



中南财经政法大学  
青年学术文库

# 德性主义抑或事功主义

## 朱熹、陈亮“王霸义利”之争 及其政治思想史意义

**Moralism or Utilitarianism:**

the Debate of "Wang Ba Yi Li" between Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang and its Significance  
in the History of Political Thought

罗雪飞◎著



世界图书出版公司



中南财经政法大学  
青年学术文库

# 德性主义抑或事功主义

## 朱熹、陈亮“王霸义利”之争 及其政治思想史意义

**Moralism or Utilitarianism:**  
the Debate of "Wang Ba Yi Li" between Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang and its Significance  
in the History of Political Thought

罗雪飞◎著



中国出版集团公司



世界图书出版公司

广州·上海·西安·北京

## 图书在版编目 ( CIP ) 数据

德性主义抑或事功主义：朱熹、陈亮“王霸义利”  
之争及其政治思想史意义 / 罗雪飞著. — 广州：世界  
图书出版广东有限公司，2016.11  
ISBN 978-7-5192-2060-0

I. ①德… II. ①罗… III. ①儒学—研究 IV. ①B222.05

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2016) 第 272528 号

- 
- 书 名 德性主义抑或事功主义  
——朱熹、陈亮“王霸义利”之争及其政治思想史意义  
DEXING ZHUYI YIHUO SHIGONG ZHUYI ZHUXI CHENLIANG  
WANGBAYILI ZHIZHENG JIQI ZHENGZHI SIXIANGSHI YIYI
- 著 者 罗雪飞
- 责任编辑 孔令钢
- 装帧设计 黑眼圈工作室
- 出版发行 世界图书出版广东有限公司
- 地 址 广州市新港西路大江冲 25 号
- 邮 编 510300
- 电 话 020-84460408
- 网 址 [http:// www.gdst.com.cn](http://www.gdst.com.cn)
- 邮 箱 [sjxscb@163.com](mailto:sjxscb@163.com)
- 经 销 新华书店
- 印 刷 北京振兴源印务有限公司
- 开 本 710mm × 1000mm 1/16
- 印 张 17
- 字 数 294 千
- 版 次 2017 年 1 月第 1 版 2017 年 1 月第 1 次印刷
- 国际书号 ISBN 978-7-5192-2060-0
- 定 价 52.00 元
- 

版权所有，翻版必究

(如有印装错误，请与出版社联系)

本书受中南财经政法大学出版基金资助

---

# 《中南财经政法大学青年学术文库》

## 编辑委员会

主 任：杨灿明

副主任：吴汉东 姚 莉

委 员：（排名按姓氏笔画）

朱延福	朱新蓉	向书坚	刘可风	刘后振	张志宏
张新国	陈立华	陈景良	金大卫	庞凤喜	胡开忠
胡贤鑫	徐双敏	阎 伟	葛翔宇	董邦俊	

主 编：姚 莉

## 中文摘要

“道”是中国古代的政治思想和政治实践中所涉及的最为重要的词。儒家作为中国传统政治文化的主流，对“道”有着丰富的论述。大体而言，儒家内部对“道”有两种不同的理解：一是德性主义的解释，即将“道”本身及其实践视为道德理想主义，认为由内圣可以实现外王，只有这样的王道的政治秩序才是可欲的，才具备政治合法性；二是事功主义的解释，即将“道”本身及其实践视为权变的事功主义，以现实主义的眼光看待“道”在历史和现实政治中的展开，认为只要能解决时代所遇到的紧迫问题，使国家统一、秩序稳定、不受外侮，即为王道之事功。儒家对“道”的这两种不同理解，基本上是围绕王霸义利问题而展开的，实质是儒家内部关于解决治理问题的不同路径选择。

德性主义和事功主义的争论由来已久。南宋孝宗淳熙年间，道学的领袖朱熹和事功之学的杰出代表陈亮之间围绕三代和汉唐的王霸义利的争论，就是德性主义和事功主义正面交锋的突出事例。这场关于王霸义利的争论，虽然已经过去八百多年，但是两人争论的内容及其在政治思想史上的意义究竟为何，却并不因时代变迁而失去探讨的必要。本书所要研究的核心问题正是朱熹和陈亮关于以王霸义利之辨为核心的争论的具体内容及其在政治思想史上的意义。对此，本书尝试着将朱熹的思想体系作为德性主义，将陈亮的思想体系作为事功主义，并视其为解决治理问题的两条不同路径，试图通过对朱陈之争的思想史资源以及历史语境的挖掘，在全面梳理其所争内容的基础上，探讨其在政治思想史上的实质性意义、有限性意义与典范性意义。

