

Conference Paper

The Possibility of Teaching Chinese Students of Architecture to Write (A House)

Tordis Berstrand

Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Department of Architecture, Suzhou, China

Abstract

Writing, as the projection of a building, is integral to the discipline of architecture. In the specification, the architect describes the edifice from inside out so that it may materialise in accordance with the plan drawn up. There are other kinds of writing too, if not the writing of a house itself – a paper house built from words without even folding the surface of its flat ground. I propose to write this house by moving four times around my chosen site – an A4 sheet of white paper. Four times because tracing the contours of this field means turning a corner four times. Two times two, because when turning the paper itself, the writing splits across one side and the other. One times four, because writing a hole in the centre allows me to peep through this central void to charge the whole structure from within. And if, by then, the boundary of the site also splits, then a space will emerge between its double lines and I will have arrived in a new location – possibly a new kind of house. Can I write this house?

Keywords: Academic writing, Western philosophy, architectural metaphor, Chinese houses

Corresponding Author:

Tordis Berstrand

Tordis.Berstrand@xjtlu.edu.cn

Received: 15 March 2019

Accepted: 25 May 2019

Published: 20 November 2019

Publishing services provided by
Knowledge E

© Tordis Berstrand. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons](#)

[Attribution License](#), which

permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the Architecture across Boundaries Conference Committee.

1. Introduction: Weaving a Net-outline

What does it mean to write a house? About houses? Constructing a line of argument? A structure for the alignment of thinking? Conceiving an edifice that holds up? One can always begin to write, or draw, or build an argument like a house. The 'architectural metaphor', as the philosopher Jacques Derrida once explained to the architect Peter Eisenman, is at work when architecture provides philosophy with a structure on which to ground thinking [1]. It is the house as a structure of logic in the form of a building founded on solid ground, grounded on a solid foundation. Can we write this house? Teach students to design this other building, in writing? To construct other houses open to questions regarding what holds a house in the first place? The paper explores Western thinking as the thinking of a particular kind of house, and it asks what kind of house writing relies on when teaching academic writing and argument to students of non-Western backgrounds, especially Chinese.

 OPEN ACCESS

The present enquiry pursues writing as a possibility for architecture beyond conventional practices of setting words to buildings. It is interested in how forms of writing serve to frame and deepen our shared understanding of what architecture is and could be. By extension, whether trans-cultural education facilitates particular opportunities for the development of writing and scholarship actively engaged in the thinking as well as practice of architecture. Academic writing, as a particular kind of building, is a proposition with a history that not only involves disciplines from the built environment [2]. The construction of argument according to principles of structural stability goes a long time back with its desire for securely grounded reasoning based on solid evidence in support of claims made and conclusions drawn. The requirement for *stability*, *utility* and *beauty* would seem as pertinent as ever for this discursive edifice to hold up [3]. The breaking of ground for the new building would be as precarious as any real-time construction. That architectural terminology appears to suit the outline of the academic argument so well is perhaps due to the latter conforming to the former rather than the other way around, yet what does it say about writing and building? What does it say about the writing of a building? The building of a paper argument?

If the ground has not yet been fully broken, then an outline has been drawn within which a topic is framed and beyond which it now must be explored. Could there be another place from where to start than to begin by framing this (w)hole in the ground which the paper promises to fill? The hole which the investigation despite all its intuitions and convictions acknowledges is likely to remain after the paper building pretends to cover it up. Could one begin by suspending a softer notion of ground across this void that the initiating questions have brought into focus – a suspension for temporary occupation in the sense of an architecture without foundation that simply latches onto something available if not essential? Could it be a spatial occupation, which rather than simply pave over, fill up or attempt to line and retain a basement would leave the ground untouched, for a start?

Across the notion of *ground*, I suspend a net, and it holds the suggestion that in a school of architecture academic writing and critical argumentation – as the design and building of an edifice – might be challenged. The weaving of the net sets out a series of questions, and if one cannot escape the architectural metaphor, or change the paper template, then these questions will hover, suspended above the ground. The questions are the following: what opportunities emerge from trans-cultural education engaged with writing in a school of architecture located in China? What does it mean to teach across profoundly different cultures in terms of traditions of thinking, construction of knowledge and argument? What opportunities could be missed, if the tradition of one

culture dominates practices to the detriment of the other which is largely silenced? Is it possible to develop a framework for exploring alternative designs for thinking, arguing and creating buildings in writing? Is it possible to write a new trans-cultural architecture?

