

## 北京大學歷史學系簡介

提供 · 北京大學歷史學系

本系前身是1899年京師大學堂設立的史學堂，是近代中國最早建立的史學教育科系，至今已近百年。在中國這段艱苦輝煌歷史進程中，她培育了一代又一代具有歷史目光和胸襟的人才，在各條戰線都發揮了積極作用。在她的畢業生名單上，排列著一批批著名學者、革命者、愛國志士和社會賢達的名字。在她的教師行列中，先後湧現出李大釗、胡適、馬敘倫、傅斯年、孟森、錢穆、毛子水、鄭天挺、翦伯贊、陳翰笙、顧頡剛、向達、齊思和、邵循正、鄧廣銘、周一良等傑出的史學家。實事求是的優良學風，嚴謹扎實的治學態度，承前啟後，代代相傳。強大的師資陣容，豐富的教學經驗，累累的科研碩果，活躍的學術氣氛，使北大歷史系在國內外享有很高的聲譽。

本系課程門類設置齊全，分本科和研究生兩個層次，學士、碩士、博士三級學位。

本科教育從1994年起列為國家歷史學科人才培養基地，設中國史和世界史兩個專業，學制四年。基礎課程有中國通史、世界通史、中外史學史、史學理論等類別，選修課有斷代史、國別史、專題史等約十門左右，還有公共課和工具、語言、方法、輔助學科等課。此外，社會調查將學生的視野和知識引向廣闊天地；按年級逐年提交的讀史報告、讀論報告、學年論文、畢業論文，使學生經過系統的訓練，學會科學的思維和嚴謹的寫作。

本科生除主修一個專業之外，還可以輔修應用性課程和外系外專業的課程，修滿學分，即可授予輔修專業的畢業證書。學生有根據自己的興趣和愛好選擇學習領域的機會，有充分擴大知識面和發展自身潛能的餘地。

碩士研究生分四個專業，學制三年。中國古代史專業從先秦至明清分設八個斷代史，另設中西文化交流史、歷史文獻、史學史、歷史地理等，共十二個研究方向。中國近現代史專業分設近代史、現代史、中外關係史等三個研究方向。世界古代史專業分設有上古史、中世紀史兩個研究方向。世界近現代史分設主要國別史、地區史、史學理論、現代化進程、歐洲封建過渡、殖民主義史等十九個研究方向。

博士研究生分中國古代史、中國近現代史、世界近現代史、世界地區國別史四個專業，其中中國古代史、世界近現代史是國家級重點學科。全國最先設立的博士後流動站也在本系。博士導師十餘名。鄧廣銘、周一良、張芝聯、田餘慶、許大齡等史學前輩雖已退休，仍對前來請教的海內外學子，熱心指導，不遺餘力。馬克堯（歐洲中世紀史）、羅榮渠（亞非拉史）、吳榮曾（先秦史）、祝總斌（魏晉南北朝史）、閻步克（魏晉南北朝史）、吳宗國（隋唐史）、王天有（明清史）、劉桂生（中國近現代史）、王曉秋（中國近現代史）、劉祖熙（俄國東歐史）、徐天新（蘇聯史）、林承節（印度史）、沈安仁（日本史）、何芳川（世界近現代史）、郭華榕（地區國別史）、何順果（地區國別史）、鄭家馨（地區國別史）、梁志明（世界近現代史）、林被甸（世界近現代史）等著名學者，正承擔著培養博士的重任，傳道授業，誨人不倦。

為了促進系內外跨學科的交流合作，集中力量進行專深的研究，本系設立或兼管五個研究中心和研究所：中國古代史研究中心（榮譽主任鄧廣銘、主任王天有），世界現代化進程研究中心（主任羅榮渠、代主任林被甸），中外婦女問題研究中心（主任鄭必俊），中外文化研究所（主任王天有），東北亞研究所（主任宋成有）。這些機構，經常圍繞各種重大課題，召開研討會議，舉辦學術講座等。有的機構還不定期地出版自己的刊物。

全系共有教師71名，其中教授31名，副教授19名，講師、助教共21人。可謂人才濟濟，各有所長。除了教書育人之外，他們還承擔著國家級社會科學研究課題10餘項，省部級課題若干項，國際合作或海外基金獎助課題4項。每年都有大批的學術論著發表，其中很多論著在全國、教委、北京市和北大的評選活動中榮獲各種獎勵。在歷史學諸多的學科前沿領域中，活躍著本系的學者。如此豐碩的研究成果，引起海內外學術界的矚目。

每年面向海內外招收本科生50餘人，碩士研究生30餘人，博士研究生10餘人，接受各種層次的進修生10餘人，進修教師20餘人，訪問學者10餘人。國內外莘莘學子會聚一堂，切磋交流，取長補短。本系還充分注意利用首都地區和北京大學的文化地位、學術優勢和人才資源，每學期均聘請一些國內外第一流的專家學者，前來舉辦各種專題的講座、報告，將最新的學術成果和信息傳達給本系的廣大師生。這種充分面向全國、面向世界的學術環境，造就了一批又一批目光開闊、學識淵博的優秀人才，故有「學者的搖籃，知識的淵藪」之稱譽。

本系的學生會、研究生會素有熱心為廣大同學服務的優良傳統，多次被評為北大的先進群眾組織。每年五四青年節都舉辦各類有益的學術活動。學生平時自己辦有各種系列、班刊，供同學之間交流學問、思想和生活感受，以文會友。形形色色的學生社團，為志向、愛好和公益心相同的同學們提供了社會活動和交際的活躍渠道，很多同學參加了各種富有北大特色的社團活動。我系學生的文藝體育活動也豐富多采，籃球、排球、足球、田徑、棋類、歌詠、舞蹈、書法等都曾經在全校賽事中贏得好名次。許多文體高手有志於從歷史中學會深沉的思索，著名圍棋國手張文東九段目前就在全系學習。

隨著改革開放事業的不斷發展，國家和海內外各界在我系設立的各類獎、助學金也不斷增長。目前，本系每年有50多人次可以獲得各種獎助學金。其中，洪業獎學金、楊乃英獎學金、依田熹家獎學金、世川良一獎學金等厚獎，是捐助人專為歷史學系的學生和研究生設立的。凡是家庭生活困難的學生，都可申請獲得學校的專款補助。

歷史學是一門百科全書式的人文基礎學科。具有豐富歷史知識的畢業生，在眾多的工作領域中都能顯示出厚實的功底和靈活的適用性，從而在近年來競爭日趨激烈的人才市場上，擁有較好的就業前景。

「讀史明鑒」。歷史使人明智，鑒往知來，通古博今，達觀於世。我們熱情歡迎有志學史的青年學生前來報考北大歷史學系。

---

## 【研究動態】

# 回憶與歷史 ——兼論德國紀臣大學 (University of Giessen) 的「回憶文化」 研究計劃

麥勁生  
香港浸會大學歷史系

回憶(memory)與歷史兩者不可分割。每個人都有回憶的能力，生命歷程中的種種片段殘留於每個人的腦海。即使神智不清的人，仍會發覺各種過往的事件不時無秩序地呈現眼前。回憶驅使歷史家借助訪問、文獻研究及考古發掘等方法去全面認識過去。但歷史家所用的材料，嚴格來說亦只是

