

# 中國古代闡釋學研究

周裕鍇 著



黃陳詩集注  
 大凡以詩名  
 發必有所考  
 有來去處宋  
 晉疑此字僻  
 工有此錫字  
 以用銚字思  
 六銚詩云劉  
 郎用字嚴密  
 如朝山谷老  
 人寒冰焉故  
 二有蓋其學  
 該不之說莫  
 不盡戶鄉倘  
 佯於巖一  
 家之詩略注  
 家以待後之  
 重陽日書  
 所以載道而  
 也周詩三百  
 大而天地日  
 出父子別而  
 去瀆怨不至  
 古者登歌清  
 賦與夫士大  
 子曰爲此詩  
 詩之用於世

復旦大學出版社

中國古代闡釋學研究



周裕鍇 著

復旦大學出版社

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

中国古代阐释学研究/周裕锴著. —上海: 复旦大学出版社, 2019.6  
ISBN 978-7-309-14143-6

I. ①中... II. ①周... III. ①阐释学-思想史-中国-古代 IV. ①B089.2-092

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2019)第 016863 号

### 中国古代阐释学研究

周裕锴 著

责任编辑/王汝娟

复旦大学出版社有限公司出版发行

上海市国权路 579 号 邮编: 200433

网址: fupnet@fudanpress.com <http://www.fudanpress.com>

门市零售: 86-21-65642857 团体订购: 86-21-65118853

外埠邮购: 86-21-65109143 出版部电话: 86-21-65642845

上海盛通时代印刷有限公司

开本 890 × 1240 1/32 印张 13.625 字数 324 千

2019 年 6 月第 1 版第 1 次印刷

ISBN 978-7-309-14143-6/B · 686

定价: 68.00 元

---

如有印装质量问题, 请向复旦大学出版社有限公司出版部调换。

版权所有 侵权必究



周裕锴，1954年生，成都华阳人。文学博士，四川大学文新学院二级教授、博士生导师，中国俗文化研究所研究员。四川省学术与技术带头人，国务院特殊津贴获得者。任中国苏轼学会会长，韩国东方学会、中国宋代文学学会、中华诗教学会副会长，《文学遗产》、《中国诗学》、人大复印资料《古代近代文学研究》等刊编委。日本大阪大学客座研究员，台湾大学、东华大学客座教授。著有《中国禅宗与诗歌》《宋代诗学通论》《文字禅与宋代诗学》《禅宗语言》《中国古代阐释学研究》《宋僧惠洪行履著述编年总案》《法眼与诗心》《语言的张力》《梦幻与真如》等书，为《苏轼全集校注》三位主编之一。



## 内容提要

从阐释学的角度来重新审视中国古代传统学术是一个饶有兴味的课题。本书试图通过搜集分析散见于各种典籍中有关言说和文本的理解与解释的论述，演绎经学、玄学、佛学、禅学、理学、诗学中蕴藏着的丰富的阐释学理论内涵，由此揭示出中国古代阐释学理论发展的内在逻辑以及异于西方阐释学的独特价值。

全书约三十三万字，共分为七章。本书一方面按照历史编年的方法，阐述了中国古代不同时期、不同学派关于理解与解释的重要看法，并揭示这些看法产生的哲学背景或文化背景。另一方面将典籍中零星的观点分类汇集，发现贯穿于其间的一系列平行的学术传统和基本原则，并追寻这些学术传统中贯穿的中国独有的思维方式和言说方式。

本书考察了先秦诸子关于语言、思想与现象世界的关系的各种论述，提出儒家的“正名”与道家的“无名”，在对语言有效性问题上，分别持信任和怀疑的态度。并借用西方哲学家“形上等级制”

的概念，分析了先秦诸子对文字、语言、思想和真理之间关系的不同认识，指出儒家的“言以足志，文以足言”与道家的“书不尽言，言不尽意”奠定了中国阐释学的基石，前者成为后来各种意图论阐释学的源头，相信读者的理解能与作者的意图达到同一；后者则派生出来一种“得意忘言”的方法，形成重视读者个人体验的阅读传统。

本书认为，“以意逆志”是针对“断章取义”和“以诗为史”的两种错误的诠释倾向而提出来的，不能简单称为“意图论阐释学”，而包含着“多元论阐释学”的思路，因为“意逆”的说法意味着承认读者各种不同的推测都有合理性。在先秦儒家“知人”和“知言”的阐释循环中，“以意逆志”和“知人论世”在互为前提和预设的情况下，为正确进入循环实现完美的理解提供了一种可能。

