Periodizations of Chinese History																
Models	2000 BC	E	500 0 C			Timeline E 500			1000				15	500		
Traditional Dynastic Model	Xia Shang (ca. 2100–1600) (ca. 1600–1050)		Zhou (ca. 1046–256) Qin (221–206)		Han (206–220)			Sui (581–618)	Tan (618–906)	Five Dyna- sties (907– 960)	Song (960–1279)	Yuan (1279– 1368) (1368–1644)		'	-	ROC (1912–1949) PRC (1949–Pres.)
Jacques Gernet: Transformations in Chinese Political Forms		Palace Civilization (ca. 1600–900)	of Aristo- M cratic In	velopment of onarchical astitutions (500–220)	Conquest of Former Kingdoms (220 BCE-190 CE)	Military Warlords (190–310)	Military Aristocracy (310–590)	Sino- Barbaria Aristocra (590–755	an Adve ncy Div	ilitary enturers/ vision 5–960)	Reunification (970–1280)	Non- Chinese Empire (1280– 1370)	Autocracy (1370–1520)	Political Crisis Prosperity and Peace (1520–1800)	/ Collaps and Lo of Nation Indepe dence (1800 1900	Dictator- ship and Peasant Militias, est. of PRC
Mark Elvin: Social and Economic Developments	Early Origins in the Yellow River Valley		Permanent Agriculture (800s-onward)			State Administration of Land Holdings (200s)		Expans of Yangt: Rive Valle (600s)	ze r y	Revolution in Farmin Water Transport, and Money and Cred (700s–1350)			Economic Advantage		Economic Subjugation by the West (1800s–onward)	
Marxist Interpretation of Chinese History		Society Shang)	Decentralized Feudal S (Zhou to Sui)			Society				Bureaucratic Feudalism (Tang to Opium War)					Capita Socie (1800	
Naitl Torajiro-Kyoto Hypothesis	Ancient (Prehistoric Times to Middle of Eastern Han)					Medieval Period (chusei)					Early Modern/Modern (kinsei)					

Chart and questions developed by Angela A. Lee

Discussion Questions:

- What are the problems with the traditional dynastic approach?
 Suggests changes in Chinese life when change not evident (only political)
 Suggests degree of continuity that is not always there (other side of coin)
 Stresses history of political elite
- Overlooks economic and agricultural life (which affected a much higher percent of population throughout Chinese history)
- Does Gernet's model have the same issues? What else does it offer?
- Does Elvin's model have the same issues? What else does it offer?
- Does the Marxist model have the same issues? What else does it offer?

Synthesis Questions:

- Should each Chinese dynasty be seen as a "separate" empire? Or should Chinese dynasties be considered ONE continuous empire?
- Compare the traditional dynastic model with Mark Elvin, who asks the question "why did the Chinese Empire stay together when the Roman Empire, and every other empire of antiquity or the middle ages, ultimately collapse?"
- How do these different models help deepen our understanding of Chinese history?
- Can these different types of models be applied to other empires in world history?

Sources

Traditional Dynastic Model:

"Timeline of Chinese History and Dynasties." *Asia for Educators*, last modified July 4, 2011, http://tinyurl.com/34lwuh2.

Halsall, Paul. "Chinese Cultural Studies: A Brief Chinese Chronology," Brooklyn University, http://tinyurl.com/bo496tn.

Gernet, Jacques. A History of Chinese Civilization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Elvin, Mark. The Pattern of the Chinese Past. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1973.

Marxist Model:

Dirlik, Arif. *Revolution and History: The Origins of Marxist Historiography in China, 1919–1937.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989. *UC Press E-books Collection*, http://tinyurl.com/jqcllll.

Naito Model:

"Naito Torajiro." *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing*. Edited by Kelly Boyd. Vol. 2. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1999. 850–851; *Google Books*, http://tinyurl.com/jl9ewp5.

Tanigawa, Michio. *Medieval Chinese Society and the Local "Community."* Trans. Joshua Vogel. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985. *UC Press E-books Collection*, http://tinyurl.com/z376dyd.