

DOCTORAL THESIS

論明清中國士人信徒對祭祖禮的探討以耶穌會羅馬館藏明清士人信徒祭禮文獻28篇為考察範圍

陳文寧

Date of Award:
2016

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and intellectual property rights for the publications made accessible in HKBU Scholars are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners. In addition to the restrictions prescribed by the Copyright Ordinance of Hong Kong, all users and readers must also observe the following terms of use:

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from HKBU Scholars for the purpose of private study or research
- Users cannot further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- To share publications in HKBU Scholars with others, users are welcome to freely distribute the permanent URL assigned to the publication

提 要

由 14 位作者寫於 17 世紀、收於耶穌會羅馬館的 28 篇祭禮文獻，是迄今所見最早一批出自中國士人信徒之手，在禮儀之爭期間就傳教士對祭祖禮的顧慮作出回應的文章。按內容來看，傳教士的顧慮可歸納為兩類，一是採取詢問的方式，向這批士人信徒請教與祭祀相關的問題，二是對祭祖禮已持有否定態度，致令這批作者撰文予以反駁。

從祭祖禮的觀點方面來說，28 篇文獻作者主要是從祭祖本義、祭祖禮是否真的含有與天主教信仰相抵觸的成份等兩方面，進行論述。對於前者，他們認為祭祖源於人情、德育及治國三方面的需要；對於後者，他們指祭祖禮既無求福的成份，亦不認為祖先仍會來格來饗於祭祀現場，因此祭祖之“祭”與祭上帝之“祭”在本質上迥異。雖然在該如何理人死後的靈魂狀態、嘏辭是否在當時社會中已無人應用等細節上，個別作者有不同的意見，然而他們基本上是一致認為祭祖禮應允許中國信徒繼續奉行。

從立論方式來說，28 篇文獻作者中縱使有個別作者對某些儒家經典的可信性存疑，但他們大多仍是主要採用經學進路，強調先王、孔子、儒學的地位及中國文字用法有其特別之處，援引儒家經典、尤其是《禮記》對祭祖禮的描述，以及宋儒的觀點、當中又尤以朱熹為主，作為探討時的論據。

以 28 篇與其所身處的明末清初時期經學主流相較而言，他們的確反映了當時整體經學風氣所尚——以朱熹為宗、漸開漢宋兼爭之勢。不過，對於祭祖禮本義的理解，比對作為當時經學相關方面的代表人物——朱熹及其學派的陳澧、納蘭性德等人的觀點，在情、德、治三方面之外，朱熹等人並不否認祭祖求福、相信祖先能來格來饗，朱子甚至認為祭祖的本義之一，就是在於以祭祀之誠讓祖先的魂魄能夠得以安頓。

以 28 篇與其所身處 17 世紀來華傳教士、教廷相較而言，耶穌會傳教士的觀點最與 28 篇相近，他們注意到祭祖禮在情、德方面對中國人的意義，認為仍有允許中國信徒奉行祭祀的價值。然而，多明我會、方濟各會傳教士則持定相反意見，他們的關注點不在於祭祖禮對中國人的意義、價值，而是禮儀中所存在的求福於祖先、相信祖先仍能來格來饗等成份，與天主教信仰相悖。至於教廷，則會按傳教士上呈的資料，而對祭祖禮是否仍能奉行於信徒之間，在答覆時作出相應的調整。立論方式上，除耶穌會與多明我會的萬濟國，會引用中國儒家經典作為討論依據外，托鉢修會的傳教士主要是按眼見當時社會上祭祖禮情況作出判斷。

雖然在論述過程中，28 篇文獻一方面與明末清初經學主流對於祭祖禮本義的理解存在歧異，另一方面亦出現對經典的錯解、邏輯上的謬誤等若干不足；但是，不管是讓後世得以更全面地認識禮儀之爭這段歷史，抑或是為當代有關“祭祖”問題的研究帶來參考與啟發，這批文獻皆具有重要的價值。

Abstract

The 28 documents, collected by the Society of Jesus Roman Archive, were written in 17th century by 14 authors. They were possibly the earliest Chinese scholar-believers that discussed with the western missionaries about the concept of ancestral offering ritual during the Chinese Rites Controversy. Since the ancestral offering ritual had been held negative attitude, the scholars had to write these documents for refuting.

For the ancestral offering ritual, the authors mainly discussed the original meaning of ancestral offering ritual, and consider whether it is in contravention of the Catholic faith. They believed that ancestral offering ritual contained three elements: humanity (人情), morality (德育) and social order (治國). They neither looked for blessings from ancestors nor thought that the spirits of ancestors would be present to the ritual, thus, the ancestral offering and the offering sacrifice to God were different in nature. Though individual authors had different views on the state of the spirits of ancestors, they agreed that ancestral offering ritual should be allowed to continue to practice among Chinese believers.

