

Taiwanese Philosophy: "Philosophical Activities in Taiwan" or "Taiwanese Philosophy with Subjective Characteristics" ? An Exploration of the Relationship between Two Semantic Divergences "

Abstract

The examination of "Taiwanese Philosophy" is intricately influenced by the complex meanings of its terms⁴, fostering a range of interpretations and understandings that play a crucial role in the methodological discussions on how Taiwanese philosophical ideas are analyzed and developed. I highlight that the conventional approaches to interpreting "Taiwanese Philosophy" are mainly divided into two models: the PIT framework, signifying "Philosophical activities in Taiwan," and the TP framework, indicating "Taiwanese Philosophy noted for its unique subjectivity" (see Hung & Gao 2018)⁵. In the early twentieth century, Mou Zongsan's emergence of New Confucianism shaped the academic reception towards the PIT model and elicited critiques of the TP perspective. This trend guided scholars in Chinese philosophy towards the CPIT (Chinese Philosophy in Taiwan) approach for deciphering "Taiwanese Philosophy," typically viewing it as a form of "Chinese philosophical endeavors in Taiwan." The prevailing contemporary academic opinion posits that initial supporters of New Confucianism failed to recognize Taiwanese philosophy's unique characteristics and position following colonialism, reducing it to the CPIT model. This stance places "Taiwanese Philosophy" within the broader realm of Chinese Philosophy, highlighting the hierarchical differences between Chinese and Taiwanese philosophical traditions, which later drew substantial critique from supporters of Western liberalism and decolonization efforts. Recently, the importance of "Taiwanese Philosophy" and "Taiwanese Theory" has been increasingly acknowledged, with a growing agreement that "Taiwanese Philosophy," ideally interpreted through the TP model⁶, mirrors Taiwan's collective ethos and academic value rather than the more exhaustive PIT classification, which encompasses diverse philosophical lineages. Proponents of TP recognize the historical importance of the PIT model in documenting the evolution of Taiwanese Philosophy but strongly dispute its completeness for grasping the essence of "Taiwanese Philosophy." I intend to argue that, notwithstanding the recent criticisms against the PIT approach, revisiting PIT with the aid of extensive textual collections, cultural archives, and the study of intellectual history might offer a solid basis for a deeper appreciation of TP. It will explore how the PIT model can lead to significant misunderstandings by introducing two main biases: the belief that PIT sufficiently encapsulates "Taiwanese Philosophy," and the limitation of PIT to a mere geographical context. In addressing these biases, I offer a potential amicable reinterpretation and reassess the critical elements for a metaphysical description of the subjectivity emphasized in TP.

Keywords: Optimal interpretation of Taiwanese Philosophy, Subjectivity and Agency, Genealogy of Knowledge, Methodology of Constructing Theories, Characteristics of Regional Philosophy

⁴ Under contemporary mainstream theories of cognitive linguistics, almost all words possess polysemous characteristics, Even "proper names" have their "core meaning/reference" and "marginal meaning/reference." Although this debate is rich in linguistic philosophical interest regarding "meaning and reference," this paper will not address it due to constraints of length and topic.

⁵ Hung, Tzu-wei & Gao, Jun-He (2018). Whose philosophy? Whose history? the past and future of Taiwanese philosophy. In Tzu-wei hung and Duen-min Deng (eds) *Enlightenment and Rebellion: 100 years of Taiwanese philosophy*. National Taiwan University Press (In Mandarin). This paper's reconstruction of (I) PIT and (II) TP, although originating from Hong & Gao (2018), does not overlap with the main context of their discussion.

⁶ Recent Taiwanese philosophical works that have recognized the significant implications of (TP) include: Hung, Tzu-wei, (ed.) (2016), "Existential Engagement: Philosophy in Taiwan during the Japanese Era," Taipei: Linking Publishing; Hung, Tzu-wei & Deng, Duen-min (eds) (2018), "Enlightenment and Rebellion: A Hundred Years of Taiwanese Philosophy," Taipei: National Taiwan University Press; Liao(2022), "Visions of Philosophy in Pre-war Taiwan: A Journey of Existence." Taipei: Wu-Nan.

