

當代中國哲學與全球化世界之認識

羅亞娜*

摘要

許多具有影響力的二十世紀中國哲學家設法維繫他們的思想傳統，而此一傳統所使用的語言對於意識本身仍起著本質性的影響，可以在社會現實之間具有實用性，也就是規範性作用。這些取向與理論結果之間的一個一致性解釋，是我們去檢視任何理論與社會實際之間互動關係的實用性前提。

若我們反省，現代中國哲學在面對千禧年時可以提供何種新知識，使我們在全球化發展中具有積極而正面的意義，從而發現一種新理解的知識論。這意味著，我們的首要之務必須要建立一種創造性的對話，此種對話可以超越特定的種族中心主義之評價與歧視，進而引導一種理解之新形式。是以比較哲學即是聯結各個不同的哲學傳統，這些哲學傳統是在其特定的文化範圍中發展出來。故比較研究的核心與基本任務，便是要研究不同哲學傳統中的可共量形式。當然，這些共量形式在方法學上最關鍵的部分，即是保證對於研究對象之分析與解釋是客觀且可供驗證的。

關鍵詞：現代中國哲學、比較哲學、文化間研究的方法論

2005.4.12 投稿；2005.7.5 審查通過；2005.10.16 修訂稿收件。

* 羅亞娜現職為【斯洛維尼亞】盧布爾雅納大學漢學系主任、正教授。

Contemporary Chinese Philosophy And The Recognition Of The Global World

Jana S.Rošker

Abstract

The majority of the most influential Chinese philosophers of the 20th Century tried to remain loyal to their own tradition of thought, in which language had an essential influence on consciousness, while also having a practical, i.e. regulative function within (social) reality. (ibid, p. 171) A coherent interpretation of these approaches and their theoretical results is thus a necessary prerequisite to any examination of the pragmatic, interactive relation between theory and social praxis.

If we ask ourselves, what kind of original knowledge might modern Chinese philosophy offer us at the dawn of the new Millennium, we have to make good use of the positive aspects of global development and find a new epistemology of understanding; that means, that we first have to establish creative dialogues that transcend the limitations of specific ethnocentric valuations and discriminations and lead to new forms of comprehension. Comparative philosophy connects philosophical traditions which developed in relative separation and isolation from one another and which were determined to a great extent by specific cultural and regional particularities. The central and elementary task of comparative studies is the search for forms of mutual commensurability of different philosophical traditions. The most crucial of these forms is, of course, that of a methodological commensurability that can guarantee the objective and verifiable analysis and interpretation of research objects.

Keywords: Modern Chinese philosophy, Comparative philosophy, methodology of intercultural research

We may ask ourselves what kind of new knowledge can be provided to us by the Chinese philosophy from the edge of the new Millennium. We are living in the era of globalisation. Like all the other things, this fact, also, has two different sides; globalisation as one of the central social, political and economic trends, prevailing at the decline of the second and at the doorstep of the third millennium, can be seen as a form of basic transformation of human societies. This period doubtless represents a critical one, although this critical situation cannot be understood in an absolute negative sense; it represents a phenomenon, which is dangerous on the one side, but provides to us a number of new possibilities on the other.

1 Unity instead of uniformity

One of the most important chances, which are offered to us by this development of worldly dimensions, is connected with technological progress. In respect to interactions in the field of international and intercultural understanding, people at the doorstep of the third millennium possess undreamed possibilities of rapid and efficient communication. As history has proven unnumbered times, technology or technologic development as such was by no means the factor, which accelerated the discrimination of weaker and unjust privileges of minor elites. Hence, the negative connotation of global development most likely does not manifest itself in technology as such, but in different possibilities and modes of its application.

This danger, which has been implied in global trends of the present moment, and which is connected to specific features of existing relations of power, has naturally also been shown at the level of cultures¹ and of various particular forms or modes of life. Nowadays, we are witness to accelerated extinction of particular species of living beings. To the same degree, we are also witnessing the extinction and transformation respectively of certain traditional structures of being. The culture of new unity, which is gradually replacing the variety of particular living forms, as have been formed in the context of different traditions, or in the frameworks of different cultures, is a

¹ The meaning of culture is of course multilayered; its concrete connotation is changing in respect to the context, in which it has been applied. These contexts can be philosophical, literary, historical, sociological, biological, anthropological, etc.

culture of production and accumulation of the capital, as well as the culture of consummation, that belongs into the same system. In this context, communication is not anymore only a tool for spreading values, but also a tool for their preservation and reproduction. This is not only about the tendency towards a cultural unification; it is not about a development, that could enable us to surpass cultural determined misunderstandings between us and that could lead us to a path of a new, more consistent mutual understanding. It is rather about a tendency of cultural uniformity, bearing an potential of erasing particular, cultural identities, that have been seen as "irrational" or at least "redundant" from the viewpoint of ware communications. However, cultural identity is of utmost importance for the autonomy of personalities, which forms a basic hope for a free humanity.