別人的回憶。可以說，歷史研究是千千萬萬的人，無論在世或是逝去的人的回憶的總合。回憶不單是個別人的智能活動或學術興趣，更是社群或國家的生存條件。社群或民族所以能團結凝聚，全賴成員的集體記憶(collective memory)。通常，集體記憶不時提醒大家過往的共同經歷，彼此的思想、行為及文化共通的地方，甚至那些人非我族類。缺乏了集體記憶，生活在同一環境的人們仍會問彼此有何相干。就因為一個社群或民族的興衰及發展頗受集體記憶的影響，政治家及社會領袖都喜歡塑造一些「官方的集體記憶」，以求操縱政治及社會的<sup>1</sup>。

回憶，既然與歷史、政治及社會有著千絲萬縷的關係，歷史家當然不會將之輕視。然而，較早將這幾種因素作系統的研究的，卻首推法國社會學家夏爾伯域(Maurice Halbwach)。他的重要作品大部份出現於二〇至四〇年。其《集體的記憶》(*La Memoire Collective*)更是膾炙人口的經典。也因為他與法國《年鑑》(*Annales*)歷史家過從甚密，有謂他的想法和布洛克(Marc Bloch)及費伯弗爾(Lucien Febvre)等人互相輝映。夏爾伯域對回憶的研究至少有以下三種貢獻。首先，他明確地將回憶與歷史的關係界定。他指出回憶有一神秘及情緒性的作用，它固然能將現在與過去的隔膜打破，但卻滲入太多的個人因素及價值判斷。歷史研究縱然由當代的問題引起，但其目的則在中立及批判性地研究過去。回憶通常涉及一些會一再出現的事件，而歷史研究則針對一些獨一無二的事件。回憶帶有強烈的虛幻成份而且容易消失，歷史知識則能夠驗證也能長久存在。夏爾伯域大致認為歷史的工作旨在過濾不同的記憶<sup>2</sup>。夏爾伯域的另一發見，是指出我們個人的記憶與我們的社會身份互相依從，不能分開。我們的記憶內容往往涉及我們作為某政黨、某階級、某國家的成員的所見所聞。第三，夏爾伯域強調一個群體會因特定的需要而將集體記憶重新整合剪裁。更清楚點說，它會因為不同的原因選擇性地記憶一些事情，或者忘記一些事情。夏爾伯域表明，個人的記憶若與集體記憶不相排斥，傳說習俗及各種共有信念就能得到保存，否則文化的衝突就會出現<sup>3</sup>。

自二十年代開始，回憶和集體記憶的研究逐步在歐美各國得到發展。幾項相關的項目的進步，更有助其聲勢。口述歷史經近數十年的廣泛使用，已達致較成熟的階段。歷史家開始相信，存在活人腦袋的記憶，其價值絕不下於文獻資料。另外，心理及生理學的研究，也證明活人的記憶，經數十年仍可以相當準確，足可應用於史學研究。今天的歷史家，在肯定個人回憶及集體記憶在歷史研究的貢獻外，更進而將「回憶的歷史」視為一個研究對象。很多的相關新課題先後出現。好像民族與社群保持記憶的方法(諸如民謠、民間故事及紀念碑等等)，都成了上好研究題材。一種回憶如何隨時代改變而呈現不同的面相，不但是歷史家要考慮的問題，也吸引社會心理學家的注意，隨著歷史研究領域的擴大，一些久被忽視的社群如婦女、兒童、農民及乞丐等等的經歷已廣受歷史家重視。如何重建這些社群的集體記憶，並且藉此重新檢定傳統的史學知識也是十分富挑戰性的工作。最後，一個群體的回憶也反映出它的自我形象及它如何看待自己的過往以至現狀。仔細研究一個群體的回憶有助我們以較新的角度去研究文化課題。

回憶的歷史，一直在法國史學界備受重視。至今有關的作品數量繁多。在此特意介紹德國紀臣大學的「回憶文化」研究計劃，主要有兩個理由。首先，長久以來德國在二次世界大戰之後的史學發展在華語地區少有被介紹。一般學者對十九世紀的蘭克學派(Rankean School)早有認識，但對於近二、三十年的德國史學概況可能較少涉獵。因此，本文以介紹紀臣大學這個龐大的研究計劃作為起點，逐步引介近代德國史學。其次，法國年鑑歷史家人才濟濟，影響深遠，更執社會史及文化史研究之牛耳。其他歐陸各國受其影響，復結合本土之研究傳統，進步亦十分顯著。紀臣大學的「回憶文化」研究計劃明顯有年鑑史學的影子，但亦有其本身特色。在此特別將之介紹，可助大家了解在《年鑑》以外，歐洲史學近況之一鱗半爪。

紀臣隸屬德國中部的希遜(Hessen)邦，位處法蘭克福以北約八十公里。紀臣於一二四八年被立憲為市。經數百年政治風雲，至一六〇七年成為大學城。在一九四四年間，紀臣市受盟軍猛烈轟炸，全城四份之三被夷為平地。至今這住有七萬人的城市已無復舊觀，工商業均無可觀之發展。但紀臣大學仍為德國中部較具規模的大學。全校有二千教研人員，學生二萬一千人，分屬二十學院。歷史系設中古史、藝術史、東歐史、德國區域史、近代史及現代史六個研究所。

「回憶文化」研究計劃由德國研究聯會(Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft)贊助，紀臣大學近代史教授羅德士(Gunther Lottes)統籌。單單紀臣大學就有十六個學系共同參與，包括歷史系、古典文學系、英文系、心理學系等等。附屬此研究計劃的小型研究達三十多個，當中不乏與英、法、意諸國合作者。而這些研究，題材上涉希臘羅馬時代，下達二十世紀，不像年鑑史學般集中於中世紀末至十八世紀一段時期。好像由居柏斯教授(Prof. Dr. Jochem Koppers)、蘭法斯特教授(Prof. Dr. Manfred Landfester)及馬甸尼教授(Prof. Dr. Wolfram Martini)合辦的「羅馬帝國二世紀時的回憶及文化整合」，



主要探討古典文學及藝術中表達的回憶文化。居柏斯教授的研究著重顯示二世紀的拉丁文學如何成為帝國中不同的民族的記憶互相交鋒之場地。馬甸尼教授則通過觀察二世紀的繪畫去重新發掘當時的羅馬人故意忘記的重要社會及文化元素。

另一個重要的附屬研究為羅斯拿教授(Prof. Dr. Werner Rosner)、摩勞教授(Prof. Dr. Peter Moraw)及羅德士教授的中世紀及近世研究計劃。羅斯拿教授側重分析口述傳統與文字傳統對保存回憶的不同功用，及兩者之間的衝突。而摩勞教授則考究回憶文化和德意志人的成份形成的關係。羅德士教授專長近代英國及德國社會及文化史，他對十四至十八世紀的城市中的回憶文化有深入的研究。

近代的研究副題為「十九及二十世紀的回憶文化和回憶政治」。參與者包括精研法國大革命及近代德國史的比爾丁教授(Prof. Dr. Helmut Berding)、東歐史專家賀拿(Prof. Dr. Klaus Heller)及德國殖民史專家舒伯金(Dr. Winfried Speitkamp)。比爾丁教授的研究闡釋區域性的回憶文化或國家的神話的關係。賀拿教授則指出十九至二十世紀期間，俄羅斯境內的俄羅斯人的記憶文化和其他少數民族的回憶文化的衝突。舒伯金觀察德國統治的非洲地區後，結論謂非洲的部族雖然淪為歐洲人的附庸，但在外力衝擊下，部族的回憶卻反而被重視及得到保存。

「回憶文化」研究計劃在過去三年在多方支持下甚有進展，至今先後籌備六十多次演講會及兩次大型國際會議，並定期與海外學者交流，部份作品亦已以英文、法文及德文出版<sup>4</sup>。

---

<sup>1</sup> Nathan Wachtel, "Introduction" of *Between Memory and Culture*, ed. Nathan Wachtel (Chur: Harword Academic Press, 1990), 11-12.

