

# SYMPOSIUM ON CHINESE STUDIES

Commemorating the Golden Jubilee of  
The University of Hong Kong

1911-1961

香港大學  
五十週年

## 紀念論文集

第二冊

DEPARTMENT OF CHINESE  
UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

1964

# 香港大學五十週年 紀念論文集

第二冊

香港大學中文系主編



90075022

香港大學中文系惠贈

1966

月

日

Copyright 1966 by the Department of Chinese  
University of Hong Kong

First printing 1,000 copies June 1966

PRINTED IN HONG KONG  
BY THE DE LUXE PRINTING COMPANY, HONG KONG  
DISTRIBUTED BY UNIVERSAL BOOK CO. P. L. HSU,  
17 GILMAN'S BAZAAR 1ST FLOOR,  
HONG KONG

# 香港大學五十週年紀念論文集(二)

編輯者

香港大學五十週年紀念論文集編印委員會

出版者

香港大學中文系

印刷者

文采印刷公司

香港灣仔謝斐道四六〇號

發行者

萬有圖書公司

香港機利文新街十七號二樓

定價

港幣四十元

版權所有

翻印必究



1966

香港大學五十週年紀念論文集

暨南大學惠存

香港大學中文系

敬贈  
一九八二年  
二月二日



# SYMPOSIUM ON CHINESE STUDIES

COMMEMORATING  
THE GOLDEN JUBILEE OF  
THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG  
1911—1961

*COMPILED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF CHINESE  
UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG*

VOL. II

DEPARTMENT OF CHINESE  
UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

1966

COMMITTEE FOR THE PUBLICATION  
OF THE  
SYMPOSIUM

*appointed by the Department of Chinese*  
(January 1961)

Chairman: F. S. Drake

Secretary: Ella Ng

Editing Section: P. M. Liu  
G. E. Sargent  
T. I. Jao  
T. S. Mou  
Chan Hok Lam  
Cheung Man Yee  
Wong Kai Chee

Printing Section: H. L. Lo  
P. K. Yu  
V. T. Yang  
Chan Cheung  
Chiu Ling Yeong  
Lee Chik Fong

General Section: Chung Yin Leung  
Chan Fook Lam  
K. L. Hsu  
Poon Jock Woon

The Committee for the Publication of the *Symposium on Chinese Studies Commemorating the Golden Jubilee of the University of Hong Kong* gratefully acknowledges generous contributions towards the cost of publication from the following gentlemen:

Ting Hsiung-chao, Esq.	.. .. .	HK\$10,000
Fung Ping-wah, Esq.	.. .. .	HK\$ 5,000
Un Ng-tsung, Esq.	.. .. .	HK\$ 5,000
Ch'en Han-hua, Esq.	.. .. .	Huang Hsi-chiang, Esq.
Ch'en Han-jung, Esq.	.. .. .	Hung Hsiang-p'ei, Esq.
Ch'en Pi-ch'en, Esq.	.. .. .	Ma Chin-ts'an, Esq.
Cheng Chih-chih, Esq.	.. .. .	Ma Pi-hun, Esq.
Hsieh Hsi-kuei, Esq.	.. .. .	Ts'ai Chang-ke, Esq.      HK\$ 5,000

F. S. DRAKE

Chairman

香港大學五十週年紀念論文集出版，承 丁熊照先生捐贈港幣一萬元，馮秉華、袁五松兩先生各捐贈港幣五千元，陳漢華、陳漢榮、陳弼臣、鄭植之、謝錫奎、黃錫江、洪祥佩、馬錦燦、馬璧魂、蔡章閣諸先生等共捐贈港幣五千元，謹於卷首，特表謝忱。

香港大學五十週年紀念論文集編印委員會

主任委員 林仰山謹啓

## P R E F A C E

This *Symposium on Chinese Studies*, of which the First Part is now offered to the public, was commenced in 1961 as a contribution by the members of the Department of Chinese at the University of Hong Kong towards the Golden Jubilee Celebrations of the University which took place in that year.

The long list of eminent contributors who responded to the appeal with the fruits of their scholarly labours is sufficient to show the camaraderie and good will that exists in the world of Chinese scholarship. It also shows how deeply rooted is the faith of the Chinese scholars in the values of their culture, how persistent is their work, and how unflagging is their interest. No matter how unpromising are the times, how pitiless the economic pressure, how confusing the social changes, the scholars continue their investigations whether into great problems of ethical and intellectual principle, or into minute questions of historical and literary criticism. Consequently there is never any shortage of material. The books, the journals, the papers, the articles, that flow from the press unceasingly, bear witness to an unquenchable source of spiritual and cultural life, which can be traced to the hoary past. It is not surprising, therefore, that the material contributed to the present *Symposium* soon surpassed the modest limits of the one volume, which was originally planned, both in respect to the length and to the number of the papers; and a second volume was soon envisaged. It is thought advisable, however, to publish the present volume of thirteen papers first; and to follow it with the second volume of eleven papers as soon afterwards as possible. After that a third volume of papers contributed in Western languages will remain to be prepared for the press.

