

## Early German Research in Ancient Chinese Architecture (1900–1930)

### Architectural history in China

Architecture was seen as a handicraft in China until the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. This craft was documented in building manuals and passed down from generation to generation of carpenter families (Chiu Che Bing 2008). Traditional Chinese scholars were engaged in all aspects of art, but only marginally in architecture. Western-based architectural education was introduced into China during the 1920s, and only afterwards was architectural history established as an academic field of study (Xing 2002).<sup>1</sup> Nancy Shatzman Steinhardt writes: “In truth, architectural history in China in the first decades of the twentieth century was perceived as a primarily literary endeavour, interesting because of the challenge of making one’s way through difficult texts, not because the actual structures were inherently inspiring.”<sup>2</sup> Today the history of architecture is an integral part of architecture education, but faculties of art history that focus on architectural history are still very rare (Shatzman Steinhardt 2002). Foreign scholars first started conducting scientific research on ancient Chinese architecture in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, before Chinese historians started to concentrate on the topic. In the following paper, I will focus on the status of knowledge in Germany concerning Chinese architecture up to the early 1930s, when the Beijing-based *Society for Research in Chinese Architecture* (Zhongguo Yingzao Xueshe) discovered new insights by studying ancient buildings on site. The most important German scholar in the first phase of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century was Ernst Boerschmann (1873–1949), but besides him various architects and art historians also contributed to the discourse in the West with publications almost always written in German. The barriers between the German, English and Chinese languages prevented this work from reaching a wide international audience because the research findings were only discussed within a small circle of experts.

### German architects and ancient Chinese architecture

The Prussian State architect (*Regierungs-Baumeister*) Heinrich Hildebrand (1853–1924), travelled to China as a member of the German legation in 1891. As a consultant for the Chinese empire, he envisaged a plan for a systematic railway network traversing the entire country. He was also interested in the local architecture, which he studied in his spare time, but he was not able to find any documentation to satisfy his curiosity. Hildebrand was probably the first to take detailed measurements on site in order to document a traditional building. In the early 1890s, he measured the Temple of Enlightenment (Dajue Si), dating back to 1068, that was located in the Western Hills near Beijing. In 1897, his records were published in Berlin (Hildebrand 1897). In addition to the description of the temple, the book also includes the measurements and plans of the entire complex, the floor plans of individual buildings, sections and elevations as well as true to scale details and ornamentation.

Five years later, in 1902, after the Boxer Rebellion, the young architect Ernst Boerschmann came to China with German troops and stayed until 1904. He had studied architecture at the *Technische*

---

<sup>1</sup> In 1923, Liu Shiyong (1893–1973) opened the first architectural department at the poly-technical college in Suzhou (Suzhou Gaoceng Gongye Xuexiao). Liu had been educated in Tokyo, and graduated in 1920. Another teacher at this college was Liu Dunzhen (1897–1968), who graduated in 1923 in Tokyo.

<sup>2</sup> The first book on architectural history with the author’s own drawings, was published in 1933 by Yue Jiazao. See Shatzman Steinhardt, 2002: 540 and 548, note 15.

*Hochschule Charlottenburg* (today, the Berlin Institute of Technology) from 1892 to 1896. During his stay in China, he went to the Temple of Azure Clouds (Biyun Si) in the Western Hills of Beijing and measured all the different buildings in the complex true to scale. After returning to Germany, he published his findings in a magazine (Boerschmann 1906). In Beijing, he had met the German Jesuit, Padre Joseph Dahlmann, who encouraged him to investigate Chinese architectural culture (Boerschmann 1929).<sup>3</sup> Boerschmann envisaged a plan for methodical research. Supported by Dahlmann and Dr. Karl Bachem, a member of the Reichstag, he placed a proposal for a research project before the Reichstag that was accepted by the State Secretary, Freiherr von Richthofen at the Foreign Office (*Auswärtiges Amt*). The Foreign Office appointed Boerschmann to the German legation in Beijing and also provided funding for his field trip equipment and supplies during his stay in China from August 1906 to July 1909.

