

生命離其自己——簡介英譯《五十自述》第二章

——紀念牟先生逝世十週年

李淳玲

中國哲學與文化研究基金會研究員

牟宗三先生這本《五十自述》是一部奇書，因為文字緊煞、內容豐富，問題複雜深奧，向來並沒有受到學術界的重視。但是這可能與眼下的中國哲學界還湊泊不上牟先生的學問有關，並不表示這本書比他其它的著作少掉些許的價值。

這本書一共有六章，每一章的文體風格並不相同，頭兩章〈在混沌中長成〉與〈生命離其自己的發展〉算是一主一客的兩篇楔子：〈混沌〉篇描寫他「生命在其自己」的童年生活，主觀情調高，生命力豐沛，春情滿盈，美感氣氛濃郁；〈生命離其自己〉則勾繪他由少年到中年顛沛流離的時代環境，把二十世紀中國的苦難，從人物到事件，從家國到個人，透過敏銳的觀察力作出春秋史筆，筆鋒犀利辛辣，一方面表現他深刻的識見、悲憤，一方面透出他對文化生命深切的關懷；因此第二章包含了許多獨立的小品，經過他段段分述節節批判，襯出決定他成為一個哲學家的人格、背景與時代。這其中還包括一段他對文字機括的見解，談論文字與口語的差異，自成一格，大可獨立當成一篇文章型的文學理論看待。第三、四章是表述他五十歲以前的學思歷程，從〈直覺的解悟〉到〈架構的思辯〉表現他吸納二十世紀西方哲學硬碰硬的紮實工夫，又是一主一客的兩面學思，展示他哲學學思歷程的層層轉進，夫子自道，真切動人。這部分是了解牟先生學問進路的重要文獻，不可略過。第五、六章由〈客觀的悲情〉轉到〈文殊問疾〉是透露他深摯的道德情懷與宗教情操，我們留待未來有機會再談。

由於這六章每一章的主題、寫法都不一樣，所以對英譯者盧名揚先生而言，每進入新的一章，都進入一項嶄新的挑戰。例如這第二章是屬於論述性的文字，與第一章文學性的體裁完全不同；名揚至此必須揣摩原文，轉變表達風格，進入一種樸實的文風，才可能相應這項艱巨的工作，因此翻譯起來格外費神。加上英文本身的邏輯性顯明，對於意象豐滿的中文必須推敲再三，抽絲剝繭，才可能敞開文理、翻出易懂可讀的英語譯文；名揚這項翻譯手術因此必須照應多方面的文字層次。好處是他因此鬆動了原文，反而把牟先生「濃密隱

晦」的筆力、義理十字打開，展開了無邊的義蘊。因此這篇譯文除了必須攝持住牟先生澎湃的文氣以外，還需要稍微鬆動文意，展現疏朗的義理，增添它的可讀性。以下即介紹幾段名揚的英譯並綜述牟先生評論時代的精華，算是與讀者共享讀書的筆記吧：

「革命軍要打到北平的前夕，那景像就好像三十七年共黨要打倒南京的前夕。時隔二十年，以暴易暴，依樣畫葫蘆，但是畫法不一樣，卻都不是開太平。在十七年時，我是年青人，三十七年時，我是中年人…十七年時我是混沌的感受，三十七年時我是痛苦。」

The National Army's taking Beiping brought about a situation very similar to what would happen twenty years later, when the Communists were closing in on Nanjing [the seat of the Nationalist government]. In either case, it was might against might. **In neither case, there was any real peace in sight.** The party lines might be different, but essentially the two events were accomplished along the same line—that of revolution by force—and neither paved way for lasting order and stability, ushering in a period of grand peace. In 1928, I had only just emerged from the misty, wandering existence of my youth...By the end of the Civil War, I was approaching middle age; what I felt—distinctly—was a deep pain.

這是這一章論述的點睛之筆，點明他從青年到中年、這二十年與生命相應的時代感受。牟先生描述他此時的實感雖然主觀的是痛苦，但是他的意識卻是客觀的。他對國共兩黨的不能為生民立命，不能為萬世開太平都有深切的切膚之感，因此他痛下針砭，而這個針砭一直到今天現在此時似乎都還是極中肯的，令人深思。他跟著進一步說明：

「十七年的北伐，本是國共合作的結果，其本身是駁雜的。不是純然國民黨的業績。辛亥革命是純然國民黨〔革命黨〕的業績。那時的國民黨較為純淨。十三年改組後的國民黨是聯俄容共的國民黨。十五年開始北伐，十七年打到北平。它因容共生發了力量，也因容共駁雜了它自己。自此以後，國民黨是八字駁雜的國民黨，其本質從未純淨過。以後雖清共、勦共、戡亂，以及來臺的反共抗俄，然卻從未達到澄清它的本質，認識它的本質，確定它的本質的階段，它依然是個駁雜。難道真地命運注定它就是一個駁雜，一個過渡的流逝？」

The Northern Expedition was in fact a joint effort between (by) the Nationalists and the Communists, so it wasn't an achievement that belonged solely to the

Guomintang [also “Kuomintang,” the Nationalist Party], which by that time had become a mixed bag. Back when it was formed from the revolutionary forces that overthrew the Qing dynasty, it was a purer organization with a purer purpose. In 1924, it adopted the strategy of working with Soviet advisers and admitting members of the Chinese Communist Party into its rank—a move that certainly gave it the kind of military strength it didn’t have before. Nevertheless, its principles were compromised. The Guomintang would later abandon its United Front policy, purging the party of Communists, then fighting them for the control of the country, but it never again came to a clear understanding of what it stood for, yes, its very reason for existing. To this day the Guomintang, while continuing its opposition in Taiwan, has yet to reaffirm—really affirm—its principles; **it remains confused about its true mission. Is it fated to be just that—a party of transition, not the one to bring about real peace?**