The central dangers of the globalisation are therefore to be found in a potential development towards new modes of controlling and enslaving the human spirit, in possibilities of new dictatorships, arising from electronic forms of communication, as well as from absolutist standardisation of values, leading to uniformity of cultures.

2 Dialogue as part of cultural survival: Comparative philosophy

How can such a cultural uniformity be avoided? If we make good use of the above mentioned positive aspects of the global developments and try to find a new epistemology of understanding, we have first to establish creative dialogues as a basis for new comprehension that could surpass the limitations of particular ethnocentric valuations and discriminations.

Comparative philosophy connects philosophical traditions that were developed relatively separated and isolated from each other and were determined to a large degree by specific cultural and regional particularities. The central and elementary task of respective studies is a search for mutual commensurability of different philosophic traditions. In this respect, the most crucial is, of course, the search for methodological commensurability that could ensure an irreproachable analysis and interpretation of research objects. Opinions about the possibility of suchlike comparisons are rather divergent and reach from the conviction, that really objective and sensible comprehensions are impossible, to the standpoint, according to which central contents of

philosophical thought in various traditions overlapped each other to a large degree. The question of metaphysical and epistemological commensurability has been linked to comparisons of different traditions in respect to their concepts of truthfulness, as well as in respect to their comprehensive and interpretative patterns. And the question about ethical commensurability has been linked to specific ideas about the regulation of interhuman and political relations in treated societies, as well as to problems of comparing their generally valid moral systems. Especially by treating Chinese tradition it has been repeatedly shown, that these particular aspects of history of thought could not be separated in a way as has been developed in the context of European tradition. Each comparison of traditional Chinese and traditional Western thought finally proves to be a search for heuristic values, which could exceed the differences between individual, specific conceptual patterns (*see Wong, p. 1*).

“Doing comparative philosophy well can be very difficult because of the vast range of texts and their intellectual and historical contexts it requires its practitioners to cover. Oversimplifications, excessively stark contrasts, and illicit assimilations count as the most frequent sins. One benefit of comparative philosophy lies in the way that it forces reflection on the most deeply entrenched and otherwise unquestioned agendas and assumptions of one's own tradition. Another benefit at which its practitioners often aim is that the traditions actually interact and enrich one another. Demands for rigor and depth of scholarship obviously rank as some of the most important standards applying to philosophy inquiry. The task of meeting these standards becomes more manageable as the field of inquiry narrows. Such a result can be legitimate but sometimes myopic and impoverishing”. (*ibid.*)

Our confrontation and understanding of cultures, which doesn't belong into the field of the so-called European tradition, has always been linked to the problematic of different languages, histories (and historiographies respectively) and socialisations. The interpretations of different aspects, factors and elements of "non-European" cultures have always been linked to the geographic, political and economic position of the subject and the object of interpretation. In respect to specific historical conditions we have been here

again confronted with the question, whether it is possible at all, in actual existing intercultural contexts to speak about dialogues between equal partners? Let us remember a well-known story from the 2nd Century B.C., called *Milindapañha* (*Milinda's questions*). The story is about a debate between the Greek - Bactrian king Menandros, who was very interested in philosophy and rather educated in the art of disputing, and the Indian monk Nâgasena:

"The king spoke:

-'Right Reverend Nâgasena, will you continue to discuss with me?'

-'If you, the great king, will discuss in the language of sages, I am ready to discuss with you. But if you want to discuss in the language of kings, I don't want to discuss with you!'

-'How, Reverend Nâgasena, do the sages discuss?'

-'A discussion between sages, great king, winds up and down repeatedly. It contains persuading and acknowledgments, differentiations and counter-differentiations. But still, sages do not become upset because of it. This is the way, great king, in which sages discuss with each other!'

-'And how, Reverend, do the kings discuss?'

