CULTURAL TRANSFERS: THE RE-POSSESSION OF ARCHITECTURAL FORM

This paper deals with colonial-period architecture and urban form in Lahore, Pakistan, on two interrelated planes. The first is that of the typological process of the emergence of new forms of domestic architecture, and the second is related to the ways in which new urban forms emerged out of the colonial experience.

Both are related to the complex interaction among three sources of cultural knowledge: the first, the ongoing continuum of pre-colonial cultural behavior, particularly as it related to architecture and architectural and urban space; the second the forces exerted by the "colonial third culture" as defined by A. D. King; and the third, the direct influence of new ideological tendencies arising in the metropolitan cultural environment. These three sources of knowledge constitute a nexus of a weakening, albeit persistent, set of traditional values and traditional ways of perceiving and doing things in the built environment, and the way they affect how ideas and artifacts from the metropolitan world are objectively dealt with by indigenous social groups.

To take up the typological aspect of this paper first, we will consider what appears to be a misguided notion that the courtyard house that formed the building block of the pre-colonial city is now irrevocably lost. To do this, it is necessary to examine the formal qualities of the courtyard house and its replacement, the bungalow villa, at some depth.

It is common to identify the architecture of Muslim cultures with reference to the courtyard, in terms of solid form packed around open space. The implication is that architectural objects with space around them have a non-Islamic or Western provenance. There seems to be a primordial duality in the idea of form around space and space around form, and yet by its very simplicity it comprises an essential unity that has strong parallels in certain fundamental philosophical postulates. But whether it is space around matter (objectivizing matter), or solid matter around space (objectivizing space), which one of these comes first in perceptual processes is a perplexing ontological problem. The simplicity of the question is conspicuously opposed to the complexity of answers to it, as we know. Unfortunately many of us have been taught to interpret superficial observations of cultures as space-form Gestalts that often miss out on many subtleties in space-form behavior and lead us away from an informed understanding of this issue.

As a departure from the Muslim versus non-Muslim explanation, I would postulate that both archetypal ways of dealing with form and space are quite common in Muslim cultures, and if we must make bipolar distinctions, they must be sought elsewhere. To make myself clear, for an example of form packed around space, I would use the paradigm of a wall, in a culturally specific sense—and I would be talking about Islamic cultures here. For an example of form surrounded by space, and in the same culture-specific context, I would use the paradigm of the pavilion.

Both the pavilion (such as the Hasht Behisht in Isfahan) and the wall (which, while enclosing the domestic open space and separating it from the street, also often contains liveable space built into its thickness) are common in Muslim cultures, in reality often interpenetrating each other as primary conceptual entities. For instance in a classical Muslim four-square garden, the surrounding enclosure might include pavilion-like buildings at the terminal ends of the four cardinal axes of the garden as well as at the intersection of these axes. In the Baghi-Fin in Kashan, deep pavilion-like chambers on axis with the axial crossing that marks the central pavilion complement the latter. The pavilion as part of the wall is a well-known feature in most of South Asia. The theme is repeated in most enclosed Mughal gardens, be they funerary gardens like that of the Taj Mahal or pleasure gardens like the Shalimar in Lahore. The wall incorporating a pavilion is a common element in urban spaces such as squares in many South Asian cities—for example, in the small Sutar Mandi square in the old city of Lahore. In Lahore, too, bazaars
are embellished with wooden balconies called bukharchis or jharokas that are not many steps removed from the pavilions-in-the-wall theme found in the royal residences in the Mughal forts in Delhi, Agra, or Lahore. With living spaces built into their thickness, walls form the inhabited spaces of close-packed courtyard houses in all traditional Muslim cities.