這是他對國民黨極深刻的觀察，他的剖析力與批判力醒人耳目。初讀這段文字筆者十分驚訝，決沒想到牟先生會用這樣切身的筆鋒來描述一個現實的政黨，說它的清純、說它的業績、說它的八字駁雜、說它的命運、還說到它可能的流逝？他把國民黨當作一個代表民族生命的共同體來分判，說得那麼懇切。我們如何可能想到今天的國民黨好像還是在走一條「容共」以圖壯大自己的老路呢？

牟先生說「辛亥革命是純然國民黨的業績，那時的國民黨較為純淨」。這是從當時國民黨「推翻滿清，建立民國」的意識而說的；但是他跟著說國民黨從來沒有認識到它自己的本質。他是指國民黨從來沒有真正地把民國建立起來，雖說國民黨有：「三民主義，吾黨所宗，以建民國…」的國歌，但是這歌詞裏的第三句話從來就沒有真正地落實過：它在推翻滿清，完成清純的業績以後，民主建國的意識向來就很薄弱，它從來沒有真正地把民主的共合國建立起來。所以牟先生才說它八字不正！他如此一針見血，描述他的時代與環境：「它因容共生發了力量，也因容共駁雜了它自己」，國民黨似乎天生就是一個體質不良的秉賦，它太嬌貴，必須靠容共來壯大它自己，也必須因容共而駁雜它自己，它並沒有自己站立起來的、堅實的建國力量。

國民黨以後在台灣偏安的業績是「無心插柳柳成蔭」，被動地培養了一個反對黨，使它在模模糊糊的意識下，促動了台灣的民主。這只能算是它的運氣，間接修成了一個「別子」的果報；但是它仍然沒有強烈的「民主建國」意

識，所以它在二十一世紀再度傾向「容共」之時，並沒有大大方方地對中共鼓吹一個民主的中國，它還是一個八字駁雜的格局，它還是想靠「容共」求生存，壯大它自己，奪回偏安局面的政權。它對於建立一個民主中國的意識與氣魄還是很薄弱。牟先生是在這個意義上說它的可能流逝。它表現出一個既得利益的團體，多過一個真正有客觀意識的政黨，所以它才會有許多老大不掉的包袱，以及種種奇奇怪怪沒有真正民主意識、現代化意識，卻只有主觀的天子意識，權力意識的擁護者。這就是牟先生當時對革命黨員一般籠統的印象。他始終覺得他們缺乏了一種客觀意識，雖然他自己在當時也說不上來，卻隱隱地總覺得不對勁。這一點其實到今天都還是發人深省的：

「但我想革命是有其主要的客觀課題，有其固定的客觀對象。不是與人為仇，但是他們當時的意識好像把革命的主要客題，客觀對象，下散而為「與人為仇」，那極端的左傾是內心的仇恨心理。我當時朦朧中隱約有個客觀意識，而在他們身上發現不出來。我也說不出其所以然，但只覺得不對勁。我看他們也不知道革命的主要課題，固定對象在哪裡。他們口頭激烈，內心的仇恨無所施，這因為國民黨畢竟不是共產黨，沒有在農民身上展開清算鬥爭，迅速地自其在農民身上出花樣撤回，自己先投降於商人以及都市的紳士，所以連帶也把鄉村的農民以及下縣的紳士饒恕了。一切照舊。這樣一來黨人的左傾意識無用武之地，迅速的轉向腐敗，成為特殊的旗人階級，人人側目，成為最醜惡的存在。而一般智識份子，青年，新秀才，從那時所熏習的左傾，仇恨，則轉向而為氾濫與浪漫，還有一部分則本這氾濫浪漫而轉入地下的共產黨。」

In my mind, however, any revolution must have an objective theme—some larger purpose that is beyond the subjective, a goal that, once established, will be steadily pursued. Personal enmity is not what a revolution should be about. Yet the activists seemed to have made that their theme—political revolt reduced to a campaign targeting human beings, begetting inhumanity. The far-left tendencies they so extolled were the manifestations of a psychological state dominated by hatred and hostility. At the time I was already aware, if only vaguely, that there should be this objective dimension, but I couldn't articulate what it was, and from the way the party members went about their business it certainly didn't seem they had a clear objective—something to struggle for. They soon found themselves at a loss as to who the target of their animosity, their hate-filled rhetoric should be. That

was because the Guomindang, their party, wasn't like the Communists after all—the latter would wage a full-scale class struggle among the peasants. The Nationalists, whose Nanjing government got off to a shaky start, quickly gave in to the business establishment and urban elite; after that they left the rural elite alone as well and abandoned trying to stir things up among the peasants. Everything remained the same, just as it was. The party members now faced a situation that had little use for their hatred and extreme sentiments.

Many descended into a life of decadence, acting as if they had special status reminiscent of the “banner people” (*qiren*)—the designation for Manchus, the privileged race during the Qing. Like degenerate aristocrats these party cadres became the embodiment of a most repulsive kind of existence, looked askance at by others. As for that new educated class—the far-left intellectuals and youths who went along and got themselves all fired up—they would stray even further, ending up in excess, their romanticism gone unruly. Some went underground and joined the Communist Party.