-'If kings are claiming something during a discussion, and somebody is found to overthrow this claim, then they order this man to be punished. This is the way, great king, in which the kings discuss!'" (in Mall, p. 4)

Hence, comparative philosophy also often remains irrevocably captured into frameworks of existing power relations. The historical development, political - economic conditions and the inner structure of prevailing Western comprehension and interpretation of non-European cultures was evidently described by Edward W. Said in his most important book *Orientalism*. Said's critique of orientalism as a scientific discipline, which founded and conditioned the colonialist approach to different cultures, that are not a fruit of European tradition, has simultaneously been a critique of violence, which pervades classical relations between knowledge and power. Similar to the feminist critique of Western methodological processes, it has also been directed against the method of comprehending and transmitting within the structure of active (Western) subject and passive (non-Western) object of

comprehension. The Western discourses of the "East" ("*Orientalisation of the Orient*", see Said, p. 49 - 73) apply methodological criteria, based upon a domination of economic and political power. In this context, any confrontation naturally results in interpretations, based upon a value system, which has in respect to its content been determined by ideologies of material progress, and in methodological sense by the European formal logic.

As already mentioned, the problems, arising here, are principally of methodological nature. Every methodology represents a system of analysing, re-constructing and transmitting reality. Irrespective of their specific differences, every functioning methodological system is based upon a pragmatic core, which provides this dismemberment, re-construction and transmission with a consistent structure. Concrete methodologies as for example specific forms of human communication are naturally tightly connected to social relations of power. Therefore, it is not coincidental, that the methodology of social sciences and humanities, as has been developed through the history of Western theoretical discourses, provides universal valid criteria and principles for humanities and social studies the whole world over. Similar to English language, which in recent decades became the almost sole general valid mean of verbal communications all over the world, a suchlike standardised methodology also provides us with a basis for understanding in academic discourses. However, the consequence of suchlike exclusive focusing upon paradigmatic and presumptive foundations of these methodologies can also be seen in exclusions of categorical patterns, which belong to differently structured methodological systems.

Therefore, by researching Chinese philosophy, Western sinologists a-priori find ourselves in a role of comparative researchers; firstly because of the above mentioned automatic domination of Western methodological systems within contemporary social sciences and humanities, and secondly because of our own linguistic and non-linguistic socialisation, which we can not cast away like an old-fashioned clothing.

Therefore, Erdheim and Nadig demand from the researchers of foreign cultures the so-called "cultural death" (see Erdheim / Nadig, p.12), which should, according to them, represent the only possibility of surpassing their own cultural centrism and determinations, that are linked to it. This cultural centrism, of course, is not a specific Western or European speciality, but

represents an international and intercultural phenomenon. In spite of this, Eurocentrism is different from other ethnocentrism, since it arises from the inherited feeling of colonial predominance. But, the notion of social death, which doubtless also implies an ethno-psychological variant of the illusion of such scientific concepts, which could be able to objectify any kind of subjectivity, can by no means be taken without critical obstacles, because a (social) identity, which has been among others also a result of socialisation, lasting several decades, can not be simply wiped away. Therefore, it seems more sensitive to modify our own structure of experiences and value systems; the framework of one's own tradition can namely - if it is purified from prejudices and moulded images - still serve as a basis for the establishment of openness, which on the one hand enables us to liberate ourselves from the social imparted spiritual determination, and on the other, represents an indispensable basis for the acquisition and acceptance of qualitative new aspects of reality.

In a narrowed, more concrete field of researching Chinese philosophy these problems are more specific; here, we have to consider not only the differences in categories and in the functioning of the categorical apparatus, but also historical, symbolic and hermeneutic particularities of the traditional thought. It is by no means coincidental, that not only Western sinologists, but also a number of contemporary Chinese philosophers are focused upon these very questions in the present moment².

Precisely because of insufficient consideration of the specific problems in sinological studies and because of various circumstances, which defined the forming of Chinese and of Western cultures respectively, Western sinological studies, which explore elements of Chinese culture, civilisation and social reality, represent a completely different academic discipline as analogous discourses, carried out by Chinese researchers.

Although the research subject is namely the same in both cases, the concrete contents and orientations of both branches have mostly been defined by different, historically conditioned methodological principles, norms and customs, which, again, define to a great degree directions and characteristics of

² Here, we have to mention a number of contemporary philosophers and methodologists, as for instance Zhao Dingyang 趙定陽, Wang Bo 王博, Cui Qingtian 崔青田, Tang Yijie 湯一介, Hu Jun 胡軍 etc.

particular research. Sinology as a discipline, which arose and has thoroughly been developed in the context of Western social and academic institutions, is in respect to the research interests, methods and interpretations still quite different from Chinese approaches to the exploration of their own tradition (see Li You-Zheng, p. 265).

