

# 当代史学思潮与流派

## 系列反思·史学中的后现代主义

编者按：当代史学新思潮、新学派风起云涌，既有各个国家和地区的研究者学术自觉的推动，也有国际学术协作团队的努力。这一波新史学潮流的出现，尽管在 20 世纪 90 年代以后不断得到推介，但并未形成清晰的画面，个中原因恐怕还在于对话与交锋不够，互动太少，因此不免自说自话。新说的创见如不能内化为历史研究过程中的学术自觉，其影响也就日渐减于无形。有感于中国学界学术反思之不足，本刊特组织相关学者，趁各种新兴思潮、流派有一定经验和实证研究基础但尚在成长之际，截断众流，形成代际，对其聚集，着重反思，推动中国学界的反思与前瞻，推动中国史学之知识创建汇入人类整体知识洪流。系列反思第三辑以“史学中的后现代主义”为主题，邀请多位专家就有关问题发表高论，期望以此引导学界正确认识后现代主义对当下史学研究的影响，增强中国学者的学术辨别能力，准确把握当前中国史学的发展方向。

### 后现代主义和历史认识理论

中国社会科学院世界历史研究所研究员 于 沛

后现代主义（postmodernism）今天虽已是一种世界性的文化思潮，但要概括回答“什么是后现代主义”，仍是一件难事。一般认为，后现代主义产生于 20 世纪 60 年代的欧美；70 年代末、80 年代初，雅克·德里达（Jacques Derrida）、米歇尔·福柯（Michel Foucault）、J. F. 利奥塔（J. F. Lyotard）等，将西方后现代文化形式的讨论上升到具有广泛意义的哲学高度。他们在批判现代主义（modernism）的基础上形成后现代主义哲学，扩大了后现代主义的传播。20 世纪 90 年代初，已可清楚地看到后现代主义在中国史学界的影响。绝大多数中国学者最初因其理论充斥着大量抽象、武断与晦涩的概念，而不屑一顾，但随着后现代主义在国内外史坛的咄咄逼人，特别是一些人公开提出“用后现代主义史学理论推进中国史学的发展”，中国史学将发生一场“深刻的革命”，中国史学的出路寄希望于“后现代主义”等，我们就不能继续失语，不予理睬了。

近年，一些学者开始深入研究后现代主义对历史研究的挑战，不断深化对所谓“后现代史学”<sup>①</sup>的认识。笔者不揣肤浅，仅就“后现代主义与历史认识”略陈管见，主题是坚持对

<sup>①</sup> 所谓“后现代史学”这个术语或概念并不准确，具有完备科学形态的“后现代史学”在哪里呢？谁也

## CONTENTS

---

### *Talks on Paper*

#### **Series Reflecting on Contemporary Intellectual Trends and Schools of Thought in Historiography: Post-modernism in Historical Science**

*Editor's Notes* : The constant emergence of new intellectual movements and schools of thought in contemporary historical studies is the result of both the conscious endeavors of researchers from different countries and regions and the efforts of international teams engaged in academic cooperation. New trends in historiography have been continuously introduced since the 1990s; however, the picture remains unclear. The reason may be the lack of dialogue, debates and interactions, leading to a situation in which people are talking to themselves. If these new ideas cannot be internalized into academic consciousness in the course of historical research, their influence will gradually die out. Taking advantage of the fact that these trends and schools, despite having a certain experience and a basis in empirical research, are still growing, and bearing in mind the paucity of academic reflection in Chinese historical circles, we have organized scholars in the relevant fields to cut across the various streams and generations and review them with a focus on reflection, with the aim of encouraging Chinese historians to look forward and back so that Chinese innovation in historical knowledge can merge into the whole body of human knowledge. In this third series, on the theme of "Post-modernism in Historical Science", several experts have been invited to offer their views. We hope this will help academic circles gain a correct understanding of the influence of post-modernism on current historical studies, and give Chinese scholars greater powers of discernment in correctly grasping current trends in Chinese historiography.

<b>Post-modernism and Theories of Historical Understanding</b>	Yu Pei(4)
<b>Hyperbole and Coherence——Post-modernism and Historiography</b>	John H. Zammito(12)
<b>The Clash between Post-modernism and the "New Science of History" in China</b>	Huang Jinxing(24)
<b>A Brief Introduction to the Theory of Narrative History</b>	Peng Gang(32)
<b>Historical Rationality and Historiographic Practice after Post-modernism</b>	Dong Lihe(42)

---

### *Research Articles*

<b>Documents of the Office of Prime Minister and the Operation of Imperial Power in the Song Dynasty</b>	Zhang Yi(50)
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

The *zhōngshū zházi* (中书劄子) were official documents used in the office of the Prime Minister in the Northern Song dynasty for handling routine political matters and giving