The political administration at the end of the Qing Dynasty was very weak and no investment was available for the preservation of timber buildings. In the view of Boerschmann, the loss of architectural culture was visible everywhere. In the three years between 1906 and 1909, he worked studiously with the aim of finding a specific system for defining the universal character of traditional architecture in China. He brought back to Berlin about eight thousand photographs, several thousand pages of diary notes and hundreds of measurements recorded on site. During the following twenty-five years, he based his studies almost entirely on the material that he had collected on that trip through fourteen of the then eighteen provinces. During the winter of 1906/07, he stayed at the German legation in Beijing to learn Chinese and to visit some temples in the city. In the spring and summer of 1907, he travelled to various places in the region.

A tour lasting seven months brought him first to the sacred Buddhist Mountain, Wutai Shan, in Shanxi Province. He then continued to Kaifeng and further to Jinan in Shandong Province, where he visited Qufu, the place of birth of Confucius. From there, he went on to the nearby sacred Taoist mountain, Tai Shan. After this, Boerschmann took a boat to Ningbo in Zhejiang Province and visited the sacred Buddhist mountain on the island of Putuo Shan. He documented religious life and the buildings on the island before returning to Beijing. His last trip from April 1908 to May 1909 lasted more than a year and brought him to Sichuan Province, after which he continued to Guangzhou in Guangdong Province. There he again took a boat that brought him back to Tianjin and Beijing. His extensive travels, usually only accompanied by Chinese servants, allowed him to stay in many temples and other religious buildings which made a lasting impression on his general perception of Chinese culture. It was probably this experience that focused his research topic: to identify the links between religious culture and architecture. "It is this peculiar accord, I would like to say, the congruency of architecture and religion, that wakes the lively wish in the researcher, to conceive and to depict both as unity." (Boerschmann 1911: XV).

Boerschmann published three lengthy volumes under the heading of "architecture and the religious culture of the Chinese" (*Baukunst und die Religiöse Kultur der Chinesen*) in the following years. The first volume appeared in 1911 and focused on the Buddhist Island Putuo Shan that he had visited in 1908 (Boerschmann 1911). This was a large hard-book with detailed descriptions of the island and its

---

<sup>3</sup> Dahlmann was on a three-year excursion across India and China. His aim was to document Asian religious art and culture for the German public, by presenting major monuments of religious art and architecture. Joseph Dahlmann: "Indische Fahrten". Freiburg, 1908. The extended 1927 edition was reviewed by Boerschmann.

three main temples. The most important, Fayu Temple, was documented with many photos and huge plans folded in at the end of the book. Ernst Boerschmann had planned, to first publish information on an important Buddhist building and then, later, to continue with a Taoist or Confucian example. In the context of his concept of finding links between religion and architecture, this seemed only logical. However, professional critics in Germany expressed reservations with regard to this approach. William Cohn wrote in a review: “The main merits of Boerschmann’s book lies in the scientific documentation of Chinese monuments. (...) We have plenty of photographs of Chinese monuments, but it is completely lacking in any systematic procedure. (...) He does not attempt any historical and stylistic discussion.” And Cohn goes on to assert that he has the “greatest doubts about the artistic value of the buildings on P’u T’o Shan.” (Cohn 1912/13: 104).

The growth of the German colonial settlement in Qingdao brought other young architects to China. Some followed the example of Heinrich Hildebrand and developed an interest in the local architecture. Friedrich Mahlke, for example, arrived in Qingdao in 1902 and designed the new town hall for the German administration. In his spare time, he studied the construction of the characteristic Chinese roof. The exotic form of the Chinese roof caused much debate. Some westerners were of the opinion that the nomadic tent had served as a model for the form. Others rather believed that the climate was the basis of the formal development. After Mahlke returned to Germany, he published a long article on the problems of the roof-form in China, with the intention of refuting the “tent-theory” (Mahlke 1912). The architect Heinrich Schubart came to Qingdao in 1907 and stayed for three years. He collected material about traditional architecture and, after his return to Germany, wrote a dissertation at the *Technische Hochschule Dresden* that was completed in 1914. His topic was the historical development of the specific curved roof in China (Schubart 1995; Schubart 1914). Both architects tried to find a satisfactory answer by referring to their own collected data and observations, surmising that the Chinese form of the roof was not influenced by the image of the tent.<sup>4</sup>

