

The Comprehensive Understanding of History through Medicine:
a Congratulatory Remark Delivered at the Inauguration of
the Asian Society for the History of Medicine

Tu Cheng-sheng 杜正勝
Director, National Palace Museum
Member, Academia Sinica

I

This day marks the inauguration of the Asian Society for the History of Medicine at the Institute of History and Philology of the Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan, and its first biennial meeting. The founding of the Society, as I have every belief, is sure to become a most memorable event for Asian and international medical historians. As a veteran in the Institute's medical history research team, I am most delighted to witness the birth of this professional organization, and would like to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt gratitude to all those who have pledged their support for its cause.

The use of the word "veteran" here has no other meaning than saying that my age is a bit older than most of my colleagues in the medical history research team of the Institute. When it comes to the years of actual research in the field, I am afraid that my colleagues and I are still quite fresh and young, as we have been conducting related research for only a decade or so. It is true that some of us are more attentive to studies in the field than others; it is also true that some of us are only amateur players. Putting this status in the context of man's long tradition of scholarly pursuit, I must admit that our research is still at its nascent stage. This also explains why I have always regarded the founding of the Society at the Institute as an event of great importance, an event that in the years to come will offer many opportunities for my colleagues to be exposed to more advanced studies in the history of medicine.

Yet, I need not be too modest, lest we get the criticism for not being sincere. Our research work must have been admired to some extent by the international community of medical historians; otherwise, the Asian Society for the History of Medicine at the Academia Sinica's Institute of History and Philology would not have come into existence in the first place. This also leads me to believe that in art and in scholarship it is indeed possible to create unique styles of expression and to come up with convincing theoretical constructs within a short period of time. This belief reminds me of the natural phenomenon of the caterpillar

transforming into a butterfly. The process is momentary, is it not?

In the winter of 1998 I saw an exposition at Paris' Musée d'Orsay, a special exhibition comparing the artistic styles of Jean-François Millet (1814-1875) and Vincent Van Gogh (1853-1890). As you are aware, Van Gogh was very much impressed and influenced by Millet. With their works chronologically juxtaposed, I somehow had the impression that the striking color, emphatic brushwork, and contoured forms of Van Gogh's paintings emerged between 1887-1888, which collectively was to become the trademark of his style of expression.

A rather similar experience may also be evidenced in the work of Ku Chieh-kang 顧頡剛 (1893-1980) and Fu Ssu-nien 傅斯年 (1896-1950), two of China's most prominent historians of the 20th century. In mid-1990's I studied the life and work of Fu Ssu-nien, the man who established the Academia Sinica's Institute of History and Philology, and a large number of the materials I had access to also involved Fu's classmate Ku Chieh-kang and his mentor Hu Shih 胡適 (1891-1962).

In the 1920's Ku posited the hypothesis that China's high antiquity had been intricately and reiteratively layered by the inventions of later scholars, a proposal that was to cause a stir in the Chinese intellectual community and usher in a general skeptical attitude toward the validity of extant written historical works. While Ku's thesis was something that I became familiar with as early as I was in college decades ago, I was surprised to discover in the mid-1990's that his suspicion and criticism of the Chinese historiographical tradition was formulated through correspondence with his mentors Hu Shih and Ch'ien Hsuan-t'ung 錢玄

同 (1887-1939) in the short period between 1920 and 1923. Fu, on the other hand, left China in 1919 to study in both London and Berlin, and during his sojourn in Europe he had enthusiastically pursued knowledge in such sciences as psychology, mathematics, and physics, before committing himself to Oriental studies. With this background Fu was able to turn the study of history into a scientific exploration, a type of research that I call "reconstructive," one that was drastically different from what Ku Chieh-kang upheld. Fu's historical thinking has even to

this day exerted a great impact on shaping the development of the Institute of History and Philology. According to my research, the maturing of his scientific approach to the study of history, the transformation from a caterpillar into a butterfly, took place between the years of 1924 and 1926.¹

These stories are brought up to serve as a reminder. That the work of the Institute's medical history research team has within a decade's time been deemed admirable by the international community of scholars is by no means unprecedented; my colleagues and I are therefore not in any position to be self-contented. How have we made it to this point? With the integration of the Asian Society for the History of Medicine into the work of the Institute's Office for the Research of Medical History, what are we to do in the future? While I am going to give our friends from afar a rather general introduction to the work of Taiwan's medical historians (most of them are associated with the Institute of History and Philology, by the way) in the capacity of an academic veteran, I will also give my colleagues an advice or two from the perspective of an observer.

II

The Academia Sinica does not have a research tradition in medical history, nor does Taiwan's historical community. The study of medical history, or the study of the history of medicine, has traditionally been seen as an adjunct undertaking in medical schools, and only medical practitioners or scholars with medical background are deemed qualified researchers in the field. Seven years ago, I delivered an address at the Conference on Medicine and Chinese Society, an international congregation of scholars hosted by the Institute of History and Philology, introducing a number of articles on medical history from the 1930's and 1940's by Ch'en Yin-k'o 陳寅恪 (1890-1969), the renowned scholar of ancient Chinese history and the first director of the Institute's History Section.² Insofar as I am aware of, none of Ch'en's contemporaries or predecessors had ever put out any treatise on the topic.

My involvement in the research of medical history was quite accidental.

