

Other Bodies, Other Plights: Embodiment and Appropriateness in *Yuan Ye*

STANISLAUS FUNG
University of Adelaide

THE FUGITIVE TERMS

The cross-cultural study of architecture and landscape architecture faces difficult quandaries when the terms of discussion are shifting and heterogeneous. In a recent study of Chinese thought, François Jullien points out the common pitfalls of cross-cultural studies with remarkable clarity: "naive assimilation, according to which everything can be directly transposed from one culture to another, and equally simplistic comparativism, which proceeds as though ready-made, suitable frameworks existed for apprehending the differences in question."¹ Against these pitfalls, there does not appear to be firm and assured safe-guards. Working at once as philologist and philosopher, reading close-up and standing back for perspective, Jullien aims for nothing more than a "tentative entrée." These considerations, highlighted with sensitivity by Jullien, form the immediate context of the following discussion of embodiment and appropriateness in traditional Chinese garden design.

Chinese terms for "body" are not prominent in traditional writings on architecture and gardens. This relative absence provides a clear contrast with European architectural discourse in which the relationship of body and architecture forms an important tradition.² In related fields of Chinese culture, the situation is similar. The nude which, in European art, seems inseparable from the notion of the human body, is rare in Chinese art. The distinguished historian of Chinese art, John Hay, is led to ask, "Why Does the body seem to be almost invisible in a figurative tradition that flourished for over two thousand years?"³ It is understandable that students suffering from what Jullien might call "naive assimilation," or from the implicit universalism in much of contemporary writings on "architecture" or "landscape architecture," would find it frustrating when key terms prominent in the Anglo-European tradition find no functional equivalents in the Chinese tradition. The first problem of cross-cultural study is therefore: how to weigh and give due weight to fundamental differences in terminology.

The temptation here is to locate apparently similar concerns in different traditions in an effort to spell out some basic

commonality. It is possible to find instances in which traditional Chinese discussions of architecture and gardens appear to correspond to Western concerns of body and architecture. In legendary accounts, the height of the emperor is correlated with the proportional system of the *ming tang*, the canonically prescribed architectural structure for the ruler.⁴ In the theory of Five Phases (*wuxing*, active dynamic agencies working in all natural processes), parts of the body form part of an elaborate system of correspondences with the directions of space, nodal points of temporal cycles and a wide range of concrete phenomena.⁵ In Daoism, there is a precept that the human body is in the image of a landscape.⁶ It is possible to locate these notions at a general level of philosophy and religion and relate them to Chinese architecture and landscapes, or to use them to give specific architectural cases a fixity of meaning. The structuralist hermeneutics of Mircea Eliade and those it has attracted (such as, at one time, Joseph Rykwert), would incline us to do so.⁷ Yet, it remains evident that traditional Chinese writers have not generally resorted to these sorts of explanations. Moreover, there is no doubt that the important nexus of body-geometry-architecture familiar to Western scholarship is not evident in much of Chinese discourse on architecture and gardens. For those concerned with cultural specificity, these are tell-tale signals that remind us of Jullien's second pitfall: the simplistic comparisons that line up similar thematic material which presuming the viability of the framework of analysis. The second problem of cross-cultural study is therefore: how to locate an appropriate framework in which disparate materials are brought into contact without a ready-made sense of tact, and without the reduction of diverse materials to one (Western) set of terms?⁸

These two problems of the cross-cultural study of architecture and landscapes call to us with urgency today. The differences between the Chinese and Anglo-European traditions lead us to explore their being together. The task is not the safe-guarding of each tradition by their segregated consideration in research and curricula: Dualist thinking in Western architectural thought in terms of subject/object, nature/culture, body/mind are intimately connected with

