

Revisionist Approaches to the Historiography of Chinese Architecture

WENBO GUO

Georgia Institute of Technology

GEORGE B. JOHNSTON

Georgia Institute of Technology

Keywords: Revisionist Approaches, Methodologies, Historiography, Chinese Architecture, Practice

The study of Chinese architectural history by Chinese scholars started quite late as compared to the study of Western architectural history by Western scholars. Influenced by the philosophy of Confucianism, which devalued material artifacts, architecture was not considered to be a scholarly field in pre-Modern China.¹ Chinese scholars treated architecture as a technique mastered by craftsmen and excluded it from the domain of fine arts such as painting, calligraphy, sculpture and inscription. The Western idea of architecture as a respected gentleman's career was not introduced into China until the end of the Qing Dynasty (1644-1911) with the increasing presence of foreign populations. Once Chinese scholars accepted the idea that architecture was a scholarly discipline, they commenced the study of Chinese architecture through the application of historiographical approaches adapted from non-Chinese sources. Contemporary Chinese scholars are now pursuing revisionist approaches to Chinese architectural historiography that takes account of these complicated lines of influence. In light of these complex cultural genealogies, the objective of this paper is to chart some of the methodological questions to be considered in the development of a critical approach to the historiography of Chinese architecture.

THE PREDECESSORS OF THE STUDY OF CHINESE ARCHITECTURE—TRADITIONAL CHINESE INTELLECTUAL SCHOLARS

In contrast to the objectifying European gaze toward Chinese architecture, Chinese culture was influenced over much of its long history by the philosophy of Confucianism, which esteemed metaphysics over material artifacts. Consequently, architecture was lowly ranked as a social occupation, and there was no concept of architect in the Western sense. Architectural practitioners were more akin to builders and they were trained by an apprentice system on construction sites instead of through formal schooling. Constrained by their inferior social status, almost all of them were illiterate. Therefore, it is rare to find any texts about Chinese architecture left by builders themselves. Building construction methods and skills, to a large extent, were handed down orally by generations of builders. Meanwhile, Chinese intelligentsia showed lack of interest in the

field of architecture. Therefore, writings on Chinese architecture in history were very limited..

From the Western perspective, the earliest literary descriptions of Chinese architecture might be travel writings from the records by European merchants. By the eighteenth century, European architectural practitioners began to contribute to the field of Chinese architectural writing, owing to a large extent to the rising popularity of Chinoiserie.² As the pace of colonial expansion in the world accelerated in the nineteenth century, the West sought to acquire more academically rigorous knowledge about the non-Western world. Therefore, studies of the non-Western world were conducted in Western academic circles under headings such as Orientalism, Indology, Africanism, etc. Among them, Sinology, the discipline of study regarding Chinese knowledge and culture, particularly helped the study of Chinese architecture to mature. Stimulated by the frenzied Asian art market in the eighteenth century, some Sinologists shifted their interests into the area of East Asian Arts.³ Chinese architecture, as a kind of Asian arts, became a target of their research.⁴

China did not have the concept of architecture in the Western sense until 1920s when a group of Chinese students finished their architectural education overseas and returned to practice. Before that, Chinese architectural practice was strongly associated with the Western-educated civil engineers who came back to China earlier than the architects. Those returning civil engineers were another mainstream of architectural design in China along with the foreign architects. Therefore, architecture was seen as an applied science instead of an art, and architects saw themselves as engineers rather than as artists. As a result, at the turn of the twentieth century most architectural practitioners only focused on practice and were scarcely concerned with the fields of history, culture and arts. Architectural practitioners contributed little to the studies of the history of Chinese architecture. Instead, traditional Chinese literati took the lead at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Chinese literati traditionally were more concerned with metaphysical subjects such as literature, history, and philosophy than applied science. Chinese academic traditions transformed considerably at the turn of the twentieth century, however, due to the development of Pragmatism.⁵ Additionally, the Western

notion of practical science came into China in the late Qing, which further encouraged Chinese intelligentsia to pay close attention on pragmatic subjects. This combination of the above factors may give a general explanation why intellectuals rather than architectural practitioners were the first group in early twentieth century China to treat architecture as a scholarly discipline and to study it as a historical and cultural subject.