2. Turning the First Corner: The Architectural Metaphor

The academic essay, by all means the pre-dominant submission format in schools of architecture as concerns writing assignments, is a European invention. As such, the essay is a piece of writing developing in the sixteenth century based on the French verb *essayer* meaning 'to try, to attempt' plus the Latin *exigere* meaning 'to drive out, to try, or to examine' [4]. It is the French philosopher Michel de Montaigne (1533-92) who launches the "elastic form" eventually utilised by the English philosopher Francis Bacon (1561-1626) as suitable for the development and dissemination of empirical science [5]. Considering this more tentative nature of the essay's initial connotations, one might consider if architecture has exercised a rather forceful metaphor over the years. Today's essay-writing students tasked with exercising an argument on a given subject must follow certain standards ensuring profound exploration, articulation and the drawing of a conclusion, if not the drawing of a house. The analogy to the grounded edifice is never far away, and it is perhaps surprising that the distinction between writing and designing architecture seems to prevail in the student mind. The design work is reserved for the studio, although it is also in this place that – towards the end of the day perhaps – the essay might be written. The writing of the essay might take place in the space of the design project developing in parallel and how then can the two not inform each other? If a tendency to separate the writing on architecture from the design of it is predominant in architectural education, then the same table might well provide the ground for both. If a house inevitably is drawn by means of the academic essay, then students of architecture should be particularly well suited to design this house in new thought-provoking ways. Chinese students of architecture in a Sino-Western educational institution located in China should be particularly well placed to explore the possibilities of trans-cultural academic writing. Furthermore, in the way that design studio teaching might endorse a return to local traditions and customs in building rather than wholesale submission to the Western tradition or global design trends, academic writing could possibly resurrect attitudes to textual framing and development of knowledge dormant in local culture.

One evening in the autumn of 1987, the philosopher Jacques Derrida met with the architect Peter Eisenman's students at Cooper Union, New York. Derrida explained his practice of *deconstruction* as a thinking that while dismantling philosophical premises

at the same time dismantled architectural premises [6]. Derrida clarified, “I saw that architecture, as a Western tradition, was sharing the same premises, the same assumptions, the same axioms as, let us say, philosophy or metaphysics as a whole ... The notion of foundation, the notion of system, the hierarchy, the modes of representation, the relation of place to the very conception of place, of dwelling, of the culture in which architecture is rooted, all these were supposed to be questioned by deconstruction” [7]. If the term *deconstruction* were perceived as inherently architectural, which Derrida suggested, then the operation of deconstructing the premises of philosophy would be inherently architectural too. It would be an operation of dismantling the notion of *ground*, of *foundation*, and deconstruction, as such, “the gesture which would try to disclose the naked ground of [bui]lding” [8]. The house, complete with foundation, structure, closure and other such presumed certainties serving to ground, frame and hold, would be the kind of household that philosophy needed to ground its thinking and argument. “The deconstruction of ph[iloso]phy should be at the same time the deconstruction of the architectural metaphor, which is at the core of philosophy and of the architectural tradition which is philosophical through and through,” Derrida continued while suggesting that architecture’s presumably grounded structure not only was a problem for philosophical thinking but also for itself [9]. In other words, the architectural metaphor, providing philosophy with a structural framework for thinking its ground, was itself *groundless* and would be revealed as such when used to deconstruct philosophy.

3. Turning the Second Corner: Cutting the Edifice

In 1974, the artist/architect Gordon Matta-Clark cut a house straight through with a chainsaw. In the ten-minute film that is the work *Splitting*, one witnesses Matta-Clark cutting through and levering one half of the house down by means of very simple hand tools. Once the foundation of the split house was lowered, tipping half of the building down appeared like an undertaking defying the notion of building, if not gravity, itself. Movement in a static structure, unlikely to take place unless a house is about to collapse, was generated by the gesture and the fine line between support and collapse was negotiated a number of times while the forces remained in place. Setting the house in motion was, however, not only juggling the building by complicating the relationship between support and collapse, rather it questioned the notion of a supporting structure in the first place. To cut along the centre line while retaining both forces was a balancing act already before altering the foundation of the house. The possibility of collapse was imminent, the level of support already just the required – immediately after the making

of *Splitting*, Matta-Clark explained, “The whole event gave me new insight into what a house is, how solidly built, how easily moved. It was like a perfect dance partner. I can’t wait to do it again ... What I mean is that the realisation of motion in a static structure was exhilarating” [10].

