

78

何炳棣著

中國會館史論

學堂書局印行



何炳棣著

中國會館史

學生書局印行

中國會館史論

著者：何炳棣

出版者：臺灣學生書局

代表人：劉國瑞

發行者：臺灣學生書局

台北市和平東路一段一五五號
郵政劃撥帳戶：四六一六號
電話：二一〇一

定價新臺幣

中華民國五十五年二月初版

內政部出版登記證內版臺業字第〇八八四號

版權所有

謹以此專刊敬獻

先
師
蔣
廷
黻
博
士

(一八九五——一九六五)

引 言

傳統中國社會的主要特徵之一，是具有高度的血緣性和地緣性。以近代觀點看來，這種高度的血緣性和地緣性在傳統中國社會造成了零散分割的局面，加強了小群的觀念，削弱了大群的意識，因而延展了我國社會的「近代化」。但自歷史觀點看來，血緣組織如家族制度，地緣組織如會館制度，皆係應傳統社會某些階段中實際的需要而產生，曾具有積極的社會與經濟功能。家族制度的社會功能極為重要，其經濟功能可能不如一般學者想像的重要^①，而且不在本文討論範圍之內，可以不論。工商性質的會館的經濟功能非常重要，曾引起不少日本學者的注意。早在一九二二年和田清已經對我國會館和工商行會問題提出討論。不久加藤繁和仁井田陞即到北京調查若干行會和工商性質的會館，就地搜集資料。根岸信除了曾作全面性的研究以外，又以上海行會會館為對象。今喇誠二則以清代及民國的歸綏行社為對象。都先後有專著行世。他們研究的方法，是先對實地調查過的若干行會的組織、功能、經費、規制等加以詳細的分析，然後再作一般的推論。因為他們研究的核心仍是有限數量實地調查過的工商行會，資料集中而且原始，所以易見功效，成績超越西方學人之上^②。

因為日本學者的主要對象是工商行會而不是地緣組織，所以他們對地緣性的會館制度尚未曾作全部的研究。例如明清兩代北京各省府州縣試館性質的會館，他們僅僅附帶提及而未加詳論。他們雖對北

京、上海、歸綏等地的若干工商行會有重要的供獻，但似乎還不能圓滿解答一些比較廣泛的問題。例如：我國明清及當代大都市中究竟有多少會館和兼具地緣性的公所行會？是否僅僅北京和大的都市纔有會館？究竟會館的地理分佈普遍到什麼程度？這類廣泛的問題雖極基本，事實上却最難解答。內中主要的困難是由於缺乏全面性的文獻和調查資料。本文主要目的之一即在詳列大小城市會館之名，以爲今後中外學人更進一步較全面研究的參考。因爲文獻資料極端零散，大多數方志皆忽略會館公所，這項近乎機械的工作，費力雖多，收效則甚爲有限。因爲文獻記載多闕，本文所能列舉大小各地的會館當然不會詳盡，與實際數目相差必遠。但這有限的收獲已經代表十餘年來作者爲研究明清土地、作物、人口、移民而遍翻北美所藏中國方志的附帶結果之一。

日本學者研究的主要對象是我國業緣性的工商行會，因行會而牽涉到地緣組織的會館。本文的研究對象完全是會館制度，雖有時不得不兼論會館與公所行會的關係，但重心始終在地緣組織。再前此中外學人研究我國行會及會館制度時，往往僅注意到這種制度如何強化我國小群的觀念，延展了大群意識的產生。這當然是相當正確的，前此論者已經很多，本文不再贅述。不過地緣組織表面上雖反映強烈的地域觀念，但無時不與同一地方的其他地緣業緣組織經常接觸，發生關係，謀求共存共榮。幾百年中同一地區各種地緣業緣組織經常接觸的結果，也未嘗不有助於窄狹畛域觀念的融消和大群意識的產生。此點前人既未多發揮，本文最後一章中當提出實際例證，以說明明、清兩代的會館制度，在我國社會逐漸

「近代化」的過程中，實曾具有積極的推動作用。

至於會館制度之起源，晚明博聞彊記如沈德符、朱國禎，和合著帝京景物略的劉恂與于奕正等人已經不甚了了。近代中日學人無不遵循彼輩之說，以為北京會館之制始於十六世紀六十年代嘉、隆之際。方志中倖存的資料證明早在十五世紀二十年代永樂遷都之時，即已有人創建會館。再近人論北京會館性質者，無不根據晚清文獻和現代人士的印象，以為北京各郡邑會館自始即係試館。但史實並不如此。所以本文第二章中對北京會館之起源與演變加以詳論。再則我國的籍貫觀念在人類史上確是相當特殊，此種特殊的籍貫觀念與地緣組織之極度發達有直接的因果關係。故本文第一章就分析形成籍貫觀念的主要因素。至於會館和公所的組織、功能、經費、規制等等，都是前此學人所最注意的，本文除偶一涉及以外，均行避免討論。

