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Abstract

The study of the architecture of buildings help us to understand the environment, material culture and the thinking of people who designed them. Thus, it is one of the mean to understand the culture of a society. Keeping this in view this article deal with the evolution of architectural study in Indian Sub-continent. With the foundation of Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, the British began studying Indian art and architecture. This study deliberates on the various research works on architecture and shows how and why various categories of architecture has evolved. Study concludes that Indian architecture is an excellent example of inter cultural influences of Greek, Persian and others.
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Introduction

Although the Subcontinent has enjoyed a virtually uninterrupted history of art and architecture, an appreciation of India’s past only began with linguistic and philosophical researches in the second half of the 18th Century.

Till this period the only styles known or thought worthy of attention were the Roman and those derived from it. Thus when Giovanni Battista (also Giambattista) Piranesi composed his *Prima parte di Architettura e Prospettive* in 1743, *Antichità Romane de’ tempo della prima Repubblica e dei primi imperatori* ("Roman Antiquities of the Time of the First Republic and the First Emperors") in around 1774 and *Remains of the Edifices of Paestum* in 1778 it was only the Roman style with some suspicion of the value of Greek art.¹

Sir William Jones, a judge of the Calcutta Supreme Court was one of the pioneers whose endeavours helped in a better understanding of not only Indian philosophy but also Indian art and architecture. As early as 1774, Jones along with Samuel Johnson, a famous lexicographer, urged the Governor General of India, Warren Hastings, to ‘Survey the remains of (India’s) edifices, and trace the vestiges of its ruined cities”. Exactly a decade later, on 15 January 1784 Sir William Jones founded the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal whose aim was to ‘inquire into the history and antiquities, the arts, sciences and literature of Asia’.²

The foundation of the Asiatic Society in Calcutta was entirely in keeping with the scientific spirit of the 18th Century Britain. J. Gibbs has suggested that Sir William Jones owed the idea of this society to the Society of Arts in Britain. Jones attempted to link Indian history to the universal history, as it was then understood.²

Till around 1800, the knowledge of Indian architecture was still almost unknown, and thus when Jean Nicolas Louis Durand published his famous *Receuil et Parallele des Édifices en tout genre, Anciens et Modernes*, in 1800, out of the sixty three plates, he devoted one to Gothic art, and “half a plate sufficed for all that was then known of Egyptian”. India and the other ‘outlying styles’ were totally neglected as they were unknown till then.³

---


² J. Gibbs, “The history of Archaeology in India”, *Journal of the Bengal Society of Arts*, no.34, pp.555-64

A new era however started from around 1834 when James Prinsep popularized the works of Charles Masson in Kabul valley. From 1833-8, Charles Masson was employed by the British East India Company to explore the ancient sites in southeast Afghanistan. He recorded or excavated about 50 Buddhist monuments, bought numerous ornaments, gems and coins in Kabul bazaar and amassed an estimated 60,000 coins, gems, seals, rings and other, mostly bronze, surface finds from the urban site of Begram north of Kabul. His finds not only shifted the attention to Indian architecture but also provided numismatic evidence for the spread of Buddhism into eastern Afghanistan in the 1st century AD.

Around the same time Jean Baptiste Ventura, an Italian soldier in the army of Ranjit Singh spent his spare time in Peshawar exhuming Bactrian Greek and Kushan coins from Buddhist stupas in the Khyber Pass, and despatching them on to the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta. Cunningham on the other hand added to the knowledge through his ‘excavations’ of the stupas at Sarnath and Banaras. Since his arrival in India & his contact with James Princep, whose close associate he was, Cunningham had initially published almost exclusively on the Indo-Greek & Bactrian coins and other antiquities, which bore strong imprints of Buddhism. In 1839, he surveyed the region of the sources of the Punjab Rivers and published the report in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1841. He was working at a time in India when the accounts of Chinese travellers, Fa Hian & Huiyen Tsang were coming known to the European scholarship. In 1839, H.H.Wilson had also written a detailed paper on the geographical identifications based on the accounts of Hiuen Tsang.