這一段文字有一點夾纏，卻很重要。他似乎先是在說一般的革命黨人，但是跟下來他確實是在緊扣著說國民黨人，他這裏說了四層意思：

(1) 革命原當有一「爲之生、爲之死」清楚的客觀意識與目的，但是他在這批一般革命黨人的身上感覺不出一絲這樣的客觀意識，反而覺出一股「與人爲仇」的仇恨意識，所以他們的「口頭激烈」，內心的仇恨卻「無所施」；(2) 但是國民黨畢竟不是共產黨，所以並沒有真在農民身上展開清算鬥爭。這是民國以後的國民黨沒有共產黨那麼徹底的革命意識所在，所以說國民黨人的革命情懷是「熏習的」、是「沾染得來的，是八字駁雜的」，是「不當行的」；反之，共產黨在當時的革命精神是「當行的」，他們有唯物論的理論，也有唯物論的信仰，他們真能做到清算農民、鬥爭地主，所以後來能夠得勢，完成他們革命奪權的目的。這與後來在台灣的情況有點類似，國民黨的走向民主是被迫的，是「沾染得來的」，所以當時它的民主意識並不當行，反而是想奪權的民進黨人比較認真地談民主，所以台灣的民主路徑，國民黨人並不能居功，它只是扮演了一個消極被動的角色；這與先秦的時代也有些類似，最後完成統一建國大業的是法家人、而不是儒家人。這是根據牟先生在《歷史哲學》及《中國哲學十九講》裏的說法表述的：牟先生以爲法家人的現實感迫切，改革現狀的心態比較強烈，結果改革現實政治的任務就由他們來完成；(3) 反之，當此

時，一批國民黨人則先投降於商人及都市的紳士，轉成破落貴族——「一切照舊」；而其他一些「黨人的左傾意識無用武之地，迅速的轉向腐敗，成為特殊的旗人階級…成為最醜惡的存在」。他把這個時代一批軟疲無力的、失落的、對現實變化沒有恰當反應的存在面貌沉痛地勾繪了出來，充滿了一般末世的腐朽氣；(4) 而剩下的一些還存有理想的分子，則部分轉成氾濫與浪漫，部分轉成地下的共產黨。轉成共產黨人的部分不說，他這裏所謂氾濫的浪漫份子，卻是以吳稚暉先生為典型的。他說只有這分浪漫在當時還能吸引一些有理想的青年人：

「惟看到一篇最長的『一個新信仰的人生觀與宇宙觀』，我才見到了光彩，見到了風姿，見到了波瀾壯闊與滑稽梯突的新奇；那真夠勁，夠刺激。那也是吳稚暉個人自己的浩瀚生命縱橫才氣的直接向外膨脹，沒有簡別，沒有迴環曲折，只是一個大氣濤濤在那裏滾…吳氏的浩瀚生命縱橫才氣向外膨脹正投合了我這個青年的混沌生命之直接向外膨脹向外撲，他那浩瀚縱橫壓倒了淹蓋了那一切平庸之聲，也使我跨過了俯視了那一切平庸之聲…他壓倒那些平庸之聲，只是他的生命之浩瀚，才氣之縱橫，這是力，不是理。他那漆黑一團的宇宙觀，也只是那生命那才氣之直接膨脹所撲向的混沌。我之欣賞他，也只是我的混沌生命之直接向外膨脹，向外撲，和他接了頭。這也是力的，不是理的。我事後覺得，我之直接膨脹是我青年發展中之一階段，而他依其身分地位年齡，那時也是如此，則是他之淺薄，他之不成材。而他之淺薄不成才則象徵那時代之淺薄不成材。這表示中華民族苦難之未已，尚未達到自覺其自己，建立其自己的時候。」

A book called *Science and The Philosophy of Life—a Debate* caught my attention. Although I didn't grasp all its contents, most of the essays in there seemed to me lackluster, mediocre in spirit. Even the give-and-take between Ding Wenjiang and Zhang Junmai, who started the science vs. metaphysics controversy, I found dull. An exception was Wu Zhihui's "A Philosophy of Life and a View of the Universe Based on a New Faith [New Values]," the longest piece in the collection. That I found exciting. A combination of audacious thinking and pointed satire, his prose had character and luster and, therefore, struck me as a real novelty. I was hooked.

Wu's powerful personality, as well as his considerable talent, was clearly on display in that essay. Yes, it was a fierce outpouring—reading it, you could sense his

immense life force emerging like a wave, coming toward you directly, without any detour, any zigzag, a wave powerfully undulating, its roar drowning out all voices of mediocrity... The appeal of his writings came more from their energy, their expression of primal force. Which struck a chord with me—my romantic temperament matching his, the outpouring of my life force, straight from its amorphous, undifferentiated state, meeting his. And riding on the wave Wu generated, I too looked down on those mediocre voices and felt I could bypass them, indeed, that I'd already gone beyond them...

Wu's influence on me, powerful as it was, was temporary; later on in life I would disagree with every single one of his ideas. At the time, however, his great force of character did impress me so, and in my young mind all those voices of mediocrity had been drowned out by his roar. But it was just that—might, not right, forceful personality rather than reasoned truths. In the end, the outpouring of life force that had lent such luster to his writings produced only a pitch-dark worldview as murky and formless as its source. A strong statement for sure, a powerful expression of primal energies, and one that I could easily appreciate—for my own swirling life force was going outward, reaching for objects that matched its amorphous, roving nature, yes, in a manner that wasn't so thought-out either. Might, not right, was the basis of our meeting of minds.

