

预流、立场与方法

——追寻文史研究的新视野

葛兆光

引言：学术史告诉我们什么？

现代中国学术史研究在二十世纪九十年代曾经成为“显学”，不过，回顾学术史的意义，并不仅仅在于面对不如人意的当下学界，发一些思古之幽情，也不仅仅在于见贤思齐，表彰几个学界前辈的高风亮节，甚至不仅仅是建立学统，描述或总结某些学人的学术成就。我总觉得，在人文学科尤其是文史领域中，学术史需要讨论的是以下问题，一是传统学术在西潮与东风的鼓荡下，是如何转型成为所谓现代学术的，二是这种来自西方的所谓现代学术，在现代中国政治、文化和知识语境中，如何形塑出中国式的现代学术，三是这些所谓现代学术在资料、方法、工具和观念上，如何重新理解和诠释了古代中国，并影响到对于现代中国的想象和设计。从学术史角度说，第三个问题尤为关键，因为它决定了我们对于既往学术史的回顾，是否能够让学术界了解学术发展脉络如何延伸，使学者对于未来学术的潮流和取向有所自觉。

很多人都注意到，20世纪20年代到30年代，是中国现代学术史上最重要的一个时期。我曾经很长时间内，特别关注现代中国这一时期中两个办得最成功的研究机构，一个是1925年成立的清华学校研究院，就是仅仅办了四年却影响深远的所谓“清华国学院”；一个是1928年成立的中央研究院历史语言研究所，就是傅斯年所开创后来迁到台北的所谓“史语所”。这两个研究机构之所以能够成为典范，我想，除了当时正处在中国学术从传统向现代转化的关键时期、外在相对平稳的社会环境恰好给了学术界一个契机，以及各自拥有一批兼通中西的学者外，从学术史的角度看，有以下三方面原因：

第一，他们始终站在现代国际学术前沿，不仅在研究领域上把握了国际学界的关注点，而且在方法和工具上始终与国际学界同步。像王国维对西北地理和蒙元史的关注和以两重证据法研究上古史，像李济推动科学的考古包括他的山西考古和后来的安阳殷墟发掘，像陈寅恪研究“殊族之文，塞外之史”，教授西人之东方学目录，以及作敦煌文书的多语文考证，像赵元任的语音学和方言调查，还有傅斯年所念念不忘的“虏学”，这些选题、材料和方法都是当时的前沿，就连梁启超对于历史研究法的阐释和对于佛教史的研究，也吸收了国际学术界的很多新思路和新成就，这就是陈寅恪讲的，进入了“世界学术之新潮流”即国际学术研究问题、材料、和方法的主流¹。

第二，不仅仅是“预流”，中国学者的中国研究必然不能简单等同与国外学者的“汉学”，它必须逐渐建立中国的立场、问题和方法。在经历了晚清民初整体向西转的大潮之后，在西方的学科制度和研究意识全面侵入中国现代学术界的时候，他们始终坚持以“中国”为中心的研究立场，他们不是在稗贩西方知识，而是在试图重新诠释中国，甚至提出，要使对于中国的解释权重新回归中国，像梁启超的近三百年学术史研究、王国维的古史新证、李济的中国考古，都在试图拿回对于古代中国的解释权。当时史语所提倡的历史研究，有相当清楚的大理想和大方向。据说，主其事的傅斯年的目的，就是“以历史研究所为大本营，在中国

¹ 陈寅恪《陈垣〈敦煌劫余录〉序》“一时代之学术，必有其新材料与新问题。取用此材料，以研求问题，则为此时代学术之新潮流。治学之士，得预于此潮流者，谓之预流（借用佛教初果之名），其未得预者，谓之未入流。此古今学术史之通义，非彼闭门造车之徒，所能同喻者也。敦煌学者，近日世界学术之新潮流也”，《金明馆丛稿二编》，266页，三联书店，2001。

建筑‘科学的东方学正统’，这一号召是具有高度的鼓舞性的……（傅）他是这一运动理想的领导人，他唤醒了中国学者最高的民族意识”²。很多年以后，李济《感旧录》里还说到这一点，“当时学术界（对外人文化侵略）普遍存在着‘不满’和‘不服气’的情绪，要反对这种文化侵略，只有自己去搜集去研究，直到中央研究院成立后，才站在国家学院的地位，把学术界这种情绪导入了正轨”³，所以，傅斯年在宣言式的《史语所工作旨趣》最后，要大声疾呼“我们要科学的东方学之正统在中国”⁴。也许这种说法有一些学术民族主义，但是它却促进了现代中国学术之独立，这可能恰恰是这两个研究机构成功的基础。

第三，仅仅有充分国际化的预流和相对中国立场的意识，可能还不够，清华学校研究院和历史语言研究所之所以能够成为影响现代中国学术研究的重镇，还得益于的“地利”，我所谓的地利，是说那个时代恰恰在中国不断出现了新资料。像殷墟甲骨、敦煌文书、居延汉简和大内档案等所谓四大发现，都在那个时代的新思路和新眼光下被使用起来，并且给重新理解历史提供了坚实的基础。也许有人会指出，甲骨和敦煌都是二十世纪初的发现，并不是二十世纪二十年代的事情，但是，新史料需要有新眼光才能在研究领域发酵，而甲骨卜辞和敦煌文书要到二十世纪第二个和第三个十年，才超越和结合传世的历史文献，真正使用在历史的重新理解上，因而它不是史料的量的增加，而是历史的质的变化。

总之，当年清华学校研究院和历史语言研究所殷商甲骨研究上古史、以汉简和敦煌文献研究中古史、以大内档案研究近世史，追踪新史料开拓新领域，（一）在文史研究的工具和资料上，特别重视考古发现的证据、多种语言的对比、边缘资料的使用，（二）在文史研究的视野上，关注四裔历史、并试图与国际学术界讨论同样的话题，（三）在文史研究的方法上，重视社会科学的方法、极力将语言学与历史学联结。这些“新”风气、“新”方法，挟“科学”之名义，借“西学”之影响，又隐含着争东方学“正统”的立场，所以一下子就站在了国际的前沿，使得这两个研究机构成为中国学界乃至国际学界引人瞩目的中心。

这些年，无论在国内还是国外，我常常在图书馆翻阅当年国外的中国学期刊，深深感到那个时代中国文史研究的国际影响力，那个时代的国外中国学家，不像现在某些人那样，觉得中国的论著不足以观，却不得不常常翻译和介绍中国学者的著作。举一个例子，像日本京都大学至今仍然出版的著名学术刊物《东洋史研究》，从1935年创刊的第一卷起就频繁地关注中国学术的新进展，像闻一多的高唐神女说研究、《禹贡》派的历史地理学、柯绍忞的《新元史》、孟森的“七大恨”研究、陈寅恪的各种论著、郭沫若的先秦天道观研究以及陶希圣、朱希祖、傅斯年、顾颉刚、全汉升、陈梦家等等的动态。就是在七七事变以后的交战状态下，日本学者也仍然介绍了罗根泽和顾颉刚的《古史辩》、陈垣的《南宋初河北新道教考》等等⁵。这个时候，中国的文史研究绝不亚于任何地区的中国学，傅斯年念念不忘的争回中国学正统，似乎很有成功的希望，而陈寅恪痛心疾首的“群向东邻受国史，神州士子羞欲死”⁶，经过那个时代人的努力，状况也许并没有那么严重。

那么，现在的中国文史学界应当如何应对“世界学术之新潮流”，它将在什么地方走自己的路呢？以下陈述的，正所谓“野人献芹”，只是我个人的想法而已。

² 傅乐成《傅孟真先生年谱》28-29页，传记文学社刊行，台北，1964。

³ 李济《感旧录》72-75页，台北传记文学社，1967；转引自陶英惠《抗战前十年的学术研究》，载《抗战前十年国家建设研讨会论文集》上册，77页，中研院近史所，台北，1985二版。

⁴ 傅斯年《历史语言研究所工作之旨趣》，载《历史语言研究所集刊》第一本第一分，1928。

⁵ 日本人在三十年代相当注意中国的研究，包括一些相当左倾的研究，如东亚同文会办的《支那》，在二十二卷第二号三号四号（昭和六年二月至四月），曾连载赖贵富译郭沫若著《支那奴隶制度について》（上，54-62页）（中，79-90页）（下，69-78页），在二十一卷第六号（昭和五年六月）又译有被称为“中国共产党派之巨头”的甘乃光的《先秦经济思想の一考察》（45-63页，同卷九号续完）。此外，关于这一方面的情况，还可以参看今崛诚二《北京の学界それから》，《东洋史研究》地8卷5-6号，98-101页，京都，1944。

⁶ 陈寅恪《北大学院己巳级史学系毕业赠言》，载《陈寅恪文集·诗集》19页，三联书店，2001。

一、国际视野：从“虏学”到“从周边看中国”

八十多年前，梁启超在《中国史叙论》中，曾经把中国历史区分为中国之中国、亚洲之中国和世界之中国三个阶段，分别对应“上世史，自黄帝以迄秦统一”、“中世史，自秦统一至清代乾隆之末年”、“近世史，自乾隆末年至至于今日”⁷。这个分法很有意思，也可以作种种解读，像许倬云就说，这是以种族的交涉与竞争为着眼点，也隐隐以封建、帝制及立宪三种政体作为三个时代的主要政治形态⁸。不过，在这里我也想以“中国的自我认识”为中心，也想把以往的中国历史分成三个阶段。

第一个阶段可以称作“以自我为中心的想象时代”。这个时代的中国，由于对外交通的困难、汉文明传统的强大和外来文明无法形成巨大冲击，换句话说，在没有巨大的“他者”的情况下，中国仿佛处于一个没有镜子的时代，这形成了以自我为中心的“天下观念”（对于周边的鄙视和傲慢）和以自我为天朝大国的“朝贡体制”（尽管从宋代起，情况便发生变化）。我们可以从古代所谓的九州、五服记载、“北狄、南蛮、东夷、西戎”的说法、《王制》所谓的“五方之民”，到古代的天下地图和《朝贡图》⁹，可以看到，尽管实际的世界地理知识早已经超越了汉族中国，但是，在观念的天下想象中，人们仍然习惯地以自我为中心，想象一个处在天之中的“中国”。

但是，自从晚明西洋人逐渐进入东方以来，特别是晚清西洋人的坚船利炮迫使中国全面向西转之后，中国人认识“自我”，开始有了一个巨大的“他者”（The Other）即西方，从此进入第二个阶段即“一面镜子的时代”，这个时代正如列文森（Joseph R. Levenson）所说，从天下到万国，实际上是一个很大的变化¹⁰，由于在西方这个“他者”的映照下，中国人才开始了对中国的重新认识，这当然是一个巨大的进步。然而，这种重新认识确实以“西方”，而且仅仅是一个似乎同一的“西方”为基础的，无论是晚清所谓“中体西用”还是“西体中用”的争论，无论是李大钊、陈独秀还是梁漱溟等人的中西文化比较观念，无论是五四时代以西方为对照重新解读中国的思潮和鲁迅以后的“中国国民性”剖析，还是一直蔓延到八十年代的“文化热”讨论，其实都是在这一面镜子下的自我认识。

可是，我们现在要问，这面镜子是正确的镜子还是一面哈哈镜呢？它是认识自己的唯一镜子吗？它难道能够全面地让我们自我认识吗？就像我们在理发室里修剪头发的时候，仅仅靠眼前的那面镜子是不够的，还必须“菱花前后照”才能看到后脑勺，那么，我们是否还需要一面或多面西方之外的镜子吗？可是中国人从来很少明确认识到，作为“他者”，自己周边的日本、朝鲜、越南、印度、蒙古与自己有什么不同，人们始终觉得，他们似乎还是自己文化的“边缘”，因此并不会用这些异文化眼光来打量自己。可是，真的是这样吗？我总觉得，中国与“西方”的差异对比，只能在大尺度上粗略地看到自我特征，而那些看似差异很小，甚至曾经共享一个文化传统的不同国度的比较，才能真正认识什么才是“中国的”文化，因此，在今天这个全球化看似普遍同质的时代，恰恰也许我们有可能进入第三个时代，即“在多面镜中认识自我的时代”，《宋高僧传》卷五记载唐代华严大师法藏有一个著名的设计，他

⁷ 梁启超：《中国史叙论》（饮冰室文集，卷三十四，25页，商务，1925）

⁸ 许倬云：《寻索中国历史发展的轨迹》，载其《江渚候潮汐》（一）159-160页，三民书局，2004。按：这个分期方法与日本当年的中国史著作是否有关系？明治三十一年出版的著名的桑原鹭藏《中等东洋史》是以（一）上古期：汉族膨胀时代（到秦统一），（二）汉族优势时代（从秦汉到唐末），（三）蒙古族最盛时代（从北宋和辽到明末），（四）欧人东渐时代（从清代至今）。

⁹ 葛兆光：《山海经、职贡图和旅行记中的异域记忆——利玛窦来华前后中国人关于异域的知识资源及其变化》，载《明清文学与思想中之主体意识与社会——学术思想篇》345-369页，台北，中研院中国文哲研究所，2004年12月。又，参看傅斯年与顾颉刚讨论战国人对于世界的想象一信，载国立中山大学《语言历史研究所周刊》第一集第二期，1927年11月8日。

¹⁰ 列文森（Joseph R. Levenson）《儒教中国及其现代命运》第一部分第七章指出，“近代中国思想史的大部分时期，是一个使‘天下’成为‘国家’的过程”，郑大华等中译本，87页，中国社会科学出版社，2000。

曾经面对学者“取鉴十面，八方安排”，就是在上下八方各悬镜子，面面相对，中间安一佛像，用炬光照耀，于是交影互光，重重映照，当然，我们想说明的，并不是法藏的“佛法无尽，彼此交互”，让“学者因晓刹海涉入无尽之义”，而是想像拍立体电影一样，用多台摄影机从四面八方拍摄，然后组合起一个立体的中国。因而，**从周边看中国，重新确立他者与自我，换句话说就是，从周边各个区域对中国的认识中，可能我们会重新认知历史中国、文化中国和政治中国。**