some of the most significant problems of contemporary practice. As Augustin Bergue has pointed out recently, the Chinese tradition has developed within a non-dualist cosmology and has not entertained “the subject/object opposition.”⁹ Herein lies the exemplarity of China for going “beyond the modern landscape.” At the same time, it has become apparent that much of modern scholarship on Chinese architecture and landscapes has been conducted within the terms and concerns of Beaux-Arts scholarship,¹⁰ involving precisely the kind of dualistic thinking that is challenged by theorists today. The re-consideration of Chinese materials therefore requires a firm view of the Eurocentric frames of reference which might be brought to bear on them and which will diminish their value vis-à-vis the consideration of contemporary predicaments. A sense of the mutual relevance of traditions is crucial here. The task is not just to explain a remote tradition of China to a Western audience in the interest of liberal learning; it is not met by resolutely sticking to the given cultural limits of conventional architectural scholarship in accord with a humble recognition of the limits of one’s expertise. Rather, the task calls for the “drawing out,” or education, of possibilities of collaboration and the creation of new audiences and participants. The efficacy of cross-cultural studies is not only to be sought in the invention of new readings of treatises, but also in the invention of new collaborative practices in scholarship and of new gatherings of people with mutually relevant expertise and concerns. The recent interest in “the body” in Western cultural studies, as John Hay notes, “has something peculiarly Western” about it,¹¹ but in so far as it is concerned with a critique of dualism’s such as body/mind and subject/object, it can be an opportunity of potential insight for cross-cultural studies of architecture and landscapes.

In this regard, the Chinese treatise on garden design, *Yuan ye*, is of particular interest for its use of the character *ti* to denote one of the qualities of master designers. *Ti* is literally “body” but normally understood in this context as *de ti* (literally, “get body” or “attaining embodiment”), commonly read as “being suitable” or “attaining propriety.” The treatise extols the importance of the master designer by articulating four key terms—interdependence, borrowing, suitability and appropriateness:

The skill [*qiao*] of designing gardens lies in interdependence [*yin*] and borrowing [*jie*] and their excellence [*jing*] lies in their suitability [*ti*] and appropriateness [*yi*]... “Interdependence” means following the rise and fall of the site [*ji shi*]¹² and investigating its proper disposition, pruning the branches of obstructing trees, directing streams to flow over rocks so that they are mutually complementary [lit. borrowing and resourcing], erecting pavilions and kiosks where appropriate, not interfering with out-of-the-way paths, and letting them wind and turn: This is what is called “excellent and appropriate.” [*yi*] “Borrowing” means even though every garden distinguishes between in-

side and outside, in obtaining views there should be no restriction on whether they are far or near. A clear mountain peak rising up with elegance, a purple-green abode soaring into the sky—everything within one’s limit of vision—blocking out the commonplace, adopting the admirable, not distinguishing between cultivated and uncultivated land, making all into a misty scene: this is what is called being “skillful and suitable.” [*de ti*]¹³

Elsewhere, Mark Jackson and I have analyzed the manner in which the alignment of terms in this passage indicates a logic of discourse that does not involve the opposition of subject and object.¹⁴ Here I will only focus on *ti* and *yi*.

THE RESONANCE OF WORDS

Ti: body, “bodying forth,” suitability. The consequence of choosing one English word for one Chinese character in translating classical Chinese into English inclines us to read *ti* (“suitability”) almost as the synonym of *yi*, “appropriateness.” Yet the Chinese text clearly indicates that four terms are used to discuss the importance of the master designer. Our first task is therefore to restore distinctive sense to *ti* and *yi*. The traditional sources however do not offer simple univocal or reductive definitions for these terms; on the contrary, we find that the terms are expansive. Since the distinction of these terms cannot be obtained by contrasts of definitions, our task is to be pursued by the ramification of sense and philological connections.

In classical Chinese lexicons, *ti* is frequently used to define its cognate *li*, “ritual action.”¹⁵ These Chinese characters are the only two that share the phonetic *li**, “ritual vessel.” Ritual action is related to notions of body in that it is a “bodying forth” of meaning and value. *Ti* and *li* are also linked by their connotation of “organic form” and this suggests that both ritual and body are of “variable shape,” appropriating their definition from changing contexts. Ritual and personal embodiment have a feedback to-and-fro: “A person engaged in the performance of a particular formal action, appropriating meaning from it while seeking himself to be appropriate to it, derives meaning and value from this embodiment, and further strengthens it by his contribution of novel meaning and value.”¹⁶ In this way, ritual action and body involves a polar (or non-dualistic) relationship of form and matter, and action and body: “Any particular ritual action can be understood only by reference to a formalized body of actions, a cultural tradition; meaning and value can be enacted only by embodiment in ritual actions.”¹⁷