首先，本书利用观念史的偏重内在理路的研究方法，对朱熹和陈亮之争发生以

前的儒家关于王霸义利问题的讨论进行溯源。本书之所以选取孔子、孟子、荀子、董仲舒、王通和程颢六人的观点来加以分疏，主要是因为他们的观点是朱熹和陈亮共享的思想史资源，尽管朱陈两人对这些观点的认知不同。通过分析，本书勾画出了两条不同的王霸义利观的演变路线：一是孔子→孟子→董仲舒→程颢的德性主义路线；二是孔子→荀子→王通的事功主义路线。

其次，本书利用历史语境主义的研究方法，从宏观、中观以及微观三个层面来对朱陈之争发生的历史语境进行深度挖掘。宏观语境是经过长期变迁而形成的政治和文化的宏观历史结构，塑造了朱熹、陈亮两人的思想和气质的底色；其中，政治语境主要指的是君主专制政体的延续与治乱循环不已，思想语境侧重的是儒家的体制化与内卷化。中观语境所指向的是朱熹、陈亮所置身的历史世界，这种中观的历史结构对于朱熹、陈亮两人的思想和气质的影响更为直接和有力；其中，政治语境主要指的是儒家士大夫在朝廷强化集权背景下回向三代的不懈追求以及宋室南渡，思想语境侧重的是宋代儒学复兴运动下的儒学多元发展以及道学的独大和正统化。微观语境指的是朱熹和陈亮所直接面临的生活世界和政治世界，侧重于两人各自的生活、问学、交游以及仕宦情况，这种微观的历史结构可以生动地展现两人的差异。

再次，本书从三个层次来讨论朱熹和陈亮之间的王霸义利之争：第一层次是分析两人的理欲观以及在此基础上的义利之辨；第二层次是分析两人的历史观以及建基于其上的王霸之辨；第三层次是分析两人的道统观以及以此为基础的道邪之辨。朱熹的德性主义的王霸义利观以动机来判分三代和汉唐之高低，认为王霸的本质区别在于君心之正与不正，能否做到正心诚意，王道政治以义为依归，霸道政治以利为依归；陈亮的事功主义的王霸义利观以结果来论证汉唐与三代没有本质区别，认为三代做得尽，汉唐做得不尽，王霸没有本质区别，霸道本就源自王道，汉祖唐宗之所行也并非全在功利上而毫无道义。朱熹和陈亮在围绕三代和汉唐争论王霸义利的同时，也在争论着对“道”的解释权，进而争夺道统的占有权和垄断权，这又意味着两人在解决治理问题的思路上的不同。对道统的不同建构进一步强化了两人在王霸义利问题上的差异，但是两人都在不同程度上接受了儒家的理欲二元观的传统、双重历史观的传统以及阐发道统的传统。

最后，本书从三个方面讨论了朱熹的德性主义和陈亮的事功主义之间的争论所含有的政治思想史意义：一是就其实质性意义而言，德性主义与事功主义的争论彰显了政治理想主义与政治现实主义之间的对立以及德性伦理和事功伦理之间的紧张；

二是就其有限性意义而言，从知识论的角度看，双方均没有摆脱全能主义知识论的思维传统，德性主义在知识论上属于以道德性命之学为基础的摄智归仁式的德性主义的全能主义知识论，事功主义在知识论上属于以事功经世之学为基础的重在救世济民的事功主义的全能主义知识论；三是就其典范性意义而言，朱陈之争所彰显的德性主义与事功主义之间的冲突并未随两人争论的结束而消失，而是当德性主义成为主流之后，在明清之际和晚晴均引起了以经世实学的兴起为标志的事功主义的反弹。

通过对朱熹的德性主义与陈亮的事功主义之间的争论的分析，我们可以发现，帝制中国时期，由于没有替代性的制度选择以及可以借鉴的知识资源，不管是德性主义还是事功主义，均未能妥善地处理好外王事功不显这一始终困扰儒家的重大问题；在现代社会，要摆脱外王事功不显之困局就需要建立民主政治以奠定政治合法性之制度基础，而以德性主义彰显政治合法性之道义基础，进而在民主政治的框架中，在德性主义的引领下，充分地实现外王事功，以奠定政治合法性之政绩基础。