---


6 See A. Gardiner, The Fall of the Sikh Empire, Delhi, 1898 (reprint 1999); See also Alexander Cunningham, Archaeological Survey of India, Four Reports Made during the years 1862-63-64-65, Vol I, Delhi, 1972, p. xix

7 A. Cunningham, Coins of Ancient India from the Earliest Times, London, 1891

8 H.H. Wilson, Ariana Antiqua: A Descriptive Account of the Antiquities and coins of Afghanistan with a Memoir of the Buildings Called Topes by C. Masson, reprint 1997
In 1854 he published his Bhilsa Topes, which not only gave an historical account of the rise, progress and decline of Buddhism but also a detailed description of the stupas of Sanchi, Sonari, Satdhara, Bhojpur and Andheri.9

Thus due to these works accomplished between 1830’s and 50’s began the discovery of the Buddhist art and architecture which forced the scholars to attempt towards some sort of appreciation and classification of the Indian architecture.

Central to Cunningham’s achievement was the way he systematized the knowledge of ancient India gained by the Archaeological Survey of India and developed a chronological framework into which to fit new discoveries. Thus, Indian antiquities grouped together into three basic periods, viz.

(a) Brahmanical (before c.500 BC)
(b) Budhhist (500 BC – 1200 AD)
(c) Mohammadan (after 1200 AD)

As he realized that this simple classification could not adequately cope with the enormous variation of architectural styles, Cunningham also devised & seconded a more complicated scheme for identifying and dating Hindu and Muslim Architecture.

The Hindu style divided in to the following chronological divisions:

i. Archaic (c.1000 – 250 BC) – “rude monuments” & localities associated with Buddha & Alexander the Great.
iii. Indo-Scythian (57 – AD 319)
iv. Indo-Sassanian (AD 319 – 700)
v. Medieval Brahmanic (AD 700 – 1200)
vi. Modern Brahmanic (AD – 1200 – 1750)

The Muslim style showed the following chronological stages:
1. Ghor-Pathan: with overlapping arches (1181 -1289 AD)
2. Khilji-Pathan: with horse-shoe arches (1289 – 1321)
3. Tughluq-Pathan: with sloping walls (1321 – 1450)
4. Afghan: with perpendicular walls (1450 – 1555)
5. Bengali Pathan (1200 – 1500)
6. Jaunpuri Pathan (1400 -1500)

---

9 A. Cunningham, The Bhilsa Topes or Buddhist Monuments of Central India : Comprising a Brief Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress and Decline of Buddhism with an Account of the Opening and Examination of the Various Groups of Topes around Bhilsa, London, 1854 (reprint, 1997)
7. Early Mogul (1556 – 1628)
8. Late Mogul (1628 – 1750)

The broad features of each of these divisions were describe with reference to their main examples, styles, dates & racial groupings. Cunningham’s views that the earliest Indian monuments were not older than 1000 BC, endured until the early 1920’s.

The entire reign of Cunningham’s successor at Archaeological Survey of India, James Burgess was mark entirely by archaeological surveys, primarily in west & south India and partly in North India. He had a deep-rooted conviction, that archaeology meant a study of architecture. It was however James Fergusson, a Scottish Indigo-planter, who attempted for the first time a systematic study of the entire panorama of Indian Architecture which was based on his close study in the field between 1838 – 42. In his first major publication “On the Rock-cut Temples of India” (read, 1843; pub.1845), Fergusson laid stress on a comparative study of architectural features to fix approximate dates by differences of style and other distinctive features along with Inscriptions to arrive at a conclusion.10

In this work, Fergusson classified all types of Indian rock-cut caves into:
   i. Natural caves adapted for the purpose.
   ii. A veranda fronting the cells or a square hall on 3 sides of which the cells were arranged;
   iii. As no.ii, but the hall is now supported by pillars & has in a cell or deep recess opposite the entrance, a statue of Buddha with his usual attendants.
   iv. Chaitya caves showing and external porch, an internal gallery or the entrance, a central nave roofed with a plain wagon vault and a semi-dome terminating end, under the centre of which is the stupa.
   v. Brahmanical caves, resembling Buddhist caves but with walls covered with sculptures.
   vi. Rock-cut models of Brahmanical temples.
   vii. Jain caves.

Based on this classification, Fergusson undertook a detailed analysis of the stylistic components and study of evolution of cave architecture.