¹ For more information on the formulation of Ku's and Fu's historical thinking, see Tu Cheng-sheng, "Fu Ssu-nien te shih-hsueh ko-ming yu shih-yu-suo te ch'uang-li 傅斯年的史學革命與史語所的創立 (The Historiographical Revolution of Fu Ssu-nien and the Founding of the Institute of History and Philology)," *Ku-chin lun-heng* 古今論衡, 1 (1998).

² Tu Cheng-sheng, "I-liao, she-hui yu wen-hua: ling-lei i-liao-shih te ssu-k'a 醫療、社會與文化—另類醫療史的思考 (Medicine, Society, and Culture: an Alternative Perspective on Medical History)," *Journal of New History*, 8:4 (1997).

In 1988, I, ignorant of developments in the field, was working on a paper in celebration of the 80th birthday of my professor Kao Ch'u-hsun 高去尋 (1909-1991), the renowned archaeologist. My specialization is in the history and archaeology of ancient China, and I was at the time into the socio-political aspects of ancient Chinese history, and had published a number of works proposing several theoretical hypotheses. Fixing to write something new to dedicate to my beloved mentor, I found the assignment rather difficult. Just as I was finding my way out of the waxing situation, the treatise "Shen-hsien-k'ao 神仙考," or, "On the Immortals," by Wen I-to 聞一多 (1899-1946) that I had once read came to mind. What else can be more appropriate for the occasion than the search for immortality? Here, I must point out that the late 1980's was also the time when the change in my historical thinking took shape. Unsatisfied with the kind of socio-political research that I for years had been conducting, I was deliberating on means to attach flesh and blood, and to inject life and emotion, to what I called the bone structure of historical studies.³ At any rate, I was able to come up with the theme "Ts'ung mei-shou tao ch'ang-sheng 從眉壽到長生," or, "From Venerability to Longevity," tracing the evolution of the notion of "life" in ancient China. However, I was not able to have it submitted for publication in time, because the number of issues that I intended to tackle was way too large and the scope that I intended to cover was much too broad. It was not until 1995 when the article finally got published.⁴

With the thoughts on historical research becoming even more mature towards the end of the 1980's, I assembled a group of historians from the Academia Sinica and Taiwan's universities, and managed to published a new periodical known as *Hsin-shih-hsueh* 新史學, or, *Journal of New History*. It is also the spirit, the *raison d'être*, of the periodical that gave birth to Taiwan's historical study of medicine. Within the group of new historians, there is no commander, nor is there any dogma. The word "new" implies a multitude of possibilities, as a matter of fact. The historical study of medicine, in its purest sense, is a branch of what we call "new history," and it is probably the most outstanding branch thus far.

³ Tu Cheng-sheng, "Hsin-shih-hsueh chih lu: chien lun t'ai-wan wu-shih-nien-lai te shih-hsueh fa-chan 新史學之路—兼論台灣五十年來的史學發展 (The Road to New Historiography, with an Examination of the Development of Historical Scholarship in Taiwan over the Past Fifty Years)," *Journal of New History*, 13:3 (2002).

⁴ Tu Cheng-sheng, "Ts'ung mei-shou tao ch'ang-sheng: chung-kuo ku-tai sheng-ming kuan-nien te chuan-pien 從眉壽到長生—中國古代生命觀念的轉變 (From Venerability to Longevity: Changes in Ancient Chinese Concepts of Life)," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 66:2 (1995).

When Taiwan's historians were exploring new dimensions in their research, the anthropologists of the Academia Sinica were also searching for new paths in their scholarly quest. My friend Dr. Huang Ying-kuei 黃應貴, realizing that existing anthropological theories or concepts would not meet his research requirements, set out to explore the notion of "people" or "social community" through an categorical analysis of the constituents of culture, and the first of which he addressed was "man."⁵ In 1991 he organized an inter-disciplinary congress, and I was invited to give my ideas on the theme from the perspective of historical research. The paper that I contributed is entitled "Hsing-t'i ching-ch'i yu huen-p'o 形體、精氣與魂魄," or "Body, Vitality, and Soul," outlining the understanding of "self" in traditional China.⁶ The research began with the physical body, and it went on to deal with *ching* 精 (the essence of life) and *ch'i* 氣 (the vital energy connected with the breath), two important concepts in Chinese medicine that lie in between what is physical and what is more metaphysical. Thus I entered the realm of empirical studies in the history of Chinese medicine.

While the continued search for new scholarly orientations is a general trend in the academic community, the occurrence of individual incidents in the pursuit must not be forgotten. I must apologize that my memories of how we at the Institute of History and Philology started the research of medical history in the early 1990's have become rather vague. Yet, it seems that it was Dr. Lin Fu-shih 林富士, then a post-graduate student at the Princeton University, who asked me to lead the way into the field, a realm that neither the Institute's professionals nor Taiwan's historians had at the time ever treaded upon. Though geographically detached, our communication was made possible through the exchange of letters and notes. If, mind you, our research in medical history is to occupy a place in the history of scholarship, even a place remotely similar to that of the skeptical school headed by Ku Chieh-kang, our correspondence may just have the kind of intellectual value that the first volume of the work *Ku-shih-pien* 古史辨, or, *Ancient History Discussion*, has.⁷

⁵ Dr. Huang organized three such conferences in 1991, 1994, and 1998, addressing issues related to "man," "space," and "time." The proceedings are entitled *Jen-kuan, Yi-i yu she-hui* 人觀、意義與社會 (1993), *K'ung-chien, li yu she-hui* 空間、力與社會 (1998), and *Shih-chien, li-shih yu chi-i* 時間、歷史與記憶 (1999), respectively.

