

作為區域史的東亞文化交流史：

問題意識與研究主題

黃俊傑

〔摘要〕

本文探討作為「區域史」(regional history)的東亞文化交流史研究之方法論與問題意識，並建議若干研究主題。

本文共分五節，第一節主張介於 20 世紀以降的「國別史」(national history)與 21 世紀廣受注意的、新興的「全球史」(global history)之間的「區域史」研究，是一個值得研究的新領域。第二節提出一種有關「區域史」研究的新視野，主張我們可以將過去聚焦於文化交流活動之「結果」的研究，轉向聚焦於文化交流活動的「過程」的研究，從而進行某種東亞文化交流史研究的「典範轉移」。第三節則提出「東亞文化交流史」研究的兩項新問題意識：(1) 東亞文化交流史中「自我」與「他者」的互動；(2) 東亞文化交流與權力結構的互動。本文第四節提出三個研究主題：(1) 人物的交流：「媒介人物」及其對「他者」的觀察；(2) 物品（尤其是書籍）的交流；(3) 思想的交流。

本文結論提出：隨著亞洲（尤其是東亞）在 21 世紀的興起，以及「全球化」的加速發展，東亞人文社會科學界開始從 20 世紀「國家中心主義」的研究格局，逐漸轉而以東亞為研究的視野。作為「區域史」的東亞文化交流史研究，正是回歸並重訪亞洲文化傳統的重要工作！

Some Observations of the Study of the History of Cultural Interactions in East Asia

Chun-chieh Huang

[Abstract]

This article attempts to incorporate the history of East Asian cultural interactions into the field of “regional history,” and propose certain subjects to be explored.

The article consists of five sections. Section 1 aims to draw attention to “regional history,” an emerging discipline different from “national history” – which occupied great academic interest in the 20th century – and “global history” – a speedily heating issue in the 21st century. Section 2 suggests a new way of study in “regional history”: to shift our focus from the “result” of cultural interactions to the “process”, thus making a “paradigmatic shift” as well in the study of history of East Asian cultural interactions. Section 3 raises two problematiques in the proposed field of “regional history”: the mutual influence between “self” and “other,” and that between “culture” and “power structure.” Section 4 proposes three types of “interaction” for further research: (1) interaction of personage (between “professional intermediate agents” and “others”); (2) interaction of articles (especially books); (3) interaction of thoughts.

The last section concludes that, with the rising of East Asian countries on the world stage in the 21st century, the state-centrist style of historical study shall be re-directed to a broader East Asian perspective. By redefining the “history of East Asian cultural interactions” as “regional history,” we will be able to make crucial revisit to and reflection upon our traditional cultures.

区域史としての東アジア文化交流史：

問題意識と研究テーマ

黄俊傑

〔摘要〕

本文は「区域史」(regional history)としての東アジア文化交流史研究の方法論と問題意識を探り、そして若干の研究テーマを提案するものである。

本文は五節から構成されている。第一節では 20 世紀以降における「国別史」(national history)と 21 世紀に広く注目を集めている新しい「グローバル化」(global history)の間の「区域史」研究が重要な研究の新領域であることを主張する。第二節では一種の「区域史」研究に関わりを持つ新しい視野を取り上げる。これまで我々は文化交流活動の「結果」の研究に焦点を当てて来たことに対し、これからは文化交流活動の「過程」の研究に焦点を当てるべきであり、したがって一種の東アジア文化交流史研究の「手本の転換」を行うべきであると主張する。第三節では「東アジア文化交流史」研究の二つの新しい問題意識を取り上げる：(1) 東アジア文化交流史の中で「自我」と「他者」の対話；(2) 東アジア文化交流と権力構造の対話。第四節では三つの研究テーマを取り上げる：(1) 人物の交流：「媒介人物」及びその「他者」に対する観察；(2) 物品（特に書籍）の交流；(3) 思想の交流。

本文の結論では、21 世紀にアジア（特に東アジア）の発展と共に、「グローバル化」が加速することに従い、東アジアの人文社会科学界は、20 世紀の「ナショナルリズム」的な研究範囲から、次第に転じて東アジアを研究の視野とし始める。「区域史」としての東アジア文化交流史研究は、まさにアジア文化伝統を再び省みる重要な仕事なのである！

Some Observations of the Study of the History of Cultural Interactions in East Asia

Chun-Chieh Huang*

I. Introduction

As historians engage in the craft of historical inquiry, that is, in the process of investigating historical documents and then writing histories, one of the questions that commonly occur to them is: should the scope and purview of historical inquiry most ideally be national, regional or global? Focusing upon this question, we may note that, since the French Revolution in 1789, studies in “national history” have constituted the mainstream of historical practice. During the 19th and 20th centuries, the first half of the 20th century in particular, historians tended to take “nation state” (usually that of their own) as the basic unit of historical inquiry. As a result, studies of “national history” inevitably became the leading trend in the 20th century, and historians wrote discourses of meaningful historical inquiry on the basis of political or cultural nationalism.¹ Qian Mu’s (錢穆, 1895-1990) classic work *Guoshi dagang* (國史大綱, Outline of national history), published in 1939, provided a good example representative of the historical studies in 20th-century China.² However, as Geoffrey Barraclough (1908-1984) pointed

* Distinguished Professor of History, National Taiwan University; Research Fellow, Academia Sinica, E-mail: cc10.huang@msa.hinet.net, Homepage: <http://huang.cc.ntu.edu.tw>

¹ Supported by the European Science Foundation, Chris Lorenz and Stefan Berger led a team of scholars from 2003 through 2008 in carrying out the large-scale research project, “Representations of Past: The Writing of National Histories in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Europe” (NHIST – www.leipzig.de/zhsesf). The results of this project will be presented at a roundtable on, “Religion, Nation, Europe and Empire: Historians and Spatial Identities,” at the International Congress of Historical Sciences in Amsterdam in 2010. Afterwards, the results will be published in a 6 vol. set, as well as in 10 specialized books, by Palgrave Macmillan, UK.

² Chun-chieh Huang, “Qian Binsi shixue zhong de guoshi guan: neihan, fangfa yu yiyi” 錢賓四史學中的「國史」觀：內涵、方法與意義 (The “National History” in Qian Mu’s Historical Thinking: Contents, Methods and Meanings), *Bulletin of the Department of History of National Taiwan University*, No.26

out in 1979, since the end of the World War II, ethnocentric national histories that were once in vogue prewar had become distasteful; many European intellectuals came to believe that the studies of ethnocentric national histories were to be placed among the intellectual origins of World War II!³ Under such intellectual atmosphere, the rationale for national history has been weakened and come to be regarded as dubious. Although during the past century nearly every country in Asia experienced the traumas of invasion and colonization, yet ironically national history remains the major approach of historical research undertaken by Asian historians.⁴ Nonetheless, historians in postwar Japan have sought to stir up nationalistic fervor as matters for reflection. All in all, we could say that the focuses of the national historical inquiry practiced in postwar Japan had shifted from state-centric to people-centered studies.⁵

While studies of “national history” dominated historical inquiries conducted in the 20th century, the study of “global history” has started to catch the attention of historians in the 21st century. Recently, Georg G. Eggers (1926-) and Q. Edward Wang (王晴佳, 1957-) reviewed the trends in historical research since 1990, and pointed out

(December, 2002), pp.1-37; Chun-chieh Huang, “Historical Thinking as a Form of New Humanism for Twentieth-century China: Qian Mu’s View of History,” paper presented at the *International Conference on “New Orientations in Historiography: Regional History and Global History,”* held at East China Normal University, Shanghai, November 3-5, 2007.

³ Geoffrey Barraclough, *Main Trends in History* (New York & London: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1979), p. 149. For the study of history in the 20th century, see Georg G. Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge with a New Epilogue* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2005), as well as his, “The Historians and the World of the Twentieth Century,” *Daedalus* (Spring 1971).

⁴ For a recent review on the sorts of historical studies conducted in Asia, see Masayuki Sato (佐藤正幸, 1947-), “East Asian Historiography and Historical Thought,” in the *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 2002), pp. 6776-6782.