关于这个问题的思想史意味，这里无法详细讨论。从文史研究的角度，我更想讨论这一研究方向的学术史意义。

如果我们回顾中国学术史，在某一个角度上说，**中国学术国际化和现代化的第一波，似乎可以上溯到清代中叶对于西北地理和蒙元史的研究。**自从钱大昕以后，由于考据学发展的内在理路(考据领域的拓展和延伸)和国情变化的外背景(嘉道以后国际形势的变化)，人们开始意识到西北地理、辽金及蒙元史研究，在超越汉族中国传统空间的意义。首先，它不再仅仅是考据学家所涉猎的“汉语”、“汉族”和“汉文献”，其次，研究范围也不仅仅是考据学家们熟悉的儒家世界和传统经典，再次，他们研究的内容已经不仅仅局限在政治史的范围中。不妨看一下蒙元史的研究，在钱大昕以后，曾有邵远平《元史类编》、魏源《元史新编》、曾廉《元书》以及洪钧《元史译文证补》之作，到了屠寄在晚清时期修《蒙兀儿史记》，就务求蒙古在历史中固有之分际，扩大蒙元史之范围。他引用资料远远超出传统汉文史料，有高丽史料、云南史料、西域史料，尤其是采用了外文史料，《凡例》中提到“至洪氏钧《元史译文补正》出，始知西域人泰西人书足补元史者不少”，又提到《秘史》虽然详细，但“与西域人施特哀丁所撰《蒙兀全史》及撒难薛禅所撰之《蒙兀源流》互有出入”，还说到多桑的《蒙古史》、美国米亚可丁《蒙古史》三巨册、英国人的《史家之历史》等等¹¹。在那个时代以后，中国学者的眼界才大大打开¹²，晚清学者们开始参与到如突厥三大碑(噶欲谷碑、阙特勤碑、毗伽可汗碑)的考释¹³、蒙元文献的译读¹⁴、唐代三夷教即火袄教即波斯琐罗亚斯德教(Zoroastrianism)、景教和摩尼教的研究等等国际性的课题中¹⁵，就是后来对满蒙回藏研究很深的日本学界，初起步时都不得不看中国人如张穆、何秋涛、李文田的著作¹⁶，就连傲慢的俄国人，对沈曾植考释突厥碑也只好刮目相看，“译以行世，西人书中屡引其说，所谓总理衙门书者也”¹⁷。在中国学术转型的这一波中，无论在空间视野、语言工

¹¹ 参看杜维运《屠寄传》，载其《历史的两个境界》118-120页，东大图书公司，1995。

¹² 比如1917年出版的陈垣的名著《元也里可温教考》，无论在选题、问题意识，还是在语词考辨上，很大程度上都受到这些学术潮流的影响，他的考证就是在洪钧《元史译文证补》以及所引用的多桑《蒙古史》、以及日本人田中萃一郎、坪井九马三用阿拉伯、希腊、蒙古等多种语文文献互证的成果的基础上，对汉文文献研究的结果。见《元也里可温教考》，收在陈垣《明季滇黔佛教考(外宗教史论著八种)》4—7页，河北教育出版社，2000。

¹³ 突厥三大碑：噶欲谷(Tonyukuk)碑、阙特勤碑、毗伽可汗碑，据说是1890年芬兰人A.Geikel在蒙古鄂尔浑河东岸和硕柴达木(Khoshoo-tsaydam)发现的，另一种说法是1889年俄国学者雅德林采夫(N.Yadrintsev)发现的，由丹麦哥本哈根大学教授，比较语言学家汤姆森(Vilhelm Thomsen, 1842-1927)根据A.Geikel的报告在1892年最先解读，并出版了《鄂尔浑碑铭译解》(Deciphered Orkhon Inscriptions)。中国学者如沈曾植，虽然不懂突厥文，但根据西洋的释读，加上自己丰富的唐代文献知识，给予历史的解释，也作出了贡献。

¹⁴ 如何秋涛、张穆、李文田、沈曾植对于《皇元圣武亲征录》的校正等。

¹⁵ 火袄教(即波斯Zoroastrianism即琐罗亚斯德教)研究，在中国，最早曾有文廷式《纯常子枝语》中提到，也许是看到外国的研究。摩尼教的研究，最早是蒋斧在1909年发表的《摩尼教流行中国考略》，参看林悟殊《摩尼教研究之展望》，载《新史学》第七卷第一期，台北，1996。

¹⁶ 如日本最早进行元史研究的那珂通世，就通过奉湖广总督张之洞之命到日本考察学制的陈毅，收集中国学者所撰的《皇元圣武亲征记校正》、《元朝秘史李注补》等等，见田中正美撰《那珂通世》，载江上波夫编《东洋学の系谱》7页，大修馆，1992。

¹⁷ 王遽常《沈寐叟先生年谱》，台北，商务印书馆，1997，沈氏著有《元秘史笺注》十五卷、《蒙古源流笺注》八卷。

具、文献范围上看，这都是一个巨大的变化，并开拓了后来的学术新领域。

当晚清民初的中国，在政治、经济和文化上被迫日益进入国际的时候，学术界也发生了相当深刻的变化。正如前面所说，进入二十世纪二十年代前后，中国出现了一批最好的学者，他们不仅视野开阔，而且相当敏锐，无论是从哲学、文学而入史学的王国维，还是并未出洋却深谙国际学术潮流的陈垣，无论是主张全盘西化的胡适，还是恪守中国文化本位的陈寅恪，在学术上都在努力地“预流”，即进入“世界学术之新潮流”。恰好这个时候有所谓“四大发现”，尤其是敦煌文书的发现和**研究**，我们知道，当时王国维考证过敦煌的文献、陈垣编过《敦煌劫余录》，胡适和陈寅恪更是研究敦煌文书的大家，**这些努力便促成了中国学术国际化的第二波¹⁸**。这是由于，**第一，“胡语文献”刺激了语言学和历史学的结合**，比如陈寅恪以梵文、藏文和汉语对勘敦煌文献，**第二，敦煌出土的原始文献刺激了对传世文献的怀疑和辩证**，如胡适对禅宗文献的考证；**第三，敦煌这一非政治、宗教与文化中心区域所保存的不同语言的文献，引起了对中外交通、文化接触的研究兴趣**；**第四，各种非政府文书和非儒家文献的出现，引起了对经济史（如敦煌寺院经济）、宗教史（如三夷教、佛教和其他宗教）、地方史（如归义军、吐蕃、西域）的重视，促使历史研究领域传统的重心和边缘的彼此移动。**

那么，**第三波究竟是什么呢？我不敢断言，但我以为“从周边看中国”这一课题，也许在某种程度上可以刺激学术史的变化。**

首先，我注意到前两波的学术史变动中，关注的空间都在西北，与传统的丝绸之路重叠，却比较少地注意到东边，比如日本、琉球、朝鲜、越南等等，可是，事实上这些区域所存的有关中国的文献相当丰富，过去，吴晗先生曾经在《李朝实录》中辑出十几册有关中国的珍贵史料¹⁹，其实远不止这些，比如韩国景仁文化社影印的《韩国历代文集丛刊》近三千巨册，绝大多数是汉文书写，大致相当于明清时代的史料；而韩国东国大学校林基中教授和日本京都大学夫马进教授分别编辑的《燕行录全集》和《燕行录全集日本所藏编》一百零六册，几乎五万页的资料基本上是明清两代朝鲜人对于中国的观察和记录；朝鲜通信使在日本的多种日记和诗文，也记录了大量日本和朝鲜人对于中国的观察、想象和评价，而日本江户时代在长崎和其他地方接待清帝国船只的各种记录以及所谓唐通事的资料，像著名的《华夷变态》、《唐通事會所日録》、《古今华夷通商考》，以及寺岛安良《和汉三才图会》（1712）、中川忠英编的《清俗记闻》（1799）、冈田玉山的《唐土名胜图会》（1805），都呈现着已经分道扬镳的日本对中国的冷眼旁观，至于在越南留下的一些文献如所谓“汉喃文献”，也保留了相当多有关中国的记载。俗话说，“当局者迷，旁观者清”，也许这些资料能够让我们“跳出中国，又反观中国”，了解中国的真正特性。

其次，近代以来我们习惯了东西文化对比，从最初以时间先后而论优劣的“西学中源”说，到道器不同而论本末的“中学为体西学为用”说，再到五四时代以来的“东西文化”论争和“全盘西化”与“中国文化本位”之争，最后到如今的“东方主义”或“后殖民主义”理论，在讨论中国文化的时候，都是在“西方”这个巨大而朦胧的“他者”背景下立论的，冰炭不同、冷热迥异，让人看起来似乎很清晰，但是，这个看似清晰的文化描述中，却包含了相当朦胧的内容。追问下去，究竟这个“西方”是哪个“西方”，这个“东方”是那个“东方”？因此，也许以看似文化差异不大的周边为“他者”，倒更能看出它们与“自我”那些细微却又至关重要的文化差异来。比如，表面上同样信仰朱熹之学，但是固执地恪守朱子学说不动摇的朝鲜两班士人，和没有科举制度的日本儒家学者，以及在满清王朝的考据学和异

¹⁸ 陈寅恪在1942年写的《朱延丰〈突厥通考〉序》中，其实已经感觉这一波学术与清代西北史地之学的关联，并预见这一学术趋势的发展，他说“惟默察当今大势，吾国将来必循汉唐之轨辙，倾其全力经营西北，则可以无疑。考自古世局之转移，往往起于前人一时学术趋向之细微，迨至后来，遂若惊雷破柱，怒涛振海之不可御遏。”《寒柳堂集》163页，三联书店，2001。

¹⁹ 吴晗编《朝鲜李朝实录中的中国史料》，中华书局，1962。

族文化双重影响下的中国士大夫，却是很不一样的，在各种文献中常常看到朝鲜人对于清帝国学术和思想的讥讽，都能看到朝鲜和日本人因为蔑视中国文明沦丧而自称“中华”，看看这种差异，就能够更清楚地理解这个“东方”或者“东亚”，其实，并不是冈仓天心想象的“一个”²⁰。

再次，正如傅斯年在《历史语言研究所工作之旨趣》中所说的，史料的扩充和工具的改进，其实就是学术的进步。他说，（一）凡能直接研究材料，便进步；凡间接的研究前人所研究或前人所创造之系统，而不繁丰细密的参照所包含的事实，便退步。（二）凡一种学问能扩张他研究的材料便进步，不能的便退步。（三）凡一种学问能扩充他作研究时应用的工具的则进步，不能的则退步²¹。1928年的时候，他觉得，中国学术界“多不会解决史籍上的四裔问题的”，在边疆民族史地和中外关系史研究方面落后于外国的东方学家，在匈奴、鲜卑、突厥、回纥、契丹、女真、蒙古、满洲等问题上，就不曾像欧洲人那样注意，所以，亟须扩展研究的史料和使用的工具，借鉴比较历史和语言的方法。而且，他曾经设想中国研究，将来一步一步西去，到中央亚细亚，又设想在广州建“南洋学”中心，认为“南洋学应该是中国人的学问”。这是一个绝大的判断，前面我们提到中国学术国际化的第一波和第二波，正是像他所说，在一步一步西去，从敦煌、安西到中亚，重心在西北，偶尔也南下。可是，第三波是否应当转身向东呢？1938年，胡适在瑞士的 Zurich 代表中国第一次参加国际历史学大会，在题为《近年来所发现有关中国历史的新资料》（Recently Discovered Material for Chinese History）的英文论文中，提到当时他所想到的有关中国史最重要的史料，包括当时被称作大发现的甲骨卜辞、敦煌卷子、大内档案以及禁书逸书，而与这些大发现并列的，就是“日本朝鲜所存中国史料”²²，可是，近七十年过去了，除了吴晗后来在《李朝实录》中辑的资料之外，似乎有关中国的朝鲜汉文资料，尚没有特别好的整理和研究，至于日本有关中国的资料如长崎唐通事的资料，更很少看到人充分使用。当然，这个学术史的大趋势，并不是我能够预料的，不过，如果逐渐转身面向这个“周边”，将使得过去我们所不够重视的上述历史资料和周边各种语言，成为新的领域和新的工具，套一句经济学界常用的术语，也许，它将成为学术“新的增长点”²³。

二，中国立场：与域外中国学的比较

毫无疑问，注意“中国”的周边并不是中国文史学界的专利，甚至不是中国学者的发明²⁴，比中国学者更早，欧洲和日本的学者从十九世纪末二十世纪初就已经开始了有现代学术意味的“中国周边研究”，他们在这些研究中使用了历史学、文献学、考古学和语言学的综合方法，取得了相当大的成就。比如，法国的沙畹（E. Chavannes）、伯希和（P. Pelliot）、费瑯（G. Ferrand）、马伯乐（H. Maspero）等等，虽然通常我们都把他们称作“汉学家”，他们的关注中心确实也都在中国，但是，他们的研究范围却常常涉及四裔，从冯承钧所译的

²⁰ 冈仓天心《东洋の理想》，龟井胜一郎、宫川寅雄编《冈仓天心集》6-7页，东京，筑摩书房《明治文学全集》38，1968。

²¹ 傅斯年《历史语言研究所之工作旨趣》，《傅斯年全集》第四册，1304-1306页，联经出版事业公司。

²² 《胡适致傅斯年》（1938年9月2日），王汎森辑《史语所藏胡适与傅斯年来往函札》，载《大陆杂志》第九十三卷第三期，11页，1996年9月。

²³ 这一研究新领域的开拓，我以为引出的学术史变化，有可能是（A）语言学的重新重视、（B）非汉族的宗教史的重视、（C）不得不参考外国文献与研究论著、（D）重新界定与认识“中国”和“他国”、（E）学术和文化之民族主义与世界主义问题。在这一点上，其实东洋和西洋学者已经有一些做得很好了，参看 Colin Mackerras: *Western Images of China*, (Oxford University Press, 1989)，又可参看荒野泰典、石井正敏、村井章介等编《自意识と相互理解》，《アジアのなかの日本史》V，东京大学出版会，1993。

²⁴ 比如宫崎市定在1943年就写有《中国周边史总论》，讨论到朝鲜、满洲（即今东北）、蒙古、土耳其斯坦（即古西域、今新疆）、西藏、印度支那半岛，且不论其对“中国”的理解，他提倡的研究，在聚焦中心和研究目的上，显然与我们不同，见《宫崎市定全集》第19册，149-162页，岩波书店，1992。

《西域南海史地考证译丛》三大册中可以看到，题目常常出现的地名，是吐蕃、波斯、爪哇、真腊、安南、蒙古、占城、高昌、印度、吐谷浑、黎轩、罽宾，常常出现的宗教，是火袄教、摩尼教、景教、佛教以及后来的天主教和基督教，而常常出现的典籍，则是《诸蕃志》、《魏略西戎传》、《瀛涯胜览》、《真腊风土记》、《玄奘传》、《元秘史》、《长春真人西游记》、《宋云行纪》、《使印度记》等等²⁵。

