



雷祥麟

中央研究院
近代史研究所副研究員

得獎專書： *Neither Donkey nor Horse: Medicine in the Struggle over China's Modernity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2014. 《非驢非馬：醫療與中國現代性之爭》

得獎簡評：

Neither Donkey nor Horse: Medicine in the Struggle over China's Modernity 一書探討中醫在二十世紀民國時期面對西方醫學傳入的困境時，積極地改造其理論與實作，並介入國家衛生醫療政策的過程。作者的研究修改了過去學界以為現代中醫為國家意識型態推動下之被動產物的看法，並補充了當下全球醫療史研究在討論西方醫學進入非西方世界之課題時，對中國部分研究之嚴重不足。

本書之取材豐富，立論新穎，被評者認為是目前為止探討近代中醫史涵蓋面最廣，最具深度的著作。

得獎感言：

本書源於一個十分素樸的疑問：自十九世紀以來，東亞各國關於自然現象的所有傳統知識幾乎全部都被現代科學所取代，唯有傳統醫療留存至今。是什麼樣的歷史過程造成這個現象？這個歷史現象的意義究竟何在？感謝這個問題引領我走上的旅程、使我得以有幸結識的師友，希望本書的獲獎，能鼓舞更多學者投入這個至今仍在發展中、在生活中俯拾即是、而又具有啟發性與現實意義的問題。

*Neither Donkey nor Horse:**Medicine in the Struggle over China's Modernity*

by Sean Hsiang-lin Lei

About the author:

Sean Hsiang-lin Lei is Associate Research Fellow at the Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica, Taiwan, and Associate Professor at the Institute of Science, Technology and Society (STS) at Yang-ming University. He specializes in the history of medicine, including both biomedicine and traditional medicine, in modern China and Taiwan. His first book, *Neither Donkey nor Horse: Medicine in the Struggle over China's Modernity* (University of Chicago Press, 2014) seeks to understand how Chinese medicine was transformed from an antithesis of modernity into a potent symbol and vehicle for China's exploration of its own modernity. His on-going research investigates the changing conceptions of the body, selfhood, and moral community through the history of two competing diseases: modern Tuberculosis and *laobing* ("wasting disorder"), a traditional disease that is caused primarily by various forms of overwork. Drawing on historical studies, he explores larger issues such as the relationship between modern science and non-Western knowledge traditions, the emergence of the capitalist body in China, and the role of techno-science in the modern transformation of East Asia.

About the book:

This book aims to answer one question: How was Chinese medicine transformed from an antithesis of modernity in the early twentieth century into a potent symbol and vehicle for China's exploration of its own modernity half a century later? Until now, most scholars have understood this historic transition as resulting directly from a change in Chinese governmental policies toward traditional Chinese medicine, a change that was motivated largely by ideological and political considerations such as cultural nationalism. Instead of viewing this transition as a derivative of the political history of modern China,

this book argues that China's medical history had a life of its own and at times reversely influenced the ideological struggle over the definition of China's modernity and the Chinese state.

Far from being a “remnant” of pre-modern China, Chinese medicine in the twentieth century co-evolved with Western medicine and the Nationalist state, undergoing a profound transformation – institutionally, epistemologically, and materially – that qualified it to be recognized as modern Chinese Medicine. Nevertheless, this newly created modern Chinese medicine was stigmatized by its opponents at that time as a mongrel form of medicine that was “neither donkey nor horse,” because it attempted to integrate modern medicine with what they considered the “pre-modern and un-scientific” practices of Chinese medicine.

My use of the phrase “neither donkey nor horse” intends to highlight the fact that this new species of Chinese medicine was defined by its enemies as one of impossibility, pathology, and self-contradiction. Unlike the post-colonial concept of hybridity, the phrase “neither donkey nor horse” was a phrase used by the actors to refer to this newly created medicine as a real historical entity. Being attacked by its critics as a “mongrel” that was infertile, valueless, and pathological, this deliberately derogatory expression accurately conveys the humiliation and emotional violence that the advocates of Chinese medicine had to endure during this time. Against this hegemonic discourse of modernity that rejected the possibility of productive crossbreeding between the modern and the traditional, the definitive feature of this new medicine was the fact that it took the discourse of modernity (and the accompanying knowledge of biomedicine) seriously and survived the resulting epistemic violence by way of negotiation and self-innovation. Through these efforts, its history demonstrates in concrete terms that the relationship between Chinese medicine and modernity was not destined to be antithetical. In this sense, the historic rise of this “neither donkey nor horse” medicine constitutes a local innovation of crucial importance for the general history of modernity in China, fundamentally challenging the universalist conception of modernity.