⁵ See Shigeki Tōyama 遠山茂樹, *Sengo no Rekinshigaku to Rekishishiki* 戦後の歴史学と歴史意識 (*Historical Studies and Historical Consciousness in Postwar Japan*) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1968).

five new directions shown in recent historical inquiry:⁶ (1) the notion of “culture” became closely associated with “language,” and the two are reformulated together in “new-cultural history;” (2) the rise of women’s history and feminist history; (3) confronting a strong postmodern critique, historical inquiry and the social sciences became somewhat merged; (4) the criticism from postmodernism went in hand with a strong post-colonialist critique of national history; (5) the rise of world history, global history and history of globalization. Among the upward trends in historical studies since 1990, the rapid rise of studies in “global history” is particularly noteworthy. Reflecting on this spike in studies in “global history,” Hayden White (1928-) recently pointed out that in the purview of “global history,” the very notion of a “global event” has been transformed into a brand new one, viewed in the perspective of the entire globe. This new notion of “global event” may serve to deconstruct the abstract concepts of “time,” “space,” and “causality” that were assumed in the historical studies conducted as a modern Western scientific discipline.⁷ Viewing from a cosmopolitical point of view, Frank Ankersmit (1945-) is dubious about modernist “world histories,” for that they not only tend to exaggerate the impact of non-human factors, such as plagues and famines, on the course of human history, but also could lead to paradoxical sorts of “dehumanized history.”⁸ Edoardo Tortarolo (1956-) examines and discusses the concepts of “past,” “present,” and “future,” pointing out that the writing of “world history” faces challenges regarding the author’s ideology as well as the legitimacy of his

⁶ Georg G. Iggers and Q. Edward Wang, “The Globalization of History and Historiography: Characteristics and Challenges, from the 1990s to the Present,” paper presented at the *International Conference on “New Orientations in Historiography: Regional History and Global History.*

⁷ Hayden White, “Topics for Discussion on Global History,” paper presented at the *International Conference on “New Orientations in Historiography: Regional History and Global History.”*

⁸ Frank Ankersmit, “What is Wrong with World History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View?” paper presented at the *International Conference on “New Orientations in Historiography: Regional History and Global History.*

or her research.⁹ Be that as it may, the purview of “global history” still has to confront the “master narrative” assumed in historical studies in the past as it becomes a major research trend in the near future.¹⁰

Between the “national history,” which flourished in the 20th century, and the newly rising studies in “global history,” there also exist the studies of “regional history” conducted in different regions (interdisciplinary “area studies” of selected “regions” are as well in practice), such as East Asia, Western Europe, North America, Latin America, etc. “Regional history” in this sense is a new field of history that warrants serious thought and reflection. The main purposes of this article are illustrated as follows: first, to analyze the methodological basis of the practicing studies of “regional history” in one given area, i.e. the history of cultural exchanges in East Asia; secondly, to point out issues of problematques in studying the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia, and at last, to suggest related new research topics.

“Regional history,” as a field of historical inquiry, can be divided into two principal types: one lies somewhere between “national history” and “local history,” and the other between “national history” and “global history.”¹¹ The former type concerns the history of different regions within a country, such as the history of southern Taiwan, while the latter emphasizes the history of various trans-national regions, the histories of East Asia and Eastern Europe for instance. Based on the categorization, the domain

⁹ Edoardo Tortarolo, “Universal/World History: Its Past, Present and Future,” paper presented at the *International Conference on “New Directions in Historiography: Regional History and Global History.*

¹⁰ Chris Lorenz, Dominic Sachsenmaier, Sven Beckert, et al., will hold a panel discussion on, “Global History—An Inter-Regional Dialogue,” at the International Congress of Historical Sciences in Amsterdam in 2010.

¹¹ On these two kinds of “regional history,” see Allan Megill, “Regional History and the Future of Historical Writing,” paper presented at the International Conference on “New Orientations in Historiography: Regional History and Global History.

examined in the present article belongs to the latter type of “regional history,” as it concerns a trans-national region.

II. Reflections on Methodology

A. East Asia as a “Contact Zone”

Before discussing the methodological problems in the study of the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia, we must first look into some overall characteristics of this geographic region. Geographically, the region comprises mainland China, the Korean peninsula, Japan, Taiwan, the Indochina peninsula, and has its own distinctive climatic conditions, temperature ranges, etc. The 20th century Japanese philosopher, Tetsuro Watsuji (和辻哲郎, 1889-1960), identified three categories of regional characteristics in the world: monsoon, desert, and grazing land. He described that people who live in the monsoon region are delicate and rich in emotional life. Furthermore, they are willing to face disgrace and humiliation in order to fulfill a task and have a strong sense of history.¹² Perhaps Watsuji’s theory exhibits a dubious form of geographic determinism, yet the East Asian geographic region certainly is distinguished by its distinctive climates, environments and cultures.

“East Asia” is the “contact zone”¹³ of its constituent countries, peoples and cultures. For two thousand years, under unequal relationships of domination and subjugation, all kinds of exchange activities have been undertaken there. Prior to the 20th century, the Chinese empire was the dominative power in East Asia; during the first half of the 20th

¹² Tetsuro Watsuji, *Fudo: Ningengaku teki kosatsu* 風土—人間学の考察 (*Local cultures and customs: Anthropological observations*) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1935, 1960, 1979).

¹³ “Contact zone” indicates social spaces where people of different cultures interact and impact each other. Cf. Mary L. Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 2000, c. 1992), p. 6.

century, the Japanese empire rose to power, and other countries in the region were invaded by Japan and suffered the blood, sweat and tears of Japanese colonization; in the postwar period, with the United States leading the new hegemony, East Asia was reestablished on the new order of the Cold War. The turn of the 21st century witnessed the rapid rise of mainland China, which is fast pushing a realignment and rearrangement of the political and economic order of East Asia.

In the “East Asia” contact zone, the Chinese empire was vast and populous and enjoyed a long, continuous history. It not only exerted a powerful influence on politics, economics and culture of East Asian countries, inclusive of Korea, Japan, Vietnam, and the neighboring countries, but also played the role of the “center” of this “region.” From the standpoint of the countries on the periphery, China was the source of common elements of East Asian culture, including Chinese characters and their related culture, Confucian learning, Chinese medicine, etc. As a matter of fact, China did stand before them as a gargantuan “Unavoidable Other.”¹⁴

Because China played such a crucial role in forming the distinctive character of the East Asian region, the study of the history of cultural exchanges in this region is all the more complex and challenging. In the history of East Asia, China could be described, in terms of the history of modern nation-states, as a “trans-national” power in politics, economics, society and culture. For this reason, in the study of cultural exchanges within East Asia, to speak of exchange activities between China and Korea or Japan, or to speak of Sino-Korean or Sino-Japanese exchanges, would not be as precise as to

¹⁴ Noyakuni Koyasu 子安宣邦, *Kanjiron: Fukahi no tassha* 漢字論：不可避の他者 (*On Chinese Characters: The “Unavoidable Other”*) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2003).

speak of exchanges between the Zhejiang region and Japan or between the Shandong peninsula and Korea, which is considered more historically concrete.

B. The New Purview of “Regional History” Studies: The Turn from “Results” to “Process”

On the basis of the foregoing discussion, we may proceed to look into some methodological problems in the study of the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia. The first noteworthy problem is to shift the focus of the study from the “results” to the “process” of the regional cultural exchanges. This would be, in effect, to carry out a “paradigm shift” in the study of the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia.

In order to clarify this methodological reflection, we may take an influential compilation of writings by leading Japanese historians, *Iwanami Kōza Sekai Rekishi* (岩波講座世界歴史, *Iwanami Series of World History*), published in 1970, into account at discussion.¹⁵ This massive work in 31 volumes was far-reaching and broad-spirited. In the “Preface,” the editors first criticized the tendency of Japanese historians during the Meiji period (明治, 1868-1911) for their treating the term “world history” as synonymous with “western history.”¹⁶ The editors went on to remark that during the

¹⁵ Historians in postwar Japan have been enamored of “world history.” During the quarter century from the end of World War II until 1970, Japanese historians published 14 series, which titled *World History*. See Ming-shih Kao 高明士, *Zhanhou Riben de Zhong'guoshi yanjiu* 戰後日本的中國史研究 (Postwar Japanese studies on Chinese history) (Taipei: Mingwen Book Company 明文書局, 1996), p. 48, n. 1. The biggest and most representative work is *Iwanami Kōza Sekai Rekishi* 岩波講座世界歴史 (*Iwanami World History Series*) in 31 vols. The first printing was in 1970-71, and the second in 1974-75.

¹⁶ I would like to point out as well that preliminary stage of Western historical studies conducted in Japan covered the period from the early Meiji period until the beginning of the Tai Shiō era (大正, 1911-1926) is now complete. At the end of the 19th century, the History Department at Tokyo Imperial University was gradually laying its foundation and attracting and cultivating eminent faculty. In 1877, the great German historian, Ludwig Riess (1861-1928), came to lecture in Tokyo University, and was greatly influential. Next, the Japanese historian Kumezou Tsuboi (坪井九馬三, 1858-1936) returned to Tokyo University from studying in Europe in 1891 to lecture on history. From 1897, Tokyo University had

Showa period (昭和, 1926-1989), due to the influence of Marxism, Japanese historians underwent a major change in historical consciousness, and a new theoretical approach to “world history” was born. By then, Japanese historians had begun to criticize the Western Eurocentric historical perceptions of previous generations. However, the wartime outlook that the Pacific War was Japan’s “historical destiny” vanished into history along with Japan’s crushing defeat in the war. Since the end of the war, the study of “world history” in Japan has developed to new directions both in research and education. Thus, the editors of *Iwanami Kōza Sekai Rekishi* sought to criticize and assimilate these various forms of “world history.” In consideration of the reorientational historical consciousness of the Japanese people, the editors attempt to compile the latest Japanese research results in “world history.” In the ensuing work, the editors divided “world history” into eight “worlds,” ranging from antiquity to the present. They are: 1. The World of the Ancient Near-East, 2. The Mediterranean World, 3. The World of East Asian History, 4. The East Asian World, 5. The World of Inner-Asia, 6. The World of Western Asia, 7. The World of Medieval Europe, and 8. The World of Modern History.¹⁷

Although this compilation nominally claimed to cover the purview of “world history,” yet the chapters of each volume were written in the perspective of “national

many specialists in European history, such as Murakawa Kenko (村川堅固, 1875-1946), Uchida Ginzo (内田銀藏, 1872-1919), etc. Kyoto University established its College of Liberal Arts in 1906. In 1907, Kyoto University established its distinctive division of Western history. On November 1, 1889, Professor Riess’ students established the *History Association Journal* (later rechristened as *History Journal*). The direction and focus of the early issues of the journal were set by Professor Riess. In 1908, 坂口昂 initiated the “Historical Studies Association.” In 1916, he established the *History Grove* journal to encourage students to study Chinese and Western history in the purview of world history. Cf. Sakai Saburo 酒井三郎, *Nihon Seiyō Shigaku Hattatsushi* 日本西洋史學發達史 (*History of the Development of the Study of Western History in Japan*) (Tokyo: Yoshikawakōbunkan, 1969).