ENGLISH ABSTRACT

It is generally recognized that next to family and kinship common geographic origin provided a most important basis for voluntary association in traditional China. In Peking and in hundreds of cities and towns the associations based on common geographic origins have played a vital economic and social role during the past five centuries. Such associations are usually called hui-kuan, many of which have been called t'ung-hsiang-hui since the founding of the Republic in 1912. Literally the nearest Western equivalents to such Chinese terms as tung-hsiang and hui-kuan (or t'ung-hsiang-hui) are the German words Landsmann and Landsmannschaften.

The institution of hui-kuan or Landsmannschaften of China has been a subject of considerable study by Western and Japanese scholars, such as, for example, D. J. MacGowan (1886), H. B. Morse (1909), Sidney D. Gamble (1921), J. S. Burgess (1928), Wada Sei (1922), Kato Shigeta (1935 and 1942), Negeshi Tadashi (1940, 1951, and 1953), Niida Noboru (1950), and Imahori Seiji (1955). Valuable as their contributions are, their researches on the institution of Chinese Landsmannschaften have still left a few stones unturned. This is because they have treated Landsmannschaften mainly as an appendage of Chinese commercial and industrial guilds and have relied mostly on sample surveys rather than on all types of extant data.

The present study, An Historical Survey of Landsmannschaften in China, which is based, among other things, on new inscriptional data and on an extensive search of Chinese local histories, yields the following new findings:

1. As far as can be ascertained from local-history data, the earliest Landsmannschaft was established in the nation's capital Peking in the Yung-lo period (1403-1424) by officials who were

natives of Wu-hu, Anhwei. The beginning of the institution of Landsmannschaften must therefore be dated some 140 years earlier than those given in various late-Ming works which have been accepted by all Japanese writers on the subject.

2. Somewhat different from the common belief of late-Ming and modern Japanese scholars that Landsmannschaften in Peking were from their very inception hostelrys established exclusively for Landsmann of various provinces, prefectures, and counties who went to Peking triennially to take the metropolitan and palace examinations, the data at the present author's disposal indicate that originally there were two types of Landsmannschaften in Peking, none of which was exclusively for Landsmann examination candidates. The first type, such as that of Wu-hu, was in the nature of an exclusive club, open only to natives of Wu-hu who served as officials of the central government. The second type, such as that of Shə-hsien, Hui-chou, southern Anhwei, was launched in 1550 by merchants of Shə-hsien and partook of the nature of a true Landsmannschaft, open to all Landsmann, officials as well as merchants. Owing to the increasing importance of the examination system as a major channel of social mobility and also to the fact that various localities vied with one another in producing socio-academic success, the two types of Landsmannschaften in Peking gradually changed their functions. Not until the first half of the Ch'ing period did both types of Landsmannschaften in Peking become largely hostelrys for Landsmann examination candidates. By the late nineteenth century there had existed in Peking nearly 400 Landsmannschaften which represented all the provinces, scores of prosperous prefectures and counties.

3. In the rest of the country Landsmannschaften began to appear in a number of major cities and even in some actively trading and manufacturing sub-county towns from the Wan-li

period (1573-1619) onwards. Because of their stereotyped format and contents the majority of the more than 3,000 editions of Chinese local histories available in North America usually overlook records on Landsmannschaften. The successive surveys on trade and guilds (including Landsmannschaften) made by the Imperial Chinese Maritime Customs are likewise far from complete. Even from all sorts of necessarily incomplete data, however, we do learn of the existence of Landsmannschaften in major and minor coastal and inland ports, in provincial capitals, and not infrequently in obscure county-cities and sub-county towns. Most of these Landsmannschaften were established by merchants and craftsmen of various geographic groups and some of them were in the nature of Landsmann guilds (kung-so). Some Landsmannschaften in provincial capitals were established mainly by Landsmann who served as officials in non-native provinces. Whatever the main functions of Landsmannschaften outside of Peking, they all more or less partook of the nature of general Landsmannschaften, open to all Landsmann, merchants, craftsmen, officials and scholars. This was because throughout the Ming-Ch'ing period the concept of social status was flexible and the social-status system rather fluid.