If cutting through and forcing the house open meant to expose its already broken structure and opening the cleavage made the central void concrete, then altering the foundation and sinking the house down questioned the house as *grounded*. When Matta-Clark’s work challenged the balance between support and collapse, it not only challenged the standing structure itself but the fact that it stood as well as what it might have been seen to stand for. Furthermore, the seemingly grounded house would not only potentially hide its own groundlessness but also the notion of an *abyss* upon which it pretended to stand. Mark Wigley draws a line from the philosophers René Descartes, Immanuel Kant and Martin Heidegger’s thinking on the edifice of philosophy to Jacques Derrida’s strategy of deconstruction, and it is a drawing that challenges building with its reliance on foundations, grounds and stable structures [11]. The need of especially metaphysics to emphasise the ground as support is seen by Wigley as a sign of *groundlessness* since why else the fixation? With reference to Heidegger, Wigley discusses the notion of an abyss that opens below a thinking *without ground* or a thinking which does not *trust* its ground. Wigley writes, “When interrogating this edifice to reveal the condition of the ground on which it stands, Heidegger raises the possibility that the ground (*Grund*) might actually be a concealed abyss (*Abgrund*) and that metaphysics is constructed in ignorance of, or rather, to ignore, the instability of the terrain on which it is erected” [12]. The German word *Grund* [ground] also means ‘reason’ and the *Abgrund* might as such be seen as a ‘lack of reason’. Wigley thereby approaches the architectural metaphor and the relationship of mutual dependency identified between architecture and philosophy.

While architecture provides philosophy with a structure, a representational edifice on which to ground thinking, philosophy provides a theory in support of the architectural structure on which it is itself grounded. Architecture represents philosophy’s essentially *absent ground* when projecting the “complete, secure, undivided” edifice materialising the structural logic on which philosophy hinges [13]. The deferral of the fulfilment of this task ensures that both disciplines retain an ongoing purpose and validation. Architecture produces the standing object in the form of a whole, properly grounded house, a complete(d) edifice as validation of philosophy’s properly grounded, ideally complete(d) thinking. Architecture is thereby “bound up with the forever incomplete project of philosophy,” as Wigley writes [14].

This convoluted affair between theory and practice, thought and matter, concept and structure, architecture and philosophy becomes from the point of view of architecture ultimately a restraint – can the discipline escape the task of repeatedly (re)affirming philosophical thinking with each new building it attempts to structure, ground and build? Might architecture overcome the reliance on philosophy to theorise what built fabric already gives presence to? Might architecture overcome the notion of *ground*? Might it overcome this notion in its thinking and writing?

While Wigley suggests that Derrida's deconstruction brings the workings of the architectural metaphor to the surface of philosophy by resembling a negative architectural metaphor, the paper proposes that Matta-Clark's work brings the philosophical metaphor to the surface of architecture when un-grounding the edifice in the form of the dwelling house. Derrida writes about deconstruction in relation to architecture, "It is not simply the technique of an architect who knows how to de-construct what has been constructed, but a probing which touches upon the technique itself, upon the authority of the architectural metaphor and thereby constitutes its own architectural rhetoric" [15]. In this light, Matta-Clark's probing touches upon the authority of the architectural metaphor when demonstrating that the un-building of the dwelling house rather than mark a "reversed construction" is "able to conceive for itself the idea of construction," as Derrida's writes [16]. The work *Splitting* thereby breaks the authority of the architectural/philosophical metaphor when destabilising what the building stands for as well as the fact that it stands despite its broken/incomplete foundation. The cut is a probing for other possible structures to emerge, and Matta-Clark's eventual un-building of the house is in this sense potentially an un-building of the notion of structure itself.

