

Wang, M. C. Haertel, G. D. & Walberg, H. J. (1993) What is a knowledge base: why, how, for whom? [J]. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(3), 365-376.

[苏]苏霍姆林斯基著,唐其慈等译.把整个心灵献给孩子们[M],天津:天津人民出版社,1981.

Comment on Wang and Others' Researches in Factors Affecting School Learning

ZENG De-qi

(Sichuan Normal University Institute of Education Science, Sichuan, Chengdu 610068 China)

Abstract: American educational researchers Wang and Walberg apply three methods of content analysis, expert ratings and meta-analysis to quantitative synthesis of the knowledge of certain school learning. In their opinion, the result of the three methods study of the factors affecting school learning and their relative importance shows that a "knowledge base for school learning" is taking shape, which is applicable to educational reform direction.

Key words: educational research; research synthesis; meta-analysis; educational reform

[责任编辑:王永政]

●文史札记●

《列子集释》补正一例

《列子·说符篇》有云：“白公问孔子曰：‘人可与微言乎？’孔子不应。白公问曰：‘若以石投水，何如？’孔子曰：‘吴之善没者能取之。’曰：‘若以水投水，何如？’孔子曰：‘淄澠之合，易牙尝而知之。’白公曰：‘人固不可与微言乎？’孔子曰：‘何为不可？唯知言之谓者乎。夫知言之谓者，不以言言也。争鱼者濡，逐兽者趋，非乐之也。故至言去言，至为无为。夫浅知之所争者未矣。’白公不得已，遂死于浴室。”张湛于“争鱼者濡，逐兽者趋，非乐之也”下注云：“自然之势，自应濡走。”杨伯峻先生《列子集释》云：“伯峻按：《吕览·举难篇》云：‘救溺者濡，追逃者趋。’”

今按：《列子·说符篇》此段文字的书证，并非杨先生所引用的《吕览·举难篇》“救溺者濡，追逃者趋”之语。检《吕览·精谕篇》亦有“白公问于孔子”一段，其中云：“求鱼者濡，争兽者趋，非乐之也。故至言去言，至为无为。浅智者之所争则未矣。……”很显然，《吕览·精谕篇》的这段文字才更与《列子·说符篇》相合（少数异文异句兹不出校）。又《文子·微明篇》亦云：“……争鱼者濡，逐兽者趋，非乐之也。故至言去言，至为去为。浅知之人，所争者未矣。……”此与《列子·说符篇》之文亦合（少数异文亦暂不出校），所异者《文子·微明篇》作老子语，以答文子之问，且末有“夫言有宗”等语。又《淮南子·道应篇》亦有“白公问于孔子”一段，其中亦有孔子曰“争鱼者濡，逐兽者趋，非乐之也。故至言去言，至为无为。夫浅知之所争者未矣”等语，《列子》之文与此引无一异文（《淮南子》段末加“故老子曰言有宗”云云，与《文子》同）。又《说苑·谈丛》亦云：“逐渔者濡，逐兽者趋，非乐之也，事之权也。”此未作孔子语，且有节录，“事之权也”一语则是对“逐渔者濡，逐兽者趋，非乐之也”的解释，大意则与张湛所谓“自然之势，自应濡走”相近。而《吕览·举难篇》“救溺者濡，追逃者趋”之语在“季孙氏劫公室”一段之末，虽似为孔子语，却无涉白公，语后更无“非乐之也”以下一段，故不得作为《列子·说符篇》本段文字的书证。又检《列子集释》，《说符篇》本段引王重民、王叔岷、俞樾等皆及《吕览·精谕篇》，又及《淮南子·道应篇》，杨先生校“孔子不应”张注亦引用了《吕览·精谕篇》高诱注，然其释“争鱼者濡，逐兽者趋，非乐之也”却不用《精谕》、《道应》，亦未检《文子·微明》和《说苑·谈丛》，似有疏也。（晓名）