关于诗歌文本的理解，本书发现中国古代诗歌实际上可划分为记事性文本和象喻性文本两种不同类型，文本类型的差异规定了各自有效的阐释方法。“以意逆志”和“知人论世”的结合只对记事性文本的解释起作用，象喻性文本是一种不确定的、变动性的因而也是开放性的文本，“见仁见知”、“诗无达诂”的说法正是对这种文本的阐释差异的承认。在后世的诗歌阐释实践中，各个时代对不同类型文本的强调造成了中国诗歌阐释方法的不断演变，这种演变甚至影响到诗歌文本的编辑和解释方式。宋代读者倾向于把诗歌看作记事性文本，发明了“诗史”的概念，醉心于诗人年谱、诗集编年本以及诗人诗篇纪事的编纂，提倡一种以诗为史的阅读态度。他们相信弄清了诗人创作的本事，就能了解诗人的本意，并能正确领会诗歌的本义。元代明代的读者则倾向于把诗歌看成象喻性文本，像“水月镜花”一样不可解析，因而最好的阐释态度是“不说破”，以个人阅读体验为中心的评点形式压倒传统的笺注形式成为这一时期诗歌诠释的主流。

本书探讨了从汉代到清代儒家解经传统的演变，揭示了各个学

派阐释理论的合理价值及其缺陷。今文经学家“亿度”的方法建立了以读者自身观念为中心的“六经注我”的诠释模式，而古文经学家对语言文字的信赖，则建立了以通古今异言、各方殊语为目的的训诂学诠释模式。魏晋的解经者力图超越语言文字的桎梏，以辩名析理的手段直接领悟形而上的意义。宋代经学的疑古思潮旨在摒弃那些偏离儒家思想体系的曲说和杂说，恢复儒家经典的原始本义。清代由经学而衍生出来的考据学，则相信语言文字是阐释学中唯一的先决条件，以文字、声音、训诂的研究确定文本文字的字形、读音和意义，恢复文本的原始形态，探明文本的原始意义，以跨越时间距离造成的理解障碍。而清代校勘、辑佚、辨伪与金石、地理、典章制度等学术的勃兴，均与注意经籍阐释的有效性验证相关。

佛教阐释学是本书关注的又一内容。鉴于翻译涉及文本理解，本书将各种汉译佛经的翻译理论纳入了阐释学的研究范围，讨论了翻译作为跨文化的理解与接受的意义。本书还探讨了佛经义疏中从定义的比附、原义的诠释到己意的发挥等各种现象，总结出佛经义疏的附会性、扩展性、细密性与多元性的特点。本书提出这样一个观点：禅宗“不立文字，教外别传”的方式，表面上看是反对任何对佛教教义的解释，而实质上是佛教义理更深刻的本土化的解释。不同于义疏的是，禅宗以超越语言的本体诠释取代了依赖语言的文本诠释。

在对中国诗歌注释中使用的“诗史互证”的方法进行考察时，本书发现中国古代阐释学中有一种根深蒂固的“互文性”的观念，在解释者的意识中，任何文本和其他文本都存在着互文关系。因此，本书提出了中国古代阐释学是一种“互文性阐释学”的观念。中国学术史上儒、释、道融通以及文、史、哲不分家的现象，就是这种“互文性阐释学”的体现。

本书还对中国古代一系列常见的阐释学术语的理论内涵进行了分析。



## ABSTRACT

Study of traditional Chinese scholarship from the perspective of hermeneutics provides new insights into and appreciation for the tradition. This book explores the rich and varied theories of hermeneutics that have formed the Chinese tradition; it bases its findings on a thorough collection and analysis of discourse on textual interpretation that is scattered throughout ancient codes and records. The primary sources are studies of the Confucian classics, teachings of the Metaphysical School, translations and interpretations of Buddhist sutras, quotations of Chan masters, the works of Neo-Confucianism, and annotations of poetry from Pre-Qin times to the Qing Dynasty. This work also clarifies how the process of ancient Chinese hermeneutics and its theoretical values differed from Western theories of hermeneutics.

The book is divided into seven chapters. It is organized historically, expounding the major ideas on understanding and interpretation advanced by



the various schools at specific historical periods. In this context, it presents the philosophical and cultural background of these ideas. Moreover, through gathering expositions dispersed in numerous documents, it discovers a series of traditions and principles of research; it seeks to clarify the unique mode of thought and expression that has permeated the Chinese tradition of scholarship.