受到欧洲的影响，明治以来学术近代转型后的日本中国学家更是关注所谓“满蒙回藏”以及中国周边。从兼治朝鲜与蒙古史的那珂通世（1851-1908）以后，明治、大正到昭和年间的日本学者，相当多的有这种关注中国四裔的趋向，著名的如白鸟库吉（1865-1942）、藤田丰八（1869-1928）、桑原鹭藏（1871-1931）、箭内互（1875-1926）、池内宏（1878-1953）、羽田亨（1882-1955）、和田清（1890-1963）等等，对于蒙古、朝鲜、安南、西域、西藏等等史地领域，都有相当出色的研究。其中，奠定日本明治时代东洋学的重要人物白鸟库吉，他关于突厥、乌孙、匈奴、粟特、康居以及朝鲜的研究，都赢得了欧洲学界相当高的评价，显示了当时日本中国学的新潮流。这使得日本学者对于进入世界学术潮流相当自信，他们甚至觉得，日本人比中国人懂得西洋新方法，又比西洋人更善于阅读东洋文献，所以，日本才应当是“东洋学”的前沿。这一潮流的参与者羽田亨曾经总结说，这一时期日本东洋学的进步，表现在（一）东方新的考古资料与诸文献的研究（如阙特勤碑）、（二）古代语文的发现（如回鹘文、吐火罗文、西夏文）、（三）西域各国的人种的研究、（四）各种非汉族宗教文献的新发现（如摩尼教经典）、（五）粟特文化对东方的影响、（六）回鹘文化的东渐。显然，这些新研究远远超越了传统“中国”的空间、历史、文化、典籍和语言，正如他所说的，明治大正年间，日本东洋学的发展，“不仅在美术史、风俗史、历史地理上的研究数量不少，更由于中亚所发现的史料，使得中国历史事实被阐明得更多……从上述取向可见，如果从事中国史特别是塞外地方的历史研究，晚近学者可以向何方努力，学术的大趋势究竟会走向何方”，其中他特别提到了“第一武器”即语言知识在新研究中的意义²⁶。这使得中国学者尽管不服气，却也不得不承认，“对于中国正统史事之研究，吾人当可上下其是非得失，相与周旋，至于西域、南海、考古美术之史的研究，则吾人相去远矣”²⁷。

这是当年席卷欧美、日本以及中国的国际学术潮流，看起来，这一潮流有它的同一性，似乎是世界一致的风尚。不过，仔细考察就知道，无论在欧洲还是在日本，这一趋向自有其政治史和思想史的特殊背景。以和中国最为密切的东邻日本为例，如果说，从学术史上来说，它是学术近代化与国际化的推动所致，充分表现了它的现代意味，那么，从思想史的角度来说，这一学术风气中恰恰在看似纯粹的学术取向、学术方法和学术话题背后，隐藏了日本对于中国的某种特殊意图。

从学术史的角度看，所谓日本这一学术趋向的现代意味是很清晰的。这一趋向导致了日本对于中国研究的传统出现了危机，过去对于中国的传统认识似乎被颠覆，过去理解中国的习惯方法被改变，正如子安宣邦所说的，既因为研究方法的现代性而充满对传统中国学术的轻蔑，引起“支那学”的自负，也由于西洋学术方法的盛行，颠覆了传统学术，导致了危机意识，“这一危机意识，是对支配了近代日本学术制度的西欧近代人文科学而来的”²⁸。但是，它确实促成了日本中国学的现代形态。明治以来，自认为与中国有久远关系的日本理应比欧洲人更能够掌握解释中国的主导权，因此，它努力通过（一）和西方学术一致的工具、

²⁵ 《西域南海史地考证译丛》第一卷、第二卷、第三卷，其中第一、二卷原为冯承钧自1926年以来陆续翻译的法国中国学家的论著1-9编，第三卷为后来辑在一起的六种专书和论文，商务印书馆，1995，1999。

²⁶ 羽田亨《晚近における东洋史学の进步》，原载《史林》（1918年）第三卷一、二号，后收入羽田亨《羽田博士史学论文集》，635-653页，京都，同朋社，1957，1975。

²⁷ 贺昌群《日本学术界之“支那学”研究》，原载1933年10月26日天津《大公报·图书副刊》第三期，收入《贺昌群文集》第一卷，447页，商务印书馆，2003。

²⁸ 子安宣邦《日本近代思想批判——国知の成立》，岩波书店“岩波现代文库：学术110”，115页，东京，2003

资料和方法，（二）从事西方学界感兴趣的领域、课题和问题，并且（三）采取和西方科学相同或相似的，被标榜为“中立”的客观主义立场，在研究方法上，促进日本“东洋学”的形成。而在研究视野上，他们也极力效仿欧洲来自传教士和人类学家的汉学传统²⁹，把“中国学”变成“东洋学”³⁰，即把领域逐渐从汉族中国，扩大到中国的周边，并有意识地把它作为与“西洋”相对的历史空间来研究³¹，一方面建立一个在历史、文化、民族上，可以和“西洋”并立，叫做“东洋”的历史论述空间，一方面又把日本从这个“东洋”里抽离出来，成为有两个“他者”的“本国”。所以，当那珂通世提出在日本本国史之外，分设“西洋史”和“东洋史”的时候，日本东洋学界，就把“东洋史”从“中国”扩大到“四裔”，“中止了日本历来仅仅以中国史为中心的偏狭，而必须包括东洋诸国、东洋诸民族的历史”³²。明治大正时期，日本各种如《东洋哲学》等刊物的学术关注，白鸟库吉等学者的学术训练，和各个学者多选择以满、蒙、回、藏为主的学术课题，都现实了这种追求现代性、融入国际潮流的趋向。

然而，从思想史的角度看，这一学术转向背后却隐藏了很深的政治背景。明治以来逐渐膨胀的日本民族主义，以所谓“亚细亚主义”的表象出现，日本对于过去在亚洲最大的对手中国，重新采取一种俯视的眼光来观察。其中，最有影响的就是不再把过去的“中华帝国”看成是庞大的“一个”，而是借用欧洲流行的“民族国家”新观念，把过去所谓的“中国”解释成不同的王朝，这些王朝只是一个传统的帝国，而实际的“中国”只应该是汉族为主体，居住在长城以南、藏疆以东的一个国家，而中国周边的各个民族应当是文化、政治、民族都不同的共同体³³。自从明治时代“国权扩张论”的膨胀，借了安全和利益的名义，对于中国以及周边的领土要求越来越强烈。因此，在明治时代的日本中国学研究者，对于中国“四裔”出现了异乎寻常的热情，对朝鲜、蒙古、满洲、西藏、新疆都有格外的关注，而不再把中国各王朝看成是笼罩边疆和异族的同一体³⁴。正如日本学者所说，“在日清战争爆发的刺激下，

²⁹ 桑原鹭藏《支那学研究者の任务》一文中，作为学习的典范，他列举了一些西洋中国学家，如美国的 Rockhill（研究西藏和蒙古佛教、文化、地理及研究《诸蕃志》、《岛夷志略》等有关南海交通文献）、英国的 Phillips（研究荷兰占领时期的台湾史及明代中国与南洋交通）、Wylie（精通蒙古文、梵文、满文，研究传教士对中国的影响）、Legge（研究和翻译中国经典）、俄国的 Bretschneider（研究蒙古时代），并且检讨“我国（日本）最大的失误，在与我国的支那学研究，还没有充分使用科学的方法，甚至可以质疑的是，也许还在无视这些科学的方法，然而，科学的方法并不只是西洋学问应当应用，毫无疑问，日本的支那学研究也是应当依据的”，《桑原鹭藏全集》第一卷，591-594 页，岩波书店，1968。

³⁰ 在讨论白鸟库吉的史学趋向时，桑田六郎、植村清二、石田干之助曾说到白鸟库吉的理念“不是中国史，而是东洋史”，参看吉川幸次郎编《东洋学の创始者たち》，22 页，讲谈社，1976。据泷川龟太郎的回忆，市村瓚次郎早在明治二十年（1887）大学毕业的谢恩会上讲话，就批评从来的东洋学中未开拓的地方很多，如所谓中国学家的中国史研究中不免就疏漏了自来中国与外国的关系，而中岛敏在讨论市村瓚次郎的时候，也特意讲到他在明治三十年（1897）出版的《东洋史要》两卷，是从“中国史到东洋史”，他在次年（1898）出版的《东洋史统》第一卷凡例中也开明综义地说到这一点，见江上波夫编《东洋学の系谱（1）》，28、31 页，大修馆书店，1992。

³¹ 像白鸟库吉的志向，就是要使日本的东洋学，超过欧洲，所以他在若干年后写的《满鲜史研究の三十年》中，就说到，“为了不输给欧美学者，我们建立了规模很大的东洋历史学会，与实业家、政治家携手，提倡根本的东洋研究的必要性，特别是当时欧美人在东洋研究方面，多在中国、蒙古、中亚，确实其中有非常权威的成就，但是，在满洲和朝鲜研究上，却尚有未开拓处，因此，我们日本人必须要在欧洲人没有进入的满洲、朝鲜的历史地理方面，有自己的成果”。转引自松村润《白鸟库吉》，载江上波夫编《东洋学の系谱（1）》45-46 页。

³² 江上波夫编《东洋学の系谱（1）》，3 页。

³³ 例如和田清在《支那及び支那人という語の本义について》（原载 1942 年 1 月与 2 月的《实验医疗》十九卷 1、2 期，后收入其《东亚史论叢》，生活社，1942）中就认为“蒙古、满洲、西藏在过去，与中国并非一国，人种不同，语言不同，文字和宗教也不同，风俗习惯也不同，历史和传统更是有差异，这从满洲兴起的大清帝国统一才归到一起，没有理由把这些一样地说成是‘支那’或‘支那人’，这无需论证，不言自明”（202-203 页）

³⁴ 参看桑兵《国学与汉学》第一章《四裔偏向与本土回应》，浙江人民出版社，1999。

（日本）国民对亚洲大陆越来越关心，这一历史观念，就是在日本作为近代国家急剧上升的明治二十年代，面对西洋，日本作为亚洲民族的自觉日益高涨，面对西洋文化，出现主张独特的东洋文化的时代思潮的背景下形成的”³⁵。当时，这种军国主义的政治行为，激活了学术领域的研究兴趣，而这一学术领域的研究取向，又逐渐变成一种理解中国的普遍观念³⁶，这种观念一直发展到二战前后，便在日本历史学界形成热门话题，其中最有代表性的，是1923年出版的矢野仁一《近代支那论》，这部书开头就是《支那无国境论》和《支那非国论》两篇文章，矢野认为，中国不能称为所谓民族国家，满、蒙、藏等原来就非中国领土，如果要维持大中国的同一性，根本没有必要推翻满清王朝，如果要建立民族国家，则应当放弃边疆地区的控制，包括政治上的领属和历史上的叙述³⁷。

学术史上的国际视野和现代方法，与思想史上的民族立场和论述策略，在这里纠缠不清，那么，现在我们讨论“从周边看中国”，是否也会遇到这种问题？也许可以说远一些，这涉及到一个有关传统学术研究的根本问题，就是传统文史研究的意义究竟在哪里？我觉得，除了给人以知识的飨宴，训练人们的智力之外，一个很重要的意义就是建立对国族（是文化意义上的国家，而不是政治意义上的政府）的认知，过去的传统在一个需要建立历史和形塑现在的国度，它提供记忆、凝聚共识、确立认同，美国学者芭芭拉·塔克曼（Barbara W. Tuchman）在《从史著论史学》（Practicing History）中在提到以色列为什么对考古有特别的兴趣时，说“一个民族为了觉得自己是国家，不但必须有独立和领土，并且还要有历史”³⁸。如果说，明治时代的日本学界，无论是有意还是无意地把中国放在东洋，而把东洋的各个民族历史文化放在和中国同等的位置，加以重视和研究，既是吻合现代的民族国平等家观念，又是隐含了对中国的政治图谋，那么，我们现在提倡“从周边看中国”，又如何确立我们和日本中国学相区别的立场呢？

我们可以说一段往事。中国现代文史之学，从一开始就与民族主义的立场和世界主义的潮流始终分不开，如果说梁启超《新史学》标志着现代作为科学的历史学的开端，那么他在这篇宣言式的文章开篇所谈的爱国心，恰恰就是文史之学的民族立场和国族认同。在九一八事变后，傅斯年专门写了一部《东北史纲》，我们知道傅斯年以提倡“史料即史学”这种现代学术的观念著称，但是，尽管他和日本学者一样，相当关注“虏学”即所谓“四裔”的研究，但是，在这部书中，他却专门驳斥日本学者“满蒙非中国论”（如白鸟库吉、箭内互、中山久太郎、矢野仁一等），尤其是反驳矢野1931年发表在《外交时报》的《满蒙藏は支那の领土に非る论》，他坚持用“东北”而不用“满洲”，认为这是“专图侵略或瓜分中国而造

³⁵ 江上波夫编《东洋学の系谱（1）》，3页。

³⁶ 比如，1894年即甲午战争那一年，日本军队参谋本部出版了《满洲地志》，稍后在学界就出现了如田中萃一郎的《满洲国号考》（1903）、足立栗园、平田骨仙的《满洲古今史》（1904），1908年，白鸟库吉向满铁总裁后藤新平建议设立调查部，而学术界中如箭内互、津田左右吉、池内宏等就加入了对满洲的调查，至于京都学派的内藤湖南，也对满洲历史文化有异常的兴趣。而随着日本对朝鲜的侵略和占领，在当时的学术界，也出现了大量关于朝鲜的论著，自林泰辅的《朝鲜史》（1892）、《朝鲜近代史》（1901）之后，有坪井九马三、白鸟库吉、池内宏、今西龙、原田淑人等的大量研究。参看和田清《我が国に於ける满蒙史研究の发达》，在《东亚史论藪》241-268页，生活社，1942

