

《文與哲》專號：

跨文化漢學：走向共生的未來

莫加南 中山大學中國文學系助理教授編輯

A Special Issue of the Journal *Literature and Philosophy*

Towards Mutual Co-Existence: Sinology as Transcultural Practice,

edited by Mark McConaghy

毫無疑問地，近年來海內外漢學界面臨了一系列在認識論和政治上的挑戰。美國與中華人民共和國日趨緊張的關係，使得兩國之間經濟和政治上的衝突不斷升高。同時，美國社會長期受到民粹主義、種族主義以及貧富差距的負面影響，中國則在習近平的領導下朝向非自由主義的路線發展。全球疫情讓美中衝突變得格外複雜，也再一次煽動了美國和其他的西方國家內部長期隱藏的反華情緒。不過，美中兩國在貿易上仍維持相當密切的關係，兩者皆為全球投資和資本累積的中心，即使兩國在政治、外交關係有如此巨大的隔閡，其在經濟上仍相互依存。

作為臺灣著名的人文研究學術期刊，《文與哲》將於2021年底發表專號，本期旨在探索下列問題：若將漢學視為中國古代和現代哲學、文學、政治、社會和文化史的研究，且充滿人道主義精神、以漢文為基礎、多元一體、傳統與現代並行不悖的學科，漢學的學術傳統能否回應此時充滿危機的當代時刻？本刊欲鼓勵中國大陸以外的漢學家思考一個關鍵性的問題：中國古代帝國、中國民國時期和現代革命的歷史可以提供給當代什麼樣的思想資源？在這眾聲喧嘩的時刻以不同的思維方式來思考如何在未來「共生」？

漢學作為跨國的學術領域，近幾年在方法論上出現了「解構」和「建構」兩種不同面向的論述。華語語系研究（2013）試圖以多元、地方性的「華語語系（Sinophone）」代替「中國」/「中國性（Chineseness）」的概念來思考海外華人社會。近期受華語語系啟發的學者對於如何「超越漢學（Beyond Sinology, Bachner, 2014）」、何謂「重新思考中國性」（Tam, 2013）、了解中國/中國性所帶來的「不安」（Dirlik, 2015），以及亞洲何以代替單一民族國家作為新興的研究方

法（陳光興, 2010）。海內外的學者亦試圖反駁這些「解構」的論述，強調中國作為歷史主體、文明共同體和文化認同的統一性和合法性（葛兆光, 2011, 2017）。在馬克思主義學術的傳統下，美國學者 Rebecca Karl（2016, 2020）不斷地強調漢學家不能引用文化本質主義來思考中國歷史。其激勵漢學界思考現代世界的物質基礎：資本主義的政治經濟制度，更強調學者們要分析此制度對政治動員和歷史想像的負面影響。對 Rebecca Karl 而言，中國 20 世紀的社會主義革命為能提供當代社會重要的思想資源，走向 21 世紀的反資本主義的未來。

上述的學術論辯無論多麼駁雜與激烈，漢學作為充滿人道主義精神的學科還是保有其學術的價值和地位。在 2005 年，澳洲漢學家 Geremie Barmè 為 21 世紀國際漢學提出一種生動且極具說服力的構想——「新漢學/後漢學 New Sinology」。「新漢學」近幾年不僅在學術機構中引發了重要變革（如：澳洲國立大學 2010 年建立的研究中心 The Australian Center for China in the World），也啟發了海外學者開始跟中國學者合作進行翻譯和研究計畫（Cheek, Fogel, and Ownby, 2019 年）。「新漢學」不僅強調學者們需要對古代文言文、明清白話、清末報紙所用的混文、民國白話以及革命中國的詞彙系統具有深刻的了解，也試圖培育國際人道主義的精神，鼓勵海內外學者的多方互動，打破二元對立的傳統漢學方法。在「新漢學」中，外籍漢學家與中國學者能共同思考（think with China），而不再霸權地以研究者高傲的姿態將中國置於被動的位置，且視為需要透過西方理論來釐清的無聲對象（working "on" a passive China, in need of Western theoretical illumination）。

本期專號繼承新漢學的精神，進一步將其構想為「跨文化漢學」，於此「跨文化」一詞具有三種含義：一、指海外學界如何理解中國及其週邊地區的歷史進程；二、指中國的傳統文人和現代知識分子如何理解更廣泛世界的歷史進程；三、指的是當代漢學中的國際性。位於世界各地研究機構的漢學家們，其研究和教學活動不僅僅只關注中國歷史和社會，往往也需回應當地社會所面對各自不同在知識和政治上的困境。倘若中國文明的遺產儼然成為世界思想的重要資源，跨文化漢學理應服膺此一觀念作為基本精神。