These intellectuals differed from builders who only cared for technics and skills of building construction. Instead, they paid particular attention to literary and esthetic aspects of architecture. In so doing, their writings presented substantive and stylistic distinctions compared with past writings such as the builder manuals. Their writings were indicative of literary and historical trends promoting the academicization of architectural studies. And the methodologies applied to the study of architecture showed the influence of traditional research customs which relied on the reading of ancient and classic texts.

This generation of architectural scholars successfully established architecture as a field of study despite long-standing disregard by intellectuals from upper echelons of society. Their writings and research methods, however, were ultimately challenged and even criticized by a younger generation of Chinese architects, those who received professional architectural education abroad.

THE FOLLOWERS OF THE WESTERN SCIENTIFIC METHODOLOGIES—FOREIGN EDUCATED CHINESE ARCHITECTS

A sense of decay and failure of Modern China in the competition with the Western world gave rise to a voice among the whole society to the importance of “Learning from the West.” One of the approaches was to send young people to study in Western universities primarily majoring scientific and engineering fields. It is calculated that by the 1930s, the number of foreign-trained architectural professionals returning to China was roughly one hundred and twenty-seven.⁶ They actively devoted themselves to practice by opening architectural offices in the big cities such as Shanghai, Beijing, Nanjing, and Guangzhou. In so doing, they promptly replaced the builders who had been trained through the system of traditional apprenticeship. In the meantime, some of these foreign-educated architects engaged the field of architectural education, setting up the first group of architectural schools at university-level institutions. This group of people later formed the intellectual mainstream of Chinese architecture studies. This generation of architects who received foreign education in the 1930s is commonly recognized as the first generation of professional architects in China.⁷

Because these young foreign-trained architects were educated under Western curriculums, they were very familiar with the framework and research methods of Western architectural history. By comparison, the history of Chinese architecture constructed by the traditionally educated scholars was deemed

to be incorrect or unscientific. As a result, these young foreign-trained architects were eager to reconstruct a true history of Chinese architecture according to the standard of Western scholarship. Their endeavor of adopting rational and scientific methods for the study of Chinese architecture was advanced through their contributions to the research program of *The Society for the Research in Chinese Architecture* founded by ZHU Qiqian in 1930.⁸

The Society was comprised of two departments: the Department of Standards in charge of field investigation of extant ancient buildings, and the Department of Philology in charge of philology, collecting and deciphering all the ancient materials. LIANG Sicheng and LIU Dunzhen were the directors of the two departments respectively. Since they joined the Society in 1931 and 1932 successively, Liang and Liu quickly established their scholarly leadership in the Society and rapidly launched a series of research initiatives according to Western scientific methods. The Society transformed into a truly academic society—the key venue for the study of Chinese architecture before 1949.

LIANG Sicheng is considered to have been one of the most influential architects, architectural historians, and educators in China. In addition, Liang’s wife and collaborator LIN Huiyin is also a renowned architectural historian, her name standing beside Liang’s on many papers and projects. Therefore, Liang and Lin need to be considered side by side. Liang studied at University of Pennsylvania majoring architecture during 1924 to 1927. Lin also went to Penn with Liang at the same year. Despite the fact that she had to major in fine arts as the School of Architecture at Penn at that time did not accept female students, she took many architecture courses and proved her excellence and talent in architecture by winning the position of assistant instructor for her fellow classmates in architecture class.⁹ After their graduation, Liang and Lin accepted the invitation from ZHU Qiqian to join the Society, which opened up their life-long pursuit of the history of Chinese architecture.

The research works by Liang and Lin during the period of the Society were prolific. Their contributions to Chinese architecture studies were to introduce and adopt Western scientific research methodologies into Chinese architectural history. Different from the predecessors, who studied Chinese architecture based on secondary resources, Liang and his colleagues emphasized primary resources.¹⁰ Field investigation was their critical tool to access to primary resources. The extant ancient structures and buildings across eleven provinces around China were explored.¹¹