<sup>2</sup> Patrick H. Hutton, *History is an Art of Memory* (Hanover N H : University of Vermont, 1993), 76.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 77-80.

<sup>4</sup> 進一步資料請參閱 <http://www.uni-giessen.del~g81013/>

---

## 【學術會議】

### 玉器·絲織品·漢簡

### ——「開闢歷史教育的眼界」講座紀要

周佳榮  
香港浸會大學歷史系

1998年2月28日，香港商務印書館舉辦了一個介紹中國文物考古的學術講座，藉以推動本地的歷史教育，題為「開闊歷史教育的眼界」。筆者很榮幸被邀為這個講座的主持，一邊主持一邊學習，得益不少，實在擴闊了文化的視野。

負責主講的三位專家，分別來自內地不同的地區，各以他們的專長深入淺出地作出講解，互相配合。首先，由殷志強先生講述「玉器在新石器時代的文化意義——以良渚文化玉器為例」，他指出玉器的使用是中國古代文化的重要特徵之一，新石器時代玉器是中國玉文化的第一個高峰，而良渚文化玉器更是中國新石器時代的一支奇葩，其埋葬之獨特、組合之嚴謹、數量之眾多、用料之講究、雕琢之精細、內涵之深奧皆世所罕見。再者，新石器時代玉器奠定了中國玉文化的基礎，「君子此德於玉」應萌芽於此時，對後世影響深遠。殷志強先生現為南京博物院社會教育部主任、副研究員，對中國古玉有較深入的研究和較高的鑒定水準、有《翡翠》、《古玉至美》、《吳越文化》(合著)等著作，他此次的演講尤其闡發了玉器的文化意義。

接著，彭浩先生講述「楚國絲織品的歷史地位及文化內涵」。他指出考古所見東周時期的絲織品約二十來處，集中分佈於楚國故地。楚人繼承了養蠶織絲的傳統，廣泛吸納各國能工巧匠，不斷推陳出新，而使楚國成為當時有名的絲綢生產地。繡品的藝術風格，盡顯其無拘無束的浪漫作風和楚人獨有的審美情趣；楚人十分崇拜鬼神，繡品紋樣亦明確表達了其追求人神交往的精神世界。楚地出產的織錦和繡品，通過民族間的交往、商貿等途徑傳往歐洲和西伯利亞等地，這是目前所知中國絲織品和繡品外傳的最早實例，比張騫開通的絲綢之路要早五百多年。彭浩先生現任湖北省荊州博物館副館長、研究館員，從事戰國秦漢考古和古代簡牘文書研究，主要論著有《江陵馬山一號楚墓》、《包山楚墓》、《楚簡帛文字編》、《楚文化》(以上合作)及《楚人的紡織與服飾》等。

最後，由李永良先生講述「漢簡所見河西長城的歷史面貌」。他指出甘肅是漢代的邊防重地，政府於當地興建河西長城外，更設置了不少烽火台和要塞，以防遊牧民族入侵。從漢代留下的竹簡記錄看來，政府對長城邊塞的防務極為重視，而且管理十分完善，邊塞的簡牘上記錄了防禦武器的種類和數量，又有簡牘教導士兵如何分辨武器的良劣，士兵的日常值勤工作有明確規定，此外還有傳教軍情烽火信號的法令。政府對邊郡交通、郵驛和通訊制度的控制，也十分嚴密。總之，漢代河西的簡牘提供了許多有關當時邊防事務的重要資料，彌補了文獻資料記載的不足，其價值是不可忽視的。李永良先生現任甘肅省文物考古研究所副所長、副研究員，兼西北師範大學歷史系副教授，專長於漢代簡牘的研究。

中國的地域文化有各自的特色，而又共冶一爐，而成整全的中國文化，充分表現了其「多元一體性」。殷志強先生的演講指出，龍和鳳是中華民族的象徵，良渚文化、紅山文化(東北)和龍山文化(河南)的文物中，竟都出現了形態各異的龍鳳玉器，是中華民族肇始的象徵。全國各地新石器時代普遍使用玉器，反映了中華文化的趨同性。彭浩先生的演講亦提到，楚國繡品紋樣以龍、鳳為主題，形象奇異，變化多端；楚人彷彿把鳳鳥當作代表四方和四方鳳的神，還視其為季節和天象的代表，龍鳳相搏紋則反映楚人企求「合鬼神」，使靈魂得以升天的願望。

與會的文化界人士和中學教師逾五十人，幾乎座無虛席。南京博物院梁白泉院長和商務印書館總編輯陳萬雄博士，發表了他們對於文物考古如何與歷史教育配合的看法。荊州市博物館張緒球館長、甘肅省出版工作者協會副主席郭耀中先生、甘肅人民出版社總編辦公室桂海盛主任、南京博物院副研究員郭群先生、湖北省博物館攝影師郝勤建先生，也出席了講座。商務印書館助理總編輯張倩儀小姐，將講者提到的艱深字詞在投影機膠片上書寫出來，為聽講人士提供了很大的方便。

回想1996年1月間，商務印書館在同一會場(聯合出版集團演講廳)舉辦「考古研究與歷史教育」研討會，由孫守道先生(遼寧省文物考古研究所名譽所長)主講「東北文化之最新考古發現」、魏堅先生(內蒙古自治區文物考古研究所副所長)主講「內蒙與兩河流域之關係」，然後由香港中文大學歷史系梁元生博士及筆者作出回應，就如何運用考古發現加強歷史教育提出意見。筆者並主持了一個「中國地域文化交流晚宴」，會上孫守道先生主講「牛河梁和龍的發現」，徐秉琨先生(遼寧省博物館學會理事長)主講「東北的騎馬文化對朝鮮和日本的影響」，蘇俊先生(中國內蒙古自治區文化廳文物處處長)主講「內蒙古地區兩河流域(黃河與東部地區的西拉木倫河)的早期文明——新石器時代至早期青銅時代的考古發現研究」，著名文史學家饒宗頤教授也發表了講話。轉眼間事隔兩年餘，但其題旨和內容是逢相呼應的。

## 學人動向

### 何炳棣教授 (Prof. Ho Ping-ti) - - 應商務印書館之邀作公開演講

著名歷史家何炳棣教授應商務印書館(香港)有限公司的邀請，來港於1997年10月22日擔任「資訊時代的中國文化與社會」其中一講，作為慶祝商務印書館成立一百周年的活動之一，講題是「中國人文傳統對二十一世紀可能做出的貢獻」。何教授的演講全文，載《廿一世紀的中國與世界》(香港：商務印書館，1998年)。

何炳棣教授畢業於北京清華大學，後以清華庚款留美公費生的身份，在哥倫比亞大學完成英國及西歐史的博士學位。1965年至1987年間，任芝加哥大學歷史系湯遜講座教授。1966年當選台灣中央研究院院士，1975-76年出任美國亞洲學會會長，1979年當選美國藝文及科學院院士。何教授在五十年代末及六十年代初完成兩種主要著作，已被國際學術界列為經典之作。其一是*Studies on the Population of China, 1368-1953* (Harvard University Press, 1959; 3rd printing, 1987)；另一是*The Ladder of Success in Imperial China, 1368-1911* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964)，寺田隆信、千種真一的日譯本題為《科學與近世中國社會：立身出世階梯》(東京：平凡社，1993年)。其研究興趣在七十年代轉移到中國文化的土生起源，代表作是*The Cradle of the East: An Inquiry into the Indigenous Origins of Techniques and Ideas of Neolithic and Early Historic China, 5000-1000 B.C.* (Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong; and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975)。

