



哈佛大學圖書館



此圖為哈佛大學新建圖書館之像此館為維得納(Widener)夫人出資修建以爲其子紀念者也(其子為哈佛畢業生死於前年鐵丹斯克(Titanic)沈沒之難)哈佛圖書館建立在二百年前藏書九十八萬二百七十五冊實美國大學圖書館中藏書之最富者也

FAU Studies and Sources in Sinology 1

Marc Andre Matten / Yang Zhao

The Transnational Development of China's Modern Historiography

The Role of Chinese Doctoral Students at American Universities during the Republican Era (1912-1949)



Marc Andre Matten / Yang Zhao

The Transnational Development of China's Modern Historiography
The Role of Chinese Doctoral Students at American Universities
during the Republican Era (1912-1949)

FAU Studies and Sources in Sinology

Band 1

Editors:

Andrea Bréard

Marc Andre Matten

Editorial Board:

Iwo Amelung (Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main)

Lorenzo Andolfatto (University of Fribourg)

Pablo Blitstein (EHESS, Paris)

Federico Brusadelli (Università di Napoli L'Orientale)

Fan Xin (Cambridge University)

Natascha Gentz (University of Edinburgh)

Arunabh Ghosh (Harvard University)

Joan Judge (York University)

Li Xuetao (Beijing Foreign Studies University)

Xavier Paulès (EHESS, Paris)

Henrike Rudolph (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen)

Dominic Sachsenmaier (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen)

Sebastian Veg (EHESS, Paris)

Kai Vogelsang (Universität Hamburg)

Wang Youjun (Shanghai Normal University)

Marc Andre Matten / Yang Zhao

The Transnational Development of China's Modern Historiography

The Role of Chinese Doctoral Students at American
Universities during the Republican Era (1912-1949)

Erlangen
FAU University Press
2023

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Bitte zitieren als

Matten, Marc Andre/Yang, Zhao: 2023. *The Transnational Development of China's Modern Historiography. The Role of Chinese Doctoral Students at American Universities during the Republican Era (1912-1949)*. FAU Studies and Sources in Sinology Band 1. Erlangen: FAU University Press. DOI: 10.25593/978-3-96147-702-9.

Das Werk, einschließlich seiner Teile, ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Die Rechte an allen Inhalten liegen bei ihren jeweiligen Autoren.
Sie sind nutzbar unter der Creative-Commons-Lizenz BY.

Der vollständige Inhalt des Buchs ist als PDF über den OPUS-Server der Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg abrufbar:
<https://opus4.kobv.de/opus4-fau/home>

Verlag und Auslieferung:
FAU University Press, Universitätsstraße 4, 91054 Erlangen

Druck: Docupoint

ISBN: 978-3-96147-701-2 (Druckausgabe)
eISBN: 978-3-96147-702-9 (Online-Ausgabe)
ISSN: 2942-4143
eISSN: 2942-4178
DOI: 10.25593/978-3-96147-702-9

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Scholars of Western History who studied in the United States during the Republican Period and the American Tradition of Western Historiography – A Case Study of Six Doctoral Dissertations	19
3	The Doctoral Dissertation of Jiang Tingfu	73
4	Lei Haizong's Doctoral Dissertation and the Academic Tradition of Western History at the University of Chicago	93
5	Qi Sihe's Doctoral Dissertation on Chinese History and the Tradition of American Historiography at Harvard University	121
6	Biographies of Persons Mentioned in the Texts	167

1 Introduction

1.1 About the Author

This book presents the English translation of four texts published by Yang Zhao 杨钊 between 2018 and 2020. Yang (born 1987), a historian at the Institute for Global History at Beijing Foreign Studies University, received his PhD degree from Beijing University in 2016 for a thesis on “New York State Party Politics and the Origins of the Two-Party System in the United States 纽约州政党政治与美国第二政党体制的起源, 1812-1824” (published in 2019 with China Social Sciences Press). Written under the guidance of Li Jianming 李剑鸣 (born 1960) the thesis profited from Yang’s own experiences as a foreign student. In the academic year 2013 to 2014, Yang Zhao spend one year as a Fulbright visiting scholar at Princeton University where he worked with Sean Wilentz (born 1951), a historian with a focus on the social and cultural history of the United States. The stay at Princeton allowed him to consult the PhD theses of three important Chinese historians Jiang Tingfu (Tsiang Tingfu 蒋廷黻, 1895-1965), Lei Haizong (Lei Hai-tsung 雷海宗, 1902-1962), and Qi Sihe (Chi Szu-ho 齐思和, 1907–1980), who graduated in the 1920s and -30s from universities of the East Coast. Yang shows that the dissertations of Chinese students at American universities in the Republican period were of extraordinary quality regarding methodology, linguistic competence and the wide array of sources used in the theses.

These translations have been made possible by the Volkswagen Foundation grant »Writing History with China – Chinese Concepts in Transnational Historiography« (2021–2028) for which I express my gratitude.

1.2 About the Book Cover

The book cover depicts the three historians discussed in this volume, Qi Sihe, Jiang Tingfu, and Lei Haizong (clockwise). The buildings on the right are University of Chicago (top) and the Widener Library of Harvard University (bottom).

Sources:

- Qi Sihe, <https://baike.baidu.com/item/齐思和>
- Jiang Tingfu, <https://baike.baidu.com/item/雷海宗>

- Lei Haizong, <https://baike.baidu.com/item/雷海宗>
- The old University of Chicago (1916), Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Page:A_History_of_the_University_of_Chicago_by_Thomas_Wakefield_Goodspeed.djvu/39 (public domain).
- Widener Library of Harvard University, in: *Kexue*, vol. 1, no. 2, 1915 (inlay).

1.3 Translated Texts

1. Yang Zhao. “Minguo shiqi liu-Mei Xiyang shixuezhe yu Meiguo de xiyang shixue chuantong – yi boshi lunwen wei zhongxin de kaocha” 民国时期留美西洋史学者与美国的西洋史学术传统——以博士论文为中心的考察 (Scholars of Western History who studied in the United States during the Republican Period and the American Tradition of Western Historiography – A Case Study of Six Doctoral Dissertations), *Shixue lilun yanjiu*, no. 2, 2020, pp. 113-124.
2. Yang Zhao. “Jiang Tingfu de boshi lunwen” 蒋廷黻的博士论文 (The Doctoral Dissertation of Jiang Tingfu), *Dushu*, no. 10, 2018, pp. 139-146.
3. Yang Zhao. “Lei Haizong de boshi lunwen yu Zhijiage daxue de xiyang shi xueshu chuantong” 雷海宗的博士论文与芝加哥大学的西洋史学术传统 (Lei Haizong’s Doctoral Dissertation and the Academic Tradition of the Studies of Western History at the University of Chicago), *Jiangsu shifan daxue xuebao (zhexue shehui kexue ban)*, no. 3 (2018), pp. 10-15, 116.
4. Yang Zhao. “Qi Sihe de Zhongguoshi boshi lunwen yu Hafo daxue de Meiguoshi xueshu chuantong” 齐思和的中国史博士论文与哈佛大学的美国史学术传统 (Qi Sihe’s Doctoral Dissertation on Chinese History and the Tradition of American Historiography at Harvard University), *Shixueshi yanjiu*, no. 1, 2019, pp. 42-51.

1.4 Introduction to the Four Translations

Marc A. Matten

The transformation of the historiography of modern China at the turn of the twentieth century has continuously been shaped by transnational knowledge flows. The foreign aggression, the defeat in numerous wars since the First Opium War (1839-42), as well as the enforced signing of unequal treaties made scholars at the end of Qing Dynasty (1644-1911) rethink the position of China in the world, turning not only to science and technology, but also to the humanities in Japan, North America, Europe, and the Soviet Union in the course of the twentieth century. In addition, the self-perceived weakness of China, often described by the metaphor of the Sick Man of East Asia (*Dongya bingfu* 东亚病夫), questioned the legitimacy of traditional knowledge, antiquated technology, and the Confucian conservative worldview. The insight of not being well equipped to survive in a world of social Darwinism and imperialism grew increasingly among the elite after the destruction of the Old Summer Palace in 1860 by Anglo-French expeditionary forces in the Second Opium War (1856-60). The Taiping rebellion of the 1850-60s that challenged the socio-political order gave rise to institutional reforms that included the modernization of the military. In hindsight, the Self-Strengthening Movement (1861-ca. 1895) did not generate the expected progress. For Immanuel C.Y. Hsu 徐中约 (1923-2005), the failure to acknowledge the need for large-scale transformation of the empire and the lack of capital caused many reform attempts to fail. Finally, the still unquestioned sense of the superiority of Chinese civilization led to exaggerated caution in adopting Western knowledge.¹

More progressive scholar-officials argued to go one step further by proposing to enroll students in institutions of higher learning outside China. The contribution of this move to national modernization has been the focus of historical research since the 1980s. Based on archival sources, Sanetō Keishū 実藤惠秀 (1896-1985), Huang Fu-ch'ing 黄福庆 (born 1934), Ōsato Hiroaki 大里浩秋 (born 1944) and Son An-suk 孫安石 (born 1965) have emphasized the students' role as knowledge brokers, translators, and agents of cultural transfer in the era of colonialism and imperialism.² Studies on the mobility of Chinese students and especially their career after returning to China

¹ Immanuel C. Y. Hsu, *The Rise of Modern China*, 5th ed (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 287-93.

² Huang Fu-ch'ing 黄福庆, *Chinese Students in Japan in the Late Ch'ing Period*, trans. Katherine Whitaker (Tōkyō: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1982); Sanetō Keishū 実藤

have pointed out that patriotism and nationalism were a central motivation at the time. A look at testimonies of students in Japan, the United States and Europe confirms this interpretation.³

The first country where Chinese enrolled in institutions of higher learning outside the Qing Empire were the United States. Already in 1872 Yung Wing 容闳 (1828-1912) had convinced the Imperial Court to send a group of 120 students to schools at the East coast. Himself having graduated from Yale College, Yung cherished the education that had transformed him into a life-long reformer with an open mind to the different civilization of the Occident, as he recalls in his biographical work *My Life In China And America* (1909):

“Would it not be strange, if an Occidental education, continually exemplified by an Occidental civilization, had not wrought upon an Oriental such a metamorphosis in his inward nature as to make him feel and act as though he were a being coming from a different world, when he confronted one so diametrically different? This was precisely my case, and yet neither my patriotism nor the love of my fellow-countrymen had been weakened.”⁴

The Chinese Educational Mission (1872 – 1881) was a pioneering initiative of the Self-Strengthening Movement, yet in hindsight was no more than an unsuccessful attempt to implement reforms.⁵ Edward Rhoads describes in his monograph the experiences of the young Chinese students during their stay in the United States, comparing them to other Chinese in the country. Based on a wide array of archival sources he details their experiences abroad. The 120 students, with some being younger than ten years, traveled to the

惠秀, *Chūgokujin – Nihon ryūgakushi* 中国人 — 日本留学史 (The History of Chinese Students in Japan) (Tōkyō: Kuroshio shuppan, 1981); Ōsato Hiroaki 大里浩秋, and Son An-Suk 孫安石 (ed.), *Chūgokujin Nihon ryūgakushi kenkyū no gendankai* 中国人日本留学史研究の現段階 (The current stage of research on the history of Chinese Students in Japan) (Tōkyō: Ocha no mizu shobō, 2002).

³ Zhou Yichuan 周一川, *Jindai Zhongguo nüxing Riben liuxueshi (1872-1945 nian)* 近代中国女性日本留学史 (1872-1945 年) (The history of modern China's women studying in Japan (1872-1945)) (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2007); Zheng Gang 郑刚, *Liuxuesheng yu jindai Zhongguo yanjiusheng jiaoyu* 留学生与近代中国研究生教育 (Chinese Students Abroad and the Education of Graduate Students in Modern China) (Zhengzhou: Daxiang chubanshe, 2020); Cong Xiaoping 丛小平, *Shifan xuexiao yu Zhongguo de xiandaihua – Minzu guojia de xingcheng yu shehui zhuanxing 1897-1937* 师范学校与中国的现代化：民族国家的形成与社会转型 1897-1937 (Teacher's Schools and China's Modernization—The Formation of the Nation-State and Social Transformation 1897-1937) (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2014).

⁴ Yung Wing, *My Life In China And America* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1909), iii.

⁵ Lian Xi, “Returning to the Middle Kingdom: Yung Wing and the recalled students of the Chinese Educational Mission to the United States,” *Modern Asian Studies* 49, no. 1 (2015), pp. 150-176.

US in several detachments and lived with American families, which eventually made them cast away their traditions and take over American customs, such as changing hair styles and clothing, as well as playing baseball and joining the university's rowing team, thereby potentially losing their attachment to China and forgetting to original purpose of studying abroad, as Qing authorities feared. Facing an unchanged society after their enforced return well before graduation, they were not only not welcomed, but also deprived of any career chances in China.⁶

Two decades later another study destination emerged that was culturally closer to China: Japan. In the First Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95 the neighboring empire had defeated the Qing by which not only regional hegemony was shifted from China to Japan but also Taiwan had to be ceded to the victorious power, which exerted colonial rule on the island until 1945. Facing increasing imperialist aggression that in the quelling of the Boxer Rebellion (1900) reached a new height the Qing court decided to display an unforeseen reform zeal, sending thousands of students to Japan. The new destination had shown what a successful modernization could look like. Ending more than two centuries of seclusion in the Edo period (1603-1868) Japan had been opened to the outside world by the Convention of Kanagawa in 1854. Shortly after the Meiji Restoration in 1868 the newly formed government under the central rule of Meiji Tennō 明治天皇 (1852-1912) commissioned delegations around the world to study Western arts and sciences by educating themselves in Europe and North America, and by translating Western knowledge in natural sciences, military, humanities and engineering.⁷ Its success had become obvious in 1901 when Japan was a signatory of the Boxer Protocol on an equal rank with the Western powers.

The numbers of students enrolling in Japanese colleges and universities were quickly on the rise.⁸ Reasons for choosing Japan as a primary destination are listed in guidebooks, such as the *Guide to Study in Japan* (*Riben youxue zhinan*) of 1901. Published by Zhang Zongxiang 章宗祥 (1879-1962), a native

⁶ Edward Rhoads, *Stepping Forth Into the World: The Chinese Educational Mission to the United States, 1872-81* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2011). See also Qian Gang 钱钢 and Hu Jincao 胡劲草, *Liu Mei youtong—Zhongguo zuizao de guanpai liuxuesheng* 留美幼童—中国最早的官派留学生 (Chinese Educational Mission—The first group of Students sent abroad by the Chinese Government) (Shanghai: Wenhui chubanshe, 2004).

⁷ For an overview on what has been translated see the appendix in Huang Fu-ch'ing (1982) and chapter five in Sanetō Keishū (1981).

⁸ Compare here the tables provided by Sanetō Keishū (1981) detailing the development of Chinese students and graduates from 1898 until 1937, “*Chūgoku Ryū-Nichi gakusei kankei no itsutsu hyō* 中国留日学生関係の五つ表,” in Sanetō Keishū (1981), inlay on page 544.

of Zhejiang Province and later minister to Japan in the 1910s who had studied law at Tokyo Imperial University from 1899 to 1903 before serving in the administration of the Qing Empire, the study guide recommended Japan for the following reasons:

“As regards the time taken for the journey, those from a more distant place will take ten days and those from a nearer place will take only five days to reach there. As regards expenses, those who spend more will use over two hundred yen and for those who spend less, a hundred-odd yen will be sufficient. As regards schools, subjects like politics, agriculture, industry, commerce, military art, and arts and crafts are all taught. Therefore, if we wish to study abroad in order to seek knowledge which is not yet available in China, there is nowhere which offers such convenience as Japan.”⁹

In addition, the cultural closeness of both countries, similar living customs, and the use of Chinese characters on the archipelago turned Japan into a shortcut to modernity, as many guidebooks argued.¹⁰

Open letters appealed to provincial officials in Hunan and Zhejiang to send students abroad and even to support them financially.¹¹ In fact, both the provincial and the central government not only provided scholarships, but also promised positions in the state administration if a degree had been attained abroad. In 1903, Zhang Zhidong 张之洞 (1837-1909) promulgated at the behest of Empress Dowager Cixi 慈禧太后 (1835-1908) the so-called Regulations for Encouraging Graduated who have Studied Abroad (鼓励留学毕业生章程), confirming that degrees of foreign institutions were acknowledged as equivalent to a degree in the traditional civil-service examination (*keju* 科举). This made a trip to Japan even more desirable for the young generation, especially when Japanese universities established fast-track courses allowing students to graduate within six months or even shorter. The quickly rising number of Chinese students abroad and their efforts of translating foreign

⁹ Quoted in Huang Fu'ching (1982), 6. See also Sanetō Keishū (1981), 172-192. Zeng Guofan 曾国藩 (1811-1872) and Li Hongzhang 李鸿章 (1823-1901) also supported the education of the young generation abroad. See here their letter submitted in March 1871 to the Zongli Yamen (the new institution that handled foreign affairs in the late Qing dynasty), Zeng Guofan and Li Hongzhang, “On Sending Young Men Abroad to Study,” trans. K.C. Liu, in: *Sources of Chinese Traditions*, Vol. II (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 240-41.

¹⁰ The first justification for studying in Japan referring to the common culture and language in China and Japan can be found in Zhang Zhidong's *Exhortation to Study* (*Quanxuepian* 劝学篇) of 1898, see Paula Harrell, *Sowing the Seeds of Change – Chinese Students, Japanese Teachers, 1895-1905* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 26-27.

¹¹ See here “Letter Exhorting Provincial Elders to Send their Children Overseas to Study,” *Youxue yibian*, March 1903; “Letter Respectfully Urging Fellow Provincials To Send Their Children Overseas for Study, and To Find Public Funding for Such Students,” *Zhejiangchao*, July 1903.

knowledge resulted in a thorough modernization of the education. Japanese books on history, geography, and moral education became bestsellers in the continuously expanding market of school textbooks,¹² as well as in the publications of encyclopediae, not to mention the rapid development of dictionaries.¹³

It goes without saying that living and studying abroad posed considerable challenges. Not only did young men and women have to adjust to a different society and culture, but also become acquainted with a foreign language and new forms of pedagogy. The difficulties are detailed in their diaries, including experiences with racial discrimination. For example, Huang Zunsan 黄尊三 (1880-1951) who studied in Tokyo from 1905 to 1912 depicts the problem of getting accustomed to Japanese food (too bland), sickness and mood changes (pp. 30-43), problems of learning foreign languages (page 44, 95), his enagement when visiting the Yasukuni Shrine in Tokyo (page 91), and how humiliating the search of his luggage by the Japanese police was (page 32).¹⁴

Such experiences were also common in the United States. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and the increasing anti-Chinese sentiment caused by the

¹² Cheng Meibao 程美宝, “You aixiang er aiguo: Qingmo Guangdong xiangtu jiaocai de guojia huayu” 由爱乡而爱国: 清末广东乡土教材的国家话语 (From loving the hometown to loving the country: the national discourse of the local textbooks in Guangdong in the late Qing Dynasty), *Lishi yanjiu*, 4 (2003), pp. 68-84; Huang Donglan 黄东兰, “Shinmatsu minkokuki chiri kyōkasho no kūkan –ryōdo, kyōiki, kokuchi” 清末 民国期地理教科書の空間表象—領土疆域国恥 (Spatial Representations in Geography Textbooks in the Late Qing and Republican Periods: Territory, Space, and National Shame), *Chūgoku kenkyū geppō* 59, no. 3 (March 2005), pp. 24-39; Peter Zarrow, *Educating China: Knowledge, Society and Textbooks in a Modernizing World, 1902–1937* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Shu Xincheng 舒新城, *Jindai Zhongguo liuxueshi* 近代中国留学史 (The history of studying abroad in modern China) (Shanghai: Shanghai wenhua chubanshe, 1989) (originally published 1939); Li Xiaolian 李孝迁, “Qingji Zhinashi, dongyangshi jiaokeshu jieyi chutan” 清季支那史、东洋史教科书介译初探 (A Preliminary Study on the Interpretation and Translation of Textbooks on the History of China and the History of the East in the Qing Dynasty), *Shixue yuekan*, no. 9 (2003), pp. 101-110.

¹³ Milena Doleželová-Velingerová and Rudolf G. Wagner (eds.), *Chinese Encyclopaedias of New Global Knowledge (1870–1930)—Changing Ways of Thought* (Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer, 2014); Michael Lackner, Iwo Amelung and Joachim Kurtz (ed.), *New Terms for New Ideas. Western knowledge & Lexical Change in Late Imperial China* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

¹⁴ Huang Zunsan 黄尊三, *Shinkokujin Nihon ryūgaku nikki: 1905–1912* 清国人日本留学日記: 1905–1912 年 (Diary of a Chinese student studying in Japan: 1905-1912), trans. Sanetō Keishū 実藤惠秀 and Satō Saburō 佐藤三郎 (Tōkyō: Tōhō shoten, 1986). On a more general introduction to the situation of Chinese students in Japan in the first decade of the twentieth century see Harrell, *Sowing the Seeds of Change*. The classic short story describing humiliation of Chinese students in Japan in the first half of the twentieth century was Yu Dafu's 郁達夫 (1896-1945) short story *Sinking* (*Chenlun* 沉淪). For a translation of this widely received

Yellow Peril discourse in late nineteenth century made racial discrimination a daily occurrence.¹⁵ The experiences with racism and orientalism were not accepted silently, as an open letter of a Chinese student to the president of the University of Michigan, Marion LeRoy Burton (1874-1925), documents. Its author Ch'ang Hsiao Chuan (dates unknown) bewails the gross and racist misrepresentation of Chinese people and their customs in an opera called "Tickled to Death" that was put on stage in 1924 in the Mid-West of the United States, and declared to leave the university as sign of his protest.¹⁶

Similar frictions occurred with regard to Japan. In 1908, the Tatsumaru Incident 辰丸事件 in South China resulted in the first anti-Japanese boycott after the Qing had captured a ship with the same name on the charge of smuggling arms, and in 1915, when the Japanese government had delivered its Twenty-one Demands to President Yuan Shikai 袁世凱 (1859-1916) its imperialist ambitions became increasingly visible. The demands were met in China with a boycott of Japanese products and a movement against national humiliation (a slogan coined at that time), while the popularity of the United States as a study destination continued to grow. As a result of the establishment of the Boxer Indemnity Fund (庚子賠款獎學金) America became in the 1910s a new destination. After the Boxer Rebellion had been quelled in 1900 by the Eight-Nation Alliance, the Imperial Court in Beijing had to agree to the stipulations in the Boxer Protocol, which included the payment of 450 million taels of silver as indemnity to the Western powers. In 1908, the U.S. Congress decided to forfeit remaining claims and instead turn the excess of more than 17 million dollars to China by starting a scholarship program for Chinese students to be educated in the United States. President Theodore Roosevelt (1858-1919) saw this step as an opportunity for American-directed reform in China that could improve the relations between both countries.¹⁷

text see Yu Dafu, "Sinking", trans. Joseph Lau and C.T. Hsia, in Joseph Lau and Howard Goldblatt (eds.), *Columbia Anthology of Modern Chinese Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 44-69; Yu Dafu, "Versinken" (*Chenlun* 沈淪), trans. Marc Hermann, *minima sinica* 1 (2002), 93-135. For a psychological study of Chinese students in Japan in general see Yan Ansheng 嚴安生, *Nihon ryūgaku seishin shi* 日本留学精神史 (A psychological history of studying abroad in Japan) (Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten, 1991).

¹⁵ Erika Lee, *At America's Gates: Chinese Immigration During the Exclusion Era, 1882-1943* (University of North Carolina Press, 2003); John Kuo Wei Tchen and Dylan Yeats, *Yellow Peril! An Archive of Anti-Asian Fear* (London: Verso Books, 2014).

¹⁶ Ch'ang Hsiao Chuan, "Why I left the University of Michigan," *The Chinese Students' Monthly* 20, no. 4 (February 1925), 31.

¹⁷ On the negotiations see Michael H. Hunt, "The American Remission of the Boxer Indemnity: A Reappraisal," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 31, no. 3 (1972), pp. 539-59.

As a result, the fund became the most successful program in the Chinese foreign-study movement in the modern era.¹⁸

Well-known intellectuals who had studied in North America since the May-Fourth Movement (1915-1925) were Hu Shi 胡適 (1891-1962), He Bingsong 何炳松 (1890-1946), Jian Bozan 翦伯赞 (1898-1968), Lin Yutang 林語堂 (1895-1976), Kong Xiangxi 孔祥熙 (H.H. Kung, 1880-1967), and Wu Yujin 吳于廑 (1913-1993), to name a few.¹⁹ Next to these renowned intellectuals whose texts are viewed as foundational for China's enlightenment in the twentieth century (to borrow the title of Vera Schwarcz's book)²⁰ and who returned to China for their career, there are scholars who chose not to, be it for political reasons, career opportunities, or personal reasons. The reason to stay or to return to China were in most cases highly individual, and often contingent, even within one family.

For instance, Chen Hengzhe 陈衡哲 (1890-1976), who in 1920 became the first female professor in China and taught Western history at Peking University, had studied history and literature in America between 1914 and 1920 at Vassar College and University of Chicago (her studies had been supported by the Boxer Indemnity Fund). As a historian of the West and expert of the European Renaissance she published a number of short stories, essays and fables for which she became famous. After her return to China, she compiled textbooks on Western history that were published by Commercial Press of Shanghai on the invitation of He Bingsong and Wang Yunwu 王云五 (1888-1979).²¹ Her daughter Ren Yidu 任以都 (or E-tu Zen Sun) (1921-2021), on the contrary, decided to remain in the United States. Born in Beijing she arrived

¹⁸ See also the discussion in: Weili Ye, *Seeking Modernity in China's Name: Chinese Students in the United States, 1900-1927* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2001); and Teresa Brawner Bevis, *A World History of Higher Education Exchange: The Legacy of American Scholarship* (Cham: Springer International Publishing AG, 2019).

¹⁹ Studies on female students going to Japan and the United States are rare. See exemplarily Weili Ye, "Nü Liuxuesheng: The Story of American-Educated Chinese Women, 1880s-1920s," *Modern China* 20, no. 3 (1994), pp. 315-346; Joan Judge, "Talent, Virtue and Nation: Chinese Nationalism and Female Subjectivities in the Early Twentieth Century," *The American Historical Review* 106, no. 3 (2001), pp. 765-803; as well as the study by Huping Ling who provides quantitative data on the growth and decline of Chinese (female) students in the United States during the twentieth century: Huping Ling, "A History of Chinese Female Students in the United States, 1880s-1990s," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 16, no. 3 (1997), pp. 81-109.

²⁰ Vera Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment Intellectuals and the Legacy of the May Fourth Movement of 1919* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1990).

²¹ While studying at Vassar College, Sophia Chen was also an associate editor of *The Chinese Students' Monthly* published in the state of New York. On Chen Hengzhe see Katrina Gulliver, "Sophia Chen Zen and Westernized Chinese Feminism," *Journal of Chinese Overseas*

in the United States in July 1941 where she studied at Vassar before pursuing a MA and PhD in Chinese history at Radcliffe College at Harvard University. After several research positions at Harvard, Radcliffe, and Penn State she was promoted to a full-time faculty member in the History Department at Penn State in 1966, achieving the same aim as her mother: Ren became the department's first female full professor. She played a crucial role in establishing the East Asian Studies Program where she also took over the role as its first director from 1970-1977.²² During her years at Harvard she worked as an assistant to John King Fairbank (1907-1991),²³ compiling with him and John DeFrancis (1911-2009) numerous handbooks and source collections on contemporary Chinese history.²⁴

1.5 The Foreign Studies Movement and the Transformation of Historical Sciences in China

The translation and transfer of foreign knowledge had immediate and powerful effects on the professionalization of historical sciences in the late imperial era. The experiences of Chinese students in Europe, North America and Japan had a direct impact on the establishment of a new system of higher education which was tightly knit to an influence from outside of China. The need to invest in higher education had been recognized in the late Qing when the predecessor of Peking University (Beijing University), the Imperial University of Peking 京师大学堂 in 1898 was founded in reaction to a call of reformers such as Liang Qichao 梁启超 (1873-1929) and Kang Youwei 康有为 (1858-1927) after the Qing's defeat in the First Sino-Japanese War.²⁵

vol. 4, no. 2 (2008), pp. 258-274; Denise Gimpel, *Chen Hengzhe: A Life between Orthodoxies* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2015).

²² See here her obituary, "Etu Zen Sun (1921-2021)", Koch Funeral Home, last accessed January 2, 2022, <https://kochfuneralhome.com/tribute/details/2474/Etu-Sun/obituary.html>.

²³ Fairbank, in turn, had been taught by Jiang Tingfu when taking Chinese history seminars at Tsinghua in the 1930s.

²⁴ These are: John King Fairbank, and E-tu Zen Sun, *Chinese Communist Publications: an Annotated Bibliography of Material in the Chinese Library at Harvard University* (Cambridge, Russian Research Center: Harvard University, 1949); Ssu-yü Teng, and John King Fairbank, *China's response to the West, a Documentary Survey, 1839-1923. Research guide by Ssu-yü Teng and John K. Fairbank, with the collaboration of E-tu Zen Sun, Chaoying Fang, and others* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954); and E-tu Zen Sun, and John DeFrancis, *Bibliography on Chinese Social History: a Selected and Critical List of Chinese Periodical Sources* (New Haven: Institute of Far Eastern Languages, Yale University, 1952).

²⁵ On the development of a new system of higher education in twentieth century see William C. Kirby, *Empire of Ideas. Creating the Modern University from Germany to America to China* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2022).

Tsinghua University in Beijing was founded in 1911 with money of the United States who had returned the Boxer Indemnity funds to China, Tongji University in Shanghai had evolved from the German Medical School of 1907, and Yenching University 燕京大学 had evolved from four Christian colleges in Beijing between the years 1915 and 1920.²⁶

The first minister of education of the Republic of China, Cai Yuanpei 蔡元培 (1868-1940) who had studied philosophy, psychology and art history at Leipzig University in Germany under Karl Lamprecht (1856-1915) and Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920), emphasized the importance of institutional autonomy and urged to pursue an education with a worldview (“*shijieguan jiaoyu*” 世界观教育).²⁷ This was also applied to the discipline of historical sciences when he took office as president of Peking University in 1917. In December of this year, Chen Duxiu 陈独秀 (1879-1942) – who had been appointed by Cai as the university’s dean and during the May-Fourth period introduced Marxism to his students – proposed a curriculum reform that would have set the focus of studies on the history of foreign countries.²⁸ In the ensuing years, the History Department at Peking University became the leading research institution in the country, it was home to many historians who had studied abroad, be it He Bingsong, Chen Hengzhe, Chen Yuan 陈垣 (1880-1971), or Fu Sinian 傅斯年 (1896-1950).²⁹

When the Second Sino-Japanese War broke out in 1937, three universities in Northern China – Peking University, Tsinghua University and Nankai University – merged to form the Changsha Temporary University and later the National Southwestern Associated University 国立西南联合大学 that moved to Kunming in Southwest China, where some of the historians discussed by Yang Zhao taught during the war years.³⁰

The new public universities not only oriented themselves to the disciplinary set-up but also to the canons taught at universities abroad. This included the

²⁶ Its first principal was John Leighton Stuart 司徒雷登 (1876-1962), a missionary educator and later United States ambassador to China (1946-49) who had established a partnership with Harvard University of which the Harvard-Yenching Institute resulted in 1928.

²⁷ Cai Yuanpei 蔡元培, *Duiyu xin jiaoyu zhi yijian* 对于新教育之意见 (*My Opinion on New Education*), *Jiaoyu zazhi* vol. 3, no. 11 (February 8, 1912).

²⁸ For a biography of Chen see Lee Feigon, *Chen Duxiu – Founder of the Chinese Communist Party* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).

²⁹ On the development of the Department of History at Peking University see Shang Xiaoming 尚小明, *Beida shixuexi zaoqi fazhanshi yanjiu* (1899-1937) 北大史学系早期发展史研究 (1899-1937) (*Research on the early development of Department of History at Peking University* (1899-1937)) (Beijing: Beijing University Press, 2010).

³⁰ John Israel, *Lianda: A Chinese University in War and Revolution* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

introduction of novel methods of historical research, as well as the creation of a new language. The need to translate knowledge from a variety of distant languages such as English, German, French, Japanese and Russian and the urge to disseminate that new knowledge beyond the ivory tower resulted in a fundamental transformation of the Chinese language.³¹ In January 1917 Hu Shi, a philosophy student at Columbia University, had published his “Tentative Proposal for Literary Reform” (*Wenxue gailiang chuyi* 文學改良芻議) in which he called for writing in the vernacular. In the following decade, classical Chinese was replaced with a modern variant, a process similar to the disappearance of Latin in Europe. The linguistic and conceptual changes³² created an epistemic rupture that became fundamental to the evolution of modern thinking in China. In fact, the translation of texts detailing the ideas of revolution, nationalism, and modernization in the Western world (including Japan) caused a radical shift in China’s discursive understanding of the world.

In historiography, this included the acceptance of objectivity, causality, and rationality as new epistemological principles. When Liang Qichao published his *New Historiography* (*Xinshixue* 新史學) in 1902, he offered a radical critique of traditional historiography that boiled down to the fact that it neither cared about the fate of the nation, nor did it care about actual problems that the people and the state were facing. Traditionally, historiography in imperial China was understood as a mirror for the ruler to guide his actions. It did not describe progress but was considered to describe the constantly changing relationship between individual and collective actors on the one hand, and the cosmological order embodied by the *dao* 道 on the other hand. If both were in balance, a perfect social order could be achieved. Liang Qichao was the first historian who shifted the agency to members of society. He defined history as a history of progress and evolution and emphasized the need to think and act in national, and not cosmic, terms. In his eyes, historiography had to describe and explain why certain nations were developing, and others not. The intervention of Liang Qichao helped to establish the teleological vision of history that became a core element of both nationalist

³¹ Elisabeth Kaske, *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education, 1895-1919* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

³² Lydia H. Liu, *Translingual Practice. Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity – China, 1900-1937* (Stanford/California: Stanford University Press, 1995); Ivo Spira, *A Conceptual History of Chinese – Isms—The Modernization of Ideological Discourse, 1895 – 1925* (Leiden: Brill, 2015); Jin Guantao 金觀濤 and Liu Qingfeng 劉青峰, *Guannianshi yanjiu: Zhongguo xiandai zhongyao zhengzhi shuyi de xingcheng* 觀念史研究：中國現代重要政治術語的形成 (Studies in the History of Ideas: The Formation of Modern Important Political Terminology in China) (Hong Kong: Zhongguo daxue chubanshe, 2008).

and Marxist historiography in twentieth-century.³³ It also brought forth a new periodization along the familiar lines of the ancient, middle and modern era that was further refined in Marxist historiography by introducing the stage-like model of socioeconomic mode of development (the classless primitive community, slavery, feudalism, capitalism, and the advanced classless society of communism).³⁴

In the May-Fourth period (1917-1927) historians heatedly debated how to construct a coherent narrative that would help to reaffirm China's role in the world and to strengthen national consciousness.³⁵ Their engagement with foreign theories and models contributed to the professionalization of historical sciences, yet not without frictions.³⁶ The reconciliation of indigenous ideas with foreign methods, or Chinese history with foreign values,³⁷ was a cumbersome process at the time.

Starting in the 1920, historians began to reflect on the question what European modernity meant for China, asking which historiographical models and analytical categories were applicable, and which ones not. For instance, the Marxist historian Guo Moruo 郭沫若 (1892-1978) published extensively on the question whether there had been a slave society in China, and Qi Sihe compared European feudalism with its counterpart in China. For some historians, the debate of how and where to situate China in the continuously shifting world order gave rise to calls for stronger nationalism and a distinct Chinese cultural identity, while others such as Chen Hengzhe preferred a

³³ Peter Zarrow, "Old Myth into New History: The Building Blocks of Liang Qichao's 'New History,'" *Historiography East & West* vol. 1, no. 2 (2003), pp. 204-241.

³⁴ On the introduction of Marxist historiography and historical materialism to China – a process starting in the late 1910s that was shaped by leftist scholars such as Guo Moruo, Chen Duxiu and Li Dazhao 李大钊 (1889-1927) – see Arif Dirlik, *Revolution and History: The Origins of Marxist Historiography in China, 1919 – 1937* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978); Maurice Meisner, *Li Ta-Chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967); Li Huaiyin, *Reinventing Modern China: Imagination and Authenticity in Chinese Historical Writing* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013); as well as Germaine A. Hoston, *The State, Identity, and the National Question in China and Japan* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994).

³⁵ Q. Edward Wang, *Inventing China through history: the May Fourth approach to historiography* (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 2001).

³⁶ Ying-kit Chan and Chen Fei, "Introduction: Politicized Histories in Modern China," in *Alternative Representations of the Past. The Politics of History in Modern China*, ed. Ying-kit Chan and Chen Fei (Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2020), 119-147.

³⁷ Joseph Levenson, *Confucian China and its Modern Fate – A Trilogy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968).

greater degree of internationalism where an international spirit based on the teaching of Western history could achieve world peace.³⁸

Lei Haizong (Lei Hai-tsung 雷海宗, 1902–1962), on the contrary, emphasized nationalism. When the Second Sino-Japanese War broke out in the 1930s, he understood this war as one that could only be won when the Chinese nation and its interests were foregrounded. The struggle for survival was real, he argued, and thus a stronger cultural conservatism was needed, and this included the rejection of national history due to its inherent Eurocentrism. When Lei published a book review of H.G. Wells' (1866–1946) *An Outline of History* (1920) in 1928 after he had graduated from the University of Chicago with a thesis on "The Political Ideas of Turgot" (127 pages), he pointed to the problematic fact that the *Outline* equated history with Western history where China was not sufficiently represented: it overemphasized the origins of human civilization in the middle East and gave far more space to the Western world while the history of Babylonia, Egypt, India, China, Japan, and the Mongolian empire only received a short discussion. Following this intervention, an ideal global history would have to take into account a quantitative balance when covering the regions of the world, Lei argued.³⁹

To situate China in the world meant to determine whether China was part of world history, and whether it followed the same path of historical development. To answer such question, historians born at the end of the Qing Dynasty with little to no formal education in the Confucian classics and dynastic histories turned to European history, its analytical concepts and methodologies in their research. The three scholars presented in this volume, Jiang Tingfu (Tsiang Tingfu 蒋廷黻, 1895–1965), the aforementioned Lei Haizong, and Qi Sihe (Chi Szu-ho 齐思和, 1907–1980), were born at the turn of the twentieth century and could no longer pursue an academic career in the old system after the imperial examinations had been abolished in 1905. Their turn to foreign knowledge was motivated by the search of new insights explaining and determining China's present and future, and this became a key element of their PhD theses.⁴⁰

³⁸ Xin Fan, *World History and National Identity in China – The Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), chapter 2.

³⁹ Lei Haizong 雷海宗, "Ping hanyi Weiersi zhu Shijie shigang 评汉译韦尔斯著《世界史纲》" (A Discussion of H.G. Wells *An Outline of History*), in: *Bolun shixueji* 伯伦史学集 (Boluns collected works on historiography), ed. Wang Dunshu 王敦书 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2002), 614. A detailed biography by Fan Xin can be found in Lei Haizong, *Chinese Culture and the Chinese Military* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), vii–xii.

⁴⁰ For a list of PhD theses submitted to North American universities from 1873 to 1960 see Warren F. Kuehl, *Dissertations in History. An Index to Dissertations Completed in History*

For instance, Jiang Tingfu—who due to his education at the Yizhi School founded by the American Presbyterian Church in Changsha and his later studies in the United States (where he became familiar with liberalist ideas) had been exposed to American culture⁴¹—detailed in his dissertation the relationship between imperialism and the labor movement. Enrolling as a PhD candidate at Columbia University in 1919, he submitted his thesis “Labor and Empire: A Study of the Reaction of the British Labor Party, Mainly as Represented in Parliament, to British Imperialism Since 1880” (220 pages) in 1923. The choice of topic at the time was influenced by the peace negotiations in Versailles and by the October Revolution 1917. Both events made him realize that the imperialism of the twentieth century was an economic question that was also relevant to the future of China.⁴²

Lei Haizong’s PhD thesis was a typical study in the history of ideas. Exploring Turgot’s view on French monarchism, education, and enlightenment he identified the contribution of the French physiocrat and statesman to the development of liberal authoritarianism, while pointing to his breakthrough in discovering the connection between the bourgeoisie and the working class that should fully play out in the development of modern capitalism.

The PhD thesis of Qi Sihe investigates a specific problem of ancient Chinese history. He submitted in 1935 to the Department of History at Harvard University (288 pages) a dissertation entitled “Chinese Feudalism During the Ch’un Ch’iu Period.” During the Republican era (1912-49), feudalism was a heatedly discussed topic among Chinese historians. Though originally not having any motivation to study in the United States – Qi believed that the level of researching of Chinese history in America was far lower than in his country – he followed the encouragement of his mentor Professor William Hung (Hong Ye 洪业, 1893-1980) to familiarize himself with Western research methods and to apply them to Chinese history. This is visible in Qi’s thesis, which excels in the use of archival sources and research literature in more than one foreign language. His dissertation lists sources in German, French and English, ranging from Otto Franke’s (1863-1946) report on the

Departments of United States and Canadian Universities, 1873-1960 (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1965).

⁴¹ See Charles Ronald Lilley, *Tsiang T’ing-fu: Between Two Worlds, 1895-1935* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1979).

⁴² Reacting to the increasing tensions with Japan, Jiang decided to leave academia in 1935 and start a career in the Chinese Nationalist government. In 1945, he became the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations and served as ambassador of China to the United States. After 1949 he continued to support the Republic of China and rejected the diplomatic claims of the People’s Republic of China.

system of feudal tenure in China given at the Prussian Academy of Sciences (1927)⁴³, Marcel Granet's (1884-1940) contribution on *Marriage Customs of Ancient China* (1912)⁴⁴, to Lynn Thorndike's (1882-1965) monograph *The History of Medieval Europe* (1917)⁴⁵ and Sakuya Yoshida's 吉田作彌 (1859-1929) dissertation thesis on feudalism in Japan.⁴⁶

The three historians introduced by Yang Zhao made a significant contribution to the development of historical sciences in their country by introducing foreign research and its methodologies, but also by establishing comparisons as a feasible approach to gain a more refined understanding of Chinese history.⁴⁷ An intriguing comparative approach can be found in Wu Yujin's thesis "Kingship and Law in Feudal China—An Inquiry into the Nature of Kingship and Law in Feudal China in the Light of a Comparison with Kingship and Law in Feudal Europe" (227 pages). Submitted in 1946 to the Department of Government, Harvard University it highlighted the evolution of the notions of kingship and law in Europe by contrasting them with their development in China. Wu argues that in contrast to China European feudalism was a result of the disintegration of the Roman Empire, while feudalism in China emerged when a new political system was founded in the Zhou Dynasty that possessed a distinct and powerful central authority. In other words, European feudalism was rather a centrifugal than a centripetal force, yet this did not impact the answer to his rhetorical question that if a Chinese and a European scholar of the respective feudal era met, they would agree on many details of the relationship between kingship and law in their feudalisms. Similar historical backgrounds would bring forth similar ideas, and a comparative approach to these would help to "appreciate the general standpoint of modern critical historical scholarship, namely, the standpoint

⁴³ Otto Franke, "Zur Beurteilung des chinesischen Lehenswesens," in: *Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte* (1927), 350-377.

⁴⁴ Marcel Granet, "Coutumes Matrimoniales De La Chine Antique," *T'oung-pao* vol. 13, no. 1 (1912), pp. 517-558.

⁴⁵ Lynn Thorndike, *The History of Medieval Europe* (New York: Houghton, 1917).

⁴⁶ Sakuya Yoshida, *Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Staatsverfassung und des Lehnswesens von Japan* (Dissertation, Univ. Bonn, 1890).

⁴⁷ According to Zhou Mian's biographical dictionary listing Chinese students who went abroad during the nineteenth and twentieth century there were 56 students in historical sciences (two of which were female, Chen Hengzhe and Ceng Zhaoyu 曾昭燏 (1909-1964)), of which seventeen received a PhD degree. Eight spent some time in Germany, fourteen in England, eleven in Japan, and twenty-two in the United States. See Zhou Mian 周棉, *Zhongguo liuxuesheng da cidian* 中国留学生大辞典 (A Dictionary of Chinese Foreign Students) (Nanjing: Nanjing daxue chubanshe, 1999).

of historical relativism.”⁴⁸ In the research on the academic achievements of Wu Yujin after his return to China in 1947 when he became professor of history at Wuhan University, his sympathetic attitude towards Western scholarship changed. When shifting his research focus to world history he increasingly criticized Eurocentrism in non-Chinese scholarship by pointing to its hierarchical thinking that placed other world regions at a lower level of civilizational development which again became one of the causes of colonialism. Undoubtedly, such changes were affected by his return to China as well as the changes in geopolitics during the 1950s.

While the role of Chinese scholars who had pursued an education abroad and their contribution to the country’s modernization have long been acknowledged in historical research, most of the biographical studies have focused on the historians’ writings after their return to China.⁴⁹ The republication of their complete works in most cases do not include non-Chinese language writings, which includes their dissertations (primarily due to the fact that the theses are stored in the libraries of their alma mater and are often not published or publicly accessible).⁵⁰ The following translations of texts authored by Yang Zhao set out to remedy this situation by identifying the PhD theses as key to the understanding of historiographical thinking of scholars whose academic career started after the founding of the People’s Republic of China in 1949 and who had to adapt to a radically changing political environment. The texts—based on extensive archival research and published between 2018 and 2020—display amply how their writing of history is the result of global entanglements that cross linguistic, conceptual and cultural boundaries.