Ernst Boerschmann continued with the analysis of his own data in Berlin and published his second book, entitled *Gedächtnistempel*, in 1914. The title is an artificial combination of two German words for remembrance and temple. The book was dedicated to what he called the “old Chinese cultural circle” (*Altchinesischer Kulturkreis*), and covered aspects of Chinese temples in addition to the descriptions of Buddhist architecture found in the first book. The temples for Confucius, such as the main temple in Qufu, and the temple for prominent persons in history, such as the temple for the legendary hydraulic engineers Li Bing and Er Wang, from about 200 BC in Sichuan, were very well documented with plans and detailed photographs. Additionally, he covered some aspects of family temples and, in the introduction, he writes about the history of memorial temples for legendary heroes. This mix of aspects with different points of focus provoked criticism. In a review, the art historian Max Kutschmann wrote: “There are several temple complexes, without regard for their time of construction, place, artistic value and character, and only because they are dedicated to the worship or the remembrance of persons, does the author name them *Gedächtnistempel* and constrains them on a Procrustean bed.<sup>5</sup> (...) The great and unquestionable value of the book lies in Boerschmann’s attempt, to portray architecture in

---

<sup>4</sup> Ernst Boerschmann never focused on the form of the roof. In his later publications (*Chinesische Architektur*, 1926), he wrote about roof decoration (*Dachschmuck*).

<sup>5</sup> Proverbial reference to an arbitrarily determined standard, or set of conditions, to which everyone is forced to conform.

the conditionality of the cult and the design that comes out of the particular surrounding landscape.” (Kutschmann 1917/18: 142).

While the critics clearly and positively expressed their agreement with the collection of material about architecture and Boerschmann’s deep conviction about the correlation between the architecture and the landscape, they nevertheless criticised what appeared to them as an indiscriminate grouping of different basic categories. The focus of the criticism, above all, was that he did not make any attempt to find a systematic historical and stylistic order.

Since no attempts had ever been made to find categories or classified groupings of Chinese architecture, the expectations of the professional public, in this respect, were very high. Ernst Boerschmann was, however, one of the first foreigners to see positive aspects in traditional Chinese architecture in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and to call attention to the problems of preservation and reconstruction. He recognised the limits of his work, seeing it (and his publications) as a collection of material to be used for later classification of architecture. In the catalogue for the exhibition of Chinese architecture in 1912, at the *Kunstgewerbe-Museum* (Museum of Applied Arts) in Berlin, he wrote about his future goals: “The aim of the work on Chinese architecture is to obtain an independent aesthetic evaluation of the alien form-world, further the classification in the system of art history, (...) and finally in the proof of its great meaning for the knowledge of the most general cultural thoughts of mankind.” (Boerschmann 1912: 3).

The above-mentioned two books in the series “Architecture and the religious culture of the Chinese” focused mainly on the connections between the two topics of religion and architecture. The formal classification of Chinese architecture began with the catalogue for the exhibition at the *Kunstgewerbe-Museum* (Museum of Applied Arts). His system did not, however, seek categories such as region, epoch or style. The exhibition was presented in four rooms using a holistic approach: Boerschmann showed city maps, photographs of landscapes, single buildings, ornaments, sculptures and details such as glazed terracotta elements.

His analysis of the collected materials was interrupted in 1914 by World War I. Ernst Boerschmann served as a soldier and as chief of the military construction authorities in Königsberg in Prussia where he directed the construction of war cemeteries in the Eastern provinces. In 1921 he returned to Berlin and continued with the scientific analysis of the collected materials, again with financial support provided by the Foreign Office.

In 1921, the art historian Bernd Melchers published a book on Buddhist sculptures and temples in China. He collected material on art and architecture during trips between 1916 and 1919, mainly in Shandong Province and in the vicinity of Beijing. He voiced direct criticism of Boerschmann’s approach to combine architecture and religious culture: “The writer deliberately did not go into detail about the religious culture of the Chinese, convinced that this did not have a greater influence on the development of Chinese architecture, as arose by the matter-of fact” (Melchers 1921: 9). His written statements were accompanied by comprehensive photographic documentation and supplemented by plans of temples and housing units measured on site. He compared floor plans, sections and elevations in order to define different types. The comparisons were not particularly clear, since he only indicated superficial formal connections under the non-specific headings of “development of the single hall” or “central buildings”. Yet even if the result was rather poor, it was nevertheless the first attempt

to classify Chinese architecture according to formal layout in a systematic way. Boerschmann wrote, in a very positive review of the book, that Melchers had neglected to mention the links that he, Boerschmann, had identified between religion and architecture: “Also Melchers could not escape the truth that the Chinese architecture, especially the religious, pictures a unit of formal and religious philosophical, aesthetic and scenic relations, (...)” (Boerschmanns 1922/23: 173).

