

湘学研究丛书

王船山道論研究

啓良題



邓辉 著

湘潭大学出版社

湘学研究丛书

王船山道論研究

辛巳臘月
鄧輝



邓辉 著

湘潭大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

王船山道论研究 / 邓辉著. —湘潭: 湘潭大学出版社, 2010.4

ISBN 978-7-81128-179-8

I. ①王… II. ①邓… III. ①王夫之 (1619~1692)
—哲学思想—研究 IV. ①B249.25

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2010) 第 054902 号

王船山道论研究

邓辉 著

责任编辑: 王晓园

封面设计: 胡瑶

出版发行: 湘潭大学出版社

社址: 湖南省湘潭市 湘潭大学出版大楼

电话(传真): 0731-58298966 邮编: 411105

网 址: <http://xtup.xtu.edu.cn>

印 刷: 湘潭大学印刷厂

经 销: 湖南省新华书店

开 本: 880×1230 1/32

印 张: 10

字 数: 261 千字

版 次: 2010 年 4 月第 1 版 2010 年 4 月第 1 次印刷

书 号: ISBN 978-7-81128-179-8

定 价: 30.00 元

(版权所有 严禁翻印)

湘潭大学中国哲学省级重点学科资助

湖南省社会科学基金项目

凡 例

一、本论文以明清之际的思想家王夫之为研究对象，文中提及王夫之之处，皆以其号“船山”或“王船山”称之。

二、本论文所作船山研究以岳麓书社 1988 年至 1996 年间所陆续校刊的《船山全书》为研究的主要文本依据，辅以中华书局出版的船山著述各单行本。

三、文中所引船山原文及其它古籍皆于引文之后标明出处，至于现当代参考文献及诸家所涉船山之讨论或其他相关言论概列于各页之下的注释中。

四、为方便起见，本论文所引用的船山著述皆以简单的符号表示。如：“天者，合往古来今而成纯者也”出自《读通鉴论》卷三，见《船山全书》第十册第 138 页，则表示为：“天者，合往古来今而成纯者也。”（十，读通鉴论，138）

中文提要

作为儒者，王船山一生力辟佛老，以发明正学为己任，希求守正道以屏邪说。他一生遍注经、史、子、集，“参伍濂、洛、关、闽”，“辟象山、阳明之谬，斥钱、王、罗、李之妄”，且“于二氏（即佛老二氏，笔者注）之书，入其藏而探之”，最后归宗于张子之“正学”。“张子之学，无非易也。”船山极其重视易学，他一生学《易》、研《易》、探《易》、释《易》、阐《易》、创《易》，将张子之学与“易学”会融一处，视为“正学”，这是船山别于朱熹最明显之处。如何将易学系统，这其中包括船山的张子学以及他所涵养消融了的老庄及楚辞学思想等，与孔孟程朱陆王思想系统统一起来，实为理解船山道论思想重点之所在。这不能不涉及船山思想渊源及其一生著述属年问题。若不能大体分清其思想来源及其著述的先后年代，对船山道论甚或其基本思想之性质的判断产生某种偏离是可以预期的，甚至于有可能产生基本方向的误判。

因此，首先通过对王船山思想渊源、重要著述以及道与船山学之考释，我们发现，此考析之于船山道论研究重要意义有三：

其一，从其学术渊源之探察，可知船山的哲学思想之建构有一个先消化再创立的内在过程，即先力图对传统儒释道三家的深入研究和系统消化，并在历史条件的允许下，尽可能地涵化所能

触及的西学思想，在此基础上，全面检讨中国古代学术，再奋力创发“别开生面”的新思想新体系。此先化后创之可能之实现，都离不开他对道的诠释。正是在对“道”理解与解释的不断深化和拓展中，船山整合了儒释道及某些西学思想精神，形成其独特的“道论”思想体系，体现了一种“化传统为己有”的博大气象和海纳百川的包容胸怀。此传统，在船山，已不仅仅为华夏文化之传统，还涉及了西学之思想传统。无论中西俱可为吾之传统，俱可为我所涵摄。而这一切都集合在“道论”中，以道释之。