繼承跨文化漢學的精神，此專號將探索漢學如何回應此時此刻人類所面臨的危機，思考中國思想史、政治史，以及文化史怎麼能提供給我們走向「共生」的未來、培養「共生」的知識實踐。

There is little doubt that the field of China studies understood as a globally interconnected practice has faced a series of critical epistemic and political challenges in recent years. Economic and political tension has risen to startling heights between an increasingly illiberal People's Republic of China (PRC) and an America riven by domestic currents of nativism, institutionalized racism, and growing economic disparity. The global COVID-19 pandemic has only exacerbated such tensions, and indeed re-animated long latent expressions of Sinophobic attitudes across the West. Yet, ironically, the United States and China remain among each other's largest trading partners, dual directional magnates of global investment and manufacture that ensures they remain locked together within the circuits of global capital, whether they like it or not.

This special issue of *Literature and Philosophy* (《文與哲》), a leading humanities journal in Taiwan, asks the question: can Sinology, understood in inclusive terms as the linguistically grounded, broadly humanistic study of China's philosophical, literary, political, social, and cultural past and present, help us respond to our contemporary moment of crisis? Particularly for practitioners of Sinology in the larger Sinophone world, what resources for thought does the Chinese past (Imperial, Republican, or Revolutionary) provide us to help navigate the tensions of this moment?

Chinese Studies has in recent years seen a powerful array of both deconstructive and re-constructive work emerge to provoke methodological debate for the field. For example, *Sinophone Studies* (2013) has called for the notions of China/Chineseness to be replaced with a locally imbedded, plurally constituted concept of the Sinophone. Scholars in recent years have explored what it means to go "Beyond Sinology" (Bachner, 2014), to "rethink Chineseness" (Tam, 2013), to interrogate the way the concept "China/Zhongguo" can erase than highlight internal difference within the Mainland (Dirlik, 2015), and to open up intellectual work in East Asia away from nation-centered methodologies towards "Asia as Method" (Chen, 2010). Scholars operating in and outside of Mainland China have countered such deconstructive efforts by insisting on the unity and coherence of China as an object of historical study and cultural identity both past and present

(Ge, 2011, 2017). Meanwhile, working in a Marxist tradition, Rebecca Karl (2016; 2020) has consistently urged colleagues against succumbing to the seductions of culturally particularistic discourse of any kind, encouraging instead a thorough interrogation of the capitalist political-economy that undergirds the material and imaginative structuring of the world, and the revolutionary attempt in the Chinese twentieth-century to overcome it.

Against the backdrop of these debates, Sinology as a broadly humanist, culturally integrative endeavor remains a powerful academic discipline. Geremie Barme (2005) has been most persuasive in articulating the parameters of what a "New Sinology" could be for the twenty first century. This "new" Sinological paradigm has in recent years led not just to important institutional configurations (such as Australian National University's Center for China in the world, founded 2010), but also inspired groundbreaking translingual collaborations between scholars working in the Euro-American and Mainland Chinese academies (Cheek, Fogel, Ownby, 2019). Such work has integrated deep training in Chinese linguistic and historical materials (both modern and classical) with a globally collaborative spirit in which one does not work "on" China but rather "thinks with" China, breaking the anthropological gaze that has marked the global China field for centuries.

This special issue calls for papers that explore the question of how Sinology as global practice can help us respond to our contemporary moment of crisis, and whether China's own philosophical, political, and social past can act as a resource towards thinking a practice of mutual co-existence in our contemporary moment. The special issue is conceived in solidarity with Geremie Barme's claims regarding "the distinctiveness of Sinology as a mode of intellectual inquiry" (2005), one that possesses within it integrative resources that can underpin contemporary thought. The term "transcultural" here is mobilized to indicate the complicated historical processes by which the larger world came to understand China's classic and modern life-worlds, as well as the processes by which China's pre-modern literati and modern intellectuals came to understand the larger world around them. Transcultural Sinology also denotes the by now globally inflected nature of sinological work as a whole, as scholars working to understand the Chinese past

and present operate within local contexts across the world, and in which teaching and research agendas with/about China are often formed against the backdrop of local intellectual and political struggles.

Working in this spirit, the special issue calls for papers that address the question of how Sinology as a global practice can help us cultivate, in the philosophical, pedagogical, or social realms, a future defined by mutual co-existence.