³⁷ 矢野仁一《近代支那论》，弘文堂书房，1923；参看五井直弘《东洋史学与马克思主义》，载其《中国古代史论稿》，58页，姜镇庆、李德龙译，北京大学出版社，2001。五井氏指出，随着二战时期日本对中国的占领，激发了日本当时的东洋史热，矢野的这种论点越来越流行，例如《世界历史大系》（1933-1936年，平凡社，26册）和《岩波讲座东洋思潮》（1934-1936年，岩波书店，全18卷）就是这一潮流中的产物。此期间，又相继出版了池内宏《满鲜史研究》（冈书院，1933）、冈崎文夫《支那史概说》上（弘文堂书房，1935）、桔朴《支那社会研究》（日本评论社，1936）等等，均多少有这些观点的影子。1943年，在第二次世界大战的关键时刻，矢野更在广岛大学的系列报告中，便提出了超越中国，以亚洲为单位的叙述理论，此年以《大东亚史の构想》为题出版矢野仁一《大东亚史の构想》，31页以下，东京，目黑书店，1944。又，关于这一时期日本中国学研究与日本民族主义政治的关系，还可以参看当时东亚研究所编《异民族の支那统治史》，大日本雄辩会讲谈社，东京，1944-1945。

³⁸ 芭芭拉·塔克曼（Barbara W. Tuchman）《从史著论史学》（Practicing History）（梅寅生译，久大文化公司，台北，1990），165页。

之名词，毫无民族的、地理的、政治的、经济的根据”³⁹。很显然，同样是讨论“东北”或者“满洲”，中国和日本学者立场如此大相径庭，无疑告诉我们文史研究尤其是历史研究，不得不面对一个各自不同的学术策略与思想立场问题。正是在这一点上，我们要提倡“批评的中国学研究”，因为我们常常会忘记，尽管他们研究中国以及中国周边的历史与文化，但是，欧美也罢，日本也罢，他们的“中国研究”，并不应当算作“中国的”学术史与思想史，而是“外国的”学术史和思想史，应当把它们看作“外国学”，并且放入它们自身的政治、社会和历史语境中去讨论。

我们提倡“从周边看中国”，并不是打算重拾过去欧美和日本学者对满蒙回藏等等的学术兴趣，他们对日本、朝鲜、琉球、越南、蒙古、印度等等地区历史文化的研究，我们可以归入“区域研究”之中，在现在看来，这种研究可能有超越现代的“民族国家”的空间限制的意义，使历史文化空间超越政治领属空间，从而认识历史与文化交流 and 接触的真相；然而，我们提倡的“从周边看中国”却仍然是聚焦中国史，在“中国”这个近世形成的文明空间和现代已经成型的政治国家，仍然在文化上和政治上强有力地笼罩的情况下，以中国这个“民族国家”为中心的历史研究，仍然有它的意义。我曾经在一篇论文中说到，超越民族国家，从民族国家中把历史拯救出来，这是以欧洲历史为背景的后现代思路，在中国未必行得通。为什么？一方面中国和欧洲不同，中国的政治疆域和文化空间是从中心向边缘弥漫开来的，即使不说三代，从秦汉时代起，“车同轨，书同文，行同伦”，语言、伦理、风俗和政治的同一性就开始把这个空间逐渐凝固起来，特别是在宋代，由于国际形势的变化，其实已经形成了中国独特的近世“民族国家”，这与欧洲认为“民族原本就是人类历史上晚近的新现象”不同⁴⁰；另一方面中国和日本也不同，日本的单一民族、语言、文化，与其在范围明确的空间重叠，因此在形成近代民族国家的过程中，不会有民族、空间、文化和语言的复杂问题，而中国却在近代民族国家的建立中，始终要在传统王朝的延长线上，继承变动的又是传统的遗产。因此，把传统帝国与现代国家区分为两个时代的理论，并不符合中国历史，也不符合中国的国家意识观念和国家生成历史，在中国，并非从帝国到民族国家，而是在无边“帝国”的意识中有有限“国家”的观念，在有限的“国家”认知中保存了无边“帝国”的想象，近代民族国家恰恰从传统中央帝国中蜕变出来，近代民族国家依然残存着传统中央帝国意识，从而是一个纠缠共生的历史⁴¹。

传统文史的研究并不完全是一种“无国界”的普遍性科学，现代学术的转型与民族国家重新界定和重新建构始终同步，文史研究不是在破坏一种认同、一种观念、一种想象，就是在建构一种认同、一种观念、一种想象，特别是当你研究的是一个关于民族和文化的传统时候尤其如此。按照当时的认识，它是一个“公共的信仰”，也是一个“认同的基础”。当年丁文江发表《中央研究院的使命》一文，曾经这样阐发文史研究的意义，“中国的不容易统一，最大的原因是我们没有公共的信仰，这种信仰的基础，是要建筑在我们对于自己的认识上，历史与考古是研究我们民族的过去，语言人种及其他的社会科学是研究我们民族的现在，把我们民族的过去与现在都研究明白了，我们方能够认识自己”，他的结论是“用科学方法研究我们的历史，才可造成新信仰的基础”⁴²。所谓“(我们)民族的过去”、“(我们)民族的现在”和“(我们的)公共的信仰”，常常并不能共享。因此，同样研究周边的历史文化，“中”与“外”是不同的，如果说他们关注的是“周边”，而我们关注的却是“中国”。

或许，关注东亚、中亚、西亚、南亚是一百年前欧美、日本学术界的时尚，或许，超越

³⁹ 见《东北史纲》3页，中研院历史语言研究所，1932。

⁴⁰ 比如霍布斯邦(Eric J.Hobsbawm)《民族与民族主义》8页，他已经注意到这“是源于特定地域及时空环境下的历史产物”，所以，在讨论到民族国家的语言问题时，他也说到“不过中国的情况是一大例外”，李金梅译本，75页，麦田出版，台北，1997。

⁴¹ 葛兆光《重建关于“中国”的历史论述》，载《二十一世纪》2005年8月号，总第90期。

⁴² 文载《东方杂志》第三十二卷第二号(1935年1月16日)。

民族国家，把各个不依国界的区域当作研究空间，是当今的风气，但是，理论虽然不是陈酒越旧越值钱，但也绝不是时装越新越好销，当“历史上的中国”仍然是一个有关文明和传统的意义空间的时候，重建以周边（日、韩、越、印、阿、藏、蒙等）为“他者”的新参照系统，来认识历史意义上的文化中国，既可以使传统历史与文化的研究具有确立认同之意义，也可以使人们可以清晰地区分一个移动的历史中国和一个现实的政治中国。同时，我们从“周边”的反应来观察一个历史上文化与传统曾经不断变化的“历史中国”，其实，也是试图对“现实中国”自身有一个新认识。正如我在前面说的那样，也许现在是一个“需要多面镜子的时代”，周边各个区域长期以来对于中国这个“庞大的他者”的不同认识，可能恰恰是多面洞烛细微、使中国认识更加准确的镜子，与这些和中国亲密接触、看上去有些“同质”的文明体比起来，那个“异质”性似乎太大的“西方”，似乎只是一面朦胧含糊的铜镜，虽然看得见整体中国文化的轮廓，却怎么也看不清具体文化中国的细部。

三、交错的文化史：不必划地为牢

我们关注的重心在中国，也试图以“中国的”文化和历史作为研究的主要领域，但并不是说我们想划地为牢，把视线集中在传统中国的自我认识上，我们也想研究中国以及周边各个文明体在文学、宗教、学术、艺术等方面的彼此互动。以前，比较宗教学的创始人缪勒（F. Max Müller）引用过歌德的一句名言，“只知其一，便一无所知”（He who knows one, knows none），这对于我们永远是一句箴言，尽管作为中国学者，“从周边看中国”是我们的研究重心，但了解彼此文化之间的交错同样应当关注。古代禅师有一句话说，“一波才动万波随”，近世中国和周边的关系也是这样，只是我们不希望把这种接触、交错和影响，变成一种简单而呆板的“牛比马大，马比羊大、羊比猫大”式的比较，而是希望透过文学、宗教、学术、艺术以及语言的具体接触史，看看这一文化的大链条，究竟是怎样一环扣一环地连接起来的。

1940年，宫崎市定在《东方的文艺复兴和西方的文艺复兴》中曾经提出一个假设，在十五至十六世纪的欧洲，很多绘制圣母的形象，例如香奇博物馆藏十五世纪圣母像、安格兰·夏伦敦（Enguerand Charonton）与让·贝来阿尔（Jean Perreale）的圣母像等，可能已经受到了东方观音形象的影响，如瓜子形的长椭圆脸，合十的动作等等。此后，还有人指出，正是因为观音和圣母形象的如此接近，当日本长崎的天主教徒受到迫害转入秘密之后，来自中国泉州制作的陶瓷观世音像尤其是童子拜观世音像，就曾经替代了圣母玛利亚的塑像，被心中仍然向往天主的日本信徒膜拜⁴³。而1943年，方豪先生则写过一篇文章，讨论“跨越十字架”这种来自日本禁抑天主教信仰的“蹈绘”方式，是怎样传入中国，影响雍正以后的清帝国，并被中国的官府用来作为考验中国信教者的方法⁴⁴。在这两个例子中，“圣母形象”和“蹈绘考验”就贯穿了若干个有趣的文化史链条。

其实，在近世中国与周边，知识、思想和信仰彼此关联，形成或隐或显的大链条的例子很多，我们不妨再看三例。第一个涉及宗教史和艺术史，关于明代中国国家祭典尤其是文庙祭祀孔子的乐舞，根据比利时学者钟鸣旦的研究，万历年间的宗室朱载堉在《乐律全书》中曾经对于这些乐舞有过富于创造力的阐述和改造，虽然它未能真正在国家祭典上得到实现，但是却远传到欧洲，因为它引起了耶稣会士法国人钱德明（Joseph Marie Amiot，1718-1793）的注意，最早的一批有关朱载堉的舞蹈图示被收录在 *Mémoires concernant l'histoire, les*

⁴³ 宫崎市定《东洋のルネッサンスと西洋のルネッサンス》，《宫崎市定全集》第19册，33-36页，岩波书店，1992；中译本《东方的文艺复兴和西方的文艺复兴》载中国科学院历史研究所编译组译《宫崎市定论文选集》下卷，60页，商务印书馆，1965。

⁴⁴ 方豪《清代禁抑天主教所受日本之影响》，1943年发表，后收入《方豪文录》，47-66页，北平上智编译馆，1948。

sciences, les arts, les moeurs, les usages, etc. des Chinois (Paris: Nyon, 1780) 一书中, 而且他还把总数超过 1400 页的朱载堉舞蹈图示的绘本送到了欧洲⁴⁵, 究竟这些整齐有序规模庞大的国家乐舞以及它背后的儒家涵义, 对欧洲有什么影响, 这还需要研究; 无独有偶, 同样是万历年间, 国家对于文庙祭祀儒家先祖孔子的乐舞, 曾经由一个归依了天主教的著名学者李之藻 (1565—1630) 进行修订, 他的《泮宫礼乐疏》(1618, 1619) 前几章讨论乡校 (即泮宫) 中的圣祠, 对于祭器、祭典上的音乐和颂歌都有记载和讨论, 而且其中记载了三套、每套 32 个姿势的大夏舞。然而, 更有趣的是, 李之藻的《泮宫礼乐疏》中记载的乐舞, 又在 1672 年, 被明亡以后流亡到日本的虔诚儒家学者朱舜水, 作为基本依据, 用来为水户藩德川家圀制定祭孔典礼, 因而成为后来日本孔庙祭祀乐舞的格局⁴⁶。从一个乐舞传播的过程中, 我们似乎可以看到文化接触中的“东山钟鸣, 西山磬应”现象。**第二个涉及朝鲜天主教传教史和政治史**, 在李朝朝鲜, 十八世纪末十九世纪初虽然有像李承熏这样受过北京的西洋传教士汤士选 (Alexander Gouvea) 的洗礼, 带了宗教书籍、十字架、天主教绘画等回国的朝鲜天主教徒, 在两班阶层中开始传教活动, 但是, 另外一个重要的宗教领袖, 居然是来自中国苏州的中国人周文谟 (Jacques Vellozo), 是他奉汤士选之命, “约会边境, 扮作驿夫, 昼伏夜行, 混入国都, 多年匿置, 为伊等之渠帅”⁴⁷, 而且进入上层政治圈, 向正祖大王的庶弟之子常溪君的妻子宋氏、媳妇申氏传教, 并深得宋氏信仰, 而宋氏即后来在 1849 年即位的哲宗的祖母。在这样的活动中, 他把天主教在朝鲜的传教演变成了一个国际性的政治活动⁴⁸, 而且事涉西洋、清帝国、朝鲜王国三方, 并在某种程度上激起了后来影响极大的“辛酉大教难”, 而这一事件在后来, 则间接影响了嘉庆十年 (1805) 清帝国对天主教传教的严厉禁令⁴⁹。**第三个来自朝鲜赴清帝国贺岁使和赴日本通信使的资料**, 对于取代明帝国的大清帝国的文化和政治, 到底朝鲜人如何看? 面对日本德川时代的文化, 朝鲜人究竟采取什么态度? 政治上和文化上逐渐强盛起来的日本人对于中华文化的发源地中国和转运地朝鲜, 究竟是什么态度? 在现存数以百计的《燕行录》和有关诗文中, 我们可以看到朝鲜人怀着对大明帝国的感情、对传统中华文明的崇敬和对朱子学说的执着, 他们对清帝国相当蔑视和失望, 这促成了朝鲜朱子学说的延续和坚守; 而通过朝鲜通信使的日记和诗文, 我们又知道他们面对日本的时候, 尽管在政治上他们对日本的虎视眈眈相当紧张和不安, 但是在文化上他们又以“中华文明”代言人自居, 对于日本有着一一种无端的自负和傲慢; 而日本人呢? 通过现存大量的《唐风说书》、唐通事资料等等, 我们知道他们通过长崎这个通商窗口, 通过对大量到达长崎的清国商人的讯问和调查, 通过各种唐船舶来的书籍, 他们对于中国的政治、经济、军事以及文化状况有了相当了解, 因而在政治和文化上都对当时的清帝国渐渐形成了一直延续到近世的偏见和轻视⁵⁰。

长期以来, 我们的文史哲各个学科, 不仅仿佛“铁路警察, 各管一段”似地各自画地为牢, 形成了各自的边界和壁垒, 而且由于中国和外国和研究界限, 使得我们的研究仿佛也有了国界和海关一样, 不办护照没有签证就绝不能出境, 这也许在某种程度上限制了我们的

⁴⁵ 钟鸣旦 (Nicolas Standaert): *Ritual Dances and Their Visual Representations in the Ming and the Qing*, *The East Asian Library Journal* (Princeton Univ.) XII,1 (Spring 2006), pp. 68-181.