“In modern times, China needs Western academic achievements much more than the West needs the Chinese. This historical tendency naturally limits the aims of Western sinology and the general interest of Western scholars in the Chinese. These facts become an external factor retarding the progress of comparative studies. The result is that Chinese studies of various kinds have not been incorporated into the main Western academic context”. (ibid)

In recent years, however, Western sinologists by dealing with Chinese philosophy also increasingly concentrate upon certain elementary questions, regarding intercultural hermeneutics³. Here, we have to mention, for instance, the question, whether (and to what extent) the forms of describing the world were really dependent on linguistic structures, as well as the question, whether the differences between particular cultural determined discourses are basic to a degree, which leads to completely different systems of categorisations and to completely differently structured paradigmatic patterns. (see Lenk, p. 4).

In the context of respective search for the most suitable comparative methods of different traditions of thought we can also mention the methodological approaches of one of the most notable contemporary researches and interpreters of classical Chinese logic, Chad Hansen:

“Understanding the theory of language gives us a distinctive perspective on the chief figures and schools in Chinese philosophy. We cease to treat Chinese philosophy as obscure and rationally incomprehensible. Theory of language is a central concern in forming the theories of the pivotal theorists of the period. It gives us a novel and natural way to subdivide the period to replace the school approach.” (Hansen 1989, p. 107)

³ Important methodological approaches in contemporary sinological research were created by Robert E. Allinson, Chad Hansen, Christoph Harbsmeier, Hans Lenk, Hans - Georg Möller, Donald Munro, Gregor Paul and others.

According to Heiner Roetz (see Roetz, p. 70), it is much more plausible to understand a cultural tradition by way of the common possession of a specific language, if it is interpreted in terms of homogeneity and conventionalism. In his opinion, this also explains Hansen's most important heuristic device that manifests itself in a hermeneutic of coherence which favours a homogeneous interpretation over and against a differentiated one.

Instead of following the rudimentary horizon of Western discursive patterns and categorisations, we could try to treat Chinese tradition through the optic of language and writing, to which it belongs. If we try to follow the inherent laws of its specific concepts, we could gain a completely different, much more autochthonous and much less "exotic" image of this tradition. But how can we surmount the abyss between different cultures, if we don't possess a generally valid, common horizon of problems anymore? By no means by trying to "think like the Chinese" in a sense of some different logic. Hansen himself explicitly rejects this possibility. Instead, he endeavours a methodology of intercultural research in accordance with the principles of the so-called "hermeneutic humanism" (see *ibid*).

“According to this hermeneutic principle of translation, we should, when faced with several possible interpretations, choose the one that reveals a 'pattern of relations among beliefs, desires, and the world... as similar to our own as possible'. The imputed similarity is not a similarity of beliefs - for these are seen as relative to a context - but of interrelations among beliefs, and between beliefs and a specific cultural background”. (*ibid*)

This universalistic presumption leads to a contextual turn: according to Hansen it is the very acceptance of the supposition about the existence of a common logic, which could offer a possibility of different views upon different worlds that have been formed upon the background of particular linguistic, cultural and historical conditions⁴.

⁴ In the debates about the problems of universality and cultural determination respectively of logical thought I most often miss a definition or interpretation of the term logic, to which the particular argumentation refers. Unfortunately, Chad Hansen is no exception in this respect.

In respect to Western sinological research in traditional Chinese philosophy, Hansen's methodological presumptions can be concretised:

“Whenever we interpret Chinese philosophical texts, we should not give them a meaning that confirms our own conviction, but rather the meaning that would be the most plausible for us if we shared what might be called the Chinese ontology. Thus, a correct interpretation must always be backed up by a basic theory concerning that background ontology. This is what Hansen calls the 'principle of coherence'.” (ibid, p. 71)

Maybe we could claim that current comparisons of Chinese and Western traditions are - to a certain degree - already based upon an awareness of the above exposed problems. That holds true principally for comparative studies of language within cultural contexts. In this sense, comparative philosophy is no longer only

»a cabinet of curiosities for different philosophical word descriptions and esoteric fields of study, but has gained systematic relevancy for analytical and foundational disciplines with considerable import for all other philosophical fields. Ontology can no longer be separated from epistemology, epistemology from the philosophy of language, and philosophy of language from the philosophy of culture and institutions, including 'life forms'. And this is true whether or not one would like to naturalise epistemology sensu Quine...« (Lenk, p. 4)

Hence, intercultural dialogues are possible and sensitive. If we think about their value and significance in the framework of contemporary global developments, we can with an easy conscience also raise the question about the concrete share, provided by the results of modern and adequate reinterpretations of classical Chinese philosophy.