4. Turning the Third Corner: Writing a Chinese House

Whether traditional Chinese thinking is perceived by the Chinese as philosophy supported by the structure of a building in a manner corresponding to the European conception is a question. Is the architectural metaphor at work in Chinese thinking? Has it been over the years? If so, a traditionally very different conception of the Chinese house would allow for a similarly very different framework for thinking. Or learning, as is perhaps a more adequate framing of the practice of acquiring knowledge, or wisdom, in the Chinese context, as the contemporary scholar Fang Zhao-hui makes clear [17]. According to Fang, Chinese philosophy is, by all means, a category that hardly exists, as one should not conflate Western philosophy's approach to understanding with Chinese methods of learning. If historically, the Western mindset has been challenged when

confronted with traditional Chinese scholarship, due to what has been perceived as a lack of clear distinctions between categories, then Chinese publications from the twentieth century onwards have attempted to re-organise Chinese learning according to the Western schema. This tendency to Westernise Chinese scholarship has been part of a larger embrace of foreign influence, yet it has profoundly affected the way that Chinese learning has become organised in academic institutions in China, as Fang points out [18]. Following such reconfigurations, it has been overlooked that Chinese learning already relied on its own systematics, if of a profoundly different nature than the Western classifications. To reconfigure Chinese learning has therefore violated intrinsic relations between Chinese texts and broken up schools of thought established over long periods of time [19]. If the result of this wave of Westernisation is that university students in China today lack deeper knowledge and understanding of the Chinese learning tradition, then a need to rediscover this heritage would seem as pertinent as the rediscovery of design and construction heritage.

French sinologist and philosopher François Jullien raises a profound question once confronted with the Chinese learning tradition, and he might be asking on behalf of the Chinese as well as non-Chinese. Jullien asks, “But how can one enter this way of thought? It requires so much time ... so much patience, ‘skill’, memory, to be initiated into the classical Chinese language and to venture into its immense forest of texts and commentaries” [20]. Not only does Jullien speak of *entering* as if entering a house but the philosopher touches on an important difference between Western and Chinese thinking which is the profoundly different inner logics and systematics that, historically, have served to develop different philosophical categories and formats of writing and dissemination. The Chinese commentaries, for example, mark one such difference with their tendency not to explain or question yet rather to confirm the studied texts within a self-referential framework [21]. “Can we think without questioning?” – Jullien asks when confronted with the first line of the Chinese *Book of Changes* [I Ching, Zhou Dynasty], which offers the sinologist an entrance only to discover that everything appears to be stated to perfection immediately and the only way to approach is through commentary [22]. “So many ancient Chinese texts are constructed beginning from basic formulas that serve as core or matrix, and all the elaboration that follows does nothing but exploit their richness,” Jullien writes [23].

If on the threshold to Chinese thinking and learning, the non-Chinese searches in vain for structured reasoning and argument, something else presents itself which is the presence of a silent force, already complete yet in movement. The meaning of a text might remain elusive for the rational mind, but the commentary will illuminate

the depths of wisdom further. Such was seemingly the case when the ancient Chinese philosopher Guo Xiang (Jin Dynasty) commented on Zhuangzi in what was perceived to be a more articulate and argumentative fashion than the main source. While applauded by some, it was also suggested that Zhuangzi had written a commentary on Guo Xiang [24]. So, the tradition of Chinese thinking moves in circles within and beyond itself and if we find our way in, then we have entered a realm of thinking, learning and teaching far from the settled edifice of Western philosophical thinking so confident in its own standing. Twentieth century philosopher Fung Yu-lan writes, “The sayings and writings of the Chinese philosophers are so inarticulate that their suggestiveness is almost boundless,” [25]. Should this sound like a negative comment to some, then suggestiveness is considered to be ideal, following traditional Chinese thinking on how to approach the Dao. The aphorisms of Laozi and allusions and illustrations of Zhuangzi are examples of this highest form of expression.