Consequent to a review of the arguments presented by the various Pre-Qin schools of thought regarding the relationship between language or thought and existence, the author concludes that the idea of “zheng ming”(rectification of names) maintained by the Confucian school reflects a trustful attitude regarding the idea that words can effectively express one’s thought. In contrast, the Taoist concept of “wu ming” (no name) reflects a skeptical attitude.

This study then provides an analysis of the “metaphysical hierarchy” regarding written and spoken languages, as well as thought and truth in the argumentation of Pre-Qin schools. On the basis of this analysis, it concludes that there are two conceptions which provide the foundations of Chinese hermeneutics. The Confucians stated that spoken words can be used to express ideas and written words can be used to express spoken words. Taoists claimed that “writing can not perfectly express speech and speech can not perfectly express ideas”. The Confucian view provided a common source for varied intentional interpretations that suggest a reader can understand what an author means. On the other hand, from the Taoists emerged a way of understanding that advocated, “forget the words by which the meaning is attained”. From this understanding, a tradition that emphasized the reader’s reception and response came into being.

This study contends that an issue raised by Mencius, known as “to

infer the author's intention by the reader's understanding", was directed against two fallacies of interpretation known as "quoting out of context" and "reading poetry as though it were history". This viewpoint should be termed "pluralistic hermeneutics" rather than "intentional hermeneutics" because the term "infer" means to recognize that various conjectures from readers have rationality.

In accordance with the hermeneutic circle between "knowing the author" and "understanding the words", there were two ways in Pre-Qin Confucian thought of saying "inferring the author's intention by the reader" and "knowing the author's thought through researching his career". When each aspect presupposed the other aspect, it provided the possibility of coming into the circle in the appropriate way and thus realizing perfectly the assimilation of understanding and interpretation.

Regarding the topic of understanding of poetic text, this book shows that poetry in ancient China can be divided into two types, namely the recording text and the imaging text. The different textual types determined which method used to interpret them were valid. The method that combines "inferring the author's intention by the reader" with "knowing the author's thought through researching his career" is effective only when it is used to interpret the recording text. The imaging text is an indeterminate and changeable text, thus an open text. The wording of "a poem has no best interpretation" simply calls for acknowledgement that varied interpretations are reasonable.

In the poetic textual interpretation of later ages, the emphases on different types of texts from previous ages resulted in a various interpretive methods. This variety even influenced the way in which poetic texts were compiled and annotated. Scholars of the Song Dynasty preferred to view

poetry as a recording text. Because they advocated the attitude of “read poetry as history”, they preferred to compile the chronological lives of poets, to organize poetic works in the annalistic style, and to present records regarding poets and poems. They believed that a reader could completely understand a poet’s intention and a poem’s meaning only if he were familiar with the background of the composition of the poem.

In contrast, the critics of the Yuan and Ming Dynasties preferred to regard poetry as an imaging text, which could not be explained by words like “the moon in the water or flowers in a mirror”. They thought that the best interpretation was an incomplete or unclear interpretation. In fact, the critical method based on the reader’s impressions of poems, which substituted for the traditional annotation method based on historical records or literary quotations, became an important method in these periods.

This book also discusses the development of the Study of Confucian Classics from the Han Dynasty to the Qing Dynasty, and it provides an analysis of the relative value of the hermeneutical theories raised by the various schools. The way of “conjecture” used by the School of Modern Script in the Han Dynasty established an interpreting mode known as “the six Confucian classics are precisely the explanatory notes of my theory”. This mode regarded the reader’s own method as the dominant factor.

Because of its confidence in the spoken and written language, the School of Ancient Script founded a interpreting method of semantics which aimed to interpret different languages at various times or various places.

And yet the exegetes of Metaphysical School in Wei and Jin Dynasties tried to avoid semantic explanations; instead, they endeavored to understand metaphysical meanings directly through the methods of naming discrimination and logical argumentation. The interpreters of Confucian

classics in the Song Dynasty proposed discarding the misinterpretations and fallacies that had deviated from the ideological system of Confucianism since the Han Dynasty, in order to rediscover the original meaning or intention of the Confucian classics. In the Qing Dynasty, the scholars of textual criticism believed that spoken and written languages were the only prerequisites in textual interpretation. They researched grammatology, phonetics and semantics in order to define the form of written characters, the pronunciation and semantic meaning of words in the Confucian classics. In order to surmount an obstacle in understanding from temporal distance, they tried to restore the original texts of the classics and to reveal the original meanings of texts.