其二，研究船山哲学思想主要依据其文本。从其重要著述之考释，可知船山著述中有两个方面值得特别注意：一则，船山对其著述十分慎重，屡屡重订其文稿，尤其是晚年对其文稿反复作了修订整合。这表明船山著述虽历经40年，但就其思想大旨言，当基本统一。二则，也有需要特别对待的，即有的著述重订较早，晚年或并没再次修订，即便修订过，也不可否认其著述中依旧存在着早年与晚年思想的差异，尤其是作为早年著述所特有的一些痕迹是难以抹除的，除非另起炉灶重新写过。故研究船山哲学思想当对其文本有此一基本认识，即既要注意其思想著述整体的统一性，又要关注其著述因时间前后间隔较大而可能有的差异性。而此统一性与差异性正是船山一生对“道”之诠释不断深化和拓展的最好证明。

其三，从道与船山学之省察，可知船山思想经历了一个从早年崇朱到晚年归张的思想变化过程，即早年以朱子学为正宗到晚年归宗于横渠之正学。而张载之学无非《易》也。船山一生学《易》、研《易》、探《易》、释《易》、阐《易》，实以“易学”为其思想之统综和归依之所。即言之，船山之学亦无非《易》也。其言：“亡国孤臣，寄身秽土，志无可酬，业无可广，唯《易》之为道则未尝旦夕敢忘于心。”故船山哲学重在论道而非

言理，充满了“易学”形而上之道之历史性意识，而非程朱理学形而上之理之绝对思辨精神。

在前述考析基础上，本论文通过对船山道之义理诠释，进而认为，道之诠释是王船山构筑其思想体系的最重要环节，其整个哲学都是围绕道进行的。而对于道的理解，船山整合消融了中国传统思想，尤其是宋明以来道学思想体系，着重继承发展了“易学”特别是发挥了《易传》思想以及张载“由气化有道之名”的学说，将道诠释为活动、变易、生成，显扬了生存的历史性意识，从而澄明了道之历史性。道之诠释的哲学视域不再是有无生灭之辨，而转化为隐显幽明为一物之证。道就不再是以一个玄而又玄的绝对者出现，从有无相生来创有世界；而是转化为以一物两体或一体两立为核心的道气合一、虚实合一论的活动，即通过一阴一阳、一隐一显、一幽一明的聚散、屈伸、往来的变化活动开展出自然与人文之历史世界，形成“立人极”以“相天”，“相天”进而“复天”，从而“与天同化”的历史性思想体系。由是，道并不在世界之外或之上，而就在世界之中，或言之，就是此世界之为此世界本身。

是故，船山道论思想系统可看作一历史性之哲学体系，即它就是一个宏观的历史哲学体系，包括船山所谓天之化、物之化与人之化三个层次的开展。这三个层次以“道”为灵魂，以时间性、生命性和历史性为本真，以“立人极”之人澄明显扬道之历史性为枢纽，形成了道之在天而化、道之在物而化、道之在人而化以及道在天人而互化并终于大同之化（重回天化）的首尾相衔的道之历史性开展的圆满完整历程。以此为契机，船山通过历史实践生发其历史性哲学，即通过对历史本体（历史事实总体本身）的哲学考察，以其独特的历史性哲学，阐发了其具体的历史哲学思想。由此，船山哲学形成了一个由“通极于道”的形而上思辨到以道入史、以史显道从而“汇归于道”的，逻

辑与历史相统一，理论与实践相统一的完整的历史性哲学体系。而这正对应于道之开展为自然与人文之世界，形成天之道与人之道，进而统合天人之道。可以说，船山道论所要实现的任务，即在于此。