Apart from empirical research, Liang and his colleagues also carried on the traditional research method—literature research, the key tool for the earlier generation of intellectual scholars, to study Chinese architecture. Liang believed that in order to learn the essence of Chinese wooden-structured buildings, grasping the two official building manuals — the ancient *Ying Zao Fa Shi*

from the Song Dynasty in the 12th century and a second more recent treatise on design and construction from 1734, *Gong Cheng Zuo Fa Ze Li* — was critical.¹² Therefore, he started with deciphering the Qing Style by the Qing official building manual *Gong Cheng Zuo Fa Ze Li* as it was closer to his times, and there were more exemplary existing buildings and living builders to consult. As a result of this attempt, Liang published the book *Qing Shi Ying Zao Ze Li* (Qing Structural Regulations) in 1934. This experience served Liang as the preparation for decoding *Ying Zao Fa Shi*, the official building manual of a thousand years ago. Once he had a clear understanding of the building construction methods of the Qing, he was able to more accurately establish the dates of buildings before the Qing. This research continued almost all his life and was finalized as the book *Ying Zao Fa Shi Zhu Shi* (Annotation of Ying Zao Fa Shi).

The juxtaposition of investigating existing buildings of different times and decoding ancient authoritative documents built up the basic system of the studies of Chinese architecture.¹³ Through a series of elaborate comparisons of their surveying data and *Ying Zao Fa Shi*, Liang and his colleagues discovered the oldest wood structure and proved it was constructed in the Tang Dynasty, which expanded the history of Chinese architecture a thousand years.¹⁴

The history of Chinese architecture constructed by Liang and his colleagues was based on the evolution of architectural structure. They believed the essence of Chinese architecture was embedded in structure rather than ornament, style or material. Liang and Lin both proposed this point of view in their earlier papers. For example, LIN Huiyin compared the framing system of Chinese architecture to the modern reinforced concrete frame structure or steel frame structure, as both of them were lintel systems. She described Chinese architecture as “pure,” “honest,” “organic” entities because the appearance of the architecture was the truly expression of its structure.¹⁵ This was a groundbreaking theory at that time, which penetrating the surface, discovered the authentic beauty of Chinese architecture that was deeply embedded in structure.¹⁶

Furthermore, they advanced the view that the development of Chinese architecture also had rises and declines chronologically just as art did. Lin stated, for example, “Every art experienced all the stages of evolution: creation, experimentation, maturity, repetition, proliferation and decline, so did architecture.”¹⁷ The quintessence of architecture, the couple believed, was the optimal functionality of structure. An excellent architecture is structure-functional without overly complicated elements. Later, Lin further traced the historical curve of the evolution of Chinese architecture, which reached its climax in the Tang Dynasty (618-907), tended to degenerate in the Song Dynasty (960-1279), and even further declined in the Ming (1368-1644) and Qing Dynasties because of its overly decorated style.¹⁸ This definition of the development of Chinese architecture was further refined in Liang’s book, *A Pictorial History of Chinese*

architecture, in which he divided the development of Chinese architecture from the Tang Dynasty to the Song Dynasty into three periods: the Period of Vigor, the Period of Elegance and the Period of Rigidity.¹⁹

CRITICAL ASSESSMENTS OF DIFFERENT APPROACHES BY CONTEMPORARY SCHOLARS

LIANG Sicheng’s position in Chinese architecture was secure. We might say that decades-long developments in the history of Chinese architecture were based on the scholarly system constructed by Liang and his collaborators during the period of the Society. It was not until recent years that different voices began to challenge some parts of Liang’s scholarly system.

One of the challenges was from the contemporary scholar, ZHAO Chen.²⁰ He deems that Liang’s theoretical system is paradoxical and even tragic, and it to large extent resulted from scholarly Classicism. It is indispensable to associate Classicism with Liang’s educational background at the University of Pennsylvania in the 1920s, which had been strongly influenced by the Beaux-Arts system. Zhao believes that the Classicism inherited from Penn tremendously influenced Liang’s scholarly views and research approaches, and even the scholarly system established by Liang and his fellows.²¹

The evidence Zhao used to prove his argument is Liang’s architectural interpretation for the two “Grammar Books”, *Ying Zao Fa Shi* and *Gong Bu Gong Cheng Zuo Fa*. The manner of Liang’s interpretation clearly indicates the adoption and application of the grammars of Western Classicism. First, the compositional theory typically utilized in the design of Western Classical façades was adopted by Liang to analyze Chinese architectural façades. The tri-partite architectural composition of the Renaissance façade was used as a parallel for the façade of Chinese architecture, which also included three parts: base, column-wall system, and roof. Second, the column was particularly emphasized in Classical architecture theory in establishing and controlling the proportion and scale of the façade. Likewise, the structural element, “dougong” (bracket system) was considered analogous to the capital of Classical architecture since their positions were all at the top of columns. Third, “cai” and “fen” in *Ying Zao Fa Shi*, “doukou” in *Gong Cheng Gong Bu Zuo Fa*, were interpreted as Ratio in Classical architecture, used to govern the proportion and scale of façade. While the system of Chinese architectural analysis was partially built upon such Classical grammars, Zhao mounts the critique that Chinese architecture is in essence contradictory to the Classical architectural system.²²

