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Of the three styles into which Hindû architecture naturally divides itself, the northern is found spread over a far larger portion of the country than either of the other two. It wants, however, the compactness and strongly-marked individuality of the Dravidian, and never was developed with that exuberance which characterised the southern style from the 15th to the 18th century. In many respects it resembles more the Chalukyan style, the examples being small and elegant, and found dispersed over the face of the country, where wanted, without any apparent massing together in particular spots.

Unfortunately, we have no name which would describe the style in its ethnographical and geographical relations without being open to the objection of expressing either too much or too little. In this respect the southern style is singularly fortunate: Dravidian correctly limits it to people speaking Tâmil, Telugu, or some cognate dialect; and the country where the people speaking those tongues are to be found is generally and correctly known as Drâvida-desa, or country of the Dravidians.

The term Chalukyan, applied to the second style, is not so expressive; but it is unobjectionable, as it cannot mislead any one. It is only a conventional term, derived from the principal known dynasty ruling in that country, applied to a style occupying a borderland between the other two, but a
land whose boundaries cannot yet be fixed with precision. Till they are, a conventional name that does not mislead is all that can be hoped for.

If it were allowable to adopt the loose phraseology of philological ethnography, the term Aryan might be employed, as it is the name by which the people practising this style are usually known in India, and it would be particularly convenient here, as it is the correct and direct antithesis of Dravidian. It is evident, however, that any such term, if applied to architecture, ought to be descriptive of some style practised by that people, wherever they settled, all across Europe and Asia, between the shores of the Atlantic and the Bay of Bengal;¹ and it need hardly be said that no such style exists. If used in conjunction with the adjective Indian or Indo-Aryan, it becomes much less objectionable, and has the advantage of limiting its use to the people who are generally known as Aryans in India—in other words, to all those parts of the country where Sanskrit was spoken, or where the people now speak tongues so far derived from Sanskrit as to be distinguishable as offsets of that great family of languages. Its use, in this respect, has the great convenience that any ordinary ethnographical or linguistic map of India is sufficient to describe the boundaries of the style. It extends, like the so-called Aryan tongues, from the Himālayas to the south of the Vindhya mountains. On the east, it is found prevalent in Orissa; and on the west in Mahārāshtra. Its southern boundary between these two provinces will only be known when the Nizam's territory is architecturally surveyed.

Another reason why the term Aryan should be applied to the style is, that the country just described, where it prevails, is, and always has been, called Āryāvarta by the natives themselves. They consider it as the land of the pure and just—meaning thereby the Sanskrit-speaking peoples—as contrariwise distinguished from that of the casteless Dasyus, and other tribes, who, though they may have adopted Brahmanical institutions, could not acquire their purity of race.

The great defect of the term, however, is that the people inhabiting the north of India are not Aryans in any reasonable sense of the term, whatever philologists may say to the contrary.

The Sanskrit-speaking people, who came into India 2000

¹ In 1848 Gen. Cunningham applied the term Aryan to the architecture of Kashmir, apparently on the strength of a pun ('Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,' vol. xvii. pt. ii., 1848, p. 242). This, however, was limiting a term that belongs to two continents to an insignificant valley in one of them. It was, besides, wholly uncalled for. The term Kashmiri was amply sufficient, and all that was wanted for so strictly local a style.
or 3000 years B.C., could never have been numerically one-half of the inhabitants of the country, except, perhaps, in some such limited district as that between the Satlaj and the Jamnâ; and since the Christian Era no Aryan race has migrated eastward across the Indus, but wave after wave of peoples of Turanian race, under the names of Yavanas, Sakas, Hûnas, Türkis, or Mongols, have poured into India. This, combined with the ascendency of the mixed or aboriginal races during the period when Buddhism was the prevailing religion of the country, has so completely washed out Aryanisin from northern India during the building ages, that there is probably no community there which could claim one-tenth of pure Aryan blood in its veins, and with nine-tenths of impurity the term is certainly a misnomer. If it were not, we would certainly find some trace of external Aryan affinities in their style; but in fact, no style is so purely local, and, if the term may be used, so aboriginal, as this. The origin of the Buddhist style is obvious and unmistakable; that of the Dravidian and Chalukyan nearly as certain, though not quite so obvious; but the origin of the northern Hindû style remains a mystery, unless, indeed, the solution suggested above (ante, vol. i. p. 325) be considered an explanation. It may be so, to some extent; but I confess it is to my mind neither quite satisfactory nor sufficient.

Thestyle was adopted by the Jains, and several examples of the peculiar forms of their vimânas, or sikharas have already been given (Woodcuts Nos. 290, 299, etc.); but it still remains to be ascertained from what original form the curvilinear square tower could have arisen. There is nothing in Buddhist, or any other art, at all like it. It does not seem to have been derived from any wooden form we know, nor from any brick or stone, or tile mode of roofing found anywhere else. I have looked longer, and, perhaps, thought more, on this problem than on any other of its class connected with Indian architecture, but I have no more plausible suggestion to offer than that hinted at above. The real solution will probably be found in the accidental discovery of old temples—so old as to betray in their primitive rudeness the secret we are now guessing at in vain. Meanwhile, we probably may remain sure that it was not an imported form, but an indigenous production, and that it has no connection with the architecture of any other people outside of India.

The view above proposed for the origin of the style derives considerable support from the mode in which the temples are now found distributed. There are perhaps more temples now in Orissa than in all the rest of Hindustan put together. They are very frequent in Mahârâshtra, and, if we admit the Jains
who adopted this style, they are ten times more frequent in Gujarát, Rajputana and the valley of the Narbadâ than in the valley of the Ganges, or in Áryávarta, properly so called. The first and most obvious explanation of this fact must be that the last-named country has for 600 years been occupied by a Muhammadan empire, and they, hating idolatry and idol temples, have destroyed them wherever they were so absolutely in possession of the country as to be able to do so with impunity. My impression, however, is that it does not correctly represent the whole state of the case. That the Moslims did ruthlessly destroy Jaina and Hindû temples at Ajmîr, Delhi, Kanauj, and elsewhere in northern India, is quite true, but it was, partly at least, because their columns served so admirably for the construction of their mosques. The astylar temples of the followers of Siva or Vishnu could have served principally as quarries, and stones that had been previously used in Hindû temples have not been traced to a large extent in Moslim buildings. But admitting that at Delhi or Allahâbâd, or any of their northern capitals, all Hindû buildings have been utilised, this hardly would have been supposed the case at such a provincial capital as Faizâbâd, once Ayodhyâ, the celebrated capital of Dasaratha, the father of Râma the hero of the Râmâyana, but where little besides a few pillars in Bâbar’s mosque can be discovered that belongs to any ancient building.\footnote{1 ‘Gazetteer of Oudh’ (1877), vol. i. p. 7. Sâlîr Mas’ûd Ghâzi, the nephew of Mahmûd of Ghaznî, passed through Ayodhyâ in 1033, and would hardly have failed to display his iconoclastic zeal. Gen. Cunningham attempts to identify the various mounds at this place with those described as existing in Sâketa by the Buddhist Pilgrims.—‘Ancient Geography of India,’ pp. 401 et seqq.; ‘Archæological Reports,’ vol. i. pp. 293 et seqq. The truth of the matter, however, is, that neither Fah Hian nor Hiuen Tsiang were ever near the place. The city they visited, and where the Tooth-brush-tree grew, has not been identified. \footnote{2 ‘Sacred City of the Hindus,’ London, 1868, pp. 271 et seqq.; ‘Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,’ vol. xxxiv pp. 1 et seqq.}}

The most crucial instance, however, is the city of Benares, so long the sacred city, par excellence, of the Hindûs, yet, so far as is known, no vestige of an ancient Hindû temple exists within its present precincts. James Prinsep resided there for ten years, and Major Kittoe, who had a keener eye than even his great master for an architectural form, lived long there as an archæologist and architect. They drew and measured everything, yet neither of them ever thought that they had found anything that was ancient; and it was not till Messrs. Horne and Sherring\footnote{2} started the theory that the buildings around the Bakariyâ Kund were ancient Buddhist or Hindû remains, that any one had discovered any traces of antiquity in that city. But the buildings about the Bakariyâ Kund were erected by
Muhammadans, and the pillars and roofing-stones, with a few possible exceptions, were carved by them for the purposes for which they were applied. They may have used the stones of deserted monasteries, or other Buddhist or Hindû buildings, in the foundations or on their terraces, or for little detached pavilions; but all the architecture, properly so called, is in a style invented, or at least introduced by the Pathâns, and brought to perfection under Akbar.

That the Moslims destroyed Hindû temples all over the south of Hindustan and in their raids into the Dekhan is certain, but it was not till the time of Aurangzib that any of their monarchs felt himself sufficiently powerful or was so bigoted as to dare the power and enmity of the Brâhmans of Benares, by erecting a mosque on the site of one of their most sacred temples as an insult and a defiance to the Hindûs. Even then, had such a temple as the great one at Bhuvaneswar existed in Benares, every stone of which, from the ground to the kalas, is covered with carving, it seems remarkable that all these carved stones should be hid away and not one now to be found. But so it appears; still we know historically that there were many temples in the city, and during the pre-Mughal period the city was often sacked, whilst the river courses have changed and probably buried what the Moslim failed to destroy.

The rock at Gwâliar was one of the earliest conquests of the Moslims, and they held it more or less directly for five centuries. They built palaces and mosques within its precincts, yet the most conspicuous objects on the hill are Hindû temples, that were erected before they obtained possession of it. In like manner Chitor was thrice besieged and thrice sacked by the Muhammadans, but numerous buildings there are comparatively intact.

