Abstract: How should one conceptually distinguish traditional Chinese from traditional Indian architecture? The late Nelson Wu posed a China/India dichotomy as a way of clarifying one’s thinking about traditional architecture in China and India in his essay length book, Chinese and Indian Architecture. His position has remained a major lens for understanding the difference between these two great poles of Asian architecture. This paper will examine and assess his view of the subject, arguing that it’s a useful framework upon which to build.
these two cultures’ architecture be carried into a more general understanding of the built environment?

The late Nelson Ikon Wu posed a China/India dichotomy in 1963 his essay length book, *Chinese and Indian Architecture*, which was published as a part of *The Great Ages of World Architecture* series by Braziller. The series attempted a fresh look at various aspects of world architecture by American scholars. Wu’s position has remained a major lens for understanding the difference between these two great poles of Asian architecture. This paper will examine his view of the subject, and reflect upon it.

Wu was a charismatic figure and a professor at Washington University in St. Louis, where he held the Edward Mallinckrodt Distinguished University Professor of the History of Art and Chinese Culture in Arts & Sciences, and was a founding member of the St. Louis Asian Art Society.

He was born in Beijing in 1919 during the tumultuous years after the fall of the Qing Dynasty. Because of the war with Japan, he graduated with a bachelor’s degree from the National Southwest Associated University in Kunming before traveling to the United States in 1945. He studied at the New School for Social Research in New York before going to Yale University to earn a master’s (1949) and Ph. D. (1954) in art history, and taught at Yale, San Francisco State College (now University), and Kyoto University in Japan before going to Washington University.
In his book Wu started off by suggesting a commonality. “Both traditions exhibit a strong desire to relate a cosmic ideal with man’s own image and role within it.” The desire to relate the human condition to the perceived cosmic order is indeed at so primordial a level that almost any culture that built and reshaped the physical environment would share this interest in connecting the human condition to a conception of the cosmic order as that culture conceived it.

Then, Wu quickly shifted to differences “with a Chinese world of walled cities…shaped by… [an] ideal of regulated harmony in society, and rooted in the human intellect. In contrast there was “an Indian world of holy places…[and a] concern for eternity,” based upon the search for the meaning of life. Clearly what had caught Wu’s interest and attention was how these two civilizations had conceptualized the human condition, the cosmos, and the relationship between them. To illustrate this dichotomy, Wu used a Western Han tile design of the “Four Deities” dated about 200 BCE, and a medallion from the Amaravati Stupa of about 150 CE. Each was a two-dimensional representation of a three-dimensional reality that had been created towards the end of the formative periods of each.
The Han tile was a square that stood for a cube representing the Han world of man. As Wu explains: “the Chinese universe is actually a cube. The design here is merely a plan of it. The central shaft is memory, that tenacious tie of ancestral worship, and is also time. In Huai-nan Tzu, a Han dynasty book almost contemporary with the making of this type of tile, the reality of the universe is understood as the combination of “a six-sided world” (top, bottom and four sides) plus “past, present, and future.” As this cube of a universe spins down the central axis of time, Chinese history unreels, the four seasons revolving with the Chinese cyclical calendar. There are good years and bad years, but the nation is forever the Central Kingdom.” (Wu, 13) Four of the sides of the cube contained within it a cosmic orientation, and a cluster of meanings:

East – the Blue Dragon, blue-green vegetation, wood and the up-reaching tree.

South – the Red Phoenix of Summer and fire at the zenith.

West – the White Tiger of metallic autumn symbolic of weapons, war, executions and harvest; of fruitful conclusion, the calmness of twilight, of memory and regret, and unalterable past mistakes.

North – the Winter, cold region, black, the element water; “Hsuan-wu a snake coiling around a turtle, two hibernating reptiles forming a picture behind man’s back of life preserved underground.” (Wu, 12)

The fifth element not represented by a picture but by writing is man in the middle with the scattered words “One thousand autumns and ten thousand years, enduring happiness, never to end.” For Wu this and the many other similar Han brick and tile designs were “self-portraits of the houses or cities of which the tiles were a part.”
The rectilinear tile “is a rigid, finite, and unnatural design [by which I take him to mean intellectually abstract].” (Wu, 29) “Always keeping man in its center, it is an image of man’s society, organizing its enclosed space around him. The Chinese designer is continually challenged and inspired by the specific requirements of each social program and by the human relationships in the society which his building serves and portrays.” (Wu, 30) The courtyard dwelling, and the walled city represent this conception at radically different scales.