3 Chinese thought in the 21st Century: Central problems and possible solutions

For China, the 20th Century was a period of turbulent concussions and integral social transitions. Already on the doorstep of the previous century, the ancient "Middle Kingdom" - despite of its immense geopolitical dimensions -

found itself lost at the margin of the modern world and became part of the semi-colonial periphery. While the most obvious aspects of Western culture manifested themselves in violence and external aggressions, carried out by economic and military invasions, Western philosophies, which came to China somehow in attendance of the Western capital and its troops, were principally seen as a challenge. (see Cheng, *Chung-ying*, p. 371). Among others, this challenge was expressed by the particular language of modern formal logic and analysis, by social functions of reason, incorporated in modern science and technology, as well as in the Western type of legal state, legislation and democracy. It has also manifested itself in forms of Cartesian dualisms, in their structure of mutual contradictory polarities and in the formal frame of traditional European dialectic. This challenge also arose from concepts and categories, which were specific for the contexts of Western history of thought, as for instance the notion of substance, objectivity, truth, etc. Most challenging were also the elementary methodological conditions that determined this muddled set of new, mostly unknown categories and concepts. These were shown in demands for evidences or formally faultless founding of essential presumptions and results, for application of explicit argumentations and in requirements for accurate formulated definitions.

“The story of twentieth-century Chinese Philosophy focuses on the effort of traditional Chinese philosophy to adjust to a new world and to absorb valuable elements from a foreign tradition. It is a positive and creative effort that requires deep understanding. The drive of contemporary Chinese philosophy to break from its past has given it strength to rediscover and revitalise itself. It has transcended itself by creatively seeking to realise a higher goal”. (ibid., p. 365)

Despite of the need to understand, explore and to apply Western ideas and ideal concatenations respectively it was namely attested, that a (more or less reflected) acceptance of these foreign theories was merely a superficial phenomena, since Chinese tradition of thought essentially proved to be much more sustainable and flexible, as it seemed at first sight. Although the sinificated "Marxism - Leninism", that prevailed in China during the second half of the 20th Century in the role of the new state ideology, originally belonged to Western theories, its social function thoroughly remained to a

large degree a traditional Confucian one, although on a strictly formal level, the Confucian terminology has been replaced by the ideological framework of a sinificated version of “Marxism – Leninism”.

In traditional China, Confucianism namely served as a state doctrine, based upon ethical paradigms, which were declared as arising from genuine Confucius' thought, as formulated in the 4th Century B.C. In this respect, the formal critique of all the other ideologies, based upon their suppositional incompatibility with this paradigmatic "truth" was absolute logical. Hence, on a symbolic level, the "genuine" teachings of Confucius (or, in the P.R. China, the “genuine teachings of Marx and Mao Zedong respectively) represented that legal instance, which ensured in the context of traditional culture the general accepted "correctness" (zheng 正) of social interactions, especially of a "proper" execution of governmental policies. In fact, a dogmatism of this particular kind indeed resembles to ideological functions of state religions in Western societies. The difference lies merely in the absolute pragmatism and utilitarianism of Confucian ethics; however, the consequences of this difference have been much more wide-ranging, as it seemed on the first sight. It doubtless holds true, that the Confucians didn't allow any critical questioning of the prevailing doctrine in the field of society, i.e. in the sphere, to which it actually referred. Being the prevailing state doctrine and mainly dealing with pragmatic problems of regulating interhuman relations, the classical Confucianism consequently neglected the significance of the religious sphere. Therefore, it didn't need to prove the accuracy of its ethical premises by non- social arguments. Thus, Confucianism - in contrast to Christian or Islamic systems of thought - at least tolerated this kind of inner freedom.

The historical era of cultural modernisation in China can be roughly divided into three periods: the first one is the period of active modernisation that lasted approximately from 1910 to 1937. This was the period of a systematic, extraordinarily extensive and qualitatively profound introduction of Western discourses. The beginning of the 2nd World war, which began in China already with the Japanese occupation of Manchuria in 1937, represented

the beginning of the period of theoretical stagnation, which lasted – at least in the P.R. China - over four decades, i.e. until 1978. The third period, which began parallel with the external opening and inner liberalisation of the P.R. China, can be designated as a period of the spread and of critical evaluation of the most influential currents of Western thought. At the moment, philosophy as academic discipline has been carried out in China within the frameworks of four scopes of contents (see Li You-Zheng, p. 97 - 98):