In 1923, Boerschmann published his, commercially, most successful book *Baukunst und Landschaft*. An English language version was published in the same year, entitled *Picturesque China*, and under the sub-heading of *A journey through twelve provinces* (Boerschmann 1923). The book contains 288 photographs, but no plans or building descriptions and only a flowery introduction, which appealed to the lay reader. The prevailing mood of all the reviews was positive and only the art historian Karl With, expressed a demand for more information about architecture (With 1924: 251). The Sinologist Erich Hänisch wrote: “Besides its aesthetic and general instructional value, the work is of great importance for artistic, cultural and historic research.” (Hänisch 1924: 170). By 1926, twenty thousand copies of the German version of the book had been printed.

In Germany in the early 1920s (and in the West in general), knowledge about Chinese architecture grew slowly, with a limited discourse. The central theme of research on traditional architecture was, however, taken up by some Chinese intellectuals: Li Shiqiao wrote about Zhu Qiqian (Chu Ch'i-ch'ien, 1872–1964), the former Minister of the Interior, and the significant role he had played in the development of Chinese architectural research (Li 2003). Zhu rediscovered the Yingzhao Fashi building manual (*Treatise on Architectural Methods or State Building Standards*) from the Song Dynasty, written and published by Li Jie (1065–1110) in 1103, and arranged a photolithography reprint in 1919. After several reprints in the early 1920s, a revised academic edition was published in 1925. The German architect Rudolf Kelling, working in Dresden, wrote a dissertation on Chinese traditional housing between 1920 and 1923 (Kelling 1935). He used a copy of the first reprint of the Yingzhao Fashi building manual as the basis for his research. Chinese students who were studying in Dresden at the time had given him the book (Kelling 1935: vii).<sup>6</sup> Kelling was unable to travel to China himself, so he based the dissertation entirely on the scarce literature that was available. He also copied most of the illustrations from the Yingzhao Fashi for the publication of the dissertation in 1935. In a review of the book, Boerschmann was critical of the fact that the study of historical texts did not include any on-side comparisons. He also criticised the use of the old illustrations: “And the construction drawings from the unique and rightly famed architectural work of Li Ming-tschung [Li Jie] from the Sung-Dynasty [Song Dynasty] of 1100 AD are so disfigured in the handed-down transcriptions with errors in the copied drawings, that only seldom can proof of the details be obtained even from the now restored reprints.” (Boerschmann 1936: 141).

In 1926, Boerschmann published his double-volume, *Chinesische Architektur*, which was intended to provide a full overview of the topic. With this work, he continued his second line of research on the formal aspects of architecture along with his main topic on the religion-architecture reference. “To fulfil the purpose of showing the clean form-language of architecture, a subdivision in twenty sections was chosen with the most important groups and single parts of buildings in methodical order, not according to time or cultural meaning, but only according to form.” The architecture was grouped under sub-

---

<sup>6</sup> Most probably the urban planner Shen Yi, who wrote his own dissertation in Dresden, gave him the book.

headings, such as city walls, entrance gates, solid buildings, pavilions, towers, central buildings, roof decorations or carved building fronts. More than six hundred photographs and over one hundred drawings accompanied the text. In the preface, Boerschmann made it absolutely clear that he only intended to offer a preliminary overview and not, by any means, a comprehensive study of Chinese architectural history. His book was almost entirely based on the material that he had collected on his trip between 1906 and 1909, and he was fully aware of the limitations arising from this fact. For the reviewers of the book, however, it seemed that a first attempt had been made towards the classification of architecture in China, and they were generally rather positive in their criticism (Franke 1926; Kümmel 1927/28; Yetts 1927). The Sinologist Otto Franke, recognised it as making a significant contribution towards shaping the image of Chinese architecture in the West in the future (Franke 1926: 619). Otto Kümmel, the founding father of East Asian art history in Germany, was more critical: “The colourful general arrangement is equivalent to the colourful image of the single chapters in which fairly heterogeneous things without regard to scale, time, place, material, function and – the author will please forgive me – value are concentrated.” (Kümmel 1927/28: 208). Despite the criticism, he is “thankful for the treasures”, that are included in the book. The British art historian Walter Perceval Yetts, expressed his general approval of the book, but also his deep regret that Boerschmann had not employed a more ambitious and extensive approach and had not included all his knowledge of Chinese architecture in the book: “The text as it stands gives the impression of being a somewhat perfunctory accompaniment to the plates.” (Yetts 1927: 124).