5. Turning the Fourth Corner: Learning to Write (a House)

Returning to the question of how Chinese students of architecture then learn to write as part of their academic education is a return to the question of the academic essay as the typical format for written submissions involving critical argument. If the essay in its initial sixteenth century form was allowed to work along suggestive lines, it seems to have transformed into a firmer template for structured argument over time. “In [the] process of institutionalisation the form of the essays underwent a pedagogical formalisation, moving away from its literary characteristics to emphasis on a logical and factual treatment of a topic in an objective register that until recently discouraged the voice, views or identification of the identity of the author and, in particular, the use of the first person singular,” educational scholar Peeters write [26]. As such, the alignment with the requirements for scientific argument, developing in Europe after Montaigne’s initial launch of the essay, would seem to have gradually eliminated the allowance for tentative or literary statements. However, as suggested by Peeters, recent years might have seen a more flexible attitude towards compliance with the scientific objective by permitting the author voice some space to sound and even write the ‘I’. The architect and critic Jane Rendell considers the writer’s position as central to critical engagement with a given work through the ‘critical spatial practice’ of her ‘site-writing’ [27]. Rendell uses psychoanalytic theory and methods, especially related to the transitional space of the setting in which analysis takes place, to “write the sites” of her critical engagement

with chosen artworks. “‘Site-writing’ is what happens when discussions concerning site-specificity extend to involve criticism, and the spatial qualities of the writing become as important in conveying meaning as the content of the criticism,” Rendell explains [28]. ‘Site-writing’ not only emphasises the space in which art criticism takes place as an active agent in a critical spatial practice but acknowledges the writing subject as situated in this space. His/her position is integral to the critique, and this permission to occupy the text challenges the presumed objectivity conventionally associated with academic writing. Entering the space of the work under scrutiny means to enter a transitional space where multiple voices, relations and interpretations are playing themselves out. The writer/critic becomes herself part of a configuration “to challenge criticism as a form of knowledge with a singular and static point of view located in the here and now” [29].

The learning of students of architecture is, of course, in a particular category as writing in all its possible academic formats is not the main objective. Writing exercises usually belong to lecture-based modules while the design studio tends to involve supplementary information only unless a student insists on writing the building, which is rare. If one nevertheless imagines cross-writing between the studio and a theory-based class, for example, the opportunity for returning to the idea of the academic argument as the design of a house is tempting. When students of architecture write essays in order to exercise their abilities as writers of theory and structured argument, they might use their skills as designers. Creative writing, then, if of a somewhat extended kind, with the possibility of strengthening the students’ interest in writing as a tool for the design of buildings as much as design can be for theoretical argument. Site-writing, then, of the extended kind proposed by Rendell, with the possibility it opens for self-reflectivity in the work and the extended spatial exploration and articulation that this occupation facilitates.

6. Conclusion: Turning the Paper

The architectural metaphor is powerful and not only when setting out a structure for (scientific) argument as the solidly grounded, firmly structured edifice. The metaphor provokes thinking beyond this promise of academic soundness in the way that it opens to other conceptions of structures, buildings and spaces as frameworks for thinking, writing and reasoning. That is if one looks behind the metaphor’s immediate, perhaps rather forceful, configuration. If a ground is needed for something to stand and hold up, then this is not a base which can be taken for granted, as Heidegger reminds us [30]. We might follow the philosopher in addressing the abyss before us, or rather below,

in which case the suspension of a net might be the safe option – one can look down, through it. Returning then to the questions hovering in the net-outline above, architects and engineers might have something to say about foundations, buildings and stable structures – about the weighing and balancing of opposing forces – of great interest in regards to developing a more inclusive attitude to academic argument, writing and notions of soundness. New kinds of support structures in writing, if not yet making.

For a school of architecture located in China, such engagement would involve studies of Chinese writing traditions along the lines of the engagement with building traditions also taking place in the design studio. Increased efforts in this regard would respond to what is already a wider call in architectural education in China today to rescue local/national traditions and practices. China Academy of Art in Hangzhou with Wang Shu, Lu Wenyu and Wang Xin is a good example of this attitude to not only revive but to re-develop heritage for the contemporary age. Yet, in an institution such as XJTU, the exchange between cultures sets the agenda for trans-cultural teaching and learning on a very wide scale. The opportunities that this presents are significant and the development of new teaching and learning frameworks should be based on increased understanding of traditional writing cultures from all corners of the world. Such would explore possibilities for new frameworks for spatial writing across multiple scales, formats and notions of ground, and build, for example, on the suggestiveness of traditional Chinese scholarship as much as other types of approaches.

To outline this architecture of hybrid cultures then possibly requires a deeper exploration of the issues at stake, and more than one peep through from a central location within the enquiry. At the same time, looking around from this small clearing achieved by means of one (piece of) paper only, one gets a sense of the larger possible space. A space awaiting further address, further weaving, re-tracing and tracing over while opening up new dimensions of writing and building as cultural inscription. The house as just one thing among others on a string of belongings. The scholarly outcome as something that holds and settles in multiple ways.