Part of the answer to why this should be so has indeed to do with climate and with other “man-environment” modes of understanding things. Another explanation might be sought in the problem of how space is apprehended, used, and understood in a culture—whether the space being subjected to scrutiny is an inside space, a space included in one’s territorial mapping and excluded from public domain. Or is it that this “inside space” in the form of an enclosed garden or a courtyard is at the same time an “outside space,” relative to a sense of shelter and withdrawal when seen from the vantage point of a cave-like space? This is as true of the Mughal diwan-i-khas as it is of the loggia-courtyard relationship in houses of the Indo-Persian tradition where a dalaan on axis is such an essential typological feature.

The typological process that reflects this interaction between the wall and the pavilion reappears to us again in colonial Lahore. It will be subjected to a brief examination in this paper, particularly in the evolution of a phenomenon concurrent with the colonial urban enterprise—the rise and perpetuation of the bungalow form as appropriated by the indigenous educated class—and its significance for post-colonial residential architecture. The presence of pavilions in all major Mughal gardens makes one reconsider A. D. King’s well-known work on the British presence in India. King describes the appropriation by the British of the simple free-standing Bengali peasant’s hut into a global phenomenon, the bungalow, in a sort of linear progression. My contention is that the source of the bungalow was not as primitive and that the process of appropriation might have been more complicated. It is worth thinking about whether the indigenous urbanizing classes during the British period in South Asia so easily adopted the British colonial bungalow simply because it was not after all a very foreign thing, but corresponded fairly closely to the familiar pavilion in the round. Many bungalows built by these indigenous social groups remind us as much of local garden pavilions and courtyard houses as they do the power-structured relationships as a result of which the colonized would want to emulate the colonial bungalow.

For a number of years, mainly in the course of my early work as an architectural practitioner, the question of the bungalow form as it pervaded the social consciousness of the upper-income elite in the countries that were created from British India preoccupied my mind. In Pakistan, which I can account for by reason of having lived there most of my life, bungalow building is the basic self-actualizing drive of the power-wielding classes—the bureaucracy, the officer class of the armed forces, the feudal aristocracy, and the rising industrialist/merchant classes. Bungalow building is an almost compulsive psychosis emerging out of the powerful yet complex cultural relationships of the Raj. Moreover, in Pakistan bungalow building has been the mechanism by which publicly owned land has been appropriated for private real estate in city after city. I was therefore drawn to a historic instance in the life of Lahore that appears to be more or less where it all started—the beginning of post-colonial social behavior. More important, I began to ask if an inquiry could be conducted into the nature of typological transformations across cultures. This paper is one step taken in that direction. The subject of our inquiry is a residential settlement in Lahore called Model Town, established in 1921. Model Town is now well enmeshed in the suburban sprawl that the proliferation of the bungalow form has created for Lahore. But in 1921 it was a distinct entity, a new “satellite” pole of the city. Model Town is situated about 10 kilometers from the administrative center of Lahore, on the southeastern route, the Ferozepur Road,
that heads out towards Kasur. The road crosses the lower branch of the Lower Bari-Doab canal which now bisects the city of Lahore, separating the old, dense part from the post-independence suburbs. In the early twentieth century the canal flowed quite outside the geographical limits of the city, and Model Town was intended to be a statement outside of and in opposition to it. As late as the early sixties, people setting out for work from Model Town set out for Lahore; they viewed themselves as quite distinct from the rest of the people of Lahore, and the Model Town Bus Service, with its red and yellow buses, stood out from the other elements of Lahore’s public transport system.

The historical background to the creation of Model Town does not go very far back in time—only to the middle of the nineteenth century. The territories of the Punjab, with Lahore as its capital, were annexed by the British in 1849 after several years of intermittent warfare with the ruling Sikh dynasty. The Sikhs had ruled the Punjab for over a century. At the beginning of their rule large areas of Mughal Lahore had been left devastated by invading Afghan armies and by the warring Sikh clans themselves. The advent of the British appears to have been a welcome relief for the people of Lahore, with the city enjoying a refreshing program of rehabilitation provided by the major building programs that were necessary for the establishment of the colonial military and administrative presence. The latter included the colonial military encampments (the cantonments or chhaoonis), the civil station, buildings for important civic and educational institutions and institutions relating to the “engineering” of the colonized territories of the Punjab and the trans-Indus regions: the irrigation department and the North Western Railways, constructed between 1860 and the early nineteen hundreds.