因此，船山的道论历史性哲学系统，可作如是观：由“因而通之以造乎其道”的形而上建构到“汇归于道”的历史实践，可谓其经；由道之历史性在天、物、人三个层次的开展所生发出的道之在天而化、道之在物而化、道之在人而化以及道在天人而互化并终于大同之化而构成的首尾相衔的道之历史性开展的圆满历程，可谓其纬。经纬交织熔铸一体便创生了一个有机整体的历史性哲学系统。该系统以历史性及有机统一性为宇宙人生历史现实之本真性，通过对历史性概念和人之为人的生存意义的创造性诠释，以此实现了对宇宙人生历史这一有机统一整体的精神重建。而这正是船山道论的根本意义之所在。

最后，本论文通过王船山道论与海德格尔和雅斯贝尔斯的存在论哲学之比较，进一步突显船山道论思想所具有的特殊意义。我们认为，船山道论与海德格尔和雅斯贝尔斯的存在论哲学的最大共同点就是，他们的哲学都是建立在对本真时间性、生命性和历史性的极为诚恳深切的体认上所作反思而建构的一系历史性哲学体系，在其理论上均获得了相当大的创获。王船山与海德格尔、雅斯贝尔斯都强调在化传统为已有的基础上的超越。前者是以天人合一为本向主客二分的超越，后者是以主客二分为基向天人合一的超越，虽然他们各自路线不同，但实质内涵基本一致，殊途同归，各自发展了统合天人合一与主客分立思维的新的哲学，从而形成了时间性与生存性相统一的历史性哲学思想体系。故他们惊人一致性也就体现在此，而他们的根本差别性其实也正体现于惊人一致性的内容中。显然，这对于当今以“一体化”为大势的世界哲学发展以及中国哲学重建的意义是不言而喻的。

对于我们而言，王船山所建构的全新的“天人合一”论，既是对旧有“天人合一”又是对单纯“主客分立”思想的超越。它致力于既摆脱旧有“天人合一”失之于神秘体验的窠臼，又避免因主客分立而可能造成的天人悬隔的危险，走向了一条“天人合一”与“主客分立”相融通的思想发展道路。这无疑为我们如何理解中国传统哲学提供某种可能的诠释途径，进而开显中国当代哲学可能致思之路。

Summary

As a Confucian scholar, Wang Chuanshan tried his best to refute Buddhism and Daoism in his whole life. He took carrying forward Confucian orthodoxy as his own duty, hoped and sought to defend the authentic Confucian to remove heresies. He annotated almost all Confucian classics, studied Buddhism and Daoism, and return to "Zhengxue" (Authentic Confucianism) rooted from Zhangzai. The thoughts of Zhangzai came from ZhouYi (*Book of Changes*). Wang Chuanshan attached great importance to learn and study ZhouYi in his whole life. He put Zhangzai's thoughts and Yi's ideas together as "Zhengxue", which is distinct from Zhuxi. It is the most important thing that understand his theory how to systemize the Yi's thought. This must involve his ideological origins and the sequence of his writing completed. So We must to gain a clear idea of his ideological source and the writing time, or we will easily misunderstand his theory.

Therefore, we find out three important meanings in doing research on the source of his ideas and works:

Firstly, from his deep source, we can see the construction of Wang Chuanshan's thoughts is a process of which before digesting

their theoretical and then creating his own ideological. He tried his best to do deep research on Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism, and even, in the historical conditions of the permission, as much as possibly acculturated what he could come into contact with Western thoughts. Based on this, he almost gave a comprehensive review of Chinese ancient works, and tried to create a new thought system. In this process, the most essential factor is the way of his interpreting Dao. During studying further in Dao, he integrated of Confucianism, Buddhism, Daoism and some Western ideological and spiritual, to form his unique system of Daoism.