Afterward I realized Wu's dazzling romanticism was really a failing: while my embrace of his writings was a phase in the development of a young mind, the writings themselves, done by someone of his age and status, only exposed a lack of depth, a poverty in moral character. Wu, despite his talent and imposing personality, had failed to come into his own as a human being. **And that shallowness was itself a reflection of the times, a sign that our culture was in dire straits. The Chinese had yet to reach self-awareness as a nation—knowing oneself, building up oneself [recognizing one's humanity and building upon it]—and until then, the crisis would continue.**

他這段對吳稚暉先生的素描深刻極了，看似苛刻嚴厲，實是表現他對客觀意識的反省力及反映他生命動向的所在。他以天生混沌的生命力直接向外撲，與吳先生的才氣相駁，當下即因才氣的縱橫而俯視了一切，這是一般青年人很容易相應的一股狂捐氣。但是他馬上就看出這樣縱橫的才氣只是一種氾濫激情的大浪漫，並不必要是建體立極的堅實力量。他反身一思，這樣脫韁的浪漫氣質

竟然是出現在吳先生那樣身分地位年齡的風雲人物身上，馬上就顯出一種淺薄與不足，他由此判斷吳先生的不成材，及時代的不成氣候，民族的苦難未已。因為建體立極必須依靠理性，不能只靠勢力、激情——一如他在《歷史哲學》及《時代與感受》中評鑑中國人傳統的風氣時所說的：中國人向來不欣賞事功精神，太史公對蕭何「祿祿無奇節」的風評，表現中華民族的品味及強烈的浪漫性格，但是建國立國卻正需要蕭何這樣錄錄無奇節的事功精神與理性力量。奇氣奇節到頭來只能換來一時的熱鬧、領取一時的風騷。若是無體、無力、無理去撐持這樣的風騷，其結果是沒有什麼自覺的民主國家可能被建立的。所以在這段話裏他已經知己知彼，精闢懇切地結論出：「這表示中華民族苦難之未已，尚未達到自覺其自己，建立其自己的時候。」這真是他的真知灼見了，在那個時代，甚至到現在，並不是每一個人都可能看得穿這個局面的。人都好風流、領風騷，政治人物在此並不例外，並不必有為生民立命，為萬世開太平的識見。而正是在這些刀口上的反省，才使他終於成就了一個哲學家的人格，而不只是一個泛泛的學者而已。我們回頭再看一段在民國十七年時，他對王國維與梁啟超這兩位客觀人物的批評，他說：

「那是民國十七年…我只隱隱約約聽說王國維於初夏跳頤和園昆明池自殺了，梁任公隱身於天津，藏起來了。王國維是一代國學大師，晚年鑽研甲骨文，殷周史，於考古學上有貢獻。然沒有進入中國文化生命的底蘊，於西方文化生命的來龍去脈亦未能抓住其綱要。自己生命的途徑，中國文化命的途徑，皆未能知之確，信之堅，遂鬱悶以終，自殺了事。他不會贊成從廣州來的那一道風。清末民初留下的學人就是那樣清客式的典雅，而於天人之際，古今之變，則一無器識。」

I arrived in Beijing in the spring of 1928 still quite naïve and ignorant, barely aware of the events taking place. The renowned scholar Wang Guowei had committed suicide the previous summer, drowned in the lake at the Summer Palace. Wang had been a preeminent figure in classical scholarship; he devoted the latter part of his life to studying ancient history and deciphering the script on the oracle bones, contributing greatly to our knowledge of Chinese antiquities. But in his delving into our civilization's past he never got to the core of the matter, never did put his finger on the pulse of Chinese culture and come into contact with its true vitality, its life. Wang was also one of the first to venture into the world of Western thought, yet there

too he failed to grasp its fundamental character, the spirit behind its evolution. At a time when Chinese civilization seemed caught in a struggle for survival, the mandarin intellectual was lost, unsure of the way ahead for both his culture and his own life—indeed, lacking the faith that there was a way. Had he lived, Wang certainly wouldn't have aligned himself with the republican forces hailing from the south. In despair, he opted for a swift exit. That kind of self-regard—the self-styled elegance of a refined tribe—was typical of scholars of Wang's generation; the breadth of vision, depth of conviction needed to face the issues of the day they just didn't have. How could the culture survive? How should one live? The momentous changes that prompted those questions only exposed how cut off from the vitality of Chinese culture—its spirit, its life—they actually were.

他以清客式的典雅來形容王國維先生。這種人在他的眼中是學問廣博，十分博雅，但是缺乏古今之變的器識。筆者以後曾聽他以類似的風評評論過方東美先生，他以為方先生的學問大得很、博雅得很，論學卻甚飄忽，概念都落不下來，不能穩定；也曾聽見他說佛教徒根本沒有歷史文化的意識。筆者在當時都感到辛辣刺激，好像是被打了兩個巴掌似的〔筆者自己曾是方先生的學生，並且學思歷程是由佛學走起〕，結果總是歷經幾重反省，思維自己、及週遭學佛的朋友、現象，才有辦法體會並首肯他的判斷，並漸漸明白儒家人對歷史文化的擔負。而他說：

