

Introduction

Jana S. ROŠKER, Editor-in-chief

This issue (Volume 11, Issue 1) of the journal *Asian Studies* is the second part of a special double issue on the problems of transcultural (post)comparative philosophy. This special double issue is entitled *Transcultural (Post)Comparative Philosophy*, Part 1 and Part 2, respectively, and the two interconnected parts address problems and developments in the methodologies and practices of various (post)comparative approaches to transcultural philosophical dialogue between Asia and Europe. The first part of the double issue was subtitled *Methods and Approaches*. It focused mainly on purely theoretical and methodological issues, but also proposed some innovative practical approaches. In this way, several innovative methods for the study of transcultural philosophy were proposed. The volume addressed several key problems or thematic areas which are reflected in its structure, consisting of three sections. The first section dealt with the relations between Asian and global philosophies and included studies by Robert A. Carleo III, Li Chenyang, Vytis Silius, and Jana S. Rošker.¹ The second part dealt with various problems of language and logical reasoning in a transcultural perspective. The authors who published their papers in this section were David Bartosch, Jaap van Brakel, Ma Lin, and Bo Mou.² The third section presented several new approaches that can be applied in the field of comparative and post-comparative philosophy. The authors of this section were Dimitra Amarantidou, Paul J. D'Ambrosio, Hans-Georg Moeller, Margus Ott, and Sašo Dolinšek.³ To place this special issue in a broader context of the conceptualization of *Asian Studies*, its editor concluded the volume with a review of earlier articles published in the same journal that addressed similar questions (Rošker 2022b).

The present volume (Volume 11, Issue 1) is the second part of this double issue and deals with more concrete examples or demonstrations of the theory presented in the first part of this double issue. The articles in this volume contrastively analyse philosophers, theories, methods, and exchanges between Asian and European philosophical discourses. The subtitle of the volume is therefore *Philosophical Dialogues between Asia and Europe: from Plotinus to Heidegger and Beyond*.

1 See Carleo (2022); Chenyang (2022); Silius (2022); Rošker (2022a).

2 See Bartosch (2022); van Brakel and Ma (2022); Mou (2022).

3 See Amarantidou and D'Ambrosio (2022); Moeller (2022); Ott (2022); Dolinšek (2022).

It comprises five sections with different emphases. The articles published in the first section, entitled *Dialogs with Heidegger*, deal with various elements of the philosophical work of this German thinker that can be compared to (or enriched by) East Asian philosophy. The section contains three articles written by Fabian Heubel, Eric Nelson, and Mario Wenning. Each of them explores different elements in the philosophical interaction between Heidegger and East Asia: Heubel's contribution treats dialogs with Heidegger from the point of view of transcultural philosophical comparisons and argues that they are interdependent. The author demonstrates this thesis by analysing the relationship between comparative and transcultural philosophy through a connection between François Jullien's "comparative" and Martin Heidegger's "transcultural" understanding of "Being" (*Sein*) and "Between" (*Zwischen*). Eric Nelson, in turn, shows how Heidegger's reflections on nothingness and emptiness are interwoven cross-culturally with East Asian discourses by thoroughly examining the work of Kitayama Junyū, a neglected Japanese philosopher who was active in Germany and one of the earliest East Asian interpreters of Heidegger. The author of the final contribution in this section is Mario Wenning, who problematizes Heidegger's preoccupation with the importance of rootedness for his existentialism and shows how and why the transfer to East Asia allows for a deprovincialization of Heideggerian themes.

The second section continues to focus on the thought and possibilities of the cross-cultural analysis of a particular European philosopher, namely Plotinus. The section is entitled *Conversations with Plotinus*, and consists of two articles. The first was written by Marko Uršič and aims to explore the similarities and differences between Plotinus' idea of the One and Plato's *chóra*, on the one hand, and Nishida Kitarō's notion of *basho*, on the other. David Bartosch, the second author in this section, also examines Plotinus' philosophy, but from a different, more epistemological angle, namely by focusing on the problem of the relations between consciousness and reality and establishing a productive contrastive tension with the ideas of the Neo-Confucian philosopher Wang Yangming on the same topic.

The next section is entitled *Philosophical Comparison between European and Japanese Philosophy* and consists of three papers, all dealing with three different ways of comparing European and Japanese thought. The section begins with Jay Hetric's article on Deleuze and the philosophy of the Kyoto School, and the two discourses are compared in their ethical and aesthetic aspects. Marko Ogrizek's article then focuses on historically more distant philosophies. He compares the ideas of two philosophers from Japan and Europe who lived in the 17th and 18th centuries, respectively, Itō Jinsai on the one hand and David Hume on the other, focusing in particular on their views of the role and importance of moral motivation. The third author in this section, Abe Hiroshi, takes us back—once

again—to Heidegger, but this time in a very different way, exploring the Japanese philosopher Tetsurō Watsuji's idea of community as an alternative to Heidegger's somewhat dangerous notion of the "Volk". According to Hiroshi's interpretation, Watsuji's specific idea of nonduality between the self and the other can help us look at our primary coexistence in a different way to that offered by Heidegger.