The instances of early temples discovered during the last forty years, however, bears some testimony to the numbers that must have existed all over the country prior to the Musalmân conquests. These are very numerous in the west and south-west of Bengal, where the Aryan element in the population is a minimum. No temples are mentioned in the Vedas or the older Indian writings, and were not required for the simple quasi-domestic rites of their worship; and so long as they remained pure perhaps no temples were built. With the introduction of the Brahmanic ritual they became a necessity. It is to be understood then that though we may use the term Indo-Aryan as the most convenient to describe and define the limits of the northern style, the name it is intended to convey is, that the style arose in a country which they once occupied, and in which they have left a strong impress of their superior mental power.
and civilisation, and over which the languages spoken are of Sanskritic descent.

If this reservation is always borne in mind, I know of no term that more conveniently expresses the characteristics of this style, and it is consequently proposed to adopt it in the following pages as the name of the style that prevailed among the Hindūs in northern India, between the Himālaya and Vindhya mountains, and even much further south, from the 7th century to the present day.

309. Dravidian and Indo-Aryan Temples at Pattadakal. (From a Photograph.)

The general appearance of the northern temples, and the points of difference between them and those of the south, will be appreciated from the above woodcut (No. 309), representing two very ancient temples, built in juxtaposition at Pattadakal, in Bijāpūr district. That on the left is a complete specimen of Dravidian architecture *(ante*, vol. i. p. 355). There is the same pyramidal form, the same distinction of storeys, the same cells on each, as we find at Māmallapuram (Woodcut No. 185), at Tanjor (Woodcut No. 213), or at Madurā (Woodcut No. 195). The right-hand temple—that of Galaganāth, to the north-west of Sangamesvar’s—is Indo-Aryan of somewhat later date, and in which, on the contrary, the outline of the pyramid is curvilinear; no trace of division of storeys is observable, no reminiscence of habitations and no pillars or pilasters any-
where. Even in its modern form (Woodcut No. 310), it still retains the same characteristics, and all the lines of the pyramid or sikhara are curvilinear, the base polygonal. No trace of utilitarianism is visible anywhere. If Woodcut No. 310 is compared with that at vol. i. page 339 (Woodcut No. 195), the two styles will be exhibited in their most modern garbs, when, after more than 1000 years’ practice, they have receded furthest from the forms in which we first meet them. Yet the Madras temple retains the memory of its storeys and its cells. The Bengal example recalls nothing known in civil or domestic architecture.

Neither the pyramid nor the tumulus affords any suggestion as to the origin of the form, nor does the tower, either square or circular; nor does any form of civil or domestic architecture. It does not seem to be derived from any of these, and, whether we consider it as beautiful or otherwise, it seems certainly to have been invented principally at least for æsthetic purposes, and to have retained that impress from the earliest till the present day.

The plan of a northern temple is always a square internally, and generally the same form is retained in the exterior; but very rarely, if ever, without some addition. In some instances it is only a thin parallel projection, as at A in the diagram
(No. 311) Sometimes it has two such slices added, as at B; but in the oldest examples these are only half the thickness shown here. From this they proceeded to three projections, as at C, the oldest examples being the thinnest. In more modern times the thickness of the projections became equal to their distance from each other, as at D; so that the temple became in plan practically a square, the sides of which were parallel to the diagonal of the original square or to the line E F G. Even, however, when this was the case, the cell always retained its original form and direction, and the entrance and windows kept their position on what had thus practically become the angles of the building. This is the case with the temple at Benares, shown in Woodcut No. 310, and generally also with the Jaina temples, and especially the case with the temple on the Takht-i-Sulaimān in Kashmir. Although the depth and width of these offsets vary considerably even in the same design, the original square is never lost sight of; the four central angles, as at F, being always larger and more strongly accentuated than the others, and their line is always carried through to the summit of the pyramid.

It will be observed that by this process we have arrived at the same form or plan for a solid building that was attained by the arrangement of pillars described vol. i. page 317. In fact, the two forms were elaborated simultaneously, and were afterwards constantly used together. My impression is, that the pillared arrangement is the oldest, and led to the deepening of the additions to the solid square till the two became identical in plan. Whether this were so or not, it is one of the most distinguishing features of northern Hindū architecture.

In the very centre of India, at Amarakantak, near a place marked Ajmīrgadh on the map, is a sacred tank, from which it is said that the Sōn flows to the north, the Mahānāndī to Katak in the Bay of Bengal, and the Narbādā to the Indian Ocean. All these rivers have their sources in the hill. The spot has always been held sacred, and is surrounded by temples, two or three of them—as far as can be gathered from the imperfect accounts available—of considerable age.1 On the south and east of this hill extends the great and fertile table-land of Chhattīsgarh. This is now, and has always been, so far as our knowledge extends, one of the principal seats of the native tribes. If that country and the surrounding districts were carefully surveyed, we might find temples, some of which would add very materially to our knowledge of the history of this style.2

---

1 Mr. Beglar in 'Archeological Survey of India Reports,' vol. vii. pp. 227 ff. and plates 20, 21; but the account and drawings are very defective.
2 Conf. Cousens, 'Lists of Antiquarian Remains in the Central Provinces and Berar,' Calcutta, 1897, which indicate some promising remains.
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The two provinces of India, where the Indo-Aryan style can be studied with the greatest advantage, are Dhârâwâr on the west, and Orissa on the east coast. The former has the advantage of being mixed up with the Dravidian style, so as to admit of synonyms and contrasts that are singularly interesting, both from an ethnological and historical point of view. In Orissa, on the contrary, the style is perfectly pure, being unmixed with any other, and thus forms one of the most compact and homogeneous architectural groups in India, and as such of more than usual interest, and it is consequently in this province that the style can be studied to the greatest advantage.

One of the most marked and striking peculiarities of Orissan architecture is the distinct and almost absolute contrast it presents to the style of the Dravidian at the southern end of the peninsula. The curved outline of the towers or vimânas has already been remarked upon, but, besides this, no Orissan towers present the smallest trace of any storeyed or even step-like arrangement, which is so universal further south, and the crowning member is never a dome, nor a reminiscence of one. Even more remarkable than this, is the fact that the Orissan style is almost entirely astylar. In some of the more modern examples, as for instance in the porches added to the temples at Bhubaneswar and Puri in the 12th and 14th centuries, we do find pillars, but it is probably correct to state that, among the 100 or 150 original shrines at Bhubaneswar, scarcely a pillar is to be found.1 This is the more remarkable because, within sight

---
1 The Bhogamandapas of the Lingarâja, Jagannâth and Yamesvara temples have each four pillars supporting their roofs; but these mandapas are of later dates than the temples themselves.
of that capital, the caves in the Udayagiri (ante, p. 13) are adorned with pillars to such an extent as to show that their forms must have been usual and well known in the province before any of the temples were constructed. When we recollect that no great temple in the south was considered complete without its "hall of 1000 columns," and many besides this had hundreds dispersed about the place, and used for every conceivable purpose, the contrast is more striking, and shows what a complete barrier the Chalukyas interposed between the two races on this side of India, though not on the other. As a rule, every Orissan temple consists of two apartments, similar in plan, as shown in the diagram (Woodcut No. 184). The inner one is generally a cube, surmounted by a tower, here called Barâ-deûl, or Dewal, corresponding with the vimâna of the south, and in it the image or images of the gods are enshrined; in front of this is a porch or antarâla, called Jaga-mohan, generally square in plan or approaching it, and surmounted by a pyramidal roof of varying pitch. The peculiarities are illustrated in the diagram (Woodcut No. 184) just referred to, which purports to be an elevation of the celebrated Black Pagoda at Kanârak. It is only, however, an eye-sketch, and cannot be depended upon for minute detail and correctness, but it is sufficient to explain the meaning of the text. Sometimes one or two more porches (mandapas) were added in front of this one, called the Nâta-mandir or dancing-hall—corresponding to the Sabhâ-mandapa in a Gujarât temple—and the Bhoga-mandir or refectory, but these, in almost every instance, are afterthoughts, and not parts of the original design. Be this as it may, in every instance in Orissa the tower with its porch forms the temple. If enclosed in a wall, they are always to be seen outside. There are gateways, it is true, but they are always subordinate, and there are none of those accretions of enclosures and gopurams that form so marked a characteristic of the southern style. There generally are other shrines within the enclosures of the great temples, but they are always kept subordinate, and the temple itself towers over everything to even a greater extent than that at Tanjor (Woodcut No. 213), giving a unity and purpose to the whole design, so frequently wanting in the south.

Other contrasts will come out as we proceed, but, in the meanwhile, few examples bring out more clearly the vast importance of ethnography as applied to architecture. That two peoples, inhabiting practically the same country, and worshipping the same gods under the guidance of the same Brahanical priesthood, should have adopted and adhered to two such dissimilar styles for their sacred buildings, shows as clearly as anything can well do how much race has to do with these
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matters, and how little we can understand the causes of such contrasts, unless we take affinities or differences of race into consideration.

HISTORY.

