Morphological transformations in subterranean architecture across ages

Abhishek Sharma[1], Ar. Nishtha Joshi[2]
[1]*Undergraduate Student, Amity University Chhattisgarh*
[2]*Assistant Professor, Amity University Chhattisgarh*

***Abstract* – Subterranean architecture – "the design and use of underground spaces" – has emerged as a vital consideration in modern urban planning and environmental sustainability. Yet few realize its existence dates back to the dawn of humankind. From simple burrows to intricately carved caves, subterranean structures can be traced to our earliest civilizations. While scattered information about underground structures exists across the internet, no single source provides a comprehensive journey through centuries of human underground construction – from early caves to modern Mars base planning. This research, titled "Morphological Transformations in Subterranean Architecture across ages" aims to bridge that gap by offering underground architecture enthusiasts a clear narrative of our evolution: from primitive underground dwellers to sophisticated designers who shape subterranean spaces for contemporary needs.**

***Index Terms—Ancient architecture,* Civilization timeline, Cultural significance, Subterranean taxonomy, Underground construction.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Subterranean structures trace their origins to prehistory, with caves serving as natural shelters. Scholars like Rappaport (1979) highlight how geography and climate influenced early underground human settlements. These spaces provided thermal insulation, protection from predators, and spiritual sanctuaries. Studies of sites such as the Cappadocia underground cities in Turkey and ancient tombs in Egypt and China (Coulson, 1997) reveal the symbolic and ceremonial significance of subterranean architecture. Morphologically, these structures were simple yet ingenious, utilizing natural formations to minimize construction efforts.

The evolution of these simple shelters into complex subterranean systems marked significant advancements in engineering, social development, and construction methodology**. This progress is well-documented with reference images and illustrations in "Underground Bases and Tunnels: What the Government Is Trying to Hide" (Richard Sauder, 1995). Additionally, architectural theories like the metabolism movement (Kenzo Tange) and biomimicry (Benyus, 1997) offer valuable perspectives for understanding subterranean morphology.

However, gaps persist in integrating historical evolution with modern technological innovations and advanced construction methodologies. There's also a lack of a comprehensive, single-source guide for the entire timeline of this evolutionary journey, which is exactly why this report exists.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Nature of Study

This study employs a historical-analytical approach, combining literature review, case study analysis, and comparative methods to examine the transformation of subterranean architecture over time. The research is qualitative and theoretical, exploring changes in the design, function, and materials of subterranean structures across key historical civilizations. It analyzes shifts in design methodologies, purpose, and construction techniques of underground structures, presenting the most relevant data in a descriptive tabular format. This research combines insights from architecture, archaeology, history, and engineering to provide a comprehensive understanding of subterranean architecture's evolution.

B. Data collection method

Primary data collection was not feasible due to the vast timeline and diverse geographical locations involved. Therefore, the secondary data collection methods were employed. This approach involves a comprehensive review of historical and architectural texts, research papers, excavation reports and archaeological finding related to subterranean structures.

This study examines a wide variety of case studies featuring specific subterranean structures (e.g., Lascaux Caves, Cappadocia underground cities, London underground, etc) to illustrate morphological transformation over time. Data from these case studies are gathered through the aforementioned techniques and compiled in the table 1.

METHODOLOGY	DESCRIPTION
1.Dividing history into Key era	Dividing history into distinctive time periods such as Prehistoric, Bronze age, Classical era, Modern to track the evolution of subterranean structures.
2.Defining purpose of subterranean architecture in that era	For each era, identifying the primary purpose of subterranean structures (e.g., shelter, burial, religious use, storage, transportation).
3.Analyzing characteristics	Examining the materials, construction techniques and design features of subterranean structure in each era.
4.Identifying examples of structures	Providing specific examples of subterranean structures from each era (e.g., Lascaux Caves, Cappadocia Underground Cities, London tunnel, etc.)
5.Respesentation and Visualization	Organizing the data systematically through tables for clear presentation and analysis

Table 1. Research methodology

C. Literature review

The literature on subterranean architecture spans a wide range, from conspiracy theories to Cold War-era patented research papers. The sources include books, academic publications, research papers, magazines, vlogs, and journals—all of which are cited in the reference section and were used to create the timeline in Table 2.