4. An aspect that has been almost entirely overlooked by previous writers is the unusually high density of Landsmannschaften in central and upper Yangtze provinces, such as Kiangsi, Hunan, Hupei, and Szechwan. This phenomenon was accounted for less by interregional trade than by long-range interregional migrations that had taken place throughout the Ming-Ch'ing period up to about 1850. Unlike those of other parts of China which were largely results of interregional trade, the majority of Landsmannschaften of the inland Yangtze region including the Han River drainage were established by k'e-min (peasant-immigrants). Nearly every

of the more than 100 counties of Szechwan had Landsmannschaften and not infrequently a county had several dozen temples erected by various immigrant Landsmann groups.

5. Contrary to impressions of previous writers that the prevalence of Landsmannschaften reflected the existence of unusually strong local particularism in China and has hence hindered China's modernization, detailed case-studies of Landsmannschaften of several major cities and of the whole province of Szechwan based on new inscriptional and local-history data reveal that the institution of Landsmannschaften has in fact facilitated interregional economic and social integration.

目 錄

引 言	一
第一章 籍貫觀念的形成	一
第二章 北京郡邑會館的起源與演變	一一
第三章 晚清北京郡邑會館統計（府城試館、省垣試館附）	二二三
第四章 會館的地理分佈（上）：商埠、省會、一般州縣、工商鎮市	三七
第五章 會館的地理分佈（下）：長江中、上游與漢水流域	六七
第六章 會館與地域觀念的逐漸消融	一〇一
後 記	一一五
引用書目	一二九

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Chapter I Factors Relating to the Growth of the Chinese
Concept of "Geographic Origin"

Chapter II The Origin and Evolution of Landsmannschaften in
Peking

Chapter III Statistics of Landsmannschaften in Peking

Chapter IV Geographic Distribution of Landsmannschaften in
Major and Minor Ports, Provincial Capitals, Ordinary
Counties and Sub-County Towns

Chapter V Geographic Distribution of Landsmannschaften in
Central and Upper Yangtze Region and the Han
River Drainage

Chapter VI Landsmannschaften and Interregional Economic and
Social Integration

Postscript

Notes

Bibliography

第一章

籍貫觀念的形成

眷懷鄉土本是人情之常，但直迄晚近，國人對鄉土籍貫的觀念，實較任何開化民族遠為深厚。我國幅員之廣，相當歐洲全洲，雖自秦以降已作到「書同文」的地步，但兩千年來各地區間仍保有不同的風俗和方言。方言的不同是造成強烈鄉土觀念的主因之一。這是常識，無待贅述。

我國傳統籍貫觀念之特殊深厚，必有特殊的原因。特殊的原因有三：一、有關儒家「孝」的禮俗和法律；二、有關官吏籍貫限制的行政法；三、科舉制度。分別略論如下：

(甲) 孝與籍貫

儒家最重視的孝，至東漢已漸成上層社會人士的準宗教。到了唐代，廣義的孝所包括的對親長養生送死的種種義務和儀節，更進一步正式編入法典，宋元明清莫不如此。就唐以後的法律而言，子孫奉養祖父母父母並不一定必在本籍。但自歷代正史及方志中「獨行」「孝行」「孝義」等傳推測，典型的孝子却應該履行「父母在，不遠遊」和「安土重遷」這類古訓，在祖宗墳墓所在的本籍躬自奉侍親長。所

以在禮俗上，孝的「養生」方面與籍貫往往發生密切的關係。

至於孝的「送死」方面，法律上對統治階級規定甚嚴，原則上所有官員皆須回籍奔喪，在籍守制二十七個月。雖然自唐迄清皆不乏大員「奪情」實例，但時代愈晚，執行愈嚴，例外愈少。入仕之人須在原籍守制，至少在明清成爲通例，偶有「奪情」，物議紛紛，足徵禮俗對於丁憂一事較法律尤爲嚴格。至於庶民，唐以後法律上僅有服喪二十七月的規定，並未明言庶民服喪必在原籍。大多數庶民既世代從事農耕，事實上服喪當在原籍。至於迫於衣食不得不去異鄉營販的庶民是否也一律在原籍服喪二十七個月，史例缺乏，無法肯定。但另一方面，自東漢兩晉以降，凡是爲父母長期守墓，以及千里迎柩原籍歸葬的人，正史及方志列傳無不大事標榜，認爲是至孝的典型。所以自禮俗及法律交互影響來着，廣義的孝與籍貫問題，實有密切的關係①。