何炳棣教授的中文專著有《中國會館史論》(台北：學生書局，1966年)及《黃土與中國農業的起源》(香港：香港中文大學，1969年)。較近期的著作是《中國古今土地數字的考釋和評價》(北京：社會科學出版社，1988年)，台灣版加以擴充，改題《中國歷代土地數字考實》(台北：聯經出版事業公司，1995年)。此書共分五章，依次為〈西漢末到北宋末〉、〈南宋經界法新探〉、〈明初魚鱗圖冊編製考實〉、〈明清土地數字的性質〉及〈從納稅單位到耕地面積〉，何教授且在〈序言〉中交代了他的治史經驗，極富啟發性和參考價值。

### 張壽安博士 (Dr. Chang So-an) - - 任香港浸會大學訪問學人

台灣中央研究院近代史研究所副研究員張壽安博士應香港浸會大學的聘請，來校擔任林思齊東西學術交流研究所1997年至1998年度訪問學人。

張壽安博士畢業於台灣大學中文系，為該校中文研究所碩士及香港大學哲學博士，曾在香港浸會學院(香港浸會大學前身)及美國Seton Hall University任教，主要研究明清學術思想史。相關著作有：〈戴震義理思想之基礎及其開展〉(《漢學研究》，1992：12)；〈程瑤田的義理思想——從理到物則〉(《漢學研究》，1991：12)；〈凌廷堪的正統觀〉(《第二屆清代學術研討會論文集》，1991：11)；〈十七世紀儒學思想與大眾文化間的衝突——以喪葬禮俗為例的探討〉(《漢學研究》，1993：12)。專題座談有：〈乾嘉實學研究展望〉(《中國文哲研究通訊》，台北，中央研究院文哲所，1992：12)；《乾嘉義理學研索》(《中國文哲研究通訊》，1994：3)。其專著《以禮代理——凌廷堪與清中葉儒學思想之轉變》(台北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1994年)，探討清代中葉禮學思想的興起。書中首先介紹「以禮代理」此一思潮產生的社會與經濟背景，其次闡釋此思想首倡者凌廷堪(1755-1809年)禮學思想的內容；再說明嘉道間崇禮思想蔚起，並分析當時的禮、理爭議；最後討論禮學思想的實踐，以證明清學在思想與經世間的聯繫性。此書出版後，於1996年榮獲首屆「中央研究院年輕研究人員著作獎」。

最近，張壽安博士出版了另一本專著《龔自珍學術思想研究》（台北：文史出版社，1997年）。此書除〈緒論〉及〈結論〉外，共有五章：第一章〈自珍的生平及思想背景〉，首先對龔氏及其時代作一交代；第二章〈自珍的治經態度〉，討論其對乾嘉學的批評及治經態度的轉變；第三章〈自珍的尊史思想〉，分尊古之心、鈎沈古史兩節論述龔氏經、史思想一以貫之及其經世思想之成立；第四章〈自珍的公羊學〉闡明常州學的興起和發展，以及龔氏與劉逢祿、魏源公羊學之異同；第五章〈自珍的經世思想〉，分析他對時政的譏評、經濟重農思想及變革思想等言論。

### **周策縱教授 (Prof. Chow Tse-tsung) - - 獲香港浸會大學頒授榮譽博士學位**

香港浸會大學於1997年12月4日頒授榮譽文學博士學位給國際著名學者及教育家周策縱教授。周教授祖籍湖南，畢業於中國政治大學；其後負笈美國密芝根大學，於1955年獲博士學位。1961年任職威斯康辛大學東亞研究系，1966年榮陞教授，1973年至1979年間任系主任，1994年起為榮休教授。他數十年來一直從事研究和教學工作，桃李遍天下。

周策縱教授於1960年出版其代表作*The May-fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China* (Harvard University Press, 1960)，轟動學壇，為五四運動研究開闢了新天地，至今仍為有關方面的必讀經典著作。此書有幾個中譯本，較早的是：周策縱原著，默夫編譯《五四運動史》（台北：龍田出版社，1981年修訂再版）；近期則有丁愛真等譯《五四運動史》（香港：明報出版社，1995年）。

周策縱教授亦精於文學研究，1971年出版的《論王國維的人間詞》（香港：萬有圖書公司，1972年）從中西文學理論分析王國維的詞話和作品，發前人之未發。他對《紅樓夢》一書愛好甚深，並將紅學研究發展成為國際漢學研究的重點之一。此外，他也是一位詩人。

### **陳學霖教授 (Prof. Chan Hok Lam) - - 就職香港中文大學講座教授演講**

香港中文大學於1998年2月27日在該校陳國本樓演講廳舉行講座教授就職演講，由歷史學講教授陳學霖教授主講「從『封建』到『封建主義』——古詞新釋與國史研究」。

陳學霖教授的演講題旨，是追溯「封建」一詞的源流及語義，及探討其在後代經過不同意識形態的詮釋而產生的變化，以此作為思想史及史學的個案研究。他指出「封建」一詞在帝制結束之前具有正面形像，民國以來，「封建」之義從制度變為概念進而為「主義」，成為攻擊舊社會傳統的矛頭，更與馬克思學說的社會發展階段理論配合而被賦予負面意義。透過「古詞新釋」的論釋方法，考察「封建」這詞匯三千年來語義和用法的演變，分析其在不同時代的功能，鑒古知今，正可體認歷史的多元層面和避開意識形態的糾纏，為歷史研究開創「範式」(paradigm)。陳教授的演講全文載《中文大學校刊》附刊三十九。

陳學霖教授原籍廣東新會縣，生於香港，香港大學文學士、碩士，美國普林斯頓大學博士，專攻宋金元明史。歷任紐西蘭奧克蘭大學歷史系高級講級、美國哥倫比亞大學《明代名人傳》編纂研究員、澳洲國立大學遠東史系研究員、台灣大學歷史系客座教授、美國華盛頓大學傑克遜國際研究學院及歷史系教授，現任香港中文大學歷史學講座教授及《中國文化研究所學報》主編。

### **黃嫣梨博士 (Dr. Wong Yin Lee) - - 應聘為天津南開大學周恩來研究中心特邀研究員**

天津南開大學於1997年6月成立周恩來研究中心，旋即聘任香港浸會大學歷史系副教授黃嫣梨博士為永久性的特邀研究員。黃博士在此之前，已於4月間訪問南開大學，發表題為「天津『女愛會』與『覺悟社』的婦女先鋒暨馬克思主義傳佈者——張若名及其著作」的演講。1998年3月底至4月初，又出席了天津市政府與南開大學合辦的第二屆周恩來研究國際學術討論會，並宣讀論文，題目是〈周恩來在舊詩中所表現的愛國情懷〉。南開大學歷史系同時聘任黃博士為客座研究員，為期三年。

黃嫣梨博士畢業於香港浸會學院，其後在澳門東亞大學取得文學士學位，在香港大學取得哲學碩士及哲學博士學位。專著有《從詩詞看中國婦女心態》（香港：波文書局，1983年）、《漢代婦女文學五家研究》（香港：API Press, 1990年；開封：河南大學出版社，1993年）、《朱淑真及其作品》（香港：三聯書店，1991年；台北：新文豐山版社，1991年）、《蔣春霖評傳》（台北：文史哲出版社，1993年；南京：南京大學出版社，1997年）、《中國文化與婦女》（香港：香港教育圖書公司，1994年）等，編著有《香港浸會大學校史》（香港：香港浸會大學，1996年）、《張若名研究及資料輯集》（香港：香港大學亞洲研究中心，1997年）等。