Zhao argues that the Western Classical architectural system in itself is parochial and biased. On the one side, this system is West-centered and narrowly portrays world civilization to be a lineal history of Egypt, Greece and Rome, etc. On the other side, it emphasizes monumental structures while overlooking other numerous anonymous buildings. Western architectural

culture traditionally makes a big distinction between these two categories of architecture. Furthermore, the Classical system is based on monumentality, and its history is defined by the stylistic evolution of these buildings. Such a gap, however, does not exist in Chinese architectural culture; rather, Chinese architecture embodies secular characteristics. There in fact is not a big difference in terms of style and form in the comparison between imperial architecture and residential buildings. Imperial architecture could be seen as a scaled, sophisticated and advanced development of residential buildings. Therefore, Zhao believed using the Western Classical architectural system to interpret Chinese architecture was fated to be wrong.²³

In recent years, while some scholars have questioned the so-called “scientific” research approaches adopted by Liang and his colleagues, some scholars have begun to reconsider the value of research works and approaches used by their predecessors who were steeped in a pre-scientific intellectual tradition, such as the first *History of Chinese Architecture* that was written by YUE Jiazhao, a typical Chinese intellectual scholar, in 1933. When Liang encountered the work, he bitterly criticized his writing, “*Yue knows neither what architecture is nor what history is.*”²⁴ Liang’s negative assessment of the content and approach of Yue’s research relegated this work to the shadows for decades. Fortunately, contemporary scholars have rediscovered Yue’s and other intellectuals’ works. A majority of these revisionist scholars primarily focus upon re-evaluating or justifying the contributions of those works from a historical point of view. Only a relatively few efforts have been made, however, to unpack the traditional methodologies and to rigorously assess the potential benefits of traditional approaches for the study of Chinese architecture for contemporary scholars. LAI Delin is one of them.²⁵

Lai believes that, because Yue is a typical traditionally-trained scholar, his studies on Chinese architecture are significantly influenced by the Confucian Classics and must be interpreted within that conceptual framework. One area where Confucian concepts become evident is in Lai’s application of studies of Mingwu to an interpretation of the Ritual System which encompasses a series of ancient Chinese architectural elements and types.²⁶ Lai demonstrates the impact of Mingwu on Yue’s studies of Chinese architecture as reflected in his tracing of the evolution of architectural terms. Yue’s work utilizes two approaches in this regard. One approach, as previously mentioned, is literature research. The other approach is Xungu (textual research), the study of the meanings of words, a small branch of the studies of ancient linguistics.²⁷ For Yue, sorting out the chronological order in variations of the names of architectural elements implies the path of historical development.²⁸

In addition to the studies of Mingwu, Yue’s particular attention to the Ritual System of architecture also shows the influence from the Confucian Classics. Yue regarded the Ritual System as the basic foundation for building design and city planning, and

he discussed the four types of structures constituting this Ritual System in his book. They are gate system, city system, imperial-building system, and the system of Worship place. For instance, Yue described the Gate system of the Zhou Dynasty (1046-256 BC), in which the number and the style of Gates were broken down into several classifications according to social statuses of the clients—for the emperor, for the dukes and princes, and for the literati and officialdom.²⁹

Based upon Lai’s summaries of Yue’s research methodologies, it becomes apparent that Yue’s approaches are very different from those that were adopted by the later foreign-trained architects. If western research methodologies represent the canon, then the history constructed by Yue’s generation must be deemed unscientific and less-objective by comparison, whether from the eyes of the first generation of Chinese architects or from the eyes of contemporary architects. Yet, the broader cultural value of Yue’s work is to provide us a different critical perspective about contemporary historiography of Chinese architecture. In a search for the characteristics of an authentic Chinese architecture, how can we benefit from the traditional understandings of Chinese “architecture” grounded in a Confucian world-view?

METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS ON THE HISTORY OF CHINESE ARCHITECTURE

The research in Chinese architecture by Chinese architects themselves started late. It is, as it were, the interactional product of Western cultural-colonization of the East and the growing rationalism of Chinese intellectuals. The formation of the historiography of Chinese architecture in the first half of the twentieth century was influenced by the complicated genealogical lines, from the sides of the West, the old-styled Chinese intellectuals, and the foreign-trained Chinese architects. And the relationships of these lines were complex and convoluted.

That the Chinese intellectual-class became interested in architecture, to a great extent, was the direct response to the Western colonial expansion of China, especially in terms of the culture domain. Under this condition, the progressive scholars represented by ZHU Qiqian, and YUE Jiazhao, began their earliest exploration of Chinese architecture with the goal of “*discovery of the buried gems of Chinese ancient culture.*”³⁰ However, their backgrounds of traditional schooling and non-professional architectural training determined their studies of Chinese architecture completely based upon the customs and methods of the studies of the traditional Classics. This traditional grounding was exactly what was so sharply criticized by the later generation of Chinese architectural scholars, those foreign-trained architects.

It is not difficult to understand that these bitter criticisms resulted from their Western architectural education. When they found the history written by their predecessors and realized the research methodologies they employed were so different from methods of the studies of the traditional Classics. This traditional grounding was exactly what was so sharply criticized

by the later generation of Chinese architectural scholars, those foreign-trained architects.

It is not difficult to understand that these bitter criticisms resulted from their Western architectural education. When they found the history written by their predecessors and realized the research methodologies they employed were so different from what they had learned in the West, they took it for granted that neither their works nor their research approaches were “scientific” and “correct.” It seems they believed only the Western scholarly system was the standard, and the Western methodologies were scientific. However, the sentiments of this generation of Chinese scholars toward the West, along with existing Western scholarship on Chinese architecture, were paradoxical and complicated. On one side, in the face of the scarcity of Chinese scholarly works and the “backwardness” of research methodologies, they had to heavily rely on the research works conducted by the Western scholars. On the other side, in light of the West’s aggressive cultural colonization of China, indigenous scholars’ self-esteem was deeply stung by some of the one-sided, biased and even incorrect understandings of Chinese architecture. A strong sense of nationalism made these Chinese scholars anxious to extricate themselves from Western scholarly influence and establish China’s own architectural genealogy which could stand side-by-side with the evolutionary tree of Western architecture. Tragically, even when they were trying to divorce themselves from Western influence, the influence, in fact, had subliminally penetrated into the system they established.

The scholarly system of Chinese architecture formed by LIANG Sicheng and his colleagues of the Society necessitated comparing Chinese traditional architecture against the model of Western Classical architecture. This approach was further developed by subsequent generations who faithfully followed their scholarly predecessors in this doctrine of Chinese architectural study. We may conclude that even until today Chinese architectural studies are still under the influence of the theories of Western architectural history, which have been deeply embedded into the minds of generations of Chinese scholars. Many of them are accustomed to treating all architectural questions as a function of Western architectural history. This can often result in frustration, however, when one realizes that some questions are culturally resolvable only within the system of Chinese architectural history.

Therefore, in order to transcend preconceptions based in the West-East dialectic to think about Chinese architectural history, we need to face Chinese architecture directly, rather than through the mirror of the theories of Western architecture. Generations of Chinese architectural historians over the past century have been focusing their studies upon artifacts, buildings, and historical documents rather than upon the modes of their production. In contrast to the prolific scholarship of architectural history, the field of architectural practice has drawn

far less attention. Furthermore, far beyond the well-studied field of design, the field of construction — the other component of architectural practice, is still a virgin field yet to be explored by contemporary Chinese historians especially in light of major shifts in Chinese political economy that have transpired over the 20th century. Perhaps attention to the intricate and fluid relationships among different professionals, particularly the tri-partite of owner, architect, and builder which bridges over the fields of design and construction, can help us better contextualize the overall picture of architectural practice in China. It will certainly provide us with a new train of thought for constructing the system of Chinese architectural history.

