

一、顧炎武《日知錄》卷十三〈宗室〉之文如下：

漢唐之制，皆以宗親與庶姓參用。入為宰輔，出居牧伯者，無代不有。漢孝昭始元二年，以宗室無在位者，舉茂才劉辟疆劉長樂皆為光祿大夫。辟疆守長樂衛尉。孝平元始元年，詔宗室為吏，舉廉佐史，補四百石。唐玄宗開元二十五年五月辛丑，命有司選宗子有才者，宗正薦四從叔前奉令知正，四從叔前祁縣令志遠，五從弟雒陽尉遇，六從弟酸棗丞良，五從弟武進尉肅，五從姪鄭縣尉瞻，五從姪前宋州參軍承嗣，皆授臺省官及法官京縣官。詔曰，至公之用，本無偏黨，惟善所在，豈隔親疎。四從叔知正等，咸有才名，見推公族，稟惟清之操，稟致遠之資。朕每慮同盟，不勤於德，常懸右職，以勸其從。先委宗卿，精為內舉，量能考行，歷在踰時，名數則多，升聞蓋寡。光膺是選，諒在得人，固可擢以清要，遷於臺閣。將觀志於七子，冀籍名於八人。書不云乎，九族既睦，平章百姓。凡今懿戚，可不慎與！遠道漫常，義無私於王法，脩身效節，思豈薄於他人！期於帥先，勵我風俗，深於自勉，以副明言。天寶三年五月，詔皇五等以下親，及九廟子孫，有材學政理，委宗正寺，揀擇聞薦。德宗貞元二年八月，以睦王府長史嗣虢王則之，為左金吾大將軍。謂宰臣曰，朕不欲獨用外戚，故選宗室子有才行者獎拔之。昭宗乾寧二年六月丁亥朔，以京兆王尹嗣薛王知柔，兼戶部尚書判度支，兼諸道鹽鐵轉運等使。制曰，支度牢籠之務，弛張經制之宜，當擇通才，俾繼成績。余曰叔父，庸予簡求，匪私吾宗，示張王室。終唐之世，有宰相十一人。而舊史贊之曰，我宗之英，曰皋與勉。宋子京以為周唐任人不疑，得親親用人之道。惟本朝不立此格，於是為宗屬者，大抵皆溺於富貴，妄自驕矜，不知禮義。至其貧者，則游手逐食，靡事不為。名曰天枝，實為棄物。曹同所謂今之州牧郡守，古之方伯諸侯。或比國數人，或兄弟竝據。而宗室子弟，曾無一人間廁其間。正本朝今日之事也。崇禎時，始行換授之法，而教之無數舉之無術，未見有卓然樹一官之績者。三百年來，當國大臣，皆畏避而不敢言，至先帝獨斷行之而已晚矣。然則親賢竝用，古人之所以有國長世者，後王豈可不鑒乎？

問題：（一）請問顧炎武上述議論之意旨為何？（7%）

（二）請任以傳統中國三個王朝為例，具體說明其宗室政策，並進一步就上述顧炎武的議論，闡述您對宗室政策與國祚長久關係問題之看法。（18%）

二、章學誠《文史通義》內篇五〈史德〉之文如下云：

才、學、識，三者得一不易，而兼三尤難，千古多文人而少良史，職是故也。昔者劉氏子玄，蓋以是說謂足盡其理矣。雖然，史所貴者義也，而所具者事也，所憑者文也。孟子曰：「其事則齊桓晉文，其文則史，義則夫子自謂竊取之矣。」非識無以斷其義，非才無以善其文，非學無以練其事，三者固各有所近也；其中固有似之而非者也。記誦以為學也，辭采以為才也，擊斷以