Of the twenty-four papers contributed to the first two volumes, six are by members of the University staff; the remaining eighteen are by eminent scholars who are related more or less closely to the University itself or to individuals in it. But in either case, they need no introduction to the learned world. We are therefore the more grateful to these

scholars for taking so much time from the pursuit of their personal interests, in order to devote themselves for a time to our particular endeavour. In a casual glance at the list of authors, a number of outstanding names will at once catch the eye. The range of topics found in the *Symposium* shows the rich variety of subjects in which these scholars are interested, and on account of which they are famed. We confidently commend this volume to the public, as another example of the spontaneity, the ingenuity, and the irrepressibility of the Chinese scholars, even in the physical separation from their homeland, and in a sense exiled from their country. They may indeed be cited as the world's supreme example of scholarship for scholarship's sake.

Next, we wish to express our gratitude to the many Chinese friends who have made possible the publication of this *Symposium* by their generous donations. If the Chinese scholars are to be commended for their belief in and devotion to pure scholarship, no less are the Chinese merchants, administrators, and men of affairs, to be admired for their liberal gifts and intellectual support. It is of frequent occurrence in China that the great administrators are themselves great scholars. And great scholars, through their general recognition as leaders of the community, are often compelled, however reluctantly, to become men of affairs. Chinese political philosophy, while recognizing economic welfare as the first concern of the government of the state, always insists that ethics and learning, which in China are two aspects of one principle, are its life and strength. Hence merchant - administrator - scholar are not so unrelated as might be supposed. The merchants are accustomed to making generous grants to finance the labours of the scholars, as their contribution to the welfare of the state and of mankind. So while we express our thanks to those who have made such generous donations on the present occasion, we do so against the broader background of China as a whole, and in the appreciation of the fact that the support of the merchants is due to their belief in the efficacy of what the scholars are doing.

Finally, a word about the Department of Chinese in the year of the University's Jubilee may not be out of place. Chinese Studies commenced

at the University of Hong Kong about thirty-seven years ago headed by several eminent Chinese scholars and with the active support of Chinese businessmen, with whose aid funds were raised and two buildings were donated in 1931—a building for Chinese studies, and a Chinese Library. Between the years 1933 and the commencement of the war in the Pacific in 1942, there were twenty-two B.A. graduates specializing in Chinese studies, and one M.A. graduate.

During the war years the University closed, but after the war the Department of Chinese was revived and expanded together with the rest of the University, and in 1952 with greatly increased staff and revised syllabus it was more closely integrated with the Faculty of Arts, and its Degree work was transferred to the Main Building of the University. An Institute of Oriental Studies, including a Research section, a Language School, and a Museum of Chinese Art and Archæology, was established for the teaching of Chinese to non-Chinese students, and to facilitate publications and research. A *Journal of Oriental Studies* was established, and a number of important research works and text-books were published.

The number of undergraduates taking courses in Chinese rose in 1960-1961 to a maximum of 191, of whom 66 were specializing in Chinese subjects for the Final B.A. Degree examination. In the eleven years from 1952-1963, the total number of B.A. graduates specializing in Chinese was 174, and the number of M.A. graduates was 16. The number of students in the Language School in 1963-1964 was 54.

The Editorial Committee appointed to manage the present publication was composed of both staff and student members of the Department of Chinese. Our thanks are due to the members of the Committee for collecting and editing the papers, and for seeing the volume through the press.