In pursuing the ramification of terms, we would not expect every aspect of the ramifications to be directly related to our text on master designers, but some points of inflection can already be identified: The context of the quoted passage indicates that its purpose is to explain the importance of the master designer, but this explanation takes the form of a discussion framed around gardens themselves (i.e., not the

designer). The sentence reads literally *yuan lin* (gardens) *qiao* (skill), *yu* (in), *yin* (interdependence), *jie* (borrowing); *jing* (excellence) *zai* (lies in) *ti* (suitability) *yi* (appropriateness). We interpose the word “designing” to make the translation grammatical since, in English, gardens cannot have skills. Thus, at the beginning of this passage, we find it drifting between the body and actions of the designer and the body and transformations of the landscape. This is indeed consonant with the absence of a dualistic understanding of subject and object. Within the passage itself, there is another kind of drifting. The discussion begins with *ti* and ends with *de ti*, between a “bodying forth” and what the efficacy is (*de ti*-suitable, but literally “get body”), i.e. between action and agency. There is no conceptual separation of form/body/*ti* and meaning/suitability/*de ti* here, and this is partly why the modern Chinese commentators have no scruples in reading *ti* as *de ti*.

In the correlation of *ti* and *li*, the sinologist Roger T. Ames has foregrounded the absence of the passivity of body in the dualistic relation of the mind and body, and consequently, the necessity of highlighting the dynamic aspects of *ti*. The physical body is the means of “engaging, taking from and contributing to its environs.”¹⁸ This appropriative and contributory sense of *ti* is indicated by the active notion of blocking and adopting views and “making all into a misty scene,” active intervention, yet dependent on and responsive to, the concrete circumstances at hand.

Yi: appropriateness, something appropriate, right, and proper. Classical Chinese writings on philosophy and philology define *yi* in terms of its homophone, *yi*, aesthetic and moral meaning or rightness.¹⁹ These are terms that involve the notion of person as person-in-context. Whereas *yi* refers to an appropriateness resulting from “yielding, or giving up of oneself and ‘appropriating’ meaning from the context,” *yi* is the “active and contributory integrating of self with circumstances.”²⁰ *Yi* refers to appropriateness of person-in-context, while *yi* points to appropriateness of person-in-context. *Ti*, body, is a physical repository of *yi*, holding the physical dispositions inherited in tradition, *Li*, ritual action, is human action, is human action invested with the conditioned by *yi*. The “yielding” sense of *yi* and the contributory sense of *ti* are directly reflected in the quotation from *Yuan ye*. Since *yi* involves appropriateness to context born of “yielding,” the text speaks of “following the rise and fall of the site,” and letting paths wind and turn. Activity and passivity are here related as *yin* is to *yang* and not as mutually exclusive terms in dualistic opposition: the yielding that marks *yi* involves the active “directing” of streams and erecting buildings as appropriate.

The manner in which *yi* (appropriateness) and *yi* (rightness), and *ti* (embodiment) and *li* (ritual action) are related indicates that the importance of the master designer has an ethical and moral dimension. In this regard, it is important to emphasize that the notions of “aesthetic and moral rightness” and “ritual propriety” involved here do not entail the normative force of ethical principles. Rather,

matters of human conduct within the process of existence characteristically represent novel situations which require a person to bestow his *yi* in perpetually changing and ever-unique sets of circumstances...attaining *yi* must be characterized by a flexibility necessary for a person to interact with and integrate into ever new situations...*yi* is as much the consequence of a particular decision or action as its cause...The articulation of *yi* with respect to a given situation involves the emerging awareness of what is or is not appropriate in that situation and how one might act so as to realize the appropriateness in its highest degree. This articulation occurs *pari passu* with the act itself. Neither determined nor determining, *yi* is actualized in the interplay between decision and circumstance...There is no principle of *yi* existing apart from persons-in-context.²¹

This contextual and contingent nature of Confucian thinking and acting is consistent with several features of *Yuan ye*. First, the treatise does not contain discussion of ritual prescriptions associated with building works. The terms *ti* and *yi* do not re-appear in any detailed discussion in the treatise. Their fugitive nature precludes consistent discussion of garden design relating principles and concepts to applications. Second, in the place of a discussion of concepts and principles and their applications, the treatise correlates particular actions and circumstances:

When clearing away thickets of undergrowth, selectively prune the overgrown vegetation; obtain views according to the circumstances. Along mountain streams, skirts, and trim the irises...Plant willow trees along an embankment, prune plum trees surrounding the house, erect a thatched hut in a cluster of bamboo, divert the long course of a river-branch, array a screen of tapestry-like hills.²²