### 王雙懷博士 (Dr. Wang Shuanghuai) - - 任香港浸會大學歷史學系訪問學人

陝西師範大學歷史系副教授王雙懷博士參加香港浸會大學與亞洲基督教高等教育聯會合辦的中國學人訪問計劃，於1998年10月15日起成為浸大歷史系的訪問學人，至1999年6月30日止，為期九個月。

王雙懷博士著有《武則天評傳》（與趙文潤合作，三秦出版社，1993年）、《陝西通史·歷史地理卷》（與史念海、蕭正洪合作，陝西師範大學出版社，1998年），其博士論文《明代華南農業地理研究》亦將於近期出版。王博士專長隋唐文化史、女性史及歷史地理，訪港期間將致力於有關方面的研究。

（香港浸會大學歷史系資料室）

---

## 【Historian and History】

# Jacob Burckhardt: A Man of Contradictions

Yik-yi Chu  
Department of History  
Hong Kong Baptist University

When I was thinking about the title for the article, my first reaction was to call it “Jacob Burckhardt: The Cultural Historian,” which reflects the common understanding of this nineteenth-century scholar. On second thought, I believe that the description, “Jacob Burckhardt: A Man of Contradictions,” is more apt and encompassing than the former, in throwing light on his life, theories, and scholarship. It might seem strange to some readers, who know about Burckhardt, that I plan to talk about his ironies, and the opposites in his philosophy. After all, this Swiss historian came from the most prestigious family in Basel, went to the University of Berlin, which was the focus of intellectual attention in Europe at that time, and got his doctorate at the age of only twenty-five. His book, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (1860), received much praise and fame, as one of the first modern attempts to study cultural history. Spending most of his life teaching at the University of Basel, Burckhardt did not have a heavy workload. The lectures of his late years were plainly meditation exercises for students in front of his portfolio of drawings. Surely, Burckhardt's life seemed stable, enjoyable and admirable. It appeared to be free of conflicts, like the history of the Italian Renaissance, which he sought to portray.



In fact, Burckhardt's life was full of contradictions, so as nineteenth-century Europe, and this was reflected in, and became a feature of his scholarship. Having originally decided to succeed his father as a pastor, Burckhardt finally concluded that God did not exist. Respected as part of the German intellectual tradition, and having owed much of his thinking to Leopold von Ranke, Burckhardt dismissed his former teacher, and only returned to Berlin once after his graduation in 1843. While *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* was a search for the origins of modernity, Burckhardt proclaimed to be a diehard conservative, and refused to participate in any discussions on the political and social issues of the modern age of nineteenth-century Europe. Indeed, Burckhardt was a misfit of his time, always ready to live as an outsider.<sup>1</sup> As a cultural historian, he stressed the importance of culture in providing the European people with an identity. In some ways, he was also a culturalist, devoting his attention to the daily life of the ordinary people, and emphasizing culture as the underlying thread that ran through all the political cycles in history. However, it will be a great leap from here, to conclude that Burckhardt considered history only a record of the everyday life of the people. In *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, his intent was not to find out what history was, but to tell his fellow people what to look for in their history. Burckhardt showed a strong distaste for the rising phenomenon of nation-states, the upsurge of the power of the state, and the appearance of mass movements in nineteenth-century Europe. He wanted Europeans to understand their own culture, so that each individual could discover and perfect himself/herself, and resist the overwhelming pressure of politics and the irrationality of the mob. According to Burckhardt, the Renaissance seemed to be the golden age for the development of the individual, embracing the early praiseworthy qualities of modernity. Thus, his book carried an aristocratic liberal agenda: emphasizing the individual while deploring mass revolutions. He wrote strictly for his own time, and his own Europeans. Burckhardt's cultural history was not a declaration of what history should be, but his remedy for the problems of nineteenth-century Europe. Interestingly, I doubt that Burckhardt would have been willing to write a cultural history of his own time, considering his abhorrence at mass movements.

### ***Burckhardt's Cultural History***

*The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* established Burckhardt as a pioneer of cultural history. In the early nineteenth century, the field of cultural history had already received recognition, though it was only the endeavor of a few.<sup>2</sup> Karl Dietrich Hullmann was one of those historians, who offered classes on the life of the ordinary people. He identified two functions of cultural history: to explore the daily life of society and its different groups, which had seldom been studied before, and to differentiate between the various stages in history. Focusing on urban activities, he came up with a six-volume work in the 1820s, on the towns of the Middle Ages, discussing about different aspects of life, such as drinking and gambling, festivals, fashion, trade, family and prostitution. It seemed that Burckhardt had found some support from this earlier scholarship, as similar subjects soon appeared in *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*: costumes and fashions, music, domestic life and festivals. In addition, Hullmann's cultural history was a response to the lingering sentiments of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, that one historical period could stand out more superior than its past, in purely qualitative terms. Employing the criterion of cultural and social advancement, he put forth "four brilliant ages" in history, that of Alexander and Pericles, Caesar and Augustus, Medici, and Louis XIV.<sup>3</sup> The concept of continuity, embedded in Hullmann's analysis, was characteristic of the scholarship in the nineteenth century. Every great era in history had its origins and causes, and it became the job of the historian to locate them.

Such qualitative evaluation of history was evident even in Burckhardt's earliest work, *Age of Constantine* (1852). In the book, he identified a transitional period from the classical to the medieval, which witnessed the shocking situation of the aging of the classical culture.<sup>4</sup> After Burckhardt had pointed out this epoch of cultural crisis, he recognized another historical period, but of an opposite nature. He talked about the revival of antiquity in *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. The later work represented "the search for the definition and causes of modernity," which was a common theme among intellectuals of the nineteenth century.<sup>5</sup> As Burckhardt wrote: "The most elevated political thought and the most varied forms of human development are found united in the history of Florence, which in this sense deserves the name of the most modern state in the world."<sup>6</sup> Thus, the modern age began in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.<sup>7</sup> In Burckhardt's opinion, the roots of modernity lay in the Italian Renaissance, as it was the time, in which the

individual was able to attain his/her highest development. The Renaissance was praiseworthy, because of its subjective advancement of the “spiritual individual,” who had a free personality, being cosmopolitan and all-sided.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, it was not just an imitation of ancient art, but “a new rebirth” of the antiquity.<sup>9</sup> This understanding of the Renaissance demonstrated Burckhardt's belief in the continuity of history, no great moment could stand alone without some connections with the past. He expressed the idea in *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*: “But culture, as soon as it freed itself from the fantastic bonds of the Middle Ages, could not at once and without help find its way to the understanding of the physical and intellectual world. It needed a guide, and found one in the ancient civilization, with its wealth of truth and knowledge in every spiritual interest.”<sup>10</sup>