「梁任公是一代的風雲人物。戊戌政變，以及與蔡松坡合力討袁，都見他的風力，與風雲中恢廓得開的才氣，然他的見識亦只是時代中橫剖面的政治變法之意識，立憲之意識…這自然是民主政治的意識，這是不錯的，然在中國要實現這個新政體，是要費大力的。就要牽涉到文化生命的問題。他晚年感覺到徒政治之不足，要從講學起。因此他也成了一位國學大師，然因他的意識受滿清三百年的影響太深…乾嘉的考據學風，他不知是中華民族生命歪曲後而來的文化生命之歪曲，他把它當作一個正面的統緒承繼於其生命中。他簡別不出這其中的委曲…他接不上中國的學統，他通不了中國文化生命的底蘊。還是那考據的興趣，爭博雅的清客學人之意識，三代漢唐宋明儒的大業，他根本接不上。結果是一部清淺而庸俗的《歷史研究法》。他的講學與他的政治事業中所養成的政治意識根本通不起。由他的學問見他的器識，是卑下了，他的政治意識因此也孤離了…他自己生命的途徑，中國文化生命的途徑，他根本無所知。」

As the National Army made its way north, the democrat statesman Liang Qichao was living in seclusion in Tianjin. A commanding presence on the political stage since the Hundred Days Reform in 1898, Liang again showed his mettle when in 1913 he and his student, the military governor Cai Songpo, effectively forced Yuan Shikai to abandon his monarchical dreams [the young Republic was saved and Yuan died in shame]. That Liang had the capacity to navigate the treacherous waters of Chinese politics was undeniable. Yet his vision had been, for the most part, a political one, its scope limited to contemporary affairs—a cross-sectional analysis missing the root of the matter. The main solution Liang had offered concerned our form of government—the change to a constitutional monarchy for the Qing dynasty and, later on, the adoption of a constitution for the newly formed Republic. In this regard he represented a much-needed democratic consciousness in Chinese politics. But, as he himself had come to realize, to bring about democracy in China, under the circumstances of the time, would take enormous effort—a close-to-impossible task—and political vision alone was not enough. Deeper cultural, historical issues were at stake. The life of the culture was at stake.

So, around 1920, Liang retired from politics and turned to academic life, devoting his last years to classical scholarship. Despite his progressive views, as a scholar he would stay within the intellectual tradition of the Qing era. The Manchu court and its milieu had had a profound impact on him... The kind of scholarship that became dominant during the Qing was textual studies, philological research (*kaoju*). This stagnant tradition was a travesty of Chinese cultural life. But Liang didn't seem to realize that. What was a misdirection, resulting from the suppression of the Chinese people and their spirit, their vitality, he took as a legitimate way for the culture to evolve. What was the true path, extending from the ancient sages and taken up by the great Confucian thinkers of the Han and Tang and, later on, Song and Ming eras, he never embarked upon.

As long as his mind remained beclouded thus, Liang couldn't have picked up the broken thread that was the grand heritage of Chinese thought. His scholarly works showed he had the same philological orientation as members of that refined tribe—intellectuals patronized by the court—and, like them, he had had no contact with the true vitality of Chinese culture. His *Method of Historical Research* was banal and superficial. In the end, the scholarship did nothing to enhance the political vision; instead, it betrayed a mind of insufficient caliber, lacking in cultural insight and

philosophical depth. Meanwhile, his political vision, an outgrowth of his political experience, remained rootless, isolated from the life of the culture—in short, a dead end.

Liang was a talented man, clever enough to grasp how momentous the changes taking place were and, in response, advocate for a form of government that would fit in with the times. But when it came to finding the way ahead for both his culture and his own life, he was clueless.

The seventeenth year of the Republic, 1928, was a watershed moment. Not only did the campaign led by the National Army—what came to be known as the Northern Expedition—bring down the Beiyang warlords, it marked the end of a whole intellectual and political milieu. Gone was the intellectual dominance by scholars steeped in the philological tradition of the Qing—their self-conscious gentility and enervated thinking were, like themselves, remnants from the imperial era. But gone, too, was the political consciousness, the democratic spirit, of those who fought for change, people like Liang Qichao, Sun Yat-sen [the great revolutionary] and Yan Fu [renowned translator of English writings]. Their ideal of a republican, constitutional government turned out to be just that—a superficial and fleeting vision.

他對這幾位時代客觀人物的批評不可不謂嚴苛，但是這並不表示他的批判不精當。他從中洞見了那個時代精神狀態的軟弱與病態，中華民族的文化生命在那個時代並沒有挺立起來。一般所謂客觀人物的器識也不過如此，王國維是迂了，梁任公亦不過是個政治的識見、橫切的生命，並沒有縱貫的歷史文化意識，他從政壇退下走向學術，講述的學問也是單薄庸俗的，既接續不上、也擔當不住文化生命的慧命。牟先生晚年在《中國哲學十九講》裏，就常以這一點提澌後學，要學人有縱貫的文化意識、生命與態度，才會有「生長、覺悟的過程」，不要只是「橫剖面地掛搭在現在的時空中」〔第五講〕，只是「爭博雅的清客學人」，並沒有真正哲學家的智慧與識見。而如今我們從「後見之明」，隨著他的識見看去，竟發現我們自己所在的時代與人物與他所批判察照的性格相去不遠，好像還要更差些，連那一點恢弘的器度風力都不及，我們的民族文化生命還沒有遠離他察照出來的病根。他所描述的人物器識，還歷歷在我們眼前表演著他們極為平庸的識見。他所說的三種典型人物：汜濫式的浪漫、清客式的典雅及考據式的支離，在眼前的社會大眾與學術文化界裏都還是佔著大多數。我們不必走得太遠，品評別人，只要捫心問問自己是不是落在他