About eighty years ago Mr. Andrew Stirling published an 'Account of Orissa proper or Cuttack,' giving a dynastic list of the rulers from B.C. 3101 to the beginning of last century, with dates and notable events of their reigns. This was drawn up from native records belonging to the temple of Jagannâth at Puri; and, dismissing the early portions as manifestly fabulous, the record, from the accession of Yayâti Kesarî towards the end of the 5th century, was accepted as tolerably trustworthy, and was revised and published with a fuller list of the names by Sir W. W. Hunter in his 'Orissa.' But, like other native histories, it cannot stand examination, and must be discarded as worthless previous to the 12th century, and very inaccurate even for the last four or five centuries. Here, as elsewhere, we can hope for trustworthy historical information only from the steady pursuit of epigraphical research, which as yet has yielded but four or five names of a Somavânsi or Lunar dynasty that ruled before the 12th century; and their inscriptions are unfortunately dated only in regnal years, and must be relegated, on epigraphical grounds, to about the 11th century. We have thus, as yet, but little help from historical sources. It is true that the dates of two of its temples have been approximately ascertained. The great one at Bhuvaneswar is said to have been erected about A.D. 640—but possibly later—and that at Puri between A.D. 1080 and 1140, nearly the first and the last of the series. My impression is that in the later direction it can hardly be extended beyond the year 1260, but within these limits it seems possible to arrange the sequence of all the temples in the province without much difficulty, and to ascertain their dates with some degree of approximate certainty.

With the exception of the great temple of Jagannâth at Puri, the buildings described in this chapter were mostly erected

---


2 'Orissa' (ed. 1872) vol. i. pp. 198 ff.; and vol. ii. pp. 183-191; also in Sewell's 'Lists of Inscriptions and Dynasties of Southern India,' pp. 204-209. An outline of the history of Orissa is given in the new 'Gazetteer of Puri,' chap. ii.

3 Among four successive rulers, of which we have inscriptions, tentatively placed in the 11th century, the third, Yayâti Mahâ-Sivagupta, may possibly be the Yayâti Kesarî, which the Vamsâvall makes the founder of the dynasty in 474-526, or five centuries before his probable date.—Dr. J. F. Fleet in 'Epigraphia Indica,' vol. iii. pp. 323-359.
before the commencement of the 12th century, when we find
Anantavarman Chodagangadēva (1078-1142) of the Eastern
Ganga dynasty recording that he replaced the fallen lord of
Orissa in his kingdom.1 About this period the Ganga-vansa
dynasty succeeded, the second of whom was the builder of the
great Puri temple—or at least completed it—for its erection is
ascribed to his father, Chodaganga, thirty years earlier. They
were nominally Saivas, but patronised also the Vaishnavas,
whilst the preceding dynasty seem to have been devoted
Saivas.

Owing to its remoteness from the seats of Muhammadan
power, Orissa almost entirely escaped the ravages which
devastated the principal Hindu cities in the earlier and more
intolerant age of their power. The first serious invasion of
Orissa was only made about 1510 by 'Alāū-d-Dīn Hasain Shāh,
King of Bengal, whose army sacked Katak and plundered Puri,
but was driven back; and it was not till 1567-1568 that Sulaimān
Khān Karārānī, the Afghan Viceroy of Bengal, finally defeated
the Orissa king at Jājpūr. Soon after it was annexed by Akbar,
and after four more years of contests it became a province of
his empire in 1578, after which further outrages were hardly to
be feared.

At Jājpūr the Muhammadans had already wreaked their
vengeance on all that was Hindu; but elsewhere the monuments
were left more nearly intact than any other group in the north
of India. Neither at Bhuvaneswar nor at Puri or Kanarak are
marked traces of their violence. In later times the Orissa
remains have suffered from the sordid proceedings of the Public
Works Department, which destroyed the fort at Barbati and
other public buildings, to mend roads or to save some money in
erecting a lighthouse at False Point. Further injury has been
done by the antiquarian zeal of the officers who removed some
of the best statues of the Rājarānī temple,2 and by the vandals
who pulled down the Navagraha sculpture from the Kanarak
temple. Lastly, and worst of all, by the Archaeological Survey,
a few years ago, which caused the interior of the mandap of
this famous monument to be completely filled up with stones
and sand and so “shut up for ever.”3

Besides their immunity from the ordinary causes of destruction
of Hindu buildings, the Orissa group forms in itself one of
the most complete and interesting in all India. The Khajurāho

3 This was conceived to be the only way of preventing the roof from falling in.—Mr. Marshall’s ‘Annual Report, 1903-1904,’ p. 48.
group is nearly as extensive and magnificent, but they were all erected within the limits of about a century, 950 to 1050, so that little sequence can be traced among them. There are also temples in the Kanarese districts more magnificent than any in Orissa, and extending through a long series of years; but they are scattered over a wide extent of country, and are consequently varied by local peculiarities of style. It therefore requires more knowledge and experience to classify them than it does those in this province. Altogether there is not, perhaps, any group which, if properly investigated, would add more to our knowledge of Indian architecture, and give it more precision, than the Bhuvaneswar temples.  


2 The late Ràjendralâl Mitra, who was sent with the expedition organised by the Bengal Government in 1868 to survey the antiquities of Orissa, most unfortunately had no knowledge whatever of architectural surveying or draughtsmanship; nor had he any acquaintance with Indian styles to guide him in determining the periods to which different buildings belonged. Even his vaunted acquaintance with epigraphy was superficial and inexact; and the two folio volumes he prepared at public expense, added little, if anything, to our knowledge.—*Indian Antiquary,* vol. ix. pp. 113f. and 142f.; Fergusson’s *Archæology in India,* pp. 48ff.
The oldest temple in the town of Bhubaneswar is probably that called Parasurâmeswar (Woodcut No. 312), which, from the termination of the name, as well as the Linga in the cela, and subjects portrayed in the three principal niches of the tower, mark it as a Saiva shrine. It may belong to the 7th century, though it may be as late as the 8th. Its style is certainly different from the other early temples here, and more like what we find at other places outside the province. It is not large, being only 20 ft. square\(^1\) at its base; but its sculptures are cut with a delicacy seldom surpassed, and there is an appropriateness about the ornaments greater than is seen in most of the temples.

The temple itself is apparently 42 ft. in height, and from the summit to the base it is covered with sculptures of the most elaborate character,\(^2\) but still without detracting from the simplicity and vigour of its outline.

If I am correct in assigning so early a date to the tower of this temple, it is evident that the porch must be a subsequent addition, because it fits badly to the tower. It may, however, be that if this is really the oldest temple of its class in Orissa, its design may be copied from a foreign example, and borrowed, with all its peculiarities, from a style practised elsewhere. Be that as it may, it is interesting as showing the mode by which light was sometimes introduced into the porches of these temples between the ends of the beams of the stone roof. As the sloping roofing-stones project considerably beyond the openings, a subdued light is introduced, without either the direct rays of the sun, or the rain being able to penetrate.\(^3\)

The temple of Mukteswar (Woodcut No. 313) is very similar in general design to that of Parasurâmeswar, but even richer and more varied in detail, and its porch partakes more of the regular Orissan type. It has no pillars internally, and the roof externally exhibits at least the germ of what we find in the porches of the great temple at Bhubaneswar and the Black Pagoda. Its dimensions are somewhat less than those of the last temple described, but in its class it may be considered the gem of Orissan architecture.\(^4\)

\(^1\) This dimension is from Bâbu Râjendra Lal’s ‘Orissa Antiquities,’ vol. i. p. 41, but I don’t like it. [Judging from a photograph—the estimated height being about 43 ft.—this dimension seems to be at least 27 ft.]


\(^3\) This temple has of late been in the hands of the official, and we learn that it has been thoroughly restored; the whole roof of the mandapa was dismantled and rebuilt.”—‘Archaeological Survey Annual Report, 1902-03,’ p. 46.

\(^4\) This temple is surrounded by “a number of small shrines, and close to it also stands the temple of Siddhârâna, a larger structure. All the shrines are inferior works of art, but nevertheless they have all been restored.”—Dr. T. Bloch, \textit{ibid.} p. 46. No survey is mentioned as having been made.
Besides these, there are several other temples which, from the style of their architecture, I would feel inclined to place as earlier than the great temple. One is known as Sāri Dewal, near the great temple, and another, a very complete and beautiful example, is called Maitreswar, which is almost a duplicate, on a small scale, of the great temple, except that it
GREAT TEMPLE OF BHUVANESWAR.

The great temple of Bhuvaneswar, known as the Lingarāja, is one of the landmarks in the style. It is traditionally ascribed to a Lalatendra Kesari, who is said to have ruled in the 7th century; though this is mere fable, the temple may tentatively be ascribed to about the 9th or 10th century; but be this as it may, taking it all in all, it is perhaps the finest example of a purely Hindu temple in India.

Though not a building of the largest class, the dimensions of this temple in plan are, so far as I can make out, far from contemptible. The whole length is about 210 ft., with a breadth varying from 60 ft. to 75 ft. The original temple, however, like almost all those in Orissa, consisted only of a vimāna, or Baradewal, and a porch or Jagamohan, shaded darker in the plan (Woodcut No. 314), and they extend only to 160 ft. The Nāta- and Bhoga-mandaps, shaded lighter, were added possibly about the 12th century or even later. Though several temples have all these four apartments, so
far as I can make out, none were originally erected with them. The true Orissan temple is like that represented in Woodcut No. 184, a building with two apartments only, and these astylar, or practically so: the pillars were only introduced in the comparatively modern additions.