⁴⁸ Wu Bao’an, “Kingship and Law in Feudal China—An Inquiry into the Nature of Kingship and Law in Feudal China in the Light of a Comparison with Kingship and Law in Feudal Europe” (PhD thesis, Harvard University, 1946), 212.

⁴⁹ See here also the recent monograph of Xin Fan that simply mentions that Wu was a “Harvard-trained historian”. Xin Fan, *World History and National Identity in China*, 156.

⁵⁰ A rare exception is the case of Qian Xuesen: Qian Xuesen, *Collected Works of Hsue-shen Tsien* 钱学森文集 1938–1956 海外学术文献, 2 Vols, (Shanghai: Shanghai Jiaotong University, 2011).

**2 Scholars of Western History who studied
in the United States during the
Republican Period and the American
Tradition of Western Historiography –
A Case Study of Six Doctoral
Dissertations**

民国时期留美西洋史学者与美国的西洋史学术传统：以博士论文为中心的考察

Yang Zhao

杨钊

Translation by Joseph Ciaudo

历史学在中国是一门传统十分深厚的学问。到了民国之后，西方历史学的学术规范和学术话语开始大量引入中国，与中国传统史学的研究方法产生了交流与碰撞，使民国史学真正做到了融汇中西，获得了长足的发展，并涌现出了一大批优秀的史学大家和史学著作。在这个过程中，赴美学习历史学的学者们起到了非常重要的桥梁作用。国内学术界在关注民国史学时对这个群体也进行了较为深入的研究。¹然而，这些研究大多把目光聚焦于那些赴美学习中国史的学者，而且更多研究的是他们回国之后对中国史学所产生的影响。事实上，在赴美学习历史的学者中，有相当一部分人在美国从事的是西洋史方面的研究，他们不仅在研究方法，而且在研究内容方面都深入到了西方学术的脉络之中，受到了更加彻底的西方学术训练。²这批在美国从事西洋史研究的学者在回国或留美任教之后，有的继续从事西洋史的教学与研究，有的则转向了中国史领域，但他们所受到的学术训练，对中国史学的发展，特别是中国世界史学科的建立都做出了巨大的贡献。本文尝试以几位在留美时主要从事

¹这方面的代表性研究既有对留美生群体之于中国历史学影响的整体性研究，如李春雷：《留美生与中国历史学》，南开大学出版社 2009 年版，该书对留美生影响民国时期中国历史学发展的多个面向进行了深入细致的探究，但是缺乏对留美生留学时期学术状况的梳理；也有对民国时期留美中国史学者进行的专门性研究，如元青：《民国时期留美生的中国历史研究与美国汉学——以博士论文为中心的考察》，《广东社会科学》2015 年第 6 期，该文聚焦民国时期留美中国史学者的博士论文，探讨了这批博士论文在选题缘起、研究内容和学术理路方面与美国汉学的复杂互动，深入到了留美生留学时期的学术状况，但没有涉及留美的西洋史学者。

²本文所关注的西洋史学者，主要指他们赴美选择攻读的学科是西洋史，所修读的主要课程是欧洲史和美国史方面的，他们的导师主要从事的也是欧美史的研究。而在具体的博士论文选题上，他们则未必完全聚焦于西洋史，有的可能做的是中外关系史方面的题目，有的可能是从中西比较的视野来看待中国历史上的问题。但是从总体上看，这些学者所受的基本学术训练是西洋史学科的，而且在回国之后大都从事了西洋史方面的教学与研究工作，所以从这个意义上称他们为西洋史学者。

History is a discipline with a longstanding tradition in China. However, the Republican period witnessed a massive influx of academic norms and discourses originating in Western historiography, which both interacted and conflicted with traditional Chinese historiographical methods. As a result, in Republican China, the discipline saw a veritable fusion of East and West and made significant progress, as reflected in the many outstanding historical works and skilled historians which appeared during this era. Chinese scholars who studied history in the United States played a crucial intermediary role in this process. Mainland Chinese scholars have already studied this group of intellectuals of the Republican era in some detail.⁽¹⁾ That said, most of the available studies have focused on scholars who went to the United States to study Chinese history and the impact they had on Chinese historiography after their return home. As such, little to no attention has been paid to the significant number of scholars who spent their time in the United States researching Western history and were thus more thoroughly schooled in Western scholarship not only on a methodological level, but also in terms of the content of their research.⁽²⁾ After returning to China or when teach-

⁽¹⁾ Representative studies include general overviews of the influence scholars who studied in the United States exerted on Chinese historiography, such as Li Chunlei, *Liu Mei sheng yu Zhongguo lishixue (Chinese Students in the United States and Chinese Historiography)* (Tianjin: Nankai daxue chubanshe, 2009) which provides an in-depth exploration of the various ways in which these students influenced the development of Chinese historiography in the Republican period. Unfortunately, however, this book does not include a comprehensive survey of the academic outlook and achievements of these students during their time abroad. We also have case studies of individual scholars specialized in Chinese history who stayed in the United States during the Republican period, such as Yuan Qing, “Minguo shiqi liu Mei sheng de Zhongguo lishi yanjiu yu Meiguo Hanxue: Yi boshi lunwen wei zhongxin de kaocha” (Chinese Historical Studies by Chinese Students in the United States during the Republican Period and American Sinology: A Case Study of a Few Doctoral Dissertations), *Guangdong shehui kexue*, no. 6, 2015. Through an analysis of several doctoral dissertations, this article depicts the complex interactions between a number of Chinese students of history and American sinology. It specifically focuses on how the topic, content, and approach of their dissertations were tied up with the field of American sinology, but does not discuss Chinese students of Western history in the United States.

⁽²⁾ The scholars of Western history who are the protagonists of this article are therefore mainly people who chose to study Western history in the United States, followed graduate courses in European and American history, and whose doctoral advisors were mainly concerned with the study of European and American history. As to the specific topics for their doctoral dissertations, the corpus studied here does not exclusively focus on students of Western history, but also includes scholars who did research on the history of Sino-European relations. Although some of them may have looked at issues in Chinese history from an East-West comparative perspective, one can nonetheless note that, on the whole, their basic academic training was in Western history. I refer to this group of intellectuals as “scholars of Western history” because most of them engaged in teaching and research in Western history after returning to China.

西洋史研究的学者的博士论文为考察对象，探究美国的西洋史学术传统如何影响了中国的世界史学科。

留美西洋史学者博士论文的选题特色

在民国时期赴美攻读历史学博士的学者中，绝大多数人都选择了中国史领域的博士论文题目。究其原因，首先是因为中国学者从事中国史研究更有语言和文化背景上的优势。当时美国致力于中国史研究的本土学者语言能力较弱，整体研究水平有限。因此，美国史学界非常希望中国的留学生们能够选择中国史方面的课题，这样在传播美国历史学的研究方法之外，还能够借助中国学生的汉语能力，把他们的研究成果纳入美国学术的脉络之中，从而提升整个美国史学界的中国史研究水平。³其次，中国留美攻读博士学位的历史学者，多数都是在国内大学完成的本科教育。而国内当时极为缺乏从事西洋史研究的基本条件，比如一手史料几乎无法获取，开设西洋史课程的老师不能用自己的研究成果来指导学生，等等，所以民国大学历史系的本科生只能获得一些西洋史的基础知识，很难受到系统的西洋史学术训练。在这种情况下，他们主要的学术积累都来自于中国史方面，留学后如果另起炉灶，选择西洋史方面的课题，对其显然是一个巨大的挑战。

³ 参见元青《民国时期留美生的中国历史研究与美国汉学——以博士论文为中心的考察》，《广东社会科学》2015年第6期，第118—119页。

ing in the United States, some of these scholars continued studying Western history, while others turned to the field of Chinese history. Nevertheless, their academic training contributed greatly to the development of Chinese historiography, as is especially evident in the case of the development of the discipline of world history in China. This article attempts to examine the doctoral dissertations of several scholars who were primarily engaged in Western history research during their time as students in the United States. It will explore how the academic tradition of Western history in the United States influenced the birth of world history as a discipline in China.

Dissertations by Chinese scholars of Western history in the United States: Remarks concerning their Choice of Topics

The vast majority of students who went to the United States to enroll in doctoral studies in history during the Republican period chose to pursue a dissertation topic in the field of Chinese history. The primary reason for this was the fact that Chinese scholars had an advantage over their American peers, seeing how they already possessed the linguistic and cultural skills needed to engage in the study of Chinese history. At that time, American historians of Chinese history generally had rather poor language skills and overall limited research skills. As a result, the American historical community eagerly welcomed Chinese students interested in pursuing Chinese history. In addition to serving as a means to spread the research methods of American historiography, American scholars of Chinese history saw an opportunity to draw on the language proficiency of their Chinese students and incorporate their research results into the American academic context, thus raising the prestige of the field of Chinese history in the American historiographical community as a whole.⁽³⁾ Another important reason for the general preference for Chinese instead of Western history was the fact that most Chinese students of history who stayed in the United States to pursue their doctoral degree had completed their undergraduate training at Chinese universities. We should bear in mind here that research into Western history was in a dismal state in China at the time: primary source materials [for research] were almost impossible to come by, teachers who taught courses in Western history could not use research in guiding their students, and so on. Under-

⁽³⁾ See Yuan Qing, "Minguo shiqi liu Mei sheng de Zhongguo lishi yanjiu yu Meiguo Hanxue: Yi boshi lunwen wei zhongxin de kaocha", pp. 118–119.

尽管如此，仍有少部分留美生迎难而上，选择攻读西洋史专业的博士学位，他们修读了大量的西洋史课程，并顺利完成了资格考试和论文答辩。他们的博士论文选题各具特色，为我们提出了诸多值得进一步探究的问题。本文根据著名的《中国留美同学博士论文目录》(*A Guide to Doctoral Dissertations by Chinese Students in America 1905—1960*)，以及搜集到的原始资料，选取了其中最具代表性的六篇博士论文。⁴具体情况见下表：

民国时期留美西洋史学者博士论文一览表

作者姓名	毕业学校	毕业时间	论文题目
蒋廷黻	哥伦比亚大学	1923	劳工与帝国：关于英国工党，主要是工党议员对于 1880 年以后英国帝国主义的反应的研究 (<i>Labor and Empire: A Study of the Reaction of British Labor, Mainly as Represented in Parliament, to British Imperialism Since 1880</i>)
雷海宗	芝加哥大学	1927	杜尔哥的政治思想 (<i>The Political Ideas of Turgot</i>)
齐思和	哈佛大学	1935	春秋时期的中国封建制度 (<i>Chinese Feudalism During the Ch'un-Ch'iu Period</i>)
皮名举	哈佛大学	1935	胶州湾租借：一项基于外交和帝国主义的研究 (<i>The Leasing of Kiaochow: A Study in Diplomacy and Imperialism</i>)
吴保安 (吴于廑)	哈佛大学	1946	封建中国的王权和法律：对比封建欧洲探讨封建中国的王权和法律 (<i>Kinship and Law in Feudal China: An Inquire into the Nature of Kinship and Law in Feudal China in the Light of a Comparison with Kinship and Law in Feudal Europe</i>)

⁴ 参见 Tung-li Yuan, *A Guide to Doctoral Dissertations by Chinese Students in America 1905 — 1960*, Published under the Auspices of the Sino-American Cultural Society, Inc., 1961。

graduates at the history departments of Chinese universities could at most acquire elementary knowledge of Western history, but it was nearly impossible for them to receive systematic academic training in this field. Given these circumstances, their training remained mostly grounded in Chinese history. Last but not least, it was obviously quite challenging for scholars such as these to choose a topic in Western history if they wanted to make a fresh start after their stay abroad.

Nevertheless, a small number of students in the United States still rose to the challenge of pursuing a PhD in Western history. They took numerous courses in Western history and successfully completed their qualifying exams and dissertations. The topics of their doctoral dissertations were all unique and raise many questions worth exploring in further detail. Based on the famous book *A Guide to Doctoral Dissertations by Chinese Students in America 1905-1960* and additional primary source materials, I have selected six of the most representative doctoral dissertations of this period.⁽⁴⁾ Details of the corpus are summarized in the following table:

List of doctoral dissertations by scholars of Western history who stayed in the United States during the Republican era

AUTHOR	UNIVERSITY	YEAR OF GRADUATION	DISSERTATION TITLE
Jiang Tingfu (Tsiang Tingfu 蒋廷黻)	Columbia University	1923	<i>Labor and Empire: A Study of the Reaction of British Labor, Mainly as Represented in Parliament, to British Imperialism Since 1880</i>
Lei Haizong (Lei Hai-Tsung 雷海宗)	University of Chicago	1927	<i>The Political Ideas of Turgot</i>

⁽⁴⁾ See Yuan Tung-li, *A Guide to Doctoral Dissertations by Chinese Students in America 1905-1960*, published under the Auspices of the Sino-American Cultural Society, 1961.

何炳棣	哥伦比亚大 学	1951	英国的土地与国家, 1873—1910: 对土地 改革运动和土地政策的研究 (<i>Land and State in Great Britain, 1873—1910: A Study of Land Reform Movements and Land Poli- cies</i>)
-----	------------	------	--

这六位学者留学美国的时间集中在 20 世纪 20 至 40 年代, 在时间上跨越了“五四”之后的民国大部分时期。在此期间, 无论是中国的历史学研究, 还是美国的历史学研究, 都经历了很大的变化, 他们成为了中美史学发展与史学交流的重要见证者。从选题的内容来看, 既有像蒋廷黻 (1895—1965)、雷海宗 (1902—1962)、何炳棣 (1917—2012) 这样选择纯粹的西洋史研究课题, 也有像皮名举 (1907—1959) 这样从国际关系史的视角来审视中国的对外关系, 还有像齐思和 (1907—1980)、吴于廑 (1913—1993) 这样以中西比较的视野来看待中国历史上的重大议题, 在选题上呈现出几个突出的特色。

首先, 一些选题体现了作者本人强烈的现实关怀。近代中国留学运动兴起的最重要背景就是中国处于“数千年未有之大变局”, 受到了西方列强全方位的强烈冲击。中国人留学的目的不仅是学习西方的科学文化知识, 而且是为了寻找西方国家富国强兵

Qi Sihe (Chi Szu-Ho 齐思和)	Harvard University	1935	<i>Chinese Feudalism During the Ch'un-Ch'iu Period</i>
Pi Mingju (Bee Ming-Chu 皮名举)	Harvard University	1935	<i>The Leasing of Kiaochow: A Study in Diplomacy and Imperialism</i>
Wu Bao'an (Wu Pao-an 吴保安 a.k.a Wu Yujin 吴于廑)	Harvard University	1946	<i>Kingship and Law in Feudal China: An Inquire into the Nature of Kinship and Law in Feudal China in the Light of a Comparison with Kinship and Law in Feudal Europe</i>
He Bingdi (Ho Ping-ti 何炳棣)	Columbia University	1951	<i>Land and State in Great Britain, 1873-1910: A Study of Land Reform Movements and Land Policies</i>

The six scholars listed here studied in the United States between the 1920s and the 1940s, a period which covers most of what is usually called the post-May Fourth period. During these three decades, both Chinese and American historical sciences underwent formidable changes. As such, this period bears witness to the development of these distinct historiographical traditions as well as the increasing interactions between them. In terms of content, the research listed here includes topics purely grounded in the field of Western history, such as those of Jiang Tingfu (Tsiang Tingfu 蒋廷黻, 1895-1965), Lei Haizong (Lei Hai-Tsung 雷海宗, 1902-1962), and He Bingdi (Ho Ping-ti 何炳棣, 1917-2012), examinations of China's foreign relations from the perspective of the history of international relations, for example Pi Mingju's (Bee Ming-Chu 皮名举, 1907-1959) dissertation, and investigations such as those of Qi Sihe (Chi Szu-Ho 齐思和, 1907-1980) and Wu Yujin (i.e., Wu Bao'an 吴保安, 1913-1993) which approached major issues in Chinese history from an East-West comparative perspective. These different topics display several striking features.

First, some of the topics reflect the author's strong concern for the concrete situation in which they found themselves. To understand the motivation of Chinese students studying abroad, we should remember the intellectual background of that time: China was experiencing a profound change, "a

的药方，“就像学生在‘五四’后因地位上升而一度以运动为正业、以学习为副业一样，留学生从一开始就被赋予或寄予了各式各样超越于学业的重任”。⁵即便专业是像历史学这样的人文学科，留学生们也想以史为鉴，实现救亡图存、复兴国家的现实目标。比如蒋廷黻选择研究 1880 年之后工党的外交政策，就是试图探讨在英国政党政治格局发生变化之后，这个新生的左翼政党能否改变英国长期的帝国主义外交政策，从而改善像中国这样的落后国家的国际环境。他在博士论文的序言中指出，“英国影响越来越大的政治因素，即英国工党在最近的四十年中对于英国的帝国主义究竟做了些什么？”“像印度、墨西哥和中国这样深受近代帝国主义之害的国家，能从几大列强国内的左派政治势力中获得比右派政治势力更好的待遇吗？”⁶也就是说，蒋廷黻看似选择研究的是英国的政党政治，实际上想要探讨英国国内政治与外交政策的关系，最终关注的是中英关系在工党执政之后能否有实质性改变，从而使中国获得更加平等的国际地位。

再比如皮名举选择的题目是胶州湾的租借问题，更是体现了中国学者对近代中国主权受到严重侵犯情况的高度关注。德国

⁵ 罗志田：《中国的近代：大国的历史转身》，商务印书馆 2019 年版，第 310 页。

⁶ Tingfu F. Tsiang, *Labor and Empire: A Study of the Reaction of British Labor, Mainly as Represented in Parliament, to British Imperialism Since 1880*, Columbia University Press, 1923, p. 7.

change of a scale not witnessed in thousands of years,” as the late-Qing statesman Li Hongzhang 李鴻章 (1823–1901) famously put it. On all fronts, China was under the strong impact of the Western powers. Chinese people studying abroad were not simply trying to learn from Western science and culture. Rather, they were looking for remedies, that is to say, means used by the Western powers to acquire economic power and military strength. In the words of the historian Luo Zhitian 羅志田, “just as in the case of students during the post-May Fourth era – who having gained a higher status devoted themselves first and foremost to the movement and dedicated only sparing time to their studies – outgoing international students were from the very beginning also entrusted with responsibilities that overshadowed their scholarly endeavors.”⁽⁵⁾ Even if they were majoring in a humanities subject such as history, Chinese international students wished to learn from history to achieve a concrete goal: saving their country and reviving the nation. Jiang Tingfu, for instance, chose to study the foreign policy of the Labor Party after 1880 to ascertain whether this nascent left-wing party could change Britain’s long-standing imperialist foreign policy. He wondered whether a change in the British domestic political landscape could lead to an improvement in the international standing of a country such as China. In the preface to his dissertation, Jiang wrote: “What has the rising political player in Great Britain, namely the British Labor Party, done about British imperialism during the last forty years? [...] Can countries such as India, Mexico, and China, who have been the most immediate victims of modern imperialism, expect better treatment from the political left than from the political right of the great powers?”⁽⁶⁾ In other words, although on the surface, Jiang was studying British party politics, he actually intended exploring the relation between British domestic politics and foreign policy. His real concern was with the question as to whether Sino-British relations would be substantially altered should the Labor Party come to power and thus allow China to gain a more equitable international status.

Another example of the strong concern for socio-political reality among Chinese students of history in the United States can be found in Pi Mingju’s

⁽⁵⁾ Luo Zhitian, *Zhongguo de jindai: daguo de lishi zhuan Shen* (China’s Modern Age: A Turning Point in the History of a Great Nation) (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2019), p. 310.

⁽⁶⁾ Tsiang Tingfu F., *Labor and Empire: A Study of the Reaction of British Labor, Mainly as Represented in Parliament, to British Imperialism Since 1880* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1923), p. 7.

1898 年把胶州湾变为租借地，掀起了西方列强瓜分中国的狂潮，中国的民族危机空前严重。因此，皮名举想要借助多国的外交档案，将重点放在“德国殖民政策的发展，远东的国际政治，中国的对外关系史”上，从史实上还原中国的这段屈辱经历。⁷德国在 19 世纪的现代化进程中姗姗来迟，直到 1871 年才实现统一，而当时英、法等国已经基本上将殖民地瓜分完毕。可是，德国由于拥有超强的教育与科技实力，在统一的过程中迅速崛起为世界一流强国，并且非常渴望在“帝国的年代”里获得一席之地。在这种情况下，德国把目光投向了远东。作者详细梳理了强租胶州湾之前，德国的远东外交政策如何从俾斯麦时期的相对克制，演变为威廉二世时期的帝国主义海外扩张的整个过程。皮名举的论文完成于 1935 年，正值日本加紧对华侵略的步伐，中国面临着非常严峻的外部环境。而当时的南京国民政府正与纳粹德国政府保持着密切的双边关系，蒋介石试图借助德国的投资与援助，在短时期内迅速增强中国的军事和经济实力，以抵御日本的威胁。同时，“德国的特殊发展道路——一个在 19 世纪最后三分之一岁月里实现了统一并成为世界性强国，接着又从第一次世界大战失败中迅速东山再起——提供了一个国家用非革命的方式快速发展的典范”，这对蒋介石政府非常有吸引力，成为学习借鉴的对象。⁸那么，纳粹德国真的是中国抗击日本侵略的可靠盟友吗？纳粹德国的远东政策和威廉二世时期的远东政策有本质区别吗？这些疑问成为皮名举博士论文选题的重要现实背景。

⁷ Ming-chu Bee, “The Leasing of Kiaochow: A Study in Diplomacy and Imperialism”, Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1935, p. 1.

⁸ 柯伟林：《德国与中华民国》，陈谦平、陈红民、武菁、申晓云译，钱乘旦校，江苏人民出版社 2006 年版，第 4 页。

dissertation on the leasing of Kiautschou Bay (膠州灣, Jiaozhou Bay). In choosing this topic, Pi addressed one of the foremost concerns of his contemporaries, namely the encroachment on China's sovereignty in modern times. The German lease of Jiaozhou Bay in 1898 was a key moment in setting off a frenzy for the partitioning of China by the Western powers, thus exacerbating China's national crisis to an unprecedented level. As such, by exploring the diplomatic archives of different countries, Pi wished to focus on "the development of German colonial policy, on world politics in the Far East, and on the history of Chinese foreign relations." His aim was to return to the origins of this humiliating experience for China through historical facts and documentation.⁽⁷⁾ In the 19th century, Germany was regarded as a latecomer to the modernization process. The country only became unified in 1871, the year the British and French had already largely finished carving up the world into their own colonial territories. However, capitalizing on its intellectual and scientific strengths, Germany quickly emerged as a world power thanks to this unification process. It was eager to assume its rightful place in this "age of empires." It is within this context that Germany started turning its attention to the Far East. In his dissertation, Pi detailed German foreign policy in the Far East before the leasing of the Jiaozhou Bay: it had evolved from relative restraint under Bismarck to full-blown imperialist expansion under Wilhelm II. Pi's thesis was completed in 1935, at the exact moment when Japan's aggression against China was intensifying and China became confronted with a severe predicament on the international stage. The Nationalist government in Nanjing maintained close bilateral relations with the Nazis because Chiang Kai-shek (1887-1975) was trying to secure German investments and assistance in a bid to rapidly strengthen China's military and economic power. The goal of the nationalists was to acquire the means to defend the country against Japanese aggression as quickly as possible. At the same time, "[i]n its emergence as a unified state and global power in the last third of the nineteenth century, and in its startling recovery from defeat in the First World War, Germany could appear as an exemplar of rapid – and nonrevolutionary – national development." Since this proved to be a highly attractive ideal to Chiang Kai-shek's government, Germany became a prominent object of study in China.⁽⁸⁾ Chinese intellectuals wondered if

⁽⁷⁾ Bee Ming-Chu, *The Leasing of Kiaochow: A Study in Diplomacy and Imperialism* (PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 1935), preface.

⁽⁸⁾ William C. Kirby, *Germany and Republican China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984), pp. 4-5.

其次，民国时期的留美西洋史学者大都在国内完成了本科教育，国内史学界的重大史学争论成为他们重要的问题意识来源。比如齐思和与吴于廑的博士论文都聚焦于非常热门的“封建”问题。⁹ 20世纪30年代初，国民大革命失败后的中国思想界围绕“中国的社会性质”问题展开了非常激烈的争论，随后又引发了对中国古代社会性质的论战，其中非常关键的一个问题就是“封建”问题。齐思和在博士论文的序言中指出，“另一方面，年轻的中国学者能够获取中国的原始史料，但是对封建这个概念的真正含义知之甚少，因为它对中国历史学者来说是一个全新的概念。也许在马克思主义社会学家的影响下，他们认为中国历史只不过是一个扩展的封建时代，而且一些争论围绕当代中国是否仍然是封建社会而展开”。¹⁰ 齐思和显然对国内学者对“封建”概念所知有限的情况非常不满，试图重新厘清这个重要概念。无独有偶，吴于廑对“封建”概念在国内学术争论中的误用也提出了尖锐的批评，“‘封建’一词被时下中国政论家的滥用已经到了几乎无法定义的地步。在很多情形中，人们用‘非现代’一词来替换它，当然，‘非现代’是不等同于‘封建’的”。吴于廑还认为国内关于“封建”问题的论战水平有限，最重要的原因“来自某些误导性的但是颇具影响的概念，它们深深地植根于中国封建主义独有的特点里和封建时代结束后不久的思想发展史之中”。¹¹ 二人都是由于对国内学术论战的现状不满意而参与到“封建”问题的讨论之中。齐思和的论文主要探讨春秋时期的封建制度，这个时期封建制度正在走向衰落。吴于廑则聚焦中国封建时期的“王权”与“法律”这两大主题，并与欧洲中世纪的封建制度进行了深入的比较。二人的博士论文尽管视角有所不同，但都是为了回应郭沫若为代表的“泛化封建论”，并且都充分利用欧美史学界的学术理论与方法，说明中国的封建制度与欧洲的封建制度相似性远大于差异性。¹² 他们二人在哈佛大学学习

⁹ 齐思和本科就读于燕京大学历史系，吴于廑本科就读于东吴大学历史系，硕士就读于南开大学经济研究所。

¹⁰ Chi Szu-ho, “Chinese Feudalism During the Ch’un-Ch’iu Period”, Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1935, p. III.

¹¹ 吴于廑：《士与古代封建制度之解体；封建中国的王权和法律》，武汉大学出版社2012年版，第175、177页。

¹² 以郭沫若为代表的“新思潮派”则主张“泛化封建论”，认为以农业为基础的战国时期直到近代的中国都是封建社会，从而使“封建”的概念泛化为“以农业为基础”。关于论战中的“封建”问题，参见冯天瑜《“封建”考论》，武汉大学出版社2006年版，第245—270页。

Nazi Germany would prove to be a reliable ally against Japanese aggression. Was Nazi Germany's Far East policy fundamentally different from that of Wilhelm II? These questions could be regarded as an important background for Bee's choice of topic.

A second major characteristic of the dissertations listed above is related to the fact that most scholars of Western history during the Republican era had completed their undergraduate education in China. As a result, their awareness of historical issues was informed by debates within the domestic historiographical community. For example, the doctoral dissertations of Qi Sihe and Wu Yujin were both concerned with the contentious issue of "feudalism."⁽⁹⁾ In the early 1930s, after the failure of the National Revolution, a fierce controversy regarding the question of "the nature of Chinese society" erupted among Chinese intellectuals. The key concept in this debate was precisely that of "feudalism." In the preface to his doctoral dissertation, Qi Sihe pointed out that "even though they have access to primary historical sources on China, young Chinese scholars are clueless about the concept of feudalism, since this is an entirely new concept for Chinese historians. It is probably under the influence of Marxist sociologists that they have begun to conceive of Chinese history as one long period of feudalism. Debates have even been devoted to the question as to whether contemporary China is still a feudal society."⁽¹⁰⁾ Qi was clearly dissatisfied with the limited understanding of the concept of "feudalism" among Chinese scholars and therefore tried to clarify its meaning. Wu Yujin also sharply criticized the widespread misuse of the concept of "feudalism" in Chinese academic debates and claimed that "the term 'feudalism' has been misused by current Chinese political commentators to such an extent that it has become almost impossible to define. In many cases, the term 'non-modern' has even been employed as a substitute for it. However, it goes without saying that 'non-modern' is not synonymous with 'feudal.'" Wu believed that the most important reason behind the shallowness of these debates stemmed from "the profound influence exerted by a number of misleading concepts which are, in turn, deeply rooted in the unique characteristics of Chinese feudalism as well as

⁽⁹⁾ Qi Sihe studied at the Department of History at Yanjing University for his undergraduate degree. Wu Yujin studied at the Department of History at Soochow University before enrolling in the Institute of Economics at Nankai University for his MA.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Chi Szu-ho, *Chinese Feudalism During the Ch'un-Ch'iu Period*, PhD. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1935, p. iii.

的基本是西洋史方面的课程，导师也都是哈佛大学著名的英美宪政史和西方政治思想史大家查尔斯霍华德·麦基文 (**Charles Howard McIlwain, 1871 – 1968**) 教授，可是，他们不约而同地选择研究中国的封建问题，说明民国时期留学美国的西洋史学者高度关注中国学术界的热门话题，即便是留学期间的学位论文也要对其做出回应，带着鲜明的中国学人的问题意识。

另外，这批留美西洋史学者的博士论文在选题上主要侧重欧洲国家的历史，而没有选择美国和拉美国家的历史。蒋廷黻选择研究 19 世纪 80 年代后英国工党的外交政策；雷海宗主要探讨法国旧制度末期“重农学派”思想家和政治家杜尔哥 (**Anne Robert Jacques Turgot, 1727—1781**) 的政治思想；皮名举通过租借胶州湾来探讨德意志第二帝国的远东外交政策；何炳棣则聚焦英国

the intellectual developments following the end of the feudal era.”⁽¹¹⁾ Qi and Wu both felt the need to address the issue of “feudalism” because of their dissatisfaction with the state of the academic debate in China. Qi’s dissertation was concerned with the decaying feudal system during the Spring and Autumn period (771-476 BCE), while Wu’s dissertation focused on the two major issues of “sovereignty” and “law” in feudal China by providing an in-depth comparison with the feudalism of medieval Europe. Although their doctoral dissertations differed in perspective, they each in their own way answered the call to broaden the application of the term “feudalism” championed by Guo Moruo 郭沫若 (1892-1978), making full use of the academic theories and methods deployed by European and American historians in order to show that the Chinese feudal system shared much more in common with European feudalism than had previously been assumed.⁽¹²⁾ Both Qi and Wu had mainly studied Western history at Harvard University under the supervision of Professor Charles Howard McIlwain (1871-1968), Harvard’s leading scholar of Anglo-American constitutional history and the history of Western political thought. However, their desire to study feudalism in China demonstrates that scholars of Western history studying in the United States during the Republican era were well acquainted with burning issues in academic circles back home. In their dissertations, they took the trouble of responding to ongoing Chinese debates, which clearly shows that they shared the same problem consciousness as scholars at home.

Additionally, one should note that the doctoral dissertations of this group of scholars were mainly focused on the history of European countries and hardly touched upon the history of the United States and Latin America. Jiang Tingfu chose to study the foreign policy of the British Labor Party after the 1880s; Lei Haizong explored the political thought of Anne Robert Jacques Turgot (1727-1781), a French thinker, politician and physiocrat who lived at

⁽¹¹⁾ Wu Yujin, *Shi yu gudai fengjian zhidu zhi jieti: fengjian Zhongguo de wangquan he falü* (Scholar-Officials and the Disintegration of the Ancient Feudal System: Sovereignty and Law in Feudal China) (Wuhan: Wuhan daxue chubanshe, 2012), p. 175 and p. 177.

⁽¹²⁾ The “New Thought School” represented by Guo Moruo advocated the theory of “feudalism in a broad sense,” arguing that China had been a feudal agriculture-based society from the Warring States period until the modern era. As such, this school broadened the concept of “feudalism” to cover the more general category of “agriculture-based societies.” On the controversies regarding the meaning of the concept of “feudalism,” see Feng Tianyu, “Fengjian” kaolun (An Examination of “Feudalism”) (Wuhan: Wuhan daxue chubanshe, 2006), pp. 245-270.

19 世纪末 20 世纪初的土地改革与土地政策;齐思和与吴于廑在研究中国的封建制度时,也是与欧洲中世纪的封建制度进行对比。他们虽然都留学美国,而且有些人主修的都是美国史课程,但是他们显然对欧洲国家的历史更感兴趣。这主要与当时中国学者对西洋史的认识有关。20 世纪第一个十年曾留学美国瓦萨女子大学 (Vassar College) 与芝加哥大学的陈衡哲 (1890—1976) 是我国西洋史领域的知名学者,她的《西洋史》一书是民国时期中国人撰写的西洋通史的开创性著作,是“一部‘流布极广’的中学教材,曾在 20 世纪上半叶构筑过无数国人心中西方历史的镜像”。¹³ 陈衡哲在该书的例言中对“西洋史”进行了界定,“本书的范围以‘文化的欧洲’(见第一编第二章)及纯粹欧化的美洲为限,故定名曰《西洋史》”。¹⁴ 也就是说,西洋史主要研究欧洲和像美洲这样欧化程度很高的地区的历史。这部《西洋史》在内容安排上,按照上古、中古、近世的时间顺序,梳理了欧洲从古希腊、罗马,到中世纪的封建制度,再到近代文艺复兴、宗教改革、地理大发现、法国革命、工业革命、1848 年革命、第一次世界大战等重大事件的发展历史,基本上以欧洲为中心,对美国和美洲的历史很少提及。陈衡哲的这种对西洋史的认知,其实代表了当时大多数中国学人的看法,所以这批学者在留美之后自然更为关注欧洲国家的历史,认为其研究价值更高。此外,欧洲历史悠久,这方面的学术积累也非常深厚,在与中国古代历史进行比较时更有参考价值。

¹³ 高毅:《邂逅阎宗临》,《中国图书评论》2008 年第 3 期,第 76 页。

¹⁴ 陈衡哲:《西洋史》,辽宁教育出版社 1998 年版,第 7 页。

the end of the *Ancien Régime*. Pi Mingju studied the foreign policy of the German Second Empire in the Far East through the leasing of Jiaozhou Bay. He Bingdi focused on British land reform and land policy in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In their studies of China's feudal system, Qi Sihe and Wu Yujin drew many comparisons with feudalism in medieval Europe. Although these scholars all studied in the United States and some of them even majored in American history, they were clearly more interested in the history of European countries. This should be understood against the background of how Western history was perceived by Chinese intellectuals at the time. Let us consider "an 'extremely popular' secondary school textbook which shaped the image of Western history in the minds of countless people during the first half of the 20th century,"⁽¹³⁾ Chen Hengzhe's 陈衡哲 (1890–1976) *History of the West*. Chen, who had studied at Vassar College and the University of Chicago in the first decade of the 20th century, was a well-known scholar in the field of Western history in China. Her *History of the West* was the first general Western history ever written by a Chinese scholar during the Republican period. In her introduction to this book, Chen offered the following definition of "Western History": "The scope of this book being limited to the 'civilized Europe' (See Part 1, Chapter 2) and to the essentially Europeanized parts of America, I decided to entitle it *History of the West*."⁽¹⁴⁾ In other words, Western history was regarded as the history of highly Europeanized regions such as parts of the Americas and, of course, Europe itself. Chen's *History of the West* was arranged in a chronological order as a successive examination of ancient, medieval, and modern history. It explored the history of Europe's development from ancient Greece and Rome to the feudal system of the Middle Ages, proceeding to discuss the Renaissance, the Reformation, the discovery of the New World, the French Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, the 1848 Revolution, and World War I. It was fundamentally centered on Europe and only incidentally mentioned the history of the United States and the Americas. Chen Hengzhe's perception of Western history actually captures the general view held by Chinese scholars at that time. Against this background, it becomes easy to see why our group of Chi-

⁽¹³⁾ Gao Yi, "Xiehou Yan Zonglin" (Encounter with Yan Zonglin), *Zhongguo tushu pingshuo*, 2008, no. 3, p. 76.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Chen Hengzhe, *Xiyang shi (History of the West)* (Shenyang: Liaoning jiaoyu chubanshe, 1998), p. 7. Translator's note: for an overview of Chen's contribution to historical sciences see Denise Gimpel, *Chen Hengzhe: A Life between Orthodoxies* (Lanham, Lexington Books, 2015).

而美国历史极为短暂，并不为拥有深厚史学传统的中国学人所重视。据齐思和的女儿齐文颖回忆，齐思和本来并不想去美国大学学习美国史，认为美国史很短，没有什么可学的，最后在老师洪业 (William Hung, 1893—1980) 的一再劝说之下方才成行，而且最后并没有选择美国史领域的博士论文题目。¹⁵ 再加上这批学者在留学美国时，欧洲的几大强国依然主导着国际秩序，世界科学文化的中心仍然在欧洲，因此即便从以史为鉴的角度来看，欧洲历史对中国学者无疑更有吸引力。

留美西洋史学者博士论文的学术价值

留学美国的这批西洋史学人，克服语言和文化上的障碍，主动选择美国人更为擅长的西洋史作为自己博士论文的研究对象，对自己提出了很大的挑战。他们能够顺利完成论文，通过答辩并获得学位，本身已经非常不易。在评价这些论文的学术价值时，除了要顾及他们的留学生身份，更重要的还是要将其放在美国的西洋史学术脉络下进行考察。

¹⁵ 参见齐文颖口述《齐思和：燕园第一位哈佛博士》，《新京报》2005年12月28日。

nese scholars continued to pay more attention to the history of European countries after their stay in the United States. They believed that exploring Europe's history had greater academic merit. Furthermore, with its long history and longstanding scholarly traditions, Europe appeared as a more suitable object of comparison for a country as old as China.

By contrast, the history of the United States was regarded as still being in its infancy, which implied that it was not valued as much by Chinese scholars who prided themselves on being part of a longstanding tradition of historiography. According to Qi Sihe's daughter, Qi Wenying 齐文颖, Qi was initially not interested in studying American history at an American university. He thought the history of the United States was so brief there was hardly anything worth researching there and he only came to change his mind under the influence of his teacher William Hung (1893–1980). Still, in the end, Qi did not choose a doctoral dissertation topic in the field of American history.⁽¹⁵⁾ Although the scholars we are considering here studied in the United States, they did so at a time when European powers still dominated the international order. Europe was still the center of the world in terms of science and culture. For these soon-to-be professional Chinese historians, European history undoubtedly remained the most attractive option.

Evaluation of the Academic Value of the Dissertations

The Chinese scholars of Western history who are the topic of this paper succeeded in overcoming linguistic and cultural barriers. They took it upon themselves to write doctoral dissertations in the field of Western history, a field better mastered by American scholars. In doing so, they had to overcome considerable challenges. The very fact that they were able to successfully complete and defend their dissertations and obtain a PhD degree was no mean feat. Their status as international students is therefore a first thing to focus on in evaluating their contributions. Apart from that, we should take care to place them in the context of the academic networks that structured the field of Western history in the United States.

Historical materials are the foundation of historical research and a standard criterion for evaluating the scholarly value of historical works. Most of the

⁽¹⁵⁾ See Qi Wenying's remarks in "Qi Sihe: Yanyuan di yi wei Hafo boshi" (Qi Sihe: The First Harvard Doctor of Yanyuan), *Xinjing bao*, December 28, 2005.

史料是历史学研究的基础，也是评价史学著作学术价值高低的基本标准。本文提及的几位学者，大都能够充分利用美国大学优越的西洋史资料条件，为自己的博士论文奠定了坚实的史料基础。当时国内从事西洋史研究的学者非常稀少，其中的一个关键原因就在于无法获取从事研究的原始资料。留学美国并从事西洋史方面的研究，明显具有资料上的优势。皮名举的论文属于国际关系史领域，运用多国的外交档案是他论文材料的突出特色。他使用的中文史料包括《清季外交史料》《教案奏议汇编》《清代筹办夷务始末》《清光绪朝中日交涉史料》《光绪政要》等，既有清朝的外交档案，又有晚清的教案资料，还有光绪朝的谕旨、奏疏等官方文件。德国方面的档案包括《欧洲各国内阁的大战略，1871—1914：外交部外交档案汇编》(*Die grosse Politik der europäischen Kabinette, 1871 — 1914: Sammlung der diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes*)、《外交部外交档案，1871—1914》(*Die diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes, 1871 — 1914*)、《国家档案：当代史官方档案》(*Das Staatsarchiv: Sammlung der offiziellen Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Gegenwart*)、《德意志帝国议会会议速记》(*Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages*)等。皮名举还使用了部分英国、日本、法国、俄国、美国的外交档案，如《美国对外关系文件集》(*Foreign Relations of the United States*)，以及大量各当事国重要外交决策者的日记与回忆录。¹⁶ 皮名举的论文在材料运用上令人叹为观止，不仅涉及的国家广，运用的语言多，而且种类极为丰富。这充分展现了皮名举出色的语言能力，以及细致的资料搜集功夫。

¹⁶ 参见 Ming-chu Bee, “The Leasing of Kiaochoh: A Study in Diplomacy and Imperialism”, Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1935。

scholars mentioned here were able to make extensive use of well-preserved historical materials in laying a solid foundation for their doctoral dissertations. As already mentioned above, one of the main reasons for the scarcity of scholars working on Western history in China at that time was a lack of access to primary sources. Studying in the United States and conducting research at American Universities gave them an obvious advantage in this respect. A prominent feature of Pi Mingju's dissertation – a study in the history of international relations – was the fact that it drew on the diplomatic archives of several different countries. Among the Chinese materials explored, we can mention the *Historical Diplomatic Documents of the Late Qing Period* (*Qingji waijiao shiliao*), the *Collection of Memorials and Essays Related to Christian Cases* (*Jiao'an zouyi huibian*), the *Complete Qing Record of the Management of Barbarian Affairs* (*Qingdai chouban yiwu shimo*), the *Historical Documents Regarding Sino-Japanese Diplomacy Under the Reign of the Guangxu Emperor* (*Qing Guangxu chao Zhong Ri jiaoshe shiliao*), the *Essential Political Documents of the Guangxu Reign* (*Guangxu zhengyao*), and so on. As to the German side of his topic, Pi consulted records such as *The Grand Strategy of the European Cabinets, 1871–1914: Compilation of the Diplomatic Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs* (*Die grosse Politik der europäischen Kabinette, 1871 - 1914: Sammlung der diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes*), *The Diplomatic Files of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1871–1914* (*Die diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes, 1871-1914*), the *State Archives: A Collection of Official Archives for Contemporary History* (*Das Staatsarchiv: Sammlung der offiziellen Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Gegenwart*), and the *Stenographic Reports of the Reichstag Proceedings* (*Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Reichstages*). Pi's text also made reference to certain British, Japanese, French, Russian, and American diplomatic archives, such as the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series, as well as a large number of diaries and memoirs of important foreign policy-makers.⁽¹⁶⁾ The sheer amount of materials used by Pi in his dissertation is stunning, not merely covering a wide range of different countries and languages, but also displaying a striking variety in the different types of sources consulted. Pi's dissertation is a testimony to the excellence of his linguistic skills and the meticulous way in which he collected data.

⁽¹⁶⁾ See the bibliography in Ming-Chu Bee, "The Leasing of Kiaochow: A Study in Diplomacy and Imperialism," Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1935.

何炳棣的论文主要关注英国 1873—1910 年间的土地改革与土地政策，属于英国农业史领域。他在史料上非常下工夫，在半个世纪后的回忆录中依然对此颇为自豪，“半世纪后重读哥大博士论文的第一感想是史料充实的程度使我自己都吃一惊”。¹⁷何炳棣对自己这篇博士论文使用的基本史料的质与量进行了概述：

先谈英国议会 101 种文件（内包括 31 种法令全文），最初卷帙浩繁的《议会辩论》（1870 至 1910 年 40 年间）必须不时翻检可以不论，有关城乡土地及地方财政等问题的 71 种专门文件之中，由英王（事实上是政府行政部门）指令刊印公开出售的“command papers”即有 53 种之多；这些“指令文件”都是 Royal Commission（皇家专门问题调查委员会）和较小型更专门、由议会指令所组的调查委员会（Select Committee）的报告书，有的数年始调查完成，都是最翔实、多视角的第一手资料。但是，至今最令我自豪的是罕为人知、幸存于哥大赛里格曼专藏和纽约公共图书馆亨利乔治专室的不少 19 世纪后半和 20 世纪初叶英国主要土地改革会社的章程、会员录、年报、重要公开演讲，联合各种进步分子，扩大宣传游说，以至 1906 年后向当政自由党政府施压请愿等等的纪事专册。这些都是极其可贵的，真正“草根性”的最原始史料。¹⁸

何炳棣博士论文使用的原始资料，即便按照美国西洋史研究的标准来看，也实现了重要的突破。除了那些一般欧美学者都会使用的英国议会的辩论记录和政府的官方指令文件之外，何炳棣还使用了大量的普通英国土地改革会社的草根性文献。这些草根性的原始史料大都未被其他英国史学者所利用，因此具有非常特殊的价值。这些史料使何炳棣的论文在视角上做到了官方和基层相结合，更加全面地为读者呈现了英国在 1873—1910 年间土地改革和土地政策的历史面相。

¹⁷ 何炳棣：《读史阅世六十年》，广西师范大学出版社 2005 年版，第 252—253 页。

¹⁸ 何炳棣：《读史阅世六十年》，第 253 页。

Ho Ping-ti's dissertation focused on land reform and land policies in England between 1873 and the 1910s. As such, it dealt with British agricultural history. He toiled relentlessly to gain access to relevant historical material. Half a century later, Ho was still proud of his accomplishment: "The first thing that struck me when I reread my doctoral dissertation half a century later was the scope and the richness of the historical materials I had gathered."⁽¹⁷⁾ He offered his own outline of the quality and quantity of the basic historical materials used in his dissertation:

Among my sources, I should, first of all, mention the 101 British Parliamentary Papers (including the full text of 31 Acts), and the original voluminous Parliamentary Debates (40 years from 1870 to 1910) which I had to consult quite frequently. Among the 71 various special papers on issues such as urban and rural land and local finance, there were 53 "command papers" published by order of the King (in fact, the executive branch of government). These "command papers" included the reports of the Royal Commission which led inquiries into special problems as well as the reports of the Select Committee which are relatively smaller, and more specialized. These documents were the most informative, multifaceted, and first-hand accounts on the topic. But what I am most proud of to this day are the rare surviving documents I gathered in the Seligman Collection at Columbia and the Henry George Room at the New York Public Library: volumes of the constitutions, membership records, annual reports, major public speeches, and various documents that depicted the progressive efforts to unite and expand the lobby of the major British Land reform societies in the latter half of the 19th and early 20th centuries, not to forget the petitions to the Liberal government in power after 1906. These were the most valuable and original historical materials I used and were truly of a "grassroots" nature.⁽¹⁸⁾

Ho's doctoral dissertation achieved an important breakthrough in terms of primary sources – an assessment valid even by American standards of historical studies. In addition to the records of British parliamentary debates and official government documents that are generally the bread and butter of European and American scholars, he also used a large number of grassroots

⁽¹⁷⁾ He Bingdi (Ho Ping-ti), *Du shi yue shi liushi nian (Sixty Years of Reading History and Observing the World)* (Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 2005), pp. 252–253.