The tone of the text equivocates between suggestion and prescription. The correlated actions and circumstances are not involved in the weighing up of alternative design possibilities that might entail abstract forms of reasoning of the hypothetical-deductive and counterfactual varieties.²³ They are expressive of the concrete and contingent nature of appropriateness. Third, the absence of weighing up alternative possibilities means that here is no call for the kind of ethical deliberation that would require a general ethical theory as the ground of justification. Consequently, the debates between a conservative dogmatism that argues for a single “correct” theory and the skeptical relativism arising from an inability to decide on the most adequate theory are also avoided. The Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns, that key point in the history of absolutism and relativism in Western architectural thinking, finds no parallel in traditional China. In *Yuan ye*, there is no attempt at constructing a general theory along absolutist or relativist lines. Fourth, the correlation of action and circumstance has a counterpart in the mutuality of agent and act, designer and designing. The designer does the

designing, but the designing also “does” the designer, i.e., the designer is “actualized” as designer in the making of a particular garden. Becoming-a-designer occurs *pari passu* with the act of designing. It is not a question of *being* a designer by virtue of an established capacity to design.

SHUTTLLING

The considerations have significant consequences for the notions of authorship, authority and education. Elsewhere, I have discussed the way these notions have become complicated by a hybrid logic resulting from the modern professionalization of architecture in twentieth-century China.²⁴ Here, I will only limit myself to a few remarks that bring the Chinese materials into the neighborhood of some recent works of American scholarship. The important mutuality of agent and act in classical Confucian thought is consonant with the fact that Chinese gardens are traditionally remembered as deeds, expressive of *zhi*, “intent.” There is no custom of narrating gardens in terms of the development of an “art form” with a life of its own. The relatively small number of exemplary gardens celebrated in Chinese tradition invariably retain the coupling of person and garden. However, it was the *zhi* of the owners of gardens that were correlated with the garden-making. The importance of garden designers who made a living designing for others did not emerge in discourse until the time of *Yuan ye*. *Yuan ye* was in fact making a case for the *auctoritas* of designers,²⁵ but without sharply differentiating it from the established authority and authorial agency of owners. To make a case for the sole authorship of gardens on behalf of garden designers would have assumed a monodic authorship more in line with the *ex nihilo* creation of the world in Western cosmology (the earthly architect imitating the Divine Architect etc.) than with the Chinese emphasis on mutuality in relationships in a world of flux. *Yuan ye*'s promotion of the importance of the master designer was unprecedented in Chinese tradition, but it is no way disenfranchised the traditional literati's authorial agency in garden-making, and is very far from 19th-century European claims of professional authority/authorship in terms of an exclusive access to a bounded domain of knowledge.²⁶ Indeed, the conventional logic of professionalism, based as it is on the homogeneity of a class or set did not emerge in China until the advent of Beaux-Arts conceptions of architecture and architectural education. What we have in traditional Chinese accounts of garden are exemplary persons, enumerated as what John Rajchman might call “disparate aggregations,” singularities recited without an abstractive purpose that would identify common “group characteristics.”²⁷ Even as *Yuan ye* spelt out the key terms explaining the importance of the master designer, it did not identify principles that would provide a transcendental ground for identifying designers.

Against the importance of the mutuality of act and agency, designer and designing in the Chinese case, we can contrast Peter Eisenman's attempt to displace the figure of

“man” from the position as originating subject, his “ambition to articulate the system of differences through which architecture functions as a language.”²⁸ Where Eisenman uses the notion of a universal language of architecture to displace the notion of the designer as intentional subject, leaving intact the American star system in architecture and his signature function, the Chinese tradition focuses on exemplary persons and particular speech acts. In the 1960's and 1970's, Western discussion of language and architecture remained focused on universal structures. We can contrast this Western language of abstract generalizations which ground references to objects with the Chinese emphasis on a language of particularity and concreteness. The notions of difference, presence and absence in Eisenman's subsequent work (such as the Romeo and Juliet project) also offers opportunities for contrast with Chinese materials: the absence of abstract nouns in classical Chinese militates against the denotative and referential use of language in a significant way. Whereas “there is a real referent—real or putative—beyond the act of referencing itself” in the languages of presence and absence, classical Chinese operates as a language of deference

in which meaning is disclosed and/or created by virtue of a recognition of mutual resonances among instances of communicative activity. Language is the bearer of tradition....The language user appeals to present praxis and to the repository of significances realized in the traditional past, and he does so in such a manner as to set up deferential relations between himself, his communicants, and the authoritative models invoked.²⁹