⁴⁶ 参看林俊宏《朱舜水在日本的活动及其贡献研究》第四章, 200-209 页, 秀威资讯科技出版, 台北, 2004。

⁴⁷ 这是朝鲜李朝政府在嘉庆六年岁末 (1802) 给清廷报告中的话, 见李晚秀《轺车集》, 载林基中编《燕行录全集》第六十卷, 533-540 页。韩国, 东国大学校韩国文学研究所, 1992。

⁴⁸ 参看浦川和三郎《朝鲜殉教史》关于这一事件的研究, 东京, 国书刊行会, 1973;

⁴⁹ 参看葛兆光《邻居家的陌生人——清中叶朝鲜使者眼中北京的西洋传教士》, 载《中国文化研究》2006 年 3 期。1-12 页。

⁵⁰ 参看葛兆光:《从朝天到燕行——十七世纪中叶后东亚文化共同体的解体》, 载《中华文史论丛》2006 年 1 期, 总 81 期; 葛兆光:《地虽近心渐远——17 世纪中叶以后的中国朝鲜和日本》, 载《台湾东亚文明研究学刊》第三卷第一期总第五期, 台湾大学人文社会高等研究院, 2006 年 6 月。

视野。可是，自古以来，尤其是近世的中国和周边，就算是严厉的海禁时期也罢，彼此的来往是很多的，文学、宗教、学术、艺术等等，常常并不需要护照和签证，自己就越境出界，构成交错的图景。只是需要注意的是，文化河流漫堤而出顺势流到各个区域，这个时候，它会随着地势高低起伏的变化，改变流向，或急或缓，有时候积成大湖，有时候变成急流，一些看似相同的宗教、思想、学术和艺术，在不同区域生根，却会结出不同的果实，全看各地的风土适宜如何，因此，我很赞同思想史理论家斯金纳（Quentin Skinner）的说法，他说，需要讨论的不是悬置在抽象半空中的，而是落实在语境中的思想（Ideas in Context）⁵¹。由于各自语境也就是风俗、观念、组织和宗教等等生活世界的不同，传来的文学、宗教、艺术和学术也显出不同的面貌来。

这里再举思想和宗教方面的两个例子。**第一个例子关涉到程朱理学。**当程朱理学受到考据学的挑战和科举制的庇佑，从而既在知识上失去了权威性，又在思想上失去了生命力的清帝国，越来越成为僵化的教条和虚伪的包装时，这个时候理学在李朝朝鲜，却被士大夫真诚而坚决地捍卫着，为什么？很简单，因为朝鲜当时有“两班制度”，就是在朝鲜人中，只有世家子弟才有参加科举的权力，由于只有世家子弟可以参加科举考试，就形成了一个不大流动的特权阶层，由于特权阶层的自豪和自负，使他们对属于自己的文化和经验捍卫特别固执，而理学就是他们自认为纯正正统的学问。可是在德川时代的日本，正如日本学者渡边浩所指出的，由于日本没有科举制度，士人不可能全靠这一学问安身立命，因而理学并不能成为绝对的和普遍的意识形态，由于日本本身的民众文化并不具备如此讲究日常道德和伦理秩序的传统，因而理学虽然经由藤原惺窝和林罗山等提倡而成为德川时代的上层思想，但是却无力渗透到生活世界⁵²。同样是朱子学说，在三个不同的文化背景下，却命运如此不同。**第二个例子来自近代佛教史。**当晚清中国的佛教在自身腐化、政府压制和现代科学等三方面的影响下越来越衰败的时候，日本佛教虽然也受到明治维新“神佛分离”等政策的打压，却因为他们自身的迅速转型，一方面以国家主义的立场、世界主义的途径以及外出布教的策略，一方面改变佛教的形态，开放畜发带妻、食肉饮酒，反而开始兴盛。19世纪末20世纪初日本佛教重新出发，随着殖民主义的扩张，传到朝鲜与台湾，但是在朝鲜、台湾引起的既有日本化的影响，也有佛教民族主义思潮的反弹。同时，日本佛教也影响到中国大陆，但是一个直接的后果却是刺激了中国佛学尤其是唯识学的复兴，而这一复兴的契机却和日本布教的意图完全不同，按照杨文会、章太炎、宋恕和梁启超等人的说法，除了振兴中国自己的佛教之外，一是为着理解西方的科学和哲学的需要，一是为了刺激起精进的民族意志和高扬“群治”的社会精神⁵³。

四、结语：新资料、新方法和新典范——文史研究的展望

2000年秋天我到欧洲访问，曾经在荷兰莱顿大学汉学院参观了他们关于荷兰人早年在日本长崎绘制的各种图像与日本开国时期的图像资料，也和主持其事的著名学者许理和（Erich Zürcher）交谈。这一经验给我印象很深，使我联想到美国斯坦福大学的胡佛研究中心有关中国近现代文献的收藏，想到日本东京大学的史料编纂处和东洋文化研究所的中国绘画资料库等等。我们知道，**在文史研究领域，任何一个有意义的研究，都是从发现新资料开始的。**在中国，最近几十年里有大家所熟知的包括马王堆、张家山、郭店、上博、走马楼

⁵¹（英）玛利亚·露西亚·帕拉蕾丝—伯克编《新史学：自白与对话》，彭刚译，271页，北京大学出版社，2006。

⁵² 渡边浩《日本德川时代初期朱子学的蜕变》，中文本，载《史学评论》第五期，205页，台北，1983。

⁵³ 参看葛兆光《西潮却自东瀛来——东本愿寺与中国近代佛教复兴》，《葛兆光自选集》，广西师范大学出版社，1997；《互为背景与资源——从近代东亚佛教史讨论文化传统的普遍性与特殊性》，《中国典籍与文化论丛》第七辑，2002。

一直到里耶、悬泉置的战国秦汉竹简的发现，也有包括陆续发现的石刻资料的收集，还有由于研究视野转变之后，日益显出重要性的民众日常生活资料的引进，将来还会有“周边”关于中国的历史资料的研读。资料仿佛是建楼的基础，没有一个坚实的基础，就好像在沙上建房，我以为，中国的文史研究机构，当然需要在资料库的建设上下功夫，第一，尽可能收集和保存新的文献资料，这是“预流”的基础条件，第二，研究文史的文献资料不局限于传统的经典，也包括民间资料，不局限于文字文献，也包括图像与影像，不局限于中国的资料，也包括外国的资料，这是“拓宽文史研究视野”的必须，第三，尽可能形成一个自己的有特色的资料库，因为天下文献资料太多，没有什么研究中心可以包罗无遗。

当我们有了新资料之后，如果还有新的方法，这些新资料将会向我们提出很多过去没有想到的新问题。无论这些问题将来被证实，还是被证伪，它都将引起学术研究典范的新变化。就像甲骨卜辞的发现，经过王国维《先公先王考》等论文的考释，形成了地下资料与传世文献互证的两重证据法，就像敦煌禅宗文献的发现，经过胡适《荷泽大师神会传》等论文的阐发，形成了对教内文献“攀龙附凤”的怀疑，剥开了子孙炮制传灯系谱的伪饰一样。新资料刺激起对新方法的需求，新方法又引出一个新典范的建立，这是一个必然的，也是最容易出现的学术新变。

在本文的最后，我想再回顾一下学术史。当1902年梁启超写下《新史学》和《论中国学术思潮变迁之大势》这些不同于传统中国历史学的著作，宣告新的研究典范的开端时，也许他主要依靠的资源是西洋和东洋近代历史学的启迪⁵⁴，而1919年胡适写下《中国哲学史大纲》上卷，成为中国哲学研究的“开山”，并成为新的典范的时候，也许他主要也是用的西方哲学研究的模式⁵⁵。他们之所以可能开创新典范，一方面是因为晚清民初中国学术大转型时期的特殊条件，即传统的文史研究刚好由于外来的新观念和新方法的冲击而来了一个大转向，他们适逢其时，一下子就站在了学术潮流的前列，但另一方面，他们也恰好顺应了当时中国需要建立自己的学术统绪和文化解释，以树立自己的民族自信心的契机，所以他们看来只是学术的研究，却介入了民族国家重建的主流⁵⁶。我们现在是否能有这样的时代机遇和国际潮流？我不敢作无根据的预言，但正如我一开始说的，真正成为后来学人可以效仿的典范的学术成就，却是在四大发现之后，1920年代到1930年代，清华学校研究院和历史语言研究所殷商甲骨研究上古史、以汉简和敦煌文献研究中古史、以大内档案研究近世史，追踪新史料开拓新领域，**在文史研究的工具和资料上，在文史研究的视野上，在文史研究的方法上，都努力推陈出新。**这些“新”资料、“新”方法、新“典范”，伴随着他们面对新世界而产生的新问题，开出了中国文史研究的新局面，正如前面我们看到的陈寅恪《陈垣〈敦煌劫余录〉序》所说的，“一时代之学术，必有其新材料与新问题。取用此材料，以研求问题，则为此时代学术之新潮流。治学之士，得预于此潮流者，谓之预流（借用佛教初果之名），其未得预者，谓之未入流”，正是因为“预流”，这两个研究机构才成为中国学界乃至国际学界引人瞩目的中心。

差不多七十年过去了，清华学校研究院已经成为历史，虽然被学术史的热心者常常提起，但是往往只是作为针砭当下学术体制的样板，四大导师也好像是遥远的学术史上不可企及的背影；而中研院历史语言研究所则迁到了台北，在日益追求本土化的潮流中，研究中国的传统文史之学不仅因为缺乏真切关怀，而有些风雨飘摇，也因为学术群体的缩小和历史资料的

⁵⁴ 梁启超《新史学》、《论中国学术思潮变迁之大势》，见《梁启超全集》第三卷，736-753页，561-615页，北京出版社，1999。

⁵⁵ 余英时《学术思想史的创建及流变》指出胡适的这部书“在于超越乾嘉各家个别的考证成就，把经史研究贯连成有组织的系统，运用的是西方哲学史研究方法。甚至本书最后还进行明显的评判部分——即以实验主义观点来批判古人的学说”，因此，胡适此书是“典范”（paradigm），这个所谓的“典范”，就是内容是中国的，形式和概念上是取西方的。见《古今论衡》第三辑，68-69页，台北，1999。

⁵⁶ 所以梁启超反复说，学术思想尤其是历史学与民族主义精神有关，是爱国心之源泉，能够促进国民团结和群治进化，见《新史学》，《梁启超全集》736页，《论中国学术思潮变迁之大势》，同上561页。

缺乏，变得很难成为中心。那么，现在的中国大陆的文史学界，是否能够在国际国内形势越来越复杂的背景下重新出发，对传统中国文史有新的研究，不仅成为新的“国际学术潮流”的预流者，而且成为对中国文史的诠释有话语权力的研究中心呢？

2006年10月3日—22日

初稿于北京——上海

Trends, Positions and Methods:
Seeking New Perspectives in Humanities Research

by Ge Zhaoguang

IAHS, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

【Abstract】 This article reviews intellectual history in China and discusses how Chinese scholars, by modifying their views, positions and methods, can help open up new vistas in traditional humanities research. In the article, the present author proposes that the scholars should 1) view China within the frame of neighboring countries so as to change the Chinese people's self-concepts, which were formed in the solely egocentric and the solely West-oriented periods, 2) take into consideration the work of overseas sinologists and see how their work differs from ours in terms of research approaches and methods so as to establish our own positions and form our own problem-consciousness, and 3) avoid bias and stereotypes in selecting research materials and foci through interdisciplinary analyses of different cultures. It is hoped that these ideas will be of some help in expanding the breadth of traditional humanities research, and in seeking new materials, methods, and models in the studies of Chinese history and culture.

【Key words】 humanities research; history of learning; viewing China within the frame of neighboring countries; overseas sinology; interdisciplinary analyses of different cultures.

I. Introduction: What Does Intellectual History Tell Us?

In the last decade of the 20th century, intellectual history emerged as a popular research subject in contemporary China. But the significance of such research lies neither in the description or summary of the academic achievements of certain scholars, nor in the attempt to establish certain origins of academia. On the contrary, the main purposes are to discuss 1) how traditional scholarship has modernized under the influence of both the West and the East, 2) how Western modern research has given birth to new perspectives and methods in political, cultural, and academic contexts within China, and 3) how modern scholarship, in terms of research perspectives, materials, tools and methods, has influenced the way we see ancient China and the way we conceive of China's future. These three issues are of crucial importance in that they can determine whether the study of the history of learning in China can help us outline key threads of development in academic research and thus make informed predictions regarding coming trends.

As many have noted, the 1920s and the 1930s were important years for modern Chinese scholarship. During this period, the two most successful research institutes were the Research Institute of Tsinghua College 清华学校研究院, otherwise known as the Academy of Tsinghua University 清华国学院, which had far-reaching influence despite its four-year existence, and the Institute of History and Philology of Academia Sinica 中央研究院历史语言研究所, founded by Fu Si-nian 傅斯年 and later known as the Academia Sinica when it moved to Taipei. Several things explain the exemplary nature of these two institutes. For one, they were founded at a time

when Chinese scholarship was transitioning from traditionality to modernity, when a relatively peaceful social environment grounded their prosperous development, and when they both had reaped huge benefits from a wealth of scholars who were well-versed in both Eastern and Western scholarship. Apart from that, I think there are, as far as academic research is concerned, three other reasons.

First, the two institutes were always at the cutting edge of international academic research, not only in terms of their research foci, but also of the tools and methods they used. This is what Chen Yin-ke 陈寅恪 calls *yu-liu* 预流 (meaning, roughly, the “trend”), which suggests that scholars should keep up with the changes in foci, materials, and international academic research methods of their time.¹ However, merely abiding by *yu-liu* is not enough. Chinese studies carried out by native scholars should not be simply equated with “sinology” conducted by overseas scholars. Rather, we Chinese scholars should formulate our own questions, take our own positions, and establish our own methods. In a time--the late Qing Dynasty and early years of the Republic of China--when a mania for “following the West” swept across the country and when the Western system of disciplines and Western concepts concerning academic research fully intruded into Chinese academia, the two above-mentioned institutes had managed to hold their ground and firmly base their research on the central concept of “China.” They did not peddle Western knowledge, rather attempted to reinterpret China’s present and past. They even argued that the right to interpret Chinese history must rest with Chinese scholars. Fu Si-nian, in his exclamatory article “The Purport and Delight of Working at the Institute of History and Philology” 《史语所工作旨趣》, drew the enthusiastic conclusion that “we should conduct oriental studies in a scientific manner and establish the orthodoxy in China.”² Such a claim, tinted with the color of nationalism though it may be, did help promote independence of academic research in modern China and pave the way for the success of the two research institutes in question.