A review of Buddhist hermeneutics is an important and interesting component of this book. In view of the fact that translation relates to textual interpretation, the book brings various theories regarding Chinese translations of Buddhist sutras into the scope of hermeneutical study thereby discussing the significance of translation as a mode of crosscultural understanding and interpretation.

It also researches various features in commentaries and sub-commentaries to Buddhist sutras. For example, it comments on farfetched comparisons with Confucianism or Taoism, explanations of the original text and expressions of the interpreter's own opinions. Accordingly, this study summarizes the characteristics of forcibility, expansibility, deliberateness and plurality in Buddhist textual interpretation. The book advances a new idea regarding the saying from the Chan Buddhist sect: "Don't use any written language and spread Buddhism beyond Buddhist sutras." While this statement seems to oppose any textual interpretation of Buddhism, it actually expresses a deep understanding of Buddhist philosophy from the

Chinese visual perspective. The Chan sect replaced the “text-hermeneutics”, that relied on language, with “onto-hermeneutics” which was based on paralanguage.

By taking careful cognizance of verification both in history and poetry, this book discerns the deep-rooted idea of intertextuality in ancient Chinese hermeneutics. In the Chinese interpreter’s opinion, there are textual relations between one text and another text in any work, such that ancient Chinese hermeneutics may be termed “intertextual hermeneutics”. In the history of Chinese scholarship, combining Confucianism with Buddhism or Taoism and then conducting a comprehensive study of various subjects, such as literature, historiography and philosophy, was simply the embodiment of “intertextual hermeneutics”.

This book also analyzes the theoretical connotations of common terms in ancient Chinese hermeneutics.

# 目 录



内容提要 / 1

ABSTRACT / 1

前言 / 1

## 第一章 先秦诸子论道辩名 / 6

- 一、循名责实：指称与世界 / 7
- 二、知者不言：真理与体验 / 18
- 三、尽言尽意：形上等级制 / 25
- 四、以意逆志：意图的重建 / 35
- 五、知言知人：理解的循环 / 47
- 六、见仁见知：象喻性文本 / 55

## 第二章 两汉诸儒宗经正纬 / 64

- 一、阴阳讖纬：神学的诠释 / 66
- 二、教化讽谏：政治的诠释 / 78
- 三、训诂笺注：语言的诠释 / 94

## 第三章 魏晋名士谈玄辨理 / 107

- 一、言意之辨：正名与无名 / 108

二、得意忘言：九方皋相马 / 121

三、辩名析理：清谈的妙用 / 131

#### 第四章 隋唐高僧译经讲义 / 141

一、译经：橘化为枳 / 143

二、义解：移花接木 / 161

三、习禅：见月亡指 / 184

#### 第五章 两宋文人谈禅说诗 / 201

一、疑古：理性批判 / 203

二、心解：情性体察 / 213

三、论世：本末探究 / 223

四、释事：密码破译 / 238

五、活参：自由解读 / 245

六、亲证：存在还原 / 255

#### 第六章 元明才子批诗评文 / 267

一、水月镜花：抗诠释文本 / 268

二、醉翁寐语：不说破原则 / 287

三、借杯浇臆：主观性阐发 / 302

四、赏文析义：艺术性诠释 / 315

第七章 清代学者探微索隐 / 329

一、返经汲古：文本的复原 / 331

二、通诂明道：本义的确立 / 342

三、实事求是：诠释的验证 / 354

四、诗史互证：背景的指认 / 366

五、扶隐阐幽：意图的索解 / 382

主要参考文献 / 401

后记 / 418

重版说明 / 421





## 前 言

如果按照德国哲学家海德格尔 (Martin Heidegger) 所说“理解” (Verstehen) 是人的存在方式的话<sup>①</sup>, 那么, 关于文本理解的学问“阐释学”就决不只是西方学术界的专利。只要面对语言与世界的关系问题, 就有阐释的现象发生; 只要有文本需要阅读和理解, 就一定有相应的阐释学理论, 不论其理论形态如何。因此, 尽管“阐释学”一词译自西文 (德文称 Hermeneutik, 英文称 hermeneutics), 尽管阐释学作为一种理论是从德国传统中发展出来的, 但这并不妨碍中国文化中同样存在着一套有关文本理解的阐释学思路。换言之, 西方阐释学所研究的问题和所提出的精辟见解, 也曾为中国哲人所思考过和讨论过。在中国卷帙浩繁的经、史、子、集四部典籍中蕴藏的语言和理解的资料, 完全可以和西方由圣经诠释发展起来的阐释学传统相媲美。

---

<sup>①</sup> Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1949, p.148.