3.1 The scope of (sinificised) Marxist philosophy

This scope (at least officially) still represents the theoretical basis of political and economic disciplines in (formally still "communist") China. It contains philosophy, which has been in theoretical, as well as in popularised context taught not only in departments of philosophy at all Chinese universities, but also represents an obligatory part of the study plans at every national educational institution. The standard textbooks of this subject are composed by groups of specialised theoreticians under the leadership and control respectively of the Ministry of Education. Although the field of the popularised "Marxism" has been rigidly defined by ideological directives of selection and interpretation of Marxist theories, i.e. by those aspects of them, which serve the interests of the ruling "Communist party", in academic circles there is also an increasing tendency towards serious analytic approaches and theoretical elaboration of Marxist and post-Marxist theories in accordance with actual global developments. On an abstract - theoretical level, these studies try to connect dialectical materialism with certain comparable constructs, which can be found within Chinese classical thought. This relatively new field of contemporary Chinese philosophy, which is comparative and interdisciplinary in essence, has commonly been called "studies in natural dialectics". (see *ibid.*, p. 99). It unites theoreticians from the fields of Marxism, natural sciences, Western theory of science and researchers in the field of traditional Chinese theoretic approaches, as have been developed within binary categorical patterns of classical Chinese thought.

3.2 The scope of traditional, particularly classical Chinese philosophy

Experts, working in this theoretical field, have usually been more detailed specialised than those, dealing with research in other philosophic

areas, since their work was mostly not a target of political restrictions and attacks (see *ibid.*, p. 98), especially, because during the political tensioned periods, this field was relatively easy to connect with Marxist reinterpretations and evaluations of classical Chinese thought. On the other hand, abstract methodological and philological studies, which have also thoroughly defined this scope of content, were never representing any direct ideological danger to the ruling political elite. Studies and results of this field are in recent years representing a more and more important paradigm of modern Chinese theories, and are simultaneously also providing significant contributions to the development of intercultural, especially sinological studies.

"Encouraged by the Chinese philosophers working abroad and by some western sinologists, and also in response to the academic competition from the international community, some philosophers in classical Chinese philosophy are becoming more ambitious and are hoping to reinstate some original topics of Chinese Philosophy as the leading themes of future philosophical discussions in China. Thus they challenge the predominant position assumed by Western philosophy in the world today. Recently many debates have taken place concerning the re-evaluation of traditional Chinese philosophy". (ibid., p. 98 - 99)

Such developments have been defined by a tendency towards the establishment of theoretical presumptions that could enable a creation and functioning of classical Chinese discourse as a methodological framework for reintegration of certain relevant aspects and concepts of Western theories.

3.3 The scope of Western philosophy

This scope mostly (at least in the P.R.China) represents an academic discipline and chair respectively, which has been divided from the field of Chinese philosophy. The research in the field of exploring and introducing Western philosophy began already at the beginning of the previous century, and was not totally interrupted even during the periods of most rigid political restrictions. On the one hand, the reason for this "tolerance" lies in the fact, that classical European thought (till Hegel and Feuerbach) represented the

ideal foundation of Marxism, and on the other in the fact, that this period of Western philosophy was not directly linked to the then major topical ideological battles within the "communist" elite. Therefore, the translations of the majority of the most influential works of European traditional thought have been available in China already for several decades. A bit more complicated is the situation in the field of Chinese research in modern, i.e. "Post-Marxist" Western theories. At the present, i.e. in the third period of Chinese confrontation with Western theoretical developments, suchlike research has been divided (similar to the West) into the "analytic" and "continental" currents.

“Owing to Lenin's judgement, this part of Western philosophy had been officially cut off from classical Western philosophy. Also its terminology and problematic were much more difficult to understand than classical Western philosophy. Lately, however, the situation is gradually changing as more and more younger scholars turn to the study of contemporary Western philosophy”. (ibid., p. 98)

3.4 The scope of Modern Confucianism

This current, which has also decisively defined the spirit of modern time, was shown in rather integral attempts to revitalize traditional (particularly Confucian and Neoconfucian) thought by means of new impulses, arising from Western systems of thought. In this process of seeking for syntheses, the spirit of German idealism was of special importance, whereby certain approaches of the Viennese circle have also aroused some interest of some of the representatives of this current. During the first twenty five years of the People's Republic, this current has been – at least in respect to the explicit, formal level – silenced down; their central issues were, however, developed further by the Taiwanese theoreticians and to a certain degree, also by the ones from Hong Kong.