Secondly, from Wang chuanshan's works, there are two aspects to deserve special attention: one is that Wang chuanshan was very careful to treat his own works, and revised his manuscript many times, especially in his old age. This indicates that although Wang chuanshan's writing career spans four decades, his subject of ideas are basically the same. The other is there are also to need special treatmentsome in his ideas. Some of his works had been revised very early or not been revised in his old age, even if revised, it is undeniable that his writings still exist in the ideological differences between early and later years. It is difficult to be removed only if to rewrite them that some signs is retained especially in his early works. Therefore, for the study of Wang chuanshan's philosophy we should have a basic knowledge of his texts, that is, not only pay attention to the ideological unity of Wang Chuanshan's writings, but also attention to the ideological discrepancies caused by Wang Chuanshan's writings completed in different period of his life. The unity and discrepancies are the best proof for his continued to deepen and expand interpreting the thinking of Dao.

Thirdly, by inspecting the relationship between Dao and Wang chuanshan's thought we can gain the idea that there is a change of Wang Chuanshan's thoughts from his early years to his old age, that is, he admired Zhuxi in his early age and he changed the focus to Zhangzai in his old age. Zhangzai's theory is all from Yi. Wang Chuanshan spent his whole life in studying Yi and according to the ideas of Yi to create his own system of thought. In other words, Wang chuanshan's thinking is none other than Yi also. So Wang Chuanshan's philosophy focus on Dao instead of Li, it contains the historical consciousness of Dao and is different from Zhuxi's theory.

Based on the textual study above, this book holds the idea that the most important part of Wang Chuanshan's philosophy is interpretation of Dao though inspecting argumentation of Wang chuanshan on Dao. Wang Chuanshan integrated and melted Chinese traditional thought, especially Neo-Confucianism since Song Dynasty, focused on inheriting and developing the thoughts of Yi, especially the theory of Zhangzai. He interpreted Dao as Huodong(Doing, Changing and Becoming), manifested the existential consciousness of historicity and enlilghteded the historicity of Dao. Philosophical perspective of interpretation Dao no longer use the viewpoint of You-Wu and Sheng-Mie, but transform into the idea of Yin-Xian and You-Ming. And Dao is no longer based on a mysterious way, which create the world by interaction of "You" and "Wu", but transform into Huodong that is "Dao-Qi-He-Yi" and "Xu-Shi-He-Yi" (Dao and Qi or Xu and Shi combine as one) based on the core of "Yi-Ti-Liang-Fen" and "Yi-Ti-Liang-Li". It carries out the natural and human history of the world though the activities of Ju-San(Aggregating and Separating), Qu-Shen(Flexing and Extending), and Wang-Lai(Coming and Going) of Yin-

Yang, Yin-Xian and You-Ming to form the system of historicity which To establish standards of man as man used to be Xiangtian (helping Tian evolution) and then Futian (rescovarying Tian) and thus Yu-Tian-Tong-hua (evolution together with Tian). So Dao is not out of this world or beyond this world, while being inside the world, or in other words, being the world itself.

Therefore, Wang chuanshan's system of thought of Dao can be seen as a philosophical system of historicity, that it is a macro-philosophy of historical system, including three levels of Wang chuanshan so-called " Tian-Zhi-Hua ", " Wu-Zhi-Hua " and " Ren-Zhi-Hua ". The three levels, which taking Dao as their soul, taking temporality, vitality and historicity as their authenticity, taking humanbeing of establishing standards of man as man enlightening the historicity of Dao as their hub, form a complete integrated course of the historicity of Dao that the four is connected end to end that Dao is to be Tian-Zhi-Hua, is to be Wu-Zhi-Hua, is to be Ren-Zhi-Hua and is to be Tian-Ren-Huhua and is to be ended with Datong-Zhi-Hua (return to Tian-Zhi-Hua). As an opportunity, Wang Chuanshan developed his philosophy of historicity through his historical practice. It means he expounded its specific historical philosophy by studying philosophically the historical facts with its unique philosophy of historicity. As a result, Wang chuanshan's philosophy became an integral philosophy of historicity what logic and history, theory and practice are integrated each other from metaphysical speculation of " Tong-Ji-Yu-Dao " (taking up with exploring Dao) to concrete history study of " Hui-Gui-Yu-Dao " (converging and returning Dao). And this is the achievement of Chanshan's theory, that Dao carries out of the natural and human world, and forms Tian-Zhi-Dao and Ren-Zhi-Dao, then integrates Tian-Zhi-

Dao with Ren-Zhi-Dao.