⁽¹⁸⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 253.

这批留美西洋史学者的博士论文除了运用扎实的史料之外，在研究视角上也有诸多创新之处。蒋廷黻在留学时敏锐地看到了一战期间工党在英国政坛上的迅速崛起这一新的政治动向，试图探究这个将来极有可能执政的左翼政党在外交政策上是否会出现大的变化。蒋廷黻选择的这个课题非常新颖，是一部“预流”之作。英国工党的兴起在蒋廷黻留学时是个刚刚发生的新现象，至少史学界还未来得及对其从历史角度进行富有说服力的解释。而且 19 世纪后期在英国和欧洲兴起的左翼政党的国内政治纲领和该国的帝国主义外交政策之间事实上充满了张力，这些政党面对一战前后的国际形势如何进行调整，或者在执政后如何改变曾经的外交政策，都是值得政界和学界思考的重要课题。蒋廷黻的博士论文完成于 1923 年，可以说很早地介入了对这些重要问题的讨论，而一年之后英国工党就第一次上台执政，更使其具有了学术与现实的双重意义。

皮名举选择租借胶州湾作为研究对象，但他没有只是将其作为对中国近代史影响巨大的一个外交事件，而是运用跨国史、国际史的研究视野，把它放到整个远东国际关系格局中进行审视。作者重点探讨了德国远东政策的形成过程，德国选择胶州湾作为远东基地的原因，德国占领胶州湾的经过，俄国对胶州湾的觊觎与干预，英国在胶州湾危机后的应对，法国、美国、日本对这一事件的态度，以及中德两国在胶州湾问题上的谈判等问题。他没有把租借胶州湾局限在中、德两国，而是多维度、立体化地呈现了以胶州湾事件为平台而展开的大国之间的激烈博

materials originating from ordinary British Land reform societies. Most of these primary source materials had not been previously used by any other scholars of British history and are therefore of tremendous value. These sources allowed Ho to combine official and grassroots perspectives, thus offering a more comprehensive picture of land reform and land policies in England during the period going from 1873 to the 1910s.

Solidly grounded in historical evidence, the PhD dissertations of the group of intellectuals studied here also contained many innovations in terms of their research outlook. During his time abroad, Jiang Tingfu keenly observed the rapid rise of the Labor Party during World War I and wished to answer the following conundrum: would this left-wing party, which was likely to come to power in the future, make any major changes to British foreign policy? The subject chosen by Jiang was very original; it is truly a work of *avant-garde*. At that time, the rise of the British Labor Party was still a new phenomenon, for which no historian had proposed a convincing historical explanation. Moreover, the tension between the domestic political programs of the left-wing parties which emerged in Britain and Europe in the late nineteenth century and the imperialist foreign policies of these same countries were an important issue to be explored by political and academic circles. The same applies to the question as to how these parties adjusted to the international situation before and after World War I and how they changed their foreign policies after coming to power. Since it was completed in 1923, we can safely say that Jiang's doctoral dissertation was one of the first studies to tackle these important issues. The fact that the Labor Party actually managed to become the ruling party for the first time in British history only a year later made Jiang's dissertation all the more relevant academically but also practically speaking.

Pi Mingju decided to work on the lease of Jiaozhou Bay, but he did not simply treat it as one of the many major events in modern Chinese history. Instead, grounding himself in the research perspectives of transnational and international history, he approached it as a means of clarifying the complete constellation of international relations in the Far East. In doing so, he focused on the formation of Germany's Far East policy, the reasons why Germany chose the Jiaozhou Bay as its base in the Far East, and how the Germans came to occupy the bay. He also put emphasis on why the Russians were coveting Jiaozhou Bay and intervened, on the British response after the Jiaozhou Bay

弈。皮名举有效利用哈佛大学优越的学术资源，综合使用多国档案，并且充分吸收美国国际关系史研究的各种范式，在研究视角上实现了突破，完成了一篇出色的国际关系史论文。

留美西洋史学者在撰写博士论文的过程中面临着语言和方法上的巨大挑战，但他们不仅克服了各种困难，顺利完成了论文，而且还得到了导师和美国学术界的充分认可。蒋廷黻的博士论文在他毕业的 1923 年由美国哥伦比亚大学出版社出版，并收入著名的由哥伦比亚大学政治科学学院编辑的“历史、经济和公共法律研究”(Studies in History, Economics and Public Law) 丛书。这套丛书主要选择哥伦比亚大学历史学、经济学、法学、社会学等专业的优秀博士论文来出版，具有很高的学术水准。¹⁹ 蒋廷黻的博士论文出版后，引起了很多美国重要学术期刊的关注，包括美国统计协会 (American Statistical Association) 主办的《美国统计协会杂志》(Journal of the American Statistical Association) 1923 年 6 月号、美国政治科学协会 (American Political Science Association) 主办的《美国政治科学评论》(The American Political Science Review) 1923 年 8 月号和美国经济协会 (American Economic Association) 主办的《美国经济评论》(The American Economic Review) 1923 年 9 月号，在这些刊物的新书信息中都提到了蒋廷黻的这部著作，而且《美国政治科学评论》1924 年 5 月号还对这本书有一段简要的介绍。²⁰ 这些都充分说明了蒋廷黻博士论文的学术价值。

¹⁹ 信奉儒家思想的经济思想史家陈焕章 (1880—1933) 1910 年在哥大完成的博士论文《孔门理财学》(The Economic Principles of Confucius and his schools)、北京大学前任校长马寅初 (1882—1982) 1914 年在哥大完成的博士论文《纽约市的财政》(The Finances of the City of New York) 也都收入了哥大这套“历史、经济和公共法律研究”丛书。

²⁰ 参见 “Briefer Notices,” *The American Economic Review*, vol. 18, no. 2 (1924), p. 426.

crisis, on the attitudes of France, the United States, and Japan toward this event, and finally on the Sino-German negotiations. He did not treat the leasing of Jiaozhou Bay in narrow terms as a purely Sino-German issue, but presented it through a multidimensional lens. In his analysis, Jiaozhou Bay became a stage for the competition between the great powers. By making effective use of Harvard University's outstanding academic resources, integrating the archives of multiple countries, and fully absorbing the various paradigms deployed by the American researchers working in the field of international relations, Pi's research outlook also accomplished a genuine breakthrough and allowed him to complete an excellent dissertation in the field of international relations.

Chinese scholars of Western history in the United States faced enormous linguistic and methodological challenges in writing their doctoral dissertations. However, they not only managed to overcome these difficulties and successfully complete their dissertations, but also received due recognition from their supervisors and the American academic community at large. Jiang's dissertation was published by Columbia University Press in 1923, the very year of his graduation. It was included in the renowned "Studies in History, Economics and Public Law" series, edited by the School of Political Science. This series included a selection of the best dissertations defended at Columbia University in the fields of history, economics, and public law, and sociology, thus stressing their high academic value.⁽¹⁹⁾ After its publication, Jiang's doctoral dissertation attracted the attention of many important American academic journals, including the *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, sponsored by the American Statistical Association, which reviewed the text in its June 1923 issue. In August 1923, *The American Political Science Review*, sponsored by the American Political Science Association, also published a positive review of the book. Later on in September, it was the turn of *The American Economic Review* (September 1923), sponsored by the American Economic Association, to mention Jiang Ting-fu's work in its section regarding new publications. The May 1924 issue of the *American*

⁽¹⁹⁾ The series "Studies in History, Economics and Public Law" at Columbia University Press had previously published the doctoral dissertations of two other Chinese scholars not discussed in this article: *The Economic Principles of Confucius and his School*, a dissertation completed in 1910 by Chen Huanzhang 陈焕章 (1880–1933), a historian of economic thought and strong promoter of Confucianism; as well as *The Finances of the City of New York*, completed in 1914 by Ma Yinchu 马寅初 (1882–1982), who would later become president of Peking University.

何炳棣的博士论文虽然经历种种曲折，遗憾地未获出版，但这并不是由学术因素造成的。他的导师柏莱柏诺 (John Bartlet Brebner, 1895—1957) 对论文评价甚高，在给何炳棣的信中说，“你不必对你的博士论文有所担心。它是一部有魄力和说服力的著作，既原创，又独立”。柏莱柏诺在给另一位教授的信中也提及了何的论文，“他的论文实在是一件值得自豪的成就，一经整理之后，在英国出版的机会应该是很好的。他怎样做出来的，我不知道，但只知道他有思维能(魄)力和显然异常强烈的欲望去使用它”。²¹ 何炳棣毕业多年之后，两位英国农业史方面的权威学者在一本书的序中也对他未刊印的哥大博士论文给予了充分肯定，“对农业史家而言，这方面最好的出发点是何炳棣教授拓建性、但可惜未曾出版的、1951年完成的论文：《英国的土地与国家，1873—1910》。这个值得赞扬并富启示性的研究，解析了构成 J. S. Mill 1870 年成立的地权改革协会的多项纲领的历史渊源，并进而考查了 20 世纪初叶自由党前后内阁乡村和城市土地政策的决定因素”。²² 一部未获出版的博士论文在多年之后还能被该领域的权威学者提及并获得肯定，实属不易。

美国的西洋史学术传统与中国世界史学科的奠基

本文提及的六位留美西洋史学者，有五位选择了回国任教，并有四位继续从事西洋史的教学与研究工作，为中国世界史学科的建立与发展奠定了坚实的基础。²³

²¹ 何炳棣：《读史阅世六十年》，第 255—256 页。

²² 何炳棣：《读史阅世六十年》，第 261 页。

²³ 何炳棣博士毕业后留在美国和加拿大等国任教，转向中国史的研究与教学工作。蒋廷黻回国后先教了几年西洋史，但之后主要从事中国近代史、中国近代外交史方面的研究；雷海宗、齐思和、皮名举、吴于廑回国后主要从事西洋史方面的教学与研究工作。

Political Science Review included a brief paragraph introducing the book as well.⁽²⁰⁾ All these journals were full of praise for the scholarly value of Jiang's dissertation.

Although Ho Pingti's doctoral dissertation never ended up being published, the reasons for this were not scientific in nature, but due to several twists and turns unrelated to its academic quality. Ho's advisor John Bartlet Brebner (1895–1957) spoke highly of the dissertation, writing in a letter to his student: "You need not worry about your doctoral dissertation. It is a vigorous and persuasive work, both original and independent." In a letter to another professor, Brebner also mentioned Ho's work, "His dissertation is really an achievement to be proud of, and once collated, it should have a good chance of being published in England. How he made it, I do not know, but only that he had the necessary intellectual capacities as well as an unusually strong desire to make full use of them."⁽²¹⁾ Two leading scholars of British agricultural history also gave full credit to his unpublished Columbia University doctoral dissertation in the preface to a book written years after Ho's graduation: "In this respect, the best starting point for agricultural historians is Professor Ho's pioneering, but unfortunately unpublished, dissertation, completed in 1951: *Land and State in Great Britain, 1873–1910: A Study of Land Reform Movements and Land Policies*. This praiseworthy and revealing study analyzes the historical origins of the programs that constituted the Land Rights Reform Society founded by John Stuart Mill in 1870, and goes on to examine the determining factors behind rural and urban land policy in the early twentieth century, before and after the Liberal Cabinet."⁽²²⁾ These remarks are quite significant, since it is very unusual for an unpublished doctoral dissertation to still be mentioned and recognized by leading scholars in the field years later.

The American Academic Tradition of Western History and the Foundations of the World History Discipline in China

Five of the six scholars of Western history discussed in this article chose to return to China after their graduation. Four of them continued teaching and researching Western history and succeeded in laying a solid foundation

⁽²⁰⁾ See "Briefer Notices," *The American Economic Review*, vol. 18, no. 2 (1924), p. 426.

⁽²¹⁾ He Bingdi, *Du shi yue shi liushi nian*, pp. 255–256.

⁽²²⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 261.

蒋廷黻回国后先在南开大学历史系教授西洋史课程，在此期间他的研究兴趣逐渐转向中国近代外交史，并尤其注重晚清时期中国方面外交史料的搜集和整理工作。1929年5月，在南开任教六年半之后，蒋廷黻转赴清华大学历史系任教，还担任了系主任一职。他在出掌清华历史系的五年内，提出了著名的“历史与社会科学并重；历史之中西方史与中国史并重；中国史内考据与综合并重”的办系理念，对清华历史系从课程设置、师资选聘、人才培养等方面进行了全面的改革。蒋廷黻本人的研究重心虽然转向了中国史，但他仍然非常重视外国史课程的开设，“就近两年论，历史系每年平均约有二十一二种课程，其中中外史各占一半”。在蒋廷黻看来，之所以要兼重外国历史，“第一是外国史本身有研究的必要。中国现在已经深入国际生活中了，闭关自守的时期早已过了。研究日本和西洋各国历史不过等于认识我们的邻舍而已……第二是外国史学，尤其是西洋史学，有很多地方可资借镜的。西洋史学的进步就是西洋各种学术进步的一方面”。²⁴在蒋廷黻担任系主任期间，清华历史系为本科生开设了种类众多的西洋史课程，以1929年至1930年度为例，孔繁霭(1894—1959)开设了“西洋通史”“欧洲近代史初期”“西洋史学史”，刘崇鋮(1897—1990)开设了“西洋近百年史”、“英国史”、“欧洲十七十八世纪史”，蒋廷黻开设了“法兰西革命史”，杜捷尔(G. M. Dutcher)开设了“西洋近代史史料概论”，蒋廷黻、孔繁霭、刘崇鋮合开了“西洋史家名著选读”，形成了涵盖西洋通史、断代史、国别史、专门史、史学史的较为完整的西洋史课程体系。²⁵蒋廷黻能够形成中国史与外国史并重的理念，显然与他留学哥大期间修读了大量西洋史课程并撰写了英国史方向的博士论文有很大关系。在哥大期间，他先后修读了

²⁴ 蒋廷黻：《历史学系的概况》，《清华周刊》向导专号，第35卷，11—12期，1931年6月1日，载清华大学历史系编《文献与记忆中的清华历史系（1926—1952）》，清华大学出版社2016年版，第10页。

²⁵ 参见《国立清华大学历史学系本科学程（1929年至1930年度）》，载清华大学历史系编《文献与记忆中的清华历史系（1926—1952）》，第47—50页。

for the establishment and development of the discipline of world history in China.⁽²³⁾

After his return to China, Jiang Tingfu taught at Nankai University in Tianjin where his research interest shifted to the diplomatic history of modern China. At Nankai he concentrated on the collection and organization of material on the diplomatic history of the late Qing period. After having worked there for six and a half years, he moved to Tsinghua University in Beijing in May 1929 where he also assumed the position of department chair. During his five years at the helm of this department, he put forward his famous idea of “laying equal emphasis on history and the social sciences, equal emphasis on Western and Chinese history, and equal emphasis on textual research and methodological pluralism within Chinese history.” He carried out a comprehensive reform of his department which influenced curricula, faculty selection, and personnel training. Although the focus of Jiang’s research shifted to Chinese history, he continued to attach considerable importance to courses in foreign history. “In the past two years, the Department of History has on average offered about twenty-one to twenty-two courses each year, of which Chinese and foreign history each account for half.” According to Jiang, the reasons behind this emphasis on foreign history were “first of all, the necessity of studying foreign history. China is now deeply involved in international life and its period of seclusion has become a thing of the past. Studying the histories of Japan and Western countries simply boils down to knowing one’s own neighbors. [...] Secondly, there is much to learn from foreign, especially Western, historiography. The progress made by Western historiography is part and parcel of the various academic advances attained in the West.”⁽²⁴⁾ During Jiang’s time as head of the Department of History at Tsinghua, this institute offered a wide variety of courses in Western history for undergraduates. For example, from 1929 to

⁽²³⁾ After graduating, He Bingdi (Ho Ping-ti) remained in the United States and Canada to teach, but his work progressively turned toward Chinese history. Upon his return to China, Jiang Tingfu taught Western history for a few years, but subsequently came to focus his studies on modern Chinese history and modern Chinese diplomatic history. Lei Haizong, Qi Sihe, Pi Mingju, and Wu Yujin mainly engaged in teaching and research on Western history after returning to China.

⁽²⁴⁾ Jiang Tingfu, “Lishi xuexi de gaikuang” (An Overview of the Department of History), *Qinghua zhoukan*, vol. 35, no. 11–12, June 1, 1931, reproduced in *Wenxian yu jiyi zhong de Qinghua lishi xi (1926–1952)* (*Documents and Recollections concerning the Department of History at Tsinghua University, 1926–1952*), edited by the Department of History of Tsinghua University (Beijing: Tsinghua daxue chubanshe, 2016), p. 10.

哥大美国史教授威廉邓宁 (William A. Dunning, 1857—1922) 所讲授的“政治学原理”、当时在纽约社会研究新学院 (The New School for Social Research) 任教的英国左翼思想家哈罗德·拉斯基 (Harold J. Laski, 1893—1950) 讲授的“政治学原理”、哥大拉美史专家威廉沙费尔德 (William R. Shepherd, 1871—1934) 讲授的“欧洲发展史”、自己的博士论文导师卡尔顿海斯 (Carlton J. H. Hayes, 1882—1964) 讲授的“欧洲近代政治社会史”等课程。

²⁶ 这些课涵盖的学科和领域很广，但都聚焦于欧洲的政治与历史，为蒋廷黻打下了扎实的西洋史学术基础，也使他充分意识到了西洋史和外国史课程对中国大学历史系学生的重要性。蒋廷黻还非常注重外国史学科的学科发展和整体布局，并有意培养这方面的后备人才。据他自己回忆，“一九三〇年我们中国尚没有日本、苏俄、蒙古、泰国及越南历史专家。一旦我发现一个青年，认为他可以研究上述某一国历史的话，我就说服他在研究院学习相关的语文。如果他在研究院成绩好，我就设法推荐他到国外去深造”。比如他培养王信忠学习日本史，朱谦云研究苏联史，邵循正 (1909—1972) 研究蒙古史等。²⁷ 这说明了蒋廷黻在学科布局上的眼光，即中国人研究外国史，不能只是关注欧洲和美国的歷史，还要注重研究中国周边国家的歷史。这种远见卓识即便放在今天都让人钦佩。

²⁶ 蒋廷黻：《国土无双：蒋廷黻回忆录》，新星出版社 2016 年版，第 76—79 页。

²⁷ 蒋廷黻：《国土无双：蒋廷黻回忆录》，第 130 页。

1930, Kong Fanyu 孔繁霁 (1894–1959) taught “General History of the West,” “Early Modern European History,” “History of Western Historiography,” and “History of Western Studies” and Liu Chonghong 刘崇鉉 (1897–1990) lectured on “The West in the Last Century,” “History of England,” “History of the 17th and 18th centuries in Europe.” Jiang Tingfu was in charge of the “History of the French Revolution,” and G. M. Dutcher mentored the “Introduction to Modern Western Historiography.” Jiang, Kong, and Liu also taught a seminar on “Selected Works of Western Historians.” Together, they managed to set up a relatively comprehensive Western history curriculum covering general history, the history of specific periods, the history of specific countries, different forms of specialized history, and the history of historiography.⁽²⁵⁾ Jiang’s ability to promote the idea of placing equal emphasis on Chinese history and foreign history was obviously the direct result of having followed a large number of courses in Western history and having written his own doctoral dissertation on British history. During his time at Columbia, he audited “Principles of Political Sciences” taught by William A. Dunning (1857–1922). He also often went to the New School for Social Research (New York), where the British left-wing thinker Harold J. Laski (1893–1950) was also teaching a course entitled “Principles of Political Science.” Apart from that, Jiang attended the lecture series “History of European Development” delivered by William R. Shepherd (1871–1934), a specialist of Latin American history at Columbia University. His doctoral dissertation was written under the supervision of Carlton Hayes (1882–1964), who was in charge of a course on the “Political and Social History of Modern Europe.”⁽²⁶⁾ These courses covered a wide range of subjects and fields, but were all focused on European politics and history. They provided Jiang with a solid academic foundation in Western history, and made him fully aware of the importance of Western and foreign history courses for history students at Chinese universities. He paid considerable attention to the development and overall layout of the discipline of foreign history and hoped to nurture a new generation of talented scholars in this field. According to his own recollections, “In 1930, we had no specialists in Japanese, Soviet-Russian, Mongolian, Thai, or Vietnamese history in China. As soon as I saw a young student showed the potential to

⁽²⁵⁾ See *Guoli Qinghua daxue lishi xuexi benke xuecheng (1923 nian zhi 1930 nian du)* (The History Department of National Tsinghua University Undergraduate Program [1929–1930]), reproduced in *Wenxian yu jiyi zhong de Qinghua lishi xi*, pp. 47–50.

⁽²⁶⁾ Jiang Tingfu, “*Guoshi wu shuang: Jiang Tingfu huiyi lu*” (A national scholar without peers: The reminiscences of Jiang Tingfu) (Beijing, Xinxing chubanshe, 2016), pp. 76–79.

雷海宗归国后先后在中央大学、金陵女子大学、武汉大学等校任教，主要开设西洋史方面的课程，他在武汉大学讲授“欧洲通史(二)”时的课程纲要后来还整理成《西洋文化史纲要》出版，梳理了从西罗马帝国灭亡到19世纪末的欧美历史，展现了他对西洋史的整体把握和对许多重大历史问题的洞见。²⁸1932年，他被蒋廷黻聘至清华大学历史系任教，并在蒋廷黻从政后继任了历史系主任。到清华任教后，雷海宗的研究重心逐渐转向了中国史，但他依然开设西洋史方面的课程，并密切关注国外西洋史领域的学术动态。1931年，芝加哥大学中世纪史名家詹姆斯汤普森 (James Thompson, 1869—1941) 的著作《中世纪史》(*History of the Middle Ages*) 出版，雷海宗随后就在《清华学报》1933年9卷1期上发表了对该书的书评。²⁹他在书评中敏锐地抓住了该书的特点，那就是用不能否认的事实努力纠正了认为中世纪历史一无是处的传统看法。雷海宗还进一步指出，中世纪由希腊罗马文化、日耳曼封建制度和基督教会这三种成分组成，“而在三种之中尤以日耳曼与教会二者为重要；希腊罗马文化只处于附属的地位”，也就是说，“中古史是一个全新的局面，一个新文化开始的创造时代”，所以“今日的西洋并非由希腊罗马而生，乃是直接由中古日耳曼民族与教会所创”。他

²⁸ 参见雷海宗《西洋文化史纲要》，上海古籍出版社2001年版。

²⁹ 汤普森教授的这部中世纪史著作可参见 James Westfall Thompson, *History of the Middle Ages, 300—1500*, W. W. Norton & Co., 1931。雷海宗的书评可以参见《清华学报》1933年9卷1期《书籍评论》栏目，第260—264页。

specialize in the history of a given country, I always tried to persuade the person in question to study the relevant language at the Institute. If they performed well during their undergraduate training, I would recommend them for further study abroad.” Among the students he encouraged in this manner, one can mention Wang Xinzong 王信忠 (1909–?) who specialized in Japanese history, Zhu Qianyun 朱谦云 (dates unknown) who studied Soviet history, and Shao Xunzheng 邵循正 (1909–1972) who explored Mongolian history.⁽²⁷⁾ This illustrates Jiang’s vision for his discipline. He believed that Chinese scholars should not limit themselves to studying the history of Europe and the United States, but should also pay attention to the history of China’s neighboring countries. This kind of foresight is remarkable even by today’s standards.

After his return to China, Lei Haizong mainly taught Western history at Central University, Jinling Women’s University, Wuhan University, and other institutions. The syllabus of the course he taught at Wuhan University, called “A General History of Europe (II)”, was later expanded and turned into a book entitled *History of Western Civilization: An Outline* (*Xiyang wenhua shi gangyao*), which covered the history of Europe and America from the fall of the Western Roman Empire to the end of the 19th century. This book displayed his overall grasp of Western history and his insight into many major historical issues.⁽²⁸⁾ In 1932, he was appointed by Jiang Tingfu as professor in the History Department at Tsinghua University, and succeeded Jiang as the head of the department when the latter left the academia for politics. At Tsinghua, Lei’s research interests gradually shifted to Chinese history, but he continued to lecture on Western history and remained attentive to international academic debates in the field of Western history. In 1933, Lei wrote a notable review of *History of the Middle Ages* in the *Journal of Tsinghua University*, which had been published two years earlier by James Thompson (1869–1941), a leading medieval historian working at the University of Chicago.⁽²⁹⁾ In his review, Lei managed to capture the book’s main gist, that is to say, its fact-based attempt to correct certain errors in the

⁽²⁷⁾ Ibid., p. 130.

⁽²⁸⁾ See Lei Haizong, *Xiyang wenhua shi gangyao* (*History of Western Civilization: An Outline*) (Shanghai: Guji chubanshe, 2001).

⁽²⁹⁾ See James Westfall Thompson, *History of the Middle Ages, 300–1500* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co, 1931); for Lei’s review see the “Book Reviews” section in *Qinghua xuebao*, 1933, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 260–264.

在书评的最后指出,“研究过去的历史,我们必须有丰富的同情心”“中古史对于今日大多的西洋人已是不可了解;我们异族异化的人若要明了,更要尽力设法与它心契神通”。³⁰ 汤普森是雷海宗在芝加哥大学读博时的导师,对他的欧洲中古史观产生了巨大的影响。汤普森对中古史的重视与肯定,修正了文艺复兴时期以来对中世纪的负面认知。雷海宗继承了汤普森的观点,并将其体现在他回国后开设的西洋史课程中。雷海宗在武汉大学的讲课提纲《西洋文化史纲要》中,将西洋文化分成三期,其中第一期就是中世纪封建时代(911—1517),包括911—1321年的封建盛期和1321—1517年的封建末期。之后的旧制度时代(1517—1815)和欧美文明时代(1815年后)构成了西洋文化的第二期和第三期。³¹ 雷海宗的这种历史分期把中世纪、近代早期、近代的历史勾连在一起,认为它们是一个整体,反对流行的“断裂”说,这明显处于他导师汤普森中世纪史观的延长线上。而雷海宗通过在武汉大学、清华大学等校开设的西洋文化史课程,塑造了大批学子的西洋中古史观。此外,雷海宗在回国后高度关注斯宾格勒(Oswald Arnold Gottfried Spengler, 1880—1936)和汤因比(Arnold Joseph Toynbee, 1889—1975)的文化形态史观,并在给学生开设的“西洋文化史”研讨课上带领学生阅读《西方的没落》和《历史研究》的外文原著,还利用其方法提出了著名的“中国文化两周说”。³² 他的学生何炳棣认为,“雷海宗的治史特点是:以一定的哲学观点来消化史料,解释历史,自成体系”。这种学术风格无疑与他留学芝加哥大学时主修历史、副修哲学,以及芝大当时对博士生注重跨学科培养的特点有关。³³

³⁰ 《清华学报》1933年9卷1期《书籍评论》栏目,第261、264页。

³¹ 参见雷海宗《西洋文化史纲要》,上海古籍出版社2001年版。

³² 参见刘超《雷海宗与蒋廷黻:兼论民国“新史学”的发展路径》,《社会科学论坛》2016年第8期,第110页。

³³ 参见John W. Boyer, *The University of Chicago: A History*, The University of Chicago Press, 2012, pp. 185—193。

traditional view of medieval history, most notably the entrenched misconception that it is largely devoid of interest. Lei further pointed out that the Middle Ages emerged as the combination of three factors: Greco-Roman culture, the Germanic feudal system, and the Christian Church. “Out of these three, the Germanic and ecclesiastical elements were the most important, whereas Greco-Roman culture occupied a subordinate position,” thus implying that “medieval history was a completely new configuration, it was a creative period which saw the emergence of a new form of civilization.” Within his line of reasoning, “the Western world as we know it today was not the offspring of Greece and Rome, but rather counts as the direct product of the encounter between the Germanic peoples and the Church.” He concluded his review by stating that “to study the past one must be full of empathy” and that “medieval history has in effect become unintelligible to most Westerners today; therefore, if we foreigners wish to understand it, we have to devote ourselves heart and mind.”⁽³⁰⁾ Thompson had been Lei’s mentor at the University of Chicago and had a great influence on his view of European medieval history. By championing a positive approach to medieval historiography, Thompson tried to go against the negative perception of the Middle Ages that had been common ever since the Renaissance. Lei Haizong inherited Thompson’s outlook and even adopted it in the Western history courses he later taught to Chinese students. In the syllabus for his course “History of Western Civilization: An Outline” taught at Wuhan University, Lei divided the development of Western civilization into three periods: firstly, the medieval feudal era (911-1517), which could be further subdivided into the heyday of feudalism (911-1321) and the period of its decay (1321-1517); secondly, the *Ancien Régime* (1517-1815)⁽ⁱ⁾; and thirdly, the era of modern Europe and America since 1815.⁽³¹⁾ Even though he divided the history of the West into three distinct periods – medieval, early modern, and modern – Lei continued to consider them as a meaningful whole. He rejected the popular “rupture” theory, thus following his mentor’s view of medieval history. Through his courses on the history of Western civiliza-

⁽³⁰⁾ Lei Haizong, “Book Reviews”, p. 261 & 264.

⁽³¹⁾ See Lei Haizong, *Xiyang wenhua shi gangyao*.

⁽ⁱ⁾ Translator’s note: the end date of the *Ancien Régime* is wrong here; it should rather be 1789 when the National Assembly was proclaimed on June 17. The counting would make sense, however, if one assumed that Lei understood 1789-1815 as a transition period (or the Napoleonic years as part of the *Ancien Régime*).

齐思和归国后先后任教于北平师范大学、燕京大学，开设了“史学概论”“西洋现代史”“美国史”等课程。齐思和的博士论文虽然研究的是中国春秋时期的封建制度，但是他在留学期间“主修美国史，选修英国史、世界中世纪史、政治思想史、史学方法、国际关系史及西洋现代史等课程”，有着非常扎实的英国史、美国史和西洋现代史的基础。³⁴他在国内率先开设了“西洋现代史”课程，学生齐世荣（1926—2015）对此印象深刻：“中国人教外国现代史，这个鼻祖是谁，我要借这个机会说一下，是齐思

³⁴ 齐文心：《先父齐思和生平及著作简述》，《农业考古》2000年第3期，第294页。

tion at Wuhan University and Tsinghua University, Lei Haizong shaped the views of numerous students. In addition, after his return to China, Lei paid great attention to the works of Oswald Arnold Gottfried Spengler (1880 – 1936) and Arnold Joseph Toynbee (1889 – 1975), who endorsed the idea of civilizational or cultural morphology. In his seminars, he had his students read *The Decline of the West* (*Der Untergang des Abendlandes*) and *A Study of History* in their original German and English editions. He also drew from both works to propose his famous theory of “the two periods of Chinese Culture.”⁽³²⁾,⁽ⁱⁱ⁾ According to his student Ho Ping-ti, “Lei Hai-tsung approach to history was characterized by his ability to digest historical materials from a specific philosophical point of view, which he used to interpret history and build his own system.” Such an academic style was undoubtedly connected to Lei’s studies at the University of Chicago, where he majored in history and minored in philosophy, and to the university’s emphasis on interdisciplinary training for doctoral students at that time.⁽³³⁾

After returning to China, Qi Sihe taught at Beiping Normal University and Yanjing University. He was in charge of courses such as “Introduction to History,” “Modern Western History,” and “American History.” Although Qi’s doctoral dissertation dealt with Chinese feudal system of China during the Spring and Autumn period (722-476), he had “majored in American history and had taken courses in British history, medieval world history, the history of political thought, historical methods, the history of international relations, and modern Western history” during his studies abroad. As such, he

⁽³²⁾ See Liu Chao, “Lei Haizong yu Jiang Tingfu: qianlun Minguo ‘xin shi xue’ de fazhan lujing” (Lei Haizong and Jiang Tingfu: A Discussion of the Trajectory of “New Historiography” in the Republican Era), *Shehui kexue luntan*, no. 8, 2016, p. 110.

⁽³³⁾ See Boyer, John W., *The University of Chicago: A History* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012), pp. 185–193.

⁽ⁱⁱ⁾ Translator’s note: According to Lei, Chinese history can be divided into two periods: the era before 383, and the one after that year. In 383, the Battle of Fei River (*Feishui zhi zhan* 淝水之战) caused the collapse of the Former Qin (351–394), a dynastic state of the Sixteen Kingdoms (304-439) under the rule of the Di ethnicity. It resulted in the split of China into a northern and southern part. For Lei, this is the beginning of a time where the country is exposed to foreign cultures, ranging from conquests by ethnic minorities to the arrival of Buddhism, compared to the earlier classical period during which the Huaxia ethnicity (a predecessor of the Han) created the Chinese culture. See Lei Haizong, “Duandai wenti yu Zhongguo lishi de fenqi” (The Problem of Dynastic Ruptures and the Periodisation of Chinese History), *Shehui kexue* (Beiping), vol. 2, no. 1, 1936, pp. 1–33. A translation with the title “The Two Cycles of Chinese Culture” is included in Lei Haizong, *Chinese Culture and the Chinese Military* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2020), pp. 117–144.

和先生。有的人以为现代史是学习苏联以后有的，其实不是，是齐思和先生第一个，当时在全国，外国现代史是各个学校都没有，中国教的只是近代史，现代史是受气的小媳妇，没有人重视，外国现代史更没人重视，也没人能教，惟一的就是齐思和先生。”³⁵ 齐思和不仅在课程设置上开了风气之先，而且用英语把授课提纲和基本史料编成了《西洋现代史：提纲与文件》(*Contemporary Western History: Outlines and Documents*)，于1940年正式出版。³⁶ 民国时期的西洋史教学基本以欧洲史为主，美国史并没受到应有的重视。齐思和在哈佛主修美国史，给他授课的几位老师都是美国史领域的著名学者，包括美国宪政史名家查尔斯霍华德麦基文、美国社会史和思想史专家阿瑟施莱辛格 (Arthur Meier Schlesinger, 1888—1965)、美国海军史专家塞缪尔莫里森 (Samuel Eliot Morison, 1887—1976) 等。³⁷ 齐思和在留学之前也很轻视美国史，但留学归来后逐渐改变了看法。在他看来，“美国文明，西方文明之粲然者也。欲了解西方文明之现状，及其将来之趋势，固须于美国史加以充分研究矣”，而且“美国与吾人之关系极为密切”，所以“吾人如欲了解西方文化，研究中国外交，于美国史有深切注意之必要，固不得误以其简短无谓而忽视之也”。³⁸ 齐思和除了强调美国史教学与研究的重要性，并在北平师范大学和燕京大学多次开设“美国史”课程外，还专门编写了《美国史书目举要》，包括通史、分期史、地方史、专史、传记、参考书这六大类书籍，供初入美国史门径者使用，成为民国时期中国人研习美国史的重要索引。³⁹ 其中涉及的多部著作就是由齐思和在哈佛大学留学时的美国史老师们撰写的。

³⁵ 《道德文章，高山仰止——“纪念齐思和先生百年诞辰学术研讨会”纪要》，齐小玉整理，《云梦学刊》2007年第6期，第6页。

³⁶ 齐文心：《先父齐思和生平及著作简述》，第295页。

³⁷ 参见杨钊《齐思和的中国史博士论文与哈佛大学的美国史学术传统》，《史学史研究》2019年第1期，第48—51页。

³⁸ 齐思和：《美国史书目举要》，《史学年报》1937年第2卷第4期，第160页。

³⁹ 参见齐思和《美国史书目举要》，第159—181页。

acquired a solid foundation in British history, American history, and modern Western history.⁽³⁴⁾ He was the first to offer a course on “Western Modern History” in China. His student Qi Shirong 齐世荣 (1926–2015) later recalled being very much impressed by Qi’s lectures: “People sometimes wonder who was the first Chinese to teach foreign modern history and I would like to take this opportunity to say that it was Mr. Qi Sihe. Some people think the study of modern history only began after we started learning from the Soviet Union, but this is actually far from accurate. It was Mr. Qi Sihe who initiated this movement. At that time, modern foreign history was not yet part of the curriculum in any school. The discipline of modern history in China was like an angry little bride neglected by everyone around her. The situation of the modern history of foreign countries was even worse, since there was no one to teach this subject, aside from Mr. Qi Sihe.”⁽³⁵⁾ Qi Sihe not only put together the entire curriculum, but also compiled a syllabus with basic historical materials in English, which was officially published in 1940 under the title *Contemporary Western History: Outlines and Documents* (*Xiyang xiandai shi: tigang yu wenjian*).⁽³⁶⁾ During the Republican era, studying Western history basically meant studying European history. As a result, American history did not yet receive the attention it deserved. Qi majored in American history at Harvard, where he was taught by several prominent scholars in the field of American history, including Charles Howard McIlwain (1871–1968), an expert in American constitutional history, Arthur Meier Schlesinger (1888–1965), a specialist of American social and intellectual history, and Samuel Eliot Morison (1887–1976), an authority in American naval history, as well as many others.⁽³⁷⁾ This led him to the following conclusion: “American civilization is the most splendid of all civilizations. If we want to understand Western civilization’s present and future, we have to devote ourselves to the study of American history.” He believed that since “the United States and us Chinese have become closely interre-

⁽³⁴⁾ Qi Wenxin, “Xianfu Qi Sihe shengping ji zhuzuo jianshu” (A Brief Description of the Life and Writings of My Father Qi Sihe), *Nongye kaogu*, no. 3, 2000, p. 294.

⁽³⁵⁾ “Daode wenzhang, gaoshan yangzhi: ‘Jinian Qi Sihe xianxiang bainian danchen xueshu taolunhui’ jiyao” (An Exemplar of Morality and Writing: A Summary of the Symposium to Commemorate the Centenary of Mr. Qi Sihe’s Birth), compiled by Qi Xiaoyu 齐小玉, *Yunmeng xuekan*, no. 6, 2007, p. 6.

⁽³⁶⁾ Qi Wenxin, “Xianfu Qi Sihe shengping ji zhuzuo jianshu,” p. 295.

⁽³⁷⁾ See Yang Zhao, “Qi Sihe de Zhongguoshi boshi lunwen yu Hafo daxue de Meiguo shi xueshu chuantong” (Qi Sihe’s Doctoral Dissertation in Chinese History and the Tradition of American Historiography at Harvard University), *Shixueshi yanjiu*, vol. 1, 2019, pp. 48–51.

皮名举与齐思和同在 1935 年毕业，回国后先后在北京大学、西南联合大学任教，主要讲授“西洋通史(甲)”“西洋近代史”“欧洲十九世纪史”“欧洲现代史”“西洋现代史”等课程。⁴⁰他讲授的西洋史课程很有特色，颇受学生欢迎，在西南联大与西洋史造诣很深的雷海宗先生齐名，人称“南有皮名举，北有雷海宗”。⁴¹他的“西洋近代史”课程要求学生画地图作为作业，给学生何兆武(1921—)留下了很深的印象，“近代史从 1815 年拿破仑失败以后的维也纳会议，一直讲到 1914 第一次世界大战，正好一百年，一个学期要求画六张欧洲政治地图，那么一个学年就得画十二张，当然我们也是照着现成书上抄的，不过我觉得这确实太有用了。以前我们对政治地图重新划分没有地理上的具体印象，但画过一遍之后就非常清楚明白了”。⁴²另一名学生汪曾祺(1920—1997)在回忆文章中也提到了这个画地图的作业，“记得我在皮名举先生的‘西洋通史’课上交了一张规定的马其顿国的地图，皮先生阅后，批了两行字：‘阁下之地图美术价值甚高，科学价值全无。’”⁴³西洋史主要讲授的是欧美国家的历史，中国人在学习时首先要具有空间上的概念，皮名举要求学生画地图

⁴⁰ 参见清华大学历史系编《文献与记忆中的清华历史系(1926—1952)》，第 64—69 页。

⁴¹ 李长林：《教书育人、潜心理学——皮名举教授在教育事业和学科建设上的贡献》，《湖南师范大学教育科学学报》2004 年第 6 期，第 126 页。

⁴² 何兆武：《上学记》，何兆武口述、文靖执笔，三联书店 2013 年版，第 110 页。

⁴³ 汪曾祺：《西南联大中文系》，载《西南联大国文课》，译林出版社 2015 年版，第 333 页。

lated, it is of paramount importance to engage in an in-depth exploration of American history, which will enable us to come to a better understanding of Western civilization as well as China's foreign relations. One should not neglect it simply because of its brevity."⁽³⁸⁾ In addition to emphasizing the importance of studying American history, Qi Sihe offered related courses at Beiping Normal University and Yanjing University. He also assembled a bibliography addressed to new students in the field of American history. This document divided relevant books into six main categories: general histories, histories of specific periods, histories of specific places, histories of specific topics, biographies, and general reference works.⁽³⁹⁾ Qi's bibliography soon became an important tool for Chinese students. It is worth noting that many of the works listed in this volume were written by his former history professors at Harvard University or by himself.

Like Qi Sihe, Pi Mingju returned to China after graduating in 1935. There he taught at Peking University and the National Southwestern Association University in Kunming. Among his courses, worth mentioning are those on "General Western History (1st Part)," "Early modern Western History," "European Nineteenth Century History" and "Modern Western History."⁽⁴⁰⁾ His courses on Western history were highly original and soon became popular among students. Because Lei Haizong was already recognized for his influence on the students at Southwestern Association University and on the field of Western historiography in general, people came up with the saying, "in the North, they have Lei Haizong; in the South, we have Pi Mingju."⁽⁴¹⁾ One of the requirements for his course "Modern Western History" was drawing maps, an assignment which left a deep impression on one of his students, He Zhaowu 何兆武 (1921–2021). He Zhaowu later recalled: "Our course on Modern History covered the century spanning from the Congress of Vienna in 1815, after the defeat of Napoleon, to World War I in 1914. We were asked to draw six political maps of Europe for each semester, which amounts to twelve in one academic year. Of course, at that time we were copying them from

⁽³⁸⁾ Qi Sihe, "Meiguo shi shumu juyao" (A Selected Bibliography of American History), *Shixue nianbao*, 1937, vol. 2, no. 4, p. 160.

⁽³⁹⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 159–181.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ See *Wenxian yu jiyi Zhong de Qinghua lishi xi*, pp. 64–69.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Li Changlin, "Jiaoshu yulen, Qianxin xueshu: Pi Mingju jiaoshou zai jiaoyu he xueke jianshe shang de gongxian" (Teaching and Educating People during a Lifetime of Scholarship: Professor Pi Mingju's Contributions as an Educator and Discipline Builder, *Hunan shifan daxue jiaoyu kexue xuebao*, 2004, no. 16, p. 126.

就是要他们在短时间内迅速熟悉欧美国家的政治地理区划，为进一步阅读外文史料打下坚实的基础。皮名举在哈佛留学时主攻欧洲外交史，并且撰写了关于租借胶州湾的国际关系史论文，对地理空间的重要性在学习时就了然于胸，从而形成了他之后的授课方式。

吴于廑于 1947 年回国，应时任武汉大学校长周鲠生 (1889—1971) 邀请赴武大历史系任教，后来还兼任系主任一职。他在武大主要担任世界通史古代部分的教学，并在 20 世纪 60 年代初与同样留学哈佛的周一良 (1913—2001) 共同主编了影响极大的四卷本《世界通史》。改革开放之后，吴于廑针对“以西欧为中心的世界史观”和“机械运用历史分段法、把各国历史分段排列的那样一派世界历史编纂学”这两大问题，撰写了《世界历史上的游牧世界与农耕世界》《世界历史上的农本与重商》《历史上农耕世界对工业世界的孕育》《亚欧大陆传统农耕世界不同国家在新兴工业世界冲击下的反应》这四篇思考世界历史整体进程

published books, but I think that it was nonetheless really useful. After drawing a map, even only once, we gained a very clear understanding of the geographical dimensions of the political redistribution of power that took place at the time.”⁽⁴²⁾ Another student, Wang Zengqi 汪曾祺 (1920–1997), also mentioned the same map-drawing assignment in his own reminiscences: “I remember that for Mr. Pi Mingju’s ‘General History of the West’ class, I once handed in a map of Macedonia. After considering it, Mr. Pi made the following remark: ‘Your map displays a high artistic talent, but it is devoid of any scientific value.’”⁽⁴³⁾ Pi Mingju believed that since Western history mainly concerned the history of European and American countries, Chinese people should first try to grasp the spatial dimension of this particular history. That is why he asked his students to draw maps so they could quickly become familiar with the political and geographical divisions of European and American countries over a short period of time. This provided them with a solid basis for further exploring foreign historical materials in depth. As a student at Harvard, he had majored in European diplomatic history and had written a dissertation on the history of international relations through the prism of the case of the Jiaozhou Bay lease. His trajectory as a student and scholar had equipped him with a good understanding of the importance of geography and space in the study of history, something which shaped his subsequent teaching style.