This philosophical current, which has been parallel to the integration of Western thought (particularly of neo-realism and pragmatism) formed during the first decades of the 20th Century, represents a systematic attempt to modernize the essential and formal core of traditional Chinese thought. The theoreticians, who have been in their academic endeavours focused upon elaborations of Confucian and even more Neoconfucian approaches, have mostly tried to react to the needs of the modern age. Therefore, they have

developed their systems of thought above all in the contexts of questions about the possibilities of adapting Neoconfucianism to the conditions of a new, modernized Chinese society, and, at the same time, upon the background of their knowledge and partial integration of the most influential ancient and modern, European and American theories. The theoretical work, which has been – particularly in the first half of the 20th century – performed by representatives of this renovation, has been extraordinarily fruitful and has met a wide response. Here, we are dealing with an important current of modern Chinese philosophy, which has nowadays been of utmost importance being the central system of contemporary Chinese thought, which is due to the fact, that it can preserve specific features of traditional culture in modern social systems of East Asia, that have been thoroughly involved into processes of overall political and economic globalisation. As already mentioned, this current has been systematically developed particularly in Hong Kong and in Taiwan, because in the P.R. China, classical Confucian philosophers have (at least at the manifest level), mildly speaking, “fallen into disgrace” as representatives of suppressing and exploiting “feudal ideologies”.

However, during the last two decades, in the process of the explosive development of economic liberalisation, in the People’s Republic of China also appeared a gradual rehabilitation of this current. Thus, its tendency to revitalize traditional thought still forms one of the central currents of contemporary Chinese theory.

4 Conclusion

In respect to comparative studies, contemporary Chinese theoreticians, who are confronting Western discourses, set themselves two major tasks on the level of application:

“The first task is to understand and interpret the old in the new and to interpret the traditional in the modern. Because the West represents the new and the modern⁵, the second task is to understand

⁵ Here we have to expose the need for a differentiated treatment of the concepts of “Western” and of “modernity”. In the West, the era of modernity has in a discursive sense overwhelmed the Medieval traditions of thought. The divisions of tradition and modernity, as it was formed in the theories of enlightenment, were thus not of universal nature. They

and interpret Chinese tradition in the light of the West and to understand and interpret Western tradition in the light of China... The first is to seek forms of rationality that conform to science and democracy; the second is to find a suitable place and voice for traditional values." (ibid., Cheng, Chung-ying, p. 372)

Re-interpretation, renewed awareness and reflection of these traditional values, adjusted to the present moment, were of crucial importance for preservation of cultural identity in the sense of a system of metaphysical and ethical presumptions. Here, contemporary theoreticians have also been confronted with the need for researching and creating new frameworks of traditional systems of thought, especially regarding the following three aspects (see *ibid.*, p. 374):

1. Most important is the re-integration of those theoretical patterns, methods and categories of autochthon Chinese philosophical tradition that can also be understood by the non-Chinese theoreticians. This aspect implies simultaneously the need for an adequate transformation of those traditional discourses, which can not be comprehended, applied or reproduced and developed respectively beyond the specific frameworks of Chinese tradition. Hence, this aspect has been connected to the necessity of analytical reconstruction of traditional concepts in the context of modernisation.
2. This process of self-comprehension can only be realised on a basis of a two-sided (and partly reciprocal) interpretation of philosophical terms and concepts: those, which belong to ancient Chinese tradition, have to be interpreted in the context of modern Western paradigms and vice-versa.
3. After establishing a suchlike elementary commensurability of both systems, the results of this integer synthesis of both basic paradigms have to be intellectual evaluated and critical estimated respectively.

The later aspect may be the most problematic one, since a paradigmatic evaluation requires an "objective" (or generally valid) valuation criteria.

are rather to be seen as ideal constructs that have corresponded to the specific conditions of European societies at that time.

However, it is by no means coincidental, that the representatives of the Modern Confucian current, which represents the leading philosophical direction of contemporary Chinese theory at the doorstep of the third millennium, don't see any relevant difficulties in establishing such criteria:

“For critical appraisal, one needs statements of ultimate reality or ultimate value as the highest standard of judgement and justification. But this standard must be justifiable by common reason or by appeal to an ideal value in the traditional paradigm”. (ibid.)

In any case, detailed and profound studies, which pay attention to semantic and morphologic functions of linguistic structures, incorporated in classical philosophic texts, can expose important epistemological aspects, that can be extraordinarily valuable for the now most topical interdisciplinary debates, incorporating the fields of political theory, ethics, epistemology, analytical methodology, categorical heuristics and of philosophy of language. According to Hans Lenk, these studies can offer to us rather important alternatives to the methodological "imperialism of Cartesian dualisms" (see Lenk, p. 4). For this reason, it is also important to avoid an overvaluation of the significance of the grammatical division between the subject and the object, which manifests itself as a division between facts and values on the epistemological, and as the problem of reality and phenomena on the ontological level.