⁶ Tu Cheng-sheng, "Hsin-t'i, ching-ch'i yu hun-p'uo: chung-kuo ch'uan-t'ung tui jen jen-shih te hsing-ch'eng 形體、精氣與魂魄—中國傳統對"人"認識的形成 (Body, Vitality, and Soul: the Understanding of 'Self' in Chinese Tradition)," *Journal of New History*, 2:3 (1991).

⁷ Part 1 of the first volume of *Ancient History Discussion* is a collection of correspondence with Hu Shih and Ch'ien Hsuan-t'ung between November of 1920 and February of 1923 before Ku came up

Most of the early members of the Institute's medical history research team had not had any experience in the studies in the field, with the exception of Dr. Lin, who had planned to study the diseases of the Han 漢 dynasty. A few examples are in place. Dr. Li Chien-min 李建民 addressed the performing and folk arts of ancient China in his master's thesis, and had initially planned to analyze the question of suicides and deaths in his doctoral dissertation. Dr. Lee Jen-der 李貞德 talked about the marital and legal aspects of Chinese womanhood during the Han, Wei 魏, and Six dynasties in her master's and doctoral papers, respectively. Even Dr. Lin Fu-shih, the man I briefly mentioned a while ago, was very much into Chinese shamanism of the Han, Wei, and Six dynasties, whether he was with the National Taiwan University or Princeton University. I recall that I once said to Dr. Li Chien-min that becoming immersed in the study of suicides and deaths would certainly make his life dull and boring, and that he would be better off if he was to study life itself. Honestly, I was pleased to learn that he, having garnered the full understanding of his academic advisor at the National Taiwan University, switched to another theme for the dissertation. When Dr. Lee Jen-der was conducting her dissertation research at the University of Washington in Seattle, my advice was that the addition of medical elements would definitely enrich her explorations in women's history. She returned to Taiwan in 1992, just in time to be part of the Institute's medical history research team. The older I become and the more I see the world, the greater the impression I get that history itself is replete with possibilities and incidentalities. The medical history research at the Institute of History and Philology of the Academia Sinica is one such example.

III

Be they accidental or inevitable, all historical events and their development are driven by man's positive initiation. The core of any historical study cannot be separated from "man" or "people," which, by the way, is exactly what concerns the study of medical history.

In July of 1992 the Discussion Group on Diseases, Medical Treatments, and Culture was formed at the Institute of History and Philology. Approximately ten meetings were held each year on Saturday afternoons, and one or two papers were presented at each gathering. In 1994, I

with his hypothesis.

presented the paper “Tsuo-wei she-hui-shih te i-liao-shih 作為社會史的醫療史,” or, “A Note on Medical History as Social History,” at the annual meeting of the Academia Sinica’s Committee for the History of Sciences, in which I gave a detailed coverage of the scope and topics of our research in medical history as well as a comprehensive introduction to the research results of the members of the Discussion Group, whether they had or had not been published.⁸

Earlier the same year, in the springtime, I had given a definition of “new social history,” at the Institute’s first Historical Study Workshop, as an academic pursuit that would also tackle such topics as the physical body, medical treatments, and the extension of lifespan,⁹ which to me are the starting points for research in medical history. Having the medical elements integrated into the study of social history is exactly what I meant earlier when I said attaching flesh and blood to the bone structure of history. If we follow the knowledge classification system introduced in the I-wen-chih 藝文志, or, bibliographical treatise, of the *Han-shu* 漢書, or *History of the Former Han Dynasty*, we realize that all medical works were seen as methods for the preservation of life. That the study of history has man at its core has therefore made the consolidation of medicine and history a very natural development.

However, I must say that the majority of the members of the early medical history research team came from humanistic backgrounds, lacking training in medical sciences. I am pleased to note, though, that today a number of our researchers do have medical training at the college level; still, there are those who are proficient in medical literature and those who are practitioners of acupuncture. Coupling these non-medical backgrounds with the more historical philosophical orientation, the early work of the research team was naturally socio-culturally centered. In a nutshell, what we were interested in was not the acquisition of any concrete medical knowledge, but the understanding of socio-cultural phenomena in history. The “alternate medical history” that we were into was quite different from what the “orthodox” medical historians, those professional scholars with formal medical training, were pursuing.

In 1994 I came up with a somewhat more mature framework for studies

⁸ Tu Cheng-sheng, “Tsuo-wei she-hui-shih te i-liao-shih: pin chieh-shao chi-ping i-liao yu wen-hua yen-chiu hsiao-tsu te ch’eng-kuo 作為社會史的醫療史—並介紹「疾病、醫療與文化」研討小組的成果 (A Note on Medical History as Social History: Introducing the Achievements of the Disease, Healing, and Culture Research Group),” *Journal of New History*, 6:1 (1995).