**关键词：**德性主义 事功主义 朱熹 陈亮 王霸义利之争



## Abstract

"Tao" is the most important word for ancient China's political thought and political practice. As the mainstream of Chinese traditional political culture, the Confucianists has a wealth discussion of "Tao". Broadly speaking, there are two different interpretations of "Tao" in the Confucianists, one is the explanation of moralism, it regards "Tao" and its practices as moral idealism, and believes that outer kingship is based on inner sainthood, and only by this can the kingly way of political order be safeguarded and its political legitimacy be realized; the second is the explanation of utilitarianism, which treating "Tao" itself and its practice as a contingency utilitarianism, taking a realism view of "Tao" and its application in historical and realistic politics, thinking that a kingly way of utilitarianism is that the current problems can be solved, the unity of the country, the stability of social order and non-foreign aggression can be realized. These two different explanations of "Tao" are basically around the problem of "Wang Ba Yi Li" and the essence of them is the different paths for the Confucianists to solve governance problems.

The debate of moralism and utilitarianism has a long history. In the Southern Song Dynasty, the debate of "Wang Ba Yi Li" around Xia-Shang-Zhou period, and Han- Tang dynasty between Chu Hsi who is the leader of Taoism and Ch'en Liang who is an excellent representative of utilitarianism is a typical head-to-head confrontation case of moralism and utilitarianism. Although this debate was happened eight hundred years ago, the content of this argument and its significance in the history of political thought remains its necessity which is not affected by the change of the times. The core problem to be researched

in this paper is the debate of "Wang Ba Yi Li" between Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang, and its significance in the history of political thought. So this paper tries to put Chu Hsi's ideology as moralism, put Ch'en Liang's ideology as utilitarianism, and regard them as two different ways to solve the problems of governance. According to digging the resources of ideological history, studying the historical context of Chu Hsi and Ch' en Liang's debate and teasing a comprehensive review of the debate content, this paper attempts to explore its substantive significance, limited significance and model significance in the history of political thought.

Firstly, by using a research method of *ideengeschichte* which emphasizing on an intrinsic logic analysis, this paper want to tracing the Confucianists's discussion on the problem of "Wang Ba Yi Li" before Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang's debate happened. The reason why this paper illustrate Confucius, Mencius, Xuncius, Tung Chung-shu, Wang Tong and Cheng Hao's thoughts at the beginning is that both Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang share these views in spite of their different cognition about these views. Through analysis, this paper outlines two evolution routes about the view of "Wang Ba Yi LI", one is the route of moralism from Confucius to Mencius, Tung Chung-shu and Cheng Hao; the second is the route of utilitarianism from Confucius to Xuncius and Wang Tong.

Secondly, by using the research method of "Historical Contextualism", this paper studies the history context of Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang's debate from macro-level, meso-level and micro-level. The macroscopic context means a political and cultural macro-historical structure which needs a long-term transition to be formed. And it shaped the bottom color of the thinking and temperament of Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang. Thereinto, the political context mainly refers to the continuation of absolute monarchy and the endless of the cycle of turbulent history; the ideological context refers to the institutionalization and involution of the the Confucianists. The mesoscopic context points to the word history where Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang exposure themselves to. The influence of this mesoscopic history structure is more direct and powerful for both Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang. Thereinto, the political context mainly refers to Confucian scholars' pursuit of Xia-Shang-Zhou under the background of government's centralization and the southern migration of Song Dynasty; the ideological context is focused on the diversification development of Confucianism

and the autocracy and orthodox of Taoism under the revival of Confucianism in the Song Dynasty. The microscopic context indicates the living world and political world where Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang facing to. This microscopic history structure can show their individual differences vividly by emphasizing on their life, learning, social intercourses and official experiences.