Within a decade after 1849, near the first bazaar established by the British, the first wave of colonial bungalows had been built. The second round of bungalow-building occurred beginning in the 1870’s when the British established the new Mianmir Cantonment, now called the Lahore Cantonment.

Very soon afterwards in certain areas of the city that were not very strictly defined in the exclusionary terms of British/native separation, certain interesting examples of how the local people built bungalows are to be found. One early exemplar of this kind of bungalow is the Ilahi Bux house. Built in the late nineteenth century, it emulates the British bungalow almost completely in plan and in terms of its isolation from local life, if not in terms of the significative mood created by the quasi-traditional arches that form its pavilion-like image. But in addition to these arches there are a number of other departures. Unlike the colonial bungalow, which was apt to be placed in the center of the available space or placed so as to create a large garden space at the rear of the bungalow for the private use of the family, the Ilahi Bux bungalow gives onto a much larger space in the front, as if both to accommodate the visiting British ruling officers and to defy the power prerogatives that these officers came out with. This unbalanced, or inverted front-back relationship was to be found wherever an indigenous power wielder—from maharajas and nawabs to the more affluent merchants and feudal landlords—set up an interface with the colonial culture. As we will presently learn, this change in the front-rear relationship was to become an abiding characteristic of bungalows built by the indigenous elite.

The Ilahi Bux house is already an incipient manifestation of the pervasive typological forces that are at play. Despite the forsaking of the courtyard and the seeming inversion of the domestic space, the close linkage between territorial space, the means of gazing onto that territorial space, and the act of taking control over it happens in a fairly culture-specific manner. As we shall see, in the evolution of the modern Pakistani bungalow villa, the garden pavilion is not given up, but is subjected to a kind of critical
reinterpretation that, on one hand, involves only an accommodation of the European cultural presence and, on the other, reiterates spatial and architectural expressions that foster traditional domestic culture and its ways of dealing with outdoor space. In this transformation, the garden pavilion reflects its containment in space as well as its metamorphosis into its antithesis—the wall that creates the enclosed space.

Lahore's Co-operative Model Town serves us well for observing some of these tendencies. In addition, it is also a rather exceptional instance of how local ways of the visual handling of the city plan as a drawn object mediate between the realities of evolving social values in a colonial setting and the power of the Utopias of the twentieth-century West, such as Ebenezer Howard's Garden City. The Co-operative Model Town Society was established when a group of local lawyers with an emerging young engineer-architect
decided to establish a housing scheme which could better fulfill the cultural needs of the emerging indigenous colonial elite. The Model Town Society was an offshoot of the Cooperative Societies Movement which came to the Punjab in 1915. Its aims were to instruct the population of rural Punjab in elementary economics and business methods, to provide capital for agriculture, and to provide lessons in the wise use of capital. Largely aimed at the rural areas which the British government was attempting to draw into the market economics of the colonial system, the cooperative movement became entrenched early in the small and large towns of the Punjab leading to the establishment of co-operative banks.

Reporting on the Model Town Society, the British Registrar of Co-operative Societies Henry Calvert reported in 1921 that "the society intends to construct a residential village for Indian gentlemen at Kot Lakhpath and to arrange for the amenities which the
educated community desire. There are cross currents and the scheme is not free from difficulties". But successive annual reports by Calvert describe the rapid success of the society, overcoming its many detractors. Upon its establishment, the society appears to have moved with considerable entrepreneurial energy and missionary zeal. As membership ranks swelled in a couple of years, the opposition that Calvert alludes to appears to have quickly evaporated.