⁹ Tu Cheng-sheng, “She-mo shih hsin she-hui-shih 什麼是新社會史 (What Is New Social History),” *Journal of New History*, 3:4 (1992).

in medical history, which is made up of five constituent parts. The first two deal with the physical body and medical categorization; both fall within the scope of traditional, mainstream historical studies of medicine, but with a concentration in the exploration of the cultural significance embedded in the systems of medical knowledge. The third addresses the need to enrich family histories through an understanding, in the medical sense, of the relations of the sexes, the raising of children, and the caring of the aged. I am in the belief that undertakings in this direction will surely fill the lacunae inherent in traditional genealogy, making it even more dynamic and interesting. The fourth pertains to the better understanding of cultural exchanges between China and foreign countries through an examination of medical history. The fifth concentrates on the interpretation of social mentality as reflected in the application of medical treatments. Here, I must emphasize that the word “mentality” is by no means equivalent to “thought,” nor is it tantamount to “ideology.” To the best of my knowledge, it was not until the 1980’s when Taiwan’s historians, largely influenced by the historiography of the French *Ecole des Annales*, began to take notice of the issue of “mentality.” To date, the number of Taiwanese works on the topic has been rather small, and that may be attributed to the failure on the part of Taiwan’s historians to draw a clear-cut line between “thought” and “ideology.” Perhaps researches into *shu-shu* 數術 (the application of numerals to the explanation of man’s interrelations with the orders of cosmos and nature), the intellectual framework of much of Chinese scientific and medical thinking, may one day prove to be of exemplary value.

My intention with the framework is not to lay the foundation upon which a full-fledged historical research system for medicine may be constructed, but to discover, by way of extensive studies of existing literature and issues in medical history, some of the aspects that have been ignored by historians in their quest for better knowledge of man, community, society, and culture. That is to say, I would very much like to see the attainment of a comprehensive understanding of history through medicine. This rationale was made even more explicit in 1997 when I delivered my address at the Conference on Medicine and Chinese Society. In short, I take the study of life as the foundation of all undertakings in historical research, and have every belief that the kind of research we have been conducting at the Institute is socio-cultural in nature. The integration of medical and social histories, in my view, is what constitutes the history of communal life, and the study of which is sure to reveal many national and cultural characteristics that historians have not detected. It is also my belief that the study of medical history will not only help us understand the surface of society in a very subtle way, but will also equip us with the

necessary means to probe into what is underneath the surface for more concrete knowledge of social mentality.

To sum up, the arrival at better understanding of society and culture is what I expect from historical studies of medicine; existing medical literature is simply a tool for the realization of the goal. This explains why I consider myself a practitioner of “alternate medical history,” not in any way competing with those with formal training in medical sciences for the academic orthodoxy of historical research. Certainly, not every member of our research team would agree with me on these regards. I must emphasize, though, that before a new academic discipline is firmly established the definition of its scope of research may require the cooperative efforts of professionals from different fields. Here we are in the stage of transitions, and it is imperative that we know exactly what we are good at and what we are short of, as such awareness will allow us to come up with more specific research strategies. Both the “alternate” and the “orthodox” historians of medicine do have something to offer, do they not?

IV

Those who first come to cultivate and develop wild country live in grass sheds, and those who first come to build new roads in remote, grassy regions may end up opening narrow paths. Among Taiwan’s medical historians, I may be one of those “first-comers.” Those who wish to see mansions that boast “the luxury of the temples and the wealth of the rich and the powerful” or to rush up and down thoroughfares will, I am afraid, have to entrust their aspirations with historians of the future.

Members of the Institute’s medical history research team are these future historians, and they have not kept us waiting too long. What they have built may not be an ostentatiously magnificent mansion; it is surely not a grass shed anymore. My observation of the developments in the past decade may be summed up as follows. First, many members of the team have grown to become important players in the field, possessive of authoritative status. Second, members of the discussion group that was the predecessor of the research team have now garnered the trust of their international colleagues, whom otherwise would not agree to have the responsibility of running the Asian Society for the History of Medicine relegated to the Institute of History and Philology. Third, with the recruitment of members who received doctoral-level graduate education in the field in Europe and the United States, the research team has become even more multi-disciplinary in academic orientation and

full-fledged in scholarly training. The days of “amateurs-guiding-novices” are now history. Fourth, members of the research team have made the acquaintance with a good many fellow professionals in the field in other countries. I must add that continued reading and frequent exchange of visits and views with these international experts and researchers have allowed the perspectives of my colleagues to become even broader, and made their thinking more acute and their scholarship more solid. Finally, I have noticed that more and more young and budding scholars are plunging into the field. It is true that a decade is far from making up a generation, but we already see that old-timers and newcomers are working shoulder to shoulder.

Frankly, my personal interest in academic pursuit lies with what has become known as new historiography. I have since the Conference on Medicine and Chinese Society of 1997 not put out any writing on topics in the field, let alone original work. With my new appointment in May of 2000 as Director of the National Palace Museum, I have not been able to find any time to take part in the activities of the research team on account of the busy administrative work schedule and the discovery of a new academic interest. I am therefore quite unfamiliar with the team’s goings-on during the past three years. Yet, I must let you know that for the talk of today I have done my homework. For the past one or two months I have during evening hours in the face of physical fatigue carefully read over the majority of the publications of my friends in the research team.