「在臺灣的哲學活動」或「具有主體特徵的臺灣哲學」？
詮釋臺灣哲學的雙重取向辨析及方法學考察

摘要

「臺灣哲學」因其詞彙上固有語義多義性(polysemy)¹的特徵，被賦予了廣泛的解讀模式與概念內涵，佔據主導地位的語義理解框架，深遠影響了「詮釋臺灣哲學」的研究方法論取徑選辨之爭端。本文闡述，傳統上「臺灣哲學」語義差異的解讀模式主要座落在兩種不同的框架之內：分別為(1)PIT 框架：「在臺灣的哲學活動(或稱：『在臺灣的哲學(Philosophy in Taiwan)』，簡稱 PIT)」、(2)TP 框架：「具主體特徵(或主體性)的臺灣哲學(或稱：『臺灣(式)的哲學(Taiwanese Philosophy)』，簡稱 TP)」（參見洪&高, 2018)²。臺灣於上世紀(即二十世紀)之際，牟宗三諸賢之新儒學盛行於學界之主流，雖有學人或對(PIT)框架保有開放態度，然針對(TP) 框架則多存疑慮與駁斥。在新儒家思潮的驅動下，涉獵與執論中國哲學的學者被囿於(CPIT, Chinese Philosophy in Taiwan)的框架範疇來詮釋「臺灣哲學」，大抵將「臺灣哲學」看作是一種「在臺灣的中國哲學實踐活動」或「中國哲學在臺灣之表現形式」。根據當代學術界主流之見解，早期新儒家學圈似未充分顧及後殖民與後遺民臺灣哲學的異質性與特殊地位，偏狹獨斷地將「臺灣哲學」逕自簡化認作為(CPIT)的觀點——此見解於理論形而上學之層面，頗有昭示凸顯「『臺灣哲學』乃『中國哲學』一支」之姿態，且亦強調中國哲學之於臺灣哲學有「主 v.s 客」、「核心 v.s 邊陲」、「宰制 v.s 隸屬」等法統位階差異，繼後數旬間屢遭承襲西洋自由主義與解殖獨立運動思潮影響的志篤之士劇烈反撥。近年來學者們更加深切關懷與反思「臺灣哲學」與「臺灣理論」的重要性³，諸多意見中，不乏有學者力言「臺灣哲學」之意義，在於學術探究價值與反映臺灣特色的群體精神上，其最適切之詮釋係屬(TP)「具主體特徵的臺灣哲學」，而非(PIT)「在臺灣的(東方與西方 i.e. 中國、英美、歐陸……)哲學活動」。倡議(TP)框架的學說家或可予以同意(PIT) 描繪與勾勒出臺灣哲學的歷史軌跡輪廓，但對於將(PIT)框架視為理解及詮釋「臺灣哲學」之充分要件，恐怕仍將遭到強烈排斥。本篇論文將指出，儘管利用(PIT)框架來詮釋「臺灣哲學」的取向近年受到眾多挑戰，但透過重塑對(PIT)框架的認識並結合大型語料庫、文化檔案、思想史的研究方法，容或能為(TP)提供與奠定一個更全面的理解基礎。筆者將嘗試說明，(PIT)框架為何可能導向嚴重的認知誤區，其中涵蓋了兩項主要偏誤：(偏誤一)(PIT)框架提出了「臺灣哲學」存有論上的充分要件；(偏誤二)(PIT)框架的「在臺灣(in Taiwan)」指的純粹是「空間地理內的臺灣」。本文透過對於前述偏誤的釐清與釋疑，提供了一種可能的善意調融詮釋。本文在最後再次審視，對於(TP)框架中所強調的主體性特徵而言，哪些要素構成了適當的形上學描述。

關鍵詞：臺灣哲學、主體性與能動性、知識系譜、建構理論的方法論、地域哲學的特徵

¹在當代主流的認知語言學理論下，幾乎所有詞彙都具有多義特徵，即便是「專名(proper name)」也有其「關鍵意義/指稱(core meaning/reference)」與「臨界意義/指稱(marginal meaning/reference)」，這雖是富有語言哲學旨趣關於「意義與指稱」的爭辯，但本文礙於篇幅與主題暫不處理。

²洪子偉、高君和(2018)，〈誰的哲學，如何百年？臺灣哲學的過去與未來〉，收錄於洪子偉、鄧敦民主編，《啟蒙與反叛：臺灣哲學的百年浪潮》，臺北：國立臺灣大學出版中心，頁 25-54。本文針對(1)PIT 框架與(2)TP 框架的重構，雖源自於洪&高(2018)的區分，但主要的討論並未重疊。

³這些意識到強調(TP)重要意涵的晚近臺灣哲學著作專書有：洪子偉(編)(2016)，《存在交涉 日治時期的臺灣哲學》，臺北：聯經、洪子偉、鄧敦民主編(2018)，《啟蒙與反叛：臺灣哲學的百年浪潮》，臺北：國立臺灣大學出版中心、廖欽彬(2022)，《戰前臺灣哲學諸相：實存的行旅》，臺北：五南。史書美、梅家玲、廖朝陽、陳東昇(編)(2016)，《知識臺灣：臺灣理論的可能性》。臺北：麥田。

晚學幸承眾多學友與師長指教，業已發表全文。謹此特別感謝總籌辦人林運鴻教授之悉心協助給予此寶貴機會，使此篇研究的初稿得以圓滿成稿。

此外，本文較早之想法曾初構曾於二零二四年春季中正大學哲學研究所學術研討會中發表，承蒙洪紹啟、邵佳滢、洪松三位學友不吝賜教，提供真知灼見。更蒙周詠盛博士不吝雅正，與晚學深入探討多方可能取徑，受益良多。四位學人之見解，對本文之修訂與完善功不可沒，晚學感懷至深，謹此一併致謝。最後，晚學亦特別感謝台灣師範大學台文系諸位教授之寶貴意見與鼎力支持，並蒙審查委員會老師不吝賜教，悉心指點，助本文益臻完善。晚學感佩至深，謹此致謝。

最後，感謝陳瑞麟教授願意作為我的對話對象，釋疑並釐清了許多我原先仍較為搖擺不定的立場，誠心感謝。

晚學 祉鈞 敬上