The spirit of independence of the society's founding fathers is reflected in a singular attribute of the society's working — its self sufficiency. The land — 1,963 acres — was sold to the society by the colonial government at market prices for agricultural land. Initial funds were raised from shares sold to each joining member, but working capital was quickly raised from sale of residential plots, from receipt of advances on the price of houses the society was to build, and from individual contributions. This enabled the society to pay off 70 percent of the price of the land to the colonial government within three years of the society's establishment.

Even a cursory glance at the location of Model Town and at the form of its plan shows how powerfully they are informed by Ebenezer Howard's Garden City ideas. At least three of the lawyers who had started to think about establishing Model Towns sometime around 1915 had been educated in London at precisely the time when the Garden Cities movement was being celebrated — viz., the early years of the twentieth century.

The ways in which the plan resembles Howard's diagram are obvious. The abstract locational principles appear to have been filtered through a modifying process, representing the social and political context of colonial Lahore. The justifications that appear to have been put forward for the ideas that promoted Model Town were clean air and hygienic conditions, a direct and healthy relationship with rural conditions and agricultural production, and a centrality given to civic functions commensurate with a "civilised and educated" existence. But hiding behind these justifications were local conditions quite remote from turn-of-the-century industrial England: the special dependent relationship of the upper-income "service" classes among the colonized people, who were to be Model Town's users, to the "colonial third culture".

These users represented a minuscule fraction of the colonized population, and, given their occupations, their pretense to a linkage with the production processes of the countryside was almost farcical. Yet there were elements of Garden City ideas that appear to have been firmly at the conceptual base of the settlement — elements such as the strong transportation link to Lahore. Model Town's bus service was an integrated part of the society's workings well into the 1960s. What is interesting is the formal literalness with which Howard's diagram appears to have been applied. Letchworth, the city Howard founded to demonstrate his ideas, has a much more interpreted and applied form, and Howard's diagram comes complete with the admonition, "A Diagram Only — Plan Must Depend Upon Site Selected." Model Town has no topographical or cadastral limitation of note that could inhibit its idealized form; there appear to have been no physical constraints such as the preexistence of villages, major roads, water channels, etc. But other instances of European thinking applied in India, including Geddes's plans for new additions to several cities in India, are more elaborate and reflect more thoughtful exploration on the part of their authors, even when the topographical situation might have been as constraint-free as in Model Town. The layout of Model Town appears to have been an elaborately Indian effort to handle Howard's diagram as a physical construct. While appearing to be an almost literal transcription of the diagram, there also seems to have been an effort to extrapolate visual pattern in the plan much as the derivation of patterns of decoration in Islamic architecture might have occurred in the hands of its practitioners. In this process the author of the master plan appears to have adhered
meticulously to the simple geometry of the plan. The perfection of the diagrammatic plan on the ground is physically coterminous with its main purpose—to create a residential settlement that would conform to the idyllic aspirations of the founders. All else, the factories, agricultural farms, fruit gardens, workmen's residences, are relegated to the imperfect areas left over outside the precinct created by the geometric plan.

It should be relevant here to mention the social configuration of the actors that brought about the Model Town Society. A sampling of about 25 percent of shareholders who bought shares in 1921 and 1922 gives some interesting insights into the sociological formation of the society. First, as to the religious make-up of the communities that comprised settlements, the sample survey that I was able to carry out from the surviving ledgers of the share certificates sold indicates that there were four main religious groups: Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs,
and Christians. Of these Christians comprised a small minority. Of the others, the overwhelmingly largest group (64 percent) were Hindu. Muslims constituted only about 20 percent and Sikhs about another 14 percent. As elsewhere in undivided India, Hindus comprised the major part of the modernizing elite.

A large majority again (about two-thirds of the total sample) belonged to the administrative and judicial part of the colonial administrative system. Except for a few, these were at most second-echelon positions: police officers, revenue officers, engineers who manned the colonial railways, roads, buildings and irrigation departments, the lower judiciary. At the time shares were purchased in the Model Town Society; about 80 percent of the shareholders lived outside Lahore in other cities, sometimes hundreds of miles away. Most of the people who lived outside Lahore held government jobs.