Time does not allow me to introduce all of these publications; in fact, it does not seem necessary to do that. What I am more concerned with is whether members of the research team have reached beyond the socio-cultural orientation to arrive at a new sphere. Within the socio-cultural realm, have they broken through the superficial layers of society to probe into the “mentality” aspects that lie underneath, something that would definitely enrich our understanding of history? I would, of course, also like to know if anything new has been appended to the framework for studies in medical history that I proposed in 1994.

My overall impression is that what was once a grass shed has turned into a grand building, and the narrow country road that we treaded upon has turned into a main street. The studies by Dr. Lee Jen-der in such areas as gender-related issues, the woman’s body, childbirth, reproductive medicine, and genecology have doubtlessly offered a more concrete,

vivid picture of woman's history.¹⁰ Dr. Lin Fu-shih, a long-time devotee to the studies of shamanism, has in recent years expanded his coverage to include the medical practices of Taoism.¹¹ I must acknowledge that religious medicine is his unique academic domain. Dr. Li Chien-min's analytical research into the formulation of the traditional studies of *mai* 脈 (the network that the *ch'i* passes through) has been very in-depth,¹² whether one agrees or disagrees with his points of view. When we examine the transition of the state of Chinese society from "classical" to "traditional," we see at the socio-political level the influences from authoritarian rule and from the registration system for the common people; at the same time, we see at the cultural level the working of a kind of social mentality resulting from how the ancient Chinese defined their interrelation with nature. Having extensively examined extant classical medical literature, Dr. Li has obviously opened up a new horizon in the studies of folk customs and the social mentality underlying the culture of

¹⁰ Lee Jen-der, "Han-sui chih-chien te sheng-tzu-pu-chu wen-t'i 漢隋之間的「生子不舉」問題 (Child Abandonment and Infanticide from Han to Sui)," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 66:3 (1995); "Han-t'ang chih-chien i-shu chung te sheng-ch'an chih tao 漢唐之間醫書中的生產之道 (Childbirth in Late Antiquity and Early Medieval China)," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 67:3 (1996); "Han-t'ang chih-chien ch'iu-tzu i-fang shih-t'an: chien-lun fu-ko lan-shang yu hsing-pieh lun-shu 漢唐之間求子醫方試探—兼論婦科濫觴與性別論述 (Reproductive Medicine in Late Antiquity and Early Medieval China: Gender Discourse and the Birth of Gynecology)," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 68:2 (1997); "Han-t'ang chih-chien chi-t'ing chung-te chien-k'ang chao-ku yu hsing-pieh 漢唐之間家庭中的健康照顧與性別 (Gender and Domestic Health Care in Early Imperial China)," in Huang Ko-wu 黃克武 (ed.), *Papers from the Third International Conference on Sinology: Gender and Medical History*, Taipei (2002); and "Han-t'ang chih-chien i-fang chung te chi-chien fu-jen yu nu-t'i wei-yao 漢唐之間醫方中的忌見婦人與女體為藥 (Forbidden but Efficacious: Woman's Body in the Medicine of Early Imperial China)," *Journal of New History*, 13:4 (2002).

¹¹ Lin Fu-shih, "Shih-lun t'ai-p'ing-ching te chi-ping kuan-nien 試論《太平經》的疾病觀念 (A Discussion of the Concept of Illness in the *T'ai-p'ing-ching*)," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 62:2 (1993); "Tung-han wan-ch'i te chi-yi yu tsung-chiao 東漢晚期的疾疫與宗教 (Epidemics and Religions in Late Han China)," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 66:3 (1995); "Chung-kuo liu-ch'ao shih-ch'i te wu-his yu i-liao 中國六朝時期的巫覡與醫療 (Shamans and Healing in China during the Six Dynasties Period, 3rd-6th Century A.D.)," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 70:1 (1999); "Shih-lun chung-kuo tsao-ch'i tui-yu i-yao te t'ai-tu 試論中國早期道教對於醫藥的態度 (Taoist Attitudes Towards Medicine in Early China)," *Journal of Taiwanese Religion*, 1:1 (2000); and "Chung-kuo tsao-ch'i tao-shih te i-liao huo-tung chi ch'i i-shu k'ao-shih: yi han-wei-chin nan-pei-ch'ao shih-ch'i te chuan-chi tzu-liao wei-chu te ch'u-pu t'an-t'ao 中國早期道士的醫療活動及其醫術考釋：以漢魏晉南北朝時期的「傳記」資料為主的初步探討 (Medical Activities and Healing Arts of Taoists in Medieval China: a Preliminary Study Based on Hagiographic materials of the Han, Wei-Chin, and Northern and Southern Dynasties)," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 73:1 (2002).

¹² Li Chien-min, "Ma-wang-tui han-mu po-shu yu-ts'ang mai-pao-t'u chien-cheng 馬王堆漢墓帛書禹藏埋胞圖箋証 (Textual Research on the Silk Writing Entitled Diagram for Burying Afterbirths from Mawangdui)," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 65:4 (1994); *Fang-shu, i-hsueh yu li-shih* 方術、醫學與歷史, Taipei (2000); and *Ssu-sheng chih ch'eng: chou ch'in han mai-hsueh chih yuan-liu* 死生之城—周秦漢脈學之源流, Taipei (2000).

ancient China. Mr. Ch'en Yuan-p'eng 陳元朋 has a number of fine papers on the scholar-physicians of the Sung 宋 dynasty,¹³ but his research in food and healing may be more prospective in the long run.