F. S. Drake

University of Hong Kong  
March 1964

# CONTENTS

		Page
Ch'ien Mu	Wang Fu-chih's Interpretation of Mencius' Theory that Human Nature is Good . .	1
Yang Vei-tsên	A Comparison of the Philosophies of Mencius and Hsün-tzŭ . . . . .	21
Liu Pai-min	Extentialism of 'Eventology' in the <i>Book of Changes</i> . . . . .	41
P'an Chung-kuei	A Study of the Works of Han Fei . . . . .	85
Chuang Shên	The Influence of Vimālakṛiti's <i>Sutra</i> on Chinese Art . . . . .	109
Tung Tso-pin	A Study of Wang Mang's Measures . . . . .	197
Sha Hsüeh-chün	The Influence of the Kroraina Oases on the Routes Used for Chinese Expansion into the Western Regions during Han and T'ang Times . . . . .	207
Lo Hsiang-lin	Li Hsün of the Persians and his <i>Exotic Pharmacopaeia</i> . . . . .	217
Wu Ch'i-yü	A Study of Tun-huang Manuscripts of Ch'ên Tzŭ-ang's Works . . . . .	241
Ruey Yih-fu	A Study of the <i>Miao</i> People . . . . .	305
Li Lin-ts'an	<i>Mo-so</i> Sound and Tone Charts . . . . .	323
Lo Chin-t'ang	A Study of the Origins of Chinese Fiction	337

## 目 錄

錢 穆	王船山孟子性善義闡釋 ... .. 1
楊 維 楨	孟子荀卿之異同 ... .. 21
劉 百 閔	易事理學的存在原理 ... .. 41
潘 重 規	韓非著述考 ... .. 85
莊 申	維摩詰所說經對於中國藝術品的影響 ... 109
董 作 賓	新莽量之研考 ... .. 197
沙 學 浚	樓蘭綠洲的存廢與漢唐經營西域的路線... 207
羅 香 林	系出波斯之李珣及其海藥本草 ... .. 217
吳 其 昱	燉煌本故陳子昂集殘卷研究 ... .. 241
芮 逸 夫	苗人考 ... .. 305
李 霖 燦	麼些族語言系統 ... .. 323
羅 錦 堂	小說考源 ... .. 337

# 王船山孟子性善義闡釋

錢 穆

自孟子唱性善之說，後儒如荀卿董仲舒揚雄荀悅以及唐之韓愈，皆不信奉。經宋代程朱之推尊，而後孟子性善之說，遂成爲此下儒家之定論。然程朱之說性善，其果有當於孟子當時之真意與否，明清兩代，遞有爭議。尤著者，爲顏習齋與戴東原，二人皆攻詆程朱，又徧及宋儒，其所辨說，果爲得孟子真義否，仍滋疑難。晚明王船山，猶在顏戴之前，獨尊橫渠以糾程朱之失，較之顏戴，似爲持平，而抑又深至。抑且於朱陸異同之外，又提出張程異同之新公案，爲治宋儒思想者所不可不知。舊著近三百年學術史於船山思想，敘述粗備，獨於此節，略而未及，本篇乃專就船山讀四書大全說一書，有關於闡釋孟子道性善之義者，撮要列舉，以資討論孟子性善論者作參考，亦爲治宋學有意研究張程異同者作例示。昔嘗有意爲舊著學術史拾遺補闕，草爲外篇，成稿四五篇，中經離亂，盡已散佚，此稿亦往昔作爲外篇之意，有志治船山思想者，可取與舊著學術史並觀，凡彼所詳，此不復贅也。

孔子極少言性與天道。論語惟性相近一章言及性字，茲先引船山說此章者於前，其言曰：

程子創說個氣質之性，初學不悟，遂疑人有兩性。所謂氣質之性，猶言氣質中之性也。質是人之形質，質以函氣，而氣以函理。質以函氣，故一人有一人之生。氣以函理，故一人有一人之性也。自人言之，則一人之生，一人之性。而其爲天之流行者，初不以人故阻隔而非復天之有。是氣質中之性，依然一本然之性也。以物喻之，質如笛之有笛身有笛孔相似，氣則所以成聲，理則吹之而合於律者也。以氣吹笛，則其清濁高下，固自有律在，特笛身之非其材而製之不中於度，又或吹之者不善，而使氣過於輕重，則乖戾而不中於譜。故必得良笛，而吹之抑善，然後其音律不爽。造化無心，而其生又廣，則凝合之際，質固不能以皆良，氣麗於質，則性以之殊，故不得必於一致，而但可謂相近。乃均之爲笛，則固與簫管殊類，人之性所以異於犬羊之性，而其情其才皆可以爲善，則是概乎善