¹⁷ *Iwanami Kōza Sekai Rekishi* 岩波講座世界歴史 (*Iwanami World History Series*) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970), *Antiquity 1*, “Preface,” pp. 1-9.

history.” When discussing such problems, we may take volume 4, “Antiquity 4,” in *Formation of the East Asian World 1*, for example. This volume contains the following twelve chapters:

1. Establishment of the Yellow River Civilization
2. Creation of the Yin-Zhou 殷周 State
3. Formation of the Ancient Classics
4. Society and State during the Warring States Period
5. On the Various Philosophers and Hundred Schools of Thought
6. Establishment of Imperial Domination
7. Authoritarian System of the Han Empire
8. The Establishment of Government Trading Bureau of “Equalization and Standardization” 平準, and the Salt Monopoly
9. Establishment of Confucianism
10. Rise of Wang Mang’s (王莽) Political Authority
11. Later Han Empire and Big Families
12. The Han Empire and Frontier Peoples

Each of these chapters on historical events, personages and thought was written in complete accordance with the purview of Chinese “national history.” Therefore, it would have been more appropriate if the original title of this volume, *Formation of the East Asian World*, was replaced with *Formation of the Chinese World*.

The contents of this compilation suffer from at least two other major problems. First and foremost, each volume breaks down into a mosaic of chapters and lacks an overall structure. Since each of the volumes is presented in the context of “national

history” without any context of “world history,” it cannot avoid manifesting a phenomenon identified by Jack H. Hexter (1910-1996) as “the tunnel effect” in the study of history.¹⁸ For example, regarding the theme of the first volume of *Iwanami Kōza Sekai Rekishi*, the context of Chinese history is relevant and important, but the purview of “world history” would have provided a broader vantage point for considering and weighing its importance and meaning.

Secondly, because of the “decontextualization” that occurs when world history is practiced in this way, it turns out that each chapter focuses more on the “results” than on the “process” in describing the development of cultures. For example, each chapter in the *Formation of the East Asian World* volume discusses the completed formation of political institutions and economic measures, as in “Creation of the Yin-Zhou 殷周 State” and “Authoritarian System of the Han Empire.” Only chapter 6, “Establishment of Imperial Domination” by Sadao Nishijima (西嶋定生, 1919-1998) touched upon the relationship between Chinese Imperial Rule and the formation of the wider East Asian World.

The preceding discussion serves to reveal the broader significance of shifting the focus of the historical studies in cultural exchanges within East Asia from “results” to “process.” This transition in approach can stimulate the following three new directions in historical studies:

(1) Turn of Perspective: from “Structural” to “Developmental”

¹⁸ See Jack H. Hexter, *Reappraisals in History* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1961), p. 194f. See also David H. Fischer, *Historians’ Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought* (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1970), pp. 142ff.

Studies of cultural history that focus on “results” are most likely to be static researches that concentrate mainly on the analysis of selected common essential factors in culture. For example, Sadao Nishijima’s “General Introduction” to *Formation of the East Asian World*, volume 4 of *Iwanami Kōza Sekai Rekishi*, pointed out four main characteristics of the history of the civilization of the East Asian world, including the culture of Chinese characters, Confucianism, System of Imperial Laws and Orders, and Buddhism.¹⁹ These four characteristics reflect the static and “structural” perspective Nishijima took in viewing the common features of the historical world of East Asia. However, by focusing on the dynamic process of the history of East Asian culture, we would see these four cultural characteristics in the context of the developments of each country, e.g. China, Japan and Korea, and the different concrete contents associated with their “contextualization” or “localization.”

(2) Transition from “Center” to “Periphery”:

The turn from “structure” to “process” inclines the historian’s eye to turn from “center” to “periphery”.

By taking a result-oriented perspective in viewing cultural developments in East Asia, like Nishijima did, we would still identify static features like the four main characteristics he concluded because they were important phenomena in the mature manifestations of East Asian culture. Following this thread of thinking, Nishijima in fact wrote that, in the perspective of world history, the East Asian World was one of many pre-modern historical worlds that existed on its own as “a self-contained,

¹⁹ Sadao Nishijima, “General Introduction,” *Iwanami Kōza Sekai Rekishi*, vol. *Antiquity 4*, p. 5. Regarding Nishijima’s historical approach, see Kao Ming-shih 高明士, op cit., pp. 44 & 70ff.

complete historical world.”²⁰ But, as recent studies reveals, from late antiquity on, every known ethnic group has been proven to be engaged in cultural exchanges. From 2000 to 1000 BCE, the western and eastern sides of the old world had already conducted various exchanges, among which the one in metallurgy by way of Silk Road provided excellent example.²¹ Thus, we can say with certainty that East Asia was not a self-contained, complete historical world.

Sadao Nishijima’s methodology was based on the supposition that, in the specific exchange relations among East Asian countries, there was a sort of abstract, common “center” with essential characteristics that “unfolded” as they were adopted by the peripheral cultures. This view of the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia unconsciously implied a cultural and political monism and assumed that in the formation and development of cultures, the peripheral regions moved toward or away from the development path of the “center.” It also emphasized that, between center and peripheral, there was a sort of “principle of subordination” mechanism, but no corresponding “principle of coordination.”²²

However, once we opt to view the history of East Asian culture from the perspective of “process” rather than “results,” the focus would shift naturally from the “center” to the “periphery,”²³ which enables us to see the processes of cultural exchange activities between countries in this region, and witness the interactions,

²⁰ Sadao Nishijima, *ibid.*, p. 7.

²¹ Victor H. Mair, *Contact and Exchange in the Ancient World* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2006).

²² The terms, “principle of subordination” and “principle of coordination,” come from Mou Zongsan (牟宗三, 1909-1995). See his book *Zhongguo wenhua de shengcha* 中國文化的省察 (*Reflection upon the Chinese Culture*) (Taipei: Lien-ching Publishing Company 聯經出版事業公司, 1983), p. 68.

²³ Naturally, this is not to say that China at “the center” is not ultimately historically important. In fact, China functioned as the “Unavoidable Other,” and continues to exert a major impact on other countries in East Asia.

conflicts, transformations, and syntheses between the “self” of one people and the “other” (other selves) of other people(s). Consequently, the common destiny and values of East Asian culture ceased to emerge from a discrete center over and above each country, a unique set of core authoritarian values. On the contrary, the common core values of East Asian culture were formed in the process of each country’s interaction with the others; hence, the history of cultural interaction in East Asia is best viewed as a formation process of cultural subjectivities of each and every country. As Chen Hui-hung (陳慧宏, 1968-) has recently held that “in the “processes” of interaction and communication, the interlocking or multiplicity of diverse viewpoints is the visual angle that researchers should adopt.”²⁴ In the wake of the change of focus from “results” to “process” we have been discussing here, and the consequent movement from the “center” to the “periphery,” we can see more clearly the plurality of East Asian cultures. Each region has its own common characteristics, as Sadao Nishijima pointed out, and the unique and distinguishing features that set it apart.

(3) From text to atmosphere:

Once we have shifted our focus from “results” to “process” in studying the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia, the object of our research also shifts from text *per se* to atmosphere or environment. In the following analysis, we will look into the interactive relations between classical interpretation and political power as a case in point.

²⁴ Chen Hui-hung, “Wenhua xiangyu de fangfalun—pingzhe zhong’gou wenhua jiaoliu yanjiu de shiye 文化相遇的方法論——評析中歐文化交流研究的新視野” (Methodology of Cultural Interactions: New Perspective of Sino-European Cultural Interaction), *Historical Inquiry*, Vol. 40 (Taipei: Dept. of History, National Taiwan University, Dec. 2007), pp.239-278; quotation from p. 253..

Before the 20th century, when studying the history of East Asian countries, intellectuals tended to pore over the Confucian classics. This was because throughout East Asian history, in the setting of the imperial high tide, the practices of interpreting and citing the Confucian classics are in a complex relationship with the political power structure. I have recently combed through materials concerning East Asian Confucian interpretations of the *Analects*, *Mencius*, and other classics of significance. As shown in the interpretations, in relation to questions on the civil service examinations during the Ming dynasty (1368-1644), proscribed passages in *Mencius* were excluded by the imperial tutors in Tokugawa Japan (1600-1868), as well as from the citations of Confucian classics in dialogues between rulers and ministers during the Han (206B.C.-220) and the Tang (618-907) dynasties. In exploring these questions, I realized that East Asian interpreters of the Confucian classics tended to combine dual identities, Confucians and government officials, into one. This further confirmed the intimate relationship between their work as classical commentators and the political power. In sum, the implications of this dual nature relationship are threefold: first, to a large extent, classical interpretation and political power were inseparable; second, there was certain competition between these two sides; third, classical interpreters tended to strive to keep these two sides in balance.²⁵

If we adopted the traditional standpoint of the study of the history of East Asian culture, our research themes would inevitably focus on the classics themselves and the analysis of how the gifted intellectuals of each country interpreted the classics. However, if we adopted the new standpoint, aside from the focus on the classics, we would at the

²⁵ Chun-chieh Huang, "On the Relationship between Interpretations of the Confucian Classics and Political Power in East Asia: An Inquiry Focusing on the *Analects* and *Mencius*," *Medieval History Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (June 2008), pp.101-121

same time pay attention to how the contemporary environment, atmosphere, and the political situation influenced the interpreter's approach to the classics. Furthermore, we would also keep an eye on the question of how the classics in turn might have influenced or changed the atmosphere or environment of the interpreter's time and country.

