

中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊
第八十四本，第四分
出版日期：民國一〇二年十二月

乾隆《貳臣傳》立傳原則平議

陳永明*

清高宗於乾隆四十一年下令國史館著手編纂《貳臣傳》，用以貶斥明、清易代之際的降清明臣。然而，當時對於明末僅登科第，入清後方列仕版者，應否視之為「貳臣」，似乎尚無定論。及至乾隆五十六年，高宗親下諭旨，明確規定，於明亡前只取得進士、庶吉士身分的清臣，一概不算作是貳臣。此一決定，為如何界定「貳臣」，確立了明確的官方標準。惟若細考《貳臣傳》，當中吳惟華、梁清標及張端三傳，則明顯違背了這個立傳原則。由於高宗的偏見和錯判，加上國史館館臣的因循，遂使這三人不明不白地成了清代統治者「斧鉞之誅」的對象，並因此而受到後世論史者的譏諷。

關鍵詞：貳臣 貳臣傳 吳惟華 梁清標 張端

* 香港大學中文學院

陳永明

On the Selection Criteria of the Qianlong
Biographies of Twice-Serving Ministers

Wing-ming Chan

School of Chinese, University of Hong Kong

In 1777, Emperor Qianlong issued an edict to the Historiography Bureau, ordering the compilation of the *Biographies of Twice-Serving Ministers* (*Erchen zhuan*) to condemn the former Ming officials who collaborated with the newly established Qing dynasty during the Ming-Qing transition. However, an edict in 1791 removed the biographies of the unappointed Ming degree holders and trainees from the historical project, such that subsequently there was no settled opinion about whether these early Qing officials who had passed the Ming civil examination but started their careers in Qing times should be classified as “twice-serving ministers” (*erchen*). While the 1791 edict provided a clear official definition of *erchen*, the cases of Wu Weihua, Liang Qingbiao, and Zhang Duan in the project obviously did not conform to this definition. As a result of the emperor’s prejudice and misjudgement, as well as the collusion of the Historiography Bureau, these three historical figures were indiscriminately labelled *erchen* and were, therefore, condemned in Chinese history.

Keywords: *erchen*, *Erchen zhuan*, Wu Weihua, Liang Qingbiao, Zhang Duan