Wu Yujin returned to China in 1947. Zhou Yusheng 周鯁生 (1889–1971), who was president of Wuhan University at the time, invited him to teach in the history department of his home institution, a department Wu would later come to chair. His teaching mainly covered the ancient period in a course on general world history. In collaboration with Zhou Yilang 周一良 (1913–2001), who had also studied at Harvard in the early 1960s, he co-edited the influential four-volume *General History of the World* (*Shijie tongshi*). After the era of reform and opening up, Wu wrote a series of four essays, entitled “The Nomadic World and Agrarian World in World History” (*Shijie lishi shang de youmu shijie yu nonggeng shijie*), “Agrarianism and Mercantilism in World

⁽⁴²⁾ He Zhaowu, Wen Jing (transcription), *Shangxue ji* (*Memories of My Student Days*) (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2013), p. 110.

⁽⁴³⁾ Wang Zengqi, “Xinan lianda zhongwen xi” (The Chinese Department at National Southwest Association University, reproduced in *Xinan lianda guowen ke* (The Chinese Language Course at National Southwest Association University) (Nanjing: Yilin chubanshe, 2015), p. 333.

的系列论文，并为《中国大百科全书外国历史卷》撰写了《世界历史》一文，代表了当时中国世界史学界对整体世界史观思考的最高水平。⁴⁴ 吴于廑在当时国内外国史史料与书籍极难获取的情况下，能够撰写出这样视野开阔、观点新颖的高水平论文，与他在哈佛大学受到的学术训练有很大关系。吴于廑硕士毕业于南开经济研究所，并考取了改制后的第五届庚款留美的经济史专业，本身就有非常扎实的经济史基础。他在哈佛历史系师从英美宪政史和西方政治思想史大家麦基文教授，研修了“他那极富启发性的西方政治思想史和中世纪英国宪法史的课程”，“涉猎到一些有关中古前期西欧封建诸国君权和法律的书籍”，博士论文选择从中西比较的视角考察封建中国的王权与法律。⁴⁵ 这种跨越经济学、政治学、法学、历史学的多学科背景，以及中西比较的宏大视野，为吴于廑之后在世界史学科的体系构建上的成就奠定了坚实的知识基础。

⁴⁴ 吴于廑：《吴于廑自传》，《晋阳学刊》1983年第4期，第78页。吴于廑的这五篇论文参见吴于廑：《吴于廑文选》，武汉大学出版社2007年版。

⁴⁵ 吴于廑：《土与古代封建制度之解体；封建中国的王权和法律》，武汉大学出版社2012年版，第171页；《吴于廑自传》，《晋阳学刊》1983年第4期，第78页。

History” (*Shijie lishi shang de nongben yu zhongshang*), “How the Agrarian World Historically Gave Birth to the Industrial World” (*Lishi shang nonggeng shijie dui gongye shijie de yunyu*), and “How the Traditional Agrarian World in Different European and Asian Countries Responded to the Challenges of the New Industrial World” (*Ya Ou dalu chuantong nonggeng shijie bu tong guojia zai xinxing gongye shijie chongji xia de fanying*). In these essays, he addressed two major problems in historiography: “World history remaining centered on Western Europe” and “the mechanistic segmentation in historiography which arranges the history of each country indiscriminately in accord to a global pattern.” These four articles, as well as his “World History” entry for the “Foreign History” volume of *The Encyclopedia of China* constituted the apex of Chinese historiography in the field of world history at that time.⁽⁴⁴⁾ The fact that Wu succeeded in writing scholarships of such high standards, not only encompassing a broad vision but also formulating an original standpoint, is all the more remarkable seeing how difficult it still was to secure access to historical materials and books concerning foreign countries. Wu’s *tour de force* was undoubtedly related to his academic training at Harvard University. Before his stay in America, Wu had graduated from the Nankai Institute of Economics with a master’s degree. Thanks to his solid mastery of economics, he was selected to be sent to the United States for further studies. He went abroad thanks to the fifth round of scholarships awarded to Chinese students by the Boxer Indemnity Scholarship Program. At Harvard, he studied in the History Department under Professor McKeown, a leading scholar of British and American constitutional history and the history of Western political thought. As Wu would later recall, “McKeown’s courses on the history of Western political thought and the history of medieval British constitutional law were truly enlightening.” In class, he “dabbled in a number of books regarding monarchical power and law in the feudal states of Western Europe during the early Middle Ages,” which had a certain influence on Wu in writing his doctoral dissertation on sovereignty and law in feudal China from a comparative perspective.⁽⁴⁵⁾ This multidisciplinary background spanning across economics, political science, law, and history, as well as the grand vision of comparing East-West, laid a solid intel-

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Wu Yuqin, “Wu Yuqin zizhuan” (Autobiography of Wu Yuqin), *Jinyang xuekan*, 1983, no. 4, p. 78. Regarding these five essays, see Wu Yuqin, *Wu Yuqin wenxuan* (Selected Essays of Wu Yuqin) (Wuhan: Wuhan daxue chubanshe, 2007).

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Wu Yuqin, *Shi yu gudai fenjian zhidu zhi jieti*, p. 171; Wu Yuqin, *Wu Yuqin zizhuan*, p. 78.

结语

民国时期的留美西洋史学者总体上人数不多，在中国留学美国的学生中是个极为特殊的群体。他们在近代中国向西方国家寻找救国良方的留学氛围下，选择与现实关联较小的历史学科，而且研习与中国并没有直接联系的西洋史，确实非常独特。在美国学习西洋史，面临着文化和语言上的多重隔膜，对留学生的挑战非常之大。但是，在中国已经面向世界的时代变局下，长期封闭的中国人急需了解他国，而该国的历史是一个非常重要的渠道。而且西洋史显然是美国史学界最为重视的领域，重要的学术范式和学术方法大都来自于此，中国的学者要想真正习得美国史学的精髓，必须深入到该国西洋史研究的脉络之中。这批学者不管后来是否继续从事西洋史的研究工作，这段重要的学习经历都深刻影响了他们的学术生涯。他们在美国的知名大学受到了严格的西洋史学术训练，大都具有非常宏阔的学术视野，即便在从事中国史的研究时也能有很多出人意料的发现，形成了自己特有的学术风格。另外，部分留美西洋史学者后来担任了学术的领导与组织工作，其西洋史学术背景使他们在改革中国大学历史系的学科布局与人才培养上发挥了巨大的作用，使西洋史的学术训练逐渐在中国大学的课堂占据一席之地，并培养与储备了大量的学术人才。

lectual foundation for Wu Yujin's subsequent achievements in the systematic establishment of the discipline of world history.

Concluding remarks

The number of Chinese scholars who specialized in Western history at American universities during the Republican era was, all things considered, relatively small. However, those who did embark on this path were a highly distinctive group within the Chinese student body in the United States. Their choice for Western history, a discipline not directly related to China, was markedly different from that of most other students who grew up in an atmosphere encouraging them to study abroad in order to find ways of saving China. Not following this pattern and choosing a topic not immediately relevant to the predicament of the Chinese nation was quite exceptional at the time. Furthermore, as they were studying western history in the United States, they were confronted with various cultural and linguistic barriers, which proved to be quite challenging for them. Nevertheless, China had entered a new stage in history, one in which it had to face the world, and learning the history of foreign countries was an important way to do so, especially for Chinese who had long been shut off from the outside world. Moreover, Western history was clearly the most important field in American historiography as the major source for academic paradigms and approaches. Chinese scholars had to delve into the very heart of the study of Western history if they were to truly become acquainted with the essence of American historiography. Their learning experience abroad profoundly influenced the academic careers of these scholars, regardless of whether they continued working on Western history or not. They received rigorous academic training in Western history at prestigious universities in the United States. There, most of them nurtured a very broad academic vision, which would later allow them to make many unexpected discoveries even when they were engaged with Chinese history. This also led them to form their own unique academic style. In addition, some of the Chinese scholars of Western history scholars who had stayed in the United States later assumed important positions in Chinese academia. Their academic background in Western history enabled them to play an important role in reforming the structure of the discipline of historiography and in training new historians at Chinese universities. Thanks to their efforts, academic training in Western history gradually came to occupy a more important position in Chinese classrooms, which

中国的世界史学科非常年轻，基础也较为薄弱，但是它的重要性又使其更需要扶持与发展。这批留美西洋史学者，在当时极为困难的学术条件下筚路蓝缕，为中国的世界史学科起到了探路与奠基的作用。

in turn allowed for the emergence of a new generation of talented young specialists. Although it may be true that the discipline of world history is still very young and unstable, its value makes it all the more important: it should be supported and developed. In that regard, one must acknowledge the pioneering role played by this group of Chinese scholars of Western history. Despite very difficult academic conditions, they succeeded in laying the foundation for the discipline of world history in China.

3 The Doctoral Dissertation of Jiang Tingfu

蒋廷黻的博士论文

Yang Zhao

杨钊

Translation by Joseph Ciaudo

蒋廷黻于一九一九年夏季进入著名的哥伦比亚大学攻读博士学位，他先是主修新闻学，后来改攻政治科学，最后把自己的专业定为历史学。蒋廷黻博士论文的题目是《劳工与帝国：关于英国工党，主要是工党国会议员对于一八〇〇年以后英国帝国主义的反应的研究》，这与他导师海斯的欧洲史研究方向相契合。他的论文在一九二三年由哥伦比亚大学出版社出版，并收入著名的由哥伦比亚大学政治科学学院编辑的《历史、经济和公共法律研究》丛书。

蒋廷黻在论文的序言中阐明了自己选题的问题意识来源：“英国影响越来越大的政治因素，即英国工党在最近的四十年中对于英国的帝国主义究竟做了些什么……像印度、墨西哥和中国这样深受近代帝国主义之害的国家，能从几大列强国内的左派政治势力中获得比右派政治势力更好的待遇吗？”在谈到自己在哥大数次变换专业的原因时，蒋廷黻曾指出：“我想如果我能成为中国报界大亨，我就能左右中国政治……为了左右政治，就必须懂得政治，欲想懂得政治，就必须专攻政治科学……欲想获得真正的政治知识只有从历史方面下手。”蒋廷黻求学哥大并撰写博士论文时正值中国民族主义情绪极为高涨的历史时期。进入哥大研究生院攻读博士学位之前，他就曾作为中国学生青年会的志愿者前往法国前线慰问中国的战地劳工，亲身经历了“一战”的过程，并在巴黎和会召开期间“数度赴巴黎”。蒋廷黻在之后的回忆中说：“我对一向主张全世界人民自决的威尔逊，实在不解，何以他竟违背了他自己的原则。不过，我想威氏此举必有不便公之于世的充分理由，也说不定。”当时美国的国力虽蒸蒸日上，并在国际事务中开始发挥越来越重要的作用，但是美国的国际主义和孤立主义两大外交传统的博弈使美国的对外参与十分有限，老牌的帝国主义强国英国仍然是最为重要的世界大国，对像中国这样的弱国的命运会产生很大的影响。此外，蒋廷黻的论文指导老师海斯是从事欧洲史研究的教授，并在一九一四年之后开始重点关注民族主义问题，因此蒋廷黻在选题时把关注的重点放在英国的帝国主义政策上是十分自然的。

Jiang Tingfu (also known as Tingfu Fuller Tsiang) entered the prestigious Columbia University in the summer of 1919 to pursue his doctoral studies. Having initially enrolled as a student in journalism, he then changed his major to political science, only to finally settle on history. Under the supervision of Carlton J. H. Hayes, a specialist in European history with whom he shared a research interest, he wrote a dissertation entitled “Labor and Empire: A Study of the Reaction of the British Labor Party, Mainly as Represented in Parliament, to British Imperialism Since 1880.” Jiang’s thesis was published in 1923 by Columbia University Press in the renowned series *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law* edited by the School of Political Science.

In the preface to his dissertation, Jiang explained the reasons behind his choice for this topic: “What has the rising political player in Great Britain, namely the British Labor Party, done about British imperialism during the last forty years? [...] Can countries such as India, Mexico, and China, who have been the most immediate victims of modern imperialism, expect better treatment from the political left than from the political right of the great powers?” Discussing his motives for repeatedly changing his major during his time at Columbia, he once noted,⁽¹⁾ “At first I figured that if I could manage to become a Chinese newspaper tycoon, I would be in position to influence Chinese politics [...] but then I saw that in order to influence politics, one must first understand it, and to understand politics one must specialize in political science [...] Finally, I realized that in order to gain real political knowledge, one has to start with history.”⁽²⁾ Jiang Tingfu studied at Columbia University and wrote his PhD dissertation at a point in time when Chinese nationalist sentiment was on the rise. Before entering Columbia’s graduate school, he had been to the Western Front in France as a volunteer for the Chinese Students’ Youth Association, offering support to members of the Chinese Labor Corps. As such, he had firsthand experience of the Great War, and “visited Paris several times” during the Paris Peace Conference. In his memoirs, Jiang remarked, “I was puzzled by Wilson. He had always advocated self-determination for all the peoples of the world and was now going against his own principles. Still, I suspected there must have been a solid reason for Wilson’s about-face, one best kept out of the public eye,

⁽¹⁾ Jiang Tingfu, *Jiang Tingfu huiyi lu* (The Reminiscences of Jiang Tingfu) (Changsha, Yuelu shushe, 2003), p. 77. This footnote and the following ones are missing in the original text.

⁽²⁾ Jiang, *Jiang Tingfu huiyi lu*, p. 74.

当然，蒋廷黻的博士论文并不是一篇传统的英国对外关系史或英国外交政策史领域的文章，他更加注重探讨英国国内的政治格局与其对外政策之间的关系。他的博士论文题目有两个关键词，一个是劳工，一个是帝国主义。蒋廷黻认为，帝国主义并不是一个新现象，每一个历史时期都曾有这样的情况，而当前的帝国主义之所以不同以往，是由于经济因素发生了变化。他指出：“准确地说，最近四十年的帝国主义不应被称为经济帝国主义，而应被称为制造商—投资者帝国主义。这不是因为现代的帝国主义者是一个单独的阶级，而是因为现代的经济生活发生了变化。”蒋廷黻还看到，经济生活的变化导致西方的政治生活也开始出现新的转变，“一个新的阶级诞生了，他们虽然在政治上被赋予选举权，但是仍然通过工资谋生，也就是说，一部分人使用另一部分人所拥有的工具和原料来工作”。这个新的劳工阶级在英国拥有了选举权，而且人数越来越多，他们的诉求和看法必将对英国的政治生活产生重大影响。蒋廷黻敏锐地抓住了英国社会所发生的这个重要变化，并且预见到代表这个新兴阶级的政党—英国工党—将会打破原有的保守党和自由党轮流执政的政治格局，使英国的政治出现新的可能。因此，通过透视这个政治上属于左翼的政党对待帝国主义的态度，可以看到英国在对外政策上可能会发生的变化，以及是否能够使像中国这样的弱国获得更好的国际环境。尽管工党的政治力量在不

but I could not quite put my finger on it.”⁽³⁾ Although the United States was a rising power and started gaining an increasingly important position in international affairs, the tensions between the two American diplomatic traditions of internationalism and isolationism were still putting a brake on U.S. foreign involvement. Great Britain, the old imperial power, remained the most influential player on the world stage and its potential impact on the fate of a weak country such as China was still of paramount importance. Additionally, Jiang’s dissertation advisor Carlton Hayes was a professor of European history whose academic interests began leaning toward the question of nationalism following the outbreak of the First World War. Jiang’s decision to focus on British imperialist policy thus came to him quite naturally.

To be sure, his dissertation was not a traditional investigation into the history of British foreign relations or foreign policy. Rather, it mainly focused on the relation between Britain’s domestic political landscape and its foreign policy. The fact that the two key words in the title of his thesis are “labor” and “imperialism” already indicates as much. According to Jiang, imperialism was hardly a new phenomenon and could be found throughout the entire course of history. What made the imperialism of his own time distinctive was a radical change in its underlying economic factors. In his own words: “To be precise, the imperialism of the last forty years should not be called economic imperialism but rather manufacturer-investor imperialism. This is not because modern imperialists are a separate class, but because economic life has changed in modernity.” Jiang observed how changes in Western economic life led to subsequent transformations in politics. Such changes had “created a new class of people who, though politically enfranchised, still earn their living through wages, that is to say, a class who labor with tools and raw materials owned by other people.”⁽⁴⁾ In Britain, this new laboring class had gained voting rights, the increasing number of workers ensuring that its demands and views would have a major impact on British political life. Jiang keenly grasped this important change within British society. He foresaw that the political party representing the new class, the British Labor Party, would break the political pattern of an alternating rule between the Conservative

⁽³⁾ Jiang, *Jiang Tingfu huiyi lu*, p. 74.

⁽⁴⁾ Jiang, *Jiang Tingfu huiyi lu*; Tingfu F. Tsiang, *Labor and Empire: A Study of the Reaction of British Labor, Mainly as Represented in Parliament, to British Imperialism Since 1880* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1923), pp. 7-8.

断上升，但是一直处于在野党的地位，所以蒋廷黻重点关注工党国会议员对待帝国主义的态度，他们是工党政治实力的代表，而且在将来极有可能成为决定英国外交政策的人。有意思的是，就在蒋廷黻博士论文出版之后的一九二四年，工党在英国历史上第一次成为执政党，该党领袖拉姆齐麦克唐纳（**Ramsay MacDonald, 1866-1937**）组阁并担任首相，这就使蒋廷黻的博士论文更加具有了现实意义。

蒋廷黻的博士论文重点探讨的就是劳工运动与帝国主义运动之间的关系，即英国国内的阶级斗争是否影响到了国家之间的斗争。他列举了几位社会主义思想家的理论，指出马克思和考茨基认为工人对国家的概念会越来越淡漠，不会像之前那么爱国，而饶勒斯和伯恩斯坦则依旧认为爱国主义是工人思想中的重要组成部分，“但他们都不会支持帝国主义或具有扩张性的民族主义”。蒋廷黻还在论文中提到了冯·伯恩哈迪（**F.von Bernhardi**）、约翰·霍布森（**John A. Hobson**）和索尔斯坦维布伦（**Thorstein Veblen**）等非社会主义思想家对阶级斗争和国家间斗争关系的理论。在这样的问题意识和思想背景之下，蒋廷黻将研究重点放在一八八〇年之后英国工党关于帝国主义的一些具体问题的立场上。而英国工党的立场主要体现在工党国会议员身上，所以蒋廷黻在论文中运用的主要史料就是英国国会的辩论记录、英国国会的文件和英国工党年度代表大会的记录。

Party and the Liberal Party. New possibilities were emerging in British politics. As such, his research into the attitude of this politically left-wing party toward imperialism enabled him to anticipate changes in Britain's foreign policy and think through the significance of these changes for a weak country such as China in trying to improve its international standing. Despite its rising political influence, the Labor Party had thus far always been in opposition. Consequently, Jiang focused on the attitude of Labor MPs toward imperialism, whom he believed represented the true political strength of the Labor Party since they were very likely to be in a position to decide on British foreign policy in the near future. Indeed, in 1924, just after the publication of Jiang's dissertation, the Labor Party actually managed to become the ruling party for the first time in British history, with Ramsay MacDonald (1866–1937) forming the cabinet as prime minister, a development which made Jiang's dissertation all the more relevant.

As already noted above, Jiang's doctoral dissertation focused on the relation between the labor movement and imperialism and attempted to establish whether the class struggle within Britain had influenced the struggle between different countries. To this purpose, he called upon the theories of several socialist thinkers: Marx and Kautsky believed that workers would become increasingly indifferent to the concept of the state and that their patriotic loyalties were bound to decline. By contrast, Jaures and Bernstein were convinced that patriotism "would remain part of the soul of the worker." Yet none of these four thinkers "would support imperialism or aggressive nationalism, or believed that workers should."⁽⁵⁾ In his dissertation, Jiang also referred to the theories of non-socialist thinkers such as F. von Bernhardi (1849–1930), John A. Hobson (1858–1940), and Thorstein Veblen (1857–1929) regarding the relationship between class struggle and interstate conflict. It is with such an awareness of the matter at hand and against the above mentioned ideological background that Jiang decided to devote his research to the position of the British Labor Party on several specific issues related to imperialism after 1880. Since the standpoint of the British Labor Party was mainly embodied in the positions of its MPs, the historical materials consulted by Jiang in writing his dissertation mainly consisted of records of debates in the British Parliament, documents of the British Parliament, and minutes of the annual congresses of the British Labor Party.

⁽⁵⁾ Tsiang, *Labor and Empire*, p. 22.

蒋廷黻在“结论”中把他的论文分成两大部分：第一部分主要关注的是工党对英国与殖民地之间关系的反应；第二部分重点探讨的是工党对英国与其帝国主义竞争者之间关系的态度。通过对这两组问题的研究，蒋廷黻认为“无论从动机还是结果来看，工党对这两组问题的反应都是反帝国主义的”，工党的主要政治人物在对殖民地和外交政策问题上的基本立场是“维多利亚时代的小英格兰主义”。蒋廷黻最后指出，工党反对帝国主义的立场将会长期持续下去，因为工党已经不仅是代表劳工运动的政党，而且已经成为所有秉持反对帝国主义立场并且拥护小英格兰主义的人的政党。

蒋廷黻在哥伦比亚大学攻读博士学位的时候，哥大政治科学学院名师荟萃，处于鼎盛时期。任教的学者包括著名的国际法学教授，并曾担任过国际法院法官的约翰·巴塞特·穆尔（John Bassett Moore, 1860-1947），担任过美国社会学协会会长（American Sociological Association）的社会学家富兰克林·亨利·吉丁斯（Franklin Henry Giddings, 1855-1931），以及培养出了陈焕章、马寅初和赵乃抃这三位中国著名经济学者的财政学和经济史大家艾德温·赛里格曼（Edwin R. A. Seligman, 1861-1939）。当时的历史系属于政治科学学院，按照规定，历史系的学生也要修读同样属于政治科学学院的公共法律与比较法学系、经济学系和社会科学系的课程。因此，蒋廷黻在读博期间修读了很多政治学、经济学和法学等课程，这对他的博士论文产生了很多潜移默化的影响，他之后出掌清华历史系提出的“历史与社会科学并重”的观念也可溯源于此。

对蒋廷黻的博士论文和学术道路影响最大的还是几位从事欧洲史和美国史研究的学者。蒋廷黻博士论文的指导教师是哥大

In his “Conclusion,” Jiang separated his thesis into two sections: the first section discussed the Labor Party’s attitude toward the relation between Britain and its colonies; while the second section focused on the Labor Party’s stance on the relations between Britain and its imperialist rivals. After a careful study of these two sets of issues, Jiang concluded that “the reaction of the Labor Party has in both cases been anti-imperialistic, in intent as well as in effect.” The fundamental position of the main political figures within the Labor Party on colonial and foreign policy issues were “the ideals of the Victorian Little-Englanders.” Jiang concluded that the Labor Party’s anti-imperialist stance would continue for a long time, because it had not only become the party representing the labor movement, but the party of all those who were supporting anti-imperialism and upholding the ideals of Little-Englandism (小英格兰主义).⁽⁶⁾

As Jiang was pursuing his studies at Columbia University, the reputation of the University’s School of Political Science was at its peak. The faculty included John Bassett Moore (1860–1947), a renowned professor of international law who served as a judge on the International Court of Justice; Franklin Henry Giddings (1855–1931), a sociologist who presided over the American Sociological Association, and the American Association of Sociologists; as well as Edwin R.A. Seligman (1861–1939), a great scholar of finance and economic history who trained three prominent Chinese economists: Chen Huanzhang 陈焕章, Ma Yinchu 马寅初, and Zhao Naituan 赵乃抃. At that time, the Department of History was part of the College of Political Science and as a rule, students in the Department of History were also required to take courses from the departments of Public and Comparative Law, Economics, and Social Science, which were all part of the College of Political Science as well. During his doctoral curriculum, Jiang thus followed many courses in political science, economics, and law, which had a considerable influence on his doctoral dissertation. Perhaps the ideal of “putting equal emphasis on history and the social sciences”, which he began championing after becoming head of the history department at Tsinghua University, can also be traced back to this period.

Several scholars specialized in European and American history had a major impact on Jiang’s PhD dissertation and on his academic career in a broader

⁽⁶⁾ Tsiang, *Labor and Empire*, p. 215.

政治学院历史系教授卡尔顿·海斯 (Carlton J. H. Hayes, 1882-1964)。海斯是美国二十世纪著名的历史学家、外交家、民族主义问题研究专家，他在哥大讲授的课程是“欧洲近代政治社会史”。他认为工业革命前的社会和工业革命后的社会是截然不同的，工业革命前的放任主义在工业革命后已全然不适用，国家必须干涉。他清楚地指出：“德国俾斯麦和后来英国的劳合乔治有关社会的立法，是顺应时代潮流而且是非常高明的。”他敏锐地发现了工业革命之后欧洲主要资本主义国家发生的重要变化，并预见了社会民主主义和福利国家思想在二十世纪西方社会中扮演的重要角色。蒋廷黻受到海斯的启发，开始关注英国工党这个方兴未艾的新政党，并试图从工党对帝国主义政策的态度中发现英国外交政策所可能发生的变化。

蒋廷黻的博士论文基本上属于政治史和外交史范畴的研究，其中必然要运用一些政治学的基本理论。他在读书期间非常重视的一门课程就是哥大著名的美国史教授威廉·邓宁 (William A. Dunning, 1857-1922) 所教授的“政治学原理”。邓宁的主要研究领域是美国内战和重建时期的历史，并创立了美国重建史领域中的邓宁学派 (Dunning School)。这派学者对重建基本持否定态度，将其视为北方人的阴谋，而且他们认为黑人在政治上十分无能，从而忽视黑人在重建过程中的作用。邓宁之所以对激进重建持否定的态度，是因为他非常看重政治秩序的稳定。在他看来，北方的激进重建政策破坏了南部政治和社会的稳定，使南方的经济受到很大的冲击。南部白人通过州权重新获得优势地位，并实行种族隔离政策之后，南部的稳定才得到恢复。他对重建时期历史的认识影响到了他在哥大讲授的“政治学原理”课程。蒋廷黻在回忆这门课时说：“邓宁不独断，不大重视教条，他仅仅提出对问题的看法。他认为如果学生肯考

sense. His dissertation was supervised by Carlton J. H. Hayes (1882–1964), a professor of history at Columbia University’s School of Political Science. Hayes was a leading American historian, diplomat, and scholar of early twentieth-century nationalism who taught a course on “Modern European Political and Social History” at Columbia. In his lectures, he argued that pre-industrial and post-industrial societies were markedly different in that the *laissez-faire* approach of the pre-industrial era was no longer applicable in the post-industrial period: the state now had no choice but to adopt an interventionist stance. He clearly pointed out that “the social legislation of Bismarck in Germany and the measures proposed by Lloyd George in England were not merely in keeping with the times but were also very ingenious.”⁽⁷⁾ He keenly identified the important changes that had occurred in major European capitalist countries after the Industrial Revolution, and foresaw the important role social democracy and the idea of the welfare state would play in twentieth-century Western societies. It was inspired by Hayes that Jiang began to pay attention to the ascendancy of the British Labour Party and tried to glimpse possible changes in British foreign policy on the basis of the Labor Party’s attitude toward imperialist policies.

Jiang’s doctoral dissertation was essentially a study in political and diplomatic history, a subfield which naturally involves some basic theories of political science. Jiang attached great importance to a course entitled “Principles of Political Science” taught by William Dunning (1857–1922), the famous professor of American history at Columbia University. Dunning’s main field of study was the history of the American Civil War and the Reconstruction era, founding the so-called “Dunning School” which specialized in the latter topic. The Dunning School was largely negative about the Reconstruction, which it interpreted as a Northern conspiracy. Scholars of this school ignored the role played by black people⁽ⁱ⁾ in the Reconstruction process because they viewed them as politically incompetent. Dunning was dismissive of the radicalism of the Reconstruction because he placed greater value on political stability. In his view, the radical policies of the North during the Reconstruction era had politically and socially destabilized the South, with disastrous effects for the South’s economy. Stability in the South was only

⁽⁷⁾ Jiang, *Jiang Tingfu huiyi lu*, p. 82.

⁽ⁱ⁾ Translator’s note: This is the term used by Yang Zhao.

虑他所提出的看法，加以深思的话，他们一定会了解政治学说的最终问题是政权的性质问题，政治家的最终目的是保护政权。在政权稳定的时候，大学教授们似乎用不着强调稳定政权的困难。但从那时起，我就感到有些国家的人民，连最低限度的稳定都做不到，而稳定政权、建立秩序乃是一国政治的基点。若干年后，我越发认为邓宁教授的见解是高明的。”蒋廷黻在二十世纪三十年代著名的独裁与民主的论战中，坚决拥护国民党政权的“新式独裁”，反对胡适等人的民主诉求，其中很重要的一点理由就是面临日本入侵威胁的中国需要保持稳定与秩序。

蒋廷黻除了在哥大听邓宁的课，还到当时在纽约新成立的社会研究新学院（**The New School for Social Research**）听英国左派政治理论家和经济学家哈罗德·拉斯基（**Harold J. Laski, 1893-1950**）讲授的“政治学原理”。拉斯基是民主社会主义的鼓吹者，试图调和自由主义和社会主义，在资本主义和苏联式的科学社会主义中间走出一个“第三条道路”，对民国时期中国的思想界也产生了巨大的影响。蒋廷黻对拉斯基的印象很深，“我上午去听邓宁的课，下午去上拉斯基的课。他们二人不仅在理论上针锋相对，教法也截然不同”。“与邓宁正相反，拉斯基教授以其雄辩滔滔的口才慑服了我们。他具有惊人的记忆力。授课时他会引证柏拉图、亚里士多德、奥斯丁、圣托马斯阿奎那以及法国大革命前各家的著述。授课时，他从不停止。我们常被他的言语带开。我认为有许多次他自己也如脱缰野马，易放难收。”从拉斯基的学术经历来看，他所受的主要是历史学的训

restored after southern whites regained dominance through the advocacy of states' rights and the implementation of segregation. Dunning's "Principles of Political Science" course at Columbia University was fraught with this understanding of the history of the Reconstruction era. Looking back at this course, Jiang later wrote, "Dunning was not a dogmatist. He kept away from preconceived notions and simply presented his perspective on different problems. He believed that if students gave due consideration to his views, they would come to understand that the ultimate problem of politics is that of a regime's authority, and that the supreme purpose of politicians is to safeguard that authority. During a time of relative political stability, many other professors at the university gave little consideration to the difficulties involved with regime stability. But Dunning's classes made me realize that there are countries whose people are unable to achieve even a modicum of stability and that stabilizing the regime and establishing order should be the baseline of national politics. Some years later, I became increasingly convinced of the brilliance of Professor Dunning's insights."⁽⁸⁾ During the famous debate between dictatorship and democracy that took place in the 1930s in China, Jiang strongly supported the "new-style dictatorship" of the Guomindang regime and opposed the democratic demands of the likes of Hu Shi. One important reason for this was Jiang's belief that China needed stability and order in the face of a looming Japanese invasion.

Aside from attending Dunning's lectures at Columbia University, Jiang also visited the recently established New School for Social Research in New York to follow the lecture series on "Principles of Political Science" given by the British leftist political theorist and economist Harold J. Laski (1893–1950). Laski was an advocate of democratic socialism who tried to theoretically reconcile liberalism and socialism and thus forge a "third way" between capitalism and Soviet-style scientific socialism. His ideas gave much impetus to the intellectual circles in Republican China. Jiang was very impressed with Laski: "I used to go to Dunning's class in the morning and Laski's in the afternoon. Not only were the two of them diametrically opposed on a theoretical level, their teaching methods were also radically different." "Unlike Dunning, Professor Laski stunned us with his eloquence and his amazing memory. During his lectures, he cited Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, and various French writers of the *Ancien Régime*. Once he

⁽⁸⁾ Jiang, *Jiang Tingfu huiyi lu*, p. 79.

练，而且他早期教授的也主要是欧洲史、英国史、政治思想史等课程。从蒋廷黻的回忆来看，拉斯基讲授“政治学原理”课程的时候最为注重的也是政治思想史。拉斯基的这种治学风格和学术背景对蒋廷黻把学术兴趣放在政治史和外交史方面是有很大的影响的。此外，作为英国工党最为重要的理论家之一，拉斯基在课堂上肯定会传播工党和费边社的政治思想。蒋廷黻选择把英国工党作为自己博士论文的研究对象，其灵感来源之一就有拉斯基的课程。而且能够亲自聆听工党理论家的授课，会有助于蒋廷黻在博士论文的写作中对工党的理论有更为准确的把握。

蒋廷黻认为，除了导师海斯教授之外，威廉·沙费尔德教授的“欧洲发展史”课程对他的影响最大，直接决定了他博士论文的选题。威廉·沙费尔德（William R. Shepherd, 1871-1934）被认为是美国史学界拉丁美洲史研究的开创者，他在一九〇九年美国历史学会（AHA）年会上发表演讲，呼吁美国史学界加强对西班牙、葡萄牙和法国的美洲殖民地的研究，而不是仅仅关注英属美洲殖民地。沙费尔德在“欧洲发展史”的课程上虽然没有直接探讨帝国主义问题，甚至没有使用过“帝国主义”一词，但是他一直在探讨欧洲人在近代的扩张。由于沙费尔德的主要研究兴趣是拉美史，所以他对欧洲的殖民扩张尤为关注就毫不奇怪了。蒋廷黻在课程上并没有明确地看到沙费尔德对殖民扩张持一种什么样的价值判断，只是听到了他对欧洲人扩张的两面性的客观分析。沙费尔德认为：“在发展过程中，欧洲国家把他们的文明（从政治、经济到宗教）带到新发展的地区去。另一方面，欧洲人也从占领地区学到一些事物，开始更了解欧洲人在欧洲以外土地上接触到新动物、新植物和新社会。”从中可以看到，沙费尔德既没有像很多殖民地国家民族主义者那样对殖民扩张进行道德上的简单谴责，也没有像宗主国中的那些拥有极强种族优越感的帝国主义者那样认为殖民扩张只有单向的正面效果，而是比较理性而全面地将其当作一个客观的历史现象

started lecturing, there was no stopping him. We were often carried away by his words. I remember there were many times when he behaved like a wild horse: teeming with energy, but hard to tame.”⁽⁹⁾ Laski had been trained primarily in history and initially taught courses in European history, British history, and the history of political thought. According to Jiang’s recollections, Laski’s course on “The Principles of Political Science” also focused on the history of political thought. One may surmise that Laski’s style of teaching and academic background had a great impact on Jiang’s interest in political and diplomatic history. In addition, as one of the most important theorists of the British Labor Party, Laski was almost certainly spreading the political ideas of the Labor Party and the Fabian Society in the classroom. As such, Laski’s course may have nudged Jiang toward his choice of the British Labor Party as the main subject of his dissertation. Moreover, being able to listen to a Labor theorist in person may have helped Jiang gain a better understanding of the Labor Party’s theories in the course of writing his thesis.

In addition to his advisor Professor Hayes, Jiang would later recall that Professor William R. Shepherd’s course on “The History of European Development” had perhaps the greatest impact on him and even directly led him to the topic of his doctoral dissertation. William R. Shepherd (1871–1934) is generally seen as a pioneer in the study of Latin American history among American historians. In 1909, Shepherd delivered a lecture at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association (AHA) in which he called on his fellow historians to strengthen the study of the Spanish, Portuguese, and French colonialism in the Americas instead of exclusively focusing on the British colonies on American territory. Although Shepherd did not directly address the issue of imperialism or even so much as use the term “imperialism” in his course, his lectures did explore the overseas expansion of Europe during the modern era. Since Shepherd’s main research interest was Latin American history, it is not surprising that he was particularly concerned with the European colonial expansion. While attending this course, Jiang did not get a clear picture of how Shepherd evaluated the colonial enterprise and had to remain content with an objective analysis of the ambiguous nature of the European expansion. According to Shepherd, “In the process of their development, European nations brought their civilizations (from politics and economics to religion) to newly developing regions. On the other hand,

⁽⁹⁾ Jiang, *Jiang Tingfu huiyi lu*, pp. 79–80.

来进行分析。他的这种态度触发了蒋廷黻对帝国主义问题的思考，促使他在博士论文中探讨英国工党对帝国主义政策的态度，而且使蒋廷黻能够心平气和地对帝国主义进行理性的分析与研究。蒋廷黻之后在《中国近代史》一书中的很多基本历史观点也可以明显地看到沙费尔德的影子。

在民国时期人文社会科学领域的中国留美生中，能够做一个与中国没有直接关系的研究课题的学人可说是凤毛麟角，特别是历史学这样需要深厚文化背景的学科就更是如此。蒋廷黻在当时美国“新史学”重镇哥伦比亚大学历史系攻读博士学位，不仅选修的基本都是西洋史和西方社会科学方面的课程，而且博士论文选择了一个纯粹的英国史（而且是当代史）的题目，前人并没有做过很多深入的研究，所以这个题目不仅拥有很强的创新性，而且具有重要的现实意义。一九二三年论文顺利出版，收入哥大著名的《历史、经济和公共法律研究》丛书，并且得到几本美国社会科学领域重要学术期刊的推介，为他之后的史学研究奠定了坚实的基础。

蒋廷黻在留学期间所修史学课程的几位老师都是当时美国史学界的一流学者，像邓宁和海斯还都曾经担任过美国历史协会的主席。他们的共同特点是基本上都曾经在博士期间留学于当时

Europeans also learned things from the areas they occupied and began to understand more about the new animals, plants, and human societies with which they became acquainted far away from Europe.”⁽¹⁰⁾ It is clear from this that Shepherd did not straightforwardly condemn the European colonial endeavor on moral grounds, as many nationalists in colonized countries did. But neither did he believe colonialism to have had exclusively positive effects, as many imperialists with a strong sense of racial superiority argued. Instead, Shepperd tried to offer a sober and comprehensive analysis of imperialism as an objective historical phenomenon. This attitude triggered Jiang’s interest in the problem of imperialism and prompted him to explore the British Labor Party’s attitude toward imperialist policies in his doctoral dissertation. In a word, Shepherd’s teaching allowed Jiang to analyze and study imperialism dispassionately. Many of the basic historical perspectives developed by Jiang’s in his subsequent book *Chinese Modern History* betray Shepherd’s intellectual influence.

During the Republican era, most overseas Chinese students in the humanities and social sciences chose a research topic directly related to China during their stay in the United States. Jiang Tingfu was a rare exception in this regard. His case is all the more remarkable because he wrote his dissertation in history, a discipline which presupposes a profound insight into a country’s cultural background. While he was enrolled as a doctoral student at the Department of History of Columbia University—a major academic center for “New History” in the United States at that time—Jiang not only attended courses in Western history and social sciences, but also chose to focus his thesis on British (contemporary) history, which was a rather unexplored field at that time. The topic was not only highly innovative but also of great relevance. Jiang’s dissertation was published in 1923 by Columbia University Press as part of the prestigious series *Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law* and was recommended by several major American academic journals in the social sciences. His book provided a solid foundation for his subsequent historical research.

During his time as an exchange student, Jiang Tingfu attended lectures given by American professors who were all leading scholars in the field of history. Dunning and Hayes, had, for example, both served as president of

⁽¹⁰⁾ Jiang, *Jiang Tingfu huiyi lu*, p. 80.

世界的科学文化中心德国，受到过德国十九世纪现代史学的熏陶，有着非常扎实的史学功底；而且他们大都研究的是欧洲史和美国史，属于美国史学界的研究主流；此外，他们还都深受二十世纪初詹姆斯·鲁滨逊和查尔斯·比尔德“新史学”观念的重要影响。二十世纪二十年代的美国史学界基本上由欧洲史和美国史占据绝对的主导地位，一流的史学人才和重要的史学方法都来自这些领域。作为一名留学美国学习历史的学生，只有完全进入美国西洋史的研究领域之中，才能真正学到美国史学界最精华的东西。蒋廷黻通过选修哥大的西洋史课程，跟随这批史学大家接受了美国第一流的史学训练，深入美国西洋史的整个学术脉络之中，并为这个学术传统做出了自己的贡献。之后，蒋廷黻回国任教于南开与清华，并提出了“历史与社会科学并重，历史之中西方史与中国史并重，中国史内考据与综合并重”的理念，塑造了一个中国史学界的清华学派，使自古传统深厚的中国史学真正完成了现代转型，实现了美国的西洋史传统在中国的知识迁移，具有十分重要的跨文化交流的意义。

参考资料

- Tingfu F. Tsiang, *Labor and Empire: A Study of the Reaction of British Labor, Mainly as Represented in Parliament, to British Imperialism Since 1880*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1923.
- 《国士无双：蒋廷黻回忆录》，蒋廷黻著，新星出版社二〇一六年版。

the American Historical Association and had both studied in Germany during their doctoral research, which was then a global center for research in the sciences and culture. Jiang's teachers were influenced by 19th-century modern German historiography and had a solid background in the study of history. Moreover, they were focused on European and American history and belonged to the mainstream of American historical profession. In addition, their works were deeply influenced by the "New History" epitomized in the early twentieth century by James Robinson and Charles Beard. In short, during the 1920s, American history was dominated by European history and American history, and the best historians and most important historical approaches came from these fields. Coming to the United States as an exchange student, Jiang was given the opportunity to fully experience the field of Western history in the United States and learn from the best in the field. By taking the Western History courses at Columbia University, he received a first-rate training in American history thanks to this group of historians. He was introduced into the academic lineage of American Western history and made his own contribution to this tradition. Jiang later returned to China to teach at Nankai University and Tsinghua University, where he put forward the idea of putting "equal emphasis on history and the social sciences, equal emphasis on Western and Chinese history, and equal emphasis on textual research and methodological pluralism within Chinese history." By so doing, he gave rise to the Tsinghua school of Chinese historiography, ushered in a veritable modern transformation of the ancient Chinese historiographical tradition, and gave voice to the American tradition of Western history in China. Jiang's work has been of great significance for cross-cultural exchange.

References

- Jiang, Tingfu F., *Labor and Empire: A Study of the Reaction of British Labor, Mainly as Represented in Parliament, to British Imperialism Since 1880*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1923.
- Jiang, Tingfu 蒋廷黻, *Guoshi wu shuang: Jiang Tingfu huiyi lu* 国土无双: 蒋廷黻回忆录 (A national scholar without peers: The Reminiscences of Jiang Tingfu). Beijing, Xinxing chubanshe, 2016.

4 Lei Haizong's Doctoral Dissertation and the Academic Tradition of Western History at the University of Chicago

雷海宗的博士论文与芝加哥大学的西洋史学术传统

Yang Zhao

杨钊

Translation by Rui Kunze

雷海宗(1902-1962),是20世纪中国著名的历史学家,他担任民国时期历史学重镇——清华大学历史系主任长达14年,真正巩固了由蒋廷黻所开创的历史学研究的“清华学派”在中国史学界的地位。蒋廷黻对清华历史系的期许是“历史与社会科学并重;历史之中西方史与中国史并重;中国史内考据与综合并重”。而雷海宗则以自己的治学实践做到了历史与社会科学并重、中国史与西洋史并重。民国时期的清华大学历史系,由于原始资料难以获取,西洋史研究受到了极大的限制,很难做出高水平的研究成果。雷海宗虽然把研究重心放到了中国史上,但一直没有放弃世界史的教学与研究工作,并且在当时的研究条件下取得了一定的学术成就,实属难能可贵。而雷海宗在世界史领域取得的成就,显然颇多受益于他在芝加哥大学学习西洋史的五年学术训练。近年来,国内史学界对雷海宗在中国史和世界史领域的教学与研究工作已经进行了很多深入细致的研究。¹但是,这些研究大多集中在雷海宗回国任教之后的学术成就及其学术思想,对于他早年留学芝加哥大学的这段经历很少关注,特别是他在芝大历史系所做的博士论文并没有得到足够的重视。²本文准备以雷海宗的这篇西洋史博士论文为重点,探讨其主要内容、基本思路和在学术史上的地位,并系统梳理雷海宗在芝加哥大学历史系所受的西洋史学术训练。包括他的导

¹ 近年来关于雷海宗在中国史和世界史领域的教学与研究工作的研究主要有侯云灏:《雷海宗早期史学思想研究》,《史学理论研究》1992年第3期;王敦书:《雷海宗的生平、治学特点和学术成就》,《历史教学》2003年第2期;王敦书:《雷海宗的环境史观和环境史学》,《史学理论研究》2009年第2期;王敦书:《雷海宗的世界历史上的中国观》,《史学理论研究》2011年第4期;陈志强:《雷海宗批评“欧洲中心论”》,《史学理论研究》2012年第3期;乔治忠:《雷海宗学术评价问题新议》,《学术研究》2014年第1期;刘超:《雷海宗与蒋廷黻——兼论民国“新史学”的发展路径》,《社会科学论坛》2016年第8期。还有专门研究雷海宗史学思想与成就的硕士学位论文,如魏连:《雷海宗史学思想研究》,2008年山东大学硕士学位论文;覃梅溪:《雷海宗史学成就研究》,2010年广西师范大学硕士学位论文;宗石丁:《雷海宗与民国时期的民族主义史学》,2011年山东大学硕士学位论文。

² 雷海宗先生1927年在芝加哥大学提交的英语博士论文《杜尔哥的政治思想》(The Political Ideas of Turgot)并未发表过,一直保存在芝加哥大学档案馆,由雷先生的弟子何炳棣先生复印并装订成册,分赠给雷海宗的夫人张景茆、南开大学历史系教授王敦书和清华大学图书馆。王敦书将这本文博士论文收入他编的《雷海宗世界史文集》(天津人民出版社2014年版,第3-101页),本文所依据的就是这个版本。

Lei Haizong (Barnabas Hai-Tsung Lei, 1902-1962), celebrated historian in twentieth-century China, had served as the dean of the Department of History at Tsinghua University – the citadel of historical studies in Republican China – for fourteen years. He truly consolidated the esteemed reputation of the Tsinghua School, which was founded by Jiang Tingfu (1895-1965), among colleagues. Jiang strived to develop the Department of History at Tsinghua into one, which was strong in “both history and social sciences; both Western history and Chinese history; and both evidential scholarship and comprehensive methods of Chinese history.”⁽¹⁾ With his academic practices, Lei had managed to build the department into one renowned for its historical studies and social sciences; Chinese history and Western history. In the Republican era, due to the limited access to primary sources, the Department of History at Tsinghua was unable to produce high-level research results in Western history. Although Lei Haizong's research focus was on Chinese history, he had never given up the teaching and research of world history; and had produced certain amount of results despite the difficult circumstances. Lei's research in the field of world history had undoubtedly benefited much from his five-year academic training in Western history at the University of Chicago. Recently Chinese historians have delved into Lei's teaching and research activities in Chinese history and world history.⁽²⁾ Their research,

⁽¹⁾ Translator's note: This assessment is taken from a contribution of Ho Ping-ti (He Bingdi 何炳棣), a Chinese-American historian, to the *Journal of Tsinghua University*, see Ho Ping-ti, “Qinghua shixue dui wo yingxiang shenyuan” (The great impact of Tsinghua's Historical Sciences on me and my work), in: *Qinghua daxue xuebao (zhesheban)*, no. 5, 2005, pp. 5-7.