ENDNOTES

1. It is commonly agreed that the Modern China starts with the Opium War of 1840 and ends with the establishment of the People’s Republic of China of 1949. Therefore, according to the rule, the pre-Modern period can be understood to be the time before 1840s.
2. Chinoiserie was a fashion popularized in the eighteenth century among the upper-level Europeans about Chinese arts, especially about the decorative arts and architecture. See Jacobson, Dawn, *Chinoiserie* (New York: Phaidon Press, 1999).
3. Sinology originally was a practical subject that included objects such as linguistics and religion that primarily served for missionaries. It experienced rapid development in the beginning of the nineteenth century and eventually evolved into an academic study, whose scope expanded widely including the subjects: Chinese literature, philosophy, history, arts and science. See Cohen, Warren I., *East Asian Art and American Culture: A Study in International Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992).
4. Wang, Min-ying “The Historicization of Chinese Architecture: The Making of Architectural Historiography in China, from the Late Nineteenth Century to 1953,” 39-46.
5. Lai, Delin, “Jing Xue, Jing Shi Zhi Xue, Xin Shi Xue Yu Ying Zao Xue He Jian Zhu Shi Xue” Old in New: Reflections on the Influence of the Traditional study of Classics, Ming and Qing Pragmatism, and the late Qing New History on the Historiography of Chinese Architecture. *Jian Zhu Xue Bao* (Architectural Journal), no. 09+10 (2014), 110-1.
6. Su, Gin-Djin, *Chinese Architecture: Past and Contemporary* (Hongkong: The Sin Poh Amalgamated Ltd., 1964), 123.
7. YANG Yongsheng, writer and chief editor of *China Architecture and Building Press*, was the first scholar who brought up the concept of generations of Chinese architects since the 20th century. The first generation of Chinese architect was that who were born in around 1911 and studied architecture overseas. Contemporary scholars commonly agree with this point. See Yang, Yongsheng, *Four Generations of Chinese Architect* (Beijing: China Architecture and Building Press, 2002).
8. ZHU Qiqian (1872-1964), an influential political official, reformist and industrialist. He discovered the transcript of *Ying Zao Fa Shi*, the oldest treatise on Chinese architecture, in Jiangnan Library in 1911, and published the transcript after six-year revisions. In order to decipher this obscure and deep bible, ZHU set up the Society by inviting the young foreign-trained architects who just recently returned to China to study Chinese architecture.
9. Atkin, Tony, “Chinese Architecture Students at the University of Pennsylvania in the 1920s,” in *Chinese Architecture and the Beaux-Arts*, ed. Jeffrey W. Cody, Nancy S. Steinhardt, and Tony Atkin (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2011), 58.
10. Wang, Min-ying “The Historicization of Chinese Architecture: The Making of Architectural Historiography in China, from the Late Nineteenth Century to 1953,” 183-4.
11. Lin, Zhu, Kou Kai LU Ban De Da Men: *Zhongguo Ying Zao Xue She Shi Lue* (Open the Door of LU Ban: the History of the Society for the Research in Chinese Architecture) (1995; reprint, Taipei: Jian Zhu Gong Ye Chu Ban She, 1997). *Ibid.*, 184.
12. The most renowned and significant monographs on Chinese architecture written before the twentieth century are *Ying Zao Fa Shi* (Treatise on Architectural Methods) and *Gong Cheng Zuo Fa Ze Li* (Engineering Manual for the Ministry of Works). *Ying Zao Fa Shi* is the oldest treatise on Chinese architecture. It was compiled by LI Jie, the Directorate of Building and Construction in 1100 during the Song Dynasty and got published in 1103. *Gong Cheng Zuo Fa Ze Li*, a treatise on design and construction of imperial buildings, was published by the Qing sovereign in 1734.

