中国古代阐释学研究

周裕锴 著

学术创新

中国古代阐释学研究

周裕锴 著

学术创新

出 版 者 的 话

　　今天的出版业繁荣昌盛,出版的各家各派的著作很多,但真正称得上原创性的,学术含量高的专著,不能算多。学术界的不少朋友感叹地告诉我们,造成这种现象的重要原因,是一些学者心态浮躁,急于求成。治学是一项崇高的事业,在中国有良好的传统,代代相承。做学问也是件十分清苦的事,需"板凳要坐十年冷",要付出艰辛劳苦的代价。前人孜孜不倦的学术创新精神,是一份宝贵的财富,值得后人学习和继承。我们已进入一个新世纪,需要学术研究有一个更大的发展;我们又处在一个昌盛的历史发展新时期,这为学术研究的健康发展提供了一个良好的机遇。因此,我们尝试搞一个"学术创新"系列,争取把更多的具有相当水准的原创性专著献给读者。

　　要求列入这个系列的学术专著,或是填补空白的,或是推陈出新的,并要求有理论的分析,从而为后人留下扎实的学术成果。"学术创新"系列的内容,着意于中国的历史学、社会学、文化学、人类学、哲学等范畴,侧重于宏观性或综观性的专题。在研究方法上,尽可能用跨学科的研究方法,去扩展历史、社会研究的时间和空间,从而在研究方法上也有创新。也许我们的要求高了些,但这主要是为了倡导良好的学风,促进学术研究的发展能跨上一个新台阶。优秀的学术成果,是作者和出版社相互配合、共同努力的结果,恳请全国学术界专家学者,不吝赐稿,并深表感谢。

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。

全书约四十万字,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,"见仁见智"、"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"镜花水月"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,以辨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 re-

search; 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" (rectify the thing's name) 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" (non-name) reflects a skeptical attitude.

This study then provides an analysis of the "metaphysical hierarchy" regarding written and spoken language, thought and truth in the argumentation of Pre-Qin schools. On the basis of this analysis, it concludes that two conceptions provided 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 contended 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 "infering 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 could 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 "flowers in a mirror or the moon in the water". 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.

The 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 language 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 in-

terpretation 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."

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

目　录