⁽²⁾ Recent studies of Lei Haizong's teaching and research in Chinese history and world history are: Hou Yunhao, “Lei Haizong zaoqi shixue sixiang yanjiu” (A study of Lei Haizong's early historical ideas), *Shixue lilun yanjiu*, no. 3(1992); Wang Dunshu, “Lei Haizong de shengping, zhixue tedian he xueshu chengjiu” (Lei Haizong's life, research focus and academic achievements), *Lishi jiaoxue*, no. 2 (2003); Wang Dunshu, “Lei Haizong de huanjing shiguan he huanjing shixue”(Lei Haizong's views and research of environmental history), *Shixue lilun yanjiu*, no. 2 (2009); Wang Dunshu, “Lei Haizong de shijie lishi shang de Zhongguo guan”(Lei Haizong's views of China in world history), *Shixue lilun yanjiu*, no. 4 (2011); Chen Zhiqiang, “Lei Haizong piping ‘Ouzhou zhongxin lun’”(Lei Haizong criticized Eurocentrism), *Shixue lilun yanjiu*, no. 3 (2012); Qiao Zhizhong, “Lei Haizong xueshu pingjia wenti xinyi” (A new assessment of Lei Haizong's academic achievements), *Xueshu yanjiu*, no. 1 (2014); Liu Chao, “Lei Haizong yu Jiang Tingfu – jianlun minguo ‘xin shixue’ de fazhan lujing” (Lei Haizong and Jiang Tingfu: on the development of the New History in Republican China), *Shehui kexue luntan*, no. 8 (2016). Master theses on Lei Haizong's historical views and achievements are: Wei Lian, “Lei Haizong shixue sixiang yanjiu” (A study of Lei Haizong's ideas of historical research) Shandong University, 2008; Qin Meixi, “Lei Haizong shixue chengjiu yanjiu” (A study of Lei Haizong's achievements in historical studies), Guangxi Normal University, 2010; Zong Shiding, “Lei Haizong yu minguo shiqi de minzuzhuyi shixue” (Lei Haizong and the nationalist historiography in Republican China), Shandong University 2011.

师和整个 1920 年代芝加哥大学的学术特色，以及当时盛行于美国史学界的“新史学”思潮，从而分析这些因素对雷海宗的史学研究所产生的重要影响。

雷海宗博士论文的主要内容

雷海宗的博士论文《杜尔哥的政治思想》(*The Political Ideas of Turgot*) 选取法国著名的重农主义思想家和政治家阿内罗伯特雅克杜尔哥 (Anne Robert Jacques Turgot, 1727-1781) 的政治思想为研究对象，是一篇标准的政治思想史论文。

该论文在结构上共分成五章。第一章是导论，简要介绍了杜尔哥的生平、杜尔哥与 18 世纪英法两国政治思想的关系、杜尔哥与法国著名思想家博须埃 (Bossuet, 1627-1704) 和卢梭 (Rousseau, 1712-1778) 之间的比较，以及杜尔哥与法国重农学派的关系。第二章的标题是“作为管理者和思想家的杜尔哥”，大致梳理了杜尔哥在任利摩日州州长 (Intendant of Limoges) 和财政大臣 (Finance Minister) 时所推行的主要改革行动，以及他的整个改革计划。第三章和第四章是整个博士论文最重要的主体部分，系统阐述了杜尔哥的政治思想。在第三章中，作者首先介绍了杜尔哥的历史哲学，考察了他政治思想的背景；接着通过探讨杜尔哥对于法国君主制的看法，总结了他所构想的法国宪法的一般特征；随后，作者考察了杜尔哥对特权和平等问题、宗教和宽容问题的观点，以及他对当时的资产阶级的看法。在第四

however, has mainly concentrated on Lei's achievement and thoughts after he returned to China. His earlier experiences at the University of Chicago, especially his PhD dissertation submitted to the Department of History there, have not received sufficient attention.⁽³⁾ This article looks at Lei's PhD dissertation, which deals with Western history, to assess its main contents, primary methods, and significance in intellectual history. It also examines Lei's academic training in Western history at the Department of History at the University of Chicago, which includes his mentors, the educational orientation of the university in the 1920s, and the methodological trend of the New History in American historical studies at the time. This article analyzes how these factors had notably influenced Lei Haizong's historical research.

Main Contents of Lei Haizong's PhD Dissertation

Lei Haizong's PhD Dissertation *The Political Ideas of Turgot*, which studies French physiocrat and statesman Anne Robert Jacques Turgot (1727-1781), is a typical thesis on the history of political ideas.

The dissertation consists of five chapters. The first chapter briefly introduces Turgot's life, situating him in relation to the political ideas of eighteenth-century Britain and France; comparing him with well-known French thinkers Jacques Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704) and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778); and positioning Turgot among French physiocrats. The second chapter titled "Turgot: Administrator and Philosopher" delineates the major reforms and his whole reform plan during his tenures as the Intendant of Limoges and finance minister. The third and the fourth chapters are the major parts of the dissertation, which offer a systematic discussion of Turgot's political ideas. In the third chapter, Lei first introduces Turgot's historical philosophy and examines the context from which his political ideas emerged; then the author summarizes the general features of the constitution conceived by Turgot through exploring his view on French monarchism. After

⁽³⁾ Lei Haizong's 1927 dissertation *The Political Ideas of Turgot* has never been published. It has been archived by the University of Chicago Library. Lei's student He Bingdi photocopied and bound the dissertation; and gave the copies to Lei's wife Zhang Jingfu 张景菲, professor of history Wang Dunshu at Nankai University, and the library of Tsinghua University. Wang Dunshu included [the translation of] Lei's dissertation into his edited volume *Lei Haizong shijieshi wenji* (Collected essays of Lei Haizong on world history) (Tianjin: renmin chubanshe, 2014), pp. 3-101. This article uses this [translated] version.

章中，作者着重论述了杜尔哥对议会体系（Municipality）进行的制度设计，以及通过教育和启蒙来为这个制度的实现提供思想基础，从而展现了杜尔哥政治思想中的民主特征。第五章是整篇博士论文的结论部分，作者对杜尔哥同时具有思想家和政治家的双重身份进行了定位，然后阐述了杜尔哥政治思想在历史上的意义和影响。

杜尔哥通常是以重农主义思想家的身份而为人所知。重农主义（Physiocracy）的主要经济观点是：农业在经济发展中的作用比制造业更加重要，提倡自由放任政策，特别是谷物的自由贸易，主张以土地所有者而非农民作为课税的对象。³可是，“以往关于重农学派的历史研究给这一运动造成了一定的损害，因为它缺乏对其政治经济学的广泛的、综合性的考察，而偏重于对其经济分析的技术层面或者对其与绝对主义的关系的本质加以挑剔”。⁴雷海宗显然意识到了这种研究上的缺陷，但他并没有把杜尔哥仅仅视作一位重农学派的经济学家，而是将其定位成一名政治思想家和政治实践家，并且把关注的重点投向他的政治思想。在导论中，雷海宗简要回顾了18世纪英法思想界的基本情况，认为杜尔哥在这个思想脉络中独树一帜。一方面他是其中唯一的政治实践者，另一方面他又独自提出了许多重要的政治思想。与主张绝对君主制的博须埃和主张共和制的卢梭相比，他的政治思想处于中间立场。杜尔哥认为绝对君主制的思想“在理论上不成熟，在实践中很危险”，他“虽然并不想抛弃君主制，但是他的主要兴趣是使人民富有和幸福”。⁵杜尔哥对卢梭的共和制思想也持否定态度，他认为主权在国王而不是在人民手中，更加符合18世纪法国的政治和社会生活实际。杜尔哥主张绝对主义和个人主义之间的妥协，希望君主实行仁慈的统治，在保证国家权威的前提下增进人民的福祉。尽管杜尔哥提出了很多独立的观点和想法，但是当时的重农主义还是给了他很大的影

³ 关于重农主义的定义与主要观点，可以参见伦敦经济学院国际关系史高级讲师蒂姆霍赫斯特拉塞尔的《重农主义和自由放任的政治》，收录于马克戈尔德、罗伯特沃克勒主编的《剑桥十八世纪政治思想史》，刘北成等译，商务印书馆，2017年版，第404-426页。

⁴ 蒂姆·霍赫斯特拉塞尔：《重农主义和自由放任的政治》，收录于马克戈尔德、罗伯特沃克勒：《剑桥十八世纪政治思想史》，刘北成等译，商务印书馆，2017年版，第425-426页。

⁵ Hai-Tsung Lei, *The Political Ideas of Turgot*, 见雷海宗：《雷海宗世界史文集》，天津人民出版社，2014年版，第14、22、39、56、63、89、97页。

this Lei examines Turgot's opinion on privilege and equality; religion and tolerance, as well as on his contemporary bourgeoisie. In the fourth chapter, Lei discusses Turgot's design of the Municipality system, whose intellectual base should be established through education and enlightenment. The author therefore demonstrates that Turgot's political ideas contain features of democracy. The fifth chapter is the conclusion part, in which Lei identifies Turgot as both a thinker and a statesman. He then discusses the historical significance and legacy of Turgot's political ideas.

Turgot has been known as a physiocratic thinker. Major economic views of physiocracy include: prioritizing agricultural productivity over manufacturing as the source of economic growth; promoting laissez-faire policies, especially a free trade in grain; taxing landowners rather than farmers.⁽⁴⁾ Yet, "[t]he historiography of physiocracy has done the movement a disservice in missing the grand, comprehensive sweep of its political economy in favor of critical scrutiny of either the technical aspects of its economic analysis or the exact nature of its relationship to absolutism."⁽⁵⁾ Lei was apparently aware of these drawbacks. He viewed Turgot not solely as an economist of physiocracy, but also identified him as a political thinker, who put his ideas into practice. Thus Lei directed his attention to Turgot's political ideas. The introduction briefly delineates the intellectual ideas in eighteenth-century Britain and France and shows that Turgot was unique in this context: he was the only thinker who practiced his own political ideas, many of which he came up on his own. Turgot stood between Bossuet, who advocated absolute monarchy, and Rousseau, who stood for Republicanism. He found the idea of absolute monarchy "unsound in theory and dangerous in practice." Although he "had no intention whatever of doing away with the monarchy, yet his main interest was to make the people wealthy and happy."⁽⁶⁾ Turgot also held a negative attitude towards Rousseau's Republicanism. He believed that the sovereignty in the hand of the king – instead of the people – was more appropriate for the political and social reality of eighteenth-century

⁽⁴⁾ On the definition and major arguments of physiocracy, see T. J. Hochstrasser, "Physiocracy and the politics of laissez-faire", in: Mark Goldie and Robert Wokler (eds): *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). Its Chinese version: *Jianqiao shiba shiji zhengzhi sixiang shi*, trans. Liu Beicheng, et al. (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2017), 404-426.

⁽⁵⁾ *Jianqiao shiba shiji zhengzhi sixiang shi*, 425-426.

⁽⁶⁾ Hai-Tsung Lei, *The Political Ideas of Turgot*, In: Lei Haizong, *Lei Haizong shijieshi wenji* (Collected essays of Lei Haizong on world history) (Tianjin: renmin chubanshe, 2014), 14.

响。他接受魁奈（Quesnay, 1694-1774）将土地作为财富主要来源的思想，也支持重农主义者的谷物自由贸易政策，以及对土地征收单一税。可杜尔哥毕竟是一位政治家，他不会教条地遵循重农主义的主要原则，而是结合法国的实际情况进行必要的妥协，这就使他与当时主流的重农主义者相比在思想上有所区别。雷海宗认为，杜尔哥和重农主义者的关系可以概括为：“他接受但是软化了他们的经济原则；他基本上忽略了他们的政治思想著作。”⁶

在分析杜尔哥的政治思想之前，雷海宗先对他的基本身份做了定位，认为他更多的是一位政治家，而不仅仅是一位政治哲学家。杜尔哥做过地方州的州长，也当过两年的财政部长，并在任内推行了许多重要的改革，具有丰富的政治实践，这就使得他的政治思想具有很多独特之处。在历史哲学方面，他相信启蒙的力量，认为人性是完美的，随着知识、科学和艺术的进步，人类的思想也会进步，整体上对历史发展持一种乐观的理想主义态度。在君主制问题上，由于当时的法国没有宪法，君主拥有巨大的权力，杜尔哥认为只有依靠君主的力量才能推进改革。杜尔哥对君主制没有敌意，但认为法国应该拥有一部宪法，只有在宪法的制约下，君主才能实行仁慈的统治，确保所有民众的利益。在杜尔哥构想的宪法中，要取消贵族（Nobility）、最高法院（Parlement）和公司享有的封建和经济特权。在杜尔哥看来，“每个人都应当为维护国家做出贡献，任何形式的偏袒或特权都是不正当的，除非需要一些特别的服务”。⁷与取消特权的观点相呼应，杜尔哥主张实行谷物自由贸易政策，并且对殖民地的贸易也采取开放政策，不再由母国垄断，这些思想在当时都是非常超前的。在宗教问题上，杜尔哥倡导宗教宽容，反对任何形式的宗教迫害。但他与伏尔泰等启蒙思想家不同，对宗教持非常严肃的态度，认可宗教所发挥的作用，尤其是教会

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

France. Turgot argued for compromises between absolutism and individualism. He hoped that a benign ruler, while guaranteeing the state's authority, could increase the people's happiness. Despite his many original views and thoughts, Turgot was strongly influenced by his contemporary physiocratic ideas. He accepted François Quesnay's (1694-1774) idea that land was the major source of wealth; and he also supported policies promoted by the physiocrats, such as a free trade in grain and flat-rate tax on land. Turgot, after all, was a statesman. Instead of dogmatically following the major principles of physiocracy, he made necessary compromises in view of the reality of France, which made his ideas different from those of his contemporary mainstream physiocrats. In Lei Haizong's view, the relationship between the ideas of Turgot and those of the physiocrats could be summarized as follows: "He adopted but softened their economic doctrines; their speculative political literature he ignored."⁽⁷⁾

Before proceeding to analyze Turgot's political ideas, Lei Haizong first positions him – more as a statesman than a political philosopher. Turgot had served as the Intendant of Limoges and then two years as finance minister. He had carried out many important reforms during his tenures and possessed rich [experiences of] political practice, which distinguished his political ideas from others. Regarding historical philosophy, Turgot believed in the power of enlightenment and perfect humanity. Assuming that human thoughts would progress with the development of knowledge, science, and arts, he generally held an optimistic idealism towards historical development. On the issue of monarchism, Turgot advocated relying upon the power of the monarch to move reforms forward, because France at the time had no constitution but a tremendously powerful monarch. Turgot was not hostile to monarchism, but he believed that France needed a constitution. Only when the monarch was restricted by the constitution would he practice the benign ruling and guarantee the interests of all the people. In the constitution conceived by Turgot, the feudal and economic privileges enjoyed by the Nobility, the *Parlement* and the corporation (公同) should be cancelled. In Turgot's view, "everybody should contribute to the upkeep of the State, and no favoritism or privilege of any sort is justified unless it entails some special service."⁽⁸⁾ Resonating with this idea of cancelling privileges was his advoca-

⁽⁷⁾ Ibid., 22.

⁽⁸⁾ Ibid., 39.

的慈善功能，倡导一种“自然宗教”（**natural religion**）。他既反对建立一个垄断的教会，也反对完全的政教分离，而是持一种中间的立场。他希望国家是世俗化的，不受任何教派的影响，但是为了公共利益维持一个教会，并对不同的教义持宽容态度。另外，政府不能干预宗教事务，教会也不能影响政治事务，二者各司其职，互不干涉。雷海宗认为，杜尔哥提倡“立宪君主制，废除特权，机会平等，劳动自由，自由贸易，彻底的宗教宽容”，都完全符合资产阶级的利益，因此，“杜尔哥是第一批支持资本和资产阶级的群体中的一员”⁸。雷海宗认为，杜尔哥最早发现了资本阶级和劳动阶级之间的联系和重要性，而且他认识到了未来属于金融家和企业家组成的资本家阶级。这些思想与其他的重农主义者是不一样的。

在分析了杜尔哥在几个核心的政治问题上的观点之后，雷海宗开始探讨杜尔哥提出的两个建设性的政治主张。他认为，杜尔哥的这两个政治主张体现了其思想中的民主特点。当然，雷海宗这里所讲的“民主”有着自己的界定，也就是民众对政府的某种参与，包括咨询顾问的形式。杜尔哥认为“国家不应当为人民做所有的事情，但是应当在人民为自己的利益行事时监督他们。人民应当在政府中拥有份额，不仅是一种权宜之计，而且是一种权利”⁹。杜尔哥的第一个建设性主张是建立一个统一的从乡村开始到中央的国会大会的议会体系（**Municipality**）。该机构对于国王来说是咨询性质的，国王依然拥有绝对的行政权力，但是议会会在自己的管辖范围内也具有一定的权力。土地所有者根据自己拥有土地的多少来获得相应份额的选票，也就是

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

tion for a free trade in grain, which should also be applicable to the colonies so that the colonizing country had no monopoly right. All these ideas were highly progressive under their historical circumstances. Regarding religion, Turgot argued for religious tolerance and against any form of religious persecution. Different from Enlightenment thinkers such as Voltaire (1694-1778), however, Turgot was serious about religion. He recognized its functions, especially the church's function of charity, and promoted a "natural religion." He treaded the middle path between a monopolistic church and the separation of church and state. He wished for a secular state that was uninfluenced by any religious sectors; but would support a church for the public interest and advocated the tolerance of different religious creeds. Furthermore, the government should not intervene with religious affairs and the church should not exert influences on political affairs. They should take care of their own duties respectively. In Lei Haizong's view, Turgot's advocacy for "Constitutional Monarchy, abolition of privilege, equality of opportunity, freedom of labor, free trade, complete religious toleration" all spoke for the interests of the bourgeoisie class. Therefore "Turgot was one of the first prominent advocates of Capital and the bourgeoisie."⁽⁹⁾ Lei argues that Turgot might be the first thinker who discovered the important connections between the bourgeoisie class and the working class; he also saw that the future belonged to the bourgeoisie class that consisted of bankers and entrepreneurs. These ideas were different from those of other physiocrats.

After analyzing Turgot's views on these fundamental political issues, Lei Haizong proceeds to discuss his two constructive political proposals. He argues that these political proposals demonstrate features of democracy in Turgot's thoughts. Certainly, the term "democracy" used by Lei Haizong had its own definition, namely, the populace's certain degree of involvement into state affairs, including that in the form of consultancy. Turgot believed that "the State should not do everything for the people, but should only supervise them when they were doing it for themselves. The people should be given a share in the government, not only as a matter of expediency, but also as a matter of right."⁽¹⁰⁾ Turgot's first proposal was to establish a unified system of Municipality, which should cover the village all the way to the national assembly. This institution should consult for the king, who retained his abso-

⁽⁹⁾ Ibid., 56.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Ibid., 63.

说，选票代表了“土地，而不是人”，这完全体现了重农主义者的原则。雷海宗认为，杜尔哥所进行的制度设计将给法国带来巨大的变革。他的计划所体现的开明专制精神并不新颖，然而他所构想的运行机制却具有独创性。杜尔哥的第二个建设性计划是实施公共教育，并将其作为实现议会体系的重要前提条件。在杜尔哥看来，政府和人民之间相距甚远，只有通过教育才能使人民理解政治。杜尔哥完全是从功利的角度来看待教育的，教育只是更好地推行政府政策的手段。他推行的是一种全国性的教育，由一个全国教育委员会来统一规划，并将增强学生们的爱国情感。总之，杜尔哥教育思想的特点是具有强烈的国家主义和实用主义色彩，这在 18 世纪的法国是非常独特的。

在整个博士论文的结论部分，雷海宗再次强调了杜尔哥作为政治思想家和政治实践者的双重身份。雷海宗指出，杜尔哥从来没有写下“任何对自己政治观念的系统性阐述和解释，只能从他留下的实际的政府公文中才能概括出来”¹⁰。可他会努力把自己的政治观点付诸实践。同时，雷海宗认为，在当时法国的绝对君主制之下，国王是唯一能够推行改革的人，但是路易十六并没有坚定的改革意志，无法抵御既得利益者们的影响，所以杜尔哥孤掌难鸣，他再好的政治构想也无法得到实施，法国最终只能走向革命。此外，雷海宗还对杜尔哥的思想及其影响进行了评价。他认为，杜尔哥是法国大革命前的启蒙时代知识阶层的典型代表，对人类的进步持乐观主义态度，并且非常相信人类理性的力量，而且他是旧制度时期最具开明思想的政治家。如果杜尔哥的思想能够付诸实践，法国将取代英国成为欧洲第一个实行自由贸易、直接税和地方自治的国家，而且他的思想已经超越了国界，在 19 世纪，就有很多西方国家加以推行。他的思想还影响到了一些具体的改革家，比如 19 世纪普鲁士的改革家施泰因（Stein），他的改革举措与杜尔哥的几乎一样，带来了普鲁士的崛起。雷海宗认为，杜尔哥的很多具体思想也对

¹⁰ Ibid.

lute administrative power; but it also had power within its own areas of jurisdiction. Landowners obtained ballots according to the amount of their land. This meant, the ballots represented “land, not individual,” a typical principle of physiocracy. Lei Haizong argues that Turgot’s institutional design would have brought about tremendous changes to France. The liberal authoritarianism embodied in his conceptions was not new, but its operational mechanism was original. Turgot’s second constructive proposal was to implement public education, which he considered as an essential precondition of realizing the system of Municipality. In his view, the wide gap between the government and the people could only be narrowed by means of education, which enabled the latter to understand politics. Turgot’s perception of education was totally utilitarian, for he saw it as a means to accomplish the goal of effectively implementing government’s policies. He promoted a national education, which should be designed and planned by a national education committee and aim at boosting pupils’ patriotism. In general Turgot’s educational ideas featured strong statism and utilitarianism, which was unique in eighteenth-century France.

In the conclusion part of his dissertation, Lei Haizong reiterates Turgot’s double identity as a political thinker and as one who practiced his ideas. Lei points out that Turgot had never written down “any systematic exposition and elaboration of his political ideas, almost all of which have to be abstracted from the actual official documents he wrote.”⁽¹¹⁾ Yet Turgot had strived to put his political ideas into practice. Meanwhile Lei Haizong is also of the following opinion: although the absolute monarchy in France at the time made the king the only one who could implement reforms, Louis XVI did not have the strong will to reform and failed to resist the influences of vested interests, which left Turgot powerless to implement his political ideas; therefore, France could not but end up in revolution. Lei further assesses Turgot’s ideas and their legacy. In his view, Turgot, the most liberal statesman within the old system, was a typical representative of the Enlightenment intellectuals in pre-revolutionary France, who were optimistic with regard to human progress and believed in the power of human rationality. Had Turgot’s ideas been put into practice, France – instead of Britain – would have become the first European country that practiced free trade, direct tax, and local self-government. Turgot’s ideas went well beyond national boundaries

⁽¹¹⁾ Ibid., 89.

后世产生了影响，比如他的教育思想影响了之后法国的教育体制，他所构想的议会体系计划甚至与苏维埃俄国的体制有某些相似之处。杜尔哥对法国所产生的直接影响并不大，但他对法国的历史意义仍然不可忽视，因为他对和平地变革法国作出了“最后的认真努力”¹¹。在法国革命之后，杜尔哥的很多观点都在法国取得了胜利。

雷海宗的整篇博士论文以法国重农主义者杜尔哥被人忽略的政治思想为研究对象，梳理了他政治思想的主要方面，并探讨了其意义和影响。雷海宗抓住杜尔哥政治家的身份定位，认为这使他的政治思想具有很多异于同时代启蒙思想家的地方，而且他还有机会实现自己的想法。他把一个通常被认为是重农主义经济学家的杜尔哥纳入 18 世纪法国政治思想的脉络中，使学术界对杜尔哥的认识达到新的角度，可以说在研究杜尔哥的领域取得了突破。此外，雷海宗的博士论文史料基础也很扎实。由于他具有良好的法文功底，所以他的论文使用了 1913-1923 年新出版的 5 卷本《杜尔哥著作集》(*Oeuvres de Turgot*)，作为全文最重要的一手史料。而且他还参考了孔多塞的著作集和杜邦对杜尔哥的回忆等其他法文材料，以及大量的英语和法语世界对杜尔哥的研究著作。雷海宗当时在芝加哥大学主修历史，副修哲学，这可能是他选择一个两学科交叉的政治思想史题目的重要原因。作为一名中国留学生，雷海宗使用法文的原始材料，用英文写出一篇标准的西方政治思想史论文，这在当时的中国留学生中并不多见，显示了他出色的语言能力和思辨能力，以及他高远的学术志向，实属难能可贵。

¹¹ Ibid.

to influence many reformers of Western countries in the 19th century. Baron vom Stein (1757-1831), for example, carried out largely the same reform measures as conceived by Turgot, which led to the rise of Prussia. Lei Haizong argues that Turgot's ideas had also influenced generations to come, for example, his educational ideas had impacted on later French education systems; while his conception of the system of Municipality even shared certain similarities with that of Soviet Russia. Turgot's ideas did not produce many direct results in France, but his historical legacy must be reckoned, for he made the "last serious attempt" to change France peacefully.⁽¹²⁾ Many of Turgot's ideas were accepted and adopted after the French Revolution.

Lei Haizong's dissertation studies French physiocrat Turgot's political ideas, which had by then been overlooked. It identifies the major aspects of Turgot's thoughts and explores their historical meaning and legacy. Lei argues that Turgot's statesmanship not only shaped his political ideas that were different from those of his contemporary Enlightenment intellectuals but also afforded him the opportunities to implement his ideas. Thus Lei repositions him, who had often been viewed as a physiocratic economist, in the history of political ideas of eighteen-century France. This opened up a new perspective to understand the physiocrat and can thus be seen as a breakthrough in the studies of Turgot. Lei Haizong's dissertation is built on solid source materials. With excellent language skills in French, he was able to use the five-volume *Oeuvres de Turgot*, published between 1913 and 1923, as the major primary source. He also referenced other French-language sources such as the works of Marquis de Condorcet (1743-1794) and the memoir of Pierre Samuel du Pont de Nemours (1739-1817) about Turgot, as well as a large number of works on Turgot in English and French. Lei Haizong majored in History and minored in Philosophy at the University of Chicago, which may explain why he chose a topic of the history of political ideas that intersects these two disciplines. As a Chinese student, Lei was able to use French-language primary sources to write a dissertation in English on the history of Western political ideas, which was rare among Chinese students then. This demonstrates precisely Lei's excellent skills of language and critical thinking as well as his high academic aspirations.

⁽¹²⁾ Ibid., 97.

雷海宗的导师詹姆斯汤普森、芝加哥大学与美国的“新史学”潮流

雷海宗博士论文的指导教师是芝加哥大学历史学教授詹姆斯汤普森 (James Thompson, 1869-1941)。汤普森生于一个荷兰新教神职人员家庭, 1895 年在建立不久的芝加哥大学获得历史学博士学位。他博士论文做的是有关法国中世纪政治史领域的课题, 题目是《路易六世统治下法兰西王权的发展, 1108-1137》(*The Development of the French Monarchy under Louis VI, le Gros, 1108-1137*)。¹² 随后, 汤普森留校任教近四十年, 并于 1913 年成为芝加哥大学中世纪史教授。1933 年之后, 他转赴美国西部的加州大学伯克利分校任教, 直到 1941 年去世。他在去世的那年还当选为美国历史协会 (American Historical Association) 主席。汤普森的研究领域非常广泛, 包括中世纪欧洲史、法国史、近代外交史和西方史学史。汤普森学术生涯中用力最多而且成就最大的当属中世纪史领域, 他写下了关于中世纪神圣罗马帝国封建制度的名作《封建德意志》(*Feudal Germany*), 以及著名的展示中世纪经济和社会发展全貌的《中世纪经济社会史, 300-1300》(*Economic and Social History of Middle Ages, 300-1300*)。¹³ 这两部重要著作奠定了汤普森在美国史学界, 特别是中世纪史领域的大家地位, 也是他在 1941 年荣任美国历史协会主席的重要原因。此外, 汤普森还在 1931 年出版了两部重要的中世纪通史, 一部是较为简略的《中世纪史, 300-1500》(*History of the Middle Ages, 300-1500*), 另一部是更为详尽的两卷本《中世纪史》(*The Middle Ages*), 他的中国学生雷海宗还在 1933 年的《清华学报》上对前者写了专门的书评。¹⁴ 汤普森在中世纪史研究中试图扭转 20 世纪之前学术界对中世纪的长期偏见, 强调中世纪史的连续性, 从经济社会史的角度来看待中世纪, 认为中世纪并不是漆黑一团和断裂的, 它一直都受到经济社会力量的持续推动。¹⁵ 除了在中世纪史研究领域成果丰硕之外, 汤

¹² James Westfall Thompson, *The Development of the French Monarchy under Louis VI, le Gros, 1108-1137* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1895).

¹³ 汤普森教授的这两部代表作可参见 James Westfall Thompson, *Feudal Germany*. 2 Vols. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1928; James Westfall Thompson, *Economic and Social History of Middle Ages, 300-1300*, New York and London: The Century Co., 1928.

¹⁴ 汤普森教授的这两部中世纪史著作可参见 James Westfall Thompson, *History of the Middle Ages, 300-1500*, New York; W. W. Norton & Co, 1931; James Westfall Thompson, *The Middle Ages*, 2 vols, A. A. Knopf, 1931。雷海宗的书评可以参见《清华学报》1933 年 9 卷 1 期“书籍评论”栏目, 第 260-264 页。

¹⁵ 对汤普森中世纪史学思想的研究可以参见兰子奇:《詹姆斯·汤普森史学思想研究: 以中世纪史观为中心》, 南京大学 2016 年硕士毕业论文。

Lei Haizong's Mentor James W. Thompson, the University of Chicago, and the Trend of the New History in the U.S.

Lei Haizong's advisor was James Westfall Thompson (1869-1941), professor of history at the University of Chicago. Born to a Dutch reform minister's family, Thompson received his PhD in history from the newly founded University of Chicago in 1895. His dissertation *The Development of the French Monarchy: Under Louis VI. le Gros 1108-1137*, dealt with the political history of medieval France.⁽¹³⁾ After that Thompson had taught at the University of Chicago for nearly forty years, in between he obtained his professorship of medieval history in 1913. He went to teach at the University of California, Berkeley in 1933 and remained there till he passed away in 1941. He was elected the chairman of American Historical Association in the last year of his life. Thompson's extensive research fields covered the history of medieval Europe, history of France, history of modern diplomacy and history of Western historiography. The field, in which Thompson had invested most energy and was most known for, was medieval history. He was the author of the celebrated works *Feudal Germany*, which dealt with the feudal system of the Holy Roman Empire, and *An Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages (300-1300)*, which presented a panoramic picture of economic and social developments during the medieval period.⁽¹⁴⁾ These two works cemented his status as a revered expert among American historians, especially in the field of medieval history, which also explained his election as the chairman of American Historical Association. In addition, Thompson published in 1931 two more important works of comprehensive history on medieval Europe: a relatively brief *History of the Middle Ages: 300-1500* and a more detailed *The Middle Ages 300-1500*. Lei Haizong's review of the former appeared in 1933 in *Tsinghua Academic Journal (Qinghua xuebao)*.⁽¹⁵⁾ In his works on medieval history, Thompson tried to avert the long-term, pre-20th-century prejudice of the academic world against the Middle Ages. From the perspective of

⁽¹³⁾ James Westfall Thompson, *The Development of the French Monarchy: Under Louis VI. le Gros 1108-1137* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1895).

⁽¹⁴⁾ James Westfall Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 2. Vols. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1928); and *An Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages (300-1300)* (New York and London: The Century Co., 1928).

⁽¹⁵⁾ James Westfall Thompson, *History of the Middle Ages: 300-1500* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1931); and *The Middle Ages 300-1500*, 2. Vols. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1931). Lei Haizong's review was published in *Tsinghua xuebao*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1933: 260-264.

普森对法国史领域也非常关注。他在 1909 年出版了关于法国宗教改革的著作《法国宗教战争，1559-1576；胡格诺派、凯瑟琳美第奇与菲利普二世》(*The wars of religion in France, 1559-1576; the Huguenots, Catherine de Medici and Philip II*)，还为弗朗索瓦米涅 (Francois Mignet) 著名的《法国革命史》(*The French revolution from 1789 to 1815*) 增写了百日战争的章节并将其重新编辑出版。¹⁶

雷海宗的博士论文选题与他导师的研究旨趣既有相似之处，又有不同的地方。汤普森的研究重点是欧洲中世纪的历史，以德国和法国为主，而且他还将自己的研究延伸到了近代早期法国的宗教改革，甚至到法国大革命时期。而雷海宗的研究对象杜尔哥则是法国大革命前启蒙时代的重要政治家与思想家，这与他导师的研究时段有重合之处。汤普森的博士论文就是做的法国史的题目，而且对法国的关注也始终贯穿于他的研究之中，这也是促使雷海宗选择法国的思想家为研究对象的重要原因。然而，雷海宗的研究兴趣又与导师有相异之处。汤普森主要关注的是中世纪的经济社会史，从经济社会的角度切入中世纪史也成为他的研究特色。此外，汤普森也会关注一些政治史和外交史的题目，但几乎没有留下思想史的研究著作。而雷海宗则选择杜尔哥的政治思想作为自己的博士论文选题，完成了一篇标准的政治思想史论文。这表明汤普森在自己有能力指导的基础上，能充分尊重学生的研究兴趣，并发挥学生的研究特长。

¹⁶ 关于这两部著作，可以参见 James Westfall Thompson, *The wars of religion in France, 1559-1576; the Huguenots, Catherine de Medici and Philip II*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909; Francois Auguste Marie Mignet, *The French revolution from 1789 to 1815*, edited with additional chapter on the hundred days, by James Westfall Thompson. New York: Collier, 1916。

economic and social history he emphasized the continuities of medieval history and argued that the Middle Ages was not an era of darkness and ruptures; instead it was constantly propelled forward by economic and social forces.⁽¹⁶⁾ In addition to prolific writings on medieval history, Thompson was also interested in the history of France. He published in 1909 the work on the religious reforms in France – *The Wars of Religion in France, 1559-1576: the Huguenots, Catherin de Medici and Philip II* – and added a chapter on the Hundred Days in François Mignet's famous *The French Revolution from 1789 to 1815* and reedited the work for publication.⁽¹⁷⁾

Lei Haizong's dissertation topic overlapped in some aspects his advisor's research interests while diverging from them in other aspects. Thompson's research focused on the history of medieval Europe, centering upon Germany and France. He then extended it to the religious reforms in early modern France and even to the French Revolution. Turgot was an important statesman and Enlightenment thinker in pre-revolutionary France. So the historical period in Lei's research overlapped his advisor's. Thompson's own dissertation and his later research dealt consistently with the history of France, which should be the important reason that Lei chose a French thinker as his research topic. Yet Lei's research interest also differed from his advisor's. Thompson was known for his approach to medieval history from the perspective of economic and social history. He also showed interest in issues of political history and the history of diplomacy, but he had never left behind any works on the history of ideas. Lei Haizong, on the other hand, chose the political ideas of Turgot as his dissertation topic and completed a thesis on the history of political ideas. This in turn shows Thompson's academic capacity to accommodate his student's research interest and help him to develop it into his own expertise.

⁽¹⁶⁾ For research on Thompson's historical approach to the Middle Ages, see Lan Ziqi, "Zhan-musi Tangpusen shixue sixiang yanjiu: yi zhongshiji shiguan wei zhongxin" (A study of James Thompson's historical thought: with a focus on the Middle Ages), master thesis, Nanjing University, 2016.

⁽¹⁷⁾ James Westfall Thompson, *The Wars of Religion in France, 1559-1576: the Huguenots, Catherin de Medici and Philip II* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909); François Auguste Marie Mignet, *The French Revolution from 1789 to 1815*, edited with additional chapter on the Hundred Days by James Westfall Thompson (New York: P. F. Collier & Son Co, 1916).

雷海宗攻读博士的芝加哥大学是美国新兴的研究型大学，由美国著名的石油大亨约翰洛克菲勒（John Rockefeller, 1839-1937）出资建立，它仿照德国 19 世纪研究型大学的模式，特别注重科学研究，所以该校的研究院实力很强。雷海宗的老师汤普森就是芝加哥大学最早的一批博士生，并在毕业后留校任教，见证了这所知名大学的崛起。到雷海宗留学的 1920 年代，芝加哥大学已经跻身于美国最优秀的研究型大学行列。根据 1925 年一项针对美国研究型大学研究生项目的调查，芝加哥大学的经济学、历史学、社会学、政治科学、古典学、英语语言文学和哲学学科都跻身美国前五名¹⁷。而且此时的芝加哥大学开始改革博士生教育，克服之前博士生知识面过窄的弊端，强调跨学科视野和科学方法的训练，在许多学科中都形成了独特的“芝加哥学派”，其中最著名的是“芝加哥经济学派”和“芝加哥社会学派”¹⁸。所以，雷海宗在芝加哥大学受到了顶尖的历史学学术训练，而且受惠于芝大 1920 年代的改革。雷海宗在芝加哥大学跟随汤普森教授主修历史学，同时辅修哲学，选了哲学系的很多课程，学术视野得到了极大的扩展。而且他选择了一个历史、哲学与政治学跨学科的政治思想史题目，可以说很好地体现了 1920 年代芝加哥大学对博士生教育的改革成效。雷海宗在回国之后所从事的历史学研究与胡适、傅斯年等注重史料与考证的史料学派有很大不同，他强调运用跨学科的方法来处理史学问题，并擅长用哲学的观点来消化史料，建立了一套独特的历史解释体系，这明显表现了芝加哥大学跨学科的博士生训练对他的深刻影响。

¹⁷ John W. Boyer, *The University of Chicago: A History* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012), 186.

¹⁸ On the graduate education at the University of Chicago in the 1920s, see John W. Boyer 2012, 185-193.

The University of Chicago, where Lei Haizong attended the PhD program, was then a new research university in the U.S. founded by the oil tycoon John Rockefeller (1839-1937). Modeling on nineteenth-century German universities that stressed scientific research, it boasted a strong research record of its graduate schools. As one of the earliest doctoral students of the university and then a teacher there, Thompson had witnessed the rise of this prestigious university. By the time Lei studied there in the 1920s, the University of Chicago had become one of the best research universities in the US. According to a 1925 study on graduate programs in American research universities, Economics, History, Sociology, Political Science, Classic Studies, English, and Philosophy at the University of Chicago all ranked the top five.⁽¹⁸⁾ Meanwhile the university started to reform its graduate education, aiming to overcome the drawback of graduate students' narrow focus by emphasizing an interdisciplinary horizon and trainings in scientific methods. This shaped the Chicago School in several disciplines, with the most famous ones the Chicago School of Economics and the Chicago School of Sociology.⁽¹⁹⁾ In other words, Lei Haizong not only received the best academic training in historical studies at the University of Chicago but also benefited from its reform in the 1920s. He studied with Professor Thompson in history while broadening his horizon with many courses in his minor philosophy. The fact that he chose a dissertation topic of political ideas, which intersected history, philosophy, and political science, can be viewed as an indication that the university's reform of its doctoral education in the 1920s was effective. Lei's research after he came back to China displayed this interdisciplinary approach, which was very different from those of the so-called "School of historical materials (*Shiliao xuepai* 史料学派)," whose representatives Hu Shi 胡适 (1891-1962) and Fu Sinian 傅斯年 (1896-1950) prioritized primary sources and evidential scholarship. Lei's strength lay in his ability to process primary sources with a philosophical approach. He had thus established an original system of historiography, which manifested the far-reaching influence of his interdisciplinary training at the University of Chicago.

⁽¹⁸⁾ John W. Boyer, *The University of Chicago: A History* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012), 186.

⁽¹⁹⁾ On the graduate education at the University of Chicago in the 1920s, see John W. Boyer 2012, 185-193.

1920年代,美国史学界深受詹姆斯·哈维·鲁滨孙(James Harvey Robinson, 1863-1936)“新史学”思潮的影响,雷海宗的导师汤普森教授就是这一史学思潮的重要提倡者,因此在雷海宗的学术研究中也能看到“新史学”思潮的痕迹。鲁滨孙在《新史学》一书中指出:“就广义说起来,所有人类自出世以来所想的,或所做的成绩同痕迹,都包括在历史里面”,“历史是一种研究人类过去事业的广泛的学问”¹⁹但传统的历史学研究“不讲别的重要事情,专偏重政治事实的记载”。²⁰也就是说,“新史学”反对传统史学只偏重对重大政治事件的研究,而忽略了其他更为广阔的领域,呼吁扩大历史学的研究范围。汤普森从经济和社会的角度来研究中世纪历史,并以此为切入点来扭转对中世纪的偏见,正是对“新史学”这一观念的践行。雷海宗在导师的影响下,虽然没有选择经济史和社会史作为自己的研究领域,但是选择研究杜尔哥的政治思想,也与传统史学有了很大的不同,响应了“新史学”的倡导。除了扩大研究领域,“新史学”还提倡在研究方法上进行创新,利用多学科研究方法来分析历史。“它一定能够利用人类学家、经济学家、心理学家、社会学家关于人类的种种发明”,“历史家同地质学家、生理学家,同生物学家一样,即使没有工夫去研究各种科学的原理,也不能不利用各种科学家有关系的学说”。²¹这与1920年代芝加哥大学博士教育提倡跨学科培养的改革方向是一致的,它对雷海宗在成为学者之后所形成的治学特色产生了重大的影响。尽管“新史学”要求运用多学科的研究方法,但依然主张保留历史学自身的学科特性,对史学的科学化倾向提出了质疑。鲁滨孙认为:“我们研究历史的人,断不能同物理学、化学、生理学或者人类学一样,成为一种真正的科学。因为人类过去的现象异常的复杂,我们又没有直接去观察它们的方法。”²²汤普森也认为:“历史家对以数量表示的事物没兴趣(偶然的東西例外),他关心的主要是质量,如思想、目的、感情等。他关心的是事实而不是事物。”²³雷海宗的博士论文将关注的目光投向杜尔哥的政治思想,而且在回国后受斯宾格勒文化形态史观的影响而提出著名的“中国

¹⁹ 鲁滨孙:《新史学》,何炳松译,中国人民大学出版社,2011年版,第1、9、13、56、34页。

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ 汤普森:《历史著作史》(下卷第四分册),孙秉莹、谢德风译,李活校,商务印书馆1996年版,第627-628页。

American historical studies in the 1920s were profoundly impacted by James Harvey Robinson's (1863-1936) approach of the New History. Thompson was one of its most avid promoters, therefore we can find traces of the New History approach in Lei's academic activities. Robinson pointed out in his *The New History* that "[i]n its amplest meaning History includes every trace and vestige of everything that man has done or thought since first he appeared on the earth" and that "[i]t is the vague and comprehensive science of past human affairs."⁽²⁰⁾ But traditional historical research is "[a] penchant more or less irresistible to recite political events to the exclusion of other matters often of far greater moment."⁽²¹⁾ In other words, the New History called for expanding the research scope of history by arguing against traditional historical research's sole focus on prominent political events while ignoring other extensive domains. Thompson's research on medieval history, which interrogated the prejudice against the Middle Ages from the perspective of economic and social history, was an example of practicing the idea of the New History. Although Lei did not select economic and social history as his own research field, his choice of studying the political ideas of Turgot diverged from traditional historical research. It resonated with the call of the New History and showed the influence of his advisor. In addition to expanding the research scope, the New History also called for innovating research methodology, which should adopt methods of other disciplines to analyze history. "[I]t will avail itself of all those discoveries that are being made about mankind by anthropologists, economists, psychologists, and sociologists" and "like the geologist, the physiologist, and the biologist, the historian is forced to make use of pertinent information furnished by workers in other fields, even if he has no time to master more than the elements of the sciences most nearly allied to his own."⁽²²⁾ All these consisted with the reform goal of interdisciplinary doctoral education at the University of Chicago in the 1920s, which had exerted significant influence on Lei Haizong's own scholarly pursuits. Although the New History called for a methodology informed by those of other disciplines, it advocated retaining the specific meth-

⁽²⁰⁾ James Harvey Robinson: *The New History: Essays Illustrating the Modern Historical Outlook* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1921). Chinese title: *Xin shixue*, trans. He Bingsong (Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 2011), 1.