C. The Relationship between “Global History,” “Regional History” and “National History”

The second methodological problem involved in bringing a “regional history” approach to the study of cultural exchanges in East Asia is: the relationship between “global history,” “regional history” and “national history.”

To start with taking the “regional history” approach in studying the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia does not involve provoking an abstract conceptual framework that prevails perpetually and ubiquitously. Quite to the contrary, it involves a field of interlocking interactions within concrete settings of specific times and places. This field of history of cultural exchanges definitely registers the blood, sweat and tears of every concerned people, such as the tortures and suffering undergone by Confucian intellectuals in their political environments. We can picture each country's exchange of envoy missions on horseback, merchants traveling across borders to exchange merchandise they possessed for those they were short of, intellectuals from different countries offering all kinds of new interpretations of the classics in light of their own cultural context. Consequently, the concept of “regional history” gradually comes to live in the interactive relationships between the “national histories” of each East Asian

country. This is certainly not an abstract sphere over and above each country's "national history."

In fact, "global history" and "regional history" are two mutually dependent research fields. Recently, scholars have been speaking more of "global history," and regarded it as a sphere of research that includes the entire globe as a research standpoint. Yet the so-called "world history" that came in vogue after the Second World War, in essence, was no different in conception from global history. In 1953, during the early postwar period, the *Journal of World History* was established, and the journal *Human History* commenced publication in 1963.²⁶ Authors of world histories in the postwar period tended to stress that historical studies ought to focus on specific historical events in historically significant regions of the world.²⁷ The historical personages and events of every country and region were to be weighed and assessed against the background or context of global history. According to such de facto standard, "regional history" constituted only a marginal sector of regional experience within "global history." But, if the unique, concrete experience of the peoples in different regions were to be put aside, then "global history" would end up with an empty abstract concept, devoid of content. Only when it is fully recognized that "regional history" forms the fundamental content for a meaningful "global history," can we go on and say that the notion of "global history" is understood more adequately as "trans-regional history."

D. The Problem of "Contextual Turn" in the Study of Regional History

²⁶ International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, *History of Mankind: Cultural and Scientific Development* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963).

²⁷ See, for example, L.S. Stavrianos, *The World to 1500: A Global History* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1975), pp. 4f.

The third methodological issue in the study of “regional history” is the problem of “the contextual turn.” The gist of this methodological issue is that in the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia, all “cultural products”²⁸ (including the classics and their values) were produced in concrete, specific cultural contexts. That is to say, each of them came from a specific time and place. Therefore, it is comprehensible that in the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia, the transmission of any cultural product (especially classical texts) to a peripheral area had to involve the process of “cultural turn” in order to become congenial to the locale. Yi T’oegye (李退溪, 1502-1571), the 16th century Korean master of Zhu Xi’s (朱熹, 1130-1200) philosophy, spent half of his lifetime editing *Zhuzi shu jieyao* (朱子書節要, completed in 1556), in which he emphasized that, given the differences in time and place between Zhu’s China and Yi’s Korea, he had no choice but to “cut out the dross 損約” in order to make Zhu Xi’s words palatable to Korean Confucian readers.²⁹ Although Yi’s expression, “cut out the dross,” originally referred to expunging passages (bowdlerizing the text), he was at the same time, in effect, running Zhu’s writings through “a contextual turn.” The interpretations of Confucius’ *Analects* appeared in the Tokugawa Japan (1600-1868) is a good case in point. This so-called “contextual turn” refers to the transplantation of various classics, which originally rooted deeply in the Chinese cultural context, into the Japanese cultural or intellectual context. The process, as was predicted, inevitably led to the production of entirely new interpretations. Such trans-cultural turn worked well in at

²⁸ The expression, “cultural product”, was coined by Roger Chartier. See Roger Chartier, *On the Edge of the Cliff: History, Language, and Practices*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).

²⁹ Yi Hwang 李滉이황, *Jujaseojeolyoseo* 朱子書節要序주자서절요서 (*Preface to Selections of the Works of Zhu Xi*), in *Dosanseowon* 陶山全書도산서원(*Complete Works of Yi Hwang*), 3 (Seoul 首爾 서울: Toegyehakyeonguwon 退溪學研究院퇴계학연구원, 1988, Toegyehakchongseo 退溪學叢書 퇴계학총서), vol.59, p.259.

least two aspects or contexts in East Asia, one in socio-political context (especially the so-called Han-Barbarian distinction) and the other in political thought (especially in the ruler-minister relationship), and gave rise to other trans-cultural problems in the interpretation of the classics.³⁰

Among the cultural products involved in the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia, the Confucian classics, in particular, underwent “contextual turns” at the hands of Confucian scholars and Confucian officials in Japanese and Korean society and courts where they had various functions and played many roles. From the Song dynasty, Chinese Confucians played crucial roles both in the society and the political arena. After passing the civil service examination, they would be promoted to high officials. Upon retiring from office, they would become country gentry. During the Choson Era (1392-1910), Korean Confucians of different ranks could eventually rise to “Yangban 兩班” aristocracy. As for the Confucians of Tokugawa Japan, they played the role of intellectuals in the society, who were not separated from the political power structure.³¹

The most representative example of “contextual turn” is the expression “China” (Zhong’guo 中國, lit. “Middle Kingdom”), which appears frequently in the early classics. In the context of Chinese culture and history, “Zhong’guo” refers at once to cultural and political identities, which, in the Chinese context, are fused into one.

³⁰ Chun-chieh Huang, *Dechuan riben lunyu quanshi shilun* 德川日本論語詮釋史論 (*A Study of the Tokugawa Confucians’ Interpretations of the Analects*) (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2006, 2007 rev. ed.), p. 43. (The Japanese translation is published by the Perikansha Press, Tokyo, 2008).

³¹ Cf. Hiroshi Watanabe, “Jusha, Literati and Yangban: Confucianists in Japan, China and Korea,” in Tadao Umesao, Catherine C. Lewis and Yasuyuki Kurita, eds. *Japanese Civilization in the Modern World V: Culteredness* (Senri Ethnological Studies 28) (Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 1990), pp. 13-30.

However, when Japanese Confucians of Tokugawa period read the expression “Zhong’guo” in the Chinese classics, they immediately sensed a dramatic gap between “political identity” and “cultural identity” because, so far as they were concerned, the term “Zhong’guo” denoted the homeland of their spirit and culture, despite the fact that the term originally meant another land historically and politically. They were convinced that instead of China, the term “Zhong’guo” referred to Japan, their own country, for they believed that, since Japan had truly obtained the Way of Confucius, Japan was more suitable to be called “Zhong’guo” than geographically central China. Quite a few similar examples of contextual turn show vividly that this is a common phenomenon encountered in the study of the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia. In contemporary Taiwan as well, the expression “Zhong’guo” has a dual reference to “cultural China” and “political China.”³² “Contextual turn” is an important phenomenon to note in the study of the history of cultural exchange within East Asia, and it will give rise to many research topics that await fresh scrutiny.

Once we begin to view the history of cultural exchange within East Asia in light of “the contextual turn,” we are better prepared to register that this history also illustrates what Clifford Geertz (1926-2006) called “thick description.”³³ Although historians began to pay attention to the problem of cultural history in the 1980s,³⁴ I still would like to emphasize that “cultural history” in the sense of “the object of the study of

³² For a more detailed discussion, see Chung-chieh Huang, “The Idea of ‘Zhong’guo’ and Its Transformation in Early Modern Japan and Contemporary Taiwan.” *Nihon Kanbungaku Kenkyu* 日本漢文學研究 (*The Journal of Kanbun Studies*) (March 2007): no. 2, pp. 398-408, Chinese version: “Lun zhong’guo jingdian zhong ‘zhong’guo’ gainian de hanyi jiqi zai jinshi riben yu xiandai Taiwan de zhuanhua 論中國經典中「中國」概念的涵義及其在近世日本與現代台灣的轉化,” *Taiwan Journal of East Asian Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2 (6th issue; Dec. 2006): 91-100.

³³ Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Culture* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), p. 5

³⁴ Georg G. Iggers, *New Directions in European Historiography* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1984), p. 200.

cultural exchanges” should not stop at examining and confirming the people, events, places and things exchanged, but should also at the same time closely examine them and seek the specific meaning of the transactions. As Clifford Geertz wrote,³⁵

[Believing that] man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be that whole web, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning.

If our study of the history of cultural exchanges enters into the webs of significance, we may start in a better position to appreciate the meaning of the exchange activities between each country in the history of East Asia.

III. Problematiques

Now that we are prepared to discuss “regional history” in connection with the problematiques in the study of the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia, I propose the two following issues for further study in this context.

A. Interaction of “Self” and “Other” in the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia

In Section II, it was pointed out that the focus of the study of the history of cultural interactions in East Asia should be shifted from the “results” to the “process” of the exchange activities. Having adopted this shift of attention in such inquiry, we would be better prepared to register the complex problems involved in the interactions, conflicts, and symbiosis of each country’s “self” with the “others.”