Most of the authors mainly used the Confucian Classics Approach (經學進路) to make their arguments. They took Confucian, especially the “Book of Ritual”, and Zhu Xi of Song Dynasty as the main sources to present their arguments of ancestral offering ritual. However, apart from the three elements, Zhu did not deny that ancestral offering ritual was to seek blessings, and believed that the spirits of ancestors would be present to the ritual. Zhu even believed that ancestral offering ritual was for settling the spirits of ancestors.

The view of the Society of Jesus was closed to that of the authors. They noted that the significances of ancestral offering ritual to Chinese people were more about humanity and morality, and thought that it was worthy for Chinese believers to practice the ancestral offering ritual. However, the Dominican and the Franciscan missionaries held of opposite view. Their concerns were not the significances and values of ancestral offering ritual, but the behaviour of seeking blessings from ancestors and the belief of the presence of the spirits of ancestors.

In the Chinese Rites Controversy, the Society of Jesus and the Francisco Varo of Dominicans referred Confucian as the basis for their discussions. The

Mendicant missionaries mainly depended on the situation at that time in the society to make judgments. The Vatican was only according to the information from missionaries to make corresponding judgments that whether the ancestral offering ritual was being allowed to practice among Chinese believers.

Although there are discrepancies and some logical fallacies between the 28 documents and the Confucian Classics of Ming and Qing Dynasties about the understanding of the original meaning of ancestral offering ritual, these documents can bring great inspiration on the contemporary research of ancestral offering ritual and make a more comprehensive reorganization of the history of Chinese Rites Controversy.

目 錄

第一章：研究背景與價值、目的、方法及概況	1
1. 研究背景與價值	2
1.1 祭祖禮於當今的研究價值	
1.2 耶穌會羅馬館藏明清士人信徒祭禮文獻 28 篇在此課題上的價值	
2. 研究目的	16
2.1 這批士人信徒於觀點與立論方式上的異同並對其研究之評議	
2.2 從經學史的角度，了解他們與明末清初經學主流在祭祖禮相關討論上的異同	
2.3 從跨文化研究的角度，了解他們與 17 世紀來華傳教士、教廷在相關討論上的異同	
3. 研究方法	24
3.1 歸納與比較	
3.2 經學史研究進路	
3.3 跨文化研究進路	
4. 研究概況	26
第二章：明清士人信徒論祭 28 篇在祭祖禮方面的探討	38
1. 明清士人信徒論祭 28 篇概述	40
2. 各作者之觀點與其立論方式	48
3. 各作者在祭祖禮觀點上的異同	69
3.1 相同之處	
3.2 相異之處	
4. 各作者在祭祖禮立論方式上的異同	90
4.1 相同之處	
4.2 相異之處	
5. 對明清士人信徒論祭 28 篇在祭祖禮探討上的評議	115
5.1 釋經上的錯謬	
5.2 邏輯上的謬誤	
6. 結語	129

第三章：從經學史角度論 28 篇與明末清初經學在祭祖禮本義探討上的異同	132
1. 明末清初整體經學風氣——以朱熹為宗、開漢宋兼采之勢	133
1.1 以朱熹為宗	
1.2 開漢宋兼采之勢	
2. 明末清初時期經學在祭祖禮本義方面的探討	140
2.1 明末清初在相關方面的三位代表人物——朱熹、陳澧、納蘭性德	
2.2 朱熹、陳澧、納蘭性德在祭祖禮本義方面的觀點	
2.3 小結	
3. 在祭祖禮本義的探討上，28 篇與明末清初時期經學的異同	173
3.1 28 篇的經學傾向與明末清初整體經學風氣的異同	
3.2 對於祭祖禮本義的理解，28 篇與明末清初經學的異同	
4. 結語	199
第四章：從跨文化研究角度論 28 篇與 17 世紀來華傳教士、教廷在祭祖禮探討上的異同	207
1. 17 世紀參與祭祖禮討論之來華修會的背景	211
2. 17 世紀各修會及教廷在祭祖禮方面的探討	222
2.1 耶穌會	
2.2 多明我會	
2.3 教廷	
2.4 其他修會	
2.5 小結	
3. 在祭祖禮的探討上，28 篇與 17 世紀來華傳教士、教廷的異同	250
3.1 祭祖禮觀點上的異同	
3.2 立論方式上的異同	
4. 結語	260
第五章：總結	262
參考書目	271
履歷	296