In 1925, Eduard Fuchs published a book on roof decoration and related Chinese ceramics (Fuchs 1925). Two years later, Boerschmann came out with a title on Chinese architectural ceramics (Boerschmann 1931). This book on a very limited topic gave again the general idea of a specific field but without any in-depth scientific explanatory notes.

In 1931, Ernst Boerschmann published his last book on pagodas (Boerschmann 1931). This was the third volume in the “Architecture and the religious life of the Chinese” series. He prepared a double-volume edition on this topic but only the first was published. The basic outline of the book was created between 1921 and 1923 with the financial support of the Foreign Office, but new publications on architectural history in China, by Osvald Sirén, Tokiwa and Sekino (amongst others) during the 1920s, provoked several revisions before the first volume was printed in 1931 (Sirén 1924; Sirén 1926; Tokiwa/Sekino 1925). Although Boerschmann showed about five hundred and fifty pagodas, he still believed that this publication merely represented a starting point for further and deeper study.

Although the number of five hundred and fifty pagodas seems high, the descriptions and the related materials were in some cases limited, but in addition to the huge multi-eaved pagodas, Boerschmann also documented iron and bronze pagodas and tomb pagodas, frequently with a huge amount of photographs, precise drawings of plans, section, side views and details. This comprehensive and varied compilation of information elicited warm praise from other scholars and critics. Otto Kümmel, for example, declared: “His enduring credit will be that he not only showed the way for future research, but also took some long strides on that path.” (Kümmel 1936: 315), and went on to point out that the research conducted by the Chinese on their architectural history was still only humble.

In 1924, Ernst Boerschmann was appointed to a lectureship on Chinese architecture at the *Technische Hochschule Berlin-Charlottenburg*, where he became an honorary professor in 1927

(Jäger 1945/49). He was probably the first professor, worldwide, to lecture entirely on Chinese traditional architecture and culture. Students of architecture and art history from both Germany and China attended his courses. Two of his Chinese students wrote dissertations based largely on his private archive material: Fozhien Godfrey Ede (Xi Fuquan, 1902–1983) focused on the tombs of the Qing Dynasty in 1929 and Woo Shaoling examined the wooden construction methods used during the Qing Dynasty in 1941 (Ede 1930; Woo 1941). A part of Boerschmann's archive on Chinese traditional architecture and culture at the University was destroyed in 1943 during World War II. From 1938 to 1944, Boerschmann also lectured at the Institute of Art History at *Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität* (today Humboldt-University) in Berlin, after World War II, he was appointed as a substitute professor to the chair of Sinology in Hamburg, where he taught until his death in 1949.

### **A Chinese approach to research**

In the 1930s, the quality and quantity of research on ancient architecture in China changed dramatically. Chinese and foreign scholars started to understand the importance of the topic for art history and national self-realisation (Ecke/Demiéville 1935).<sup>7</sup> The foundation of the *Society for Research in Chinese Architecture* by Zhu Qiqian was the most important step on the path towards the scientific documentation of historical buildings. Due to his long experience in research, Zhu Qiqian asked Ernst Boerschmann in 1931 to join the *Society* as a corresponding member (*Ostasiatische Zeitung* Nr.6, 1931: 247). In the same year, Zhu was able to persuade the young architects, Liang Sicheng (Liang Ssu-ch'eng, 1901–1972), and his wife Lin Huiyin (Lin Whei-Yin, 1904–1955), to join the society. Both had studied at the University of Pennsylvania in the USA, under the well-known Beaux-Arts architect Paul Philippe Cret (1878–1949), from whom they learned about Greek and Roman architectural history. The architect Liu Dunzhen (1897–1968), who had been educated in Japan, joined the group in 1932. The *Society* focused (by means of field trips and site measurements) on the encoding of the old building manuals, such as the *Yingzhao Fashi*, and the building regulations of the Qing Dynasty (*Gongcheng Zuofa Zeli*) from 1734 (Liang 1984; Fairbank 1994; Shatzman Steinhardt 1984; Kammann 2006). In China, between 1931 and 1937, they founded the modern historiography of ancient architecture employing a transformed Beaux-Arts methodology. The Western method was adopted and used in the search for a *Chinese Order*. The idea behind *Chinese Order* was equivalent to the Western system of classical order in Greek and Roman architecture. The leading architectural historian Liang Sicheng, was keen to transform formal aspects of ancient Chinese construction methods into a “grammar of Chinese Architecture”, intended as a guideline for modern Chinese architects (Peisert 1996).