315. View of Great or Lingaraja Temple, Bhubaneswar. (From a Photograph.)

The outline of this temple in elevation is not, at first sight,
pleasing to the European eye; but when once the eye is accustomed to it, it has a singularly solemn and pleasing aspect. It is a solid, and would be a plain square tower, but for the slight curve at the top, which takes off the hardness of the outline and introduces pleasingly the circular crowning object (Woodcut No. 315). As compared with that at Tanjor (Woodcut No. 213), it certainly is by far the finer design of the two. In plan the southern example is the larger, being 82 ft. square. This one is only about 66 ft. from angle to angle, though it is 75 ft. across the central projection. Their height is nearly the same, both of them being over 180 ft., but the upper part of the northern tower is so much more solid, that the cubic contents of the two are probably not very different. Besides, however, greater beauty in form, the northern example excels the other immeasurably in the fact that it is wholly in stone from the base to the apex, and—what, unfortunately, no woodcut can show—every inch of the surface is covered with carving in the most elaborate manner. It is not only the divisions of the courses, the roll-mouldings on the angles, or the breaks on the face of the tower: these are sufficient to relieve its flatness, and with any other people they would be deemed sufficient; but every individual stone in the tower has a pattern carved upon it, not so as to break its outline, but sufficient to relieve any idea of monotony. It is, perhaps, not an exaggeration to say that if it would take a sum—say a lakh of rupees or pounds—to erect such a building as this, it would take three lakhs to carve it as this one is carved. Whether such an outlay is judicious or not, is another question. Most people would be of opinion that a building four times as large would produce a greater and more imposing architectural effect; but this is not the way a Hindó ever looked at the matter. Infinite labour bestowed on every detail was the mode in which he thought he could render his

---

1 This and the dimensions in plan generally are taken from a table in Bábú Râjendra-lâl’s ‘Antiquities of Orissa,’ vol. i. p. 41. I am afraid they are only round numbers, but they suffice for comparison. They are certainly incorrect. In the table the tower is described as 66 ft. by 60, while all the photographs prove that it is undoubtedly square. In the plan (vol. ii. pl. 48) the sides are represented as 66 by 54 ft. from angle to angle, and the internal dimensions are given in the table as 42 square. In the plan they are 44 by 46, and approach so nearly to the exterior, that if the tower had been built, as represented in his plan, it would not have stood for an hour. In figure 314 the internal dimension is reduced to 40 ft. with the larger external one of 65 ft. The Bhoga-mandapa is said in the text (p. 72) to be 56 ft. square; by scale it is 63 by 70. The Nâta-mandir is said to be 52 ft. square, and scales 58 by 61. The Jagamohan in the text is said to measure 65 ft. by 45; on the plan it measures 70 by 50. Making these and other adjustments from the plan, it reduces the total length to about 210 ft., instead of the 290 of the plan. This is confirmed by Mr Atkinson’s plan (pl. xxviii.). In like manner the temple of Bhagavati (pl. xviii.) is represented as 160 ft. in length, while Mr. Atkinson makes it only 110.—‘Archæology in India,’ pp. 49, 50.
temple most worthy of the deity; and, whether he was right or wrong, the effect of the whole is certainly marvellously beautiful. It is not, however, in those parts of the building shown in the woodcut that the greatest amount of carving or design was bestowed, but in the perpendicular parts seen from the courtyard (Woodcut No. 316).

There the sculpture is of a very high order and great beauty of design. This, however, ought not to surprise us when we recollect that at Amaravati, on the banks of the Krishnâ, not far from the southern boundary of this kingdom, there stood a temple more delicate and elaborate in its carvings than any other building in India,¹ and that this temple had been finished probably eight centuries before this one was erected; and though the history of art in India is now written in decay, its growth and vitality had, in earlier times, been vigorous.

Attached to the Jagamohan of this temple is a Nâta-mandir, or dancing-hall, whose date is, traditionally assigned to about the year 1100: but this is perhaps too early, as there are inscriptions of the 12th and 13th centuries on the doorway of the temple porch, and they are probably earlier than the Nâta-mandir. But even then it enables us to measure the extent of this decay with some degree of certainty. It is elegant, of course, for art had not yet perished among the Hindûs,

¹ ‘Tree and Serpent Worship,’ plates 48-98; ‘Amarâvatî and Jaggayâspeta Buddhist Stûpas’ (1887).
but it differs from the style of the porch to which it is attached more than the leanest example of Tudor art differs from the vigour and grace of the buildings of the early Edwards. All that power of expression is gone which enabled the early architects to make small things look gigantic from the exuberance of labour bestowed upon them. A glance at the Nāta-mandir is sufficient for the mastery of its details. A week’s study of the Jagamohan would every hour reveal new beauties.

The last woodcut may convey some idea of the extent to which the older parts were elaborated: but even the photograph hardly enables any one not familiar with the style to realise how exquisite the combination of solidity of mass with exuberance of ornament really is.

During the five centuries which elapsed between the erection of these two porches, Bhuvaneswar was adorned with some hundreds of temples, some dozen of which have been photographed, but hardly in sufficient detail to enable the student to classify them according to their dates. On the spot it probably would be easy for any one trained to this class of study, and it would be a great gain if it were done. The group nearest in richness and interest is that at Khajurāho, mentioned above (p. 49); but that group belongs to an age just subsequent to that of the Bhuvaneswar group, and only enables us to see that some of the most elaborate of the Katak temples may extend to the year 1000 or thereabouts. It is to this date that I would ascribe the erection of the Rājarānī temple. The names of the more notable, of which I have photographs, with their approximate dates, are given in the list at the end of this chapter; but I refrain from burdening the text with their names, as I despair, by any reasonable number of woodcuts, of illustrating their marvellous details in anything like a satisfactory manner.

The Rājarānī temple, as will be seen from the woodcut (No. 317), is small; but the plan is arranged so as to give great variety and play of light and shade, and as the details

---

1 Photographs have enabled me to supply to some extent the deficiency of my local knowledge; but unless photographs are taken by a scientific man for scientific purposes, they do not supply the place of local experience; but a full architectural survey also is much desiderated.

2 Cunningham’s ‘Reports,’ vol. ii. p. 416.
are of the most exquisite beauty, it is one of the gems of Orissan art. The following woodcut (No. 318), without attempting to illustrate the art, is quoted as characteristic of the emblems of the period. Below the pillar are three kneeling elephants, over which domineer three lions or leogriFFs. Above this a Nāgī or female Nāga, with her seven-headed snakehood, adorns the upper part of the pillar. They are to be found, generally in great numbers, in almost all the temples of the province. Over the doorway are the Navagraha, or nine planets, which are almost more universal at the Lingarāja temple.

Throughout the province, from the time we first meet it, about the 7th century, if so early, till it dies out about A.D. 1300, the style seems to be singularly uniform in its features, and it requires considerable familiarity with it to detect its gradual progress towards decay. Notwithstanding this, it is easy to

1 Both the temples of Muktesvara and Rājarājēśvara have been restored by Dr. Bloch, the Archaeological surveyor, who gives photographs of them "before, and after repairs," but from so very different points of view, that it is not clear what is the extent of these repairs;—but in the Reports, this method of photographing from different points "before and after" meddling with the buildings, is remarkably frequent. No mention seems to be made of securing correct plans of the temples, which might readily have been made whilst the works were going on. The work done is thus described: "The temples generally were fairly intact, but a number of stones had become either loose or unsafe, in the roof of the man-
dapa and the upper parts of the spire. These had to be dismantled and built up again, using as far as possible the ancient materials. Carvings, when broken and lost, were replaced by new ones, and the work of the modern stonemason does not fall much behind the old work, except that modern restorations of human or animal figures are less graceful than their older models. Only such carvings have been replaced by new ones of which the original pattern was available."—"Archæol. Survey Annual Report, 1902-03," pp. 45-46. It is pitiable to think of the barbarity of 20th century imitations, or supposed—but very inferior—imitations, being inserted in these venerable structures.
perceive that there are two styles of architecture in Orissa, which ran side by side with one another during the whole course. The first is represented by the temples of Parasurāmeswar and Mukteswar (Woodcuts No. 312, 313); the second by the great temple (Woodcut No. 315). They are not antagonistic, but sister styles, and seem certainly to have had at least partially different origins. We can find affinities with that of the Mukteswar group in Dhārwar and most parts of northern India: but I know of nothing exactly like the great temple anywhere else. It seems to be quite indigenous, and if not the most beautiful, it is the simplest and most majestic of the Indo-Aryan styles. And I cannot help suspecting a wooden origin for it—the courses look so much more like carved logs of wood laid one upon another than courses of masonry, and the mode and extent to which they are carved certainly savours of the same material. There is a mosque built of Deodar pine in Kashmir, to be referred to thereafter, which certainly seems to favour this idea; but till we find some older temples than any yet discovered in Orissa this must remain in doubt. Meanwhile, it may be well to point out that the majority of the older temples in Orissa follow the type of the great temple, and the rest that of Parasurāmeswar; but the two get confounded together in the 9th and 10th centuries, and are mixed together into what may almost be called a new style in the Rājarānī and temples of the 11th and 12th centuries.

Kanārak.

With, perhaps, the single exception of the temple of Jagannāth at Puri, there is no temple in India better known, and about which more has been written than the so-called Black Pagoda at Kanārak, 19 miles north-east from Puri; nor is there any one whose date and dedication is better known, since the literature on the subject can here be depended upon. Stirling's statement that the present edifice was built by the Rāja Narasingh-deva I., who ruled from about 1238 to 1264, is supported by copperplate inscriptions. Complete as this evidence appears, one is almost tempted to question it, for the simple reason that it seems improbable—after the erection of so inferior a specimen of the art as the temple of Puri (a.m. 1100) appears to be—the style could have reverted to anything so beautiful as this. In general design and detail it is so similar to the Jagamohan of the great temple at Bhuvaneswar that at first sight I should be inclined to place it in the same century;

still the details of the tower exhibit a progress towards modern forms which is unmistakable. Abul Fazl after describing the temple with considerable detail and circumspection and ascribing it to Raja Narasingh-deva I., adds that “it is said to be a work of 730 years’ antiquity.” In other words, it was erected about A.D. 860, or just about 400 years before Narasingh’s date which must arise from an error in the hundreds figure. Narasingh-deva must, however, have employed architects of very different tastes and abilities to those engaged a century earlier in erecting the Puri temple.