Here, I find it appropriate to introduce a number of new-comers to the research team: Dr. Chang Chia-fen 張嘉鳳 of the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London, Dr. Chang Che-chia 張哲嘉 of the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Lei Hsiang-lin 雷祥麟 of the University of Chicago, Dr. Li Shang-jan 李尚仁 of the Imperial College of the University of London, and Dr. Liu Shi-yung 劉士永 of the University of Pittsburgh. They in their doctoral dissertations addressed such specific subjects as the significance of smallpox in Chinese history, the relationship between the imperial physician and his patient in Ch'ing 清 China, medicine and the Chinese state in the early 20th century, the practice of British imperial medicine in China in late 19th-century, and medical reform in Taiwan during Japanese occupation,¹⁴ which, I believe, would to a very large extent expand the perspectives of the members of the research team.

Those members whose research slants towards the historical vein, such as Drs. Chu Ping-yi 祝平一 and Ch'iu Chung-lin 邱仲麟, have all contributed greatly to our comprehension of the histories of the development of thought and society.¹⁵

¹³ Ch'en Yuan-p'eng, *Liang-sung te shang-i shih-jen yu ju-i: chien-lun ch'i tsai chin-yuan te liu-pien* 兩宋的尚醫士人與儒醫-兼論其在金元的流變, Taipei (1997); and "T'ang-sung shih-liao kuan-nien yu hsing-wei chih ch'uan-yen: yi ch'ien-chin shih-chih wei ho-hsin te kuan-ch'a 唐宋食療概念與行為的傳衍—以 千金 . 食治 為核心的觀察 (Food and Healing in the T'ang and Sung: the Shih-chih Chapter in Sun Ssu-miao's *Ch'ien-chin Yao-fang*)," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 69:4 (1998).

¹⁴ Chang Chia-feng, *Aspects of Smallpox and Its Significance in Chinese History*, SOAS, University of London (1996); Chang Che-chia, *The Therapeutic Tug of War: the Imperial Physician-Patient Relationship in the Era of Empress Dowager Cixi (1874-1908)*, University of Pennsylvania (1998); Lei Hsiang-lin, *When Chinese Medicine Encountered the State, 1910-1949*, University of Chicago (1999); Li Shang-jan, *British Imperial Medicine in Late Nineteenth-Century China and the Early Career of Patrick Manson*, University of London (1999); and Liu Shi-yung, *Medical Reform in Colonial Taiwan*, University of Pittsburgh (2000).

¹⁵ Chu Ping-yi, "Shen-t'i, ling-hun yu t'ien-chu: ming-muo ch'ing-ch'u his-hsueh chung te jen-t'i chih-shih 身體、靈魂與天主：明末清初西學中的人體知識 (The Flesh, the Soul and the Lord: Jesuit Discourse of the Body in 17th-Century China)," *Journal of New History*, 7:2 (1996); and "T'ung-kuan t'ien-hsueh, I-hsueh yu ju-hsueh: wang-hung-han yu ming-ch'ing chih-chi chung-his i-hsueh te chiao-hui 通貫天學、醫學與儒學：王宏翰與明清之際中西醫學的交會 (Medicine East and West: Wang Honghan's Synthesis of Medicine, Christianity and Philology)," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 70:1 (1999). Ch'iu Chung-lin, "Jen-yao yu hsueh-ch'i: ko-ku lian-ch'in chung te i-liao kuan-nien 人藥與血氣 割股療親現象中的醫療觀念 (The Human Flesh as Medicine and the Idea of Bvitalism: the Medical Idea of the Behavior of 'Cutting the Flesh to Heal Parent' from Sui-T'ang Dynasties to Modern China)," *Journal of New History*, 10:4 (1999); and "Ming-tai pei-ching te wen-i yu ti-kuo i-liao t'i-hsi te ying-pien 明代北京

Two renowned women scholars must not be forgotten in any discussion of the work of the Institute's medical history research team, Drs. Angela K.C. Leung 梁其姿 and Hsiung Ping-chen 熊秉真. Dr. Leung entered the field of medical historical studies in the 1980's, and has a rather extensive bibliography of materials on the history and nosology of smallpox, leprosy, and other diseases, as well as the relationship between diseases and the environment as reflected in Chinese medical philosophy.¹⁶ Dr. Hsiung, on the other hand, has led the way into the history of childcare in traditional China from the pediatric angles, ushering in yet another sphere worthy of historical exploration.¹⁷ It is interesting to note, though, that they have a common concentration on the events and phenomena of post-15th century history, which is a departure from the pre-11th century historical orientation shared by other professionals of the Institute of History and Philology. Professor Hsiao Fan 蕭璠, a very knowledgeable scholar of my generation, published several articles on endemic and parasitic diseases in the 1990's, and his research in hair-related approaches to preserving health falls into the category of historical studies in folk customs and social mentality.¹⁸

V

的瘟疫與帝國醫療體系的應變 (Epidemic in the Ming Dynasty Capital Beijing and the Reactions of the Imperial Government),” *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* (Forthcoming in 2003).