In *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, culture was the “ridicule and wit” of the individual, the rejuvenation of ancient art, architecture and classics, the popularization of education, scientific discoveries, religions, even social practices and festivals. In particular, Burckhardt devoted much attention to aesthetics. This was easy to understand, as he was also an artist, who expressed his admiration for Italian art and culture in his drawings and paintings. His earlier work *Cicerone* (1853), which was “a guide to the enjoyment of art in Italy,” earned him a teaching position at the Polytechnique in Zurich in 1855.<sup>11</sup> In Basel, he was professor of History, as well as professor of the History of Art. Often, Burckhardt was referred to as the aesthete and the historian. Nevertheless, his idea of culture was much broader than the mere expression of artistic forms. In *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, he talked about small social details, such as the perfumes, hotels, inns and jokes. In a collection of his lecture notes in Basel, which was published after his death, Burckhardt defined culture as “the sum of all that has *spontaneously* arisen for the advancement of the material life and as an expression of spiritual and moral life--all social intercourse, technologies, arts, literatures, and sciences.”<sup>12</sup>

### *His Concept of Modernity*

Burckhardt's concept of modernity exhibited the contradictions, which he had in life. After having decided that the birth of Christ was just a myth, he quitted his studies in theology in Basel, and entered the University of Berlin, to study history with the distinguished professor, Ranke. At the age of twenty-one, he was electrified by the lectures of Ranke, declaring that he would devote himself totally to history, even at the expense of having a family.<sup>13</sup> Indeed, his career seemed to occupy his total attention, and he never married. Having remarked that he had Germany to thank for everything, Burckhardt's historical method closely followed that of Ranke, relying on intensive archival research. However, he would never admit the influence of his former teacher. After the two men met by chance in Paris in 1843, when Burckhardt was working on the Italian material for the “Burgundian invasion of Switzerland in the year 1444,” he prided himself on having ridiculed “little Ranke” and his teacher's small collection of archival documents.<sup>14</sup> Despite the fact that he was considered one of the figures of the German historical tradition, Burckhardt felt that he had enough of Berlin, and refused to replace Ranke as the prestigious Chair of History in 1872. It seemed that Burckhardt tended to dislike people, with whom he once had close connections. He wanted to keep a distance from any place or any tradition, which he knew well. As usual, Burckhardt felt safe to live as an outsider. He refused to be identified with Berlin, and suspected the city's modern industrial growth and mass movements. As part of the modern age, he looked at it with ambiguity.

As a historian of his statute, I would say that Burckhardt did not get enough satisfaction from his teaching job. Friedrich Nietzsche, who was professor of classical philology in Basel, greatly enjoyed Burckhardt's lectures. Although Nietzsche was not the only admirer, he remarked: “I believe I am the only one of his sixty hearers who understands his profound train of thought with all its strange circumlocutions and abrupt breaks.”<sup>15</sup> Before a class started, Burckhardt memorized his lecture notes. He then went into the lecture hall, stood in front of the desk, and began his talk. The students' impression was that although he did not have any notes, Burckhardt “never sought for words, never hesitated, never corrected himself.”<sup>16</sup> When he was young, he was an aesthete, an artist, and a historian, who wore long hair. In his late years, Burckhardt was often referred to as the old man who carried a portfolio. By then, his lectures became hard to understand, as his students could not make any sense out of merely sitting there, and staring at a painting. It seemed that Burckhardt had no intention to make himself clear.

Burckhardt's ambiguity was reflected in his understanding of modernity. In *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, modernity expressed itself in the form of “openness, progress and enlightenment.”<sup>17</sup> Conflicts and struggles seemed to be absent. In a way, this was reminiscent of Burckhardt’s years: optimistic and free of turmoil. He died in 1897, at the end of the so-called liberal century, and never had a chance to experience the world war. On the other hand, Burckhardt's glorification of the Renaissance represented his doubts and criticism about the modern age. He resented the inference of the state and the Church in the life of the people, the mobilization of the masses, and the pressure of politics. As Felix Gilbert points out, Burckhardt admired the Italian Renaissance because it set free human potential, which was previously restrained and suppressed. Gilbert continued: “Along with this emancipation, however, came centralization and urbanization, an increasing influence of the masses, and a popularization of taste and art--briefly, developments characteristic of the modern age; and they threatened to suffocate those human qualities on which originally the emergence of modern culture had been based.”<sup>18</sup> To Burckhardt, politics was dead in the nineteenth century, and his ideal society was that of the small Italian states.<sup>19</sup> Here, he rejected the concept of progress. History was a series of cycles: when one stage fell, another would rise to take its place. The succession of stages did not point to greater progress, and in this way, Burckhardt did not share the confidence, which other intellectuals had, in their future.

Burckhardt's reservations about the modern age represented “an escape outside of modernity.”<sup>20</sup> When he wrote to his sister in 1841, he proclaimed that he had “the courage to be a conservative and not to give in.”<sup>21</sup> Against the prominent political notion of nation-states, he argued that the basis for collective identity was not the association with a nation-state, but the sharing of a common culture. To Burckhardt, it was the intellectual's role to encourage the “intellectual, aesthetic and moral cultivation of the individual as a necessary . . . requirement for worthwhile community life in a free society.”<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, the state and the Church hindered the free expression of ideas and the development of the individual. Education and the development of critical judgment became the only solution to political and social problems. This would be the job of educators, not of politicians nor of propagandists. Openly, Burckhardt expressed his contempt for politics in Berlin, describing his detachment from political activities as a “flight to Italy,” to the Renaissance in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.<sup>23</sup>

There was a long list of Burckhardt's dislikes. He disapproved of the French Revolution and the United States. He criticized “mass democracy, uniformity, industrialism, militarism, nationalism, the railways,” and the worship of power and money.<sup>24</sup> Against the unification of Germany and Italy, he instead supported the breakdown of the modern centralized state, and the dispersal of its power among a number of small independent entities.

### ***Burckhardt and/against the German Historical Tradition***

Burckhardt inherited from Ranke the emphasis on meticulous archival research. From the beginning, he attended Ranke's lectures to study historical methods.<sup>25</sup> Even though Burckhardt was not particularly fond of Florence (as he was of Rome), he worked diligently in its libraries, where he had “to work in a winter in a coat and woollen gloves.”<sup>26</sup> Burckhardt paid much attention to historical sources, but he did not support the objectivist view of making the facts speak for themselves. As an educator, his work carried the purpose of guiding his fellow Europeans to become good citizens of their community.

While he followed the tradition of sticking to the sources, Burckhardt deviated from Ranke's focus on political history. His concept of cultural history was without political developments, chronology and geography.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, he was against the major element of German historicism, that history had its own laws, and followed a pattern of progression to higher stages of human development. Fundamentally, Burckhardt rejected the concept of teleology, denying that events took place in order to fulfill a universal purpose. He dismissed Hegel, when he remarked: “I simply don't believe in an *a priori* standpoint; that is a matter for the World Spirit, not for the historian.”<sup>28</sup> He refused to see history within a framework of systems. Three years after the mental collapse of Nietzsche, Burckhardt admitted that he had never understood the philosopher. Nietzsche had sent all publications to Burckhardt, who simply considered them too much for his

“old poor head,” and claimed that he was never “philosophically minded.”<sup>29</sup> When he was teaching in Basel, Burckhardt told his students not to expect any philosophies of history from him. To him, history was not systematic and systems were not historical.<sup>30</sup> In Burckhardt's definition of culture, which was cited earlier in this article, he added: “It is the realm of the variable, free, not necessarily universal, of all that cannot lay claim to compulsory authority.”<sup>31</sup>

Neither was he interested in the positivist approach, of constructing empirically-grounded arguments. In *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, Burckhardt occasionally provided some data, which served only an illustrative purpose. Also, he did not talk about economics in his books, which was rather rare in the midst of the intellectual trend in the nineteenth century.

