從《莊子‧天下》篇首
解析先秦思想中的基本關懷

何炳棣*

　　本文研究對象是百家爭鳴以前，也就是道術尚未為天下裂的較早時期，我國哲學思想重心及其基本關懷之所在。此項工作首先需要考釋《莊子‧天下》篇首段裡幾個關鍵詞──特別是「道術」──在先秦語境內的意涵。

　　《莊子》一書，兩漢以前很少有人稱引。西晉玄學大興之際，纔開始有幾家注疏，內中只有郭象（卒於公元312年）的《莊子注》得以傳世。自郭象至今一千七百年間，傳統及近、現代中外研究道家哲學的眾多學人，幾乎一致認為「道術」一詞定是源於老、莊對宇宙、人生本原高深玄遠的探討。

　　筆者發現道術一詞並不源於道家，而是初現於《墨子‧尚賢上》。道術的內涵是在〈尚賢上〉、〈節葬下〉、〈非樂上〉、〈非命下〉四篇循環論述中纔充分明白表達出來的。簡言之，通過「博乎道術者」，「王公大人」纔能實現「國家之富，人民之眾，刑政之治」。成功地實現了「富」、「眾」、「治」這「三務」之後，纔能徹底解決民之「三患」：「飢者不得食，寒者不得衣，勞者不得息。」很明顯，《墨子》所謂的道術沒有形上意義，根本是最現實功利的「君人南面之術」。

　　以先秦語境解析《莊子‧天下》篇首段原文，發現內中提到的「天人」、「神人」、「至人」、「聖人」都是古代才德、智慧、威權、勢位集於一身的「聖王」。「道術」就是他們淳樸臻圓、「無所不在」的最高統治術。它的主要內涵是：「以事（日用）為常，以衣食為主，蕃息畜藏，老弱孤寡為意，皆有以養，民之理也。」《墨》、《莊》互證顯示出二者所論道術的內涵，基本上是高度符合的，只是語句表達方式有所不同而已。

　　更有意義的是，筆者發現《論語‧子路》、《鶡冠子‧天則》和《淮南子‧兵略訓》都有與《墨子》論道術文義相同相似的語句。這種五重意涵相符，四重文本

---

* 中央研究院院士

何炳棣

疊合的證據強有力地說明先秦思想中的基本關懷不是「宇宙、人生本原」的形上探討，而是不出生民之理、日用人倫範疇的最現實功利的「君人南面之術」。

　　除了道術詞源及內涵之外，本文也涉及以下三個問題：（一）〈天下〉篇對儒家的評價；（二）〈天下〉篇何以認為道術分裂始自墨子；（三）〈天下〉全篇何以刻意地躲避討論專事富國強兵的學派。

關鍵詞：方術　道術　內聖外王　道德

Ancient China's Primary Philosophical Concern: As Revealed in an Etymological Study of the Introductory Section of "Tian-xia" in *Zhuangzi*

Ping-ti Ho

Member, Academia Sinica

It is generally agreed that the last essay, "Tian-xia," in *Zhuangzi* is the earliest and probably also the best outline history of Chinese philosophical thought prior to the Qin unification of China in 221 BC. The introductory section of this famous essay focuses its discussion on the key term *dao-shu* (道術) which James Legge in 1891 translated as the way of the Tao (Dao) and which most Chinese and Western experts of Daoism believe to represent the highest level of philosophical speculation into the origins of the cosmos and of the meanings of human existence. During the past 1700 years since Guo Xiang's (d. 312) *Commentaries on Zhuangzi*, the term *dao-shu* has always been regarded as one of Daoist origin and therefore interpreted exclusively in terms of Daoist metaphysics.

This author submits that a proper understanding of the nature of *dao-shu* should begin with an etymological study of certain key terms in the *Zhuangzi* text. This contextual search leads to my discovery that *dao-shu* as a philosophical term was first coined by Mozi (circa 480-400 BC) as an art of rulership whose main concern was strictly utilitarian: to ensure that amongst the people the hungry be fed, the cold be clothed, and the overworked be duly rested. Hence the fulfillment of these "three tasks" would procure for the state greater wealth (*fu* 富), sustained population growth (*zhong* 眾) and better governability of the people (*zhi* 治). Comparing *Mozi*'s discourse on *dao-shu* with that in the introductory section of "Tian-xia," I find that they concur remarkably well connotatively, with only mild differences in phrasing. Of still greater significance is the discovery of three additional ancient philosophical works featuring discourses essentially similar to those on *dao-shu* in the *Mozi* and *Zhuangzi* texts. All in all, therefore, this fivefold textual overlay establishes beyond reasonable doubt that *dao-shu* originally was an art of pragmatic rulership which had nothing to do with metaphysical speculation.

何炳棣

Should the outcome of this contextual study catch students of Daoism by surprise, let me pose this question: In an ancient and uniquely man-centered civilization what concern could have greater primacy than the means to ensure man's biological perpetuation and increment?

Parenthetically, in the entire "Tian-xia" essay, I have observed that the schools of thought purposely unmentioned out of sheer abhorrence may be of greater historical significance than those covered therein. As will be shown in an impending paper of mine, it was precisely under the potent influence of *Sunzi*'s brilliant if amoral and "behaviorist" treatise on war—a subject so repugnant to the author of "Tian-xia"—that the Qin school of statesmen and generals finally ushered the contending states into an era of unified and centralized empires.

Keywords: *fang-shu*, *dao-shu*, *nei-sheng-wai-wang*, *dao-de*