Another point of interest connected with this temple is, that all authors, apparently following Abul Fazl, agree that it was, like the temple of Mārtand, in Kashmir (ante, vol. i., p. 259), dedicated to the sun. Sun-worship, we know, was prevalent in various parts of India, previous to the 12th century, but it seems to have become merged in the Vishnu cult—Surya-Nārāyana being regarded as a form of Vishnu. In the west of India there are remains of quite a number of sun-temples of about the eleventh century, and probably others will be found in Central India and elsewhere, when looked for.

This temple differs in no respect from other temples of Vishnu found in Orissa. The architectural forms are identical; they are adorned with the same symbols. The Navagraha, or nine planetary divinities, adorned the lintel of this as of all the temples of the district. The seven-headed serpent-forms are found on every temple, from the great one at Bhuvaneswar to this one, and it is only distinguishable from those of Siva by the obscenities that disfigure a part of its sculptures. This is, unfortunately, only too common a characteristic of Vaishnava temples all over India, but is not frequent in Saiva temples. A detached mandap that stood in front of it, occupying a corresponding place to that at Mudhera, and the fine stambha were removed to Puri, in the 18th century, by the Marathas; a corner of the sikhar was still standing in 1839, but within the next thirty years had disappeared; and the great lintel over the entrance to the principal hall, carved with the Navagraha, with other parts about the doorway had fallen, or were removed, and an abortive attempt was made to carry the lintel to Calcutta.

Architecturally, the great beauty of this temple arises from

1 When I visited Orissa in 1837 and sketched this temple, a great part of the tower was still standing. See ‘Pictorial Illustrations of Indian Architecture,’ plate iii. It has since fallen entirely.
2 ‘Ayeen Akbery,’ Gladwin’s translation, vol. ii. p. 16. Jarrett’s version (vol. ii. pp. 128-129) reads:—“It is said that somewhat over 730 years ago Raja Narasingh Deo completed this stupendous fabric and left this mighty memorial to posterity.”
3 Arka is a name of the sun as the “lightner”; the place is mentioned as Arka-kshetra or Padma-kshetra.
4 ‘Archaeological Survey of Western India,’ vol. ix. pp. 73, 74.
the form of the design of the roof of the Jagamohan, or porch—the only part now remaining. Both in dimensions and detail, it is extremely like that of the great temple at Bhubaneswar, but it is here divided into three storeys instead of two, which is an immense improvement, and it rises at a more agreeable angle. The first and second storeys consist of six cornices each, the third of five only, as shown in the diagram Woodcut No. 184. The two lower ones are carved with infinite beauty and variety on all their twelve faces, and the antefixæ at the angles and breaks are used with an elegance and judgment a true Yavana could hardly have surpassed. There is, so far as I know, no roof in India where the same play of light and shade is obtained with an equal amount of richness and constructive propriety as in this instance, nor one that sits so gracefully on the base that supports it.

Internally, the chamber is singularly plain, but presents some constructive peculiarities worthy of attention. On the floor, it is about 40 ft. square, and the walls rise plain to about the same height. Here it begins to bracket inwards, till it contracts to about 20 ft., where it was ceiled with a flat stone roof, supported by wrought-iron beams—Stirling says nine, nearly 1 ft. square by 12 ft. to 18 ft. long.\(^1\) My measurements made the section less—8 in. to 9 in., but the length greater, 23 ft.; and Babu Râjendralâl points out that one, 21 ft. long, has a square section of 8 in. at the end, but a depth of 11 in. in the centre,\(^2\) showing a knowledge of the properties and strength of the material that would be remarkable, were it not that they seem to be formed of blocks of short lengths, 3 or 4 in. square, built together, like bricks, and then covered with molten metal. The iron pillar at Delhi (Woodcut No. 373) is a more remarkable example than this, and no satisfactory explanation has yet been given as to the mode in which it was manufactured,—though it may possibly have been by a similar method. Its object, however, is plain, while the employment of these beams here is a mystery. They were not wanted for strength, as the building is still firm after they have fallen, and so expensive a false ceiling was not wanted architecturally to roof so plain a chamber.\(^3\) It seems to be only another instance of that pro- fusion of labour which the Hindûs loved to lavish on the temples of their gods.

---

\(^1\) *Asiatic Researches,* vol. xv. p. 330.

\(^2\) These discrepancies arose from the fact that the beams lay on the floor buried under the ruins of the stone roof they once supported, and it was extremely difficult to get at them so as to obtain correct measurements.

\(^3\) See ante, p. 95. The present survey furnishes no information, nor seems to have made any architectural drawings of the structural arrangements and details of the interior before burying it from all future examination.
When from the old capital we turn to Puri, we find a state of affairs more altered than might be expected at the date to which the celebrated temple there belongs. The Somavansa dynasty with their Saiva worship, had been superseded about 1078 by the Gangavansa, who were nominally much devoted to the service of Vishnu; and they set to work at once to signalise their triumph by erecting the temple to Jagannath, which has since acquired such a world-wide celebrity. Puri holds for the Vaishnava cult, the like rank as Benares or Kashi does for the Saiva, or Brindaban (Mathura) for the worship of Krishna.

How this great fame came to be raised by the new sovereign Anantavarma-Chodagangadewa in a style so inferior to those of the previous dynasty must be matter of conjecture. As fresh conquerors, the Gangas might not have accumulated wealth; and, moreover, they would almost certainly employ architects of their own race who were already known to them. These,
coming from the Dekhan, would naturally adopt the leading features of the temples of their native province in preference even to the best traits of the earlier structures. The style would thus be an intrusion breaking in upon the Orissan style. Even Stirling, who was no captious critic, remarks that it seems unaccountable, in an age when the architects obviously possessed some taste and skill, and were in most cases particularly lavish in the use of sculptural ornament, so little pains should have been taken with the decoration and finishing of this sacred and stupendous edifice. It is not in the detail—which, however, is seriously obscured by the plasterings applied during the last two or three centuries,—but the outline, the proportions, and arrangements of the temple, show that the art in this province had received a downward impetus at the time.

As will be seen from the annexed plan (Woodcut No. 310), this temple has a double enclosure, a thing otherwise unknown in the north. Externally it measures 670 ft. by 640 ft., and is surrounded by a wall 20 ft. to 30 ft. high, with four gates. The inner enclosure measures 420 ft. by 315 ft., and is enclosed by a double wall with four openings. Within this last stands the Bará-Dewal, A, measuring 80 ft. across the centre, or 5 ft. more than the great temple at Bhubaneswar; with its porch or Jagamohan, B, it measures 155 ft. east and west, while the great tower rises to a height of 192 ft. Beyond this two other porches were afterwards added, the Nāta-mandir, C, and Bhogamandir, D, making the whole length of the temple about 300 ft., or as nearly as may be the same as that at Bhubaneswar. Besides this there are, as in all great Hindú temples, numberless smaller shrines within the two enclosures, but, as in all instances in the north, they are kept subordinate to the principal one, which here towers supreme over all.

Except in its double enclosure, and a certain irregularity of plan, this temple does not differ materially in arrangement from the great ones at Bhubaneswar and elsewhere; but besides the apparent want of detail already remarked upon, the outline of its vimāna is quite devoid either of that solemn solidity of the earlier examples, or the grace that characterised those subsequently erected; and when we add to this that whitewash and paint have done their worst to add vulgarity to forms already sufficiently ungraceful, it will easily be understood that this, the most famous, is also the most disappointing of northern Hindú

1 'Asiatic Researches,' vol. xv. p. 315.
2 The plan is reduced from one to a scale of 40 ft. to 1 inch, made by an intelligent native assistant to the Public Works Department, named Rádhíka Prásad Mukerji, and is the only plan I ever found done by a native sufficiently correct to be used, except as a diagram, or after serious doctoring.

* Hunter, 'Orissa,' vol. i. p. 128.
temples. As may be seen from the following illustration (Woodcut No. 320), the parts are so nearly the same as those found in all the older temples at Bhuvaneswar, that the difference could

1 News reached this country, about thirty-two years ago, of a curious accident having happened in this temple. Just after the gods had been removed from their Sinhāsan to take their annual excursion to the Gundichā-ghar, some stones of the roof fell in, and would have killed any attendants, and smashed the gods had they not fortunately all been absent. Assuming the interior of the Barā-Dewal to be as represented (Woodcut No. 184), it is not easy to see how this could have happened. But in the same woodcut the porch or Jagamohan of the Kanārak pagoda is represented with a flat false roof, which had fallen. That roof, however, was formed of stone laid on iron beams, and looked as if it could only have been shaken down by an earthquake. I have little doubt that a similar false roof was formed some way up the tower over the altar at Puri, but formed probably of stone laid on wooden beams, and either decay or the
hardly be expressed in words; even the woodcut, however, is sufficient to show how changed they are in effect, but the building itself should be seen fully to appreciate the degradation in style.

JÁJPUR AND KATAK.