³⁵ Clifford Geertz, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

Many academic studies on the problematique of “self” and “other” have been published in recent years. In 2006, Richard Sorabji (1934-), a renowned expert on ancient Greek philosophy, argued that though “self” is difficult to investigate in itself, yet everyone still exhibits a “self” in responding to the world. The *conceptual meaning* of “self” is not very clear or determinate, but as for the *reference* of “self,” we can venture to say that generally it refers to a facet of our interactive activity. Because of this, Sorabji advocates that self is a sort of embodiment, which is made possible in a person’s manifold interactive relationship with the world.³⁶ In western tradition, the concept of self is also typically associated with those of “autonomy” and “rights.” Consequently, comparative ethicists tend to emphasize that the concept of “self” in Confucian philosophy is incompatible with the more individualized and abstract Western notions of “self.” Recently, however, Kwong-loi Shun 信廣來 has inquired into the practical domain of a broader “concept of man” in Chinese and western thought. Particularly, he analyzed the Confucian concepts of “mind”(xin 心, heart-mind), “will” (ci 氣, ambition, purpose), and “qi” (qi 氣, vitality, spirit), etc., and began to stress that the Western concepts of “autonomy” and “rights” are not necessarily incompatible with Confucian thought, just that in the Chinese concept of person, what is being stressed is the social dimensions of the person.³⁷ Viewed from the context of the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia, we consider that in these concrete historical experiences, the concepts of “self” and “other” will incorporate every kind or level of “self” and “other,” including gender, political, social, and cultural aspects, and so on. As I have

³⁶ Richard Sorabji, “The Self: Is There Such a Thing?” in his book, *Self: Ancient and Modern Insights About Individuality, Life and Death* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), pp. 17-31.

³⁷ Kwong-loi Shun, “Conception of the Person in Early Confucian Thought,” in Kwong-loi Shun and David B. Wong eds., *Confucian Ethics: A Comparative Study of Self, Autonomy, and Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 183-199.

illustrated elsewhere,³⁸ in the spectrum between “cultural identity” and “political identity,” one’s cultural self is more fundamental and inalienable.

The concrete interactions between “self” and “other” often bring about problematiques. In the study of the history of cultural interactions within East Asia, we can button tightly the “cultural identity” and “political identity,” which were associated with “self” and “other,” against the social and cultural background and the linguistic environment, so as to trace the gradual processes of attunement and assimilation, and confirm the significance of the theory.

In the history of cultural interactions within East Asia, the perception and construction of “self” tends to be completed in the course of interaction with the “other.” During the Eastern Chin (東晉, 317-420), Guo Pu (郭璞, 276-324) wrote in his preface to *Shanhaijing* (山海經, Classic of Mountains and Seas), “(Other) things do not regard themselves as ‘other.’ They wait for ‘me’ and then become my ‘other.’ ‘Otherness’ consequently comes from ‘me’; things are not inherently ‘other.’”³⁹ Huang Zongxi (黃宗羲, 1610-1695) said, “Filling the midst of heaven and earth, there are no so-called ‘ten thousand things.’ The expression ‘ten thousand things’ was entirely given by me (humanity), just as what I call ‘father’ is just my father.”⁴⁰ Both of these two passages maintain that “self” is constituted before “other” is recognized, and that

³⁸ Chun-chieh Huang, “Zhongri wenhuajiaoliushi zhong ‘ziwo’ yu ‘tazhe’ de hudong: leixing yu hanyi 中日文化交流史中「自我」與「他者」的互動：類型與涵義” (The Interaction between the “Self” and “Others” in the Sino-Japanese Context between 17th and 20th Century: Tensions and Implications) *Taiwan Journal of East Asian Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2 (8th issue; Dec. 2007), pp.85-105.

³⁹ Pu Guo, *Shanhai jing* 山海經 (*Classic of Mountains and Seas*) (*Siku congkan chubian suoben edition* 四部叢刊初編縮本), p. 1a.

⁴⁰ Zongxi Huang, *Huang Zongxi quanji* 黃宗羲全集 (*Complete Works of Huang Zongxi*) (Hanzhou 杭州: Zhejiang guji Press 浙江古籍出版社, 1985), vol. 1, *Mengzi shi shuo* 孟子師說 (*Comments on the Mencius*), sec. 7, “*Wanwu jiebei zhang* 萬物皆備章” (*Chapter on Myriad Things Are in Myself*) p. 149.

matches the experiences recorded in cultural exchanges between China and Korea during the Chosan period. The critique of Chinese culture and thought by Korean visitors to China reflected their observations of “self” and “other” in the concrete cultural exchanges between China and Korea. Such criticism also revealed that the Korean visitors’ perception of “self” had preceded their perception of the Chinese “others.”

In many situations, the encounters and intercourse with the “other” aroused important factors of self. Therefore, early in the 20th century when Japanese sinologists, such as Naito Konan (內藤湖南, 1866-1934), Yoshikawa Kijiro (吉川幸次郎, 1904-1980), Aoki Masao (青木正兒, 1887-1964), and Uno Tetsuto (宇野哲人, 1875-1974), toured China, they all started out with their firm Japanese sense of “political self” and “cultural self.” In the setting of Chinese politics and culture, they always underwent a realization process—from subconscious to conscious.⁴¹ The experience of Uno Tetsuto, the Tokyo University professor of Chinese philosophy, provides an excellent example. Given the fact that he felt deep reverence for Confucius (551-479 BCE), yet while traveling along the Great Wall at Badaling 八達嶺 in 1906, he climbed atop the Great Wall to sing the Japanese national anthem.⁴²

⁴¹ Chun-chieh Huang, “Ershi shiji chuqi riben hanxuejia yanzhong de wenhua zhong’guo yu xianshi zhong’guo 二十世紀初期日本漢學家眼中的文化中國與現實中國” (Cultural China and Realistic China in the Eyes of Japanese Sinologists in the Beginning of the Twentieth Century) in *Dongya Ruxueshi de xinshiye 東亞儒學史的新視野 (New Perspectives in the History of East Confucianism)* (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2004), pp.265-312.

⁴² Uno Tetsuto 宇野哲人, *Shina bunmeiki 支那文明記 (Account of Chinese Civilization)* (Tokyo: Taitokan, 1912), collected in Kojima Shinji 小島晋治 ed., *Bakumatsu Meiji Chugoku Kenbunroku Shusei 幕末明治中国見聞録集成 (Collection of Travelogues of China in the End of Tokugawa Period and the Beginning of Meiji Era)* (Tokyo: Yumane Shobo, 1997), Chinese translation given in: Xuefeng Zhang 張學鋒, *Zhong’guo wenming ji 中國文明記* (Beijing: Guangming Ribao Press 光明日報出版社, 1999.) For an account of Uno Tetsuto singing Japan’s national anthem atop the Great Wall, see p. 60 of the Chinese translation. For an account of Uno Tetsuto’s travels in China, see Joshua A. Fogel,

The interactions between “self” and “other” produced images of the “other,” especially in the self’s “representations” of the “other”—to the extent of sketching “imaginative geographies” of the “other.”⁴³ These images are particularly evident in the travel journals, written accounts and local gazettes of East Asian travelers in neighboring countries. For example, after China’s ceding of Taiwan to Japan in 1895, several Chinese intellectuals and officials toured around Taiwan and left firsthand accounts of various aspects of contemporary Taiwan, which were expressed from their Chinese perspective. These works include *Quan Tai youji* (全台遊記, traveled in Taiwan from 1891 to 1894) by Chi Zhicheng (池志徵, 1853-1937), *Kunying riji* (鯤瀛日記, traveled in Taiwan from March 22 to April, 1919) by Shi Jingchen (施景琛, 1873-1955), and Zhang Zunxu 張遵旭’s compilation, *Taiwan youji* (台灣遊記, traveled in Taiwan from April 4 to 20, 1916).⁴⁴

Sometimes, the “self’s” observations or descriptions of the “other” came from the reports of official delegates’ interactions, such as the Japanese accounts of the medieval China by the envoys dispatched to Tang China and the those written by Korean envoys to Ming China. Occasionally people drifted to other countries due to sudden changes in the weather or by accident. In 1826, after the Japanese ship drifted to Shanghai, the Chinese composed poems dedicated to the Japanese refugees. Japanese also drifted to Guangdong 廣東 and wrote descriptions of Guangzhou Harbor.⁴⁵ During

“Confucian Pilgrimage: Uno Tetsuto’s Travels in China, 1906,” in *The Cultural Dimension of Sino-Japanese Relations: Essays on the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1995), pp. 95-117.

⁴³ D. Clayton, “Critical Imperial and Colonial Geographies,” in K. Anderson et. al., eds., *Handbook of Cultural Geography* (London: Sage Publications, 2003), pp. 354-368.

⁴⁴ These three books are collected in *Taiwan Youji* 台灣遊記 (*Travel Notes of Taiwan*) (Taipei: Economic Research Office of Bank of Taiwan, 1960, Taiwan Literature Series no. 89).

⁴⁵ See Matsuura Akira 松浦章, *op. cit.*, pp. 310-344.

the Qing dynasty in 1835, Cai Tinglan (蔡廷蘭, 1801-1859), a “presented scholar” from Penghu 澎湖, encountered a storm while riding a boat to Taiwan and drifted to Vietnam. The following year, after traveling overland back to Fujian 福建, he compiled his observations in *Hainan Zazhu* 海南雜著.⁴⁶ All of the aforementioned historical records, whether intentionally written or not, provide important documentary materials concerning the self’s “representations” of others for our study of the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia.