所批評的範圍以內就可以了。我們但問自己有沒有客觀意識？有沒有理性意識？向來奉行的是客觀理性的規則？還是人情流俗的陋規就足夠了。牟先生的這些批評不可不令人驚心、警策，也不可不令人欽佩他眼光的銳利，他的識見是深刻的，所以才會有為時代痛下針砭的勁道與力量。

這當然也是打造他成爲一個哲學家生命性格的理由，表現他特立獨行的風骨，他向來就是一個「以牙還牙，以眼還眼」的真性情，惡聲至必反之，並沒有絲毫的妥協。比如說他徹底的反共意識是從客觀文化的根骨裏生發的，但是在他眼前的各流人物卻決非如此，所以他才會說他自己「不入流」。而這些所謂入流的文人清客們只會東倒西歪，始終在現實利益裏隨波逐流、附庸風雅、追逐勢力，無法真正擔當起建立民國的大業。記得曾聽他笑謔說：「當今之世只有兩個人是真正反共的，一個是蔣介石，一個就是我——牟宗三；蔣反共是爲了掙面子，他把大陸丟掉了、太沒面子了，而我反共卻是真正的反共，我是從中國文化的命脈裏反共的。」他這樣的話從來沒有人講過、也從來沒有人敢講，向來也沒有人真能體會他發話的深切，以爲他是說著玩的，呵呵一笑罷了。所以至今海峽兩岸來來往往，也沒有人真真正正的反共了。海峽兩岸還有許多人以爲他是大中國主義的統派，殊不知中國人現代化的過程未了，他所關切的民主建國在中國尚未完成，共產主義是必須在歷史上消逝的。他意識裏的中國是一個以客觀的民主意識建立的中國，並不是一個共產的中國，也不是偏安的台獨。雖說偏安的格局，有它在過渡期的珍貴，從文化的長流看，客觀民主建國的完成，才是中國現代化的完成，這與全盤的西化並不是同一個觀念，這裏的拿捏必須清楚明晰。

每一個民族文化都需要經過現代化，這是理性的要求與人類文明精神的進步與展現，是他念茲在茲討論的問題。但是現代化並不等於是西化，西化只是現代化一個相當成功的例子罷了，並不是沒有它的缺失。它當然足以成爲其他文化走向現代化的借鏡。但是它的缺失，卻正是其他文化走向現代化必須檢討與避免的。這樣的歷程未完，有待全人類一代又一代的努力，才可能截長補短，走出一條人文精神的康莊大道。這裏的概念分際必須是明確的，才可能省卻許多不必要的夾纏與紛爭。沒頭沒腦地在西化與不西化裏爭，在媚外與民粹中打轉是毫不相干、毫無意義的，似乎也只是浪漫激情的另一種表現而已。他以後多次在演講裏談到「漢宋以來傳統中國知識份子的命運」，都與這些意識

息息相關，一元文化裏的知識份子要仰人鼻息、向統治者討生活，都必須隱隱地受到政治的威脅與迫害，這些都是極發人深省的現實狀況。多元文化則是在各行各業裏出人才，而不是只在官僚與政治體系裏討生活，這也是現代化重要的一環。只是眼下中國的文化社會還沒有走到這樣多元力量的全符展現，它還沒有進入一個天行健的盛世，這更是有待後學深切的反省與努力的。牟先生的反省在此十分的深沉全面，可惜誤解他的人太多，批評他格義、西方化、哲學化，反而主張回到「春秋大義」的人，簡直就是大開倒車，荒唐之至，完全不明白學問的艱難與人類文明進步的辛苦，輕率地就把他一生的奮鬥與反省抹黑，十分的輕浮可惡。

他的學問並不是格義的，他一頭鑽入的是人類理性的綱骨，是一個個人生命與全人類人文精神的雙向交流，它是一及一切，一切及一，並沒有中間屬於一般特殊團體的路線。這中間一般特殊團體的路線，是每一個特殊團體自己必須盡性努力經營的經驗現實，並不是他這樣一個哲學家人格所關懷的事業。他曾經說孔夫子立教並不是只說給山東人聽、中國人聽的，這裏有一個深沉的普遍意識，是指向全人類的智慧，因此劈頭就是「先驗的」，它並不是一個屬於經驗一般的學問，說給某些特別階級、特殊文化、特定歷史的人物聽的；反之、它直指一個理性所價馭的人文世界，是一個人文化成的價值世界，是每一個有理性的人所嚮往、努力、開拓與實踐的世界。這才是一個哲學家所心儀嚮往的世界，也才是牟先生一生奮鬥的目標。只有從這裏貞定住，才可能對牟先生的生命人格不起誤解，而看出他一生哲學事業的業績。一個哲學家的人格成就哲學學問的事業，就已經是生命實踐的本身了，並不是離開這裏還有什麼更高貴的實踐存在。許多人不明，在這裏對他妄加批評，那是不明白哲學就是實踐的智慧學的本義。他並沒有什麼未竟之事要別人去相續，另一個哲學家人格的生命只有繼起地去創造運作哲學的學問與智慧就完了，這裏只是天才與天才間的呼應，沒有任何的折扣可打。其它的各種不同的人間企業與事業具可由不同的人格心性去擔當、去完成，與他不必相同，也不必說是繼承他的未竟事業，那反而是瞎說、瞎比附了。