III. RESULTS

A. Timeline

This timeline outlines key phases in the evolution of subterranean structures highlighting their functional, cultural and technological transformations across eras.

ERA	TIME PERIOD	KEY DEVELOPMENTS
Prehistoric Era	40,000 BCE - 10,000 BCE	Natural Shelters: Use of caves for habitation (e.g., Lascaux Caves, France).- Thermal Insulation: Adaptation to harsh climates.- Symbolic Spaces: Early ritualistic use of subterranean spaces (e.g., cave paintings).
Neolithic Era	10,000 BCE – 3,000 BCE	Burial Chambers: Development of megalithic tombs (e.g., Newgrange, Ireland).- Pit Houses: Semi-subterranean dwellings for insulation (e.g., Çatalhöyük, Turkey).- Communal Storage: Underground granaries for agriculture.
Bronze Age	3000 BCE – 1,200 BCE	Tombs and Rituals: Advanced burial sites like the Mastabas of Egypt and Mycenaean Tholos tombs.- Water Systems: Early qanats and underground cisterns (e.g., Persian qanats).- Fortifications: Subterranean tunnels for defense in settlements.
Iron Age	1,200 BCE – 500 BCE	Rock-Cut Architecture: Emergence of underground temples and monasteries (e.g., Ajanta Caves, India).- Storage Vaults: Underground granaries and wine cellars in the Mediterranean region.- Aqueduct Systems: Development of advanced water distribution.
Classical Era	500 BCE – 500 AD	Roman Engineering: Innovations like catacombs, aqueducts, and sewers (e.g., Cloaca Maxima, Rome).- Greek Tombs: Subterranean mausoleums (e.g.,

		Tomb of Philip II of Macedon).- Public Infrastructure: First underground marketplaces and bathhouses.
Medieval Era	500 AD – 1500 AD	Defensive Structures: Castles with underground dungeons and escape tunnels.- Religious Spaces: Use of catacombs and crypts in Christianity.- Preservation and Storage: Underground food storage to prevent spoilage.
Early Modern Era	1500 AD – 1800 AD	Mining and Exploration: Expansion of underground mining techniques for metals and minerals.- Urban Development: Early underground sewer systems in Europe.- Cultural Use: Hidden spaces for resistance movements (e.g., hiding places in war).
Industrial Revolution	1800 AD – 1900 AD	Urban Infrastructure: Growth of subway systems (e.g., London Underground, 1863).- Industrial Use: Underground factories and storage facilities.- Hydraulic Systems: Large-scale underground water reservoirs and pipelines.
Modern Era	1900 AD – 2000 AD	Mass Transit: Expansion of metro systems in major cities (e.g., NYC, Tokyo, Paris).- Commercial Spaces: Underground malls and parking facilities.- Military Bunkers: World War II underground fortifications (e.g., Maginot Line, France).
Contemporary Era	2000 AD - Future	Sustainability: Underground data centers, farms, and science hubs (e.g., Singapore's Underground Science City).- Futuristic Colonies: Exploration of underground habitats for Mars and extreme environments.- Resilient Cities: Urban planning to combat climate change and overpopulation.

Table 2. Timeline of subterranean structures

B. Findings

This timeline showcases the dynamic shifts in the form of subterranean structures:

1. Functionality – Transition form survival-based shelters to complex multipurpose urban spaces.
2. Material usage – Innovations in tools and materials, from natural rocks to reinforced concrete.
3. Cultural symbolism – Subterranean structures evolved as symbols of power, faith and progress.
4. Technology and Urbanization – Modern and future subterranean design are driven by sustainability and adaptability to extreme conditions.

IV. CONCLUSOIN

Subterranean architecture has transformed over millennia, addressing human needs, technological advances, and environmental challenges. It offers valuable lessons for sustainable urban planning, disaster resilience, and extraterrestrial exploration, highlighting its enduring relevance and future potential. This research explores contributions to the study of subterranean structures across time, focusing on their morphological development, historical significance, and contemporary relevance by presenting it on a timeline. By bridging historical insights with contemporary challenges, this research builds on existing scholarship to trace the transformative journey of underground structures and their potential to shape the future and a depiction of it is given on the table 3 below.