Boerschmann travelled in China for a further two years between 1933 and 1935 to continue his studies. He met Liang Sicheng and other members of the *Society for Research in Chinese Architecture* in February 1934 in Beijing. The two men most probably disagreed over the approach to use for documenting the ancient architecture of China in detail (Fairbank 1994: 29),<sup>8</sup> but Boerschmann was more than happy to find that, finally, the Chinese themselves were undertaking the necessary

---

<sup>7</sup> The German art historian Gustav Ecke, for instance, taught as Professor in Xiamen from 1923 to 1930 and then until 1949 at the Catholic University in Beijing. With the French Sinologist Paul Demiéville, he published a detailed study on the twin pagoda in Quanzhou in 1935.

<sup>8</sup> According to Wilma Fairbank, Liang Sicheng said in 1947, “(...) they both [Boerschmann and Sirén] wrote uncomprehending descriptions of Chinese buildings.”

steps for comprehensive study. Whereas Liang used the established Western classification in the tradition of Beaux Arts to include Chinese architecture in the history of architectural development in the world, Boerschmann undertook a search for a unique explanatory model with a holistic approach that aimed to include religion and the living culture. After Boerschmann's return in 1935 he continued his work of analysing the new and old material in his archive. He revised the second volume of his book on pagodas so that it was ready to go into print in 1942. Due to World War II, the book was not released and the manuscript remained in his private collection. In the following years, Boerschmann focused on two new topics: places of worship (*Kultstätten*), and the urban systems (*Stadtanlagen*) of Chinese cities. Both these studies remained uncompleted at his death in 1949.

## Conclusion

When the *Society for Research in Chinese Architecture* started to operate in 1931, foreign scholars had already been working for more than 30 years on the topic of architectural culture. The focus of this paper on the German contribution shows the fundamental difference between this and the later approach used by Liang Sicheng and his partners. Apart from all the differences in ideology and the approach to research, the value of the material that was collected and recorded by Ernst Boerschmann is without doubt immense, particularly for today's reconstruction and documentation. In his proposal for the German Reichstag in 1906, Boerschmann mentioned that all his drawing and photographic documentation would eventually outlast even the original buildings (Boerschmann 1911: X). This has proved to be true, after the building boom of the last twenty years and the mass destruction of traditional buildings. As recently as 1982, the Chinese-American art historian Wang-gong Weng wrote in his new introduction to the reprint of Ernst Boerschmann's photo-book, *Picturesque China* from 1923, that half the buildings shown had already disappeared. Some had been destroyed before the founding of the People's Republic, but many more during the Cultural Revolution of the 1960s. "Even well-intentioned but ill-advised restorations have contributed in some cases to converting treasures into trash" (Weng 1982: ix).

The lifework of Ernst Boerschmann documents the interest of foreign scholars and the foreign audience in the architectural history of China. It also offers an alternative interpretation of ancient Chinese architecture to the system established by Liang and his colleagues. In some respects, the different approaches employed by Boerschmann and Liang reflect the different aims they worked towards. Liang was in search of a new expression of Chinese national architecture according to the western Beaux Arts system, whereas Boerschmann followed a holistic approach to cover a still living culture (as opposed to an Egyptian, Greek or Roman archaeological legacy). He was one of the first foreigners to overcome the 19<sup>th</sup> century western paradigm of the standstill of cultural development in China. For Ernst Boerschmann, the traditional architecture represented a continuing culture with a consistent concept unbroken and handed down from ancient times to the present day. The influence of his work in China can be seen in the growing interest of Chinese intellectuals, in the early Republican era, in their own architectural history that, in around 1930, finally led to the foundation of the *Society for Research in Chinese Architecture*.