Yuan ye employs highly allusive language to evoke particular aspects of the literary corpus of Chinese tradition which serves here as a repository of significances realized in the past. As Ames points out,

Natural laws as general statements of relationship, universal ethical principles, and so forth, are functions of the expressive language that undergirds the languages of presence and absence. Allusive language ... suggests particular events which cannot be appropriately generalized or classified.³⁰

Returning to *Yuan ye*, one realizes that the notion of body is implicitly dispersed in the treatise. The body of tradition is adduced in many allusive passages that point to concrete instances of dwelling in a garden:

Extending to the utmost one's gaze upon a lofty field, distant peaks form an encircling screen. Halls are open so that congenial air wafts over oneself, while before the door Spring waters flow into a marsh. Amidst enchanting reds and beautiful purples, one delightedly encounters immortals among the flowers....Sweep the paths and protect the young orchids so that secluded rooms may share in their fragrance. Roll up the bamboo blinds and invite the swallows to occasionally cut the light breeze.³¹

Of other recent works that resonate significantly with the Chinese materials discussed here, I would single out the following: In Elizabeth Grosz's "Bodies-Cities," the dualistic construal of bodies and cities is displaced by their mutually constitutive relationship.³² In Marco Frascari's *Monsters of Architecture*, the call for a new "grotesque" body as architectonic generator involves a regard for tradition and memory.³³ Rykwert is interested in the timeless in the tradition of body and architecture, and Mark Rakatansky's notion of the gestic body of architecture emphasizes the gestures of architecture without situating them in tradition—but the Chinese materials point both to the importance of tradition and the performance or gestural aspects of making and meaning.³⁴

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the foregoing discussion, I have tried to offer a tentative entrée to the history of Chinese gardens in terms of the body. In treating the problem of weighing up fundamental differences in terminology, I found that, the sense of *ti* and other Chinese terms can be sharpened by holding the dualistic thinking of mind and body firmly in view. The principal motivation for juxtaposing Chinese and contemporary Western materials is to avoid the pernicious effects of segregating the traditional and Chinese, on the one hand, and the contemporary and "international" on the other. Exploring resonances means multiplying and ramifying the differences—in this regard, large-scale synoptic views of traditions as well as close reading of texts are involved.

The task of cross-cultural studies of architecture is to explore the interdependence of diverse concerns. Berque's point that the Chinese tradition has developed within a non-dualist cosmology and has not entertained the subject/object opposition is useful in locating the play of interdependence: by focusing on his point, the specificity of Chinese materials can be explored while holding in abeyance the Beaux-Arts concerns and assumptions that informs modern scholarship on Chinese architecture and gardens. At the same times, the contemporary Western critique of dualistic thinking in architecture and landscape architecture can be informed and strengthened by the resources of another tradition.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An earlier version of this essay was presented at the 1996 Northeast Regional Meeting of the ACSA held at the University of Buffalo in October 1996. In the present version, I have revised my reading of *ti* and *de ti*. For valuable advice and comments on my work, I would like to thank Roger T. Ames, Craig Clunas, David L. Hall, Paul Hogben, Mark Jackson, John Makeham, Jeff Maas, Peter Sriver, and Julian Worrall.

NOTES

¹ François Jullien, *The Propensity of Things: Toward a History of Efficacy in China*, trans. Janet Lloyd (New York: Zone Books, 1995), 20.

² See Joseph Rykwert, *The Dancing Column: On Order in Architecture* (Camb., MA.: MIT Press 1996), 26ff.

³ John Hay, "The Body Invisible in Chinese Art?" in *Body, Subject and Power in China*, ed. Angela Zito and Tani E. Barlow (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 42.

⁴ Adrian Snodgrass, *Architecture, Time and Eternity: Studies in the Stellar and Temporal Symbolism of Traditional Buildings* (New Delhi: P.K. Goel for Aditya Prakashan, 1990), 2:382ff.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 378

⁶ Kristofer M. Schipper, *The Taoist Body*, trans. Karen C. Duval (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993) Chapter 6.

⁷ Joseph Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town: The Anthropology of Urban Form in Rome, Italy and the Ancient World* (London: Faber & Faber, 1976; Camb., MA.: MIT Press, 1988).