Jáipur, on the Baitaran, was one of the old capitals of the province, and even now contains temples which, from the squareness of their forms, may be old, but, if so, they have been so completely disguised by a thick coating of plaster, that their carvings are entirely obliterated, and there is nothing by which their age can be determined. The place was the scene of the struggle in the 16th century between the Musalmâns and Hindûs for the mastery of the province; and, under Sulaimân and his Afghân soldiers, it was reduced to ruins. Like Anhilapur in Gujarât, the ruined structures became a quarry for building materials, and the handsome mosque built by Nâwâb Abu Nasir Khân in 1681 was raised out of the ancient Hindû remains.¹ There is one pillar, however, still standing, which deserves to be illustrated as one of the most pleasing examples of its class in India (Woodcut No. 321). Its proportions are beautiful, and its details in excellent taste; but the mouldings of the base, which are those on which the Hindûs were accustomed to lavish the utmost care, have, unfortunately, been destroyed.² Originally it is said to have supported a figure of Garuda—the Vâhana of Vishnu—and a figure is white ants having destroyed the timber, the stones have fallen as narrated.

A similar roof so supported on wooden beams still exists in the structural temple on the shore at Mâmallapuram, and, I have no doubt, elsewhere, but it is almost impossible to get access to these cells when the gods are at home, and the places are so dark it is equally impossible to see, except when in ruins, how they were roofed.

¹ For an account of Jáipur antiquities, see Sir W. W. Hunter's 'Orissa,' vol. i, pp. 265-273; or his 'Statistical Account of Bengal,' vol. xvii. pp. 85-89. He adds that the Public Works officers tore down "the last remnants of the ancient palace, and built bridges along the Trunk Road with the stones." ² The shaft is a chlorite monolith 29 ft. 9 in. in height, standing on a base of three plinths, 7 ft. in height. 'Proceedings As. Soc. Bengal,' 1872, part i. at p. 31; Workman's 'Through Town and Jungle,' pp. 218f.
pointed out as the identical one. It may be so, and if it is the case, the pillar is of the 10th or 11th century. This also seems to be the age of some remarkable pieces of sculpture which were discovered some years ago on the brink of the river, where they had apparently been thrown down by Muhammadan bigotry. They are in quite a different style from anything at Bhuvaneswar or Kanârak, and probably more ancient than anything of the same kind at those places.

Katak, according to tradition, became the capital of the country in A.D. 989-1006, when a certain Markat Kesari is said to have built a stone revêtement to protect the site from encroachment of the river. It too, however, has suffered, first from the intolerant bigotry of the Moslim, and afterwards from the stolid indifference of the British rulers, so that very little remains. But for this the great palace of Makund Deo, the contemporary of Akbar, might still remain to us in such a state at least as to be intelligible. Abul Fazl’s description of this palace, however, has been misunderstood by the translators, who have represented it as “consisting of nine storeys,” instead of nine courts or enclosures. “The first enclosure was for elephants, camels, and horses; the second for artillery and military stores where also were quarters for the guards and other attendants; the third was occupied by porters and watchmen; the fourth was appropriated for the several artificers; the kitchens made the fifth range; the sixth contained the Râja’s public apartments; the seventh was for the transaction of private business; the eighth was where the women resided; and the ninth was the Râja’s sleeping apartment.” “To the south,” he adds, “of this palace is a very ancient Hindû temple.”

As Orissa at the period when this was written was practically a part of Akbar’s kingdom, there seems little doubt that Abul Fazl’s description was furnished by some one who knew the place.

Although it thus consequently happens that we have no more means of ascertaining what the civil edifices of the Indo-Aryans of Orissa were like, than we have of those of the contemporary Dravidians, there is a group of engineering objects which throw some light on the arts of the period. ‘As has been

1 They were of more than life size and represented three of the Mâtris.
3 Ibid. p. 335; Hunter’s ‘Orissa,’ vol. i. p. 266.
TEMPLE OF PÂRSWANÂTH AT KHAJURÂHO
OLD JAINA TEMPLE AT LAKKUNDI

DOME IN VIMALA'S TEMPLE, MOUNT ÁBÛ
INTERIOR OF TEJAHPALA'S TEMPLE AT MOUNT ABÛ
SINNAR: TEMPLE OF GONDESVARA, FROM THE SOUTH
TEMPLE OF JUGAL SISHOR AT BRINDABAN

AMARANATH SAIVA TEMPLE, NEAR KALYAN
PALACE IN GWÀLIAR FORT, FROM THE ASCENT

'ALÀI GATEWAY AT OLD DELHI
frequently stated above, the Hindûs hate an arch, and never will use it except under compulsion. The Muhammadans taught them to get over their prejudices and employ the arch in their civil buildings in later times, but to the present day they avoid it in their temples in so far as it is possible to do so. In Orissa, however, in the 13th century, they built numerous bridges in various parts of the province, but never employed a true arch in any of them. The Athara-nalâ bridge at Pûrî has been drawn

and described by Stirling, and is the finest in the province of those still in use. He ascribes its construction to Kabir Narsingh-deva II., about 1280; Râjendralâl Mitra placed it two centuries earlier. Between the abutments it is 278 ft. long, with nineteen spans of 7 to 16 ft. wide, and with a roadway 38 ft. wide. That shown in the above woodcut (No. 322) is at Jâîpur and is probably older, and certainly more picturesque, though constructed on the same identical plan. It may be unscientific, but many of these old bridges are standing and

1 From the Pûrî temple annals.—'Antiquities of Orissa,' vol. ii. p. 112. Neither date has satisfactory authority.
in use while many of those we have constructed out of the ruins of the temples and palaces have been swept away as if a curse were upon them.

Before leaving these Orissa temples mention may be made of three at Mukhalingam, in Ganjam district, a place of pilgrimage adjoining the town of Nagarakatakan. This was the site of Kalinganagara, the old capital of the eastern Ganga dynasty of Kalinga before, and for some time after, their conquest of Orissa in the 11th century. The place is described as a wilderness of ruins, and the largest and most entire of the temples consists of a shrine and mandap with two rows of three plain pillars in each supporting the roof. Outside, this roof is in the Orissa form, somewhat flat and with three finials in line across it. The shrine is surmounted by a tower or sikharā of numerous thin moulded courses, crowned by a double amalasita with domed apex and small finial. The doorway, on the east, is deeply recessed and has two broad frames round the entrance—the inner sunk considerably within the outer—and both richly carved on their faces and lintels with floral patterns. This is flanked by square jambs sculptured on the front with figures in compartments and supporting a projecting lintel. Projecting still more on each side is a richly carved pilaster with capitals of the Gupta type, supporting an upper lintel crowded with figures.

Smaller temples occupy the corners of the court, which is enclosed by a wall, and has entrances on the east and south sides. The gateway in front of the temple has, like Orissan porches, a stepped roof with leogriifes over it. The entry, like that of the mandap, is considerably recessed, the inner jambs and three lintels being elaborately carved.

Of the Bhimesvara temple only the shrine and mandap remain, and are of the general style of the Mukhalingesvara just described. When its inscriptions have been fully examined, some definite clue may be found to determine its date, which may perhaps be of the 11th century. But the finest of the group has been the Somesvar temple, of which only the sikhara remains. It resembles in its proportions and variety of sculptures the Parasurāmeswar temple at Bhuvaneswar. The carving round the three niches on each face are exceedingly elaborate and interesting. But until we have the fuller illustrations of a survey or some epigraphical guidance, we may

---

1 Nagarakatakan is on the Vamradhārā river, in Lat. 18° 34' N., long 84° 2' E., about 20 miles N.N.W. from the modern Kalingapatam, and within the Parla-Kimedi estate.

2 These pillars and the walls bear inscriptions, some of which are said to go back to the 10th century.
assume that it belongs to the later part of the 11th or to the 12th century.\(^1\)

**CONCLUSION.**

The above may be considered as a somewhat meagre account of one of the most complete and interesting styles of Indian architecture. It would, however, be impossible to do it justice without an amount of illustration incompatible with the scope of this work, and with details drawn on a larger scale than its pages admit of.\(^2\)

An attempted classification, though merely tentative, has on several occasions been made in order to attract attention to the subject, in hopes that some one with opportunities and knowledge might examine and revise it. With only such photographs as are available to depend upon, we can come to no satisfactory conclusions: at best they give only a partial, literally one-sided view of a building, and to ascertain its age we ought to be able to look all round it, and make ourselves familiar with its locality and surroundings. The thing will not be satisfactorily done till some one visits Orissa who has sufficient knowledge of the principles of archaeology to arrange the temples in a chronometric scale; and this should not be difficult, the buildings are so uniform in character, and their architects expressed so simply and unaffectedly the feelings and art of their age.

A good monograph of the Orissan style would convey a more correct idea of what Indian art really is than a similar account of any other style we are acquainted with in India. From the erection of the temples of Parasurâmeswar and others, perhaps in the 7th century, to that of Jagannâth at Puri, A.D. 1100, the style steadily progresses without admixture of foreign elements, while the examples are so numerous that one might be found for every fifty years of the period, and we might thus have a chronometric scale of Hindû art during these centuries that would be invaluable for application to other places or styles. It is also in Orissa and Kâlinga, if anywhere, that we may hope to find the *incunabula* that will explain much that is now mysterious in the forms of the temples and the origin of many parts of their ornamentation.

---

1 The editor is indebted to Bâlu Monmohran Chakravarti, B.A., for valuable information bearing on the contents of this chapter and of that on the Orissa caves, as also for the use of photographs and notes on these temples which have formed the basis of the above account.