## Bibliography

- Boerschmann, Ernst (1906) „Pi-yün-ssu bei Peking, ein buddhistischer Tempel“. *Wochenschrift des Architektenvereins zu Berlin*, No.1, 1906: pp. 47–52.
- Boerschmann, Ernst (1911) *Die Baukunst und die religiöse Kultur der Chinesen. Vol. 1: P'u T'u Shan, die heilige Insel der Kuan Yin, der Göttin der Barmherzigkeit*. Berlin: Verlag Georg Reimer.
- Boerschmann, Ernst (1912) *Chinesische Architektur*. Berlin: (Exhibition catalogue) Kunstgewerbe-Museum Berlin.
- Boerschmann, Ernst (1914) *Die Baukunst und die religiöse Kultur der Chinesen. Vol. 2: Gedächnistempel Tzé Táng*. Berlin: Verlag Georg Reimer.
- Boerschmann, Ernst (1922/23) (review) “China, der Tempelbau. Die Lochan von Ling-Yän-Si, ein Hauptwerk buddhistischer Plastik. Von Bernd Melchers, Hagen 1921”. *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift* No.10, p. 173.
- Boerschmann, Ernst (1923) *Baukunst und Landschaft in China. Eine Reise durch 12 Provinzen*. Berlin: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth. In English (translation Louis Hamilton) (1923) *Picturesque China. Architecture and Landscape. A journey through twelve provinces*. London: Studio Ltd. (for the USA New York: Brentano's). (Reprint of the German version in 1926).
- Boerschmann, Ernst (1926) *Chinesische Architektur*. 2 Vol., Berlin: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth.
- Boerschmann, Ernst (1927) *Chinesische Baukeramik*. Berlin: Albert Lüdtker Verlag.
- Boerschmann, Ernst (1929) (review), Joseph Dahlmann, “Indische Fahrten“. *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, No.1, pp. 23–26.
- Boerschmann, Ernst (1931) “Die Baukunst und die religiöse Kultur der Chinesen.” Vol. III. Part I. *Pagoden Pao Tá*. Berlin, Leipzig: Verlag Walter De Gruyter & Co.
- Boerschmann, Ernst (1936) (review) Rudolf Kelling, “Das chinesische Wohnhaus“. *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, no. 3/4 (May/August), pp. 141–143.
- Chiu Che Bing (2008) “Yangshi Lei“. pp. 196–219 in Frédéric Edelmann (ed.): *In the Chinese city. Perspectives on the transmutation of an empire*. Barcelona, New York: Actar publications.
- Cohn, W. (1912/13) (review) “Die Baukunst und die religiöse Kultur der Chinesen. Vol. 1: P'u T'u Shan, die heilige Insel der Kuan Yin, der Göttin der Barmherzigkeit“. *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, No.1, pp. 104–105.
- Dahlmann, Joseph (1908) *Indische Fahrten*. Freiburg: Herder & Co.
- Ecke, Gustav; Paul Demiéville (1935) *The Twin Pagodas of Zayton*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Ede, Fohzien Godfrey (1930) *Die Kaisergräber der Tsing Dynastie in China. Der Tumulusbau*. Berlin-Neukölln (Dissertation).
- Fairbank, Wilma (1994) *Liang and Lin. Partners in Exploring China's Architectural Past*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Franke, Otto (1926) (review) Ernst Boerschmann, “Chinesische Architektur (1926)“. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, Nr.13: pp. 616–619.
- Fuchs, Eduard (1925) *Dachreiter und verwandte chinesische Keramik*. Munich: Verlag Albert Langen.
- Hänisch, E. (1924) (review) Ernst Boerschmann, “Baukunst und Landschaft in China. Eine Reise durch zwölf Provinzen“, Berlin. *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift* 2, pp. 170–171.
- Hildebrand, Heinrich (1897) *Der Tempel Ta-chüeh-sy (Tempel des großen Erkennens) bei Peking*. Berlin: A. Asher & Co (1943 Reprint in Beijing: Pappelinsel-Werkstatt).
- Jäger, Fritz (1945/49) Ernst Boerschmann (1873–1949). *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, No.99, pp. 150–156.
- Kammann, Christian (2006) *Liang Sicheng and the Beginning of Modern Chinese Architecture and Architectural Preservation*. (Dissertation) (<http://e-collection.ethbib.ethz.ch/cgi-bin/show.pl?type=diss&nr=16645>), (access: 2010, June 24<sup>th</sup>).
- Kelling, Rudolf (1935) *Das chinesische Wohnhaus*. Tokyo: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Kümmel, Otto (1927/28) (review) Ernst Boerschmann: “Chinesische Architektur. Berlin 1926“. *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, Nr.4, pp. 207–209.
- Kümmel, Otto (1932) (review) “Ernst Boerschmann, Pagoden. Pao Tá, Part I, Berlin Leipzig 1931.“ *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, No.6. pp. 314–316.
- Kutschmann, Max (1917/18) (review) “Ernst Boerschmann, die Baukunst und die religiöse Kultur der Chinesen. Vol. 2: Gedächnistempel“. *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift* 7, pp. 141–143.

