紹的知識文化特徵為更重視思想史。李歐梵關注晚清知識節點《泰西新史攬要》⁶⁰，該書呈現了李提摩太 (Timothy Richard, 1845-1919) 與洋場才子蔡爾康 (1852-1921) 關於歐西歷史的知識互動。倘若我們從此上溯到從英國倫敦會來到上海、香港的傳教士麥都思 (Walter Henry Medhurst, 1796-1857) 等人與理雅各 (James Legge, 1815-1897) 編輯於香港發行的《遐邇貫珍》(*The Chinese Serial*) 雜誌、上海的墨海書館 (The London Missionary Society Press) 出版偉烈亞力 (Alexander Wylie, 1815-1887) 所編輯《六合叢談》(*Shanghai Serial*) 雜誌，進行歐西知識的輸入（第一號就介紹了希臘文學與詩人荷馬）。該刊很快流傳於幕府末期的日本精英階層，均處處烙印著中國文人知識的轉型軌跡。若非從舉業中脫離出來的「海天三友」王韜 (1828-1897)、李善蘭 (1810-1882)、蔣敦復 (1808-1867) 與西人合作，《六合叢談》的出版可能無法想像。這些知識脈絡的連貫，正可歸入李歐梵確認的世界主義晚清 / 五四的人文歷程。

上文提到的松江，現在是上海所轄的一個區（明清地方史志裏卻是松江府、上海縣的等級秩序），它是作為節點反復貫穿在李歐梵著作與論文中的作家施蟄存的重要背景（現在的歷史名校松江二中有施蟄存塑像）。如果說老城廂是租界洋場的歷史背景，松江則是比上海縣更深一層的背景。在〈「怪誕」與「著魅」——重探施蟄存的小說世界〉這一章中，李歐梵省悟到須注意施蟄存這樣作家的背景，不能僅賴美國方式的理論分析。筆者特別要指出，其實「背景」裏也有理論，恩格斯 (Friedrich Engels, 1820-1895) 談莎士比亞 (William Shakespeare, 1564-1616) 不忘「福斯塔夫 (Falstaff) 式背景」，中國論文傳統裏的背景是「知人論世」，只是中國散在的理論元素沒有被有效理論化。松江天然就是江南才子

⁶⁰ 原著名為 *The Nineteenth Century: A History*，作者為麥肯齊 (Robert Mackenzie, 1823-1881)，中譯本由李提摩太與蔡爾康合譯。

的背景，而且人才輩出。少年施蛰存浸染過松江文化，所以有〈上元燈〉風格的作品，即如〈梅雨之夕〉的都市街景中偶遇所見之女人都帶江南風韻。施蛰存小說著力寫人物意識而淡筆寫外形，可那些女人的外形彷彿是松江才子改琦(1773-1828)《《紅樓夢》圖·詠》版畫的十二釵線條。張愛玲(1920-1995)推崇松江近代小說家韓邦慶(1856-1894)的《海上花列傳》，其「穿插藏閃」的形式美學變幻難測，或可與施蛰存的意識流相侔。若論科學知識的現代傳播，西人的《幾何原本》從晚明徐光啓(1562-1633)與利瑪竇(Matteo Ricci, 1552-1610)翻譯前六卷，到清咸豐年間(一八五〇年代)偉烈亞力和李善蘭合作完成後九卷，全本十五卷是松江舉人韓應陞(1813?-1860，韓邦慶的堂伯父)校讎並出資印刷。這個晚清松江，是現代也是傳統，施蛰存屬於松江—上海—世界，施蛰存小說的前衛(avant-garde)與松江背景也盡可以歸入書中這篇〈中國現代文學——傳統與現代的弔詭〉來討論。

李歐梵書中兩篇文題有「弔詭」，都與「傳統」關聯。世界主義人文的理論難題在於不同文化、文學並不都是當代模樣，不像施蛰存編的《現代》(*Les Contemporains*，意為當代人、同代人)雜誌，它非但要討論同代人的問題，更強調每一種文學與文化都有它的過去，發達的文化與文學絕大多數有其自身的偉大傳統(great tradition)。傳統與現代在多個文化文學之間可能有極為複雜的交叉組合而難以理順，於是弔詭產生，其機制往往各別特殊。司各德(Walter Scott, 1771-1832)的英國歷史題材小說 *Ivanhoe* (林紓譯為《撒克遜劫後英雄略》)的翻譯過程，其弔詭機制被李歐梵稱為「雙重文化的過濾」，司各德的小說在英語文學傳統中有從 romance 向 novel 發展的文類蛻變，譯為中文則有林紓古文，和司各德的文體並不一致，〈歷史演義小說的跨文化弔詭——林紓和司各德〉一文就要解決這樣的問題。林紓所譯標題的修辭是史傳文類而非通俗演義，而，「撒克遜劫後」講述某一種族遇上大世變的歷史，「英雄略」的完整表達是「英雄記略」。說到文類，中國小說史上的「歷史演義」原是「講史」，說書人在書臺上講述歷史過程中要敷演/敷衍「義理」是書會才人的共識，儒家文化的社會主導(說書人的祖師爺為子貢)著說書演出要敷衍「春秋大義」。林紓是不會丟開「古文」而認同「講史」的，正如他不肯承認「白話」可以為「文」。同理，林紓翻譯哈葛德的跨文化機制是「文化倫理」多於「文化政治」。而魯迅、郁達夫、老舍(1899-1966)兼擅的新舊文體在五四文化價值層面是衝突的，那些常常寫舊體詩的五四新文學家的心理與文化機制至今缺乏闡釋，他們的舊體詩是更私

人化的文體，正如新文化的重要人物維持舊式婚姻（如胡適、魯迅、郁達夫等人）的私生活。上述弔詭並不能構成對世界主義人文方向的阻礙，李歐梵這樣的人文主義者就是為挑戰悖論而生。

閱讀《晚清到五四》，其世界主義人文方向意猶未盡，多有討論空間，略述一二，是為致敬。