B. Interactions between Cultural Exchange and Power Structure in East Asia

The second aspect of the problematique in the study of the history of cultural interactions in East Asia lies in the cultural exchange activities among East Asian countries. What forms of political power came into play? This issue inevitably leads us to reflect on imperial China’s role as “Unavoidable Other” to other East Asian countries. In Chinese history, China’s vast imperial scale started with the Qin dynasty (221-206 BCE) and grew ever stronger and more mature. Once the Chinese imperial order was established as the central political order, it produced a comprehensive system for cultural transmission and intellectual infrastructure. Huai-chen Kan (甘懷真, 1963-) has summed up the complex relationships among the Confucian school, the Confucian state, and the imperial order, and provided issues for further discussions.⁴⁷ According to him,

⁴⁶ Cai Ting-lan, *Hainan Zazhu* 海南雜著 (*Miscellany of the South of Sea*) (Taipei: Economic Research Institute, Bank of Taiwan, 1960); For Cai’s Biography, see *Penghu tingzhi*, sec. 14, Yiwen b. For a recent study of Cai Ting-yan, see Chen I-yuan, *Tsai Ting-lan jiqi Hainan Zachu* 蔡廷蘭及其海南雜著 (*Cai Tinglan and His Miscellany of the South of Sea*) (Taipei: Li-ren press, 2006).

⁴⁷ Huai-chen Kan, *Huangquan, Liyi yu jingdian quanshi: zhong'guo gudai zhengzhi shi yanjiu* 皇權、禮儀與經典詮釋：中國古代政治史研究 (*Imperial Power, Rituals and Interpretations of Classics: A Study on Ancient Chinese Political History*) (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2004).

the Chinese political order unfolded as a special East Asian worldview,⁴⁸ which influenced the theory of royal power held throughout the entire region.⁴⁹ The history of cultural interactions within East Asia really unfolded in the interlocking network of imperial power structures.

Related issues that can be dealt with include:

1. After the fall of a center of political power in East Asia, the fall of the Ming in 1644 for instance, what changes start to appear in the cultural exchange activities? What is its impact on the domestic policies, thought and culture produced in other East Asian countries, such as Korea?⁵⁰
2. In the history of interactions between China and Japan, to what extent and depth do we see the cultural exchanges being influenced by the two countries' power structures?

IV. Possible Research Topics

Finally, on the basis of the above discussions, we may suggest the following three topics for further study of cultural interactions within East Asia.

⁴⁸ Huai-chen Kan, "Chongxin sikao dongya wangquan yu shijieguan—yi 'tianxia' guan'nian de zai jiantao 重新思考東亞王權與世界觀——以「天下」與「中國」為關鍵詞" (*Rethink East Asian Imperial Power and World View*) in Huai-chen Kan ed. *Dongya jinshi shijieguan de xingcheng 東亞歷史上的天下與中國概念 (Ideas of "All under Heaven" and "China" in East Asian History)* (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2007).

⁴⁹ Huai-chen Kan, *Tianxia guojia: dongya wangquanlun 天下國家：東亞王權論 (On the East Asian Imperial Power)* (Taipei: San Min Book Co. Ltd. 三民書局, 2008).

⁵⁰ For studies of Korean reverence in the 17th and 18th centuries for the Zhou dynasty and for China and their reflections on intellectual currents in the Ming dynasty, see Sun Weiguo 孫衛國, *Da Ming qihao yu xiaozhonghua yishi—qianxiang wangchao cun zhou siming wenti yanjiu 大明旗號與小中華意識——朝鮮王朝尊周思明問題研究, 1637-1800 (Flag and Title of the Ming Dynasty and "Small China" Consciousness)* (Beijing: Commercial Press, 2007).

A. Exchange of people: “Professional intermediate agents” and their observations of the “others”

In the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia, people from every country traveled along each others' roads, paid secret visits back and forth; not only can the Japanese envoys to China be traced back to medieval period, so can the Korean ministers and intellectuals who were dispatched to China, and the exchanges of envoys between Japan and Korea, etc. All of them left quantities of historical materials well worth further examination.

As for the people who actually conducted the cultural exchanges in East Asia, most of them were what Lian-sheng Yang (楊聯陞, 1914-1990) described as “professional intermediate agents 媒介人物,” including merchants, entrepreneurs, purchasing agents, compradors, labor hiring agents, matchmakers to unite two families, gatekeepers who served as messenger servants, various sorts of envoys, missionaries, pastors, high priests, wizards, teachers, translators, simultaneous interpreters, etc.⁵¹

“Private intermediate agents” are invaluable objects of the study in the history of cultural exchange in East Asia, for that these agents were not only prime movers in the political and economic activities of each country, but were also important carriers of each country's social and cultural value ideals. The first manifestation of cultural exchange in East Asia was in the exchange of people.

B. Exchange of material goods (especially texts)

⁵¹ Lien-sheng Yang, “Zhong'guo wenhua de meijie renwu 中國文化的媒介人物”(Professional Intermediate Agents of Chinese Culture) in *Dalu zazhi shixue congshu* 大陸雜誌史學叢書 (Mainland Magazine Series of Historical Studies), first series, vol. 1, *Shixue tonglun* 史學通論 (General Account of Historical Studies) (Taipei: Dalu zazhi 大陸雜誌社, n.d.), pp. 243-250; see especially p. 244.

The second research topic would be the exchange of material goods in the cultural exchanges within East Asia. The exchange of books and texts, in particular, was a special phenomenon of cultural exchange in this region. The export of Chinese literary texts to Japan in the 9th century was estimated to be totaled about 1568 titles. At the beginning of the 19th century, about 70-80% of the books Japan imported were written in Chinese.⁵² Among these books, important classics, such as Confucius' *Analects* and the *Mencius*, made a tremendous impact on Japanese thinkers. Their influence was deep and far-reaching.⁵³ Moreover, the Japanese had successfully preserved some Chinese classics, and in turn exported them back to China after these classics were lost there. Looking back again at the facts of cultural exchange between Japan and Korea, from 1395 to 1443, Japan sent envoys to Korea every year in search of important Buddhist classics, including *Da zang jing* 大藏經, *Da porou jing* 大般若經, and *Fahua jin* 法華經.⁵⁴ These cases all reflect the intimate cultural relationships between China, Japan and Korea. Consequently, Yong Wang (王勇, 1956-) recommended that, besides the Silk Road, East Asia had another "Book Road" network as an alternative pathway of cultural exchange.⁵⁵

C. Exchange of Thought and Ideas

⁵² Shaodang Yan 嚴紹璽, *Ribenren miesongren wenji shanben gouchen* 日本藏宋人文集善本鈎沉 (*Selections of the Rare Editions of the Literary Corps of Song Literati Preserved in Japan*) (Hangzhou 杭州: Hangzhou University Press 杭州大學出版社, 1996), pp. 1f.

⁵³ See Chun-chieh Huang, *Dechuan riben lunyu quanshi shilun*; Kun-chiang Chang, *Riben dechuang shidai guwenpai de wangdao zhengzhilun: yi Ito Jinzai, Daisheng Zulai wei zhongxin* 日本德川時代古學派的王道政治論：以伊藤仁齋、荻生徂徠為中心 (*Politics of Kingly Way of the School of Classical Learning in Tokugawa Japan*) (Taipei: Nation Taiwan University Press, 2004).

⁵⁴ See Kang Chu Chin 姜周鎮 강주진, "Hachaengchongjae • Haeje 海行摠載 □ 解題해행총재 • 해제 (*Collections of Travelogues • Introduction*)," in *Haehaengchongjae 海行摠載해행총재 (Collections of Travelogues)* (Seoul 首爾 서울: Minjokmunhwa Chujinhoe 民族文化推進會 민족문화추진회, 1974), 《GojeonGukyeok Chongseo 古典國譯叢書고전국역총서》78, vol. 1, pp. 1-28.

⁵⁵ See Yong Wang 王勇, *Zhong-Ri 'shuji zhi lu' yanjiu* 中日「書籍之路」研究 ("Road of Book" between China and Japan) (Beijing 北京: Beijing Library Press 北京圖書館出版社, 2003).

The above discussions on the exchange of people and material goods, especially texts, have significant implications for the exchange of thought and ideas. This is the third theme in the study of the history of cultural exchanges within East Asia. Under this theme, we find numerous research problems regarding the above-mentioned texts. Moreover, since China was perceived as the “Unavoidable Other,” the two following issues are worth exploring:

(1) The impact of Chinese thought on Japan and Korea:

There always existed a huge gap between Chinese thought and the local conditions of the peripheral countries of East Asia. The acceptance of *Mencius* in Japan is a good example. In Tokugawa Japan, the political system had clearly rejected Mencius’ political thought, so that as soon as *Mencius* was imported to Japan, it immediately drew the attacks from the thinker of Sorai school (徂徠學派), and aroused debates between the Classical Meaning school and the Zhu xi school.⁵⁶ After *Mencius* was exported to Japan and Korea, the elements of the thought, which were deemed to be inconsistent with special features of Japan’s and Korea’s political systems and intellectual styles, stirred up intellectual waves that are certainly worth further scrutiny.

(2) The problem of “self identity” arises in the cultural exchange within East

Asia: In the intimate cultural relations between each country in East Asia, the huge “Unavoidable Other,” China, always stirred up the problem of self-identity in the peripheral regions. In 18th century Japan, debates between Tou Teikan (藤貞幹, 1732-1797) and the National Learning school thinker,

⁵⁶ See Kun-chiang Chang, *op. cit.*, ch. 5, pp. 219-286.