2 Thirty years ago it was hoped that Râjendralâl Mitra’s work would, to some extent at least, have supplied the deficiency of the first draft of this outline; but this expectation was not realised by its publication in 1880. With a moderate knowledge of the science of archaeology and accuracy of observation it would not have been very difficult to arrange the temples in some sort of approximate sequence determined, by careful study of the style. Nor has much information in this direction been added since.
It is not only, however, that many technical questions will be answered when any competent person undertakes a thorough examination of the ruins, but they will afford a picture of the civilisation and of the arts and religion of an Indian community during seven centuries of isolation from external influences, such as can hardly be obtained from any other source. So far as we at present know, it is a singularly pleasing picture, and one that will well repay any pains that may be taken to present it to the English public in a complete and intelligible form.

Tentative List of Dates of the Principal Orissan Temples.¹

Dates.

650-900

Parasarâmésvar, N.W. from Mukteswar.
Sisirésvar.
Kapâlinâ.
Uttarâsvar.
Somâsvar at Mukhalingam.
Sâri Deula.
Mukteswar, S. from Siddheswar.
Lingarâj, Tribhuvaneswar or Bhuvaneswar Great Temple.
Kedârâsvar, S. from Mukteswar.
Siddheswar, 50 yards N. from Mukteswar.

Bhagavâtî.

Somâsvar, 250 yards N. from the Great Temple.
Brahmeswar.
Mukhalingeswar.
Virâjâ and Varâhanâth at Jâipur.
Mârkandeswar at Puri.
Nâkeswar.
Bhâskarâsvar.

900-1000

Râjarâni, 300 yards N.E. from Mukteswar.
Chitrâkarnâ.
Kapileswar.
Râmeswar.
Yameswar.

12th century

Maitreswar.
Great Temple of Jagannâth at Puri.
Megheswar.
Vâsudeva, on S.E. of the Vindusâgara tank.
Kanârak Sun Temple.

13th century

Nâta Mandap of Lingarâja temple.
Vishnu temple at Mâdob, in Katak district.
Gopinâth at Remunâ.

The object of this, or any chronological classification of such a series of temples, is to bring us nearer a solution of one of the most obscure problems that perplex the student of Indian architecture.

¹ This list must not be regarded as in any sense authoritative; rather it is submitted for revision on larger knowledge. Were these temples photographed and planned in the way the Dutch Archaeological Survey of Java does its work, it would be possible to arrange definitely the Orissa temples.
CHAPTER III.

WESTERN INDIA.

CONTENTS.

Dhárwár—Brahmanical Rock-cut Temples, at Elûrâ, Bâdâmi, Elephanta, Dhamnâr, and Poona.

Dhárwár

If the province of Orissa is interesting from the completeness and uniformity of its style of Indo-Aryan architecture, that of Dhárwár, or, more correctly speaking of Mahârâshtra, is almost equally so from exactly the opposite conditions. In the western province, the Dravidian style struggles with the northern for supremacy during all the earlier stages of their growth, and the mode in which the one influenced the other will be one of the most interesting and instructive lessons we can learn from their study, when the materials are available for a thorough investigation of the architectural history of this province. In magnificence, however, the western can never pretend to rival the eastern province. There are more and far finer buildings in the one city of Bhuvaneswar alone than in all the cities of Mahârâshtra put together, and the extreme elaboration of their details gives the Orissan examples a superiority that the western temples cannot pretend to rival.

Among the oldest and most characteristic of the Dhárwár temples is that of Pápanâtha, at Pattadakal. As will be seen from the plan of this temple given above (Woodcut No. 182, vol. i., page 322), the cell, with its tower, has not the same predominating importance which it always had in Orissa; and instead of a mere vestibule it has a four-pillared porch, which would in itself be sufficient to form a complete temple on the eastern side of India. Beyond this, however, is the great porch, Mandapa, or Jagamohan—square, as usual, but here it possesses sixteen pillars, in four groups, instead of the aṣṭāy ār arrangements so common in the east. It is, in fact, a copy, with very slight alterations, of the plan of the great Saiva temple at the same place (Woodcut No. 204), or the Kailâs at Elûrâ (Woodcut No. 199). These, with others, form a group of early temples
wholly Dravidian in style, but having no affinity, except in plan, with the temple of Pāpanātha, which is as essentially Indo-Aryan in its architectural arrangements. This, in fact, may be looked upon as the characteristic difference between the styles of Dhārwar and Orissa. The western style, from its proximity to the Dravidian and admixture with it, in fact, used pillars freely and with effect whenever wanted; while their use in Orissa is almost unknown in the best ages of the style, and their introduction, as it took place there, showed only too clearly the necessity that had arisen in the decay of the style, to supply with foreign forms the want of originality of invention.

The external effect of the building may be judged of from the above woodcut (No. 323). The outline of the tower is not unlike that of the Parasurāmeswar temple at Bhuvaneswar, with which it was probably contemporary — cir. A.D. 700—
but the central belt is more pronounced, and always apparently was on the west side of India. It will also be observed in this tower that every third course has on the angle a form which has been described as an amalaka in speaking of the crowning members of northern temples. Here it looks as if the two intermediate courses simulated roofs, or a roof in two storeys, and then this crowning member was introduced, and the same thing repeated over and over again till the requisite height was obtained. In the Parasurâmesvar there are three intermediate courses (Woodcut No. 312); in the great tower at Bhuvaneswar, five; and in the more modern temples they disappear from the angles, but are supplied by the miniature temple-forms applied to the sides. In the temple at Bodh-Gayâ the same form occurs (Woodcut No. 19) on the angle of each storey; but there it looks more like the capital of a pillar, which, in fact, I believe to be its real original. But from whatever form derived, this repetition on the angles is in the best possible taste; the eye is led upwards by it, and is prepared for the crowning member, which is thus no longer isolated and alone, but a part of a complete design.

The frequency of the repetition of this ornament is, so far as is now known, no bad test of the age of a temple. If an example were found where every alternate course was an amalaka, it probably would be older than any temple we have yet known. It would then represent a series of roofs, five, seven, or nine storeys, built over one another. It had, however, passed into conventionalities before we meet with it.

To the north-west of Aihole is a Saiva cave-temple,¹ and near it on the north-west is an old temple with a porch on four plain square pillars, the mandap built of massive stones, with a sloping roof, a pradakshina round the shrine, and, from the figure of Kârttikeya on the roof of the entrance porch and of Garuda on the lintel of the shrine door, it was evidently dedicated to Vishnu (Plate XXIII.) It is known as the temple of Huchchhîmallîgudi, and appears to be of quite as early a date as any at Bhuvaneswar or elsewhere. The .Sikharâ is relatively small, and if we compare this temple with that of Parasurâmeswar (Woodcut No. 312), we observe that the latter is much more developed in style than the former. Unfortunately we have no direct record of its construction, the only indication of its date is an inscription on the north side of the west front, recording a grant for oil made in the thirteenth year of the Chalukya King Vijayâditya, that is in 718 A.D.;² but the temple was clearly then established, we know not how

² 'Indian Antiquary,' vol. viii. p. 284.
long previously, though we may fairly assume that it had been erected at least as early as, if not before, the reign of Vikram-ādiyā (655 to 680 A.D.). Indeed, comparing it with the temple of Pāpanātha at Pattadakal (Woodcut No. 323) we are at once struck by the more ancient style of the features of this, and would be quite prepared, on fair evidence, to ascribe it to the beginning of the 7th century or soon after.

When the drawings made by the Archaeological Survey of the temples of this district¹ are completely published, they will, no doubt, throw immense light on the early history of this style.¹ As the case now stands, however, the principal interest centres in the caves of Bādāmi, which being the only Brahmanical caves known that have a positive date upon them, they give us a fixed point from which to reason in respect of other series such as we never had before.

**Brahmanical Rock-cut Temples.**

Although the structural temples of the Bādāmi group² in Dharwār are of such extreme interest, as has been pointed out above, they are surpassed in importance, for our present purposes at least, by the rock-cut examples.

At Bādāmi there are three caves, not of any great dimensions, but of singular interest from their architectural details and sculptures, and more so from the fact that one of them, No. 3, contains an inscription with an undoubted date upon it. There are, as pointed out above, innumerable Buddhist inscriptions on the western caves, but none with dates from any well-ascertained era, and none, unfortunately, of the Brahmanical caves at Elūrā or elsewhere have inscriptions that can be fully deciphered, and not one with a date on it. The consequence is, that the only mode by which their ages could be approximated was by arranging them in sequences, according to our empirical or real knowledge of the history of the period during which they were supposed to have been excavated. At Elūrā, for instance, it was assumed that the Buddhist preceded the Brahmanical excavations, and that these were succeeded by the Jaina; and various local and architectural peculiarities

¹ The works as yet published on this subject are the ‘Architecture in Dharwār and Mysore,’ fol., 100 plates, Murray, 1866; Burgess’s ‘Archæological Report on the Belagām and Kaladgi Districts,’ 1874; and Rea’s ‘Chalukyan Architecture,’ 1896.

² For architectural purposes the three places may be considered as one. Aihole is about 7 miles north-east of Pattadakal, and Pattadakal 8 miles east-north-east from Bādāmi. Fifteen miles covers the whole, which must have been in the 6th or 7th century a place of great importance, Vatāpipura or Bādāmi being then the capital of the Chalukyas—‘Journal Royal Asiatic Society,’ vol. iv. p. 9; ‘Indian Antiquary,’ vol. viii. p. 243.
rendered this hypothesis extremely probable. Arguing on this basis, it was found that the one chaitya cave there, the Viswa-
karma, was nearly identical in style with the last of the four chaityas at Ajantá (No. 26), and that cave, for reasons given above, was placed at the end of the 6th century, say A.D. 600. The caves next it were assumed to occupy the 7th century, thus leading on to the Rāmeswara group, about A.D. 700, and the Jaina group would then have occupied the 9th century. The age of the Kailās or Dravidian group, being exceptional, could only be determined by extraneous evidence, and, as already pointed out, from its extreme similarity with the great temple at Pattadakal, belongs almost certainly to the 8th century; and from a similar chain of reasoning the Jaina group is brought back to a slightly subsequent age.