In addition to the two aforementioned points, i.e. keeping up with international trends and becoming conscious of our own positions, another factor contributed to the significant status of the two institutes in the Chinese academic research: the “opportunities of the native land” at that time. By “opportunities of the native land,” I mean the continuous emergence of new research materials in China. For example, the so-called four great discoveries--the oracle bone inscriptions left from the Yin Dynasty, the manuscripts excavated in the Dunhuang Grottoes, the letters of the Han Dynasty found in Juyan 居延 area of Inner Mongolia, and the credential files originally kept in the Forbidden City in the Qing Dynasty — were all made in that period, and they laid a firm foundation for new understandings of China’s history. These discoveries not only led to a change in the quantity of historical materials, but also in the nature of historical interpretation.

With the newly discovered materials, the Academy of Tsinghua University and the Institute of History and Philology of Academia Sinica opened up new avenues in research. With the help of Yin-Shang tortoise shells and animal bones, Dunhuang manuscripts and Han letters, and Qing credential files, the institutes conducted research on the ancient, middle, and modern ages of Chinese history. In terms of research materials and tools, the two institutes laid special emphasis

¹ Chen Yin-ke in his *Preface to Chen Yuan’s The Record of the Remains of Dunhuang Treasures* 《陈垣〈敦煌劫余录〉序》 says: “New materials and methods in research spring up with the coming of each new period; and what we call ‘trend’ indicates the application of the new materials in dealing with new problems.” *Collected Writings in Jin-Ming House: Second Issue* 《金明馆丛稿二编》, SDX Joint Publishing Company 三联书店, 2002, pp. 266.

² Fu Si-nian, “The Purport and Delight of Working at the Institute of History and Philology,” *Collected Papers of the Institute of History and Philology (Book I)* 1928, Section 1.

on archaeological evidence, comparative study of different languages, and the application of “peripheral” materials; in terms of research perspectives, they directed their attention to ethnic and minority histories; and in terms of research methods, they valued those used by sociologists and took pains to integrate linguistic studies into historical studies. Raising the banner of “science” and “Western learning” while at the same time sticking to the very notion that “Orthodox oriental studies is always in China,” the two institutes, with their new ideas and methods, immediately stood at the international forefront and became the center of attention in academic circles both at home and abroad.

In the past few years, I have spent much time reviewing the history of learning in modern China, and have been deeply impressed by the international influence that Chinese humanities research exerted at that time. As for humanities research in present-day China, how should it confront “international research trends,” and where does its way out lie?

II. International Perspectives: From “Studies in China’s Neighboring Countries” to “Viewing China within the Frame of Neighboring Countries”

Here I would like to, for the purposes of analyzing changes in Chinese people’s self-concepts, divide Chinese history into three phases.

The first phase can be called “the age of egocentric imagination.” Because transportation difficulties limited contact with the world outside, the powerful traditions taking shape in the Han Dynasty, and the minor influence of foreign civilizations — in one word, due to the lack of the presence of the Other — China seemed to live in a *mirrorless* era. Hence the formation of the “China-is-the-world” concept (implying the contempt and haughtiness towards neighboring countries) and the egocentric “tribute-paying system” (进贡制, the situation remained unchanged until the Song Dynasty). Though the Chinese people, in the passage of time, had already extended their geographical knowledge beyond the limited area of China, they still tended to cherish the aforementioned egocentric notions and fancied themselves the sole inhabitants of the very center of the world.

However, with the gradual arrival of foreigners in the late Ming Dynasty and more significantly the foreign military invasion in the late Qing Dynasty, the Chinese people, in their self-assessment, began to realize the powerful existence of the Other (i.e. the West) and assumed an all-around West-oriented posture. From then on, China entered the second phase, “the period with only one mirror for self-recognition”—a time, as Joseph R. Levenson puts it, when the nation underwent tremendous changes from the idea of “China-is-the-world” to that of “the-world-consists-of-numerous-countries.”³ It is with this mirror in the form of the “Other” that China began to see itself in a new light. But then again, such a new understanding was based solely on the unvaried mirror image of the West. There’s the rub: Is it a faithful mirror or a distorting one? Or is it the only mirror available for our self-recognition? Or, can it really help us fully understand ourselves? Or, do we need other mirrors apart from the West?

Unfortunately, in the past one hundred years, we rarely took conscious effort to clearly differentiate ourselves from our neighbors, such as Japan, Korea, India, and Mongolia, the

³ Joseph R. Levenson, in his book *Confucian China and its Modern Fate* (Chapter 7, Part 1), points out that “Much of Chinese intellectual history is a transition from the idea of ‘China-is-the-world’ to that of ‘China-is-a-nation.’” See the Chinese version of the book (translated by Zhen Da-hua 郑大华, et al), China Social Sciences Publishing House, 2000, p. 87.

countries that can also be considered to be part of the “Other.” We are apt to place these neighboring countries on the “periphery” of our own culture, and are not accustomed to taking them into consideration. But is this help lead to self-assessment? I have always felt that by comparing and contrasting China with the West, we can only gain a rough understanding of our own characteristics. And it is the understanding of the minute differences between us and the neighbors who share our traditions that can give us a genuine knowledge of “Chinese” culture. In the process of globalization in which the tendency towards unanimity takes hold, we might have a chance to enter the third phase, “an age with many mirrors for self-recognition.” What we have to do is shoot China with cameras from various angles and form a 3-D motion picture of it. To view China within the frame of neighboring countries can help us establish new notions of not only ourselves but also the others. In other words, it might help us understand China in a new light, historically, culturally, and politically.

As to how this new research perspective relates to the history of thought, I am afraid that I cannot talk about it in detail for space reasons. But I would like to briefly discuss its significance to the history of learning from the standpoint of humanities research.

Intellectual history in China seems to suggest that the first wave of modernization and globalization in Chinese academia dated back to the middle of the Qing Dynasty when scholars initiated the study of the geography of northwestern China, the history of the Yuan Dynasty and the Mongolian minority that ruled it. Prompted by the inherent demands of textual research (the widening of the research focus) and the change of domestic and international situations since the Jia-qing 嘉庆 and Dao-guang 道光 periods in the late Qing Dynasty, Chinese scholars, starting from Qian Da-xin 钱大昕, began to realize the transcendent importance of conducting research beyond the traditional conceptual space of the Han people. The change was important, first because the scholars reached beyond the field of the Han language, the Han people, and the documents and materials that concern sinologists only, and second because they shifted the research focus beyond the sphere of the Confucian classics that textual critics were most familiar with, and third because they freed themselves from the confines of the history of politics. With a broadened point of view,⁴ Chinese scholars in the late Qing Dynasty began to delve into the textual study of the three great Turkish steles (the Stele of Tonyukuk, the Stele of Ki-tegin, and the Stele of Bilgekhan),⁵ the translation and interpretation of the documents of the Yuan Dynasty and the Mongolian minority, and other projects of international importance, such as the study on

⁴ For example, Chen Yuan's 陈垣 *On Imported Christianity in China's Yuan Dynasty* 《元也里可温教考》 is greatly influenced by the research trends at that time, as is made manifest in his problem-consciousness, his choice of research topics, and his textual analysis of documents. He has made a great contribution to the study of literature in the Han language, with the help of Hong Jun's 洪钧 *Additional Information about the Translated Materials on Yuan History* 《元史译文补考》 and the multi-linguistic study (e.g. the Arabic, Greek, and Mongolian languages) by many Japanese scholars. See *Studies on Imported Christianity in China's Yuan Dynasty*, in Chen Yuan's *Study on Buddhism in Guizhou and Yunnan Provinces of the Ming Dynasty: Eight Books on the History of Foreign Religions* 《明季滇黔佛教考：外宗教史论著八种外》, Hubei Education Publishing House 河北教育出版社, 2000, pp. 4-7.

⁵ The three great Turkish steles, i.e. the Stele of Tonyukuk, the Stele of Ki-tegin, and the Stele of Bilgekhan, are said to have been discovered by a Finnish man, A.Geikel in 1890. It is also said that the credit of the discovery should be given to the Russian scholar N.Yadrintsev rather than Geikel. But one thing is indisputable: it was Vilhelm Thomsen (1842-1927), professor of comparative linguistics in the University of Copenhagen who, according to Geikel's report, first deciphered the inscriptions on the three steles in 1892 and published his research findings in his book *Deciphered Orkhon Inscriptions*. Chinese scholar Shen Zeng-zhi 沈曾植, though unacquainted with the Turkish language, enriched the understanding of the steles with the help of Western explanations and his own knowledge of Tang-Dynasty literature.

the Three Foreign Religions 三夷教, which were introduced by Persia clergymen and thrived in the Tang Dynasty--Zoroastrianism 琐罗亚斯德教, Manichaeism 摩尼教 and Nestorian Christianity 景教.⁶ Even now, Japanese scholars well learned in studies of Manchu 满族, Hui 回族, Mongolian and Tibetan minorities, have to read works by Chinese scholars such as Zhang Mu 张穆, He Qiu-tao 何秋涛, and Li Wen-tian 李文田 as guidebooks to their research.⁷ Even arrogant Russian scholars could not help but bow their heads before Shen Zeng-Zhi, the Chinese scholar who did much textual work on Turkish steles: “Since the translated version appeared, many foreign scholars have cited Shen’s work in their own writings, and no wonder Shen was employed by the Tribunal for the Management of Affairs of All Nations 总理各国事务衙门 in the Qing Administration.”⁸ During this transformation period, the research perspectives, languages, documents, and materials that scholars used all underwent dramatic changes, accelerating the emergence of new research areas.

With the whole country being thrown into the process of globalization, politically, economically and culturally, Chinese academia continued to embrace changes into the late Qing Dynasty and the early days of the Republic of China. As mentioned in the introduction, the 1920s saw the rise of a group of superb Chinese scholars who were endowed with both openness and alertness of the mind. And it was the so-called Four Great Discoveries in this period that ushered in the second wave of modernization and globalization in Chinese academia.⁹ During the second wave, documents and materials about the minority people in northeastern China stimulated the integration of linguistic studies and history studies. Chen Yin-ke, for example, used the languages of Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Han in proofreading the Dunhuang manuscripts. Besides, the materials newly found at Dunhuang encouraged the skeptical and analytical study of the documents that were passed down through generations. Hu Shi 胡适, for instance, conducted textual research of Zen Buddhist literature. In addition, the documents found at Dunhuang, a politically, religiously, and culturally peripheral area so to speak, aroused scholastic interest in Sino-foreign communication in transportation and culture. Last but not least, the discovery of varied non-official and non-Confucian literature stimulated the interest in the economic history of certain places (such as the changing economic situation of the *viharas* at Dunhuang), the history of different religions (such as Buddhism, which thrived along with the Three Foreign Religions

6 In China, the studies of the Persian-originated religion Zoroastrianism were first mentioned by the Qing poet and scholar, Wen Ting-shi 文廷式 in his essay collection *Scattered Words of Chun Chang-zi* 《纯常子枝语》; he probably had seen the books on Zoroastrianism written by foreign scholars. The earliest research on Manichaeism in China could be seen in Jiang Fu’s 蒋斧 *A Brief Study on the Spread of Manichaeism in China* 《摩尼教流行中国考略》; see “Prospects of Manichaeism Studies in China” 《摩尼教研究之展望》 by Lin Wu-shu 林悟殊, in *New History Studies* 《新史学》, Vol.7, Issue 1, Taipei, 1996.

7 For example, Naka Michiyo, the first Japanese scholar who ever studied the history of the Yuan Dynasty, got the books by Chinese scholars such as *A Revised History of the Expedition of Genghis Khan* 《皇元圣武亲征记校正》 and *Explanatory and Additional Notes of the Inside History of the Yuan Dynasty* by Li Wen-tian 《元朝秘史李注补》 from Chen Yi, a senior Qing official who, at the command of the Governor-general of the Province of Hu-Guang 湖广总督, Zhang Zhi-dong 张之洞, went to Japan to investigate the education system there.

8 Wang Sui-Chang 王遽常, *The Chronicle of Shen Zeng-zhi* 《沈寐叟先生年谱》, Taipei: Commercial Press, 1977. Other works by Shen include *Notes of Unknown History of the Yuan Dynasty* (Vol. 15) 《元秘史笺注》 and *Notes of the Origins of Mongolia* 《蒙古源流笺注》, Vol. 8.

9 By that time, Chen Yin-ke had already sensed that this second wave must have something to do with the studies on the history and geography of north-western China in the Qing Dynasty. He put forward his predictions in his *Preface to Zhu Yan-feng* (朱延丰) 《A Complete Study of the Turk Minority》《突厥通考》(1942) *Collected Writings in the Hall of Cold Willows* 《寒柳堂集》, SDX Joint Publishing Company, 2001, p. 163.

during the Tang Dynasty), and regional histories (such as the history of the Guiyi 归义 regime at Dunhuang from the Han Dynasty to the Sui Dynasty, that of the Tupo 吐蕃 regime in Tibet from the 7th to the 9th century, and that of the Western Regions 西域, the geological vastness west of the Jade Gate Pass 玉门关). Hence the rethinking of those so-called “popular” research subjects and those “marginalized” topics.

What is the third wave then? If I may venture an opinion, the idea of “viewing China within the frame of neighboring countries” can induce certain changes in the history of learning in China.

To start with, I have noticed that the changes that occurred in the first two waves were all directed towards northwestern China, a space overlapping part of the ancient Silk Road. But little attention has been paid to our eastern surroundings, such as Korea, Burma, Japan, and the Ryukyu Islands, where, in actual fact, we could find abundant documents and materials concerned with China. Prof. Wu-han 吴晗, for example, compiles over ten volumes of precious historical materials about China from *Chronicles of the Li Dynasty of Korea* 《李朝实录》.¹⁰ Among the materials preserved in our neighboring countries, those alone which are written in the Han language would greatly astonish us. Following the saying that says the outsider is much more clear-headed, it is hoped that such materials can help us “go beyond the sphere of China, examine our country from outside,” and gain a genuine understanding of Chinese characteristics.

In addition, as we are very much used to comparing the East with the West, almost all our discussions of Chinese culture rest upon the notion of the West, the nebulous Other. However, beneath the seemingly clear description of the cultural differences between the West and the East, there are considerable ambiguities. Going deeper, we feel somewhat puzzled: what do we really mean by *the West*? And what about the concept of *the East*? On the other hand, if we take our neighboring countries (which, of course, share more cultural similarities with us) as the Other and compare ourselves with them, we will likely find more significant cultural differences (subtle as they may be). For example, under the same banner of the Zhu Xi School, there were sharp differences among the high officials and nobles in Korea who stuck firmly to Zhu’s teachings, the Confucian scholars in Japan who had not gone through anything like the Imperial Civil Service Examination 科举制度, and the Chinese scholars who were influenced by both the textual research in their own country and foreign civilizations from outside. Such differences clearly demonstrate that, just as what we call *the West* is not a monolithic conceptual entity, neither are the notions of *the East* and *Asia*.