Motoori Norinaga (本居宣長, 1730-1801), over the provenance and nature of Japanese culture is a prime example. Tou Teikan believed that Japanese cultural factors such as imperial system, language, names, etc., had originated in Korea, and that Zhen-Han 辰韓 had been descended from remnants of the vanquished Qin 秦. Tou Teikan's theory that Japan's culture was largely borrowed from overseas aroused forceful critique from Motoori Norinaga, who called Tou Teikan a madman.⁵⁷ This is known as the “Korea problem” dispute in the history of Japanese thought. Throughout this debate one can easily sense the projection of gargantuan China in the background. This is an important phenomenon in the study of cultural exchanges within East Asia.

Naturally, in the approximately 1500-year period of cultural exchanges within East Asia, the range of possible research themes is not limited to the above-mentioned exchanges of people, material goods—especially texts—and thought and ideas. Aside from these, there was also exchanges of political systems, such as impact of the Chinese imperial system on the peripheral countries, and of religious faith, such as the transmission eastward of faith in Guanyin 觀音, etc. Any of these would make a good topic worth of further inquiry.

V. Conclusion

⁵⁷ See Teikan Tô, “Shôkôhatsu 衝口發” (Spontaneous Thoughts), Norinaga Motoori, “Kenkyôjin 鉗狂人” (Madman), in Junkyô Washio 鷺尾順敬 ed., *Nihon Shirsô Tôsô Shiriô* 日本思想闘諍史料 (*Sources of Intellectual Conflicts in Japan*) (Tokyo, Meicyo Kankôkai 名著刊行會, 1970), pp. 227-312. See also Noyakuni Koyasu, *Houhoutoshite no Edo* 方法としての江戸 (*Edo as Method*) (Tokyo: Perikansha, 2000), pp. 16-26.

As globalization in the 21st century accelerates and unfolds, it is creating the effect of “de-nationalization” and “de-regionalization” on one hand;⁵⁸ on the other hand, it is leading to “interconnectedness” among regions of the globe.⁵⁹ These new developments have made a major impact on “nation states,” an idea that prevailed in the 20th century.⁶⁰ Still, it remains the case that in economic activities in the age of globalization, each person remains, first and foremost, a citizen of a nation; only in a derivative sense can he or she be reckoned a citizen of the global village. While recommending a regional approach in the study of the history of cultural interactions within East Asia, I still insist on “national history”⁶¹ so that the purview of legitimate historical research is properly expanded and that, in the future, the purview of “global history” will be sufficiently concrete and well-grounded.

In the second section of this article, I recommend to adopt a “regional history” approach to the study of the history of cultural interactions within East Asia. Methodologically, this would imply a shift of focus from the “results” to the “process” of such cultural exchanges. This adoption of a more dynamic viewpoint in conducting the study of cultural exchanges within East Asia would push the focus of the study from the “center” outward to the periphery, from the original text to atmosphere or the environment in which the text was reinterpreted.

⁵⁸ Ulrich Beck, Chinese trans. Sun Chih-pen 孫治本, *Quanchiuhua weiji* 全球化危機 (The Crisis of Globalization) (Taipei: Commercial Press, 1999), p. 90f.

⁵⁹ Anthony Giddens, *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994), pp. 4f.

⁶⁰ Peter F. Drucker, “The Global Economy and the Nation State,” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 5, pp. 159-171.

⁶¹ “National history” is still being discussed in recent publications. See, for example, Stefan Berger, Mark Donovan, and Kevin Passmore, eds., *Writing National Histories: Western Europe Since 1800* (London: Routledge, 1989); Stefan Berger, ed., *Writing the Nation: A Global Perspective* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

In section three, I also recommend that two aspects of problematiques be taken up as starting points for researches on the history of cultural exchanges in East Asia. The first one was the interaction and stress between “self” and “other” in the process of cultural exchange in East Asia. The second one was the relationship between activities of cultural exchange and the power structure of every East Asian country. Once these two aspects of problematique have been explicated, section four of the paper proposed that, among the possible research themes to pursue in this field, it would be fruitful to focus on the exchange of people, especially “professional intermediate agents,” of material goods, especially texts, and of thought and ideas, between the countries in East Asia.

Following the rise of Asia—East Asia in particular—in the 21st century and the globalization is underway, the state-centric studies in the humanities and social sciences in East Asia has gradually been changed to taking “East Asia” as a whole. For example, Tokyo University used to have a chair in “Chinese Philosophy,” which is now being reconceived as a chair in “East Asian Thought and Cultural Studies.” The Institute for Cultural Interaction Studies, Kansai University, has started publishing the *Journal of East Asian Cultural Interaction Studies* since 2008.

Recently, Yu Ying-shih (余英時, 1930-) looked back at the Chinese intellectuals’ obsession with Western analytic models of Pragmatism and Marxism during most of the 20th century, and pointed out that in the past 20 years a new turn in the study of cultural history has taken place in international historical community. He hoped that Chinese historian would truly immerse themselves in traditional Asian culture, and devise new problematiques concepts and methods for tracing the Chinese historical experience with greater probity. Preferably, they would not again be employing problematiques and methods from the outside, such as theories and practices adopted from the Western

world. Yu suggested that the reason why a society and its people merits studying is not just because they are a part of the larger world, but, more importantly, because they bear some intrinsic value in their own right.⁶² Taking a “regional history” approach to the study of the history of cultural interaction within East Asia represents a way of implementing the idea of returning to and immersing ourselves in the East Asian cultural traditions to appreciate and understand its diversity and richness.

⁶² Ying-shih Yu, “Clio’s New Turn and the Rediscovery of Tradition in Asia,” *Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy*, vol. 6, no. 1 (March 2007): 39-51.

Bibliography:

- Ankersmit, Frank, "What is Wrong with World History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View?" paper presented at the *International Conference on "New Orientations in Historiography: Regional History and Global History*.
- Barracough, Geoffrey, *Main Trends in History* (New York & London: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1979), p. 149.
- Beck, Ulrich, trans. Sun Chih-pen 孫治本, *Quanchiuhua weiji 全球化危機* (The Crisis of Globalization) (Taipei: Commercial Press, 1999).
- Berger, Stefan, ed., *Writing the Nation: A Global Perspective* (Basingstroke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).
- , Mark Donovan, and Kevin Passmore, eds., *Writing National Histories: Western Europe Since 1800* (London: Routledge, 1989).
- Cai, Ting-lan, *Hainan Zazhu 海南雜著* (*Miscellany of the South of Sea*) (Taipei: Economic Research Institute, Bank of Taiwan, 1960).
- Chang, Kun-chiang, *Riben dechuang shidai guwenpai de wangdao zhengzhilun: yi Ito Jinzai, Daisheng Zulai wei zhongxin 日本德川時代古學派的王道政治論：以伊藤仁齋、荻生徂徠為中心* (*Politics of Kingly Way of the School of Classical Learning in Tokugawa Japan*) (Taipei: Nation Taiwan University Press, 2004).
- Chartier, Roger, *On the Edge of the Cliff: History, Language, and Practices*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).
- Chen, Hui-hung, "Wenhua xiangyu de fangfalun—pingzhe zhong'gou wenhua jiaoliu yanjiu de shiye 文化相遇的方法論——評析中歐文化交流研究的新視野" (Methodology of Cultural Interactions: New Perspective of Sino-European Cultural Interaction), *Historical Inquiry*, Vol. 40 (Taipei: Dept. of History, National Taiwan University, Dec. 2007), pp.239-278.
- Chen, I-yuan, *Tsai Ting-lan jiqi Hainan Zachu 蔡廷蘭及其海南雜著* (*Cai Tinglan and His Miscellany of the South of Sea*) (Taipei: Li-ren press, 2006).
- Clayton, D., "Critical Imperial and Colonial Geographies," in K. Anderson et. al., eds., *Handbook of Cultural Geography* (London: Sage Publications, 2003), pp. 354-368.
- Drucker, Peter F., "The Global Economy and the Nation State," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 5, pp. 159-171.
- Fischer, David H., *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought* (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1970).
- Fogel, Joshua A., "Confucian Pilgrimage: Uno Tetsuto's Travels in China, 1906," in *The Cultural Dimension of Sino-Japanese Relations: Essays on the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1995), pp. 95-117.
- Geertz, Clifford, *The Interpretation of Culture* (New York: Basic Books, 1973).
- Giddens, Anthony, *Beyond Left and Rights: The Future of Radical Politics* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994).