牟先生是一個哲學家，是他的生命性情如是，才會對時代、對人物有這樣不凡的識見與評鑑。而他在這個大浪漫的時代，說他自己也像是「奔馳的野

馬」，「粗野放蕩，幾不可收拾。文字荒謬，不避骯髒…」。而當是時收拾他這匹脫韁野馬的、正是那在第一章裏打過他的老父：

「大哉父言，一口範住吳氏的浩瀚與縱橫，赤手搏住那奔馳的野馬，使我頓時從漆黑一團的混沌中超拔。那些光彩，那些風姿，那些波瀾壯闊，頓時收斂、降服、止息，轉向而為另一種境界之來臨。」

[M]y father, with his reprimand, had single-handedly halted the frenzied motions of those wild horses and retrieved my young mind from its wandering in the pitch-dark netherworld of romanticism. The powerfully undulating wave that Wu's writings had conjured up for me suddenly subsided. I felt as if I'd come to a rest stop—my spirit calmed, my energies collected—it was indeed a turning point in my life, one that marked the beginning of another state of mind.

這「另一種境界之來臨」，是從述說他老父的故事開始的：

「他是白手起家的人。剛毅嚴整，守正不阿；有本有根，條理終始。祖父棄世時，薄田不過七八畝…伯父含混…叔父年幼…他一手承擔起家庭重擔。十八歲即輟學，應世謀生。祖父留下來的騾馬店，他繼續經營了若干年。神強體壯，目光四射。指揮酬對，絲毫不爽。每當傍晚，騾馬成群歸來，他都要幫著扛抬。那是很緊張的時候，很繁重的工作。無論是人或馬都是急著要安息。他安排照應，賓至如歸…後來他常對我們說：開始原也是糊塗的，後不久忽然眼睛亮了，事理也明白了。人總須親身在承當艱苦中磨練。這話給我的印象非常深。他看人教子弟，總說要撲下身彎下腰，手腳都要落實，不要輕飄飄，像個浪蕩者。」

Father was a man of principle who never wavered in his commitment to the right path, for he had a strong sense of roots [a firm grounding in the moral teachings of our culture]. From start to end he led a disciplined life, an orderly existence. And it didn't start easy. When my grandfather passed away the family couldn't even afford to build him a proper grave. My uncle, the eldest son, wasn't the type to take charge of family affairs, while the other uncle, yet to be of age, was in poor health; father, in the middle, left school and took over the support of his family all by himself—he was eighteen. For a few years he ran the highway rest stop that my grandfather left behind. Every evening, the horses and mules would arrive in droves, and he must help settle them down. It was hard work, and in the commotion the pressure of getting it done promptly was immense—men and beasts, the herdsman and their charges, were

equally eager for rest. Father was physically a robust man, but there was also a great inner strength about him, which you could tell from the intensity in his eyes, as well as the calm, dignified manner in which he conducted himself in front of staff and customers alike...

Father often told us that in the beginning he too knew not what he was doing, then one day it all became clear. He said, a person must face the responsibilities of life and go through some real hardships—only that way would one's character be made. I always remember that. He taught his children to check our own bearings: stay close to the ground, your weight on your feet, as if ready to work—never be flighty like a drifter.

這個故事的場景異常的眼熟，是回到第一章那人馬要安歇的驛馬店了，那個老家，那個他常愛看的「老頭們在荒村野店裏吃寡酒」的情調，那人困馬乏求安息的安祥，那是一時也是永恆的安息，那是屬於保聚生命的嘉祥氣，那老中國人天長地久的生活情調，是那麼樣的平常、堅實與溫馨。牟先生說：那天路歷程也不過如此。這就是他所謂「另一種境界之來臨」了。而這「另一種境界」實在就是回到第一章裏「生命在其自己」的境界、是他從他的老父，老中國文化的陶養裏體會出來的，一種「安土敦乎仁」、有根有本的生命，一種儒家人實實在在的生命，沒有任何的花腔、光景與虛幻。所以他接著又說：

「他是典型的中國文化陶養者。他常看曾文正公家書，晚上也常諷誦古文。聲音韻節穩練從容，我常在旁邊聽，心中隨之極為清淨純潔。寫字整齊不苟，墨潤而筆秀。常叫我們不要了草，不要有荒筆敗筆，墨要潤澤，不要乾黃。因為關乎一個人的福澤。」

Father was a man steeped in traditional Chinese culture. One of his favorite things to read was the family letters of [late-Qing statesman] Zeng Wenzheng, and at night he often recited to himself passages from the ancient classics; sometimes I stood next to him and listened—his voice measured and calm—and I'd feel cleansed, my soul purified. Father was also never slapdash with his calligraphy—each stroke was in place and gracefully rendered, the ink full-bodied. He told us, “Pay attention to how you write.” The characters should convey strength. The ink should never appear sallow. How one writes mirrors the goodness, or the lack of it, one has cultivated and garnered in life.