Thirdly, this paper discusses the debate of "Wang Ba Yi Li" between Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang from three levels: The first level is to analyze Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang's debate of "Yi Li", which based on their perspective of heavenly principles and physical desire. The second level is to analyze their debate of "Wang Ba" based on their view of history. The third level is to analyze their conception of Confucian orthodoxy which is the basis of their discrimination of "Tao" and evil. Chu Hsi's view of "Wang Ba Yi LI" which inclined to moralism is motivation-based when distinguishing between the three dynasties of Xia, Shang and Zhou and the Han and Tang dynasties, and he takes the view that the essential difference between "kingly way" and "rule by force of dictators" is whether the sovereignty is just or not and whether the sovereign accumulate the sincerity and upright his mind or not. He holds that "kingly way" puts justice first while profit begins to take precedence in "rule by force of dictators". Ch'en Liang's view of "Wang Ba Yi LI" which inclined to utilitarianism demonstrate that there are no essential differences between the three dynasties of Xia, Shang and Zhou and the Han and Tang dynasties by the standard of results, the only difference between them is the degree. He holds that "rule by force of dictators" comes from "kingly way" and what the Emperor Gaozu of Han and Emperor Taizong of Tang have done also can be associated with morality and justice. When Chu Hsi and Ch'en Liang make a debate of "Wang Ba Yi Li" of the three dynasties of Xia, Shang and Zhou and the Han and Tang dynasties, they also dispute for the power of interpretation of "Tao" and then strive for the rights of possession and monopoly of Confucian orthodoxy, which means the difference in their thought to solve the problem of governance. The differences between them in constructing Confucian orthodoxy further strengthen their discrepancy in the problem of "Wang Ba Yi Li". However, both of them have accepted the tradition of confucianist that distinguishing between heavenly principles and physical desire, the dual view of history and the elaborating of Confucian orthodoxy.

Lastly, this article discusses the significance of the debate between Chu Hsi's moralism and Ch'en Liang's utilitarianism in the history of Chinese political thought. To begin with, in terms of its substantive significance, the debate between moralism and utilitarianism highlights the opposition between political idealism and political realism as well as the tension between the virtue ethics and the utility ethics. Then in terms of its limited significance, epistemologically speaking both of them has not get rid of the traditional thinking of totalitarianism epistemology. The moralism holds an omnipotent theory of knowledge based on the knowledge of moral life while the utilitarianism based on the knowledge of country-management and utility. Last in terms of its model significance, the conflict between Chu Hsi's moralism and Ch'en Liang's utilitarianism which highlighted by their debate has not come to an end along with the end of their debate. However, in late Ming and early Qing and the late Qing dynasty, when the moralism had become mainstream, it also witnessed the rebound of utilitarianism.

By the analysis of the debate between Chu Hsi's moralism and Ch'en Liang's utilitarianism, we can discover that in imperial China both the moralism and the utilitarianism had failed to resolve the issue well which has been haunting Confucianism all the time because of no alternative choice of regime and no referenced knowledge resources; in modern society, to be off the hook, the establishment of democratic politics is needed to construct the valid foundation of the system, besides, it is the moralism that highlighting the moral basis of political legitimacy and then we can fully realize "external king" and lay the foundation of performance legitimacy led by the moralism in the frame of democratic politics.

Key words: moralism    utilitarianism    Chu His    Ch'en Liang    the debate of  
"Wang Ba Yi Li"

# 目 录

导 论 .....	001
一、选题缘起 .....	001
二、关于朱陈之争的研究综述 .....	005
1. 唯心主义与唯物主义对立的视角 .....	006
2. 道德理想主义与功利主义对立的视角 .....	009
3. 对既有研究文献的评价 .....	014
三、研究方法 .....	015
四、研究思路 .....	017
五、研究创新点与不足 .....	019
第一章 朱陈之争的重要命题溯源 .....	021
第一节 孔子、孟子的王霸义利观 .....	021
一、孔子的王霸义利观 .....	022
二、孟子的王霸义利观 .....	027
第二节 荀子、董仲舒的王霸义利观 .....	033
一、荀子的王霸义利观 .....	034
二、董仲舒的王霸义利观 .....	038
第三节 王通、程颢的王霸义利观 .....	043
一、王通的王霸义利观 .....	044