While ignoring the trend toward scientific research, Burckhardt referred to history as an art. The qualities of imagination, literature and poetry were important in the writing of history. Having experienced the “quiet despair” of tackling a “new three-volume work whose important new content could be consigned to 4 or 5 pages,” Burckhardt took the effort to make *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* short and readable. The result was that it was a “brilliantly written book,” which was considered, in his time, “a model for the treatment of cultural history.”<sup>32</sup> Interestingly, Burckhardt was well-known for being “notoriously reluctant to bother with his books after they were published.” The second edition of *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, which came out nine years after the original one, was the last to have underwent his supervision.<sup>33</sup>

### Conclusion

*The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* seemed to have attained even more recognition after Burckhardt's death than during his time. Contradictions also characterized the reception of the book. Treating it as a modern approach to history, contemporary scholars were fond of its idea of researching into the ordinary life of the people, rather than concentrating on political struggles, important men and events. However, Burckhardt had shown his admiration for great personalities, which was reflected in the discussions of prominent painters, writers and their work. He had no intention of downplaying human talents, but he pointed out that too much power might lead to corruption and decadence. In addition, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* had painted a simple and over-glorified picture, ignoring the shortcomings, rivalries and conflicts of the time. Burckhardt over-emphasized the equality of status between men and women. In a way, the book was a conservative's rosy image of a forgone civilization, which he admired.

---

<sup>1</sup> H.R. Trevor-Roper, “Introduction,” in Jacob Burckhardt, *On History and Historians*, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958), xi; Felix Gilbert, *History: Politics or Culture? Reflection on Ranke and Burckhardt* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 66.

<sup>2</sup> Gilbert, *History: Politics or Culture*, 45-49.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 48.

<sup>4</sup> Peter Burke, “Introduction,” in Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S.G.C. Middlemore (London: Penguin Books, 1990), 7.

<sup>5</sup> Roberta Garner, “Jacob Burckhardt as a Theorist of Modernity: Reading *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*,” *Sociological Theory* 8 (Spring 1990): 48.

<sup>6</sup> Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, 65.

<sup>7</sup> Gilbert, *History: Politics or Culture*, 63.



- [8](#) Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, 98-101.
- [9](#) *Ibid.*, 121.
- [10](#) *Ibid.*, 123.
- [11](#) Alison Brown, "Jacob Burckhardt's Renaissance," *History Today* 38 (October 1988): 21.
- [12](#) Jacob Burckhardt, *Reflections on History* (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1979), 59-60.
- [13](#) Brown, "Jacob Burckhardt's Renaissance," 20.
- [14](#) *Ibid.*, 21.
- [15](#) *Ibid.*
- [16](#) *Ibid.*
- [17](#) Garner, "Jacob Burckhardt as a Theorist of Modernity," 49.
- [18](#) Gilbert, *History: Politics or Culture*, 67.
- [19](#) *Ibid.*, 65.
- [20](#) Richard F. Sigurdson, "Jacob Burckhardt: The Cultural Historian as Political Thinker," *The Review of Politics* 52 (Summer 1990): 417.
- [21](#) *Ibid.*, 419.
- [22](#) *Ibid.*, 420.
- [23](#) *Ibid.*, 421.
- [24](#) Burke, "Introduction," 3-4.
- [25](#) Brown, "Jacob Burckhardt's Renaissance," 22.
- [26](#) *Ibid.*
- [27](#) Gilbert, *History: Politics or Culture*, 50.
- [28](#) Brown, "Jacob Burckhardt's Renaissance," 20.
- [29](#) *Ibid.*, 22.
- [30](#) Burke, "Introduction," 4.
- [31](#) Burckhardt, *Reflections on History*, 60.
- [32](#) Brown, "Jacob Burckhardt's Renaissance," 21.
- [33](#) Peter Murray, "Notes," in Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, 353.

### *Further References*

- Brown, Alison. "Jacob Burckhardt's Renaissance," *Historians Today* 38 (October 1988): 20-26.
- Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. Translated by S.G.C. Middlemore. London: Penguin Books, 1990.
- . *On History and Historians*. With an Introduction by H.R. Trevor-Roper. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958.
- . *Reflections on History*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1979.
- Garner, Roberta. "Jacob Burckhardt As a Theorist of Modernity: Reading *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*," *Sociological Theory* 8 (Spring 1990): 48-57.
- Gilbert, Felix. *History: Politics or Culture? Reflections on Ranke and Burckhardt*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Kahan, Alan S. *Aristocratic Liberalism: The Social and Political Thought of Jacob Burckhardt, John Stuart Mill, and Alexis de Tocqueville*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Sigurdson, Richard F. "Jacob Burckhardt: The Cultural Historian as Political Thinker," *The Review of Politics* 52 (Summer 1990): 417-37.
- 

### 【Academic Conference】

## A Brief Note on the International Conference on "James Legge: The Heritage of China and the West"

Wong Man-kong  
Hong Kong Baptist University

James Legge was popularly known in the West as the first Professor of Chinese at the University of Oxford. Not only was his professorial career a thought-provoking topic in the scale of the history of cultural interaction between China and the West, his missionary career in Hong Kong was of equal significance. The life and times of James Legge become a subject as a point of departure for two dozens of papers being presented in the international conference on "James Legge: The Heritage of China and the West." It was organized at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland, between 8 and 11 April 1997.

Lord Wilson of Tillyorn, also the Chancellor of the University of Aberdeen and Patron of the conference, delivered his opening address. Furthermore, Prof. Paul A. Cohen, Professor of History, Wellesley College, and a research fellow at Fairbank Center for East Asian Studies, Harvard University, was invited to present the keynote address. Furthermore, Mr. Christopher Legge, James Legge's great grandson delivered his

concluding address. There were altogether ten panels for presentation and discussion. In addition to numerous contributions in Aberdeen, there were twenty-three scholars from different parts of the world presented their papers in this conference. What follows is a list of the papers and their authors.

“China, Christianity, and Hong Kong,” by Prof. Joanna Waley-Cohen, Department of History, New York University.

“Robert Morrison of the LMS: the Protestant Pioneer as China Watcher and China Scholar, 1807-1834,” by Prof. Murray A. Rubinstein, Department of History, Baruch College of the City University of New York.

“Son of the Pioneer: A Preliminary Investigation into the Life of John Robert Morrison,” by Prof. J. Barton Starr, Department of History, Hong Kong Baptist University.

“Early Protestant Missionary Work on Judaism and the Old Testament in the Chinese Language,” by Ms. Zhou Xun, Department of History, SOAS, University of London.

“Karl Gutzlaff, James Legge, and the Propagation of the Gospel in South-China, 1843-1873,” by Dr. R. G. Tiedemann, Department of History, SOAS, University of London.

“Taiping-Protestant Christian Guanxi: Hong Rengang and Li Zhenggao, James Legge and the Basel Missionaries,” by Prof. Jessie Lutz, Professor of History Emeritus, Rutgers University.

“James Legge and the Methodology of Mission,” Prof. James Thrower, Center for the Study of Religions, University of Aberdeen.

“Yin-yang Interaction: James Legge and Chinese Christians,” by Dr. Wong Man-kong, Department of History, Hong Kong Baptist University.

“Christianity, Missionaries, and Imperialism in China: A Reappraisal,” by Prof. Robert Entenmann, Department of History, St. Olaf College.

“James Legge's Studies of China,” Prof. Gu Weiming, Department of History, Center of Religion and Culture Studies, Shanghai Institute of Education.

“James Legge and the Strange Saga of Sinological Orientalism and the Comparative Science of Religions in the nineteenth century,” by Prof. Norman Girardot, Department of Religious Studies, Lehigh University.