⁸ The immediate Western context for thinking of bodies in terms of tact and contact is given in Jean Luc Nancy, "corpus," trans. claudette Sartillot, in *idem, The Birth to Presence* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 189-207. The immediate Chinese context for thinking of tact and contact in considering cross-cultural readings is the tradition of speaking of perception as *zhu mu*, literally, "touching the eyes": someone perceives some thing is, literally, something touching one's eyes. See Stanislaus Fung & Mark Jackson, "Dualism and Polarism: Structures of Architectural and Landscape Architectural Discourse in China and the West," *Interstices* (Auckland)4(1996).

⁹ Augustin Berque, "Beyond the Modern Landscape," *AA Files*, no.25(Summer 1993): 33. See also *idem, Les raisons d'un paysage: De la Chine antique aux environnements de synthèse* (Paris: Hazan, 1995).

¹⁰ See the brilliant historiographical work of Hsia Chu-joe [Xia Zhujie], "Yingzao xueshe-Liang Sicheng jianzhushi gouzao zhi lilun fenxi," in *idem, Kongjian, lishi yu shehui-lunwen xuan 1987-1992*, Taiwan shehui yanjiu congkan, no. 3 (Taipei: Zhou Yu, 1993), 1-40.

¹¹ Hay, "The Body Invisible in Chinese Art?" 43.

¹² On *shi* as "positional advantage," see A.C. Graham, "A Chinese Approach to Philosophy of Value: Ho-kuan-tzu," in *idem, Unreason with Reason: Essays on the Outskirts of Rationality* (La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 1992), 125. An excellent and detailed study of *shi* as "propensity" is Jullien, *The Propensity of Things*.

¹³ Ji cheng, *Yuan ye zhu shi*, 2nd rev.ed., ed. chen Zhi (Beijing: Jianzhu gongye chubanshe, 1988), 47-48; Zhang Jiaji, *Yuan ye quan shi* (Taiyuan: Shanxi renmin chubanshe, 1993), 162.

¹⁴ Fung & Jackson, "Dualism and Polarism."

¹⁵ I follow the analysis of Roger T. Ames, "The Body in Classical Chinese Philosophy," in *Self as Body in Asian Theory and Practice*, ed. Thomas P. Kasulis, Roger T. Ames & Wimal Dissanayake (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1993), 169ff.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 169-170.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 170.

¹⁸ David L. Hall & Roger T. Ames, *Thinking Through Confucius* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1987), 89.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 96ff. Ames, "The Body in Classical Chinese Philosophy," 173.

²⁰ Hall and Ames, *Thinking Through Confucius*, 96.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 95 102-103.

²² *Yuan ye zhu shi*, 51; *Yuan ye quan shi*, 168. Cf. Ji Cheng, *The Craft of Gardens*, trans. Alison Hardie (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 43.

²³ Hall and Ames., *Thinking Through Confucius*, 55-56, 264-267.

²⁴ Stanislaus Fung, "The Limits of Professional Knowledge: Designers in Traditional Chinese Landscape Architecture," *Proceedings of 4th Biennial Conference of the Chinese Studies Association of Australia*, Macquarie University, Sydney, 1995m page 26.

- ²⁵ Cf. Diane Favro, "Was Man the Measure?" in *Architects; People*, ed. Russell Elliss & Dana Cuff (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 18ff.
- ²⁶ Cf. Margaret Crawford, "Can Architects be Socially Responsible?" in *Out of Site: A Social Criticism of Architecture*, ed. Diane Ghirado (Seattle: Bay Press, 1991), 28.
- ²⁷ John Rajchman, "On Not Being Any One," in *Anyone*, ed. Cynthia C. Davidson (New York: Rizzoli, 1991), 102ff.
- ²⁸ Rosalind Krauss, "Death of a Hermeneutic Phantom: Materialization of the Sign in the Work of Peter Eisenman," in *House of Cards* by Peter Eisenman (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 184.
- ²⁹ Hall and Ames, "Thinking through Confucius", 294-295.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.* 298
- ³¹ Zhang, *Yuan ye quan shi*, 325.
- ³² Elizabeth Grosz, "Bodies-Cities," in *Sexuality and Space*, ed. Beatriz Colomina (New York: Princeton University Press, 1992), 241-253.
- ³³ Marco Frascari, *Monsters of Architecture: Anthropomorphism in Architectural Theory* (Savage, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 1991).
- ³⁴ Rykwert, *Dancing Column*; Mark Rakatansky, "The Gestic Body of Architecture," *Journal of Philosophy and the Visual Arts* (1993): 70-74.