（背面仍有題目，請繼續作答）

為識也，非良史之才學識也。雖劉氏之所謂才學識，猶未足以盡其理也。夫劉氏以謂有學無識，如愚估操金，不解質化，推此說以證劉氏之指，不過欲於記誦之間，知所決擇以成文理耳。故曰：「古人史取成家，退處士而進姦雄，排死節而飾主闕，亦曰一家之道然也。」此猶文士之識，非史識也。能具史識者，必知史德；德者何？謂著書者之心術也。夫穢史者所以自穢，謗書者所以自謗，素行為人所羞，文辭何足取重！魏收之矯誣，沈約之陰惡，讀其書者先不信其人，其患未至於甚也。所患夫心術者，謂其有君子之心而所養未底於粹也；夫有君子之心而所養未粹，大賢以下所不能免也，此而猶患於心術，自非夫子之春秋不足當也，以此責人，不亦難乎？是亦不然也。蓋欲為良史者，當慎辨於天人之際，盡其天而不益以人也。盡其天而不益以人，雖未能至，苟允知之，亦足以稱著書者之心術矣。而文史之儒，競言才學識而不知辨心術，以議史德，烏乎可哉！夫是堯舜而非桀紂，人皆能言矣；崇王道而斥霸功，又儒者之習故矣；至於善善而惡惡，褒正而嫉邪，凡欲託文辭以不朽者，莫不有是心也。然而心術不可不慮者，則以天與人參，其端甚微，非是區區之明所可恃也。夫史所載者事也，事必藉文而傳，故良史莫不工文，而不知文又患於為事役也。蓋事不能無得失是非，一有得失是非，則出入予奪相督摩矣，督摩不已而氣積焉，事不能無盛衰消息，一有盛衰消息，則往復憑弔生流連矣，流連不已而情深焉。凡文不足以動人，所以動人者氣也；凡文不足以入人，所以入人者情也。氣積而文昌，情深而文摯；氣昌則情摯，天下之至文也。然而其中有天有人，不可不辨也。氣得陽剛而情合陰柔，人麗陰陽之間，不能離焉者也。氣合於理，天也；氣能達理以自用，人也；情本於性，天也；情能汨性以自恣，人也。史之義出於天，而史之文不能不藉人力以成之；人有陰陽之患，而史文即忤於大道之公，其所感召者微也。夫文非氣不立，而氣貴於平；人之氣，燕居莫不平也，因事生感，而氣失則宕，氣失則激，氣失則驕，毗於陽矣；文非情不得，而情貴於正；人之情，虛置無不正也，因事生感，而情失則流，情失則溺，情失則偏，毗於陰矣。陰陽伏沴之患，乘於血氣而入於心知，其中默運潛移，似公而實逞於私，似天而實蔽於人，發為文辭，至於害義而違道，其人猶不自知也。故曰心術不可不慎也。夫氣勝而情偏，猶曰動於天而參於人也；才藝之士，則又溺於文辭以為觀美之具焉，而不知其不可也。史之賴於文也，猶衣之需乎采，食之需乎味也。采之不能無華樸，味之不能無濃淡，勢也；華樸爭而不能無邪色，濃淡爭而不能無奇味；邪色害目，奇味爽口，起於華樸濃淡之爭也。文辭有工拙，而族史方且以是為競焉，是舍本而逐末矣。以此為文，未有見其至者；以此為史，豈可與聞古人大體乎！

問題：（一）請問章學誠議論之主旨為何？（15%）

（二）有關史德，請試舉兩個具體例子，就章學誠之議論，闡述您的看法。（10%）

三、請說明下列文字之大意，並請討論下列文字提及之史學理論和歷史書寫。（25%）

The new history is history written in deliberate reaction against the traditional 'paradigm', that useful if imprecise terms put into circulation by the American historian of science Thomas Kuhn. It will be convenient to describe this traditional paradigm as 'Rankean history', after the great German historian Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886), although he was less confined by it than his followers were. We might also call this paradigm the common-sense view of history, not to praise it but to make the point that it has often - too often - been assumed to be *the* way of doing history, rather than being perceived as one among various possible approaches to the past ... According to the traditional paradigm, history is essentially concerned with politics ... The new history, on the other hand, has come to be concerned with virtually every human activity ... In the last thirty years, we have seen a number of remarkable histories of topics which had not previously been thought to possess a history, for example, childhood, death, madness, the climate, smells, dirt and cleanliness, gestures, the body, femininity, reading, speaking, and even silence. What had previously been considered as unchanging is now viewed as a 'cultural construction', subject to variation over time as well as in space.

The cultural relativism implicit here deserves to be emphasized. The philosophical foundation of the new history is the idea that reality is socially or culturally constituted ... This relativism also undermines the traditional distinction between what is central in history and what is peripheral.

Peter Burke, *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*.

四、請說明下列文字之大意與重要主張，並討論上述主張對二十世紀社會主義主義運動的影響。（25%）

In what relation do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole?

The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working-class parties. They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole. They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own, by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement.

The Communists are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only:

- (1) In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of nationality ...

The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence:

（背面仍有題目，請繼續作答）

編號： 29 、3

國立成功大學九十七學年度碩士班招生考試試題

共 4 頁，第 4 頁

系所：歷史學系·歷史學系在職專班

科目：歷史文獻解讀

本試題是否可以使用計算機：☐可使用，☒不可使用（請命題老師勾選）

考試日期：0302，節次：4

Abolition of private property ... Property, in its present form, is based on the antagonism of capital and wage labour. Let us examine both sides of this antagonism.

To be a capitalist, is to have not only a purely personal, but a social status in production. Capital is a collective product, and only by the united action of many members, nay, in the last resort, only by the united action of all members of society, can it be set in motion.

Capital is, therefore, not a personal, it is a social power.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*