“Recent Developments in Research on Christianity in the People's Republic of China,” by Prof. Tao Feiya, Department of History, Shandong University.

“James Legge and the Forgotten Proto-Martyr of the Protestant Chinese -- Ch'ea Kim-kwong,” by Dr. Lauren Pfister, Department of Religion and Philosophy, Hong Kong Baptist University.

“Missions Schools in the Early Twentieth Century: Presbyterians on Hainan Island as a Case Study,” by Prof. Kathleen Lodwick, Department of History, Pennsylvania State University.

“The Hong Kong Government Central School and the new Hong Kong Government Education System: The Relative Contributions of James Legge, George Smith, and Frederick Stewart,” by Dr. Gillian Bickley, Department of English, Hong Kong Baptist University.

“With the Ease and Grace of a Born Bishop: James Legge's Contribution to Religious and Secularist Education in Hong Kong,” by Prof. Anthony Sweeting, Department of Curriculum Studies, University of Hong Kong.

“Fugitive in Paradise: Wang Tao and his Life in Hong Kong,” by Dr. Elizabeth Sinn, Department of History, University of Hong Kong.

“Chinese Christians as Merchants: The Hop Yat (Union) Church and the Sincere Company of Hong Kong,” by Dr. Stephanie Chung, Department of History, Hong Kong Baptist University.

“Legge and Confucius: Sinology, Religion and the Confucian Tradition,” by Prof. Rodney Taylor, Graduate School, University of Colorado at Boulder.

“James Legge as a Student of Classical Chinese: the case of the Shih-ching,” by Prof. David Honey, Department of Chinese, Brigham Young University.

“James Legge and the Chinese Mythological Tradition.” by Prof. Anne Birrell, Clare Hall, University of Cambridge.

“James Legge's Lesser Known Works: His Chinese Theological Treaties,” by Dr. Samuel Chao, Pedderdine University.

“The Other Term Question: The Translation of Baptism, and its Effects on the Protestant Mission in China,” by Dr. Jost Zetzsche, University of Hamburg.

---

## 【Academic Conference】

# A Report on the "International Conference on Hong Kong and Modern China"

Chung Po-yin  
Department of History  
Hong Kong Baptist University

Jointly organized by the University of Hong Kong and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, sponsored by the Lord Wilson Heritage Trust and the New Asia Cultural Foundation, a International Conference on Hong Kong and Modern China was held on December 3 to 5, 1997 in the University of Hong Kong. The conference had attracted more than 130 participants, including at least 95 presentors from different part of the world. The majority of the participants was from mainland China, Hong Kong and Taiwan. About twenty of them were from Japan, Britain, Canada, Australia, and the United States of America.

The occasion was a horizon-widening experience for any China and Hong Kong observer. The coverage of the papers presented, including politics, economics, sociology, history, gender studies, archeology, and cultural studies, was extremely wide. There were more than 30 sessions, covering such topics as:

- Hong Kong in Ancient History
- Hong Kong Social and Economic Networks
- Modern Economic Development of Hong Kong
- Merchants and Hong Kong Society
- Hong Kong Society: Welfare and Women



- Political Interaction Between Hong Kong and Modern China
- The Hong Kong Economy and the China Market
- Guangzhou, Hong Kong and Macau: A Comparative Perspective
- Hong Kong in Sino-British Relations
- Public Health in Hong Kong: A Historical Perspective
- Hong Kong Labour: Past and Present
- Hong Kong and Chinese Mainland: Dependence & Autonomy
- Hong Kong - China Relations
- Hong Kong Culture & Education
- History of the New Territories
- Guangzhou, Hong Kong and Macau During the 1911 Revolution
- Hong Kong, Guangxi and Shanghai Connections
- Hong Kong and Chinese Mainland: Business & Economic Connections
- Social and Cultural Interaction Between Hong Kong and China
- Hong Kong History: Materials and Archives
- Hong Kong Political History
- Contemporary Issues of Hong Kong Politics
- The Reversion of Hong Kong to China: An Overview
- History of Hong Kong Institutions
- Hong Kong Culture and Religion
- Hong Kong Society: An Overview
- Hong Kong Literacy History

Varied as they were, the papers touched upon a similar issue - the nature of Hong Kong Society - as a melting pot between the East and the West, the ancient and the modern.

Tong Te-kong (City University of New York), in his “The Formation of the Nanyue Vassalage 204-111 BC: Beginning of Chinese Frontierism in South China”, depicted the “barbaric origin” of South China and illustrated how the barbaric south became part of China. The paper was followed by Bai Yunxiang's (Chinese Academy of Social Science). Bai concluded in his “An Archaeological Study of Ancient Hong Kong Society” that the cultural links between Hong Kong and the Pearl Delta was constituted prior to the Qin-Han period. Lee Chee-kong (Lutheran Theological Seminary), in his “Hong Kong in the Introduction of Western Ideas of Prosperity to China, 1840-1850s”, illustrated how such western books as “New Book of Making Wealth” and “Chinese Serial” were introduced to Hong Kong through missionary activities. Feng Zhongping (China Institute of Contemporary International Relations) suggested in his “Prospects for Sino-British Relations After 1997” that the resumption of Chinese sovereignty in Hong Kong and the victory of the Labour Party in Britain provided golden opportunity for Britain and China to develop a “relationship of co-operative partnership”.

Choi Po King (The Chinese University of Hong Kong) discussed, in her “The Women's Movement and Local Identity in Hong Kong”, the historical origin of feminist movement in Hong Kong. Lam Chiu-wan and Nelson Chow (both from the University of Hong Kong) traced the idea of social welfare back to the pre-war Hong Kong. Carney T. Fisher suggested, through her “The Plague in Hong Kong 1894”, that the plague in 1894 provided a “classical example of colonial hygiene and medicine.” She also discussed the cultural and political aspects of the plague in Hong Kong history. Ng Shek-hong (University of Hong Kong) illustrated in his paper, “Hong Kong Labour Law in Retrospect”, the historical path of Hong Kong's labour law in the last four decades. He suggested that “the use of labour law formulation as a political weapon by the Hong Kong government and diverse political groupings ... before 1997 has unwittingly distorted labour law and labour relations in Hong Kong.”

Zhou Jianming (Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences), in his “Hong Kong-China Relationships as Viewed from the Development of the Market Economy”, talked about the contribution of Hong Kong to China's economic reform. The argument was carried further by Tong Penchian (Shenzhen University). His paper, entitled “A Brief Comment on Economic Integration and Cooperation between Shenzhen and Hong Kong”, cited the Shenzhen's experience as a test case of China's modernization process. Chen Cheich Hsuan (Tunghai University), through his “The Impact of Hong Kong's Reversion on Market Formation in China”, suggested that modern Hong Kong was moving from a “status-oriented” society toward a “professional-oriented” society.

David Faure (University of Oxford), in his “The Common People in Hong Kong History”, concluded that there were several recurring themes in the writing of Hong Kong history - “G.B. Endacott began with government policies, James Hayes continued with the history of the people of the New Territories, Elizabeth Sinn and Carl Smith describes the elites, and Ming K. Chan and Tsai Jung-fang have started on the history of the working classes”. He suggested that at this stage Hong Kong history could be written from at least one more perspective: from the perspective of the common people, that is, a common experience overriding dialect and income differences. He believed that the experience included the “process of immigration and settlement, the evolution of the workplace, lifestyle, dreams and reality, the history of aspirations”.

---