Conflict of Interest

The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

References

- [1] Kipnis, J. & Leeser, T., eds. (1997). *Chora L Works: Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenman*. New York: Monacelli Press, p. 105.
- [2] Architect and critic Mark Wigley describes how the 'edifice' complex has developed in philosophical discourse since René Descartes' *Discourse on the Method* (1637). Wigley, M. (1995). *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp. 6-13.
- [3] Vitruvius' categories have endured as seemingly self-evident points of reference for a proper architecture. Rowland, I. D. & Howe, T. N., eds. (2017). *Vitruvius: Ten Books on Architecture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Peters, M. A. (2008). Academic Writing, Genres and Philosophy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 40, 7, p. 824.
- [5] Peters, M. A. (2008). Academic Writing, Genres and Philosophy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 40, 7, p. 825.
- [6] Kipnis, J. & Leeser, T., eds. (1997). *Chora L Works: Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenman*. New York, NY: Monacelli Press, pp. 104-112, for a transcription of the meeting. The relation between Derrida's notion of deconstruction and Heidegger's critical unbuilding is further elaborated by Mark Wigley, see Wigley, M. (1995). *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- [7] Kipnis, J. & Leeser, T., eds. (1997). *Chora L Works: Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenman*. New York, NY: Monacelli Press, pp. 104-105.
- [8] Kipnis, J. & Leeser, T., eds. (1997). *Chora L Works: Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenman*. New York, NY: Monacelli Press, p. 105. The square brackets framing the first part of "[bui]lding" correspond to the absent letters of the word where a hole has been punched through the book – one of nine holes punched through the first half of the book.
- [9] Kipnis, J. & Leeser, T., eds. (1997). *Chora L Works: Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenman*. New York, NY: Monacelli Press, p. 105.
- [10] Bear, L. (1974). Gordon Matta-Clark: Splitting the Humphrey Street Building. *Avalanche*, December, p. 37.
- [11] Wigley, M. (1995). *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, p. 7.
- [12] Wigley, M. (1995). *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, p. 39.

- [13] Wigley, M. (1995). *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, p. 25.
- [14] Wigley, M. (1995). *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, p. 25.
- [15] Derrida, J. (1986). Architecture Where the Desire May Live. *Domus*, 671, p. 18.
- [16] Derrida, J. (1986). Architecture Where the Desire May Live. *Domus*, 671, p. 18.
- [17] Fang, Z.-H. (2002). A Critical Reflection on the Systematics of Traditional Chinese Learning. *Philosophy East & West*, vol. 52, 1, pp. 36-49.
- [18] Fang, Z.-H. (2002). A Critical Reflection on the Systematics of Traditional Chinese Learning. *Philosophy East & West*, vol. 52, 1, pp. 36-37.
- [19] Fang, Z.-H. (2002). A Critical Reflection on the Systematics of Traditional Chinese Learning. *Philosophy East & West*, vol. 52, 1, pp. 44-45.
- [20] Jullien, F. (2015). *The Book of Beginnings*. Trans. Gladding, J. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, p. 3.
- [21] Jullien, F. (2015). *The Book of Beginnings*. Trans. Gladding, J. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, p. 35.
- [22] Jullien, F. (2015). *The Book of Beginnings*. Trans. Gladding, J. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, p. 30.
- [23] Jullien, F. (2015). *The Book of Beginnings*. Trans. Gladding, J. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, p. 31.
- [24] Fung, Y.-L. (2007) *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*. Tianjin: Tianjin shehui kexue yuan chubanshe, p. 22.
- [25] Fung, Y.-L. (2007) *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*. Tianjin: Tianjin shehui kexue yuan chubanshe, p. 20.
- [26] Peters, M. A. (2008). Academic Writing, Genres and Philosophy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 40, 7, p. 825.
- [27] Rendell, J. (2010). *Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- [28] Rendell, J. (2018). Only Resist, *Architectural Review*, vol. 243, 1449, p. 7.
- [29] Rendell, J. (2010). *Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism*. London: I. B. Tauris, p. 18.
- [30] Heidegger, M. (2000). *Introduction to Metaphysics*. Trans. Fried, G. & Polt, R. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.