⁽²¹⁾ Robinson, *Xin Shixue*, 9.

⁽²²⁾ *Ibid.*, 13, 56.

文化两周说”，体现了他对思想和文化的高度重视，自觉抵制了历史学的科学化倾向。

结语

在芝加哥大学的五年留学生涯对雷海宗一生的学术道路产生了重大的影响。他来到美国的历史学重镇芝加哥大学学习，并正逢芝大博士教育的转型，在美国首屈一指的中世纪史大家詹姆斯·汤普森的指导下完成了一篇标准的西方政治思想史博士论文，还深受当时美国最为盛行的“新史学”思潮的影响，接受了良好的历史学学术训练。作为一名中国留学生，雷海宗没有选择更为擅长的中国史作为研究课题，而是利用自己出色的英文和法文功底完成了一篇西洋史博士论文，真正深入到美国的西洋史学术脉络中，传承了美国的西洋史学术传统。在回国之后，雷海宗长期担任清华大学历史系主任，并同时讲授中国史和世界史方面的课程，培养了一大批出色的史学人才，开创了清华大学历史系的辉煌局面，并成为“清华学派”历史与社会科学并重、中国史与西洋史并重的践行者与倡导者。雷海宗培养的学生何炳棣可以说深受他治学风格的影响，赴哥伦比亚大学留学时做的也是西洋史题目《英国的土地与国家，1873-1910：对土地改革运动和土地政策的研究》（*Land and State in Great Britain, 1873-1910: A Study of Land Reform Movements and Land Policies*），在真正习得西洋史的研究方法后转向中国史的研究，

ods of history and was skeptical of the scientizing tendency in the discipline. Robinson believed that “history can never become a science in the sense that physics, chemistry, physiology, or even anthropology, is a science. The complexity of the phenomena is appalling, and we have no way of observing them directly.”⁽²³⁾ Thompson also thought that “[t]he historian ... is not interested in quantitative matters, except incidentally. His primary interest is in *qualities* – in ideas, purposes, emotions. He is interested in *facts*, not in things” (original italics).⁽²⁴⁾ Lei's dissertation treated the political ideas of Turgot. After he came back to China, Lei proposed his famous theory of the *Two Cycles of Chinese Culture* under the influence of Oswald Spengler's (1880-1936) culture-based historical view. All these factors evidence his priority of ideas and culture as well as his self-conscious resistance against the scientizing tendency in the discipline of history.

Concluding Remarks

Lei Haizong's five-year study at the University of Chicago had significantly impacted his academic path. His days there coincided with the transitional period of graduate education at the university. He completed a doctoral dissertation on Western political ideas under the supervision of James W. Thompson, one of the most celebrated historians in medieval history. Lei's rigorous academic training also bore the influence of the methodological trend of the New History then. As a Chinese student, Lei did not choose Chinese history as his research topic, which would be easier for him. Instead, he completed a dissertation on Western history with his excellent English and French language skills. In so doing, he truly delved into and inherited the American academic tradition of Western history. After he came back to China, Lei Haizong had served as the dean of the Department of History at Tsinghua University for a long time. He offered courses on Chinese history and world history, trained a large number of excellent talents in the field, and pioneered the glorious history of the department by promoting and practicing the Tsinghua School's accentuation on both historical studies and social sciences, Chinese history and Western history. Lei's student He Bingdi (Ho Ping-ti, 1917-2012), profoundly influenced by him, also chose

⁽²³⁾ Ibid., 34.

⁽²⁴⁾ James Westfall Thompson, *Lishi zhuzuo shi* (A History of Historical Writing) (book four of the second volume), trans. Sun Bingying and Xie Defeng, proofread by Li Huo (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1996), 627-628.

并在雷海宗曾经留学的学校——芝加哥大学担任了詹姆斯·汤普森讲座教授，而这个名称正是为了纪念雷海宗的导师汤普森。²⁴

可以说，他们师生三代的学缘恰好体现了一个来回往复的知识迁移与学术传承的精彩历程。

²⁴ 何炳棣：《读史阅世六十年》，广西师范大学出版社，2005年版，第121页。

a topic of Western history for his dissertation at Columbia University: *Land and State in Great Britain, 1873-1910: A Study of Land Reform Movement and Land Policies*. Having truly acquired the methodology of Western history, He then switched to Chinese history and became the James Westfall Thompson Professor of History at the University of Chicago.⁽²⁵⁾ We may say that the three generations of mentor-mentee relationship embody a wonderfully interactive process of knowledge transfer and academic inheritance.

⁽²⁵⁾ He Bingdi, *Dushi yueshi liushi nian* (Sixty years of reading history and experiencing the human world) (Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 2005), 121.

**5 Qi Sihe's Doctoral Dissertation on
Chinese History and the Tradition of
American Historiography at Harvard
University**

齐思和的中国史博士论文与哈佛大学的美国史学术传统

Yang Zhao

杨钊

Translation by Carissa Fletcher

齐思和(1907—1980)是民国时期著名的历史学家,他本科毕业于燕京大学,随后被派往哈佛大学历史系留学,1935年获得博士学位,成为近代中国第一位赴美国哈佛大学学习美国史并获得博士学位的中国留学生。国内学术界对齐思和先生整体的史学思想和史学成就有不少回忆性的文章和评述性的论文,关于齐思和对中国的中国史和世界史研究的学术贡献已经有了系统的梳理和评介。¹而且国内史学界也对齐思和先生具体的学术成果有了一些较为深入的研究。²从总体上看,国内史学界对齐思和的整体性研究居多,而且大多是由他的学生和后人完成的。对他的具体学术成果的研究则比较零散和琐碎,很多重要的问题亟待进行更加深入的探讨。此外,这些研究大都把关注的目光投向齐思和回国任教之后的学术成果和学术活动,相对忽略了齐先生在哈佛大学的四年留学经历,而且没有搜集和利用他的博士论文及其在哈佛的档案文献等英文史料,未能深入探究他在美国所受的美国史学术训练与他主要从事的中国史学术研究之间的关系。

¹ 这方面的代表性文章有戚国淦《史坛巨匠,后学良师——怀念齐思和先生》,《世界历史》1982年第1期;马克垚《学贯古今,史通中外——略论齐思和先生的史学》,《世界历史》1995年第2期;齐文心《先父齐思和生平及著作简述》,《农业考古》2000年第3期;齐文颖《勤奋、创新、爱国——纪念先父齐思和先生百年诞辰》,《燕京学报》新26期,北京大学出版社2009年版;杨俊光《比较与会通:齐思和的史学风格》,《史学理论与史学史学刊》2014年卷;陈峰、刘婷《齐思和与现代新史学之建立》,《求是学刊》2014年第4期。

² 这方面的代表性研究有张光华《齐思和与〈中国史探研〉研究》,南开大学2003年硕士学位论文;黄安年《融中外史学于一体的课程新体系——读〈齐思和史学概论讲义〉》,《云梦学刊》2007年第4期;杨俊光《试论齐思和的史学史思想》,《史学理论与史学史学刊》2012年卷;杨俊光《论20世纪三四十年代齐思和的史学批评》,《安徽史学》2013年第2期;张露《齐思和历史教育思想与实践初探》,四川大学2017年硕士学位论文。

Qi Sihe 齐思和 (1907 – 1980) is a well-known historian of the Republican era, who graduated from the undergraduate program at Yenching University before being sent to study abroad in the Department of History at Harvard University. In 1935, he earned his doctorate, becoming the first Chinese international student of modern China to study American history at Harvard University and to graduate as a PhD. Chinese academic circles have produced numerous retrospective essays and commentaries on the whole body of Qi Sihe's thought and achievements in historiography, and have systematically combed through and reviewed his academic contributions to the study of Chinese history and world history in China.⁽¹⁾ Domestic historical circles have also pursued more in-depth studies on Qi's concrete academic findings.⁽²⁾ Overall, comprehensive studies on this historian represent the majority in domestic historical circles, and most were completed by his students and descendants. Studies on his concrete academic findings are comparatively sporadic and trivial, and many important issues urgently await further in-depth exploration. In fact, all of these earlier studies turn their focus toward Qi Sihe's academic achievements and activities after he returned to China and took up teaching, while neglecting his four years of experience

⁽¹⁾ Representative essays in this area include: Qi Guogan, "Shitan jujiang, houxue liangshi – huainian Qi Sihe xiansheng" (A consummate craftsman in historical circles, and a fine teacher to young students: remembering Mr. Qi Sihe), *Shijie lishi*, 1982, no. 1; Ma Keyao, "Xueguan gujin, shitong Zhongwai – luelun Qi Sihe xiansheng de shixue" (Well-versed in ancient and modern learning, with mastery of Chinese and foreign history: a brief discussion of the historiography of Mr. Qi Sihe), *Shijie lishi*, 1995, no. 2; Qi Wenxin, "Xianfu Qi Sihe shengping ji zhuzuo jianshu" (Outline of the life and works of my father, Qi Sihe), *Nongye kaogu*, 2000, no. 3; Qi Wenyong, "Qinfen, chuangxin, aiguo – jinian xianfu Qi Sihe xiansheng bainian danchen" (Hardworking, innovative, and patriotic: commemorating the hundredth anniversary of the birth of my father, Mr. Qi Sihe), *Yanjing xuebao*, renewed no. 26 (Peking University Press, 2009); Yang Junguang, "Bijiao yu huitong: Qi Sihe de shixue fengge" (Comparison and integration: Qi Sihe's historiographical style), *Shixue lilun yu shixue shi xuekan*, 2014 volume; Chen Feng and Liu Ting, "Qi Sihe yu xiandai xin shixue zhi jianli" (Qi Sihe and the establishment of modern new historiography), *Qiushi xuekan*, 2014, no. 4.

⁽²⁾ Representative works in this area include: Zhang Guanghua, "Qi Sihe yu 'Zhongguo shi tan yan' yanjiu" (A study of Qi Sihe and *Exploratory Study on Chinese History*), Master's thesis, Nankai University, 2003; Huang Annian, "Rong Zhongwai shixue yu yiti de kecheng xin tixi—du 'Qi Sihe shixue gailun jiangyi'" (The new curriculum integrating Chinese and foreign historiography—reading 'Qi Sihe's introductory lectures on historiography'), *Yunmeng xuekan* (Journal of Yunmeng), 2007, no. 4; Yang Junguang, "Shilun Qi Sihe de shixue shi sixiang" (A discussion of Qi Sihe's thoughts on historiography), *Shixue lilun yu shixue shi xuekan*, 2012 volume; Yang Junguang, "Lun 20 shiji san sishi niandai Qi Sihe de shixue pip-ing" (On Qi Sihe's critiques of historiography in the 1930s and 40s), *Anhui shixue*, 2013, no. 2; Zhang Lu, "Qi Sihe lishi jiaoyu sixiang yu shijian chutan" (A preliminary exploration of Qi Sihe's thoughts and practices with respect to history education), Master's thesis, Sichuan University, 2017.

本文以齐思和先生在哈佛大学历史系 1935 年完成的博士论文《春秋时期中国的封建制度》为中心，探讨这篇博士论文的问题意识来源，使用的核心史料，主要内容，研究方法上的特色，以及它的学术地位。之所以选择研究齐思和先生的这篇博士论文为研究对象，是因为齐思和在哈佛历史系所受的学术训练基本都是美国史方面的，而且他的博士论文指导老师查尔斯·霍华德·麦基文也是从事美国宪政史研究的，可他却以一篇中国史的论文获得了博士学位。哈佛大学系统的美国史学术训练使齐思和的这篇中国史论文在研究方法上不同于在国内一直从事中国史研究的学者，而是深深地打上了美国史学的烙印。本文通过对这篇博士论文内容的分析，并兼及齐思和在哈佛的师承关系，以跨文化的视角来探讨哈佛大学的美国史学术传统如何影响了一位从事中国史研究的中国留美学者，从而实现了重要的知识迁移的过程。

齐思和博士论文的基本内容

齐思和博士论文的题目是《春秋时期的中国封建制度》(*Chinese Feudalism During the Ch'un-Ch'iu Period*)，完成于 1935 年。³ 他

³ 这篇博士论文一直未获出版。2009 年底，北京大学历史学系美国史教授王希先生和夫人庞瑾女士在购买了论文的缩微胶卷后，通过缩微胶卷阅读器将齐先生的博士论文整理出一份纸本文本，送给齐思和先生的女儿齐文颖教授和北京大学历史学系图书馆保存。本文依据的即是这个纸本文本。

at Harvard University to a certain degree. They also fail to include or draw upon his doctoral dissertation, sources in the Harvard University Archives, and other English-language historical materials, and thus cannot provide an in-depth examination of the relationship between the training in American historiography which he received in the United States and his later engagement in academic research on Chinese history.

This article focuses on “Chinese Feudalism During the Ch’un Ch’iu Period,” the doctoral dissertation that Qi Sihe completed for the Department of History at Harvard University in 1935. It explores the source of the problem awareness in the dissertation, the core historical materials it used, its principal content, the characteristics of its research methodology, and its academic relevance. Qi’s doctoral dissertation was selected as the object of research because the academic training he received in the Department of History at Harvard was essentially oriented toward American history, and his doctoral advisor Charles Howard McIlwain was engaged in research on American constitutional history, yet Qi earned a doctorate for a dissertation on Chinese history. His systematic training in American historiography at Harvard University set his dissertation on Chinese history apart from scholars who had pursued the study of Chinese history from within China in terms of its research methodology. The dissertation was deeply marked by the impression of American historiography. Through analysis of his thesis’ content, as well as the teacher-student relationships at Harvard, this article explores how the tradition of American historiography at Harvard University influenced a Chinese international student engaged in the study of Chinese history from a cross-cultural perspective and contributed to the process of a significant knowledge transfer.

Basic Content of Qi Sihe’s Doctoral Dissertation

Qi Sihe’s doctoral dissertation, titled “Chinese Feudalism During the Ch’un Ch’iu Period,” was completed in 1935.⁽³⁾ The topic he chose to study is impor-

⁽³⁾ This dissertation has never been published. In 2009, Wang Xi, a professor of American history in the Department of History at Peking University, and his wife, Pang Jin, purchased the dissertation in microfilm, and used a microfilm reader to produce a paper version of Qi’s doctoral dissertation, which was gifted to Qi Sihe’s daughter, Qi Wenying, as well as to the collection of the Library of the Department of History at Peking University. This article is based on said paper version.

选择研究的是一个中国和西方史学界都极为关注的重要问题——封建 (feudalism) 问题。齐思和 1931 年开始赴美留学, 此时正值中国学术界的“中国社会史论战”在如火如荼地进行之中。1927 年国民大革命失败之后, 围绕当时的中国到底是什么社会性质, 以及中国革命的任务是什么等重大问题, 国民党、共产党和其他各派政治势力展开了激烈的争论。现实的政治争论很快波及到了学术界, 特别是与现实密切联系的社会科学界, 于是“中国社会性质论战”又引发了“中国社会史论战”。⁴ 而这场论战中的一个重要议题就是中国历史上的“封建”和“封建制度”问题。以陶希圣为代表的“新生命派”主张“古典封建论”, 认为周代是封建社会, 而春秋战国时期封建制度就已经崩溃。以郭沫若为代表的“新思潮派”则主张“泛化封建论”, 认为以农业为基础的战国时期直到近代的中国都是封建社会, 从而使“封建”的概念泛化为“以农业为基础”。这两种观点最具代表性, 特别是郭沫若的“泛化封建论”更是塑造了今天中国人对封建社会问题的基本认识。⁵ 齐思和选择研究春秋时期的封建制度, 显然与这场民国时期重要的学术论战密切相关。他在论文的序言中指出, “另一方面, 年轻的中国学者能够获取中国的原始史料, 但是对封建这个概念的真正含义知之甚少, 因为它对中国历史学者来说是一个全新的概念。也许在马克思主义社会学家的影响下, 他们认为中国历史只不过是一个扩展的封建时代, 而且一些争论围绕当代中国是否仍然是封建社会而展开”。⁶ 除了回应中国国内的社会史论战, 参与对中国封建社会问题的讨论, 齐思和在美国写作博士论文, 显然也要与西方的学术界对中国封建问题的认识进行对话。齐思和在序言中提到了大部分西方研究中世纪史的学者对中国历史的原始史料很不熟悉, 严守对西方封建制度的定义, “质疑中国历史上封建制度的存在”。⁷

⁴ 关于这场论战的主要文献参见高军编《中国社会性质问题论战》, 人民出版社 1984 年版。

⁵ 关于论战中的“封建”问题, 参见冯天瑜《“封建”考论》, 武汉大学出版社 2006 年版, 第 245 - 270 页。

⁶ Chi Szu-ho, “Chinese Feudalism During the Ch'un-Ch'iu Period”, Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1935, p. iii.

⁷ Ibid.

tant and of great interest to both Chinese and Western historical circles: feudalism. Qi Sihe traveled to the United States to begin his studies in 1931, just as the “debate on Chinese social history” swept like wildfire through Chinese academic circles. After the Great National Revolution failed in 1927, the Nationalist Party, the Communist Party, and other political factions engaged in a fierce debate surrounding the nature of Chinese society, the mission of the revolution, and other weighty issues. The practical political controversy quickly spread to academic circles, particularly with respect to the social sciences, which are closely intertwined with pragmatic reality, thus the “debate on the nature of Chinese society” further gave rise to a “debate on Chinese social history.”⁽⁴⁾ One important topic in these debates was the issue of “feudalism” and “feudal institutions” in Chinese history. The “New Life Faction” (*Xin shengming pai*), represented by Tao Xisheng 陶希圣 (1899-1988), advocated the idea of “classical feudalism,” arguing that the Zhou Dynasty (1046-256) was a feudal society, but that feudal institutions had already collapsed by the Spring and Autumn and Warring States periods (475-221). The “New Thought Faction” (*Xin sichao pai*), represented by Guo Moruo 郭沫若 (1892-1978), upheld the idea of “extended feudalism,” arguing that China, founded as it was upon agriculture, had been a feudal society from the Warring States period up until the modern era, thereby generalizing the concept of “feudalism” as “having a foundation in agriculture.” These two viewpoints formed the leading examples, and Guo Moruo’s “extended feudalism,” in particular, shaped the essential modern Chinese understanding of feudal society.⁽⁵⁾ Qi Sihe’s decision to examine the feudal institutions of the Spring and Autumn period clearly had a close association with this important academic debate of the Republican era. In the preface to his dissertation, he pointed out, “Young Chinese enthusiasts, on the other hand, have some access to the original sources but know very little about the true meaning of the term feudalism, which is an entirely new conception to Chinese historians. Inspired probably by the Marxian socialists, they find Chinese history nothing but an extended feudal period, and some controversy has even been waged about

⁽⁴⁾ For the principal sources on this debate, see: Gao Jun, *Zhongguo shehui xingzhi wenti lunzhan* (The debate on the issue of the nature of Chinese society) (Beijing: People’s Publishing House, 1984).

⁽⁵⁾ On the topic of “feudalism” in the debates, see: Feng Tianyu, “*Fengjian*” *kaolun* (An examination of “feudalism”) (Wuhan: Wuhan University Press, 2006), pp. 245-270.

面对中外学术界对中国封建问题的认识误区，齐思和明确指出，“古代中国存在封建制度，它与中世纪欧洲的封建制度在本质上没有什么不同”，中国的封建制度“开始于传统上认为的公元前 11 世纪中叶周朝的建立，延续到公元前 5 世纪中叶的春秋末期”。⁸ 要研究春秋时期的封建制度，首先要对封建制度给出严格的定义。齐思和显然并不认同当时郭沫若的“泛化封建论”，而是严格遵守西方中世纪史学者对封建制度的定义。在他看来，封建制在政治上的表现是中央政府十分虚弱，地方同时并存着许多封建领主。这种政治架构的经济基础是封建农业经济，土地被层层分封下去，但每一级领主都仍然保有对土地的所有权，形成了土地的“多重所有制”(plural ownership)。在社会层面，封建制形成了贵族、平民和奴隶这样的三个等级，他们围绕封土形成了明确的权利义务关系。⁹

⁸ Ibid., p. iii.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 1 – 14.

whether present Chinese society is still feudalistic.”⁽⁶⁾ Apart from responding to the domestic debate over social history in China, and participating in the discussion of Chinese feudal society, through his doctoral dissertation, which was written in the United States, Qi Sihe clearly also sought to engage in dialogue with the understanding of Chinese feudalism in Western academic circles. In his preface, Qi Sihe mentioned that the majority of the Western scholars studying medieval history had very little familiarity with primary sources on Chinese history: Strictly cleaving to the Western definition of a feudal system, they were “skeptical about the existence of feudal institutions in Chinese history.”⁽⁷⁾

Faced with the long-standing misconceptions surrounding the topic of Chinese feudalism in both Chinese and international academic circles, Qi Sihe argued that, “In ancient China there was a feudal system which fundamentally was not different from that of medieval Europe,” and that “the Chinese feudal period began with the founding of the Chou [Zhou] dynasty, traditionally assigned to the middle of the eleventh century[,] and it lasted until the end of the Ch’un-ch’iu [Chunqiu, Spring-and-Autumn] period in the middle of the fifth century B.C.”⁽⁸⁾ In order to examine the feudal institutions of the Spring and Autumn period, it was first necessary to provide a rigorous definition of a feudal system. Qi Sihe clearly did not identify with Guo Moruo’s contemporary theory of “extended feudalism,” but rather strictly adhered to the definition of feudal institutions upheld by Western scholars of medieval history. In his view, feudalism politically manifests as an extremely weak central government, alongside the presence of many local feudal lords. The economic basis for this political framework is a feudal agricultural economy, and land was granted downward between classes, but the lords in each class still retained ownership of the land, forming “plural ownership” of the land. On a social level, the feudal system gave shape to three classes: nobles, plebeians and serfs, who formed a network of clear rights and obligations revolving around the enfeoffment of land.⁽⁹⁾

Qi Sihe believed that the differences between the feudal institutions of China

⁽⁶⁾ Qi Sihe, “Chinese Feudalism During the Ch’un Ch’iu Period,” Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1935, p. iii.

⁽⁷⁾ Ibid.

⁽⁸⁾ Ibid.

⁽⁹⁾ For Qi Sihe’s definition of feudalism, see: Qi Sihe, “Chinese Feudalism During the Ch’un Ch’iu Period,” pp. 1-14.

齐思和认为中国的封建制度与欧洲的封建制度差别很小，只是在起源上有所不同。他认为，中国的封建制度直接起源于诸侯国 (city state)，并没有经历大一统帝国的阶段。到了周朝之后，“广阔的地域，原始的沟通方式，被征服者的反叛本性，以及简单的政府机器，这些因素使建立一个中央集权的政府变得几乎不可能”。¹⁰ 所以周朝的统治者要么把征服的土地分给他们信任的将军，要么分给自己家族的成员，一方面是为了“监视被征服者”，另一方面也是为了“扩展在未被征服的相邻国家的影响力”。¹¹ 这种制度体系使整个周朝成为了一个大家庭。不过，各个封建诸侯国的最终建立还要经历一个非常漫长的过程。

接着，齐思和交代了自己这篇论文的三个主要史料来源——《春秋》《左传》《国语》，以及《诗经》《论语》《孟子》《战国策》《史记》《周礼》等其他史料。¹² 由于这篇博士论文是用英语写作的，一个重要的难点就是引用的中文典籍或史料需要翻译成英文，所以他在论文的序言中特别提到了英国牛津大学汉学教授理雅各 (James Legge, 1815 – 1897) 和法国传教士汉学家顾赛芬 (Séraphin Couvreur, 1835 – 1919) 对中国典籍的翻译，指出这为自己进行引文的翻译提供了很大的帮助。另外，他在文中也参考了一些西方和日本学者关于封建问题的英文、法文和德文的研究成果，包括马克·布洛赫 (Marc Bloch, 1886 – 1944)、朝河贯一 (K. Asakawa, 1873 – 1948)、福兰阁 (Otto Franke, 1863 – 1946)、葛兰言 (Marcel Granet, 1884 – 1940)、彭安多 (Albert Tschepe)、高本汉 (Bernhard Karlgren, 1889 – 1978) 等人。

齐思和的博士论文共分六章，其中第一章是导论，第六章是结语，二到五章是论文的主体部分。第二章重点介绍了春秋时期的分封制 (Seigniorial Regime)，包括分封制的地理和历史背景、周天子与王畿 (Royal Domain)、诸侯与诸侯国、诸侯国之间的

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 17.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid., pp. 34 – 75.

and Europe were minor, differing only in their origins to a certain extent. He argued that the Chinese feudal system directly rose out of city-states, without first passing through the phase of a unified empire. Into the Zhou Dynasty, "The vastness of the area, the primitive means of communication, the rebellious nature of the newly conquered people, the simplicity of their governmental machinery all made a centralized form of government impossible."⁽¹⁰⁾ The Zhou rulers therefore bestowed newly conquered lands either on a trusted general or a family member, to "watch the conquered people" on the one hand, and to "extend his influence over the neighboring unconquered states" on the other.⁽¹¹⁾ This system transformed the Zhou Dynasty as a whole into one large family, though the ultimate establishment of each of the feudal principalities involved an extremely protracted process.

Qi Sihe went on to describe the three major historical sources for his dissertation: *Spring and Autumn Annals* (*Chunqiu*), *Commentary of Zuo* (*Zuozhuan*), and *Discourses of the States* (*Guoyu*), along with *Book of Poetry* (*Shijing*), *Analects of Confucius* (*Lunyu*), *Mencius* (*Mengzi*), *Strategies of the Warring States* (*Zhanguo ce*), *Records of the Grand Historian* (*Shiji*), *Rites of Zhou* (*Zhouli*), and other historical texts.⁽¹²⁾ Because the dissertation was written in English, one major difficulty lay in the fact that any cited Chinese classics or historical texts had to be translated into English. In the preface to his dissertation, he therefore made special mention of translations of the Chinese classics by James Legge (1815–1897), a Professor of Chinese at Oxford University, England, as well as the French missionary and Sinologist Séraphin Couvreur (1835–1919), noting the great assistance these offered in his own translation of quoted passages. In addition, Qi also referenced research findings in English, French and German by Western and Japanese scholars on the issue of feudalism, including Marc Bloch (1886–1944), Asakawa Kan'ichi 朝河貫一 (1873–1948), Otto Franke (1863–1946), Marcel Granet (1884–1940), Albert Tschepe (1844–1912), Bernhard Karlgren (1889–1978), and others.

Qi Sihe's doctoral dissertation was divided into a total of six chapters, of which Chapter 1 served as the introduction, while Chapter 6 provided the conclusion; Chapters 2 through 5 represented the principal part of the dissertation. Chapter 2 focused on describing the "Seigneurial Regime" of the

⁽¹⁰⁾ Ibid., p. 17.

⁽¹¹⁾ Ibid.

⁽¹²⁾ Ibid., pp. 34–75.

关系、领主 (Seigneur) 与采邑 (Seigneurie) 等内容。第三章详细分析了春秋时期的行政机构，包括中央政府和地方政府的运作情况。第四章则聚焦春秋时期封建制度的经济和社会方面的情况，包括普遍的经济状况、农业与土地制度、井田制及其存在的问题、当时的社会结构等内容。作者在第五章中将视野扩大，对中国的封建制度与欧洲的封建制度进行了比较研究。

齐思和在论文中首先从整体上梳理了春秋时期的分封制度。齐思和指出，这一时期分封制的顶端仍然是周天子，他名义上不仅是整个帝国的政治、军事首领，而且他本人的权力具有神圣性，是整个帝国的宗教领袖，处于宗法制的核心。周天子虽然表面上拥有政教合一的权力，可是在春秋时期的实际政治运作中，他所拥有的实力与资源只是相当于一个普通的诸侯，“甚至是最弱的一个”。¹³ 春秋时期周天子的权力主要体现在批准诸侯的继任者、倾听诸侯的意见、寻求诸侯的军事和财政支持等方面，而其实际的管辖范围只是局限在王畿这块土地上。在周天子之下，是大大小小的诸侯，他们是各个独立的诸侯国的真正控制者，掌握着祭祀的宗教权力，任命官员、发布命令的政治权力，指挥军队、宣战媾和的军事权力，判决和立法的权力，以及得到贡品的财政权力。诸侯国之间也有正常的交往，包括礼节性的交往活动，诸侯之间的会盟等。诸侯国由于实力上的悬殊，形成的同盟并不是平等的，“在实力强大的诸侯国的压力下，大部分小诸侯国被迫加入这些同盟，它们必须要在受到侵略和部分让渡主权之间做出选择”。¹⁴ 受到同盟霸主保护的小国要为同盟做出财政和军事上的贡献，并且要向霸主定期纳贡。诸侯之下的层级是卿大夫，他们从诸侯手中分得土地。这块封地能够世袭，但不能转让，也不能带着它向其他诸侯效忠。一些卿大夫是诸侯国建立者的后裔，他们通常拥有大面积的封地，并占据很重要的职位。他们在自己的封地内拥有极大的权

¹³ Ibid., p. 101.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 125.

Spring and Autumn period, including the geography and historical background of this system, the Zhou emperors and the "Royal Domain," the feudal princes, their states, and the relationships between them, the seigneurs and seigneuries, and so on. Chapter 3 provided a detailed analysis of the administrative bodies of the Spring and Autumn period, including the operation of the central and local governments. Chapter 4 was devoted to the economic and social aspects of feudalism during the Spring and Autumn period, encompassing the general state of the economy, agriculture and the land system, the well-field system and the problems it presented, the contemporary social structure, and so on. In Chapter 5, Qi broadened his scope, presenting a comparative study of the feudal systems of China and Europe.

Qi Sihe began his dissertation with a comprehensive cataloguing of feudal institutions in the Spring and Autumn period. He noted that the Zhou emperor still stood at the pinnacle of the feudal system during this period: Nominally, he not only served as the political and military commander of the entire empire, but was also personally invested with divine power as the empire's religious leader and the heart of the clan system. Although the Zhou emperor superficially held the power for unification of church and state, in the actual political operations of the Spring and Autumn period, his real strength and resources were merely equivalent to "a plain feudal prince, and even among the feudal princes, he was a weak one."⁽¹³⁾ The power of the Zhou emperor during the Spring and Autumn period chiefly manifested in approving the successors to the feudal princes, listening to their opinions, seeking their military and financial support, and other areas, while the scope of his actual jurisdiction was confined to the small swathe of land found in the royal domain. Below the emperor were arrayed princes great and small, who were the true controllers of each independent state, wielding the religious power of offering sacrifices, the political power of appointing officials and issuing commands, the military power of commanding troops, declaring war and making peace, the power to pass judgment and enact legislation, as well as the financial power to receive tribute. There were also regular interactions between the states, including ritualistic activities, meetings between the princes to form alliances, and so on. The states varied greatly in their actual strength, and the alliances they formed were by no means equal: "Most of the small states were forced into these alliances by predom-

⁽¹³⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

力，包括政治、财政和军事等各个方面。随着土地的进一步分封，到了春秋后期，诸侯的影响力逐渐下降，而卿大夫的权力急剧上升。

接着，齐思和在论文中重点介绍了春秋时期的行政机构，他围绕几个主要诸侯国晋、楚、宋、鲁、郑的行政机构展开分析，并从中概括其一般特点。在他看来，中央政府具有政治和军事的双重功能，由“相”来负总责。当时的经济和社会结构使负责收税、征兵、公共建设、治安的人成为中央政府中最重要的官员，所以每个诸侯国都有司徒、司马、司空、司寇这样的职位设置。中央政府的所有官员都由诸侯来任命，通常被分成卿、大夫和士这三个等级。各个诸侯国的地方政府机构也非常相似。地方政府的基本单位是邑，其机构在本质上是统一的。邑的规模虽然不一致，“小的可能不超过 10 户，大的则可能超过 1000 户”，但“都是一个政治、经济和社会的团体”，承担着军事和生产功能。¹⁵ 邑的管理者被称为“宰”，他负责管理司法，监督农业生产，接收农民的献纳，并且领导农民保卫邑。整个诸侯国中最大的邑是首都，也被称为“国”，主要居住着贵族和商人，以“奢侈、舒适和有文化”为其特点，对诸侯国的政治拥有重要的影响力。

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 170.

inant powers, and they had to choose between invasion or partial surrender of their sovereignty.”⁽¹⁴⁾ The smaller states which were granted the protection of an allied hegemon had to make financial and military contributions to the alliance, and regularly pay tribute to the hegemon. In the rank below the princes stood the ministers and grand masters, who received a share of land from the princes' hands. Such fiefdoms could be passed down in hereditary fashion, but could not be transferred, nor could they be carried off to pledge loyalty to another prince. Certain of the ministers and grand masters were descendants of the founders of a feudal state, and they generally held vast fiefdoms, and occupied important positions. They wielded great power within their own fiefdoms, including in the political, financial and military spheres, et cetera. As the land continued to be gifted as fiefs, by the late Spring and Autumn period, the influence of the feudal princes gradually declined, while the power of the ministers and grand masters swiftly rose.

Qi Sihe then shifted the focus of his dissertation to a description of the administrative bodies of the Spring and Autumn period, providing an analysis of such institutions concentrating on the principal states of Jin 晋, Chu 楚, Song 宋, Lu 鲁, and Zheng 郑, and summarizing their general characteristics. In his view, the central government possessed both political and military functions, overall responsibility for which lay on the shoulders of the prime minister. Within the contemporary economic and social structure, the people responsible for collecting taxes, conscripting soldiers, building public infrastructure, and maintaining public order were key officials in the central government, and each feudal state therefore installed positions such as Minister of the Interior, Minister of War, Minister of Works, and Minister of Justice. All of the officials in the central government were appointed by the princes, and were generally divided into the three ranks of minister (卿 *qing*), grand master (大夫 *daifu*), and serviceman (士 *shi*).⁽¹⁵⁾ The local governmental bodies in each feudal state were quite similar to one another. The basic unit of local government was the “villa” (邑 *yi*), “and its organization was essentially uniform.”⁽¹⁶⁾ Although the villas varied in their scale, in that “a small villa might have consisted of no more than ten families, while a large one might have been inhabited by one thousand families or even

⁽¹⁴⁾ Ibid., p. 125.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Translator's note: the minister (*qing*) was the highest rank serving the king and the feudal lords, while the grand master and the serviceman were the subsequent ranks.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Ibid., p. 168.

随后，齐思和考察了春秋时期封建制度在经济和社会方面的状况。作者认为，与西欧的封建制度相比，中国春秋时期的封建制度更加重农抑商，商业活动非常稀少，原因是缺乏方便的交换媒介，交通运输条件很差，而且封建社会能够自给自足。在春秋时期，农业是整个经济的支柱，土地是财富的主要形式。土地制度实行分封制，封臣要效忠领主，并且在军事和劳役方面承担义务。封地能够世袭，但是领主有权收回封地。“邑”是基本的经济单元，每块土地被划分为供自己使用的“私田”和为领主服务的“公田”。所谓的“井田制”是否存在及其基本形式一直是个争议很大的问题，齐思和在比较了《孟子》和《周礼》对井田制的记载之后，认为井田制并不是一个历史上真实存在的制度，只是一种理想而已，而且后来也难以实现。齐思和还分析了春秋时期的社会结构，根据是否拥有土地把社会分成三个等级：贵族、平民和奴隶。贵族拥有许多特权，包括占有土地、担任官员、主持祭祀仪式、实行宗法制等，其主要工作是实行统治和进行战争。平民主要从事农业生产，被束缚在土地上，不仅受到贵族的剥削，还要承受战争之苦。他们可以获得自由并更换职业，但是无法改变自己的地位，只能成为“小人”或“庶人”。奴隶既无土地，又无财产，完全附属于主人。他们要么祖上就是奴隶，要么就是战争中的俘虏。儒家学者认为这种社会结构是自然而合理的，对其非常认可。

more," each one was "a political as well as an economic and social group."⁽¹⁷⁾ The administrators of the villas were referred to as "prefects" (宰 *zai*), who were responsible for administering justice, supervising agricultural production, receiving contributions from the farmers, and leading the farmers to defend the villa. The largest villa in the feudal state was the capital city, also referred to as the 'state' (国 *guo*). Chiefly inhabited by aristocrats and merchants, the capitals were characterized by "luxury, comfort, and culture," and wielded great influence in state politics.⁽¹⁸⁾

Qi Sihe went on to examine the state of affairs in terms of the economy and society under the feudal system of the Spring and Autumn period. He argued that, in comparison with Western European feudalism, the feudal system of China's Spring and Autumn period more heavily favored agriculture while disfavoring commerce. Commercial activities were quite rare, due to the lack of a convenient means of exchange and poor transportation conditions; furthermore, the feudal society was able to be self-sufficient. During the Spring and Autumn period, agriculture was the "mainstay" of the entire economy, and land was "the main form of wealth."⁽¹⁹⁾ A system of enfeoffment was implemented for management of the land; enfeoffed vassals pledged loyalty to their seigneurs, and undertook obligations with respect to military affairs and corvée labor. Fiefs could be passed down in hereditary fashion, but suzerains also had the right to repossess fiefs. "Villas" were the basic unit of the economy, and each plot of land was divided into "private fields" for personal use, and "public fields" in service of the lord.⁽²⁰⁾ The existence and basic form of the so-called "well-field system" have long been topics of great controversy: After comparing the records of the well-field system in the book *Mencius* and the *Rites of Zhou*, Qi Sihe argued that it was not a system that truly existed in history, but rather was merely an ideal, which later could never be realized.⁽²¹⁾ Qi Sihe also analyzed the social structure of the Spring and Autumn period, dividing society into three classes on the basis of land ownership: nobles, serfs and slaves. The nobles had many privileges, including owning land, holding positions as officials, presiding over sacrificial rites and ceremonies, implementing the clan system, et cetera, and

⁽¹⁷⁾ Ibid., p. 170.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Ibid., p. 172.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Ibid., p. 183.

⁽²⁰⁾ Ibid., p. 193.

⁽²¹⁾ See Qi Sihe, "Chinese Feudalism During the Ch'un Ch'iu Period," pp. 205-220.

齐思和的这篇博士论文在之后的一章中把视野扩大，将春秋时期中国的封建制度和中世纪欧洲的封建制度进行了比较。他认为二者有很多相似之处。在政治方面，二者的中央政权都比较弱势，君主的权力只局限在自己的小块王畿之内。在地方上存在着众多小的政治实体，后来通过兼并战争，最后形成了几个较大的诸侯国。这些诸侯或领主在自己的领地内拥有很大的权力，涵盖政治、经济、军事、法律等各个方面。土地被层层分封，形成了各种等级。每个等级都承担着相应的封建义务，通过私人关系来行使公共权力，最终松散地结合在一起。在经济方面，二者都是农业为主，工商业发展滞后，只是中国的商业更加落后，土地成为财富的唯一来源。与欧洲不同的是，中国在封建时期没有土地的私人所有者，这使中国的封建制更为简单。在社会方面，二者都形成了等级制的社会结构，最上层是贵族，中层是平民，下层是奴隶。在齐思和看来，中国和欧洲封建制度的最大不同是中国缺少一个强大的教会组织。欧洲的教会在某种程度上成为了封建世俗制度的对立面，而春秋时期的中国则不存在这种问题。君主、诸侯和卿大夫的政治和宗教权力合一，影响力更加巨大，“结果，春秋时期的中国社会在每个方面都具有封建性质，没有任何势力能够对这个制度构成制约”。¹⁶ 另一个不同之处是，中国的封建制中形成了宗法制，宗族的主体继承了祖先的遗产，并成为整个宗族的领袖，而宗族的旁系则继承了其他的封地和政府职位，从而使整个帝国变成了一个家族控制的庞大体系。而欧洲的封建领主则来自不同的宗族，“虽然也实行长子继承制，但是其他的儿子通常只能从事

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 245.

their principal tasks were to exercise their rule and wage war. The serfs were chiefly engaged in agricultural production, and were bound to the land; not only were they exploited by the nobles, they also bore the hardships of war. They were able to gain freedom and change their occupations, but they were unable to change their status, and could be nothing more than “small men” (小人 *xiaoren*) or “inferior men” (庶人 *shuren*).⁽²²⁾ Slaves held neither land nor property, and belonged entirely to their masters. Either their ancestors had been slaves, or they were captured as prisoners of war. Confucian scholars believed that this social structure was natural and rational, and regarded it with great approval.⁽²³⁾

In the subsequent chapter, Qi Sihe expanded the horizon of his doctoral dissertation, presenting a comparison of Chinese feudalism during the Spring and Autumn period and the feudal system of medieval Europe. He argued that both exhibited many points of similarity. Politically, both had relatively weak central regimes, in which the power of the sovereign was confined to his own small royal domain. Locally, there was a host of small political entities, which ultimately gave shape to several larger feudal states through annexation and war. Within their own territories, these feudal princes or lords wielded great power, including with respect to politics, the economy, military affairs, the law, and other spheres. Land was granted as fiefs, layer by layer, forming different classes. Each of the classes undertook corresponding feudal obligations, exercising public power through private relationships, ultimately forming a loose system of ties. Economically speaking, agriculture was dominant in both Europe and China, while industrial and commercial development lagged behind; it was only that commerce in China lagged a little further behind, while land became the sole source of wealth. Unlike Europe, China had no private landowners during its feudal period, with the result that its feudal system was simpler. In terms of society, Europe and China both developed a hierarchical social structure, with nobles on top, serfs or peasants in the middle, and slaves on the bottom. In Qi Sihe's view, the greatest difference between Chinese and European feudalism was that China lacked a strong church organization. To a certain degree, the European church became the ‘antithesis’ to the feudal, secular system, but this conflict was not present in China during the Spring and Autumn period.⁽²⁴⁾

⁽²²⁾ Qi Sihe, “Chinese Feudalism During the Ch'un Ch'iu Period,” pp. 226, 230.

⁽²³⁾ Ibid., pp. 232-233.

⁽²⁴⁾ Ibid., p. 244.

教会方面的事务”。¹⁷ 还有一个不同之处是，欧洲的分封关系更加复杂，“一个封臣能够从许多领主那里获得封地；领主和封臣能够以平等身份出现在另一个领主的法庭上；而且一个领主能够因为一块从他封臣手中获得的封地，而成为自己封臣的封臣”。¹⁸ 中国的封建制度则更加简单，一个封臣通常只能效忠于一个领主，而且只能严格地从上一级领主手中获得封地，每个等级都要谨守自己的位置，不能混淆。这三个不同点使“中国的封建制度更加系统化和组织化”。¹⁹

齐思和博士论文的学术地位

齐思和的博士论文选择的是一个民国学术界非常热门的话题——中国的封建制度。在经历了二十世纪三十年代初的社会史大论战之后，依然有很多中国的年轻学者关注这个重要课题，甚至把它作为学位论文的题目。最有代表性的当属燕京大学社会学系瞿同祖 (1910 — 2008) 的硕士学位论文《中国封建社会》和哈佛大学历史系吴保安 (后改名吴于廑) (1913 — 1993) 的博士学位论文《封建中国的王权和法律》。瞿同祖的论文完成于 1936 年，主要运用社会学的方法，“始终以封建社会的全部社会现象为讨论的对象，而注意其整体的社会结构及功能”。²⁰ 作者在序

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 246.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 247.

²⁰ 瞿同祖：《中国封建社会》，上海人民出版社 2003 年版，第 5 页。

Sovereigns, feudal princes, ministers and grand masters melded political and religious power into one, and were all the more influential for it: "As a result, Chinese society during the Ch'un-Ch'iu period was feudal in every aspect, and there was no influence to check the perfection of that system."⁽²⁵⁾ Another difference was that Chinese feudalism gave rise to a patriarchal clan system, under which the head of the clan inherited the legacy of his forefathers, becoming the leader of the clan, while collateral members of the clan inherited other fiefs and government positions, such that "the whole empire was converted into a great family system."⁽²⁶⁾ In contrast, the feudal lords of Europe originated from different clans, and "[a]lthough the system of primogeniture was practiced, the younger sons usually led an ecclesiastical career."⁽²⁷⁾ A further dissimilarity was that feudal relationships were more complex in Europe: "A vassal could hold fiefs from many a seigneur; seigneur and vassal could be fellow seigneurs at another seigneurs' court; and a seigneur could be the vassal of his own vassal for a fief which he held from his vassal."⁽²⁸⁾ The Chinese feudal system was simpler in that a vassal generally could only pledge loyalty to one seigneur, and was strictly limited to receiving fiefs from the hands of seigneurs of the next superior rank; each of the ranks were to carefully keep to their own positions, without any blurring of the lines. These three differences "made Chinese feudalism more systematic and better organized."⁽²⁹⁾

The Academic Status of Qi Sihe's Doctoral Dissertation

For his dissertation, Qi Sihe selected a topic of great interest to academic circles in the Republican period – Chinese feudalism. Even in the wake of the great debates on social history which have taken place since the early 1930s, many young Chinese scholars are still devoting attention to this important topic, and even adopting it as the subject of their degree dissertations. Representative examples include the Master's thesis "Chinese Feudal Society" (中国封建社会 *Zhongguo fengjian shehui*) by Qu Tongzu 瞿同祖 (1910-2008), submitted to the Department of Sociology at Yenching University, as well as the doctoral dissertation "Kingship and Law in Feudal China" by Wu Pao-an

⁽²⁵⁾ Ibid., p. 245.