ANALYSIS CATEGORY	KEY FINDINGS
MORPHOLOGICAL EVOLUTION	

Prehistoric simplicity to Geometric complexity	Transitioned from natural caves to engineered forms such as catacombs, temples, and bunkers, approaching extraterrestrial applications such as on mars underground base.
Integration of Natural and Artificial elements	Evolved from natural underground spaces to sophisticated rock-cut architecture and hybrid designs.
Material Advancements	From unaltered rocks in ancient times to reinforced concrete and steel in modern architecture.
FUNCTIONAL ADAPTATION	
Survival to Multipurpose Utility	Shifted from basic needs (shelter, burial) to religious sanctuaries, transportation networks, and data centers.
Climate Adaptation	Leveraged natural insulation and thermal regulation, continuing with modern energy-efficient designs.
Defense and Security	Used for defense throughout history, including medieval escape tunnels, WWII bunkers, and modern disaster shelters.
CULTURAL AND SYMBOLIC SHIFTS	
Spiritual Significance	Early subterranean spaces, such as burial sites and temples, reflected a spiritual connection with the earth.
Urban Integration	Transitioned from isolated structures to integral components of urban planning, such as metros and underground malls.
Global Influence	Diverse cultural approaches, from Cappadocia's cave cities to Singapore's Underground Science City, shaped subterranean architecture's evolution.
TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS	
Engineering Breakthroughs	Advancements in excavation, waterproofing, and structural reinforcement allowed for larger and more durable subterranean structures.
Modern Solutions	Technologies such as automated tunneling machines and digital simulations revolutionized complex subterranean construction.
Future-Oriented Designs	Emerging focus on habitats for extreme environments, including Mars and polar regions.
LESSONS FOR FUTURE APPLICATIONS	
Sustainability Potential	Offers solutions for urban density, energy conservation, and land preservation.
Adaptability to Climate Change	Underground spaces provide natural protection against rising temperatures, floods, and other climate-related challenges.
Interdisciplinary Approaches	Highlights the need for collaboration between architecture, geology, and environmental science for innovative subterranean designs.

Table 3. Conclusion of the research

REFERENCES

[1]. Sauder, Richard. (1995) "*Underground Bases and Tunnels: What Is the Government

Trying to Hide? “*Adventures Unlimited Press, 1995.
[2]. Jensen, J. (2003). "Catacombs and Culture: Subterranean Spaces in Ancient Rome." *Classical Antiquity Review*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 53-72.
[3]. Coulombe, D. (2010). "From Caves to Cities: The Historical Evolution of Subterranean Architecture." *World Archaeology Review*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 134-145.
[4]. NASA. (2020). "Subterranean Habitats: Lessons from Earth for Martian Colonization." *NASA Research Reports*.
[5]. Zubrin, R. (2011). *The Case for Mars: The Plan to Settle the Red Planet and Why We Must*. Free Press.
[6]. International Society for Subterranean Architecture. (2022). "Morphological Transformations in Subterranean Architecture: A Historical Perspective." *Proceedings of the International Subterranean Architecture Conference*, Singapore, pp. 145-160.
[7]. Meister, M. W. (1996). *Rock-Cut Architecture of India: Form and Function*. Princeton University Press.
[8]. Rappaport, R. A. (1979). *House Form and Culture*. Prentice Hall.
[9]. Coulson, C. (1997). *Castles in Medieval Society: Fortresses in England, France, and Ireland*. Oxford University Press.
[10]. Articles on Martian colonization and underground architecture (NASA and ESA publications).
[11]. Research reports on futuristic subterranean designs and sustainability (e.g., Singapore’s Underground Science City).
[12]. Tange, K. (1965). *A Vision of the Metabolist City*. Architectural Review.
[13]. Benyus, J. M. (1997). *Biomimicry: Innovation Inspired by Nature*. Harper Perennial.
[14]. Perlman, J. (2015). *Urban Sustainability and Underground Design*. Future Cities Journal.
[15]. Meister, M. W. (1996). *Rock-Cut Architecture of India: Form and Function*. Princeton University Press
[16]. Banham, R. (1988). *The Architecture of the Well-tempered Environment*. University of Chicago Press.
[17]. OpenAI. *ChatGPT* (Version 4). Accessed 2024. https://chat.openai.com.
[18]. Notion AI. *Notion AI Tool*. Notion Labs, Inc., 2024, https://www.notion.so.
[19]. Investigating the Anthropic Construction of Rock Art Sites Through Archaeomorphology: the Case of Borologa, Kimberley, Australia
[20]. Delannoy, J.-J., Gunn, R., David, B., Finch, D., Genuite, K., Ouzman, S., Veth, P., & Sam. (n.d.). Investigating the anthropic construction of rock art sites through archaeomorphology: The case of Borologa, Kimberley, Australia.
[21]. Peng, F.-L., Qiao, Y.-K., Sabri, S., Atazadeh, B., & Rajabifard, A. (n.d.). A collaborative approach for urban underground space development toward sustainable development goals: Critical dimensions and future directions.
[22]. Bin Hishammuddin, M. A. H., Wang, J., Bin Ismail, M. A., Abidin, H. Z., Sabri, S., Ho, C. S., & Wong, K. Y. (n.d.). Adaptive, resilient urban underground space (UUS) - Subsidence and economic impact spatial planning model (USEM): The extent development impact via cause-effect analysis circa 1980-2050 in Shanghai Megacity.
[23]. Yamac, A., & Tok, E. (n.d.). An architect’s underground city.
[24]. Piģēns, K., & Kronis, I. (n.d.). Aspects of formation of legal status of subterranean depths. Rīga Stradiņš University, Faculty of Law. Retrieved from karlis.pigens@sprk.gov.lv & ivars.kronis@rsu.lv.
[25]. Mahmoudi, S., Rezvani, A., & Amirc, A. (n.d.). An analysis of underground spaces and their applications throughout history (case study: Sāmen, Arzanfoud & Ouyi).
[26]. Mahmoudi, S., Rezvani, A., & Amirc, A. (n.d.). Study the architecture of earth shelter and its role in underground habitat formation (Case Study: Iranian Shavadans).
[27]. Besner, J. (n.d.). Cities think underground – Underground space (also) for people.
[28]. Zaini, F., Arrifin, A., Hussin, K., Suratman, R., & Rasid, K. A. (n.d.). Considerations on developing urban underground land in Malaysia: A review.
[29]. Carmody, J., & Sterling, R. (n.d.). Design considerations for underground buildings.