不善之異致，而其固然者未嘗不相近也。程子之意固如此，故必云氣質中之性而後程子之意顯。以愚言之，則性之本一，而究以成乎相近而不盡一者，大端在質不在氣。質，一成者也。氣，日生者也。一成則難乎變，日生則乍息而乍消矣。故知過在質，不在氣。乃其爲質也，均爲人之質，則既異乎草木之質，犬羊之質矣。是以其爲氣也，亦異乎草木之氣，犬羊之氣也；故曰近也。孟子所以即形色而言天性也。乃人之清濁剛柔不一者，其過專在質，而於以使愚明而柔彊者，其功則專在氣。氣日生，故性亦日生。惟本氣之理而即存乎氣，故言性必言氣而始得其所藏。乃氣可與質爲功，而必有其與爲功者，則言氣而早已與習相攝矣。氣隨習易，而習且與性成。然則氣效於習，以生化乎質，而與性爲體，故可言氣質中之性，而非本然之性以外，別有一氣質之性也。質受生於氣，而氣以理生質，善養者何往而不足與天地同流哉。質之不正，非犬羊草木之不正也，亦大正之中偏於此而全於彼，長於此而短於彼，乃有其全與長之可因，而其偏與短者之未嘗不可擴，能踐形者亦此形，而萬物皆備於我矣。孟子惟並其相近而不一者推其所自而見無不一，故曰性善。孔子則就其已分而不一者，於質見異，而於理見同，故曰相近，孔子固不舍夫理以言氣質，孟子亦不能裂其氣質之畛域而以觀理於未生之先。則豈孔子所言者一性，而孟子所言者別一性哉？雖然，孟子之言性，近於命矣，命善故性善，則因命之善以言性之善可也。若夫性則隨質以分凝矣，一本萬殊，而萬殊不可復歸於一。易曰：「繼之者善也。」言命也。命者，天人之相繼者也。「成之者性也。」言質也，既成乎質而性斯凝也。質中之命謂之性，亦不容以言命者言性也。故惟「性相近也」之言，爲大公而至正也。

以上節錄船山讀四書大全說論語陽貨篇性相近習相遠章之大意，其中有特值注意者，船山論性，毋寧更主張孔子性近習遠之說，而於孟子性善之說，猶有微辭焉。此下說孟子性善，不能忘此處之所揭一也。又張程首有義理之性與氣質之性之分別，而朱子取以注此章，謂此所謂性，兼氣質而言，又引程子曰：「此言氣質之性，非言性之本也。若言其本，則性即是理，理無不善，孟子之言性善是也，何相近之有哉。」今船山曰：「豈孔子所言者一性，而孟子所言者別一性哉。」是乃針對朱注而發，語極明顯。又曰：「所謂氣質之性，猶言氣質中之性。」而又將氣質二字分別言之，是於程說顯不贊同，而特婉言之，隱言之而已。並於義理之性一面，文中全未提及，此

固因朱注亦未提及此四字，然船山云：「初學不悟，遂疑人有兩性。」即指義理之性與氣質之性之分別言。此一分別，船山顯所不取，而此處不明白指出，語氣中多似對程朱留地步，其明白對程朱之說加以辨難者，多見於孟子篇中，此因著書體例，分條列說，不能於一處說盡也。船山於宋儒之學，獨尊橫渠，義理之性與天地之性之分別，亦最先創始於橫渠，二程盛許其說以為可以補孟子所未及，然船山謂程子所言氣質之性，實與橫渠原義不同，其言見於其所為張子正蒙註，下文當再引述。而船山論性，此節最為簡盡。讀者先於此細翫，則此下所引錄，如網在綱，有條而不紊矣。

此下摘錄其關於孟子論性善諸章之說，惟另分條理，不復拘其章次之先後，亦不備注章名，讀者有意深求，自可進窺其原書也。

論性則必溯及於天人之際，而船山於此，最有深見。其言曰：

天人之蘊，一氣而已。從乎氣之善而謂之理，氣外更無虛託孤立之理也。乃既因氣而有所生，而專氣不能致功，固必因乎陰之變，陽之合矣。有變有合而未能皆善，其善者則人也。其不善者則犬牛也。

又曰：

天行於不容己，故不能有擇必善，而無禽獸之與草木，然非陰陽之遇而變合之差，是在天之氣，其本無不善明矣。

又曰：

在犬牛則不善，在造化之有犬牛則非不善。因於造化之無心，故犬牛之性不善，無傷於天道之誠。

以上之說，有可注意者：一則船山惟以氣說天，惟以一氣之陰陽變合造化者說天；故謂天惟有誠而不能盡善。變合之未盡善，亦不得謂天有不善，以天之造化本出無心，而僅由於一氣之變合之行於不容己也。船山此說，全本於易，而頗近莊子，船山殆可謂即本先秦觀念以言孟子之性善義者也。則其與當時孟子之真意較近，殆宜然矣。

既明於船山之辨天人，乃可進而言船山之辨理氣。船山之言曰：

天下豈別有所謂理，氣得其理之謂理也。氣原是有理底，盡天地之間無不是氣，即無不是理也。變合或非以理，則在天者本廣大，而不可以人之情理測知。

又曰：