- Li Shiqiao (2003) "Reconstituting Chinese Building Tradition. The Yingzao Fashi in the early Twentieth Century." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 64:4, Dec., pp. 470–489.
- Liang, Ssu-ch'eng [Liang Sicheng] (1984) *Chinese Architecture. A Pictorial History*. Cambridge Mass. 1984: MIT Press (Edited by Wilma Fairbank).
- Mahlke, Friedrich (1912) "Chinesische Dachformen. Neuer Versuch zur Widerlegung der ‚Zelttheorie‘." *Zeitschrift für Bauwesen*, pp.400–422 and 546–570.
- Melchers, Bernd (1921) *Der Tempelbau. Die Lochan von Ling-yän-si. Ein Hauptwerk buddhistischer Plastik*. Hagen: Volkwang Verlag (Second unchanged reprint 1922).
- Peisert, Christoph (1996) *Peking und die "nationale Form". Die repräsentative Stadtgestalt im neuen China als Zugang zu klassischen Raumkonzepten*. Berlin: (Dissertation) Berliner Beiträge zur Umwelt und Entwicklung, Technische Universität Berlin.
- Shatzman Steinhardt, Nancy (1984) *A History of Chinese Architecture*. New Haven: China Institute in America.
- Shatzman Steinhardt, Nancy (2002) "China: Designing the Future, Venerating the Past." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 61:4, December, pp. 537–548.
- Schubart, Heinrich (1914) "Der chinesische T'ing-Stil. Eine baugeschichtliche Untersuchung". *Zeitschrift für Bauwesen*, pp. 498–526 and 734–760.
- Schubart, Werner and Sigrít (1995) "Als Architekt in China. Leben und Werk von Dr. Heinrich Schubart." *das neue China*, No. 4, December, pp. 14–15.
- Sirén, Osvald (1924) *The walls and gates of Peking*. London: John Lane.
- Sirén, Osvald (1926) *The Imperial Palaces of Peking*. Paris, Brussels: G. Van Oest.
- Tokiwa, Daijo; Tadashi Sekino (1925) *Buddhist monuments in China*. Tokyo: Bukkyo-Shiseki Kenkyu-Kwai.
- Weng, Wan-go (1982) *Old China in Historic Photographs. 288 Views by Ernst Boerschmann*. New York: Dover Publications.
- With, Karl (1924) (review) "Ernst Boerschmann, Baukunst und Landschaft in China". In Georg Bierbaum (ed): *Jahrbuch der asiatischen Kunst*. Leipzig: pp. 251–252.
- Woo, Shaoling (1941) *Der chinesische Hallenbau und seine Konstruktion in der Tsing-Dynastie. Ein Vorbild für den praktischen Holzbau*. Berlin (Dissertation).
- Xing Ruan (2002) "Accidental Affinities. American Beaux-Arts in Twentieth-Century Chinese Architectural Education and Practise." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 61:1, March: pp. 30–47.
- Yetts, Walter P. (1927) "Writings on Chinese Architecture". *Burlington Magazine*, March: pp. 116–133.
- Ostasiatische Zeitung* Nr.6 1931: p. 247.