(乙) 歷代官吏籍貫禁限

與其他國家比較，我國傳統行政法中特色之一，是對官吏銓選任用的籍貫禁限。地方官迴避本籍原是純地緣性的禁限，但往往與血緣性禁限同時並存，所以籍貫迴避的意義與範圍便變成非常廣泛。這原本用意純屬消極防範性的行政法規，兩千年來無形中促進深厚籍貫觀念的養成。

秦漢一統帝國建立之後，中央政權爲防止強大地方勢力的抬頭，逐漸通過了地方各級官員迴避本籍

的法令。西漢之世即有地方各級監官長吏不得任用本籍人的禁限，刺史不得用本州人，郡守國相不得用本郡人，縣令、長、丞、尉不但不用本縣人，而且不用本郡人。東漢中葉以後復有「不得對相監臨法」及「三五法」。嚴耕望曾詳考兩漢刺史及郡國守相及地方官吏籍貫三千餘條，對以上二法解釋最爲精到：

所謂兩州人士不得對相監臨者，謂若甲州人有任乙州刺史者，則乙州人不得任甲州刺史，以免相互比周之弊也。至於「三五法」則又前律之引伸：譬之甲州人士有監臨乙州，同時乙州人士有監臨丙州者，則丙州人士不但不能監臨乙州，且不能監臨甲州；又若人有爲甲州刺史而婚於乙州之女，則甲州人士亦不能任刺史於乙州；皆所以防止轉互庇護也，郡縣任官蓋亦如此④。

兩漢對地方各級官吏任用不但有單層地緣的禁限，且有雙層因血緣而及地緣的禁限，可謂備極周密。

東漢一統帝國崩潰的原因甚爲複雜，以上一類禁令的本身無法防阻地方豪族及割據勢力的興起。經魏晉終南北朝之世，中央政權不得不對地方豪族拉攏容忍，兩漢式地方官任用的地緣血緣禁限，大體無法施行⑤。但另一方面，五胡亂華，北方淪陷，土族大批南渡，東晉和南朝紛紛設立僑州僑郡，南遷之北方士族「競以姓望所出，邑里相矜」⑥，於是地望成爲他們門第的標幟，重譜牒，更不得不特重郡望⑦。留在北方異族治下的漢人士族也無不如此。所以在長期南北對峙局面之下，衰弱的中央政權雖無法維持兩漢型地方官吏任用的籍貫禁限，但當時特殊的政治與社會情況却大大增強了統治階級對原籍或

祖籍的觀念。

隋末統一之前已開始企圖削弱自漢季以來強大的地方勢力。隋書「文帝紀」，開皇三年（583）已有「刺史縣令三年一遷，佐官四年一遷」之令；統一以後，於開皇十四年（594）又有「州縣佐吏三年一代，不得重任」之令。唐六典：「漢氏縣丞尉多以本郡人爲之，三輔縣則兼用佗郡。及隋氏革選，盡用他郡人①」。通典略同。關於這點，嚴耕望先生來函，曾作以下討論：「按漢代之縣丞尉亦例用他郡人，惟三輔可用本郡人，此注適得其反，蓋誤以掾史制度說丞尉也。自漢以來，丞尉即用他郡人，隋廢掾史，保存丞尉，仍用他郡人。故此句末句不誤，但謂始於隋則誤耳。」

此外唐六典中另條：「州市令不得用本市內人，縣市令不得用當縣人②」。冊府元龜：「永泰」應係永泰之誤」元年（765）七月詔，不許百姓任本貫州縣官及本貫鄰縣官。京兆、河南府不在此限。③「就現存法令鱗爪看來，隋、唐既重建一統之局，多少恢復了一些兩漢對地方官任用的籍貫限制，至於此類禁限實施的程度，則尚有待詳考。」

兩宋基本國策之一，是加強中央對地方的統制，企圖永遠防止唐中葉以後藩鎮割據局面的重演，因此兩宋政府對官吏任用的籍貫禁限比隋、唐爲嚴密。宋會要稿最早有關的記載是仁宗嘉祐三年（1058），「以右諫議大夫新知鄧州周湛改知襄州，少府監新知襄州馬尋改知鄧州。湛、鄧州人，奏乞對換其任也。④」雖然文獻中尚未找到更早迴避的例子，上引一條很可能是根據北宋開國以來的舊例。南渡以