⁽²⁶⁾ Ibid.

⁽²⁷⁾ Ibid., p. 246.

⁽²⁸⁾ Ibid.

⁽²⁹⁾ Ibid., p. 247.

言中指出，“我不想将封建社会看成一种静的制度，我试图分析他的形成以至崩溃的过程，解剖他的各种社会组织的功能及彼此间的关系”。²¹也就是说，瞿同祖做的并不是一个纯粹的历史学研究，没有仅仅满足于串联史料，按照时间顺序进行叙述，而是从结构上对中国的封建社会进行动态剖析。从时间上来说，瞿同祖也认为中国的周代是封建社会，“到了周代，才以政治的方式大行封建，封建成为社会的中心组织，是大雨倾盆的时期，是完成的时期”。²²瞿同祖在这篇论文中详细考察了封建社会的形成与完成、封建社会的土地制度与宗法制度、封建阶级与封建政治、封建社会的崩溃等问题，涉及到了封建社会的各个方面，认为“封建社会只是以土地组织为中心而确定权利义务关系的阶级社会而已”。²³

吴保安是庚款留美考试改制后的第五届留美生，录取的专业是经济史。²⁴他在哈佛大学师从著名的英美宪政史和西方政治思想史大家查尔斯·霍华德·麦基文攻读博士学位，于1946年完成了题为《封建中国的王权和法律——对比封建欧洲探讨

²¹ 瞿同祖：《中国封建社会》，第7页。

²² 瞿同祖：《中国封建社会》，第11页。

²³ 瞿同祖：《中国封建社会》，第9页。

²⁴ 在1933年之前，庚款留美生基本上都由清华学校留美预备部选派，后来随着国立清华大学的成立，改由教育部直接管理调控，在全国统一招考，于1933、1934、1935、1936、1940、1943年共选派了六届留美生，吴于廑是1940年的第五届庚款留美生，录取的专业是经济史，参见章开沅、余子侠《中国人留学史（上册）》，社会科学文献出版社2013年版，第371—372页；何炳棣《读史阅世六十年》，广西师范大学出版社2005年版，第130—131页。

吴保安 (who later changed his name to Wu Yujin 吴于廑) (1913-1993), submitted to the Department of History at Harvard University. Qu Tongzu's thesis was completed in 1936, and it chiefly applied the methods of sociology, "taking all social phenomena of feudal society from beginning to end as the objects of discussion, while focusing on the overall social structure and functions."⁽³⁰⁾ In the preface, Qu commented that, "I do not wish to treat feudal society as a static system. I seek to analyze the process from its formation to its collapse, and dissect the functions of its array of social organizations, as well as the relationships between them."⁽³¹⁾ In other words, Qu did not pursue a purely historical study, and was not content to string together historical materials to present a narrative in chronological order; rather, he performed a dynamic analysis of Chinese feudal society from a structural perspective. In terms of the time period, Qu similarly believed that the Zhou Dynasty was a feudal society: "It was not until the Zhou Dynasty that the political system became largely feudal, and feudalism became the central social organization; this was a period of great crisis, and it was a period that ended."⁽³²⁾ In his thesis, Qu engaged in a detailed examination of the formation and termination of feudal society, its land and clan systems, feudal classes and politics, the collapse of feudal society, and other issues, touching upon every aspect of feudal society. He argued that, "Feudal society was nothing more than a class society in which the determination of the relationships between rights and obligations centered on the organization of land."⁽³³⁾

Wu Yujin was part of the fifth group of students to study abroad in the United States following the restructuring of the examination system for the Boxer Indemnity Scholarship Program, and was admitted for the major of economic history.⁽³⁴⁾ He pursued his doctoral degree at Harvard Univer-

⁽³⁰⁾ Qu Tongzu, *Zhongguo fengjian shehui* (Chinese feudal society), (Shanghai: Shanghai People's Press, 2003), p. 5. English translation: Chu Tung-tsu, *The History of Chinese Feudal Society*, transl. Wang Qingyong and Deng Weitian (London: Routledge, 2021).

⁽³¹⁾ Qu Tongzu, *Zhongguo fengjian shehui*, p. 7.

⁽³²⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁽³³⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁽³⁴⁾ Prior to 1933, students in the Boxer Indemnity Scholarship Program were essentially all selected by the Preparatory Division for Study in the USA at Tsinghua College; later, following the establishment of National Tsinghua University, the Ministry of Education took over its administration. Under the unified national entrance examination, a total of six groups of students were selected for study in the USA in 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1940, and 1943. Wu Yujin was part of the fifth group of students in 1940, admitted for the major of economic history. See Zhang Kaiyuan and Yu Zixia, *Zhongguo ren liuxue shi (shangce)* (History of study abroad by Chinese persons [vol. 1]) (Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 2013), pp. 371-372; He Bingdi, *Dushi yueshi liushi nian* (Sixty years of reading history and seeing the world) (Guilin: Guangxi Normal University Press, 2005), pp. 130-131.

封建中国的王权和法律》(*Kingship and law in feudal China: an inquire into the nature of kinship and law in feudal China in the light of a comparison with kinship and law in feudal Europe*) 的博士论文。有意思的是,齐思和的博士论文指导老师也是麦基文教授,所以吴保安可以算做他的同门师弟,而且二人的博士论文选题都把关注的目光投向了中国的封建制度。吴保安采用中西比较的方法,“试图比照封建欧洲的王权和法律,探讨流行于封建中国的王权和法律的一些基本观念”。²⁵在他看来,封建欧洲的王权既要由教会圣封,也要通过选举和继承权而取得,在理论上受到法律的制约。而封建欧洲的法律是主权法 (*the sovereign law*),它既不由人来订立,也不是成文法,人民对其有最高的忠诚,有义务为捍卫法律而反抗君主。封建中国也具有类似的王权和法律观念。中国的王权不仅要得到天意的认可,还要得到人民的归附,只有同时具备天意和民归,王权才能具有正当性。中国的王权也要受到封建法律的制约,如果王破坏了法律,他可能被他的臣民以捍卫法律的名义所反抗、废黜和弑杀。封建中国的法律是善古之法,它既非立定,也不成文,不可改变也不容侵犯。当然,吴保安在强调封建中国与封建欧洲的相似性的同时,也明确了二者的不同之处。比如中国的封建制度是从自上而下的政府制度中发展出来的,所以法律由先王所建的传统一直延续下来。而欧洲的封建制度是自下而上地成长起来,所以更加强调社会的习惯是法律的起源。另外,中国的天理没有一个像中世纪教会那样的独立解释者,因此它对王权的限制非常有限,更多是一种虚构的理论,而欧洲的教会和神权法能够对王权形成实质性的制约。尽管有这些不同,吴保安博士论文的主旨还是“说明封建欧洲和封建中国存在着对王权和法律的共同看法”,强调的是异中之同。²⁶

²⁵ 吴于廑:《土与古代封建制度之解体;封建中国的王权和法律》,武汉大学出版社 2012 年版,第 167 页。

²⁶ 吴于廑:《土与古代封建制度之解体;封建中国的王权和法律》,第 293 页。

sity under the tutelage of Charles Howard McIlwain, a well-known scholar of British and American constitutional history and the history of Western political thought, and he completed his doctoral dissertation in 1946, titled "Kingship and Law in Feudal China: An Inquiry into the Nature of Kingship and Law in Feudal China in the Light of a Comparison with Kingship and Law in Feudal Europe."⁽³⁵⁾ Interestingly, Professor McIlwain also served as Qi Sihe's doctoral advisor, thus Wu Yujin may be regarded as his fellow disciple; furthermore, both Qi and Wu directed their attention toward Chinese feudalism in selecting a topic for their doctoral dissertations. Wu Yujin employed the method of a comparison between China and the West in "an attempt to enquire into some fundamental notions of kingship and law prevailing in feudal China in comparison with similar notions in feudal Europe." In his view, kingship in feudal Europe had to be not only divinely bestowed by the Church, but also obtained through election and the right of succession, while being theoretically constrained by the law. The law in feudal Europe was the "sovereign law," which was "not enacted, nor written"; the people owed to it their "ultimate loyalty," and had a duty to defend the law, and resist the sovereign.⁽³⁶⁾ Feudal China had similar notions of kingship and law. In China, kingship required not only approval through the will of Heaven, but also the "adherence" of the people, and the kingship could only attain legitimacy by simultaneously gaining the will of Heaven and popular adherence.⁽³⁷⁾ The Chinese kingship was also subject to the constraints of feudal law, and if the king defied the law, he might face resistance, dethronement and regicide by his subjects in the name of defending the law. The law in feudal China was the "good old law," which again "is not enacted law, nor is it written"; it could neither be changed nor violated.⁽³⁸⁾ Of course, while emphasizing the similarities between feudal China and feudal Europe, Wu Yujin also articulated the differences between the two. For instance, China's feudal system developed out of the system of government from the top downward, thus the law had permanence derived from the traditions established by the first kings. The feudal system of Europe instead grew from the bottom upward, and thus greater emphasis was placed on social customs as the ori-

⁽³⁵⁾ Pao-an Wu, "Kingship and Law in Feudal China: An Inquiry into the Nature of Kingship and Law in Feudal China in the Light of a Comparison with Kingship and Law in Feudal Europe," Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1946, "Summary," p. 1.

⁽³⁶⁾ Ibid., "Summary," p. 2.

⁽³⁷⁾ Ibid., "Summary," pp. 3-4.

⁽³⁸⁾ Ibid., "Summary," p. 6.

与上面两篇论文相比，齐思和的博士论文完成的时间更早，既没有像瞿同祖那样用社会学的方法对周代的封建制度进行全面的梳理，也没有像吴保安那样从比较研究的角度对封建中国的王权和法律这两大主题进行细致的分析，而是聚焦春秋时期中国的封建制度，对其进行深入的历史学研究。按照齐思和的说法，封建制度在中国从西周建立的公元前 11 世纪中叶延续到春秋时期结束的公元前 5 世纪中叶，此后封建制就开始衰落并逐渐走向消亡。由于西周时期的史料非常少，不利于研究的进行，所以他只能把重点放在春秋时期。齐思和论文的研究目的与吴保安基本一致，都是为了说明中国也存在着和欧洲相似的封建制度。与瞿同祖一样，齐思和也运用了一些美国社会科学的研究方法，对春秋时期封建社会的诸多方面都进行了深入的研究，并概括出了许多结构上的特点。几乎与齐思和完成博士论文同时，当时已经回国任教于清华大学历史系的著名历史学家张荫麟 (1905 - 1942) 也在 1935 年的《清华学报》第 10 卷第 4 号上发表了《周代的封建社会》一文，对整个周代封建社会进行全面的分析与梳理，这篇文章后来还收入他本人的代表著作《中国史纲》中，成为一个重要的章节。²⁷ 张荫麟的这篇文章在发表后颇受好评，吴保安就在博士论文中的注释中指出，“在描述封建时期一般特点的研究成果中，张荫麟的《周代封建社会》可能是诸多最优秀的研究成果之一”。²⁸ 对比张文和齐文，可以发现二者得出的很多重要结论都是相似的，而且齐文的论证更加深入细致，聚焦的时段也更为集中。已经小有名气的学者张荫麟的这篇文章能够得到学界很高的评价，那么作为学生的齐思和的博士论文能够达到那样的水平实属难能可贵，也充分说明了该文的价值。后于齐思和的瞿同祖和吴保安在获得学位之

²⁷ 参见张荫麟《周代的封建社会》，《清华学报》第 10 卷，1935 年第 4 号，第 803 - 836 页；张荫麟《中国史纲》，中华书局 2016 年版，第 25 - 55 页。

²⁸ 吴于廑：《土与古代封建制度之解体；封建中国的王权和法律》，第 175 页，注释 1。

gins of the law. In addition, China's "Heavenly reason (*tianli* 天理)" did not have independent interpretive powers like the medieval Church, therefore its power to impose constraints on the kingship were limited, and it was more of a virtual theory; in contrast, the European Church and the law of divine right could impose substantive constraints on the kingship. Despite these differences, the purport of Wu Yujin's doctoral dissertation was to demonstrate that there were "common views on kingship and law in both feudal Europe and feudal China."⁽³⁹⁾

In comparison with the above two papers, Qi Sihe's doctoral dissertation was completed at an earlier date, and it offered neither Qu Tongzu's comprehensive scouring of feudalism in the Zhou Dynasty using the methods of sociology, nor Wu Yujin's meticulous analysis of the two major themes of kingship and law in feudal China from the perspective of a comparative study, but rather focused on China's feudal system during the Spring and Autumn period, providing an in-depth historical study. In Qi's telling, feudalism in China extended from the founding of the Western Zhou Dynasty in the mid-11th century BCE to the mid-5th century BCE, with the conclusion of the Spring and Autumn period, and the feudal system thereafter began to decline and gradually fade away. As the scarcity of historical materials from the Western Zhou period is not favorable to carrying out such a study, he necessarily focused on the Spring and Autumn period. Qi Sihe's research objective in his dissertation was essentially consistent with Wu Yujin's, in that both sought to demonstrate that a feudal system like Europe's existed in China. Like Qu Tongzu, Qi applied American research methods from social sciences, and pursued an in-depth study of many aspects of feudal society in the Spring and Autumn period, while summarizing many structural characteristics. Almost contemporaneous with Qi Sihe's completion of his doctoral dissertation, the famous historian Zhang Yinlin 张荫麟 (1905-1942), who had by then returned to China to take a teaching position in the Department of History at Peking University, also published the paper "The Feudal Society of the Zhou Period" (*Zhoudai de fengjian shehui*) in the *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies* (*Qinghua xuebao*) (1935), presenting a comprehensive analysis and cataloguing of feudal society in the Zhou Dynasty as a whole. The paper was later included as an important chapter in his representative work *Out-*

⁽³⁹⁾ Ibid., p. 212.

后都成为了各自领域非常出色的学者，他们的学位论文都共同关注中国的封建制度，充分说明了这个选题的重要性和学术价值。而且三人都是既充分了解西方的学术方法，又非常熟悉中国的传统史料，有足够的优势来完成自己的课题。瞿同祖的导师杨开道 (1899 – 1981) 在评价瞿文时指出，“瞿君同祖对于美国现在社会研究已具根基，对于欧洲中古社会情形亦极娴熟，然后以之研究中国过去封建社会，显已立于不败之地”。²⁹ 如果把“对于美国现在社会研究”换成“对于美国现在的历史学研究方法”，那么这个评价放在齐思和身上也是恰如其分的。

齐思和在完成博士论文后，在向一手促成自己留学哈佛的恩师洪业教授汇报学习情况的信件中很自豪地说：“生之论文已於四月一日交入，十五日将最后口试考过，诸事皆已结束。史系及哈燕社对生之论文，似均极满意。McIlwain 教授於学生对封建

²⁹ 瞿同祖：《中国封建社会》，第3页。

lines of Chinese History (Zhongguo shigang).⁽⁴⁰⁾ Zhang's paper was favorably received upon publication, and Wu Yujin commented in a footnote to his doctoral dissertation that, "One of the best accounts of the general features of the period is probably Chang Yin-ling's [Zhang Yinlin] 'The Feudal Society of the Chou Period'."⁽⁴¹⁾ In comparing Zhang's work with Qi's dissertation, we find that many of the important conclusions that the pair reached were similar, though Qi's arguments were more thorough and detailed, and focused on a narrower time period. Given the high praise accorded by academic circles to the paper by Zhang, a scholar who had already attained no small measure of fame, that a doctoral dissertation by a student like Qi Sihe could reach the same level is indeed laudable, while also amply demonstrating the value of his dissertation. Qu Tongzu and Wu Yujin who had obtained their degrees after Qi Sihe all became outstanding scholars in their respective fields, and their common focus on Chinese feudalism in their degree papers fully demonstrates the importance and academic value of this topic. Each of these three figures not only possessed a thorough understanding of Western academic methodology but were also quite familiar with China's traditional historical materials, providing them with ample advantages in completing their projects. Qu Tongzu's advisor Yang Kaidao 杨开道 (1899-1981) noted in appraisal of Qu's dissertation that, "Mr. Qu Tongzu already has a foundation in the current social research in the United States, and is likewise quite fluent in the conditions of medieval European society, then he used this to study China's feudal society of the past; it is clear that he is already in an unassailable position."⁽⁴²⁾ If "the current social research in the United States" were replaced with 'the current methods for historical research in the United States,' then this appraisal could also be aptly applied to Qi.

After Qi Sihe completed his doctoral dissertation, in a letter providing an account of his studies to his mentor Professor William Hung (Hong Ye 洪业, 1893-1980), who had facilitated his study abroad at Harvard, he proudly wrote: "Your pupil's dissertation was submitted on April 1, and I passed the

⁽⁴⁰⁾ See Zhang Yinlin, "Zhoudai de fengjian shehui" (Feudal society of the Zhou Dynasty), *Qinghua xuebao* (Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies), vol. 10, no. 4, 1935, pp. 803-836; Zhang Yinlin, *Zhongguo shigang* (Outlines of Chinese history) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2016), pp. 25-55.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Pao-an Wu, "Kingship and Law in Feudal China," p. 1.

⁽⁴²⁾ Qu Tongzu, *Zhongguo fengjian shehui*, p. 3.

制度之意解及学生之文笔，赞不绝口，令人愧惭。”³⁰ 麦基文对齐思和博士论文从内容到文笔的全面认可，也充分说明了该文的学术价值。

齐思和与哈佛大学的美国史学术传统

齐思和博士论文的指导老师是查尔斯·霍华德·麦基文 (Charles Howard McIlwain, 1871 — 1968)，齐思和在博士论文的序言中专门对他表示了感谢。麦基文是哈佛大学历史学硕士，1916 年成为哈佛大学历史学和政府学教授，1926 年被聘为哈佛大学政府学伊顿讲座教授，主要讲授英美宪政史和政治思想史方面的课程。麦基文在这两个领域都有很深的造诣，并在 1935 年当选美国历史学会 (AHA) 主席。麦基文在美国史方面的代表作是 1923 年出版的《美国革命的宪政解释》(The American Revolution: A Constitutional Interpretation)，该书在出版的第二年就获得了普利策奖 (历史类)。这本书试图对美国史上聚讼纷纭又无比重要的美国革命的原因进行诠释。19 世纪的“辉格主义范式”带有强烈的爱国主义、民族主义、自由主义、种族意识和精英取向，认为美国革命主要是一场由英裔白人男性发动的政治革命，具有天然的正当性。20 世纪初的“进步主义史学”则更加看重革命发生的经济动因，将美国革命看成是不同群体由于经济利益而进行的斗争。³¹ 麦基文与他们不同，从宪政争议的角度来解读美国革命的原因。他认为，美国革命实质上是英国宪法框架内的一种宪法斗争，英国议会和北美殖民地对英帝国宪法有不同的理解与解释，前者强调英帝国议会的主权涵盖整个帝国领土，可以对北美殖民地的任何事项立法，而后者则认为议会的立法权不能及于殖民地的“内政事务”。二者的宪政分歧无法调和，最终引发了革命。³² 1932 年他出版了自己的另一本代表作《西方政治思想的发展：从古希腊到中世纪晚期》(The Growth

³⁰ 齐思和致洪业信件，1935 年 4 月 17 日，未刊。

³¹ 关于美国革命的几种解释范式，可以参见李剑鸣《意识形态与美国革命的历史叙事》，《史学集刊》2011 年第 6 期，第 3—29 页。

³² 参见 Charles Howard McIlwain, *The American Revolution: A Constitutional Interpretation*, Cornell University Press, 1958; 中译本可以参见查尔斯·霍华德·麦基文《美国革命的宪法观》，田飞龙译，北京大学出版社 2014 年版。

final oral examination on the 15th; all matters have now concluded. The Department of History and the Harvard-Yenching Institute both seemed to be quite satisfied with your pupil's dissertation. Professor McIlwain profusely praised your pupil's understanding of feudalism as well as your pupil's style of writing, which made me quite embarrassed."⁽⁴³⁾ McIlwain thorough approval of Qi Sihe's doctoral dissertation, from its content to the writing style, also fully demonstrates the academic value of his dissertation.

Qi Sihe and the Tradition of American Historiography at Harvard University

Qi Sihe's doctoral advisor was Charles Howard McIlwain (1871-1968), and in the preface to his doctoral dissertation, Qi specially expressed gratitude toward him. McIlwain held a master's degree in history from Harvard University; in 1916, he had become a professor of history and government at Harvard University, and in 1926, he was appointed the Eaton Professor of the Science of Government at Harvard, chiefly teaching courses on British and American constitutional history and the history of political thought. McIlwain had brilliant attainments in both of these fields, and in 1935, he was elected as the President of the American Historical Association. His representative work in the area of American history was *The American Revolution: A Constitutional Interpretation*, published in 1923, which received the Pulitzer Prize for History the year after its publication. In this book, he sought to provide an explication of the reasons for the American Revolution, a topic of incomparable importance in American history, and one on which there are a plethora of opinions. The "Whig paradigm" of the 19th century was loaded with strong undercurrents of patriotism, nationalism, liberalism, race consciousness, and elitism, and it was argued that the American Revolution was chiefly a political revolution launched by white men of British origin, and that it had a natural legitimacy. The "progressive" historiography of the early 20th century placed more emphasis on the economic factors motivating the Revolution, regarding the American Revolution as a struggle by different groups for the sake of economic interests.⁽⁴⁴⁾ In con-

⁽⁴³⁾ Letter from Qi Sihe to William Hung (Hong Ye), April 17, 1935, unpublished.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ On the various paradigms for interpretation of the American Revolution, see: Li Jianming, "Yishi xingtai yu Meiguo geming de lishi qushi" (Ideology and the historical narrative of the American Revolution), *Shixue jikan* (Collected Papers of History Studies), no. 6, 2011, pp. 3-29.

of Political Thought in the West: From the Greeks to the End of the Middle Ages), 对西方从古希腊到中世纪晚期政治思想的发展历程做了一番详细的梳理, 是一本非常出色的西方古代和中世纪政治思想史著作。³³ 1940 年, 麦基文出版了著名的《宪政古今》(Constitutionalism: Ancient & Modern), 将美国宪政的起源从英国进一步追溯到古罗马, 认为宪政的实质是政府权力和独立的司法审判权之间的平衡, 成为宪政史领域的经典著作。

34

从麦基文整体的学术兴趣上看, 他以美国宪政史为基点, 然后追溯其古代和中世纪的宪政起源, 这对齐思和也产生了很大的影响。齐思和的博士论文聚焦中国春秋时期的封建制度, 在政治、经济和社会等方面更为侧重政治, 对封建制的权力运作和等级关系尤为重视。从他书中阐发的很多观点, 可以明显看到麦基文有关政治制度和政治思想著作的影子。齐思和在论文中

³³ 参见 Charles Howard McIlwain, *The Growth of Political Thought in the West: From the Greeks to the End of the Middle Ages*, New York, 1932。

³⁴ 参见 Charles Howard McIlwain, *Constitutionalism: Ancient & Modern*, Cornell University Press, 1940; 中译本可以参见查尔斯·霍华德·麦基文《宪政古今》, 翟小波译, 贵州人民出版社 2004 年版。

trast, McIlwain interpreted the causes of the American Revolution from the perspective of a constitutional dispute. He argued that the American Revolution was, in essence, a constitutional struggle within the framework of the British constitution, arising from the different understandings and interpretations of the constitution of the British empire by the British Parliament and the North American colonies. The former maintained that the sovereignty of the British Parliament covered all the territories of the empire, allowing it to legislate on any matter concerning the North American colonies, while the latter held that Parliament's legislative powers could not touch upon the "internal polity" of the colonies. This constitutional disagreement was irreconcilable, and ultimately led to revolution.⁽⁴⁵⁾ In 1932, McIlwain published another representative work, *The Growth of Political Thought in the West: From the Greeks to the End of the Middle Ages*, providing a detailed examination of the course of development of Western political thought, from ancient Greece to the late medieval period, in a remarkable work on the history of Western political thought in the ancient and medieval eras.⁽⁴⁶⁾ In 1940, he published the famous *Constitutionalism, Ancient and Modern*, tracing the origins of American constitutionalism from England further back to ancient Rome, and arguing that the essence of constitutional government lies in the balance between the power of the government and the authority of an independent judiciary. This became a classic work in the field of constitutional history.⁽⁴⁷⁾

In terms of McIlwain's general academic interests, he used the history of American constitutionalism as the starting point to trace the origins of constitutional government to the Middle Ages and antiquity; this approach had great influence on Qi Sihe. In his doctoral dissertation, Qi focused on Chinese feudalism in the Spring and Autumn period, touching upon politics, economics and society while placing greater emphasis on politics, and devot-

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Charles Howard McIlwain, *The American Revolution: A Constitutional Interpretation* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923), p. 2. For a Chinese translation of this work, see: Charles Howard McIlwain, *Meiguo geming de xianfa guan* (The American Revolution: a constitutional interpretation), translated by Tian Feilong (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2014).

⁽⁴⁶⁾ See Charles Howard McIlwain, *The Growth of Political Thought in the West: From the Greeks to the End of the Middle Ages* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932).

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Charles Howard McIlwain, *Constitutionalism, Ancient and Modern* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1940). For a Chinese translation, see: Charles Howard McIlwain, *Xianzheng gujin* (Constitutionalism, ancient and modern), translated by Zhai Xiaobo (Guiyang: Guizhou renmin chubanshe, 2004).

专门比较了中国封建制和欧洲封建制的相似之处，很多关于欧洲封建制的概念和认识也都是来自于麦基文的政治思想史著作，他在文末的参考书目中专门列出了麦基文的《西方政治思想的发展：从古希腊到中世纪晚期》一书。无独有偶，麦基文的另一位中国学生吴保安也深受导师的影响，他在自己博士论文的致谢中特别感谢了麦基文教授，认为“如果没有研修他那极富启发性的西方政治思想史和中世纪英国宪法史的课程，本人绝无可能萌生此念，从一个崭新的视角来考察自己国家封建时期王权和法律的观念”。³⁵ 齐思和与吴保安的论文选题有很大相近之处，前者应当也上过麦基文的这几门课程并深受启发。

齐思和在哈佛历史系的另一位重要老师是美国史知名学者阿瑟·施莱辛格 (Arthur Meier Schlesinger, 1888 – 1965)。他1917年在哥伦比亚大学历史系获得美国史方向的博士学位，博士论文的题目是《殖民地商人与美国革命》(*The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution*)，也在关注美国革命这个重要问题。与麦基文不同，施莱辛格对美国革命的阐释基本上属于“进步主义”史学阵营，注重从经济和阶级的角度来探讨美国革命的原因。这篇博士论文在1918年公开出版，得到查尔斯·比尔德 (Charles Beard, 1874 – 1948) 等进步主义史家的高度赞扬。他在哥大学习期间，除了服膺于进步主义史家，也在很大程度上受到鲁宾逊“新史学”的影响。他认为历史学不应当只关注传统的政治史，而应当把视野拓展到社会史和文化史等领域。³⁶ 他任教于艾奥瓦大学 (the University of Iowa) 时，将“新史学”理念付诸实践，开设了“美国史新观点”(New Viewpoints in American History) 和“美国社会文化史”等课程，课程的部分

³⁵ 吴于廑：《士与古代封建制度之解体；封建中国的王权和法律》，第171页。

³⁶ 关于施莱辛格的人生经历和史学思想可以参见 Arthur M. Schlesinger, *In Retrospect: The History of a Historian*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963。

ing particular attention to the workings of power and class relationships under the feudal system. Traces of McIlwain's works on political systems and political thought can be clearly perceived in many of the views presented in his dissertation. Qi especially sought to examine the similarities between Chinese and European feudalism, and much of his conceptualization and understanding of European feudalism also stemmed from McIlwain's works on the history of political thought. In the bibliography appended to his dissertation, Qi specifically listed McIlwain's *The Growth of Political Thought in the West: From the Greeks to the End of the Middle Ages*. Coincidentally, McIlwain's other Chinese student, Wu Yujin, was also profoundly influenced by his advisor. In the acknowledgment in his doctoral dissertation, Wu expressed special thanks to Professor McIlwain, commenting that, "Without attending his inspiring lectures on the history of western political thought and also on constitutional history of medieval England, the present writer could hardly have conceived the idea of reviewing from a new perspective the notions of kingship and law in the feudal period of his own country."⁽⁴⁸⁾ Qi Sihe and Wu Yujin exhibited many similarities in their selection of topics for their dissertations, and it is likely that Qi was also quite inspired by attending McIlwain's courses.

Another important instructor for Qi Sihe in Harvard's Department of History was Arthur Meier Schlesinger, Sr. (1888-1965), a well-known scholar of American history. He had obtained his doctoral degree with a focus on American history from the Department of History at Columbia University in 1917; his doctoral dissertation, entitled "The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution," also focused on the important topic of the American Revolution. Unlike McIlwain, Schlesinger's interpretation of the Revolution essentially belonged to the camp of "progressive" historiography and focused on exploring the causes of the American Revolution from the perspective of economics and class. His dissertation was published in 1918 and drew high praise from Charles Beard (1874-1948) and other progressive historians. During his studies at Columbia, apart from developing an affinity with the progressive historians, Schlesinger was also highly influenced by James Harvey Robinson's "new history." Schlesinger believed that historiography should not solely focus on the conventional political history, but rather should expand its hori-

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Pao-an Wu, "Kingship and Law in Feudal China," p. 171.

内容还出版成书。³⁷ 1924, 施莱辛格接替美国史学“边疆学派”的代表人物弗里德里希·特纳 (Frederick Jackson Turner, 1861—1932) 的位置, 正式成为哈佛大学历史系教授, 直到 1954 年退休。他在哈佛大学开设了“美国社会 and 思想史”的研究生讨论班课程, 深受学生的欢迎, 并在哈佛培养了一大批优秀的美国史方向的博士生, 他们中的很多人后来都成为了美国史领域的一流学者。³⁸ 施莱辛格非常注重城市兴起在美国历史发展中的作用, 写出了《城市的兴起》(*The Rise of the City, 1878-1898*), 成为美国城市史领域的开山之作。他的另一部代表作是与哥伦比亚大学历史系教授迪克森·福克斯 (Dixon Ryan Fox, 1887-1945) 共同主编的 13 卷本《美国生活史, 1928—1943》(*History of American Life, 1928-1943*), 聚焦于美国的社会、人口、住房、时尚、教育等生活层面的内容, 使美国历史不再局限于传统的政治、外交和军事领域。施莱辛格因其在城市史、社会史、思想史等领域的学术成就, 当选 1942 年度的美国历史学会主席。

根据齐思和女儿齐文心的回忆, 齐思和“在以严格要求著称的施莱辛格的讨论班上, 他的论文获得 ‘Good English’ 好评, 对于一个来自中国的学生来讲, 真非易事”。³⁹ 齐文心的回忆虽然

³⁷ 参见 Arthur M. Schlesinger, *New Viewpoints in American History*, Westport: Greenwood Press, 1977。

³⁸ 这批学生包括著名的思想史家亨利·F·梅, 思想史和社会史学家默尔·柯蒂、卡尔·布里登博, 移民史学家奥斯卡·汉德林, 科学史家 A·亨特·杜普雷等, 多人曾获得各类重大的历史学术奖项, 或者担任美国历史学会 (AHA) 等学术组织的主席。参见谈丽《小阿瑟·施莱辛格史学思想研究》, 复旦大学出版社 2015 年版, 第 5 页。

³⁹ 齐文心:《先父齐思和生平及著作简述》,《农业考古》2000 年第 3 期。

zon to encompass social history, cultural history, and other fields.⁽⁴⁹⁾ While teaching at the University of Iowa, he put the concept of “new history” into practice, offering courses on “New Viewpoints in American History,” “American Social and Cultural History,” et cetera, and some of the content of his courses was also published in book form.⁽⁵⁰⁾ In 1924, he replaced Frederick Jackson Turner (1861-1932), a representative figure in the “frontier school” of American historiography, formally taking a position as a professor in the Department of History at Harvard University, until his retirement in 1954. At Harvard University, he offered a graduate seminar course on “American Social and Intellectual History,” which was well-received by students. He also trained several outstanding doctoral students with orientations toward American history, many of whom became brilliant scholars in the field of American history.⁽⁵¹⁾ Schlesinger focused particularly on the role of the rise of cities in the development of American history, and his book *The Rise of the City, 1878-1898* became a seminal work in the field of American urban history. Other representative works include the 13-volume *History of American Life, 1928-1943*, co-written with Dixon Ryan Fox (1887-1945), a professor in the Department of History at Columbia University. This series addressed life in the United States on the levels of society, population, housing, fashion, education, and so on, expanding American history beyond the confines of the conventional fields of political, diplomatic and military history. For his academic achievements in urban history, social history, intellectual history, and other fields, Schlesinger was elected President of the American Historical Association in 1942.

As Qi Sihe's daughter Qi Wenxin 齐文心 recalled, “Schlesinger was widely known for his strict requirements, and in his seminar course, [Qi's] dissertation was praised for its ‘Good English’; for a student from China, that was

⁽⁴⁹⁾ For Schlesinger's life experiences and thoughts on historiography, see: Arthur M. Schlesinger, *In Retrospect: The History of a Historian* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963).

⁽⁵⁰⁾ See Arthur M. Schlesinger, *New Viewpoints in American History* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1977).

⁽⁵¹⁾ These students included the famous intellectual historian Henry F. May; Merle Curti and Carl Bridenbaugh, scholars of intellectual history and social history; Oscar Handlin, a scholar of immigration history; the science historian A Hunter Dupree, and so on. Many of them won major academic awards for history, or served as presidents of the American Historical Association (AHA) and other academic organizations. See Tan Li, *Xiao Ase Shilaixinge shixue sixiang yanjiu* (A study of Arthur Schlesinger Jr.'s thought on historiography) (Shanghai: Fudan University Press, 2015), p. 5.

没有点明齐思和上的具体是哪门课，但表明齐思和专门上过施莱辛格给研究生开设的讨论班课程，而且极有可能就是那门颇受欢迎的“美国社会 and 思想史”。作为当时美国最为顶尖的美国史名家，施莱辛格尽管并未指导齐思和的博士论文，可他的很多研究旨趣和研究方法肯定都通过讨论班的课程传递给了齐思和。齐思和研究春秋时期的封建制度，在注重该制度政治运作的同时，专门用一章的篇幅探讨了这个制度的经济和社会层面，表明施莱辛格治史领域广阔并尤为注重社会和经济史的特点对他的研究产生了重要影响。

除了这几位从事美国史的学者，齐思和在论文的致谢中还提到了一位论文指导者，这就是在哈佛大学教授汉语的詹姆斯·韦尔 (James Ware)。他是哈佛大学历史上第一个拿到中国研究方向博士学位的人，博士论文是关于《魏书》对中国佛教的记载，之后的研究领域主要集中在魏晋南北朝佛教和道教史。他在二十世纪三四十年代主要负责哈佛的汉语教学，五六十年代主要从事中国古代典籍的翻译工作，整体的学术水平并不高。齐思和把韦尔和麦基文并列为自己的论文指导老师，主要是因为韦尔博士是当时哈佛少有的通晓汉语的学者，对他在语言翻译方面提供了帮助，在研究方法上应该贡献有限。

结语

齐思和本科就读于民国时期著名的教会学校燕京大学，他在那时就已经显露出了自己的史学才华，发表了好几篇极有分量的学术论文，并担任燕大历史系《史学年报》的主编。当时的燕

truly no easy matter.”⁽⁵²⁾ Although Qi Wenxin did not identify the specific course that Qi Sihe attended in her recollections, this demonstrates that Qi Sihe participated in a seminar course that Schlesinger offered to graduate students, and it is quite likely that it was the well-received “American Social and Intellectual History.” As one of the finest masters of American history in the United States in that period, although Schlesinger did not advise Qi Sihe on his dissertation, he certainly passed on many of his research interests and research methods to Qi through his seminar courses. While Qi’s study of feudalism in the Spring and Autumn period focused on the political workings of that system, he did devote one chapter to the economic and social aspects of feudalism, demonstrating that Schlesinger’s broadening of the fields of historical research and particular focus on social and economic history had an important influence on his own research.

Apart from these scholars of US history, Qi Sihe also mentioned another advisor in the acknowledgement for his dissertation: James Ware, who taught Chinese language at Harvard University. He was the first person in Harvard’s history to receive a doctoral degree with a focus on Chinese studies; his doctoral dissertation addressed the records of Chinese Buddhism found in the *Book of Wei* (魏书 *Weishu*), and his later research chiefly concentrated on the history of Buddhism and Daoism during the Wei-Jin period and the Northern and Southern dynasties. During the 1930s and 40s, he was in charge of instruction in the Chinese language at Harvard, and in the 1950s and 60s, he chiefly pursued the translation of China’s ancient classics; on the whole, he never attained very high academic status. Qi Sihe’s decision to list both Ware and McIlwain as advisors on his dissertation was chiefly because Dr. Ware was one of the few scholars at Harvard who was proficient in the Chinese language during that period, and provided assistance with respect to translations; with respect to research methods, Ware’s contributions were likely limited.

Concluding Remarks

For his undergraduate degree, Qi Sihe had studied at Yenching University, a famous missionary school of the Republican era. At that time, he had already revealed his talent in the study of history, and had published a num-

⁽⁵²⁾ Qi Wenxin, “Xianfu Qi Sihe shengping ji zhuzuo jianshu.”

大历史系主任洪业 (William Hung, 1893 – 1980) 教授非常欣赏他的才能，把他作为燕大派赴哈佛攻读博士学位的重要人选。然而，齐思和当时的学术兴趣完全在中国史上，他并不想赴美留学，认为美国的中国史研究无论资料还是师资都不如中国。洪业则一再动员他赴美，并且建议他学习美国人最擅长的美国史，洪业说，“虽然美国历史比较短，但是他们研究得比较深，你可以学习他们研究的方法，回来之后用这种新方法研究中国史，对于中国史你就能有新的突破”。⁴⁰ 在洪先生的鼓励和督促之下，齐思和这才负笈哈佛，主修美国史，但博士论文做的依然是中国史方面的题目。齐思和由此成为第一位通过哈佛燕京学社的奖学金赴哈佛大学攻读博士学位的燕大毕业生，在整个燕大的校史上具有非常重要的意义。

洪业早年也曾留学美国历史学重镇哥伦比亚大学，并获得了历史学硕士学位，导师是美国“新史学”的领军人物詹姆斯·哈维·鲁宾逊 (James Harvey Robinson, 1863 – 1936)，论文题目是《“春秋左传”与其对中国史学思想的影响》。⁴¹ 洪业自己就是通过学习美国人治西洋史的方法，来研究中国史学的传统题目。而且根据洪业的另一位学生刘子健的回忆，洪业培养历史人才是很有计划的，主要是鼓励每个学生做相应的断代史研究，从而完成整体的学术布局，“他鼓励学生郑德坤研究考古，齐思和研究春秋战国，瞿同祖研究汉代，周一良研究魏晋六朝，杜洽研究唐代，冯家昇研究辽代，聂崇岐研究宋代，翁独健研究元代，王伊同研究南北朝，房兆楹、杜联喆夫妇和王锺翰研究清代”。⁴² 洪业的留学经历和他的学术布局深深影响了齐思和的

⁴⁰ 参见齐文颖口述《齐思和：燕园第一位哈佛博士》，《新京报》2005年12月28日。

⁴¹ 陈毓贤：《洪业传》，商务印书馆2013年版，第96页。

⁴² 陈毓贤：《洪业传》，第194 – 195页。

ber of weighty academic papers; he also served as the editor-in-chief of the *History Annual* (*Shixue nianbao*) of the Department of History at Yenching University. Professor William Hung, who was then the head of the Department, greatly admired his talent, and regarded him as a prime candidate for nomination by Yenching to pursue a doctoral degree at Harvard. However, Qi Sihe's interests revolved entirely around Chinese history at the time, and he had no wish to study abroad in the United States, due to his belief that the United States could not compare to China in the study of Chinese history, whether in terms of sources or instructors. Yet Hung continued to urge him to travel to the United States, and recommended that he study American history, at which Americans excelled. Hung said, "Although the history of the United States is comparatively short, they have studied it to a relatively profound degree; you can study their research methods and, after returning, use these new methods to study Chinese history, thus you will be able to achieve new breakthroughs with respect to Chinese history."⁽⁵³⁾ With Professor Hung's encouragement and enjoinment, Qi Sihe left home for Harvard. Though specializing in American history his doctoral dissertation examined a topic in the area of Chinese history. Qi thus became the first graduate of Yenching University to pursue a doctoral degree at Harvard University on scholarship from the Harvard-Yenching Institute, which was of great significance in the general history of Yenching University as a school.

In his youth, Hung had studied abroad at Columbia University, another bastion of American historiography, earning a Master's degree in history. His advisor was James Harvey Robinson, the leading proponent of the United States' "new history," and the title of his thesis was "*The Spring and Autumn Annals and Its Influence on Historical Thoughts of China*."⁽⁵⁴⁾ Hung drew upon his own studies of American methods for addressing Western history to study traditional topics in Chinese history. According to the recollections of another of Hung's students, Liu Zijian, Hung approached the development of talented historians in a highly planned fashion, which chiefly involved urging each of his students to pursue research on the history of a corresponding period, so as to form a complete academic portfolio: "He encouraged his student Zheng Dekun 郑德坤 to study archaeology, Qi Sihe to study the

⁽⁵³⁾ See the oral account by Qi Wenying, "Qi Sihe: Yanyuan di yi wei Hafo boshi" (Qi Sihe: Yenching's first Harvard Ph.D.), *Xinjing bao*, Dec. 28, 2005.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Chen Yuxian, *Hong Ye zhuan* (Biography of Hong Ye) (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2013), p. 96.

博士论文选题，使他用学得的美国史研究方法来考察春秋时期中国的封建制度。而之后燕大派赴哈佛大学读博的翁独健、周一良等人走的也是这种学术路径。洪业由此成为了齐思和学术生涯中的重要导师，所以齐思和在博士论文的扉页将其题献给了洪业教授 (To Professor William Hung)。

齐思和留学时的哈佛大学历史系，在美国史研究方面已经达到了很高的学术水准，并且云集了一批像麦基文、施莱辛格、塞繆尔·莫里森 (Samuel Eliot Morison, 1887 – 1976) 这样的一流学者。齐思和遵照洪业的规划，“知难而进主修美国史，选修英国史、世界中世纪史、政治思想史、史学方法、国际关系史及西洋现代史等课程”。⁴³ 这些多种多样的西洋史课程，特别是美国史的课程，大大开拓了齐思和的学术视野，而且在史学研究方法上给了他很大的启发，对他的博士论文帮助很大。此外，齐思和的几年留学生涯也对他之后的学术生涯产生了极大的影响，在回国之后，他不仅继续从事春秋战国历史的研究，而且还开设了美国史、西洋现代史、史学概论等课程。他之所以能够有实力和底气在国内率先开设这些全新的课程，与他在哈佛历史系所受的严格的美国史学术训练有极大的关系。新中国建立后，齐思和更是把自己的教学和研究工作集中在世界中世纪史领域，为我国年轻的世界史学科的发展做出了奠基性的贡献。世界中世纪史的重要研究内容，正是他博士论文所关注和参照的欧洲

⁴³ 齐文心：《先父齐思和生平及著作简述》，《农业考古》2000年第3期。

Spring and Autumn and Warring States periods, Qu Tongzu to study the Han Dynasty, Zhou Yiliang 周一良 to study the Wei-Jin period and Six Dynasties, Du Qia 杜洽 to study the Tang Dynasty, Feng Jiasheng 冯家昇 to study the Liao Dynasty, Nie Chongqi 聂崇岐 to study the Song Dynasty, Weng Dujian 翁独健 to study the Yuan Dynasty, Wang Yitong 王伊同 to study the Northern and Southern dynasties, and the husband and wife Fang Chao-ying 房兆楹 and Tu Lien-che 杜联喆, as well as Wang Zhonghan 王鍾翰, to study the Qing Dynasty.”⁽⁵⁵⁾ Hung's experiences of studying abroad and his approach to scholarship profoundly influenced Qi Sihe's selection of a topic for his doctoral dissertation, leading him to apply the methods he had learned for the study of American history to an examination of Chinese feudalism during the Spring and Autumn period. Weng Dujian, Zhou Yiliang, and other figures whom Yenching University sent to pursue doctoral degrees at Harvard University also followed this academic path. Hung thus served as an important guide for Qi Sihe's academic career, which was why Qi included a dedication to his professor on the flyleaf of his doctoral dissertation: “To Professor William Hung.”⁽⁵⁶⁾

At the time when Qi Sihe was studying overseas in the Department of History at Harvard University, it had already attained a high standard with respect to the study of American history, and had gathered a group of brilliant scholars, including McIlwain, Schlesinger, and Samuel Eliot Morison (1887-1976). In accordance with William Hung's plan, Qi Sihe “forged ahead in the major of American history, while taking elective courses on British history, world history in the Middle Ages, the history of political thought, methods in historiography, the history of international relations, the contemporary history of the West, and so on.”⁽⁵⁷⁾ This diverse array of courses on Western history, particularly the courses on American history, significantly expanded Qi Sihe's academic horizons, and provided him with great inspiration in terms of methods for the study of history, which were of considerable assistance with respect to his doctoral dissertation. In addition, Qi's years of experience studying abroad also had a profound impact on his later academic career. After returning to China, he not only continued to pursue research on the history of the Spring and Autumn and Warring States periods, but also offered

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Ibid., 194-195.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ See Qi Sihe, “Chinese Feudalism During the Ch'un Ch'iu Period.”