Finally, as Fu Si-nian points out in his article “The Purport and Delight of Working at the Institute of History and Philology,” the increase in available historical materials and the improvement in research tools are in fact signs of progress in academic research. As early as 1928, Fu recognized the importance of minority studies. He said that Chinese academia “did not seem willing to spend much time on the historical issues concerning the minority peoples,” and were falling behind orientalists overseas in the study of Sino-foreign relations and the histories of minority and frontier regions. For example, with respect to minority issues, such as those dealing with Turks, Mongolians, Sienpi, Uyghur, Khitan, Jurchen, Manchu, and the Huns, Chinese scholars did not pay as much attention to them as their European counterparts. Because of this, Fu thought it an urgent need to introduce new research tools and materials, and to combine historical studies with linguistic studies. Later in 1983, Hu Shi, on behalf of China, attended the World

¹⁰ *Historical Materials on China from the Records of the Li Dynasty in Korea* 《朝鲜李朝实录中的中国史料》, edited by Wu Han 吴晗, China Book Company, 1962.

History Conference for the first time, and submitted an English thesis entitled “Recently Discovered Material for Chinese History.” In the thesis, Hu points out some new materials concerning Chinese history, including the well-known Yin-Shang oracle bone inscriptions, Dunhuang manuscripts, Han letters, Qing credential official files, the banned books that contained abundant historical anecdotes, and the less known “literature stored in Japan and Korea.”¹¹ But the pity is that almost seven years has passed, the documents and materials kept in Korea have not been satisfactorily sorted out or studied, let alone those in Japan. Certainly, I am far from capable of predicting the general trend in the history of learning. But I am sure that if attention is paid to our “neighborhood”, the languages used by our neighbors and the historical materials kept by them will possibly stimulate the emergence of new research fields and tools. To quote a cliché of economics, they might be the “new growth points” in academic research.¹²

III. The Position of China in Comparison with Overseas Sinology

The idea of studying China’s neighboring countries is undoubtedly neither the invention nor the exclusive right of Chinese academia. By the late 19th century and the early 20th century, some European and Japanese scholars had already started conducting modern research into China’s surrounding countries. They employed methods used in the study of linguistics, archeology, history, and ancient documents, and won brilliant achievements. France, for instance, produced several notable figures in this field, e.g. E. Chavannes, P. Pelliot, G. Ferrand, and H. Maspero. These scholars, though generally referred to as “sinologists” for their research focus, often expanded their view to the countries surrounding China.

Under the European influence, the Japanese scholars since the Meiji era — a transformation period as it were in Japanese academia — became more and more interested in Chinese minorities and China’s surrounding countries. Starting from Naka Michiyo (1851-1908), who applied his intellect in the study of Mongolian and Korean history, a considerable number of Japanese sinologists in the Meiji, Taishō and Shōwa periods chose to study China’s neighboring countries. The most distinguished among them include Shirotori Kurakich (1865-1942), Fujida Toyohachi (1869-1928), Kuwabara Jitsuzo (1871-1931), Ikenaka Hiroshi (1878-1953), Haneda Tooru (1882-1955), and Wada Kiyoshi (1890-1963), all of whom were exceptionally successful in conducting historical and geographical studies of such regions as Mongolia, Korea, Annam, Tibet, and northwestern China.¹³ They had an advantage over their Chinese counterparts thanks to their better knowledge of Western research methods, and they had an advantage over their Western rivals thanks to their better understanding of oriental documents. In sum, they thought that Japan

¹¹ “Letter from Hu Shi to Fu Si-nian” 《胡适致傅斯年》, September 2nd, 1938), *Letters between Hu Shi and Fu Si-nian in the Institute of History and Philology of Academia Sinica* 《史语所藏胡适与傅斯年来往函札》, compiled by Wang Fan-sen 王汎森, see in *Mainland China Magazine* 《大陆杂志》 (September, 1996), Vol. 93, Issue 3, p.11.

¹² I think changes in this research field may occur in the following aspects: (1) re-emphasizing the value of linguistics and (2) non-Han religions, (3) the need to consult documents and research work in the West, (4) redefining “China” and “foreign countries,” (5) rethinking the relationship between nationalism and cosmopolitanism in terms of culture and academic research.

¹³ For example, Miyazaki Ichisada, in his book *A Complete History of China’s Surrounding Regions* (1943), discusses the Indian Peninsula, Korea, Turkistan (including the ancient Western Region and today’s Xinjiang Province), Mongolia, and Tibet. Obviously, there is, in terms of the foci and purposes of research, a sharp difference between his research style and that of Chinese scholars, not to mention his definition of “China.” See *Complete Works of Miyazaki Ichisada* (Book 19), Iwanami Shoten Publishing Ltd. 1992, pp. 149-162.

should be the leader in oriental studies. Haneda Tōru, a then Japanese sinologist, summarized Japan's academic achievements of that time as follows: (1) the study on the newly found ancient documents and materials in oriental studies, e.g. the Stele of Ki-tegin; (2) the discoveries of ancient languages, e.g. Tocharian 吐火罗文, and the languages of Uyghur and the Western Xia Regime 西夏; (3) the research of ethnic groups in northwestern China; (4) the discovery of the documents of non-Han religions, e.g. the classics of Manichaeism; the influence of (6) Sogdian and (7) Uyghur cultures on oriental countries. Obviously, such new changes in academic research went far beyond the study of history, culture, languages, and ancient documents in the traditionally defined space of "China."¹⁴ About this, Chinese scholars, though grudgingly, could do nothing but admit that "if the Chinese could be said to rival foreign scholars in the studies on canonical history, they could by no means match foreigners in the research on such regions as northwestern China and the South China Sea, or in the study of the history of archeology or fine art."¹⁵

This trend in academic research, which swept both the East and the West, seemed to be just an international fad at first glance. However, deep beneath the surface of the trend, we can find its special historical and political background. Take Japan, the country that has the closest kinship with us, as an example. From the viewpoint of academic research, the trend was inspired by the powerful forces of globalization and modernization in academia. But in terms of intellectual history, certain intentions on the part of Japan lurk behind the seemingly pure academic matters.

More specifically, the modernist trend in Japanese academia led to inevitable changes and crises in their traditional Chinese studies: long-standing research perspectives changed, well-established conceptions of China were subverted, and new research patterns formed. As mentioned earlier, since the Meiji era, Japan, which shares a very close kinship with China and whose scholars are certainly more skillful than their European counterparts in interpreting Chinese issues, launched an effort to develop research materials, tools, and methods after the research styles of the West. It picked up the questions, topics, and areas that catered to the Western taste, assumed a "neutral" (so called and flaunted by the West) ground, and changed the traditional "Chinese studies" into what is known as "oriental studies"¹⁶ by extending the traditional research field from Han China to its neighboring countries. On the one hand, Japanese scholars took conscious steps to create an "oriental space" in their study, as opposed to the "occidental space" (culturally, historically, and ethnically); on the other, they tried to separate Japan from "the Orient" so that their own country would be faced with two reference objects as the Other. That is why Naka Michiyo proposed that apart from "national history," there should be "occidental history"

¹⁴ Haneda Tōru, *Recent Development of Oriental Studies* (1957) and *Collected Theses of Dr. Haneda Tōru* (1975), Dohosha Publishing House.

¹⁵ He Chang-qun 贺昌群, "Chinese Studies in Japanese Academia" «日本学术界之“支那学”研究», in *Collected Writings of He Chang-qun* 《贺昌群文集》, Vol. 1, Commercial Press 商务印刷馆, 2006.

¹⁶ Kuwabara Jichuzo in his article "The Mission of Scholars of Chinese Studies" cites some Western sinologists as models of academic research, such as the American scholar Rockhill (who studies the religion, culture, and geography in Tibet and Mongolia, as well as the documents about the transportation in the South China Sea such *Stories of Foreign Countries* 《诸蕃志》 by Zhao Ru-shi 赵汝适 and *Brief Introduction to Island Countries* 《岛夷志略》 by Wang Da-yuan 汪大渊, three British scholars, Phillips (who studied the history of Chinese Taiwan under Dutch control and the traffic between China and the countries of the East China Sea), Wylie (who was well versed in Sanskrit, Manchu, and ancient Mongolian), and Legge (who studied and translated Chinese classics), the Russian scholar Bretschneider (who specialized in the Yuan Dynasty). Kuwabara Jichuzo admits in his book that "This greatest defect of Chinese studies in our country [Japan] is that we have not yet made a full use of the scientific methods used in the West, and that it is quite possible that we have even not been aware of their existence." He points out that "Those scientific methods are useful not only in studying West-born subjects, but also in Chinese studies." See *Complete Works of Kuwabara Jichuzo* (Vol. 1), Iwanami Shoten Publishing Ltd 1968, pp. 591-594.

and “oriental history,” hinting at the very fact that Japanese scholars “ended the time when their sole emphasis was put on China to the exclusion of other oriental ethnic groups and countries”¹⁷ and greatly widened their research focus. In the Meiji and Taishō periods, the topic selection of various Japanese journals, such as *Oriental Studies*, and the academic training of many Japanese scholars were both directed towards the issues concerning Manchuria, Uyghur lands, Mongolia, and Tibet, as a response to the trend of modernization and globalization.

However, as has been previously suggested, the deep political motives behind the transformation of Japanese scholarship should not be ignored. The burgeoning nationalism in Japan from time of the Meiji period surfaced as “Asianism,” implying Japan’s contemptuous view on China, once its most powerful Asian rival. Some of the most influential ideas (in the same vein with the new conceptions of “nation state” popular in Europe at that time) were: There was no such thing as “Greater China;” so-called “China” was merely an empire consisting of many dynasties; “real” China was actually a Han-dominated space occupying the areas south of the Great Wall and east of Xinjiang (which literally means “New Territory”) and Tibet; ethnic groups outside Han China were in fact different cultural, political, and ethnic entities. In the name of national interest and security, the growing ideology of “nationalist expansionism” from the Meiji period onward resulted in Japan’s ever keener interest in the territories comprising China and the surrounding countries. And it was such a political background that underlay Japan’s disinclination to view the various dynasties in China as the reigns that had power over minority groups, and also its uncommon interest in China’s minority-inhabited areas, such as Xinjiang, Tibet, and Manchuria, and its neighboring countries, such as Mongolia and Korea. This nationalist political tendency stirred up the interest of Japanese academia, and the ideas about China in academic circles became popular in society at large.¹⁸ These ideas carried through to times as late as World War II and long remained a hot topic among Japanese historians.

Here we see the entanglement of two issues: the trends of globalization and modernization in academia, and the position of the nation in the history of learning. Will we encounter the same problem when it comes to the idea of “viewing China within the frame of neighboring countries?” To push the discussion further, what we are talking about here has something to do with a fundamental question: What is the significance of traditional humanities research? In addition to entertaining us with knowledge and sharpening our intelligence, I think part of its significance lies in its effort to shape our conception of the nation (referring to the cultural notion of “country” rather than the “government” in the political sense). In this process, traditions serve to provide collective memories, build up consensus, and establish a sense of belonging. If we consider Japan’s tendency in the Meiji period to place China at equal footing with other oriental nations as a politically-conscious action against China (though this is concordant with the modern notion of the equality among nations), then how shall we cultivate problem-consciousness and establish independent research positions in our effort to “view China within the frame of neighboring

¹⁷ Egami Namio, *Contemporary History of Oriental Studies*, p. 3.

¹⁸ For example, when the first Sino-Japanese War broke out in 1894, the General Council of the Japanese army published *Geography of Manchu*, followed by other scholarly publications such as *Investigating into the Name of Manchu* (1903), *Manchu: Now and Then* (1904). In 1908, Shirotori Kurakichi proposed to the then director of the railway construction in Manchu that a department be established to study this region. And later many famous Japanese scholars participated in this project; Nito Konan, the scholar of the Kyoto School, also showed a keen interest in the history and culture of Manchu. Again, with the Japan’s invasion and occupation of Korea, academic publications on Korea mushroomed, such as *A History of Korea* (1892) and *A Contemporary History of Korea* (1901) by Hayashi Taisuke. See Wada Kiyoshi’s “The Achievements of the Studies on the Histories of Manchu and Mongolia in Japan,” in *Oriental Studies*, Shufu-to-Seikatsusha (Tokyo) 1942, pp. 241-268.

countries.”

Let us now recall something in the past. From its very early stages, modern humanities research in China was closely connected with nationalism on the one hand and cosmopolitanism on the other. For example, if we say Liang Qi-chao's 梁启超 epoch-making article “New History Studies” 《新史学》 marks the commencement of scientific history studies in modern China, the patriotism he talks about in the beginning of the article is just what is considered to be national identity and the nation's stand in humanities research. After the September 18th Incident in 1931 when Japan started to take full control of the three provinces in north-eastern China, Fu Si-nian, a historian well known for his up-to-date notion of “History studies rely on historical materials,” wrote a book *A Brief History of North-Eastern China* 《东北史纲》. Though very much concerned about the research on China's frontier regions, Fu refutes the idea proposed by Japanese scholars (such as Shirotori Kurakichi) that “Manchuria and Mongolia are not part of China.” He insists on using the name of “North-Eastern China” instead of “Manchuria,” for the latter is the very coinage of “the wishful thinking of the Western powers that coveted Chinese territory, which is totally groundless, be it economically, politically, geographically or ethnically.”¹⁹ Though dealing with the same matter, the Chinese scholars and the Japanese scholars are often poles apart in terms of the positions they adopt and the research perspectives and strategies they use. In view of this, we insist on “the critical study of Chinese issues,” for we are often unaware of the fact that though foreign scholars also do researches on the history and culture of China and of China's neighboring countries, their work should not be taken as genuine “Chinese studies.” The study on the history of thought and learning carried out by foreign scholars is actually something more “foreign” than “Chinese,” and their work must be examined within the political, social, and historical contexts of foreign countries.