Thus, Chuanshan's system as being philosophy of historicity can be treated as such: the unity of logic and history, of theory and practice from metaphysical speculation of "Tong-Ji-Yu-Dao" (taking up with exploring Dao) to concrete historical practice of "Hui-Gui-Yu-Dao" (converging and returning Dao) as the meridian; a complete integrated course of the historicity of Dao that the four is connected end to end that Dao is to be Tian-Zhi-Hua, is to be Wu-Zhi-Hua, is to be Ren-Zhi-Hua, is to be Tian-Ren-Huhua and is to be ended with Datong-Zhi-Hua (return to Tian-Zhi-Hua) as the parallel, and the meridians and parallels interwoven a system of philosophy of historicity. The system is taken historicity and organic uniformity as the authenticity of universe and life and historical reality, and achieved the spiritual reconstruction of organic unity of universe, life and history by interpreting the concept of historicity and the meaning of life of man as man. This is the fundamental meaning of Wang chuanshan's theory.

In the end, this book indicates the special meaning of Wang Chuanshan's thought of Dao through comparing with thoughts of Martin Heidegger and Karl Jaspers. The author thinks the biggest common point of Wang Chuanshan's ideas and Martin Heidegger's and Karl Jaspers's thinkings is their philosophy all constructing a system of philosophy of historicity based on a deep understanding of temporality, vitality and historicity as authenticity. Wang Chuanshan and Heidegger, and Jaspers all emphasized the transcendence based on their own tradition. The former is based on "Tian-Ren-He-Yi" to try to achieve "separation of subject and object", and the latter is transcend "separation of subject and object" to try to achieve "Tian-Ren-He-Yi". They have different research method on philosophy but their philoso-

phy has the same intension in the same problem. They developed the new philosophy, which integrated the thought of "Tian-Ren-He-Yi" and "sepration of subject and object", then formed the philosophy system of historicity. Therefore, their amazing consistencies are reflected, and in fact, the fundamental differences are reflected too. Obviously, these thoughts are meaningful to the development of philosophy for today's world as well as reconstruction of Chinese philosophy. For us, Wang Chuanshan's theory is a transcendence to not only Chinese traditional thought of "Tian-Ren-He-Yi", but also the thought of general "separation of subject-object", and open up a new path of development thinking that is the fusion of "Tian-Ren-He-Yi" and "separation of subject-object". Undoubtedly, it provides some possible ways to us to interpret Chinese traditional philosophy and gives us a new way for creative transformation contemporary Chinese philosophy.

让船山走向世界(代序)

启 良

人类学术林林总总，但大体归纳起来，不外印度、中国和西方三家。印度学术博大精深，因与现代价值之关系不甚密切，故而不被现代社会普遍重视。按照梁漱溟的说法，它的价值是将来式的而非现在式的。

严格说来，中国学术的价值，从总体上看同样不是现在式的。

老子的小国寡民，返璞归真；庄子的至德之世，物我两忘，与其说是对远古社会的眷恋，不如说是对未来理想社会的期盼。老庄是人类历史上第一批关注异化问题的思想家，思想深度亦远在上古希腊的赫西俄德和斯多葛派之上。正惟如此，诸如海德格尔这样一些欲救西方文化疾病的思想家，才格外重视道家的思想价值。因为在他们看来，现代性问题多多，惟有跳出现代文明所依凭的哲学传统，西方乃至整个人类才会有真正美好的明天。

儒家学说，从孔孟到宋明儒，再到现代新儒家，表面看来都是在世间行，以治国平天下为大任，但究其实质，同样是过去式的和将来式的。其大同理想既在远古又在将来，惟独现在不受重视。这倒不是说儒家学说于现实无甚意义，而是其学理的内在逻