二、程颢的王霸义利观 .....	048
<b>第二章 朱陈之争的历史语境 .....</b>	<b>055</b>
第一节 朱陈之争的宏观历史语境 .....	056
一、宏观政治语境——君主专制政体的延续与治乱循环不已 .....	056
1. 君主专制政体的创建及其延续 .....	056
2. 朝代更替与治乱循环 .....	060
二、宏观思想语境——儒学的体制化与内卷化 .....	062
1. 儒学的体制化 .....	063
2. 儒学的内卷化 .....	069
第二节 朱陈之争的中观历史语境 .....	075
一、中观政治语境——强化集权下回向三代的努力与宋室南渡 .....	076
1. 强化集权下回向三代的努力 .....	076
2. 靖康之变与宋室南渡 .....	080
二、中观思想语境——儒学复兴下的多元发展与道学独大化 .....	084
1. 儒学复兴下的多元发展 .....	084
2. 道学的独大与正统化 .....	094
第三节 朱陈之争的微观历史语境 .....	102
一、朱熹的生活与政治处境 .....	102
二、陈亮的生活与政治处境 .....	117
<b>第三章 朱陈之争的具体内容 .....</b>	<b>133</b>
第一节 理欲观与义利之辨 .....	134
一、儒家理欲二元观的传统 .....	134
二、朱陈不同的理欲观 .....	138
三、朱陈义利之辨 .....	143
第二节 历史观与王霸之辨 .....	147
一、儒家双重历史观的传统 .....	148
二、朱陈不同的历史观 .....	151
三、朱陈王霸之辨 .....	157

第三节 道统观与道邪之辨 .....	163
一、儒家建构道统的传统 .....	164
二、朱陈不同的道统观 .....	169
三、朱陈道邪之辨 .....	177
第四章 朱陈之争的政治思想史意义 .....	185
第一节 朱陈之争的实质性意义 .....	185
一、政治理想主义与政治现实主义之间的对立 .....	186
1. 政治理想主义与政治现实主义的不同假定 .....	186
2. 朱熹的理想主义政治观 .....	187
3. 陈亮的现实主义政治观 .....	191
二、德性伦理与事功伦理之间的紧张 .....	193
1. 两种理想类型的伦理观：德性伦理与事功伦理 .....	193
2. 朱熹的德性伦理观 .....	196
3. 陈亮的事功伦理观 .....	199
第二节 朱陈之争的有限性意义 .....	202
一、德性主义与事功主义的局限 .....	202
1. 德性主义的局限 .....	202
2. 事功主义的局限 .....	206
二、难以摆脱全能主义知识论的深层结构 .....	208
1. 德性主义与事功主义的全能主义知识论的差异 .....	208
2. 德性主义与事功主义的全能主义知识论的联系 .....	210
第三节 朱陈之争的典范性意义 .....	213
一、明清之际德性主义与事功主义之间的冲突 .....	214
1. 儒学重心的转向与空疏之风的加重 .....	214
2. 明清之际经世实学的兴起 .....	218
二、晚清德性主义与事功主义之间的紧张 .....	222
1. 理学笼罩下考据学的兴起与学术的空疏化 .....	222
2. 晚清经世实学的兴起 .....	227
结 语 .....	234

主要参考文献 ..... 241

博士学位论文完成后记 ..... 250

出版后记 ..... 254



# 导 论

## 一、选题缘起

一般而言，评价政府优劣及其政治行为正当与否的标准主要有两种：一种是理想主义的道德文化原则；另一种是现实主义的事功原则。理想主义的道德文化原则强调一种不变的永恒法则，并以此高悬之理想来衡量现实中的政府行为；现实主义的事功原则关注行为和政策的后果，并以后果来衡量行为和政策的正当性以及实施某行为和政策的政府的合法性。这两种不同的标准是人类在处理和思考政治生活时所需要永恒面对的选择，与此相关的是，价值世界与历史进程之间的张力也是人类所需要永恒面对的重要问题<sup>①</sup>。在不同文化和时空环境中，这样的问题会有不同的表达。就中国政治文化传统而言，理想主义的道德文化原则体现为德性伦理以及以此为基础而形成的解决政治问题的德性主义的治理进路；现实主义的事功原则体现为事功伦理以及以此为基础而形成的事功主义的治理进路。这两种不同的治理进路主要是通过士大夫对“道”的不同理解而获得表达和展现的。

正如有的学者所说：“在中国的历史中，有一些词受到了特别的重视，成了一个言语体系、思想体系和政治和社会的体制的拱顶石，‘道’是贯穿全部中华帝国历史的主要的词。”<sup>②</sup>帝制中国时期，政治总是绕不开一个“道”字，政治合法性的构建需要“道”来支撑。“道”作为政治合法性构建的最为核心的因素，始终是君主与士大夫群体共同关心的问题。儒家内部对“道”的不同理解，基本上可以分为

<sup>①</sup> [美]史华慈：《序》，载田浩：《功利主义儒家——陈亮对朱熹的挑战》，姜长苏译，江苏人民出版社1997年版，第7页。

<sup>②</sup> [瑞士]毕来德：《驳于连》，郭宏安译，载《中国图书评论》2008年第1期。