When we advocate the idea of “viewing China within the frame of neighboring countries,” we do not mean to pick up the research topics on Manchu, Mongolia, Quigour, and Tibet once studied by European and Japanese scholars. Their historical and cultural research on areas such as Japan, Korea, Mongolia, Burma, and the Ryukyu Islands can be classified into “regional studies,” which lifts us above the politically defined space of “nation state” and helps us understand historical and cultural exchanges among different regions. But the foundation of the research by Chinese scholars should always be laid upon Chinese history. And such study based on the notion of “nation state” is not without its significance today, when China, as a cultural entity formed in contemporary times and as a political state established in modern period, cannot free itself from cultural and political influences. Traditional humanities research is not a science totally transcending national boundaries, and the modern transformation of scholarship is always going hand in hand with the re-definition of nation state. Rather than destroy them, humanities research tries to establish consensus, form ideas, and create images. This is especially true when it comes to the study of the traditions of certain nations and cultures. And those consensus, ideas, and images are just what we refer to as “common beliefs,” or “bases of national identity.” Ding Wen-jiang 丁文江 in his published article “The Mission of Academia Sinica” 《中央研究院的使命》 claims “that the greatest difficulty of uniting China is that we lack common beliefs, the beliefs that are built upon our self-recognition.” Ding says that “history and archeology study the past of our country while anthropological linguistics and other social sciences our present state,” and that “with a better understanding of both the past and the present we can truly know ourselves.” Ting wraps up

¹⁹ See *A Brief History of North-Eastern China*, Institute of History and Philology of Academia Sinica 1932, p.3.

the article by saying that “the scientific study of our history can help create basis of new common beliefs.”²⁰ And what we refer to as “the past of our country,” “the present state of our country,” and “our common beliefs” are something that usually can not be appreciated by others. To sum up, though dealing with the seemingly identical issue, Chinese scholars and foreign scholars differ a good deal. We might as well say that while foreign scholars widen their focus to “China’s neighborhoods,” the research of us Chinese scholars always center on the very concept of “China.”

It might be trendy a hundred years ago for the scholars in Europe, America, and Japan to show concern about South Asia, East Asia, West Asia, and Middle Asia, and it seems a fashion now to do research on different regions, irrespective of national boundaries--but theory is neither like wine, which tastes better as its age increases, nor like clothes, which look worse as their age increases. At a time when the notion of “China in history” still has its significance in terms of culture and tradition, it is meaningful for us to obtain an idea of China, both historically and culturally, by creating a new reference system in which the surrounding countries and frontier regions (such as Japan, Korea, Vietnam, India, Afghan, Mongolia and Tibet) are taken as the Others. In this way, we can not only get a fair understanding of China, both as a changing entity in the historical context and a political entity in the present situation, but also establish our common beliefs through the study of history and culture. In other words, to form a historical and cultural picture of a changing China through comparison with neighboring countries is in itself an attempt at an enlightened understanding of “contemporary China.” As I have already pointed out, now is the time that calls for the coming of a multitude of mirrors. These mirrors are formed by the kaleidoscopic opinions the surrounding countries and regions hold about China, this powerful “Other,” in the passage of time. While “the West” is so different from China that it is at best a blurry bronze mirror, showing only the contours of Chinese culture and missing many subtleties; the neighboring countries, which have close contacts with China, may on the contrary help us understand our country more accurately with insightful nuances.

IV. Breaking Self-Confinement--Cross-study Analyses of Different Cultures

Placing the research focus on China by studying “genuine” Chinese history and culture does not suggest self-confinement. For Chinese scholars, the top priority certainly should be given to the task of “viewing China within the frame of neighboring countries,” but it is also important to study the interactive workings of different cultures. By studying specific communication of different cultures in fields like religion, literature, art and language, we may pinpoint how the cultural chain, one lock after another, links together China and its neighboring countries and regions.

In 1940, Prof. Miyazaki Ichisada of Kyoto University put forward a hypothesis in his article “The Renaissance in the East and the Renaissance in the West” that the popular images of the Virgin Mary in 15th-century and 16th-century Europe might in some way be influenced by the depiction of Guan-yin 观音 in the East, for example their almond-shaped face, and their clasping of the two hands together. And later, some people even point out that it is just due to the resemblances between the two religious figures that the statuette of Guan-yin (especially the statuette of a boy paying homage to him/her) produced in the city of Quanzhou 泉州 in China for a

²⁰ See *Oriental Magazine* 《东方杂志》, Vol. 32, Issue 2, January 16th, 1935.

time replaced those of the Virgin Mary and were worshiped by the Catholics in Nagasaki when they went underground after prosecution.²¹ Again, in 1943, Mr. Fang Hao 方豪 wrote an article discussing how the anti-Catholic practice of compelling people to tread on the Madonna and Child statuette in order to test whether they are Catholics was introduced from Japan to China, how it was adopted by the Chinese government for the same purpose,²² and how it left its mark on the Qing Dynasty starting from the reigning period of the Emperor Yong Zheng 雍正. In these two examples, we may find many interesting cultural clues.

Now let me cite another example, which is about the history of art and religion, to show how contemporary China is linked with its neighboring countries in belief and thought and how the great cultural chain, visible in some parts and invisible in others, has come into being. For example, the Belgian scholar, Nicolas Standaert has found out in the research, Zhu Zai-yu 朱载堉, the ninth-generation grandson of the founding emperor of the Ming Dynasty, in his *The Complete Book of Music* 《乐律全书》 makes a creative interpretation and adaptation of the Chinese national memorial performance in the Ming Dynasty, especially the dance in memory of Confucius performed at Confucian temples. Though the modified music and dance was not adopted officially in actual ceremonies, it somehow managed to spread to Europe. Another example, the French Christian priest, Joseph Marie Amiot includes several pictures illustrating the changes Zhu made to the original memorial dance in his book *Mémoires concernant l'histoire, les sciences, les arts, les mœurs, les usages, etc. des Chinois* (Paris: Nyon, 1780).²³ (As to how Europe has been influenced by this orderly and grand Chinese national dance and what Confucian ideas are embodied in the dance, these issues remain to be discussed.) Things come in pairs. Li Zhi-zao 李之藻 (1565 – 1630), a famous scholar and Catholic convert, also made some modifications to the national memorial music and dance for Confucius and wrote a book about that: *Notes on Ritual Music Performance in Schools* 《泮宫礼乐疏》. More interestingly, in 1672, Zhu Shun-shui 朱舜水, a committed Confucian scholar exiled to Japan after the fall of the Ming Dynasty, designed dances in memory of Confucius for Tokugawa Nariaki, a prominent *daimyo* in the Mito domain. These dances were based on the records in Li Zhi-zao's book and were the earliest version of the memorial dances later performed at the Confucian temples in Japan. From these examples, we may probably get an idea of the echo-like phenomenon in the cross-cultural communication.

For a long time, different disciplines in humanities research seem to wall against one another in their own self-confined space. Besides, national boundaries in academic research to some extent also limit our views. However, communications between China and its neighbors were never uncommon in history, even in the period of the severe official ban on maritime activities. History witnesses how literature, religion and art cross the national borders without showing passports or visas, and create a kaleidoscopic picture. But when the river of culture overflows the embankment and runs to different places, now rapid and now slow, now upward and now downward, now emptying into a big lake and now narrowing into a small torrent, we should remember that the seeds of art and religion, or thought and learning may grow into plants that are quite different from

²¹ Miyazaki Ichisada, "The Renaissance in the East and the Renaissance in the West," Iwanami Shoten Publishing Ltd. 1992, Vol. 19, pp. 33-36.

²² Fang Hao, *Japanese Influence on the Repressive Act towards Catholics in the Qing Dynasty* 《清代禁抑天主教所受日本之影响》, first published in 1943, and later appeared in *Collected Writings of Fang Hao* 《方豪全集》, Beijing Shang-zhi Translation House 北平上智编译馆, 1948, pp. 47-66.

²³ Nicolas Standaert, "Ritual Dances and Their Visual Representations in the Ming and the Qing," in *The East Asian Library Journal* (Princeton Univ.) XII, 1 (Spring 2006), pp. 68-181.

those in the original places, all depending on the actual climate. Take the Cheng-Zhu School of Neo-Confucianism 程朱理学 for example. When its teachings became rigid doctrines and hypocritical pretence under the shelter of the Imperial Civil Service Examination system and when they were challenged by textual researchers in the Qing Dynasty, the school was still gingerly guarded by the literati of the Li Dynasty in Korea. Why was it so? A simple reason: at that time there was a system in Korea in favor of the ruling class, which prescribed that only those from noble families could register for the Imperial Civil Service Examination. Therefore, a somewhat static privileged class was maintained, and they proudly defended their cultural beliefs and experiences, of which Neo-Confucianism was regarded as orthodox. Whereas in the Tokugawa period in Japan, as has been pointed out by the Japanese scholar, Watanabe Hiroshi, Neo-Confucianism had no ground to take pride in itself as an absolute and universal truth, for there was no such thing as the Imperial Civil Service Examination there, on which the literati had to depend for a living. Since the common people in Japan were not that much bounded by the traditions of moral and ethical regulations, even though Neo-Confucianism, due to the efforts of some Japanese Confucian scholars like Fujiwara Seika and Hayashi Razan, was accepted beliefs in Japan's high society, it had no power to penetrate into the life of common people.²⁴ And here we see how the Cheng-Zhu School met with different fates in different cultural situations. So I am very much inclined to agree with Quentin Skinner's opinion that what needs discussing is not the ideas floating in air, but those in context, and that because of all the differences in actual situations, e.g. differences in customs, values and social structures, the imported literature, religion, art, and academic research are bound to take on a different look.

V. Conclusion: Prospects for Humanities Research--New Materials, Methods and Models

Almost all the valuable studies in humanities research stem from the discovery of new materials. And these materials are nothing less than the foundation of an edifice. If no solid foundation were laid, the building would seem to be carried out on sands. In view of this, I think humanities researchers in China should put a great deal of effort into the construction of a huge database. Scholars should try to collect and preserve as many new documents and materials as possible, which indeed is the prerequisite for catching up with the international trend. Besides, the collecting work cannot be confined within the realm of traditional classics, which means that folk materials, visual and video materials (apart from written ones), and materials from overseas (apart from those found in China) should also be included. And this is a must if we want to "expand the horizon of humanities research." Finally, the database should have characteristics of our own, for so numerous are the available research materials in the world that no research center can be all-embracing in the field.

Equipped with new materials and new methods, we then will be able to raise many new questions that we never thought of in the past. And these questions, whether it can be verified or not, will certainly bring forth changes to the established models in academic research. For example, the method of twofold evidence, i.e. the cross-study of materials excavated from underground and documents passed through generations, takes shape with the discovery of the oracle bone inscriptions and with the textual and interpretative work of such scholars as Wang

24 Watanabe Hiroshi, "Changing Neo-Confucianism in the Early Tokugawa Period in Japan," Chinese version, *History Studies and Criticism* 《史学研究》. Vol.5, Taipei, 1983, p. 205.

Guo-wei's 王国维 "A Study of the Oracle Inscriptions of the Yin Dynasty: Genealogy of the Imperial Family" 《殷卜辞中所见先公先王考》. The uncovering of Zen Buddhist manuscripts at Dunhuang and the related studies such as Hu Shi's thesis "The Story of the Master Bonze Shen Hui of Heze" 《荷泽大师神会传》 cast doubt on Buddhist literature and cast light on the phenomenon that Buddhist disciples fabricate false genealogies of abbots in order to claim kinship with those in power. In one word, changes in academic research occur naturally when new materials usher in new methods, and new models.

Now let me once again review the history of learning in China. When in 1902 Liang Qi-chao wrote two non-traditional theses, i.e. "New History Studies" and "On the Great Forthcoming Changes in Chinese Academic Research" 《论中国学术思潮变迁之大势》, which served as a new model in history research, he might be inspired by modern history studies.²⁵ When in 1919, Hu Shi finished the first half of his *Historical Outline of Chinese Philosophy* 《中国哲学史大纲》, a piece of ground-breaking work in philosophy studies in China, he mainly followed the Western research models in this field.²⁶ Liang and Hu gained epoch-making success partly because they were fortunate enough to live in the late Qing Dynasty and the early Republic of China, a great transitional period when traditional humanities research in China took a big swerve in the face of new research concepts and methods, and partly because they were wise enough to grasp the opportunity when there was an urgent need for China to establish its own research methods and cultural interpretations and to build up national confidence. So in this manner, we may as well say that the research work of the two scholars was in fact part of the great project of reconstructing a new nation state.²⁷ As for us the present-day scholars, will time and fortune again favor us? Though I dare not make a definite prediction, I have a feeling that auspicious changes in academic research are on their way hither, for Chinese humanities research today abounds in new materials, questions (perhaps even more than what we had in the last century), ideas, and methods.

By now have almost seventy years passed. When the Academy of Tsinghua University have been resigned to pages of the chronicle and the legendary Four Great Advisors in the academy also became the Titans unreachable in the distant past, and when the Institute of History and Philology of Academia Sinica moved to Taipei and the number of scholars in Chinese traditional humanities research is dwindling from day to day, can the academia in mainland China make some breakthroughs in its humanities studies? Can it, confronted with ever-complicated domestic and international situations, become a research base that feature innovative studies of Chinese history and culture and co-set the trend for the world's academic research?

Translated by Zeng Min-hao

²⁵ Liang Qi-chao, "New History Studies" and "On the Great Forthcoming Changes in Chinese Academic Research," in *Complete Works of Liang Qi-chao* (《梁启超全集》), Vol.3, Peking Publishing House (北京出版社), 1999, pp. 736-753; 561-615.

²⁶ Yu Ying-Shi (余英时), in his "The Establishment and Changes of the History of Academic Thoughts" (《学术思想史的创建及流变》), points out that Hu's book "surpasses those written by individual textual analysis schools in the Qing Dynasty for Hu's comprehensive and systematic study of economics and history as well as his creative use of Western research methods in the study of the history of philosophy." Yu especially brings to attention the last section of the book in which "Hu applies empirical methods to the critical assessment of the ideas of ancient scholars." So Hu may be regarded as a paradigm who successfully applies Western research methods to study Chinese issues. See *The Past and the Present* (Vol. 3), Taipei 1999, pp. 68-69.

²⁷ That is why Liang Qi-chao repeatedly emphasizes that academic thoughts, particularly those in the field of history, are related to the cultivation of nationalistic spirit, and that they encourage patriotic feelings, create the national identity, and enhance the management of the whole nation. See "New History Studies" and "On the Great Forthcoming Changes in Chinese Academic Research," in *Complete Works of Liang Qi-chao*, pp. 736, 561.