The other major occupational category included all the professions—doctors, lawyers and teachers; they were regarded as a particularly influential group which was not so directly dependent on their livelihood on the colonial administration. Still a third group were people who owned businesses—an important group because the degree to which they could comingle with the colonial expatriate community (or the colonial third culture) was much higher than either those entirely dependent on the colonial power or those closer to the interest of the indigenous people.

This is reflected in the geometry of the settlement and designation of its parts to the four religious groups. The central diagrammatic part of the new settlement was allotted 125 acres and was surrounded on all sides with agricultural land. The diagram was essentially described by an innermost circle 360 yards in diameter, surrounded by an octagon, surrounded in turn by a square of a side equal to 780 yards. These geometrical features, together with other roads that intersected them, were in fact primary elements of a road system. The easements exiting at tangents from the circular inner ring road formed another octagon which echoes the octagonal form of the intermediate octagonal ring road, the outer ring road forming the external boundary of the square plan form. Crossing this square diagonally are four roads, beginning at the perimeter and ending at the inner circle. Two pairs of roads at right angles to the outer square perimeter begin on either side of the center of each side of the square and end at the inner circle; they would contain between them broad swaths of green area, the east, south, west and north parks, devoted to recreational activities. Pairs of roads parallel to each diagonal would intersect the intermediate ring road and at each such intersection is a local center, a small market ring complemented by social and religious functions, that defines the core of each residential sub-sector. There are eight of these sub-sectors, each called a block, identified by the letters A through H.

Each block comprised residential plots of land, quite large in size, even if they fell just short of the vast landscaped spaces in which the colonial bungalows were sited.

One of the remarkable things about Model Town was how its geometry was adapted to the religious and ethnic mix of its anticipated population. An examination of the early files of the society reveals that the center of each block, the subnucleus which represented each distinctive religio-cultural identity, was referred to by the term “place of worship.” The terms mosque, temple, church, gurdwara, etc., do not appear in the early maps; they appear only after the actual process of settlement started and applications were received by the society for the construction of the relevant structures. Whether a conscious administrative decision was made to designate the various sectors to the four religious groups that formed the population is not very clear. In the 1920’s, the intractability of religious differences that ultimately led to the division of British India was but a dim shadow lurking over the political horizon. However, it is quite clear from evidence of the allotments to religious denominations of the
sites for "places of worship" at the core of each sector that there existed some level of decision to aggregate people from the same religion to each of the "blocks" in Model Town. Although it appears that this was not rigorously enforced, it reflects both an awareness that these groups would not mix and an administrative and organizational reaction to the need for separation. This requirement might have been a continuation of the practice in traditional cities of the subcontinent whose neighborhoods were often defined by the religion of their populations. Thus the eight blocks in Model Town were designated, at least at their core, as three blocks of Muslims, three blocks of Hindus, and one block each for Sikhs and Christians. The basic unit of residential form that gave Model Town its sense of an urban settlement was the bungalow. Each block of Model Town contained about 150 to 160 plots of residential land, each one of which was to contain a detached bungalow. The size of the plots was considerably smaller than the size of a lot for an average colonial bungalow, the plots ranging from 750 square yards to as much as 2,500 square yards, as compared with the one-acre minimum for sites of colonial bungalows. In order to make up the difference, those who could afford it would buy more than one contiguous plot and consolidate them. To circumvent the by-laws of the society, for a two-plot configuration, for example, two houses would be shown on the plans submitted by the owners, one of them labeled as outbuilding, guest quarters, or servants' quarters.

The house plans of the early period (1923-38) in Model Town show interesting deviations from the prototypical colonial bungalow.