這一點他也是得到老父的真傳而終身奉行，他自己寫字也是「墨潤而筆秀」，一絲不苟。運的雖然是現代的原子筆，寫得卻像是毛筆字一樣，豎立著筆鋒筆桿，一字一撇地寫，頓挫抑揚清晰可見，沒有一撇的了草。我們於今還可以看見他一些著作的原稿，字跡清晰有力，他寫下來的句子，很少需要改動的。就跟他上課時一樣，幾個小時講下來，就是成篇的論文。他思慮縝密，吞吐有力，說出來的話，早不知在腦中轉過多少次了，向來都不是虛發的。筆者曾在下課時跑到講台上看他上課的筆記，寥寥數行寫在牛皮紙袋背面，只是寫明幾個要點，至於講課的內容，全都在他的腦子裏條理終始。他亦常喜歡看人寫字，品評人的性格，他嘗說師母寫字太剛，像是男人寫的字，也說過小孫女寫字太硬，像是師母寫的字，不夠女性的溫柔。他有這麼一套直覺的解悟，就像這裏說的「關乎一個人的福澤」，有時靈空說來，總讓人耳目一新，回味無窮。有一回陪他散步，就聽他說某某有一張「溥儀臉、命孤」，我當時實在怎麼聽都聽不懂，連問了幾次，他才拿著拐棍在地上寫出「溥儀」兩字，我一時哭笑不得，心想某某果然是個「容長臉」，就像曹雪芹形容的「襲人」一樣，但是「容長臉」怎麼就「孤」了呢？這我是毫無頭緒的。這些可能都是屬於他直感神解的那一類，與他的藝術性、創造性有關，有時他就以此來判斷人的性情，十分有味。他跟著又說：

「他是有堅定的義理信念的人。我覺得中國文化中的那些義理教訓，在他身上是生了根的…那些義理教訓都在這『安土敦乎仁』中生根，一起隨之為真實的，存在的。因此他的生命是生命之在其自己的生命…在他的生命中，你可以見到宇宙間有定理、有綱維。這是建構的、積極的，同時也是創造的，保聚的生命。他從不方便討巧…『君子居易以俟命，小人行險以僥倖』，這真理在他身上得到了印證。…我從我父親身上，親切地覺得這時代浮薄知識份子妄逞聰明，全不濟事。沒有一個是有根的，沒有一個能對他自己的生命負責，對民族生命負責，對國家負責，對文化負責，來說幾句有本有根的話。他們全是無守的，亦全是無堅定的生根的義理信念的，只是浮薄的投機取巧，互相耍著玩，來踐踏斷喪民族的生命。」

Father was a man of firm beliefs—the teachings of Chinese culture and philosophy had taken roots in his life...“Peace with the earth—that is *ren* indeed [that is truly a manifestation of humanity].” When one lived as father

did—at peace with the land and its people—those teachings became palpable and real; it was as if they had taken on a concrete presence, the teachings and the living blending into one. **My father’s life was therefore “life in itself.”** And in time his beliefs grew firmer still—there was a constancy, a purity of purpose to the way he lived. It was a proactive, constructive existence, a life that sustained life, that paved the way for more life. Father was living proof that [moral] principles could guide one’s way in the world and give our world some order and peace.

The years around 1928 were, however, a turbulent time for the Jiaodong area. Many out there—bad elements of all sorts—took advantage of the chaos to fool the gullible with promises of protection. Father, who hadn’t a crafty bone in him, would have nothing to do with them. Which demonstrated the truth, “Those who are upright remain steadfast and calm, awaiting that which life offers; the small-minded shy not from doing harm thinking they may get away with it.”

Father, by personal example, had shown me a life well lived—yes, in contrast to the superficial intellectuals of the age, **who wallowed in their smug superiority but really had nothing to contribute.** None of them had a sense of roots. None lived in a way that was morally accountable to themselves, to the people, to our nation. And so they had nothing to say that was of real worth. **They were opportunists who used artful talk to jostle for advantage and against each other, and in their hands the life of our culture had been destroyed.**

他是為他的時代愴痛到了極點，所以才說出那麼沉重的話。『君子居易以俟命，小人行險以僥倖』這是多麼嚴肅的反省與深刻的智慧，他在此藉著對老父生命的素描，把這個生命的學問如實烘托，他以後在《十九講》裏也引出孔子的：「人之生也直，罔之生也倖而免」〔第二講〕來表達這個生命的真理。這是他從老父的生命得到的印証，完全是實事實理，沒有絲毫的虛幻、光景與花腔，這才是生命真正的樸學。

所以他在最後一段裏又說：

「我願天下人都當到農村裏看看什麼是生根的生命，什麼是在其自己的生命，什麼是真理的見證者，仔細印證一番，對照一番，從頭想想，重新作一個有本有根的人，從這裏建立自己為一個有根有本的政治家、思想家與事業家。如是，中國方算上了路。」

I hope that all of us would go to the villages and see for ourselves what it is to live “life in itself” and be a testimony to truth. Let us think it through and begin anew living with a sense of roots—and from there become politicians, thinkers, and professionals with a firm grounding [in humanity, in *ren*]. **Only then will China be on its way to a brighter future.**

二十一世紀的今天，中國算是準備開始上路了。晚年在他逝世的前半年，筆者曾返台去探望他。一日、他坐在客廳高背的沙發椅上，望著眼前陽台外的天空，感懷地說：「中國人的苦難已經過去了…往後再也不會出像我這樣的哲學家了。以後是你們女人的世界，一個 assemblyman 的世界，大家分工合作。中國的苦難已經過去了！」他以他自己一生的生命擔當起二十世紀苦難中國的哲學與文化事業，他在這一刻算是竟功了，往後只是後學湊不湊泊得上的問題，與他再也不相干了。筆者當時坐在他的右後方，望著他消瘦的身影，平平實實地、孤絕獨立地，迴向著那歷史文化長流裏的往聖先賢，那混沌裏的清光，那為天地立心的靈魂，那為生民立命的氣派，他是直接走入歷史，走向聖賢的位置裏。