13. Wang, Guixiang "Fei Li Shi De Yu Li Shi De: BAO Xlman De Bei Leng Luo Yu LIANG Sicheng De Zao Qi Xue Shu Si Xiang" [Un-historical and Historical: the Absent Treatment to Ernst Boerschmann and the Early Scholarship of LIANG Sicheng], *Jian Zhu Shi* (Architect), no. 2 (February, 2011), 79-80.
14. Liang, Sicheng, "Ji Wu Tai Shan Fo Guang Si Jian Shu" (The Building Complex of the Foguang Temple, Wutai Mountains), *Bulletin of the Society for the Research in Chinese Architecture*, vol. 7, no. 1 (October, 1944), 13-61; no. 2 (October, 1945).
15. Lin, Huiyin, "Lun Zhongguo Jian Zhu Zhi Ji Ge Te Zheng" [Discourse on the Features of Chinese Architecture], *Zhongguo Ying Zao Xue She Hui Kan* (The Bulletin of the Society for Research in Chinese Architecture), 3 no. 1 (March, 1933), 179.
16. Zhao, Chen, Li Mian De Wu Hui (The Misunderstanding of "Facade") (Beijing: Sheng Huo, Du Shu, Xin Zhi, San Lian Sheng Huo Zhou Kan, 2007), 52-3.
17. Lin, Huiyin, "Lun Zhongguo Jian Zhu Zhi Ji Ge Te Zheng" [Discourse on the Features of Chinese Architecture], *Zhongguo Ying Zao Xue She Hui Kan* (The Bulletin of the Society for Research in Chinese Architecture), 3 no. 1 (March, 1933), 179.
18. Lin, Huiyin, "Qing Shi Ying Zao Ze Li Xu Lun" (Introduction to Qing Structural Regulation), in Liang, Sicheng, *Qing Shi Ying Zao Ze Li* (Qing Structural Regulation) (Beijing: Zhongguo Ying Zao Xue She, 1934); reprint in Liang Sicheng, *Liang Sicheng Quan Ji* (Complete Works of Liang Sicheng), vols 6:9 (Beijing: Zhongguo Jian Zhu Gong Ye Chu Ban She, 2000), 19.
19. Zhao, Chen, Li Mian De Wu Hui (The Misunderstanding of "Facade") (Beijing: Sheng Huo, Du Shu, Xin Zhi, San Lian Sheng Huo Zhou Kan, 2007), 52.
20. ZHAO Chen is the Professor at the School of Architecture of University of Nanjing. He specialized in the history of Chinese architecture and architectural thoughts.
21. Zhao, Chen, Li Mian De Wu Hui (The Misunderstanding of "Facade") (Beijing: Sheng Huo, Du Shu, Xin Zhi, San Lian Sheng Huo Zhou Kan, 2007), 9-45.
22. Ibid., 9-45.
23. Ibid., 9-45.
24. Liang, Sicheng "Du YUE Jiaozao 'Zhongguo Jian Zhu Shi' Pi Miu" (The Mistakes on The History of Chinese Architecture by YUE Jiaozao), in Liang, Sicheng, *Liang Sicheng Quan Ji* (The Complete Works of LIANG Sicheng), vol 2:10 (Beijing: Zhongguo Jian Zhu Gong Ye Chu Ban She, 2001).
25. LAI Delin is the Associate Professor, Head of Art History Program at the University of Louisville. Lai specialized in modern Chinese architecture and Asian Art History.
26. Mingwu is an important branch of study of the Confucian Classics that probes the origin and evolution of the names of things that once appeared in the Classics in order to examine the culture, costume and social rites of different times. See Wang, Qiang "Zhongguo Gu Dai Ming Wu Xue Chu Lun" [Preliminary Discussion on the Ancient Studies of Mingwu], *Yang Zhou Da Xue Xue Bao* (The Journal of Yangzhou University), vol. 8, no. 6 (2004), 53-7.
27. Zhou, Dapu, *Xun Gu Xue Yao Lue* (Synopsis of XunGu) (Wuhan: Hu Bei Ren Min Chu Ban She, 1984).
28. Lai, Delin, "Jing Xue, Jing Shi Zhi Xue, Xin Shi Xue Yu Ying Zao Xue He Jian Zhu Shi Xue," [Old in New: Reflections on the Influence of the Traditional study of Classics, Ming and Qing Pragmatism, and the late Qing New History on the Historiography of Chinese Architecture], *Jian Zhu Xue Bao* (Architectural Journal), no. 09+10 (2014), 108-110.
29. Ibid., 108-110.
30. Zhu, Qiqian "Zhongguo Ying Zao Xue She Kai Hui Yan Ci" [The Speech at the Opening of the Society for the Research in Chinese Architecture] *Zhongguo Ying Zao Xue She Hui Kan* (The Bulletin of the Society for the Research in Chinese Architecture), 1 no.1 (1930).