In the late Spiro Kostof’s terms the Chinese are creating an architecture emphasizing circumscription and shelter. (Kostof, 21) Circumscription refers to the act of establishing a boundary that defines what is inside the boundary from the setting around it. This act also begins the process of giving shape and dimension. Shelter is Kostof’s way of referring to the enclosure of space. In Kostof’s terms the act of marking off an area to create a space for the rituals of daily life, and further defining portions with shelters that create fully defined volumes in contrast to the exterior spaces usefully builds upon what Wu is describing.

In contrast to the Chinese square Wu juxtaposes the Indian circle, in this case the Amaravati medallion representing the numerous depictions of ritual events, “the translation of Buddha’s Alms Bowl to the Tushita Heaven.” The bowl is the central image “traveling up and down the eternal shaft of time” with the numerous surrounding figures subsidiary, and helping to maintain the focus on the central image. Wu continues: “The “center” of the medallion is somewhere about halfway between the middle and the top. It is where one would expect to find the North Pole on the picture of an
axially tilted globe, and the rings of dancers are analogous to its latitudinal lines. It suggests the all-inclusive shape of a sphere but with the invisible half of the sphere concealed from man’s knowledge. Foreground figures are seen in full, while only the heads of those in the distance are visible. Running through the center is the path of the alms bowl through the layers of heavens. The infinite universe of India revolves around that cosmic axis.” (Wu, 13) This focus on a central axis corresponds to Kostof’s notion of the central vertical solid that defines the space that revolves around it. (Kostof, 21)

One could also extend and amplify Wu’s reflections on the philosophical differences between China and India. Chinese culture has had a long interest in divination, longevity, and immortality suggesting a culture fixated upon life, its improvement, and preservation. Divination is a strategy to gain advantage in life by knowing the immediate future. This tendency goes back at least to the Shang Dynasty as represented by the archives of oracle bones that have been unearthed by archaeologists. Divination was such an important activity that it helped to give birth to writing and all that writing entails in Chinese culture and civilization. With the rise and development of Daoism one sees a significant segment of the Chinese intelligentsia and occasionally an emperor (beginning with Qin Shihuang) fixated upon techniques and herbal remedies to prolong and possibly attain immortality. All of this speaks to a culture and civilization directed towards life rather than death, and an afterlife. For instance, since there was no creator god in Han thinking (Loewe, 1982, 63-4), the world was constantly in flux and in the process of becoming. As Loewe notes about China during the Han Dynasty:
“These derived in part from a search for permanence in a highly volatile world. There was a deep concern to maintain the perpetual operation of those natural cycles whereby the world had been created and was continuing to exist, and a desire to regulate thought and behavior so as to conform with those cycles. There was a common acceptance that unseen powers may affect human fortunes, and that communication is possible with such powers, either to attract blessings or to preclude disaster. Above all, the universe was regarded as being unitary; there was no essential division between sacred and profane, and the creatures of heaven, earth and man were seen as members of a single world. Similarly there was no rigid separation between religious and intellectual categories, in the way that has become accepted in the west.” (Loewe: 1982, 7)

The lack of a clear position on what happened after death further explains the desire to focus and do well in life. Han thought focused on continual change in the shifting balance between yin and yang rather than some saga or central myth about the nature of the afterlife.

“There is no complete statement of the beliefs that Chinese entertained regarding a life hereafter. Allusions and fables abound in mythology, but there is no solemn drama or saga of sacred literature, which corresponds with the conquest of death that is enshrined in the Christian tradition. Nor is there a logical presentation of the arguments for a future life or a visionary description such as may be found in the Phaedo.”

“First, there was a wish to prolong the life of the flesh on earth as long as possible. Secondly, there was a desire to effect the entry of one element of a diseased person’s soul into another world or paradise;” (Loewe: 1982, 25.)
In another passage Loewe notes that, “…there was no insistence on the thanks or services due to an identified being, in return for the gift or life or natural wealth. No linear concept of time develops from the need to identify or (Loewe, 1982, 64) establish a single beginning from which all other processes followed. “In neither mythology nor philosophy can there be found the idea of creatio ex nihilo: creation is a process of transforming one substance into another but not one of manufacture.” (Loewe: 1982, 63-4) “The emergence of a world which possesses finite shape from a state of primeval chaos, in which heaven and earth were still formed as one substance, is mentioned in a number of myths, whose origin can hardly be traced with certainty.” (Loewe: 1982, 64)