[30]. Besner, J. (n.d.). Develop the underground space with a master plan or incentives

[31]. Dghaily, R. (n.d.). Escaping destructive communities towards an underground utopian space.

[32]. De Mulder, E. F. J., Van Ree, C. C. D. F., & Hack, H. R. G. K. (n.d.). Geo-environmental aspects of European underground infrastructure.

[33]. Skayannis, P. (n.d.). Is urban underground space luxury? From infrastructures to subterranean structures.

[34]. Hunt, D. V. L., Makana, L. O., Jefferson, I., & Rogers, C. D. F. (n.d.). Liveable cities and urban underground space.

[35]. Schiller, I., & Ferschin, P. (n.d.). A concept and three-dimensional visualization as part of the planning process of the underground city Labin, Croatia.

[36]. Liu, J., Zeng, L., & Bian, H. (n.d.). Progress on the exploitation of urban underground space (UUS) in China.

[37]. Lembo, F., Marino, F. P. R., & Calcagno, C. (n.d.). Semi-underground house models as new concepts for urban sustainable environment.

[38]. Durmisevic, S. (n.d.). The future of the underground space.

[39]. Diogo, M., Diogo, M., Diogo, J., & Diogo, P. (n.d.). The underground architecture: Case study – Cellars in Formeselhe, Spain.

[40]. Zaini, F., Suratman, R., & Kassim, A. C. (n.d.). The vertical land use zoning for underground space development in Malaysia.

[41]. Labs, K. (n.d.). The architectural underground.

[42]. Reynolds, E., & Reynolds, P. (n.d.). Planning for underground spaces: NY-LON underground

[43]. Elezaj, L., Fleury, M., & Jacques, B. (n.d.). Toward an underground architecture.

[44]. Al-Shanty, Z. A. (n.d.). Towards futuristic underground cities.

[45]. Wright, A. (n.d.). Underground architecture: Connections between ground-level public space and below-ground buildings.

[46]. Admiraal, H. (n.d.). Underground spaces unveiled: Planning and creating the cities of the future.

[47]. Dolatkhah, A., & Shojaei, N. (n.d.). Effective factors on the formation of versatile architecture: A case study of the Quran Museum, Iran.