In the drawings discovered in the long-neglected society office records, these deviations often appear as ongoing debates that
describe the degree of typological transformations occurring\textsuperscript{13}. A range of changes represent a movement away from the type of the colonial bungalow. Typically a colonial bungalow consisted of two major sets of rooms in the front, on either side of a central axial corridor. On one side, would be a drawingroom and an office across the corridor from a dining room which was connected to a pantry and, further away, a kitchen and outbuildings. Behind this front set of rooms and reached by the corridor was a series of two, three, or four bedrooms. This basic configuration of rooms was encircled by a perimeter structure of a lower height that contained verandas separated from each other by bathrooms, dressing rooms, and small rooms that served as offices. Typically the front of the house would be laid out as a lawn with a drive leading up to a porch, and a veranda.

The deviations observed in the houses in Model Town involved a relationship between the front and the rear of the house that seems to have resulted in a significant typological metamorphosis. This transformed the colonial bungalow from its free location in unenclosed space into something that appears to conform to the pavilion type in the front, while maintaining in the rear the character of a wall enclosing a courtyard. In the colonial bungalow, the front-back duality related to a formal/informal requirement that provided more space in the rear for the colonial family to maintain a private outdoor life, but the house as a whole maintained the quality of an object in the round, surrounded by space. This is illustrated by how the bungalow could be freely rotated to any angle of alignment within a rectangular plot. We will consider here how one functional element of the house, the kitchen, appears to have played a significant part in effecting this basic shift in the typomorphological quality of the colonial bungalow.

Kitchens of colonial bungalows were run primarily by servants and were separated from the main house. They would be attached to the main bungalow, if at all, by a covered passageway. Traditional kitchens on the other hand were always a part of the courtyard. One feature common to nearly all bungalows we find in Model Town is that the kitchen of the colonial bungalow is spun around to the rear of the house so as to face the space in the rear. As in the Ilahi Bux bungalow, the house is set back on the site allowing more space in the front. The rear space was consequently often reduced in scale, paved and surrounded completely by a wall, or by ancillary structures or outbuildings, the kitchen being one of them, to recapitulate the ambience of a traditional courtyard. The many designs, as well as proposals for actual construction, in the archives of the society almost all contained this space; it was called either a "courtyard," a "ladies' courtyard," or simply a "walled compound." Generally speaking, the rear space was also called by its traditional name — the sahn. A number of traditional activities such as drying clothes, vegetables, making pickles, and women drying their hair continued to be carried on in this space, even among the more modernized elite. To relate this courtyard and the kitchen to the public areas of the house, the dining room, which in the colonial bungalow was in the front opposite the central, axial corridor to the drawingroom, was now placed at the rear.

Similarly the bedrooms, which in the colonial bungalow are all at the rear of the house, occupy a space on the other side of the central corridor and run down the full depth of the house. Other functional elements such as "ladies' sitting rooms" and large private verandas resembling traditional dalaans were also introduced to help mediate between the Europeanized pavilion-like front and the rear of the house.

The presence of these deviations indicates a certain conditionality of pattern. It implies the impossibility of a complete and water-tight distinction between tradition and Europeanization. No matter what level we examine, the likelihood of complete or absolute assimilation of the colonial lifestyle was remote. Many of the families of Model Town had adopted relatively Europeanized
ways of behavior to retain security in employment with the colonial services, which required at least a minimum of Westernized behavior. But they were at best only one generation removed from a fairly Indian cultural existence. That segment of the extended family absorbed into the colonial culture was still in touch with the main body of the family consisting of parents, siblings, their children, etc., who continued to live traditionally in traditional environments. In this situation a two-way exchange of values, however unequal and unbalanced, seems to have occurred. The same house would receive the authentic European counterparts and superiors of the serving or retired native "officer," businessman, or professional and parents, relatives, munshis, and land tenants from the rural areas. There were thus a large number of links to tradition for every family that wished to live in Model Town. The role played by Model Town in the development of these patterns was emblematic of the
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processes of typological regeneration that assumed such strength in the years after Independence.

