

# 比事屬辭與方苞論古文義法： 以《文集》之讀史、序跋為核心

張高評

國立成功大學中國文學系

## 引言

方苞(1668–1749)，字鳳九，一字靈皋，晚號望溪，安徽桐城人，為清代桐城派之開創者。少時，從父兄學習經史。及長，上京師，遊太學，文章得李光地、韓菼賞識，以為「韓歐復出」、「昌黎後一人」。浙東史學家萬斯同(1638–1702)勉其勿溺於古文，於是一意求經義。又受劉言潔、劉拙修影響，始讀北宋五子之書，因而傾心程朱之學。曾自述行身祈嚮曰：「學行繼程、朱之後，文章在韓、歐之間。」<sup>1</sup>可以概括其平生之學行與文章。

方氏以古文名世，著有《望溪先生文集》十八卷、《外集》十卷、《補遺》二卷。經學致力特深，《三禮》、《春秋》學著作尤富。《三禮》之學，著有《周官集注》十二卷、《周官析疑》四十卷、《周官辨》一卷、《儀禮析疑》十七卷、《禮記析疑》四十卷、《喪禮或問》一卷。《春秋》之學，則有《春秋通論》四卷、《春秋直解》十二卷、《春秋比事目錄》四卷、《左傳義法舉要》一卷。又曾刪定《通志堂經解》，未刊行。全祖望(1705–1755)曾稱，「古今宿儒，有經術者或未必兼文章，有文章者或未必本經術」；方氏兼而有之，故推重「前侍郎桐城方公，庶幾不媿於此」。<sup>2</sup>綜覽方苞一生著述而論辨之，然後知方氏所倡古文義法，固是文章「必本經術」之發用。

錢大昕(1728–1804)以考據名家，不滿方苞出入於經術文章之間，而大談古文義法。曾批評方氏所得，乃「古文之糟粕，非古文之神理」，且詆方氏「乃真不讀書之甚

<sup>1</sup> 《方望溪先生全集》(含《文集》、《集外文》、《集外文補遺》)，《四部叢刊》初編影印戴鈞衡本(臺北：臺灣商務印書館，1979年)，附蘇惇元(輯)：〈方望溪先生年譜〉，頁六上(總頁445)。

<sup>2</sup> 全祖望(撰)、朱鑄禹(彙校集注)：《全祖望集彙校集注》(上海：上海古籍出版社，2000年)，卷十七〈前侍郎桐城方公神道碑銘〉，頁305。

者」。<sup>3</sup>錢大昕之批判，是非疑似之際，值得進一步探論。近人楊向奎著《清儒學案新編》，第三卷〈望溪學案〉稱：「望溪文人，堪稱博學，但非經師，亦非理學家，不能以經學和理學成就評價他。」<sup>4</sup>此自儒學視角求備古人，未免過苛。若就古文義法之倡導言，文章根柢經術，經術潤澤文章，相生相成；體用不二，正可於方氏之文章經術體現之。

學界探討方苞「古文義法」之論著不少，大抵多就《文集》所載文獻闡發之，止就「古文」一端說「義法」。五四時期高倡文學革新者如傅斯年等，更誤解義法之「變化隨宜，不主一道」，而指為匿實造虛，《選》學妖孽。<sup>5</sup>於是毀譽參半，準的無依，是非難斷。<sup>6</sup>今探討方苞之古文義法，借鏡全祖望所謂「文章必本經術」之說，會通《禮》學與《春秋》學之比事屬辭，選擇《文集》之讀史、序跋文獻，參考〈史記評語〉為研究文本，統合《春秋》書法、史家筆法、古文義法而一之，以重探方苞之古文義法。<sup>7</sup>

# Analogy and Fang Bao's Assertion on *Yi* and *Fa* of Ancient Chinese Prose: Based on the Study of History, Preface, and Postscript in *Fang Bao's Collected Essays*

(Abstract)

Chang Kao-ping

After the case of the condemned writings of Dai Mingshi, Fang Bao was so immersed in the Three Rites as to thoroughly master the Thirteen Classics. At the age of fifty, he finished the *Chunqiu tonglun* and the *Chunqiu zhijie*. Three years later, *Zhouguan jizhu* and *Zhouguan xiyi* were accomplished. He found that “the narrator’s value judgement in the *Chunqiu* is covered up in its contents” and proposed that “value judgement deeply involved in *Chunqiu* and *Zhouli* cannot be easily inferred from their contents.” On realizing this, Fang Bao could not fall short of his great expectation: “I desire to follow Cheng and Zhu’s academic minds and to achieve Han and Ouyang’s fame in writing.” After that, he proposed his assertion on contents and forms of ancient Chinese prose, saying that “ancient Chinese prose should be evaluated by two methods; *yi* is the warp and *fa* is the weft.” Fang Bao advocated the two writing techniques: *yi* means having substance in writing, while *fa* means having order in writing. Generally speaking, writers can learn from the good example of *Chunqiu* and transform their articles into ancient Chinese prose based on *yi* and *fa*. The writing technique and central meaning are, therefore, interwoven and fused into one. The so-called writing technique of ancient Chinese prose is based on the genre and narration of historical biography. Through comparison between historical events, value judgement can be inferred from their interaction. This is how analogy works in *Chunqiu*. From the perspective of analogy, this study investigates Fang Bao’s *yi* and *fa* by learning not only from *Chunqiu tonglun* and *Chunqiu zhijie* but also from *Zhouguan jizhu* and *Zhouguan xiyi*. Besides, this research focuses on *Fang Bao's Collected Essays* by adopting his way to study history, preface, and postscript. The purpose is to reinterpret the relation between ancient Chinese prose, analogy and narration, as well as historiography.

**關鍵詞：** 比事屬辭 古文義法 《春秋》書法 敘事 史學

**Keywords:** categorize phrases and compare events rules and principles in ancient Chinese prose expression of judgement in the *Chunqiu* narration historiography