- Guo, Pu, *Shanghai jing* 山海經 (*Classic of Mountains and Seas*) (*Siku congkan chubian suoben edition* 四部叢刊初編縮本) (Taipei: Zhonghua Publishing Company, 1965).
- Hexter, Jack H., *Reappraisals in History* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1961).
- Huang, Chun-chieh, "On the Relationship between Interpretations of the Confucian Classics and Political Power in East Asia: An Inquiry Focusing on the *Analecets* and *Mencius*," *Medieval History Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (June 2008), pp.101-121.
- , "Zhongri wenhuajiaoliushi zhong 'ziwo' yu 'tazhe' de hudong: leixing yu hanyi 中日文化交流史中「自我」與「他者」的互動：類型與涵義" (The Interaction between the "Self" and "Others" in the Sino-Japanese Context between 17th and 20th Century: Tensions and Implications) *Taiwan Journal of East Asian Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2 (8th issue; Dec. 2007), pp.85-105.
- , "Historical Thinking as a Form of New Humanism for Twentieth-century China: Qian Mu's View of History," paper presented at the *International Conference on "New Orientations in Historiography: Regional History and Global History,"* held at East China Normal University, Shanghai, November 3-5, 2007.
- , "The Idea of 'Zhong'guo' and Its Transformation in Early Modern Japan and Contemporary Taiwan." *Nihon Kanbungaku Kenkyu* 日本漢文學研究 (*The Journal of Kanbun Studies*) (March 2007): no. 2, pp. 398-408.
- , *Dechuan riben lunyu qianshi shilun* 德川日本論語詮釋史論 (*A Study of the Tokugawa Confucians' Interpretations of the Analects*) (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2006, 2007 rev. ed.).
- , "Ershi shiji chuqi riben hanxuejia yanzhong de wenhua zhong'guo yu xianshi zhong'guo 二十世紀初期日本漢學家眼中的文化中國與現實中國" (Cultural China and Realistic China in the Eyes of Japanese Sinologists in the Beginning of the Twentieth Century) in *Dongya Ruxueshi de xinshiye* 東亞儒學史的新視野 (*New Perspectives in the History of East Confucianism*) (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2004), pp.265-312.
- , "Qian Binsi shixue zhong de guoshi guan: neihan, fangfa yu yiyi" 錢賓四史學中的「國史」觀：內涵、方法與意義 (The "National History" in Qian Mu's Historical Thinking: Contents, Methods and Meanings), *Bulletin of the Department of History of National Taiwan University*, No.26 (December, 2002), pp.1-37.
- Iggers, Georg G., *New Directions in European Historiography* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1984).
- and Q. Edward Wang, "The Globalization of History and Historiography: Characteristics and Challenges, from the 1990s to the Present," paper presented at the *International Conference on "New Orientations in Historiography: Regional History and Global History."*

- Huang, Zongxi, *Huang Zongxi quanji* 黃宗羲全集 (*Complete Works of Huang Zongxi*) (Hanzhou 杭州: Zhejiang guji Press 浙江古籍出版社, 1985).
- Kan, Huai-chen, *Tianxia guojia: dongya wangquanlun* 天下國家：東亞王權論 (*On the East Asian Imperial Power*) (Taipei: San Min Book Co. Ltd.三民書局, 2008).
- , “Chongxin sikao dongya wangquan yu shijiequan—yi ‘tianxia’ guan’nian de zai jiantao 重新思考東亞王權與世界觀——以「天下」與「中國」為關鍵詞” (*Rethink East Asian Imperial Power and World View*) in Huai-chen Kan ed. *Dongya jinshi shijieguan de xingcheng* 東亞歷史上的天下與中國概念 (*Ideas of “All under Heaven” and “China” in East Asian History*) (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2007).
- , *Huangquan, Liyi yu jingdian quanshi: zhong’guo gudai zhengzhi shi yanjiu* 皇權、禮儀與經典詮釋：中國古代政治史研究 (*Imperial Power, Rituals and Interpretations of Classics: A Study on Ancient Chinese Political History*) (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2004).
- Kang, Chu Chin, “Haehaengchongjae • Haeje 해행총재 • 해제 (*Collections of Travelogues • Introduction*),” in *Haehaengchongjae* 해행총재 (*Collections of Travelogues*) (Seoul: Minjokmunhwa Chujinhoe 민족문화추진회, 1974), 《*GojeonGukyeok Chongseo* 고전국역총서》78, vol. 1, pp. 1-28.
- Kao, Ming-shih, *Zhanhou Riben de Zhong’guoshi yanjiu* 戰後日本的中國史研究 (Postwar Japanese studies on Chinese history) (Taipei: Mingwen Book Company, 1996).
- Koyasu, Noyakuni, *Kanjiron: Fukahi no tassha* 漢字論：不可避の他者 (*On Chinese Characters: The “Unavoidable Other”*) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2003).
- , *Houhoutoshite no Edo* 方法としての江戸 (*Edo as Method*) (Tokyo: Perikansha, 2000).
- Mair, Victor H., *Contact and Exchange in the Ancient World* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2006).
- Megill, Allan, “Regional History and the Future of Historical Writing,” paper presented at the International Conference on “New Orientations in Historiography: Regional History and Global History.
- Motoori, Norinaga, “Kenkyôjin 鉗狂人” (Madman), in Junkyô Washio 鷺尾順敬 ed., *Nihon Shirsô Tôsô Shiriô* 日本思想闘争史料 (*Sources of Intellectual Conflicts in Japan*) (Tokyo: Meicyo Kankôkai 名著刊行會, 1970), pp. 227-312. *Houhoutoshite no Edo* 方法としての江戸 (*Edo as Method*) (Tokyo: Perikansha, 2000).
- Mou, Zongsan, *Zhongguo wenhua de shengcha* 中國文化的省察 (*Reflection upon the Chinese Culture*) (Taipei: Lien-ching Publishing Company 聯經出版事業公司, 1983), p. 68.

- Saburo, Sakai, *Nihon Seiyô Shigaku Hattatsushi* 日本西洋史学發達史 (*History of the Development of the Study of Western History in Japan*) (Tokyo: Yoshikawakôbunkan, 1969).
- Sorabji, Richard, “The Self: Is There Such a Thing?” in his book, *Self: Ancient and Modern Insights About Individuality, Life and Death* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).
- Sato, Masayuki, “East Asian Historiography and Historical Thought,” in the *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 2002), pp. 6776-6782.
- Shun, Kwong-loi, “Conception of the Person in Early Confucian Thought,” in Kwong-loi Shun and David B. Wong eds., *Confucian Ethics: A Comparative Study of Self, Autonomy, and Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 183-199.
- Stavrianos, L.S., *The World to 1500: A Global History* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1975).
- Sun, Weiguo, *Da Ming qihao yu xiaozhonghua yishi—qianxiang wangchao cun zhousiming wenti yanjiu* 大明旗號與小中華意識——朝鮮王朝尊周思明問題研究, 1637-1800 (*Flag and Title of the Ming Dynasty and “Small China” Consciousness*) (Beijing: Commercial Press, 2007).
- Tetsuto, Uno, *Shina bunmeiki* 支那文明記 (*Account of Chinese Civilization*) (Tokyo: Taitokan, 1912), collected in Kojima Shinji 小島晋治 ed., *Bakumatsu Meiji Chugoku Kenbunroku Shusei* 幕末明治中国見聞録集成 (*Collection of Travelogues of China in the End of Tokugawa Period and the Beginning of Meiji Era*) (Tokyo: Yumane Shobo, 1997).
- Tô, Teikan, “Shôkôhatsu 衝口發” (Spontaneous Thoughts), in *Nihon Shirisô Tôsô Shirisô*, pp. 227-312.
- Tortarolo, Edoardo, “Universal/World History: Its Past, Present and Future,” paper presented at the *International Conference on “New Directions in Historiography: Regional History and Global History*.
- Tôyama, Shigeki, *Sengo no Rekinshigaku to Rekishiishiki* 戦後の歴史学と歴史意識 (*Historical Studies and Historical Consciousness in Postwar Japan*) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1968).
- Wang, Yong, *Zhong-Ri ‘shuji zhi lu’ yanjiu* 中日「書籍之路」研究 (“Road of Book” between China and Japan) (Beijing 北京: Beijing Library Press 北京圖書館出版社, 2003).
- Watanabe, Hiroshi, “Jusha, Literati and Yangban: Confucianists in Japan, China and Korea,” in Tadao Umesao, Catherine C. Lewis and Yasuyuki Kurita, eds. *Japanese Civilization in the Modern World V: Culteredness* (Senri Ethnological Studies 28) (Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 1990), pp. 13-30.

- Watsuji, Tetsuro, *Fudo: Ningengaku teki kosatsu 風土—人間学的考察 (Local cultures and customs: Anthropological observations)* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1935, 1960, 1979).
- White, Hayden, “Topics for Discussion on Global History,” paper presented at the *International Conference on “New Orientations in Historiography: Regional History and Global History.”*
- Yan, Shaodang, *Ribenren miesongren wenji shanben gouchen 日本藏宋人文集善本鈎沉 (Selections of the Rare Editions of the Literary Corps of Song Literati Preserved in Japan)* (Hangzhou: Hangzhou University Press 杭州大學出版社, 1996).
- Yang, Lien-sheng, “Zhong’guo wenhua de meijie renwu 中國文化的媒介人物”(Professional Intermediate Agents of Chinese Culture) in *Dalu zazhi shixue congshu 大陸雜誌史學叢書 (Mainland Magazine Series of Historical Studies)*, first series, vol. 1, *Shixue tonglun 史學通論 (General Account of Historical Studies)* (Taipei: Dalu zazhi 大陸雜誌社, n.d.), pp. 243-250.
- Yi, Hwang, *Jujaseojeolyoseo 주자서절요서 (Preface to Selections of the Works of Zhu Xi)*, in *Dosanseowon 도산서원(Complete Works of Yi Hwang)*, 3 (Seoul: Toegyehakyeonguwon 퇴계학연구원, 1988, Toegyehakchongseo 퇴계학총서).
- Yu, Ying-shih, “Clio’s New Turn and the Rediscovery of Tradition in Asia,” *Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy*, vol. 6, no. 1 (March 2007): 39-51.
- Yuzo, Itagaki, ed. *Iwanami Kōza Sekai Rekishi 岩波講座世界歴史 (Iwanami World History Series)* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970).