Cluster 21CW - Neo-Confucianism and Chinese Medicine in East Asia

Chien-Ling Liu Zeleny, chienlingliu@ucla.edu
W 12-3pm, Public Affairs 1343
Office hours: W 10:30am-12pm, Bunche Hall 5244

Syllabus

Course Description:
This course introduces recent scholarship on Neo-Confucianism and Chinese medicine in the transnational network within East Asia from the tenth to the twentieth century. It is situated in the juncture of Neo-Confucian philosophy and history of medicine, discovering related issues, including the relation between the patient and the practitioner, medical ethics, concepts of health and diseases, women medicine, concepts of the body, medical records and writings, and mental health in Chinese medicine.

Expectations & Assignments:
This course combines reading, presentation, and discussion in scholarly articles, as well as individual investigation of primary sources. We devote our discussion based on the worksheet questions from the assigned works, focusing on critical assessment of the arguments, the organization, the writing in these works, as well as situating them within the relevant historiography, which is introduced in week 1. Students are divided into groups in the beginning of the quarter. Each week, the group responsible for that particular week first presents critical reviews on the assigned reading and the analytical worksheet discussion follows. The worksheet will be posted on the course website under each week before the discussion. Students are advised to work on worksheet questions before the class time. During the session of discussion, students can still work on the individual worksheet and submit it at the end of the session. We particularly focus on the analysis of the primary sources that the author uses in the articles, in which we assess whether the author have used them appropriately. Furthermore, we discuss if there is a way to use these sources to support other kind of research and in which topic.

Students will be writing a short critical review and a research proposal as the written assignments, in addition to worksheets. The critical review is based on analysis of the article(s) assigned for the course. The research proposal takes off from the sources that you have investigated within the reading. The critical review is about 5-7 pages due on Wednesday, May 1, 2019, and the proposal 8-10 pages (double-spaced, font 12, 1 inch margin), due on Monday, June 10, 2019.

Grading criteria:
Class attendance and participation– 30%; Worksheets – 30%; Critical Review; 20%; Proposal– 20%

Textbook:

Weekly Themes and Readings:

Week 01: Introduction - Historiography of Neo-Confucianism and Science/Medicine, April 3

Week 02: Becoming a Confucian Physician, April 10

Week 03: The Patient and the Practitioner, April 17
Cullen, Christopher. 1993 “Patients and Healers in Late Imperial China: Evidence from the Jinpingmei.” History of Science 31. 2: 99-150.

Week 04: Research Session at YRL with Dr. Diane Mizrachi, April 24

Week 05: Confucian Concepts of Health and Diseases/Concepts of Contagion and Infection, May 1

Week 06: Confucianism and Women Medicine, May 8

Week 07: Concepts of the Body/Bodies Known from the Outsides and from Within, May 15

Week 08: Medical Records and Medical Writings, May 22

Week 09: Body and Mind, May 29

Week 10: Reviews and Conclusion and Student Research Project Presentations, June 5

Some words on reading and reviewing:
Writing good reviews is an art, demonstrating critical thinking and effective reading. Assuming you are already keen to the subject, your interest is leading you ways to sniff out the value, the originality, the weaknesses, and the significance of an article or a book. You can even do this when you know nothing about the topic except what you learn from the work itself. First of all, you start considering what the main arguments are, whether they make sense and how they are supported or not by the evidence shown in the work. What sources does the author use, including both primary and secondary sources? How does the author use these sources into supporting (or not so supporting) evidence? Can you think of any other ways that the author might have used the sources more convincingly? What is the scope of the work and how does the author decide such a scope? Are there questions or approaches that the authors might have introduced but did not, or are there of which might have been better off omitted? Also, is there something in method or style that might serve as a model for someone writing a work on a different topic? And finally, situate the work in scholarship. This will helps us understand better the significance of the work. Does the work seem to be following with some standard line of interpretation? What is its contribution in its related field(s), and in what field(s)?

Organization and format of the research proposal:
1. Title
2. Introduction (research question; scope – time and geography)
3. Literature review (situating your work in scholarship; significance of your research)
4. Sources (where to find and how to use the sources)
5. Bibliography (list of sources)
About the format of footnoting and citation:

1. The citation of this class is Chicago Author-Date Citation System (not Notes and Bibliography System) (http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html).
2. The footnotes are not to cite the sources but to explain or add information that is better to separate from the main text.

Writing and research resources:

You are encouraged to take advantage of the History Writing Center and the Undergraduate Writing Center in all stages of the writing process. Here is the link to more information and to book an appointment at these two Centers:
History Writing Center: http://www.history.ucla.edu/academics/undergraduate/history-writing-center
Undergraduate Writing Center: https://wp.ucla.edu/wc/

Here is the link UCLA Library page on history of science: http://guides.library.ucla.edu/history-of-science