

「明亡之因」的追論與議定

楊正顯^{*}

康熙十七年，清廷開「博學鴻儒科」以修《明史》是震動當時遺民士子耳目的大事。過去研究多集中於此科士人間的交往與對清初學術的影響，較少關注明史館內館臣們對重要史實與人物的看法。本文透過陸隴其《三魚堂日記》中側記館臣之言論，說明館臣們如何追論與議定「明亡之因」。首先談遺民們在「時忌」與生存壓力之下參與此科的景況。次談館臣對於「明亡流賊說」中楊嗣昌評價的爭議，說明當時吳偉業《綏寇記略》等等的負面評價，後因楊嗣昌子《孤兒籲天錄》之故，翻轉為正面的過程。再談晚明以來流行的「東林亡國」論，在館臣們爭論之中，轉以黃宗羲《汰存錄》為標準而偏袒東林，並以此評價晚明「三案」始末。最後討論「學術亡國」說。

館臣們爭論是否要依《宋史·道學傳》體例而立《明史·道學傳》，關鍵人物王陽明又是否應該進入〈道學傳〉中，但最終卻不顧陽明對於明朝學術實際的影響，而以「閑正距邪」標準，將陽明列入〈功臣傳〉中；後又因康熙帝的裁定，翻轉其評價。從對「明亡之因」追論與議定的過程來看，原本應該是透過清理史實，重建是非，以服人心之舉，卻仍然蹈襲晚明以來的「門戶之爭」，以致不合一代之公評，徒留黨人之餘習。但清廷開科修史的動作，成功地將天下士人耳目聚於明史館中，隨之而來的文字獄，更確立其對勝國史實的裁量權與發言權。

關鍵詞：博學鴻儒科 明史 三魚堂日記 忌諱 亡國

^{*} 國立海洋大學人文社會教學研究中心助理研究員

The Debate and Determination of the “Causes of the Fall of the Ming”

Yang, Cheng-hsien *

In 1678, the Qing court's inauguration of the “Erudite Scholasticus Recruitment Examination” for the collation of the *Ming History* was a great event that stirred the community of those who had lived through the dynastic transition. Previous scholarship has focused on the interactions among these examination scholars and their influence on early Qing scholarship. Less attention has been paid to the perspectives of officials in the Ming History Bureau on important historical events and personalities. This article examines Lu Longqi's *Diary of the Hall of Three Fish*, which records the discussion among the bureau officials' discussions to explain how they debated and determined “the causes of the fall of the Ming.” The article first discusses how censorship and pressure to make a living led those who survived the transition to participate in this examination. It is followed by a discussion of the debate on “the theory of marauders causing the fall of the Ming” and the negative assessments of Yang Sichang in Wu Weiye's *General Record of Piracy* and other sources. The *Record of an Orphan's Plea to Heaven*, which portrays Yang Sichang in a positive light because it was written by his son, will also be considered. The article then examines the popular late Ming argument that “the Donglin Movement destroyed the dynasty.” In their debate, the History Bureau officials took Huang Zongxi's *Record of Discarding and Preserving* as a standard and sided with the Donglin partisans. They also gave their assessment of the “the Three Cases” in the late Ming. The article concludes with a discussion of the notion about “[false] learning destroying the dynasty.”

* Assistant Research Fellow, Teaching and Research Center of Humanities and Social Sciences, National Taiwan Ocean University

The History Bureau officials debated whether or not, in compiling the *Ming History*, to follow the *Song History* model to establish a section of “Biographies of Scholars of the Learning the Way” in the *Ming History*, and whether or not to include Wang Yangming in the section. In the end, the officials ignored Wang’s concrete influence on Ming leaning. Instead, they followed the standard of “cultivating the upright and distancing heresy” and placed Wang Yangming in the “Biographies of Meritorious Officials.” Later, because of the Kangxi Emperor’s revisions, this assessment was reversed. In examining this process of debating and determining the “causes of the fall of the Ming,” it is clear that the original version of the *Ming History* was intended to reconstruct the history base on the facts, to distinguish what is right or wrong, and to construct a persuasive discourse. And yet they perpetuated the contentiousness inherited from the late Ming and were unable to unify the views of the day, which merely perpetuated factional habits. Nevertheless, the Qing court’s recruitment successfully drew together the scholars of the realm into the Ming History Bureau and silenced the clamor at the margins. This and the subsequent literary inquisition firmly established the court’s authority over the historiography of the vanquished dynasty.

Keywords: Erudite Scholasticus Recruitment Examination, *Ming History*, *Diary of the Hall of the Three Fish*, taboo words, vanquished dynasty