It is in the sphere of design that the enterprise and self-sufficiency of the society is most visible. From the design competition for the initial master plan\textsuperscript{4} to the in-house preparation of sixteen prototypical designs for the construction of houses, the society seemed to have proceeded with a momentum which appears to have lasted well over two decades after its foundation. In the society’s office, I even came across the drawings for a custom-designed bus for the society’s bus service linking Model Town with Lahore.

Over the years leading up to 1947, when Independence and the Partition of India broke down Model Town’s ecumenical character, a majority of plots in Model Town were built upon. A considerable number of these houses appear to have been design-and-build projects undertaken by the society office, based on the prototypical designs of the architect M. C. Khanna. These houses were not only typologically consistent, but had a certain coherence of design that contributed to the visual and architectural character for which Model Town became known. In addition to houses designed at the society office, outside architectural offices practicing in Model Town designed houses that had interesting parallels in stylistic trends, such as Art Deco, popular at the time in Europe and America. The degree of sophistication of this work varied from house to house. Neo-classical revival as interpreted by local enthusiasts still exists in the house of the poet Abul Asr Hafiz who was to write Pakistan’s national anthem. It was designed by an architect from his home town of Jullundhur. But the prototype houses designed under the supervision of Khanna at the society office appear the most interesting\textsuperscript{5}. While serving to propel a typological process, these houses also reinforced an eclectic stylistic trend that drew on a wide variety of colonial and local motifs. This seems to be well in keeping with the ethos of Model Town.

Masood Khan
There is evidence that the evolution of the British colonial bungalow need not be given as direct a relationship with the Bengali peasant hut as some make out. On the other hand, the bangla, that quintessentially South Asian architectural feature, repeated all over the Subcontinent from the sixteenth century onwards, appears to be the real spatial and tectonic descendant of the Bengali bamboo hut. But there is reason to believe that the British might have learned about it through the sophisticated cultures of central Indian cities rather than from the early and literal adaptations of the bamboo hut in rural Bengal. For instance, we know that the bangla had become something of a leitmotif in late Mughal and Rajput architecture. Aurangzeb uses the words bangla-ha-e-atraf in a 1652 letter to his father Shah Jahan when referring to the loggias built around the water tank of the Mahtab Bagh in Agra, which suggests that in the mid seventeenth century the term had already acquired an evolved and sophisticated meaning in the written Persian of the Mughal court (Wayne Begley and Z. A. Desai, The Illumined Tomb: An Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Mughal and European Documentary Sources (Cambridge, Mass., 1989)). For it seems to me that the British could not have overlooked the overwhelmingly evolved setting or the plethora of four-quarter gardens and the buildings in the northern and southern sections of Shahjahanabad after 1802, when the city was wrested from the Marathas. Perhaps the question of how precisely the colonial bungalow evolved needs another look.


Building on the Mughal irrigation system, the British established what is still the largest riverine irrigation system in the world.

H. R. Goulding, Old Lahore (Lahore, 1924).
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The second edition of Ebenezer Howard's 1898 book, Tomorrow, A Peaceful Path to Social Reform appeared in 1902 as Garden Cities of Tomorrow, the same year as the first garden city, Letchworth, was founded.

King, "The Bungalow," p. 0.

These have increased. Blocks I through K were added in later years in areas originally designated for agricultural and industrial production, gardens, "workmen's residences," etc.

Cf. Anthony D. King, “The Westernisation of Domestic Architecture in India,” in [title missing]. The several sources cited and quoted by King in this very relevant article appear to draw very much the same conclusion—that the cultural changes the local upper classes underwent involved foreshaking traditional forms of domestic architecture in favor of the bungalow as an archetypally different mode of spatial behavior. The very evidence that is adduced by his sources in support of this appears, however, not to have been subjected to intense scrutiny with regard to behavior transformations in architecture and typological space. This evidence itself points to the highly ambivalent nature of this transformation.

Reported by Calvert, "Report on the Working of Cooperative Societies: "The Society has offered a prize of Rs.1,200 for the best layout plan of the town, and it is hoped that actual building will commence in six months time. "

103