The fourth part of the volume deals with creative comparisons of certain concepts and categories in the context of transcultural philosophy. While Steven Burik offers readers a new way of deconstructing transcultural dialogues, David Chai explores different ways of establishing interhuman philosophy through a creative comparison of the thought of Martin Buber and Daoism. The third article in this section is written by two authors, Nevia Dolcini and Carlo Penco. Their contribution deals with some issues related to different forms of logical thinking. They compare Frege's claim that "the concept horse is not a concept" with Gongsun Long's famous thesis that a "white horse is not a horse". The authors aim to show that, despite major differences in their historical and cultural backgrounds, both paradoxes can be seen as different manifestations of similar concerns about language and, in particular, about the difficulty of referring to concepts by means of language.

The last section deals with hermeneutical problems in transcultural philosophy. It opens with Jana S. Rošker's essay on the fusion of aesthetic realms (*jingjie*) as a new method aimed at resolving some inconsistencies in Gadamer's idea of the fusion of horizons. This contribution is followed by Geir Sigurðsson's article entitled "Commensurability and Difference: A Hermeneutic-Deconstructive Engagement with Chinese Philosophy", in which the author argues that three prominent hermeneutic theories from Europe (i.e., those of Ricoeur, Gadamer, and Derrida) can offer meaningful and interesting parallels to classical Confucian interpretive approaches. The third contribution in this section is Téa Sernelj's article on the hermeneutics of Xu Fuguan. Finding in it many similarities with the theories of Schleiermacher and Gadamer, the author examines whether Xu's hermeneutical system is truly original or built on the foundation of certain European ideas. This section (and also this special issue) concludes with the contribution of Jin Qian, who also undertakes a transcultural investigation of Schleiermacher's hermeneutic model, which serves him as an inspiration for a new and creative interpretation of the Chinese Neo-Confucian concept of *xing* 性.

Similar to the first part, the various contributions collected in this second part of our double special issue on "transcultural and postcomparative" problems do not stem from the traditionally prevailing methodological systems, but rather aim to offer readers different, fresh, and innovative views on philosophies that

have emerged in the developmental streams of different conceptual histories. What they have in common, however, is their desire to move beyond the traditional framing of comparative intercultural philosophy within one-dimensional or biased contexts. In this sense, they can nourish our common hope of finding a way to live together in a world of global polylogies that can overcome divergent ideologies, autocratic social structures, devastating wars, and ecological disasters. If this volume has taken even a tiny step in that direction, it will have achieved its central goal.

References

- Amarantidou, Dimitra, and Paul J. D'Ambrosio. 2022. "Philosophy Pizza: On the Possibility of Trans-Cultural Pizzas and/Or Philosophy." *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 183–99. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.183-199>.
- Bartosch, David. 2022. "Transcultural Philosophy and Its Foundations in Implicate Logic." *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 107–26. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.107-126>.
- Carleo III, Robert A. 2022. "The Gongfu Approach to Teaching and Doing Chinese Philosophy across Cultures." *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 13–38. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.13-38>.
- Dolinšek, Sašo. 2022. "Desire Versus Ego: On How Kaneko Fumiko Transcended Stirnean Egoism." *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 241–72. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.241-272>.
- Li, Chenyang. 2022. "Chinese Philosophy as a World Philosophy." *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.39-58>.
- Moeller, Hans-Georg. 2022. "Before and After Comparative Philosophy." *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 201–24. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.201-224>.
- Mou, Bo. 2022. "A Holistic Account of Adequacy Conditions for How to Look at Contraries: How Cross-Tradition Engagement in Philosophy Is Possible." *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 157–79. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.157-179>.
- Ott, Margus. 2022. "The Problem of Ground in Comparative Philosophy: Quality, Quantity, Intensity." *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 225–39. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.225-239>.
- Rošker, Jana S. 2022a. "Sublating Sinic Relationism: On a Winding Path from Transcultural to Global Ethics." *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 81–104. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.81-104>.
- . 2022b. "Looking Back on Problems of Transcultural Methodology in Asian Studies: A Short Historical Reflection." *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 275–80. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.275-280>.

- Silius, Vytis. 2022. “Translation as a Philosophical Method: A Postcomparative Take on the Universality-Particularity Tension.” *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 59–80. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.59-80>.
- van Brakel, Jaap, and Lin Ma. 2022. “Manifest Quasi-Universals and Embedding Conceptual Clusters: The Case of Qíng 情.” *Asian Studies* 10 (3): 127–56. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as.2022.10.3.127-156>.