Bibliography

- Berninghausen, Jutta/ Kerstan, Birgit:** Warum in die Ferne schweifen? - Zu unserem Verständnis als Forscherinnen, in: *Beiträge 1990:27*, p.109-119; (Ed.: Sozialwiss. Forschungen zu Frauen), published by Beitraege, Köln 1990
- Cheng Chung-ying:** An Onto-Hermeneutic Interpretation of Twentieth - Century Chinese Philosophy: Identity and Vision, in: Contemporary Chinese Philosophy , p. 365 - 404 (Ed.: Bunnin, Nicholas, Cheng Zhongying /Chung-ying/), Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford 2002

- Erdheim, Mario / Nadig, Maja:** Größenphantasien und sozialer Tod, in: *Beiträge 1990:27, p.10 - 17*, (Ed.: Sozialwiss. Forschungen zu Frauen), published by Beitraege, Köln 1990
- Hansen, Chad:** Language and Logic in Ancient China, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Michigan 1983
- Lenk, Hans:** Introduction, in: Epistemological Issues in Classical Chinese Philosophy, p. 1 - 10 (Ed.: Lenk, Hans in Paul, Gregor), State University of New York Press, New York 1993
- Li, You-Zheng:** Epistemological Problems of the Comparative Humanities - A Semiotic/Chinese Perspective, Peter Lang - Europäischer Verlag für Wissenschaften, Frankfurt/Main, 1997
- Mall, Ram Adhar:** Philosophie im Vergleich der Kulturen. Interkulturelle Philosophie - eine neue Orientierung, Primus Verlag, Darmstadt, 1996
- Möller, Hans Georg:** Die philosophischste Philosophie - Feng Youlans Neue Metaphysik, Harrasowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2000
- Roetz, Heiner:** Validity in Chou - Thought: On Chad Hansen and the Pragmatic Turn in Sinology, p. 69 - 105, in: Epistemological Issues in Classical Chinese Philosophy, (Ed.: Lenk, Hans in Paul, Gregor), State University of New York Press, New York 1993
- Said, Edward W.:** Orientalism - Western Conceptions of the Orient , 4th Edition., Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1995; (1st Edition: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. 1978)
- Wong, David:** Comparative Philosophy: Chinese and Western, in: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2001 Edition)*, (Ed.: Edward N. Zalta), <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2001/entries/comparphil-chiwes/> , URL 2004/7/8

審查意見摘要

第一位審查人：

本論文從全球化的觀點，考察中國哲學所能提供的新知識為何？作者反對在政治、經濟、資訊等全球化發展下，將各國文化予以形式化的統一，而抹殺了個別文化的特性。作者強調在相互平等情況下對話與溝通的重要，因而對於比較哲學之方法論有深切的反省。

在研究中國哲學的方法方面，必須注意不同範疇在不同脈絡下，其運作的方式與意涵之不同，並注意到本體論、認識論、語言哲學與文化哲學、生活形式的不可分割性；這是符合中國哲學的基本特質的考察。作者對於大陸的中國哲學發展較為熟悉，分為三個階段予以論述，但對於台灣的中國哲學研究，則未見涉略及深論。在中國哲學研究方法方面，作者指出古典道家和辯者哲學所提供之情境決定相互關係的看法，以及避免對主體與客體二元區分的過高評價，都是很有價值的思想。

本論文的視野宏大，結構清楚，論點明確，資料引用恰當，如引用 David Wong、Chad Hansen 等重要學者之思想論述，但在論證方面稍弱，對於笛卡兒哲學二元論的基本架構，不對應於中國哲學之研究的相關理由，未能詳細論究，頗有意猶未盡之感。此外，本論文很可能是另一完整論文的一部份，此可由其分項編號可見。整體而言，本論文仍具相當學術價值。

第二位審查人：

比較哲學是個引人入勝的領域，卻也相當複雜難處理。作者對其中的一些重要課題起了個頭，唯限於篇幅，很難深入探究。作者關於中心與邊陲、支配與依賴、剝削與被剝削、西方東方與第三世界等命題，只是套用流行術語。大眾傳播是西方

者引用成中英的意見，認為中西交流對中國哲學的好處遠多於壞處，即可證明中國哲學在「中心與邊陲」等模式中的「劣勢」，並不等於是吃虧的一方。

作者以為西洋哲學是同質的，這決非事實。以笛卡兒的二元論做為西洋哲學的典型，也是粗略的簡化。說西洋文化「以自己為唯一普遍有效的論述」，此語很難出自當今主要哲學家或文化評論家之口。

哲學是否受語言結構所決定，作者頗游移不決。英文討論對中國哲學不見得是壞事，成中英、杜維明等人使中國哲學能在英、美發展，就如中國哲學從前在日、韓能發展一般。