Two years later, in 1847 Fergusson made use of the same methods and principles of characteristic stylistic similarities and differences to fix the dates of the medieval

10 James Fergusson, Illustrations of the Rock-Cut Temples of India, London, 1845
temples ‘of the Brahmins and Jains’. Later, Fergusson wrote his *Handbook of Architecture* in two volumes in which he was to extend his classification of all the different Indian styles, both ‘Hindu and Mahommadan’ into three heads comprising (a) Buddhist and Jain Architecture, (b) Hindu Architecture and (c) Saracenic Architecture.

In his schema of world architecture, there were two ‘dimensions’, one chronological and the other topographical on the basis of which to divide the various styles. In the first category, according to him, the world architecture could be divided into Christian and Non-Christian or ‘Heathen’. These two divisions, according to him were ‘very nearly equal in the importance of the objects described, and very easily distinguished from another.’ Topographically, all architecture could be classified as either Eastern, or West Asian. According to him, the two great styles however were the Christian and the Saracenic which sprang from the Roman which ‘was the great transitional style between the ancient and modern world’. The Christian styles were further divided into two groups, the Byzantine school and the Gothic school.

In his most significant work, *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, Fergusson came up with his ultimate classification of Indian Architecture. In this work, we find a detailed analysis of styles and their components, which are grouped into seven general categories:

a. Buddhist Architecture  
b. Architecture in the Himalayas  
c. Dravidian style  
d. Chalukyan style  
e. Jain Architecture  
f. Northern or Indo-Aryan style  
g. Indo-Saracenic (Indo-Muslim) Architecture

This classification of Fergusson was based on the ethnographical analysis of Indian history. According to him, it was divided into 5 racial categories:

1. Aryan  
2. Dravidian  
3. Dasyu or aboriginal

---

14 Ibid, I, viii  
15 James Fergusson, *History of Architecture in All Countries From the Earliest to the Present Day*, (in Four volumes), London, 1874
4. Turanians
5. Semetic

According to Fergusson, “the immaterial nature” of their faith always deprived the Aryans “of the principal incentive to architectural magnificence”. Commenting on the Aryan attitude towards architecture, he further wrote:

He (the Aryan) does not feel that virtue can be increased or vice exterminated by the number of bricks or stones that may be heaped on one another, or the form in which they may be placed; nor will his conception of the Deity admit of supposing that He can be propitiated by palaces or halls erected in honour of Him, or that a building in the Middle Pointed Gothic is more acceptable than one in the Classic or any other style.16

The Turanians on the other hand, like the Celtic race, had “the most faith in ceremonial worship and in the necessity of architectural splendour as its indispensable accompaniment”.17 This race in India constructed the most monumental tombs ‘from the Pyramids of Egypt to the mausoleum of Hyder Ali’.18

The Semetic race, although did not create such magnificent tombs, but were intellectually superior to the Turanians and “influenced the intellect of the Aryan tribes to a greater extent.19 The Dravidians, were ‘certainly Turanians’ and were intellectually inferior to the Aryans.20 The Dasyus, who were the aborigines, were intellectually far inferior to both the Aryans and Dravidians. Their hall mark was a square brick like temple with a perpendicular base and a curvilinear outline above.21

Further, according to Fergusson’s classification, the Saracenic or the Mahommadan architecture of India could be further sub-divided into “at least twelve or fifteen different styles of Mahommadan architecture”22, namely:

A. The Mahommadan Style to the North of Narbada
B. The Mahommadan Style to the south of Narbada

Amongst the first category were included:

1) Ghazni, the stepping stone by means of which the western architecture was introduced in India;
2) The Pathan style of North India (1193-1554 AD)
3) The Jaunpur Style of the Sharqis (1394-1476)

---

17 Ibid
18 Ibid., I, p.61
19 Ibid, I, p.64
20 Fergusson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, Op.Cit., p.11
21 Ibid, p.13
22 Ibid, p.490
4) The Gujarat style (1396-1572), which borrowed heavily from the Jains
5) Malwa (1402-1568)
6) Bengal (1203-1573)

Seven categories marked the styles of the country south of Narbada, viz.:

1) Bahmani, including Gulbarga (from 1347) and Bidar (1426 – 1525)
2) Bijapur (1489-1660)
3) Golconda (1512-1672)
4) Mogul (1494 [sic] – 1706) to be extended up till 1750
5) Scinde
6) Oude (1756-1847)
7) Mysore (1760-1799)