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Qi Wenxin, “Xianfu Qi Sihe shengping ji zhuzuo jianshu” (A Brief Description of the Life and Writings of My Father Qi Sihe), *Nongye kaogu*, no. 3, 2000.

中世纪的封建制度。他晚年在这方面用力甚勤，除了工作需要外，也与撰写博士论文时的研究兴趣密切相关。哈佛大学的美国史和与之相关的西洋史研究方法，通过齐思和这位优秀的中国留学生传递回了中国。与之相似，后于齐思和赴哈佛历史系攻读博士学位的周一良和吴于廑（吴保安）先生，也是在做中国史方面的博士论文的同时，修读了相当多的西洋史课程。他们回国之后，也是在从事中国史研究的同时，把相当多的精力投入到了世界史的教学和研究工作中来。他们二人合编的《世界通史》，成为中国世界史领域的经典教材，影响了数代中国的世界史学人。更有意思的是，这套四卷本《世界通史》的上古部分正是由齐思和主持编写的。也就是说，三位先后留学哈佛的历史学博士，实现了美国的西洋史学术传统在中国的知识迁移，奠定了中国世界史学科的基础。

courses on American history, modern Western history, introduction to historiography, and so on. The strength and stamina which he brought to bear in being the first in the country to offer these novel courses were closely tied to the rigorous academic training in American history which he received at Harvard's Department of History. After the founding of New China (1949), Qi concentrated even more on the field of medieval world history in his teaching and research work, making foundational contributions to the development of China's young discipline of world history. The feudal system of medieval Europe, which was the focus of Qi's doctoral dissertation, is an important topic of research in medieval world history, and in Qi's later years, he dedicated even greater efforts to this area; quite apart from the considerations of his work, it was also closely aligned with his research interests at the time when he wrote his doctoral dissertation. Harvard's methods for the study of American history and the related Western history were transmitted to China by the brilliant Chinese international student Qi Sihe. Zhou Yiliang and Wu Yujin, who pursued doctoral degrees in the Department of History at Harvard after Qi Sihe, similarly attended many courses on Western history, while writing their doctoral dissertations on Chinese history. After they returned to China, they also engaged in research on Chinese history, while simultaneously devoting considerable energies to teaching and research work on world history. *A General History of the World (Shijie tongshi)*, which Zhou and Wu co-wrote, became a classic textbook for the field of world history in China, influencing several generations of scholars of world history in China.⁽⁵⁸⁾ More interestingly, the section on early antiquity in this four-volume work was written by Qi Sihe. In other words, these three Doctors of History who successively studied abroad at Harvard achieved the migration of knowledge within the tradition of scholarship on Western history in the United States into China, cementing the foundation for the Chinese discipline of world history.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ See Zhou Yiliang and Wu Yujin, eds., *Shijie tongshi* (A general history of the world) (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 1962).

6 Biographies of Persons Mentioned in the Texts

Aristotle (384 BC–322 BC) was a scientist and philosopher of ancient Greece. A student of Plato, tutor to Alexander the Great and founder of his own school, the Lyceum, Aristotle studied a vast variety of disciplines, among them logic, metaphysics, philosophy of mind, biology, zoology, political theory, physics, ethics, aesthetics and rhetoric. The best-known of his surviving works include *Nichomachean Ethics*, *Eudemean Ethics*, *Physics*, *Metaphysics*, *Politics*, *Organon*, *De Anima*, *Rhetoric*, and *Poetics*.

Aquinas, Thomas (1225–1274) was an Italian philosopher and theologian of the Roman Catholic church. He joined the Dominican order and went to Paris to study with Albertus Magnus. Coming into contact with new translations of the Aristotelian corpus, he held the strong belief that faith and logic was not mutually exclusive and worked to integrate Aristotelian thought with Christian thought. Although some of his ideas were controversial at the time, he was granted sainthood in 1323 and given the title “Angelic Doctor” in 1567.

Asakawa Kan'ichi 朝河貫一 (1873–1948) was a Japanese historian, professor at Yale University and curator of the East Asian Collection at Yale's Sterling Memorial Library. His well-known works include *The Early Institutional Life of Japan: A Study in the Reform of 645 A.D.* (1903), *The Documents of Iriki* (1929) and *The Land and Society in Medieval Japan* (1965). He also became known for his efforts to enhance mutual understanding between Japan and the USA, for instance by explaining the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05) to the American public.

Beard, Charles (1874–1948), an American historian, received his Ph.D. from and taught at Columbia University. He is best known for *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (1913) and *The Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy* (1915), in which he emphasizes the influence of socioeconomic factors in the development of U.S.-institutions. Beard further helped establish the New School for Social Research in New York and co-authored the textbook *The Rise of American Civilization* (1927) with his wife Mary Ritter Beard.

Bernstein, Eduard (1850–1932) was a German politician and social democratic thinker. He spent several years in exile, editing the socialist journal

Der Sozialdemokrat (The Social Democrat) and became a close associate of Friedrich Engels. After returning to Germany, he was elected as member of the Reichstag multiple times. Bernstein was one of the first socialists to revise Marxian thought. He rejected the idea of the imminent collapse of capitalism and instead argued for a social democracy that resolved class differences through social reform.

Bloch, Marc (1886–1944) was a French medieval and economic historian, teaching at Strasbourg and Paris. Having founded the journal *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale* together with Lucien Febvre, Bloch is considered one of the founding figures of the Annales school. During the Second World War, he was tortured and killed for being a member of the French resistance.

Bossuet, Jacques Bénigne (1627–1704) was a French bishop known for his eloquence in sermons and funeral orations. He delivered the funeral orations on a number of influential figures, among them Henrietta Maria of France, queen of England, and her daughter Henrietta Anne of England. Bossuet was a strong advocate of absolute monarchy and the idea of rule by divine right.

Brebner, John Bartlet (1895–1957) was a Canadian historian with a research focus on Canadian history and the history of US-Canadian relations. He taught at the University of Toronto and at Columbia University. Among his best-known books are *New England's Outpost* (1927), *The Neutral Yankees of Nova Scotia* (1937) and *The North Atlantic Triangle* (1945). Together with James T. Shotwell, Brebner further developed a research program on the US-Canadian relationship on sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Chen Hengzhe 陈衡哲 (1890–1976), also known under her English name Sophia H. Chen, was a historian, writer and the first female professor at a Chinese university. During her studies at Vassar College and the University of Chicago she became acquainted with Hu Shi and started writing short stories and poems in Chinese vernacular. After her return to China, she became a professor of Western history in Peking and Nanjing. Her textbook *History of the West* became one of the standard university texts on the subject.

Chen Huanzhang 陈焕章 (1880–1933) was a Chinese economist and Confucian thinker. He first studied under Kang Youwei in Guangzhou and in 1905 moved to the USA to study philosophy. He graduated from the Columbia University with a dissertation on *The Economic principles of Confucius and His Schools*. Chen returned to China, where he committed to work in the

Confucian Church and advocated for adopting Confucianism as state religion.

Chiang Kai-shek 蔣介石 (1887–1975) was one of the most influential politicians and military leaders of the Republic of China. After military training in Japan Chiang returned to China to participate in the uprising against the Qing Dynasty. Through Sun Yat-sen's support, Chiang was appointed leader of the Whampoa Military Academy and later leader of the Kuomintang party as well as head of state of the Republic of China after the president's death. In 1949, he fled to Taiwan after being defeated in the Civil War (1945–1949) where he led the Chinese Republican government until his death.

Condorcet, Marquis Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas Caritat de (1743–1794) was a French mathematician, philosopher, and secretary to the Academy of Sciences and represented Paris in the Legislative Assembly (1791–92). In his writings, he advocated educational reforms and equal rights for women. His best-known work, *Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind*, discusses the stages of human progress on their way to ultimate perfection. He was outlawed in 1792 and died in prison two years later.

Couvreur, Séraphin (1835–1919) was a French Jesuit missionary and sinologist. In order to help missionaries to overcome the language barrier, he published a Latin-Chinese dictionary in 1877. In the years after that he went on to publish a French-Chinese and a Chinese-French dictionary and to translate the Five Classics and the Four Books. Couvreur further used his own phonetic transcription system, which became known as the EFEO system and was widely used in the French-speaking world until it was superseded by Pinyin.

Du Lianzhe 杜聯誥 (Tu Lien-che) (1902–1994) was a Chinese historian and bibliographer. She studied at Yenching University where she met and married Fang Zhaoying (see below) with whom she also collaborated on many publications. Together with him and Arthur Hummel Sr., Du edited the biographical dictionary *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period* (1644–1912). She further contributed to Boorman's *Biographical Dictionary of Republican China*.

Du Qia 杜洽 (dates unknown) was a Chinese historian whose research focused on the Tang dynasty. Du was a student of William Hung and is mainly known for publishing *Tangchu zhenbing kao* 唐初鎮兵考 (Examination of Garrison Soldiers in the Early Tang).

du Pont de Nemours, Pierre Samuel (1739–1817) was a French economist and government official. His early writings on free trade caught the attention and brought him the friendship of Turgot (see below). Though du Pont de Nemours supported the French Revolution, he disagreed with the more radical republicans, which led to his imprisonment. After his release, he and his family moved to the USA. There, following Thomas Jefferson's advice, one of du Pont de Nemours' sons founded a gunpowder company (the predecessor to the chemical manufacturing firm DuPont).

Dunning, William A. (1857–1922) was an American historian who had graduated from Columbia University and stayed there to teach. Dunning is best known for his work on the American Reconstruction era and on European intellectual history. He was one of the founding members of the American Historical Society and became its president in 1913. His work includes the three-volume series *History of Political Theories, Ancient and Medieval and Reconstruction, Political and Economic, 1865–1877*.

Dutcher, George Matthew (1874–1959) was an American historian and professor at Wesleyan university. He graduated as doctor of philosophy from Cornell University, and as a doctor of law from Allegheny College. He later became vice-chairman of the Connecticut Historical association. In 1925, Dutcher published *The Political Awakening of the East: Studies of Political Progress in Egypt, India, China, Japan, and the Philippines*.

Fang Zhaoying 房兆楹 (Fang Chao-ying) (1908–1985) was a Chinese historian and bibliographer. He graduated from Yenching University, where he met his future wife Du Lianzhe (see there). Together they moved to the USA, where Fang studied at Harvard and worked as a librarian, first at Harvard, then at the Library of Congress under Arthur Hummel. Together with Du Lianzhe, Fang edited *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing period and Dictionary of Ming Biography*.

Feng Jiasheng 冯家昇 (1904–1970), also known as Feng Boping 冯伯平, was a Chinese historian. After graduating Yenching University, he worked at Columbia University, Beiping Academy, the Institute of Archaeology and the Institute of Ethnic Studies at the Chinese Academy of Sciences. His research focused on the history of the Liao dynasty, but he also studied the history of gunpowder as well as Uyghur and Turkic texts. His main works include *History of Chinese Society: Liao (907–1125)* (co-authored with Karl Wittfogel), as well as *The Origin of Liao History* (辽史源流考) and *The Invention of Gunpowder and its Spread to the West* (火药的发明和西传).

Fox, Dixon Ryan (1887 – 1945) was an American historian and educator. During his studies at Columbia university, he was inspired by James Harvey Robinson, Charles A. Beard and Herbert L. Osgood. After graduating, he became a professor at Columbia, President of Union College and President of the New York State Historical Association. As a historian, he is most noted for the 13-volume series *History of American Life, 1928–1943*, which he co-edited with Arthur Schlesinger Sr., as well as *The Decline of Aristocracy in the Politics of New York*, and *Yankees and Yorkers*.

Franke, Otto (1863–1946) was one of the most influential German sinologists in the early 20th century. After studying history and Indology, Franke learned Chinese and worked as an interpreter at the German embassy in Beijing as well as the consulates in Tianjin and Shanghai. In 1909, he became the first professor for language and history of East Asia in Hamburg. Franke's five-volume *History of the Chinese Empire* (*Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches*) became one of the standard works in German sinology.

Fu Sinian 傅斯年 (1896–1950) (Fu Ssu-nien, Fu Mengzhen 傅孟真) was a Chinese historian and writer. He was one of the leaders of the May Fourth Movement. After studying in London and Berlin, Fu became taught at Sun Yat-sen University and Peking University. He furthermore founded the Institute of History and Philology at the Academia Sinica and served as its director until his death. In 1949, Fu fled to Taiwan, where he became president of National Taiwan University. His main academic works include *An Outline of the History of Northeast China* (东北史纲) and *The Nation and Ancient China* (民族与古代中国史).

George, David Lloyd (1863 – 1945) was a British politician of the Liberal Party and British Prime minister from 1916–1922. Becoming chancellor of Exchequer in 1908 he devised the National Insurance Act of 1911. He was also one of the Big Four heading the Paris Peace Conference and signing the Treaty of Versailles.

Giddings, Franklin Henry (1855–1931) was an American sociologist who was instrumental in transforming American sociology into a scientific discipline. He worked as a journalist until he was offered a position at Bryn Mawr College by Woodrow Wilson. Later Giddings became a professor of sociology at Columbia University and was elected as the third president of the American Sociological Society. He developed the idea of a consciousness of kind, a feeling of similarity and belonging shared by conscious beings. His publications include *Principles of Sociology*, *Studies in the Theory of Human Society*, and *The Scientific Study of Human Society*.

Granet, Marcel (1884–1940) was a French sociologist and sinologist. He is credited with being the first to apply sociological methods to the study of ancient China. During his studies at the École Normale, Granet became fascinated by the ideas of Emile Durkheim and befriended Marc Bloch and Marcel Mauss. Granet started studying ancient Chinese texts and religion and later became director of the Institute des Hautes Études Chinoises. His most famous publications include *La pensée chinoise* (*Chinese Thought*), *La civilisation chinoise* (*Chinese Civilization*), and *La religion des Chinois* (*The Religion of the Chinese people*).

Guo Moruo 郭沫若 (1892–1978) was a Chinese writer, historian, and government official. While studying medicine in Japan he developed an interest in foreign literature and published his first poetry collection. Guo joined the Communist Party in 1927. After 1949, he held many political positions, one of them being presidency over the newly established Chinese Academy of Sciences. He published poetry, fiction and plays alongside with historical and philosophical treatises, as well as translations of works by authors such as Goethe, Schiller and Tolstoy. Guo was attacked early on during the Cultural Revolution, but was not stripped of his positions.

Hayes, Carlton (1882–1964) was an American historian, professor at Columbia university and diplomat. His academic work focused on the history of Europe, nationalism, and integrating Charles Beard's New History with his own Catholic beliefs. During the Second World War, Hayes served as Ambassador to Spain, succeeding in his diplomatic efforts to keep Spain neutral. In 1945, he became president of the American Historical Association.

He Bingdi 何炳棣 (Ho Ping-ti, 1917–2012) was a Chinese historian and the first president of the Association for Asian Studies of Asian descent. Although he studied British and Western European history, his own research was primarily concerned with China. He published books such as *Studies on the Population of China, 1368–1953* (1959) and *The Ladder of Success in Imperial China, Aspects of Social Mobility, 1368–1911* (1962). From 1965 onwards, he served as James Westfall Thompson Professor of History at the University of Chicago. He was elected a lifelong member of the Academia Sinica and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences as well as an honorary member of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences.

He Zhaowu 何兆武 (1921–2021) was a Chinese historian and translator. He worked as a researcher at Chinese Academy of Sciences and became a professor at Tsinghua University in 1986. His main research interest was in historical theory, philosophy of history and intellectual history, which is represented in *History of the Development of Chinese thought* (中国思想发展史). He translated numerous texts, such as of Bertrand Russell, Edmund Burke, Immanuel Kant, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau.

Hobson, John Atkins (1858–1940) was an English economist, journalist and teacher recognized for his writings on imperialism. In his well-known *Imperialism – A Study*, Hobson related imperialism to capitalism. He saw colonial expansion as a reaction to underconsumption in industrial states, where production grew faster than purchase power. During his lifetime, Hobson never attained an academic position and was heavily criticized. His writings, however, were well-received by Lenin.

Hu Shi 胡适 (1891–1962), a Chinese literary scholar and diplomat, was one of the key advocates for adopting Chinese vernacular as the official written language. He graduated from Columbia University with a Ph.D. dissertation (supervised by John Dewey). Hu returned to China and became a professor at Peking University, as well as an influential figure in the May Fourth Movement and the New Culture Movement. During the Sino-Japanese war, he served as ambassador to the United States and was nominated for a Nobel Prize in Literature in 1939. From 1958 until his death, Hu was president of the Academia Sinica in Taiwan.

Hung, William 洪业 (1893–1980) was a Chinese historian and sinologist who played a key role in establishing the Harvard-Yenching Institute at Harvard University. He edited the Harvard-Yenching Index Series and applied modern standards of scholarship to the research of the Chinese classics. For his preface to the index of the *Book of Rites (Liji)* he received the Prix Stanislas Julien in 1937. Moving between China and the United States and engaging in numerous academic exchanges during the 1930s and -40s, the outbreak of the Korean War made a return to China impossible, forcing him to remain in the United States.

Jaurès, Jean (1859–1914) was a French socialist leader. He was a member of the Chamber of Deputies, co-founder of the socialist newspaper *L'Humanité* and author of several books, including *Socialist History of the French Revolution*. As head of the French Socialist Party, Jaurès was instrumental in unifying several French socialist factions into one party, the Section Française de l'Internationale Ouvrière. At the outbreak of World War I, Jaurès argued for

a diplomatic solution to the conflict. Shortly afterwards, he was assassinated by a nationalist fanatic.

Karlgren, Bernhard (1889 – 1978) was a Swedish linguist, known for his research on Chinese historic phonology. Although Karlgren had initially studied Nordic, Greek and Slavonic languages, he developed an interest in Chinese and started researching Chinese dialects. After publishing his dissertation *Études sur la phonologie chinoise* (Studies on Chinese Phonology), Karlgren became a professor at the University of Gothenburg and later director of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities in Stockholm. Karlgren is most famous for his pioneering work in reconstructing the sound system of Middle and Old Chinese.

Kautsky, Karl (1854 – 1938) was a Czech-Austrian Marxist theorist. As a student, he joined the Austrian Social Democrats, but became a Marxist after meeting Bernstein and Engels, with whom he became close friends. In 1883, Kautsky founded and edited the socialist review *Neue Zeit*. Between the adoption of his Erfurt program and World War I, Kautsky was a leading authority on Marxism in the German Social Democratic party, opposing both Bernstein's revisionism and Luxemburg's radicalism. After 1917, he openly criticized the Russian Bolshevik Revolution and became the target of polemics by Lenin.

Kong Fanyu 孔繁燾 (1894–1959) was a Chinese historian and professor at Tsinghua University. He studied abroad at the University of Chicago and the University of Berlin. From 1927 onwards, he taught Western historiography, methods of historiography and medieval European history at Tsinghua University.

Laski, Harold J. (1893–1950) was a British socialist thinker, scholar of political science and chairman of the British Labour Party. After obtaining his degree from Oxford University, he taught at McGill University and Harvard University until he returned to Britain and became a professor at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Laski was an outspoken advocate of Marxism. Living through the Great Depression, he believed that capitalism would cause economic difficulties that might lead to the destruction of democracy and viewed socialism as the best available alternative.

Legge, James (1815–1897) was a Scottish missionary and sinologist. After graduating from King's College, Legge served as a representative of the London Missionary Society in Malacca and Hong Kong for over thirty years. In

1875, he was appointed the first professor of Chinese studies at Oxford University. His most famous works are his translations of the Confucian Classics in *The Chinese Classics: with a Translation, Critical and Exegetical Notes, Prolegomena, and Copious Indexes*, and the *Sacred Books of the East* series.

Li Hongzhang 李鴻章 (1823–1901) was a statesman of the late Qing dynasty. As a young official, Li was involved in putting down the Taiping Rebellion. Later, he was appointed governor-general of the capital province Zhili, grand secretary and superintendent of trade in North China. In these positions, he aimed to strengthen China through modernizations like modern naval bases and Western-style warships. Li represented China in a series of negotiations following the Sino-French war, the first Sino-Japanese War (1894–95) and the Boxer Rebellion (1900).

Liu Chonghong 刘崇鋮 (1897–1990) was a Chinese historian. After graduating from Tsinghua University, he travelled to the USA to study at the universities of Harvard, Columbia and Yale. Upon his return, he worked at Nankai University and Tsinghua University and National Taiwan University, teaching classes on general Western history, Japanese history and the history of Greece and Rome.

Liu Zijian 刘子健 (1919–1993), a Chinese historian also known as James T. C. Liu, was one of the leading experts on the Song dynasty. He studied at Yenching University under William Hung (see there). After the Sino-Japanese War during which he was imprisoned Liu served as staff of the Chinese delegation to the International Military Tribunal for the Far East in Tokyo. On Hung's suggestion, Liu travelled to the US, where he studied and later taught at Pittsburgh University before accepting positions at Stanford and Princeton. He became a renowned expert on the Sung dynasty after publishing *Reform in Sung China: Wang An-shih and his New Policies*.

Louis XVI (1754–1793) was the last king of France before monarchy was abolished in 1792. His reign was marked by failed attempts to stabilize France's financial situation and rising tensions in the populations that led to the French Revolution. Events like the financial crisis following the Treaty of Paris and his attempt to flee the capital in 1791 lead to a steady decrease in his popularity. Louis XVI and his wife were executed by guillotine on charges of counterrevolution.

Luo Zhitian 罗志田 (born 1952) is a historian specializing in modern and contemporary Chinese cultural history and the history of Sino-foreign relations. He studied at Sichuan University, the University of New Mexico, and

Princeton University. In 1994, Luo became a professor at Sichuan University, until he accepted a position as professor of history at Peking University in 2003. Among his many publications are *An Attempt to Recreate Civilization: A biography of Hu Shi* (再造文明的尝试: 胡适传) and *Ten Theories on Modern Chinese Historiography* (近代中国史学十论).

Ma Yinchu 马寅初 (1882–1982) was a Chinese economist, known for his interpretation of Malthusianism. He studied at Yale and Columbia, from where he graduated with a Ph.D. in economics and philosophy. After his return to China, he taught at numerous universities, founded the Chinese Economics Society, served in several governmental positions and became president of Zhejiang University and Peking University. Ma was heavily criticized and stripped from his posts for his New Population Theory. It argued that a rapid population growth would be harmful to China's development in the long run, which was, at the time, viewed as anti-socialist. In 1979, Ma received a formal apology from the Central Committee and was appointed honorary president of Peking University. His ideas on fertility control were integrated into the family planning policies of the post-Mao era.

Marx, Karl (1818–1883), a German political and economic theorist, socialist revolutionary, was the founding figure of Marxism and a leading figure in the First International. After studying in Bonn and Berlin, Marx worked as a writer in Cologne and Paris, where he met his lifelong collaborator Friedrich Engels. In 1848, Marx wrote the *Communist Manifesto* based on a sketch by Engels. In 1849, Marx was exiled to London, where he spent the rest of his life. He continued publishing several socialist writings, especially his famous critique of capitalism, *Das Kapital*.

MacDonald, Ramsay (1866–1937) became the first prime minister of the British Labor party. He had been involved with the party's predecessor since 1894 and risen steadily to its top, with only a short interruption due to his opposition to Britain's involvement in World War II. In 1924, he became the first Labour party prime minister through the support of the Liberal party. He returned as prime minister from 1929–1930 and from 1931–35, but was expelled from the Labour Party in 1931 for leading a National Government that had little support from members of the Labour Party.

McIlwain, Charles Howard (1871–1968) was an American expert of American constitutional history and Eaton Professor of the Science of Government at Harvard University. Among his best-known works are *The American Revolution—A Constitutional Interpretation*, for which he won a Pulitzer Prize in

1924, and *Constitutionalism: Ancient and Modern*. McIlwain was president of the American Historical Association from 1935–1936.

Mignet, François (1796–1884) was a French historian, journalist, and archivist. He became a professor at Avignon but left his position to write for the liberal newspaper *Courrier Français* in Paris. He co-founded *Le National* but later quit journalism to do historical research and was appointed keeper of the archives at the foreign ministry. Mignet was elected to the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences and to the French Academy. His best-known publications include *Histoire de la révolution française* and *Histoire de Marie Stuart*.

Mill, John Stuart (1806–1873), a British philosopher, economist, publicist, and member of parliament, was one of the leading proponents of utilitarianism. Together with Jeremy Bentham Mill cofounded the Utilitarian Society and London University, which would later become University College. From 1828 onwards, he worked at the East India House. Mill became a Liberal Member of Parliament in 1965, arguing for the reform of land tenure in Ireland and women's right to vote. Among his most famous works are *Utilitarianism*, *Principles of Political Economy*, and *The Subjection of Women*.

Moore, John Bassett (1860–1947), a renowned American legal scholar and expert for international law, was the first American elected to serve in the Permanent Court of International Justice in 1921. Moore was admitted to the Delaware bar and served in the U.S. Department of State, before he became a professor at Columbia University in 1891. From 1912 to 1938, Moore was a member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague. Moore published the 8-volume *Digest of International Law*, and edited *International Adjudications, Ancient and Modern*.

Nie Chongqi 聂崇岐 (1903 – 1962) was a Chinese historian and expert of the Song dynasty. He studied at Yenching University under the tutelage of William Hung. After graduating, Nie taught there for many years and was acting director of Yenching University library. After 1949, he worked as a researcher at the Institute of Modern History of the Chinese Academy of the Sciences.

Pi Mingju 皮名举 (1907–1959), also known as Benjamin Ming-Chu Bee, was a Chinese historian. He studied at Tsinghua, Yale and Harvard university, from where he graduated in 1935 with a dissertation titled “The Leasing of Kiaochow: A Study in Diplomacy and Imperialism.” Pi returned to China and became a professor at Peking University. During the Sino-Japanese war,

he started working at Hunan University, where he was dean of the Department of History and Geography, acting dean of the National Teachers College and taught world history. He was labelled a rightist in 1957 and died shortly afterwards from a lung disease.

Plato (428/27-348/7BC), disciple of Socrates and teacher of Aristotle, was an ancient Greek philosopher that profoundly influenced philosophy and how it is understood as a discipline today. He founded the Academy, an institution for teaching and researching philosophy and science. Based on Socrates' thought, Plato developed his own philosophical system, today known as Platonism, that discussed ethics, logic, epistemology, and metaphysics and in his written works is presented mostly in the form of dialogues.

Qi Shirong 齐世荣 (1926–2015) was a Chinese world historian and professor of history. He graduated from Tsinghua University and taught at numerous Chinese universities. Qi became head of the history department at Beijing Normal University and president of Capital Normal University, where he also founded the history discipline. He was furthermore president of the Chinese Society for the Study of World Modern History, vice president of the Chinese History Society, and an Academic Member of the Institute of World History at Chinese Academy of Social Sciences.

Qi Wenxin 齐文心 (born 1936) is a Chinese historian, whose research focuses on oracle bone inscriptions and the history of the Shang dynasty. She is the daughter of Qi Sihe and sister of Qi Wenying (see there). She was a researcher at the Pre-Qin Research Office of the Institute of History at Chinese Academy of Social Sciences until 1991. Qi participated in the compilation of *A Collection of Oracle Bone Inscriptions* (甲骨文合集) and co-authored *Collections of Oracle Bones Stored in Britain* (英国所藏甲骨集) with Li Xueqin and Sarah Allan; both works have won several awards.

Qi Wenying 齐文颖 (1930–2021) was a Chinese historian who researched early American history, women's history, and the history of Sino-American relations. She was the daughter of the historian Qi Sihe. After graduation, she became a professor at Peking University, deputy director of the Peking University Yenching Center for American Studies and research librarian at Peking University Library. Between 1979 and 1989, Qi was a visiting scholar at Columbia University. She edited *Research on American History* (美国史探研) and *Overview of Chinese Women's Literature* (中华妇女文献纵览).

Quesnay, François (1694–1774) was a French economist who is considered the leading figure of the physiocratic school of economics. He was consulting physician to Louis XV and developed an interest in economics only later

in life. Quesnay's best-known work is *Tableau économique*, which became the foundation for the physiocrats. In it, he analyzes the flow of payments between different classes within an economy and argues that only a surplus in the agricultural sector would lead to economic growth.

Qu Tongzu 瞿同祖 (1910–2008) was a Chinese historian, whose work was focused on China's social and legal history. He graduated from Yenching University with a thesis on the Chinese feudal society, which was published in 1937 and translated into Japanese. Qu taught at Yunnan University and Southwestern Associated University before he was invited to the USA by Karl Wittfogel. Between 1945 and 1965, Qu worked at Columbia University, Harvard University, and the University of British Columbia before returning to China. Qu was elected a member of the Honorary Division of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in 2006.

Robinson, James Harvey (1863–1936), an American historian, is considered one of the founders of the New History approach. He taught at the University of Pennsylvania and Columbia University but resigned in 1919 to found the New School for Social Research and became its first director. Robinson was president of the American Historical Society in 1929. In his work entitled *The New History* (1912) he argues against limiting the scope of historical research to military and political events and proposes an interdisciplinary approach that adopts methods from other social sciences such as anthropology and psychology.

Rockefeller, John (1839–1937) was an American industrialist and philanthropist. Coming from a modest background, he established the Standard Oil company, one of the first major US trust companies. His business practices were heavily criticized at the time, but today he is mainly known for his philanthropy. He founded, among many other projects, the University of Chicago and the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research and donating over 500 million dollars through his lifetime.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques (1712–1778) was a widely influential Swiss-French thinker of the Enlightenment. He gained recognition with *Discourse on the Arts and Sciences* and *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, both of which argue that human beings are good by nature but have been corrupted by society. His further publications on philosophy, *Social Contract*, and education, *Emile*, sparked great controversy and were banned in Paris, forcing Rousseau to flee to Switzerland and later to Neuchâtel (at the time governed by Prussia).

Schlesinger, Arthur Meier, Sr. (1888 – 1965) was an American historian, who pioneered social and urban history. His work was influenced by the progressive ideas of J.H. Robinson and C. Beard (see there), who he met while studying at Columbia University. Schlesinger taught at Harvard for over 30 years and was president of the American Historical Association in 1942. His best-known works include *Rise of the City, 1878–1898*, which explores the role of urban growth in the development of the USA, and the 13-volume *History of American Life, 1928–1943* that he co-wrote with Dixon Ryan Fox.

Seligman, Edwin R.A. (1861–1939), was an American economist and expert on public finance, especially taxation. He was a professor of political economy at Columbia University for 40 years and helped found the American Economic Association as well as the American Association of University Professors. He edited the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* and published several works on taxation, including *On the Shifting and Incidence of Taxation* and *Progressive Taxation in Theory and Practice*.

Shao Xunzheng 邵循正 (1909 – 1972) was a Chinese historian and expert for Mongolian history, Yuan dynasty history and modern Chinese history. Between 1934 and 1936, he travelled to France and Germany to study Mongolian history. He became a professor at Tsinghua University, Southwestern Associated University and Peking University as well as a researcher at the Chinese Academy of the Sciences. Shao was one of the three Chinese experts involved in compiling the *General History of Mongolia* (蒙古通史) together with Mongolian and Russian experts.

Shepherd, William R. (1871–1934) was an American historian and expert for Latin American history. He graduated with a Ph.D. from Columbia University, where stayed as a professor of history until his death. Shepherd participated in numerous pan-American conferences and was an advisory editor of *The Hispanic-American Review*. Most of his published works, like *Latin America* and *The Hispanic Nations of the New World*, analyze Latin American history, but his most popular work is the *Historical Atlas* of 1911.

Spengler, Oswald Arnold Gottfried (1880–1936), a German historian and philosopher of history, is most famous for his two-volume work *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* (*The Decline of the West*). Therein, Spengler adopts a cyclical view of history, stating that every culture goes through several inevitable stages. According to him, the West had already passed through its creative phase and the future could only hold its decline. His views were hugely controversial in academic circles. Spengler further was an outspoken radical conservative but withdrew from politics after the rise of Hitler.

Tao Xisheng 陶希圣 (1899–1988) was a Chinese scholar, editor, and statesman. He worked as an editor for Shanghai Commercial Press, was a political instructor for the Central Military academy and taught at several universities. Tao was shortly involved with the Wang Jingwei Regime but fled to Hong Kong in 1940. Upon his return he was assigned a position in Chiang Kai-shek's government and became editor-in-chief of the Central Daily 中央日报, a position he kept after fleeing to Taiwan in 1949.

Thompson, James Westfall (1869–1941) was an American historian and expert for the history of medieval and early modern Europe. After graduating from the newly founded University of Chicago with a dissertation on the French monarchy, he stayed there for almost forty years and taught history before transferring to Berkeley in 1933. Thompson's publications include *The Living Past*, *Feudal Germany*, and *An Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages* (300–1300). He was elected president of the American Historical Association in 1941 but died before he could complete his term.

Toynbee, Arnold Joseph (1889–1975), a British historian and philosopher of history, is most famous for his twelve-volume-series *A Study of History*. Toynbee was a research professor of international history at the London School of Economics and director of studies at the Royal Institute of International Affairs. *A Study of History* analyses the rise and fall of 26 civilizations, arguing that each undergo a similar sequence of stages. Toynbee was influenced by Spengler, but his model differed in some central ways from Spengler's. Toynbee has been criticized for favoring myths and metaphors over factual data and taking a Christian perspective, but at the time his model was widely popular.

Tschepe, Albert (1844–1912) was a German sinologist and Catholic missionary in China. He was active in the Catholic mission in Yanzhou until 1912. He published several books on China and its history. These include publications in French such as *Histoire du royaume de Ou*, and *Histoire du royaume de Tsin*, but also publications in German like *Tai-schan und seine Kulturstätten* (*Mount Tai and its Cultural Sites*), and *Heiligtümer des Konfuzianismus in K'ü-fu und Tschou-hien* (*Sacred Sites of Confucianism in Qufu and Zhouxian*).

Turgot (1727–1781), full name Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot, baron de l'Aulne, was a French economist and statesman. He served as intendant of Limoges from 1761 to 1774, where he was successful in implementing reforms after the physiocratic model. He was appointed controller-general of finance under Louis XVI (see there) in 1774. In this role, he tried to implement the Six Edicts, reforms aimed at stabilizing the French economy by, for instance,

promoting free trade and abolishing the *corvée* system of compulsory free labor, but had to resign in 1776. His best-known work is *Reflections on the Formation and Distribution of Wealth*.

Turner, Frederick Jackson (1861–1932) was an American historian known for his widely influential frontier thesis. Turner taught at the University of Wisconsin and Harvard University. In his essay “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” he argued that the American character and history were significantly shaped by the moving western frontier. He was posthumously awarded with a Pulitzer Prize in 1933 for the essay collection *Significance of Sections in American History*. Turner was president of the American Historical Association in 1910 and served on the editorial board of the *American Historical Review* for several years.

Veblen, Thorstein (1857–1929) was an US-American economist, sociologist, and professor, famous for *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. Veblen graduated with a Ph.D. from Yale but struggled to find an academic position due to his controversial opinions and had to transfer several times. In *The Theory of the Leisure Class* Veblen applied Darwins evolutionary theories to modern economy, criticizing the predatory nature of some businessmen. He also coined the term conspicuous consumption for consuming goods of a higher quality or quantity than necessary to show one’s status.

Voltaire (1694 – 1778), whose real name was François-Marie Arouet, was a French philosopher, activist and one of the leading writers of the Enlightenment. Due to his outspoken criticism of the Catholic Church and French government in his works, Voltaire was repeatedly in trouble with the authorities, imprisoned twice and exiled to Britain in 1726. During his lifetime, he produced an abundant body of works among many genres. Especially well known are the satirical novella *Candide*, the essay collection *Lettres philosophiques*, the epic poem *The Henriade*, the tragic play *Zaïre*, and the historical study *The Age of Louis XIV*.

vom Stein, Heinrich Friedrich Karl (1757–1831) was a Prussian statesman and reformer. He was appointed minister of economic affairs and later chief minister to Frederick William III. In these positions, he implemented wide-ranging reforms to modernize the Prussian government based on Enlightenment ideas, which included the structural reorganization of administration, reforms on trade and land ownership as well as the abolition of serfdom. In 1808, Stein was forced to resign and fled to the Austria empire and later to the Russian empire, where he became an advisor to Tsar Alexander I.

von Bernhardt, Friedrich Adam Julius (1849–1930) was a Prussian general and military writer. In 1869, he joined the 14th Hussar Regiment and fought in the Franco-Prussian war. He rose through the military ranks and retired as a general in 1909. Thereafter, he spent his life writing on military and political topics. Perhaps best known is his *Deutschland und der Nächste Krieg* (*Germany and the Next War*), in which he urged Germany to prepare for an upcoming, necessary war and to choose an aggressive fight for global dominance, which he presented as the only alternative to its downfall. He returned to the military to fight in World War I.

Wang Xinzong 王信忠 (1909–?) was a Chinese historian and expert on Japanese history and the history of Sino-Japanese relations. He studied at Tsinghua University under Jiang Tingfu, who encouraged Wang to further his studies on Japanese history in Tokyo. Upon his return, Wang taught Japanese history at Tsinghua University and later at Southwestern Associated University. He published *The Diplomatic Background of the Sino-Japanese war* (中日甲午战争之外交背景) and *An Overview of Japanese History* (日本历史概说).

Wang Yitong 王伊同 (1914–2016) was a Chinese historian and professor emeritus at Pittsburgh University. Wang studied at Yenching University and Jingling University, where he also taught for a short time. Afterwards, he travelled to the US to study at the Department of Oriental Languages at Harvard University. Throughout his career, Wang taught at many universities, including Harvard, Columbia, and the University of Pittsburgh. His best-known work includes *Family status in the five dynasties* (五朝門第) and *Official relations between China and Japan, 1368–1549*.

Wang Zengqi 汪曾祺 (1920–1997) was a Chinese writer. He studied at National Southwestern Associated University under the tutelage of the famous author Shen Congwen 沈從文. Wang wrote short stories, essays and operas, best known is his short story “Initiation into Monkhood” (受戒). He was an editor at several literary magazines, for instance *Beijing Literary Arts* (北京文艺). During the Cultural Revolution, Wang was a member of the Beijing Opera Troupe and claims to have written one of the model operas of the Cultural Revolution, *Shajiabang* (沙家浜).

Wang Zhonghan 王鍾翰 (1913–2007) was a Chinese historian and expert of Qing dynasty history and Manchu history. He was a student of William Hung at Yenching University. After graduating, he spent two years studying at Harvard. After his return to China, he first worked at Yenching University and the Harvard-Yenching Institute before he became a professor at

Central University for Nationalities (*Zhongyang minzu daxue*). His publications include *Miscellaneous Examinations of Qing History* (清史杂考), *New Examinations of Qing History* (清史新考), and *Continued Examinations of Qing History* (清史续考).

Ware, James (1901–1993) was a sinologist, translator and the first student to receive a Ph.D. at Harvard in Chinese studies. He stayed at Harvard to teach Chinese language and history. Ware was one of the founding members of the Department of Far Eastern and together with Serge Elisséeff established the Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies. His research focused on pre-Tang Buddhism and Daoism, and he also translated several Buddhist sutras. Later in his career, Ware published selections of Confucian classics such as the *Analects*, the *Zhuangzi* and the *Mengzi* as well as a complete translation of the *Baopuzi*.

Weng Dujian 翁独健 (1906–1986) was a Chinese historian whose research focused on Yuan dynasty history and Mongolian history. He studied at Yenching University, Harvard and the University of Paris. Weng was elected a member on the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference and held positions at many universities and academic societies. These included executive director and chairman of the Chinese History Association, Director of the Chinese Frontier History and Geographical Research Center of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and Director of the History Department at the Central University for Nationalities.

Wilhelm II (1859–1941), full name Friedrich Wilhelm Viktor Albert of Prussia, was the last German emperor. He ascended the throne in 1888 and only two years later forced chancellor Otto von Bismarck to resign. Wilhelm's reign was marked by his focus on the German military, especially its fleet, and growing tensions in Germany's diplomatic relationships with Britain, France and Russia that finally lead him to side with Austria-Hungary in the Serbia crisis and the following World War. After Germany's defeat, he abdicated the throne in 1918 and fled to the Netherlands, where he lived for the rest of his life.

Wilson, Woodrow (1856–1924) was the 28th president of the United States of America, who led the country during World War I and headed the US-delegation at the Paris Peace conference in 1919. He taught at Princeton, before he became the university's president in 1902, governor of New Jersey in 1910 and was elected president of the United States in 1912 and 1916. After the outbreak of World War I, Wilson pursued a policy of neutrality until 1917, but even after the US entering the war, he tried to negotiate a peace and

presented his Fourteen Points. Wilson is credited with being the founding father of the League of Nations. In 1919, he was awarded with a Nobel Prize for Peace.

Wu Bao'an 吴保安 (1913–1993), also known as Wu Yujin 吴于廑, was a Chinese historian. He graduated from Harvard University with a dissertation titled *Kingship and Law in Feudal China*. He returned to China and taught world history at Wuhan University. Wu served as chairman to the Chinese Society for the Study of World Medieval History and the Chinese Society for the Study of World Ancient History. Perhaps his best-known works are *A General History of the World* (世界通史), a series he co-edited with Zhou Yiliang, and *Ancient Greece and Rome* (古代的希腊与罗马).

Yang Kaidao 杨开道 (1899–1981) was a Chinese sociologist and one of the pioneers of rural sociology in China. He studied at Iowa Agricultural and Technical College and Michigan Agricultural University. Upon his return to China, he held positions at Fudan University, Yenching University and National Central University, was one of the founders of the Chinese Sociological Society and initiated the Qinghe experiment in 1928. After 1949, he was appointed Dean of the Agricultural College of Wuhan University. Yang edited and wrote large parts of the 14-volume *Rural Life Series* (农村生活丛书).

Zhao Naituan 赵乃抃 (1897–1986) was a Chinese economist and an expert on economic thought. He studied at Peking University and Columbia University, from which he graduated with a dissertation titled “Richard Jones: an early English institutionalist”. After returning to China, he became a professor at the Economics Department of Peking University and later also director of the department. His works include, among others, the book *History of European and American Economics* (欧美经济学史).

Zhang Yinlin 张荫麟 (1905–1942) was a renowned scholar of history and philosophy in Republican China. After graduating from Tsinghua University and Stanford University, he taught history and philosophy classes at Tsinghua and Peking University, and from 1937 onwards at Zhejiang University. He co-founded the journal *Thoughts and Times* (思想与时代) and published the influential *Outlines of Chinese History* (中国史纲) as well as *On the Philosophy of History* (论历史哲学), and *On the Selection and Synthesis of Historical Facts* (论史实之选择与综合).

Zheng Dekun 郑德坤 (1907–2001) was a Chinese archaeologist and curator. He studied at Yenching University under the tutelage of William Hung and obtained a doctoral degree from Harvard University. He taught first at

Xiamen University but then transferred to Cambridge University, where he taught Far Eastern Art and Archaeology. Afterwards, he became Dean of Arts and the first director of the Centre for Chinese Archaeology and Art at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. His works include *Archaeology in China*, *Archaeological Studies in Szechwan*, and *Jade flowers and floral patterns in Chinese decorative art*.

Zhou Yilang 周一良 (1913 – 2001) was a Chinese world historian, who researched the history of the Wei and Jin dynasties, and the Northern and Southern dynasties. He graduated from Yenching University and received his doctorate from Harvard University in 1944, where he also taught Japanese during the last years of World War II. He returned to China after the end of the war and taught at Peking University and Tsinghua University. Among his most famous publications is the four-volume series *A General History of the World* (世界通史), which he edited together with Wu Yujin (Wu Bao'an).

Zhou Yusheng 周鯁生 (1889–1971) was a Chinese scholar of international law and diplomatic history. He studied in Japan and obtained doctoral degrees from the University of Edinburgh and the University of Paris. Zhou was a professor at Peking University, National Southeast University and Wuhan University. After teaching in the US for a short time, he became president of Wuhan University and a member of the Academia Sinica. Among his publications are *An Outline of International Law* (国际法大纲) and *Political History of Modern Europe* (近代欧洲政治史).

Zhu Qianyun 朱谦云 (dates unknown) was a Chinese historian and expert for the history of the Soviet Union. Zhu studied at Tsinghua University under the tutelage of Jiang Tingfu, who encouraged him to study Soviet history. Zhu received a scholarship to study at the University College London School of Slavonic and East European Studies and later studied at the University of Tartu in today's Estonia. While living in the Soviet Union, he worked as a correspondent in Moscow for the Central News Agency.

At the end of the Qing dynasty (1644-1911), the discipline of historical science in China experienced a far-reaching transformation. Traditional modes of recording and explaining the past were no longer seen as suitable for the young nation that had embraced the need for modernization in society and politics. In the Republican era (1912-1949), tens of thousands Chinese students went abroad to study and to transfer foreign knowledge to their compatriots.

This volume contains the translations of four texts that analyze the PhD theses of three historians, Lei Haizong (1902–1962), Qi Sihe (1907–1980), and Jiang Tingfu (1895–1965) who had obtained their degree from the universities of Chicago, Harvard, and Columbia. The author Yang Zhao is the first global historian in China to recognize the significance of PhD theses that have long been overlooked, yet—as he shows—constitute an important source for understanding the exchange of historiographical knowledge between China and the United States.

The translations have been made possible by the generous funding of the Volkswagen Foundation for the project *Writing History with China* (2021-28).