- ¹⁶ Angela K.C. Leung, “Ming-ch’ing yu-fang t’ien-hua ts’uo-shih te yen-pien 明清預防天花措施的演變,” in *Kuo-shih shih-lun* 國史釋論, Taipei (1987); “Ma-feng-ping kai-nien yen-pien te li-shih 麻風病概念演變的歷史 (The Historical Nosology of *Li* and *Lai* in China),” *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 70:2 (1999); and “Chi-ping yu fang-t’u te kuan-hsi: yuan chih ch’ing chien i-chieh te k’an-fa 疾病與方土的關係：元至清間醫界的看法 (Diseases and Regions: Doctors’ Viewpoints from the Yuan to the Qing),” in Huang Ko-wu (ed.), *Papers from the Third International Conference on Sinology: Gender and Medical History*, Taipei (2002).
- ¹⁷ Hsiung Ping-chen, *You-you: ch’uan-t’ung chung-kuo te ch’iang-pai chih tao* 幼幼：傳統中國的襁褓之道, Taipei (1995); and *An-yang: chin-shih chung-kuo erh-t’ung te chi-ping yu chien-k’ang* 安恙：近世中國兒童的疾病與健康, Taipei (1998).
- ¹⁸ Hsiao Fan, “Han-sung chih-chien wen-hsian suo-chien ku-tai chung-kuo te ti-li huan-ching yu ti-fang-ping chi ch’i ying-hsiang 漢宋間文獻所見古代中國南方的地理環境與地方病及其影響 (The Physical Environment and Endemic Diseases in Ancient South China and Their Impact on Human Activities as Viewed from the Documents of Han through Sung Times),” *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 63:1 (1993); “Kuan-yu li-shih-shang te yi-chung jen-t’i chi-sheng-ch’ung-ping: man-shih lieh-t’ou-yu-ping 關於歷史上的一種人體寄生蟲病 曼氏裂頭蚴病 (On a Human Parasitic Disease: Sparganosis *Mansoni* in Chinese History),” *Journal of New History*, 6:2 (1995); “Ch’ang-sheng ssu-hsiang han t’ou-fa hsiang-kuan te yang-sheng fang-shu 長生思想和頭髮相關的養生方術 (The Thought of Eternal Life and Hair-related Methods for Preserving Health in Traditional China),” *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 69:4 (1998); and “Chung-kuo li-shih-shang te yi-hsieh sheng-huo fang-shih yu chi-chung hsiao-hua-tao chi-sheng-ch’ung-ping te kan-jen 中國歷史上的一些生活方式與幾種消化道寄生蟲病的感染 (Life Styles in Chinese History and Some Parasitic Diseases in Digestive System),” in *Proceedings of the Conference on the History of Diseases*, Taipei (2002).

Dr. Ch'en Sheng-kun 陳勝崑 was a Taiwanese physician who had studied medical history. Instead of adopting the "orthodox" method, he approached history with a socially oriented touch. He earned his graduate degree in history from the National Taiwan Normal University while he was practicing medicine. What is even more impressive is that he published five monographs during the 1980's on a wide array of topics, ranging from traditional medicine of China, contemporary practice of medicine, and the history of diseases to psychology, folk customs, and diseases in history.¹⁹

While Dr. Ch'en's work may not be deemed acceptable by today's academic standards, we must not dismiss his role in pioneering social studies of medical history. He died at the rather young age of 38, and most of his works were published posthumously. Dr. Ch'en was of course not associated with the Institute's research team; yet, I for one am in line with his critical attitude towards Chinese medicine. The advancement of medical sciences, like any other branch of human knowledge, is a continued process. The upholding of historical studies in medicine, therefore, should not be taken as a means to promote the mystic medicine of historical China. That is why I have always held the belief that the study of medical history is not to search for knowledge, but to explore the social and cultural elements of historical events and phenomena.

The loose concepts of "society" and "culture" are very comprehensive, in terms of what can be covered. Yet, does the history of medicine have any boundary? Can alternative medical history be all-inclusive as well? Between 1997 and 2000 five more international academic congregations were organized by the Institute of History and Philology; they were: Medicine/s in China in the 19th Century (1998), History of Hygiene and Cleanness (1998), Healthcare, Healing, and Religion (1999), History of Health and Beauty (1999), and History of Diseases (2000). Indeed, the papers presented on these occasions have substantially enriched the content of medical history and have greatly expanded the frontiers of the study of medical history. I have to confess, however, that I am a bit worried. If the abstract notions of "energy" and "information," impurities in religious practice, and commercials selling weight loss

¹⁹ Ch'en Sheng-kun, *Chung-kuo ch'uan-t'ung i-hsueh-shih* 中國傳統醫學史, *Chin-tai i-hsueh tsai chung-kuo* 近代醫學在中國, *I-hsueh, hsin-li, min-su* 醫學、心理、民俗, *Chung-kuo chi-ping-shih* 中國疾病史, Taipei (1992); and *Chih-pi chih chan yu ch'uan-jen-ping: lun chung-kuo li-shih shang te chi-ping* 赤壁之戰與傳染病 - 論中國歷史上的疾病, Taipei (1993).

programs are considered legitimate subjects for historical studies in medicine, what else are not? It thus seems imperative that those of us who uphold the socio-cultural orientation in the study of medical history should be selective when it comes to identifying research topics; otherwise, alternative medical history will never become a serious academic pursuit.