The first five of these south Indian Saracenic or Mahommadan styles were according to Fergusson ‘true styles’ of Mahommadan architecture, whereas the last two were the “bastard styles”.23

Thus in Fergusson’s classification, the first phase was marked by Buddhist monuments. This was the phase of the highest level of artistic achievement. It was followed by ‘Hindu’ architectural style, which was marked by ‘corrupt’ Brahmanical influence and a waning of Greek influence and the racial subjugation of Aryans by the inferior Turanians, which led to debasement of artistic quality. This phase was classified, as we have seen above, into stylistic divisions following ethnic categories and even dynastic or geographical groups.

According to a modern writer, Fergusson’s writings on the history of Indian architecture through his construction of religious and racial categories was entirely ‘in terms of the buttressing of a single, homogenous colonial project’24, and a ‘source of ideas for the improvement of architecture in England’.25 In this classification attempted by Fergusson, he was guided by the Rankean historicism and European susceptibilities. Taste was the measure of perfection against which the stylistic units were classified: Thus Buddhist-Gandharan architecture was characterized by its ‘classical’ simplicity and purity of form, the ‘Hindu’ was its polar opposite and given to excessive ornate surface decoration. The latter was also marked by ‘false’ principles of design.

---

23 Ibid., p.492
24 For a detailed analysis on this see Monica Juneja, *Architecture in Medieval India, Forms, Contexts, Histories*, Permanent Black, Delhi, 2001, pp. 14-25
25 Fergusson, *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, op.cit., pp.5-6
It is interesting to note that although Fergusson employs the term ‘Saracenic’ to collectively designate the styles and traditions as they developed after the coming of the Turks, his attitude towards it is more positive. The ‘Saracenic’ or ‘Mahommadan’, as noted above, started with ‘Ghazni’ style, which was a stepping-stone by which the western architecture was introduced in India. In fact, the fusion of Islam in India, in the words of Fergusson, freed the Indian artists from the ‘trammells of Puranic mythology’.26

Fergusson’s sub-classification of Saracenic architecture of India shows it to be a mixture of Hindu and Muslim forms. His classification of architecture was thus, aimed at propagating the colonial interests of projecting the ‘decaying’ nature of the Eastern Civilization and the superiority of the West. On the other hand, this scheme, as Juneja points out, was also an attempt to “assimilate the ‘other’.”27

In 1910 Fergusson’s work *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture* was revised by James Burgess in which his chronometric scale of arrangement of the monuments was somewhat ‘adjusted’ in the light of advances made in Indian Epigraphy and Paleography.28

A severe critique of Fergusson’s classification was ultimately made by E.B. Havell who faulted the former for a classification in which there was lack of “essential Indianness” in the use of racial or ethnic categories.29 Havell found fault with Fergusson’s ‘persistent habit of looking outside of India for the origins of Indian art’.30 According to him all “Saracenic symbolism in architecture” was borrowed directly or indirectly “from India, Persia, Byzantium or Alexandria”.31 To him, the *mihrāb* was a Buddhist loan of the niche to Islam. Even the term *butkhāna* used by the Arabs for the temples was a corruption of ‘*Boud-khana*’ or Buddha-house.32 In fact he went on to argue that the ‘Saracenic’ art which came to India had been Indianized before it crossed the Indus.33 Thus the bulbous dome, as at the Taj Mahal, was a derivation from the Buddhist Stupa tradition.34

---

26 Ibid., pp.45-46
27 Juneja, op.cit., p. 19
30 Ibid., p. 2
31 Ibid., p. 4
32 Ibid., pp.5-6
33 Ibid., p. 11
34 Ibid., pp. 23-24
The obsession with 'Indianness' and identification with Aryan philosophy pervades his entire work of Havell. His first chapter, in the form of an introduction, deals with 'Hindu and Saracenic art' and the 'Pointed Arch'. The next chapter elaborates on 'Hindu Symbolism' and the indigenous origins of the Taj. The next three chapters are in a chronological treatment of various regional styles like Delhi, Gujarat, Gulbarga, Mandu, Sarkhej and Gaur. The sixth chapter focuses on architectural elements like Indian arches, brackets, capitals, domes and sikhara. The next eight chapters again have a chronological framework.