Underlying this attitude is the early Chinese notion that the cosmos is constantly fluxing energy [qi] rather than a set of universal fixed principles. As Ames and Hall put it, “The world is a complex set of transformative processes, never at rest.” (Ames & Hall, 42) “Qi is both the animating energy and that which is animated. There are no ‘things’ to be animated; there is only the vital energizing field and its focal manifestations. The energy of transformation resides within the world itself, and it is expressed in what Zhuangzi calls the perpetual “transforming of things and events (wuhua).”” Ames and Hall; 63)

Wu understands the Indian conception of architectural space to begin with the void and the solid. The yoni is the sculptural version of the void, the boundary around a dark emptiness at its core, and the solid, which focuses the act of worship around it, as with the linga, the altar, the column, and the stupa. So according to Kostof, of the three primordial ways of beginning the
creation of architecture, Wu understands the Indians to have emphasized the erect solid, that focuses the space around it as the main consideration. From this emphasis naturally follows ritual circumambulation. This architectural strategy is well suited to holy places and ritual dance, festivals, and pilgrimages. For Wu it is from here that Indian religious architecture unfolds.

There is a sense in which Indian [that is South Asian] architecture seems less concerned with space, and more focused upon solid and surface and the sacred dark void at the core, which contains the sacred solid, or monument as Kostof would put it. Wu’s interpretation can be easily extended to include this observation that the vertical monument focuses the otherwise undifferentiated space around it (Kostof, 21).

Hinduism poses the good life as:
1. Dharma – fulfilling one’s purpose
2. Artha – prosperity
3. Kama – desire, sexuality, and enjoyment
4. Moksha – enlightenment

The Hindu temple with its origins in the village altar and sanctuary, and later in the grabha-griha (womb chamber) generates an architecture of monuments visually understood from the outside, and an inner sanctum that is a dark womb. The Shivite sacred image, the linga, rises up out of the yoni expressing the solid in the void as the sacred center, the monument cradled within the darkness.
Buddhism poses an increased level of asceticism in comparison to Hinduism. The Four Noble Truths, Eightfold Path, and Three Refuges of Buddhism were by definition an argument for an ascetic life. Here the fundamental insights into the nature of being, the correct path based on an accurate understanding, and the construction of a community of support defined an ordered life. The stupa, with its roots in the funerary mound begins a religious architectural tradition directed to the monument as experienced from the outside. It is a solid by its very definition that can only be viewed from the outside, and it is meant to be experienced in ritual circumambulation.

Finally, the third great religion originating in South Asia poses the most demanding level of asceticism of the three religions. The highest stage of Jainism is jiva (the liberation of the soul) and moksa (the release from the cycle of death and rebirth), which extinguishes being from the condition of continual reincarnation. This goal is achieved through a five part process of radical asceticism including ahimsa (non-injury), satya (speaking the truth), asteya (not taking anything not given), brahma charya (chastity), and aparigraha (detachment from place, persons, and things).

Hinduism, Buddhism, and Jainism ultimately entertain ever stricter forms of asceticism (the practice of self-denial as a means of religious attainment through discipline) in order to achieve, what an outsider viewing these religio-philosophical models, might refer to as a “good death.”

In adding to Wu’s dichotomy my tendency is to say that whereas Chinese culture focused on the living of a good and successful life, South
Asian culture focused more on the good death, a death that brings with it a better reincarnation, or ultimately a oneness with the godhead. If this is the case then it makes sense that these differing attitudes would be reflected in the two architectural traditions.

I started out skeptical of Wu’s formulation but found myself seduced by its descriptive power, elegance and ability to differentiate the Chinese from the Indian tradition. Seeing Wu’s formulation in terms of Kostof’s three fundamental modes of architectural expression (circumscription, shelter, and monument) helps one to understand the architectural differences, giving design significance to the symbolic square and circle. Adding the notion of China as a culture directed towards life, and India as a culture directed towards the good death further clarifies the idea of the Chinese square as the enclosing courtyard giving spatial order to daily life, and the Indian circle as the monument at the core of religious ritual. Whereas one architectural tradition focuses on the dwelling as the model for other building types, the other concentrates its architectural tradition on the special nature of the religious experience.

Wu’s use of the square and circle to distinguish Chinese and Indian architecture is not an exercise in empirical research or statistical analysis. It is an attempt to symbolically distinguish two architectural traditions from one another based on his suggestions of cultural difference.
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