Will the founding of the Asian Society for the History of Medicine at the Academia Sinica's Institute of History and Philology offer us any enlightened thought? From the English translation of the name of the Society I do not sense any inclination towards the study of Asian medical history. The terminology "history of medicine" is very umbrella; it may be as broad as "international," and it may be as narrow as "Chinese." "Asian Society" may give the impression that it is an organization of Asian scholars; yet, we do not wish to confine our membership to Orientals. What I can vaguely make out of the name is that it is a professional organ for the study of medical history located in Asia.

To those historians of Chinese medicine I would like to point out that it is time to reach beyond the boundaries of Chinese medicine. As noted earlier, I brought up in 1994 a framework for studies in medical history, and one of the constituent parts relates to the realization of better understanding of cultural exchanges between China and foreign countries. At approximately the same time I conducted a preliminary comparative survey of traditional Chinese medical theories and Indian medicine as reflected in Buddhist scriptures. The study revealed that in medicine, with the exception of ophthalmologic practice, China had never been positively responsive to the medical theories of India, at least not in the same way as she accepted the religion of India. A year earlier, in 1993, I had examined the Japanese medical theory on *ch'i* of the pre-Heian period, which was inherited from Chinese medicine but rooted in Taoist philosophy. The research showed that not long after Japanese medical literature began to emerge, suggesting that the Japanese were more interested in herbal studies than *ch'i* itself.²⁰ With the founding of the Society at the Institute, I expect that the study of ancient Asian medicine and cultural exchange between Asian countries will soon attract the attention of the scholars of medical history.

²⁰ Tu Cheng-sheng, "Ts'ung i-liao-shih k'an tao-chia tui jih-pen wen-hua te ying-hsiang 從醫療史看道家對日本古代文化的影響 (Study of Taoist Influence on Ancient Japanese Culture from the Perspective of Medical History)," *Chung-kuo li-shih po-wu-kuan kuan-k'an* 中國歷史博物館館刊, 2 (1993).

It is true that the Institute's research team still centers its work on the medicine of China. The study of Taiwanese medicine has been largely neglected, with the exception of the work of Fann Yen-chiou 范燕秋²¹ and Liu Shih-yung 劉士永.²² In the late 1990's a couple of general histories of Taiwanese medicine were published, which, one by a practicing physician and the other a civilian enthusiast, have much to be desired in my view.²³ Taiwanese medicine boasts a mixed character. On the one hand, the physicians on the island have inherited the skills of their trade from the traditional and folk medical practices of China; on the other, they have through Japan acquired modern medical techniques of the Western countries. Thus, the study of Taiwanese medicine in the Asian context should yield many fruitful results.

I have every confidence to say that positive results from our undertakings are expected, if we can come out of our experiences in the study of Chinese medical history with improved methodologies and have them applied to the research in Asian or international medicines. Finally, I would like to conclude my address by quoting Professor Mizoguchi Yūzō 溝口雄三, a renowned Japanese scholar in the history of contemporary Chinese thought who has retired from the University of Tokyo:

The use of China as a means implies that the world is the goal.²⁴

By the very same token, I now suggest that we apply the means, the research in Chinese medical history, to the grander enterprise of studying the histories of Taiwanese, Asian, or international medicines. It is hoped that these opinions will be of some referential value to my colleagues in the Institute's research team and members of the Society. Thank you.

²¹ Fann Yen-chiou, "Chi-ping, pien-yuan tsu-ch'un yu wen-ming-hua te shen-t'i: i 1895-1945 yi-lan t'ai-ya-tsu wei li 疾病、邊緣族群與文明化的身體 - 以 1895-1945 宜蘭泰雅族為例," *Taiwan Historical Research*, 5:1 (1999); "Hsin-i-hsueh tsai t'ai-wan te shih-chien: ts'ung hou-t'eng hsin-p'ing kuo-chia-wei-sheng-yuan-li t'an-ch'i 新醫學在臺灣的實踐 - 從後藤新平《國家衛生原理》談起 (The Practice of Modern Medicine in Colonial Taiwan: Gotou Shinpei's Theory of State Hygiene)," *Journal of New History*, 9:3 (1998); and "I-hsueh yu chih-min k'uo-chang: yi jih-chih shih-ch'i t'ai-wan nueh-chi yen-chiu wei-li 醫學與殖民擴張 - 以日治時期臺灣瘧疾研究為例 (Medicine and Colonial Expansion: Taiwan's Malaria Research under Japanese Rule)," *Journal of New History*, 7:3 (1996).

²² Liu Shi-yung, "Yi-chiu san-ling nien-tai jih-chih shih-ch'i t'ai-wan i-hsueh te t'e-chih 一九三 年代日治時期臺灣醫學的特質," *Taiwan Historical Research*, 4:1 (1998).

²³ Ch'en Yung-hsing 陳永興, *T'ai-wan i-liao fa-chan-shih 台灣醫療發展史*, Taipei (1997). Chuang Yung-ming 莊永明, *T'ai-wan i-liao-shih 台灣醫療史*, Taipei (1998).

²⁴ Mizoguchi Yūzō, *Hōhō to shitenō Chūgoku 方法としての中國*, Tokyo (1989).