A perusal of Havell's work brings out the sum total of all the prejudices of a colonial and communal approach. The term 'Saracenic' appears like an anathema with all its prejudices unhindered.

The term 'Saracenic Architecture' was used for the styles followed by the 'Moors' (Muslims). The term had a long pedigree going back to the period of Crusades fought between the Christians and the Muslims. It connoted an architecture of the followers of Islam who conquered Persia, Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Arabia and Spain. It was chiefly an architecture of temples and mosques. Amongst its characteristic features were counted the pointed or horseshoe arch, domes, minarets, coloured decorations with red, blue, green and gold geometrical patterns and designs, an emphasis on arabesque and a total absence of sculptures.

Having its origins in the Crusades, the term Saracenic was sometimes used in the pejorative sense. Fergusson, on the other hand, used the term as an all-purpose name for the Muslim Architecture, whether in India or outside. Unlike Havell, Fergusson appears to be fairly aware and conscious of the term's negative connotation and thus alternates the term with 'Mahommadan'.

In spite of Havell's bitter criticisms, and in spite of its heavy stress on ethnology, Fergusson's categorization of Indian architecture appears to be quite enduring and better suited than the former's. However regardless of its correctness, there is an inherent drawback of his classification: Although his categorization is quite convenient, it would also imply other relationships and problems. Thus, the Kailash Temple at Ellora is counted as an example of Dravidian Rock-cut Temples. Although Dravidian style prevailed in Tamil areas, especially 'Madras Presidency', its limits were difficult to define and understand. According to Fergusson:

\[\text{On the west coast, its (Dravidian) natural boundary northwards is the Kistnah, but it did at one time (AD 700?) reach as far as Ellora...}\]

Thus, the Aryan / Dravidian dichotomy as propounded by Fergusson has its problems. Similar problem is posed by applying terms like Saracenic /

---

35 Fergusson, *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, op.cit., p.326
36 Ibid., p.320
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Mahommadan. Even shorn of its pejorative sense, the term ‘Saracenic’ is still problematic: It borrowed heavily from two very diverse sources. On the one hand, it included Persian tradition or style, which was based on the vault; on the other, it also included the Roman and Greek traditions from which it borrowed the true arch and the dome. Muslims joined both the streams to give shape to the ‘Saracenic’ or Muslim style.

The term ‘Saracenic’ is now out of use. The term in use presently is ‘Islamic Architecture’. The term in any of its form further is consciously religious and thus still problematic.

The term Saracenic / Mahommadan or Islamic Architecture for the medieval period in India used in the way that Fergusson, or for that matter Havell used, would convey the pre-supposed use of arcuate: Arcuate being Islamic and Trabeate, Hindu.

Thus, when one looks at the Akbar buildings constructed at Fathpur Sikri, and find a heavy use of trabeate, one tends to explain it by his open views towards religion and his policy of *sulh-i kul*. The whole of Akbari architecture is attributed to his religious views and policies. In this what we forget is the chronology. Akbar ordered the construction of Fathpur Sikri in 1571-72 and if we believe his contemporary historians, almost the whole palace was completed by 1578. The initiation of his policy of *Sulh-i kul* comes much later. In 1579 Akbar was still trying to take up the leadership of the Muslims by invoking the *mahzar* and trying to assume the title of *mujtahid* and *imam-i adil*.38

Then in fact, many changes were made in the trabeate when it was used by the architects of Akbar’s period: the trabeate at Fathpur Sikri is light and different from the trabeate of the ancient period. The architects of the Mughal period, being experts in geomancy knew the concept of the systems of the transfer of weights. Thus, there is a distinct lightness in the structures, which is not encountered in the earlier phases. Similar case in point would be the temple architecture of the Mughal period. The Gobind Deva Temple constructed in Brindaban is a structure built on the pattern of just any other Mughal palace and comprised a large vault supported on intersecting arches, an ‘Islamic’ or ‘Saracenic’ feature found in an otherwise ‘Hindu’ monument.39

---


Should we then do away with this type of classification and desist from such a terminology? The probable answer is no - there is much convenience in the term ‘Islamic architecture’ as it also connotes certain technological developments, which were quickly transmitted in a large area of its cultural dominance. Like Fergusson, it is better to be aware and conscious of the projected connotations but continue with them in the absence of any viable alternates.
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