The inscription of the No. 3 cave at Bādāmi is dated in the twelfth year of the reign of a well-known king, Kirtivarman I., in ‘the 500th year after the inauguration of the Saka king’; the date therefore is A.D. 578. Admitting, which I think its architecture renders nearly certain, that it is the earliest of the three, still they are so like one another, that the latest may be assumed to have been excavated within the limits of the next century, say A.D. 575-680. Comparing the architecture of this group with that known as the central or Rāmeswara group at Elūrā, it is so nearly identical, that though it may be slightly more modern, it can hardly now be doubted they too, including perhaps the cave known as the Rāvana-ka-khai, must have been excavated in the 7th century. Instead, therefore, of the sequence formerly adopted, we are forced to fall back on that marvellous picture of religious toleration described by the Chinese Pilgrim as exhibited at Allahābād in the year A.D. 643. On that occasion the King Harsha Silāditya distributed alms or gifts to 10,000 priests (religieux), the first day in honour of Buddha, the second of Āditya the Sun, and the third in honour of Īśvara or Siva;¹ and the eighteen kings who assisted at this splendid quinquennial festival seem promiscuously to have honoured equally these three divinities. With this toleration at headquarters, we ought not to be surprised if we find the temples of different religions overlapping one another to some extent.

As a reminiscence of the eclecticism of the time, it requires some experience in the antiquary to ascertain to what divinity a temple or cave, before the 8th century, was dedicated. In the Dās Āvatāra and Rāvan-ka-khai caves at Elūrā, for

¹ ‘Histoire de Hsiouen Thsang,’ p. 255; ‘Vie et Voyages,’ tome i. p. 280; or Beal’s ‘Buddhist Records,’ vol. i. p. 233; and ‘Life,’ pp. 185f.
instance, we find the sculptures about equally divided between

\[\text{Saiva and Vaishnava subjects, whilst the shrines contain}
\text{lingams of Siva; and in two of the three Bādāmi caves,}\]
whilst the larger figures are mostly Vaishnava, the others are largely Saiva, and the vedis or altars in the middle of both shrines may properly be supposed to have supported the emblem of Siva.

The Dās Avatāra (No. 15) at Elūrā, is a two-storeyed cave, very similar in its architectural details to the Buddhist Dōn Thal and Tin Thal, but the sculptures are all Brahmanical. At first sight it seems as if the excavation had been made by the Buddhists, and appropriated and finished by their successors. But on examination it appears that we owe it entirely to the Brāhmans. It is, perhaps, the earliest Brahmanical temple here; and it is natural to suppose that when the Saivas attempted to rival their antagonists in cave-temples they should follow the models that already existed, merely appropriating them to their own worship. The circumstance, however, that makes this most probable is the existence of a pseudo-structural mandapa, or shrine of the Nandi, in the courtyard (Woodcut No. 324); this evidently must have been a part of the original design, or the rock would

1 Reduced from 'Cave Temples of India,' plate 74.
not have been left here for it, and it is a model of the usual structural building found in Saiva temples in different parts of India.\(^1\) This is a piece of bad grammar the Buddhists never were guilty of; their excavations always are caves, whilst the great characteristic of Brahmanical excavations, as distinguished from that of their predecessors, is that they generally copied structural buildings, a system that rose to its greatest height in the Kailâs, already described (vol. i., page 344). The Buddhist excavations, on the contrary, were always caves and nothing else. The ground floor is little more than a corridor, 95 ft. in length, and about 30 ft. deep, with cells. The upper storey hall, of which Woodcut No. 325 is the plan, is nearly square—95 ft. wide by 97 ft. deep—the roof supported by forty-four square pillars, of which those in front are richly carved. The recesses between the pilasters in the side walls are filled with large sculptures in alto-rilievo—those on the north side being Saiva, and on the other mostly Vaishnava.

Unfortunately there are no Buddhist buildings or caves so far south as Bâdâmi, and we are consequently deprived of that means for comparison: such as are south of Kârlê, at Karhâd, etc., are of little or no account architecturally. The result, however, of the translations of inscriptions collected during the last thirty-five years, and of the surveys made, leads us to compress our history of the western caves within narrower limits than at one time seemed necessary. The caves in the south of Bijâpûr district seem all to be comprised between the years 500 and 750 A.D., and those at Elûrà, being synchronous, must also, with the exception of the Jaina caves, be limited to the same period of time, with probably a slight extension either way.

The following may now be offered as an approximate chronology of the far-famed series of caves at Elûrà:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Buddhist} & : \text{Virvakarma to Tin Thá!} & 500-650 \\
\text{Hindû} & : \text{Dâs Avatâra, Râvan-ka-Khai, and Râmesvara} & 650-750 \\
& \text{Dhumar Lena and others} & 750-850 \\
\text{Dravidian} & : \text{Kailâs} & 750-800 \\
\text{Jaina} & : \text{Indra and Jagannâth Sabhâs, etc.} & 800-1100
\end{align*}
\]

The cave at Elephanta follows of course the date here given for the Dhumâr Lena, and must thus date after the middle of the 8th century.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) The Râshtrakûta inscription on this mandapa is only very partially legible, and is probably of later date than the work. — 'Archeological Survey of Western India,' vol. v. p. 87.  
\(^2\) This is the date given in the description in 'The Caves of Elephanta,' Bombay, 1871, p. 5.
These dated caves and buildings have also rendered another service to the science of archæology, inasmuch as they enabled us to state with confidence, even before the inscriptions were properly translated, that the principal caves at Māmallapuram must be circumscribed within the same limits. The architecture there being so lean and poor, is most misleading, but, as hinted above, I believe it arose from the fact that it was Dravidian, and copied literally from structural buildings, by people who had not the long experience of the Buddhists in cave architecture to guide them. But be that as it may, a comparison of the Hindū sculptures at Bādāmi with those of Elūrā on the one hand, and Māmallapuram on the other, renders it certain that they were practically contemporary. The famous bas-relief of Durgā, on her lion, slaying Mahishāsura, the Minotaur,⁴ is earlier than one very similar to it at Elūrā; and one, the Virātarūpa or Vāmana, is later by probably a century than the sculpture of the same subject in cave 3 at Bādāmi.⁵ Some of the other bas-reliefs are later, some earlier, than those representing similar subjects in the three series, but it seems now impossible to get over the fact that they are practically synchronous. Even the great bas-relief, which I was inclined to assign to a more modern period, probably belongs to the 7th or 8th century. The great Nāga king, whom all the world are there worshipping, is represented as a man whose head is shaded by a seven-headed serpent-hood, but also with a serpent-body from the waist downwards. That form was not known in the older Buddhist sculptures, but has now been found on all the Orissan temples (for instance Woodcut No. 318), and frequently at Bādāmi.⁶ This difficulty being removed, there seems no reason why this gigantic sculpture should not take the place, which its state of execution would otherwise assign to it—say A.D. 700—as a mean date, subject to a subsequent adjustment.⁷

In a general work like the present it is of course impossible to illustrate so extensive a group as that of the Brahmanical caves to such an extent as to render their history or affinities intelligible to those who have not by any other means become familiar with the subject. Fortunately, however, in this instance, sufficient literature on the subject is available by which any one may readily attain the desired information.⁸

---

¹ 'Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society,' vol. ii. plate 4.
² Loc. cit. plate 6; and Burgess, 'Report on Belgām,' etc., plate 31.
³ Loc. cit. plates 20, 23, 40.
⁴ There is a second bas-relief, almost similar but in worse preservation, about 30 yards south from this.
⁵ Apart from the older works, reference may be made to 'The Cave Temples of India' (1880), pp. 165 et seqq.; the 'Reports of the Archaeological Survey of Western India,' vols. i. iii. v. and vi.; and 'The Rock Temples of Elephanta' (Bombay, 1871).
After all, however, the subject is one more suited to the purposes of the mythologist and the sculptor than to the architect. Like all rock-cut examples, except the Dravidian, the caves have the intolerable defect of having no exteriors, and consequently no external architectural form. The only parts of them which strictly belong to architectural art are their pillars, and though a series of them would be interesting, they vary so much, from the nature of the material in which they are carved, and from local circumstances, that they do not possess the same historical significance that external forms would afford. Such a pillar, for instance, as this one from the cave called Lankesvara on the side of the pit in which the Kailâs stands (Woodcut No. 326), though in exquisite taste as a rock-cut example, where the utmost strength is apparently required to support the mass of rock above, does not afford any points of comparison with structural examples of the same age. In a building it would be cumbersome and absurd; under a mass of rock it is elegant and appropriate. The pillars in the caves at Mâmallapuram fail from the opposite fault: they retain their structural form, though used in the rock, and look frail and weak in consequence; but while this diversity in practice prevailed, it prevents their use as a chronometric scale being appreciated, as it would be if the practice had been uniform. As, however, No. 3 at Bâdâmi is a cave with a positive date, A.D. 578, it may be well to give a plan and section (Woodcuts Nos. 327 and 328) to illustrate its peculiarities, so as to enable a comparison to be made between it and other examples. Its details will be found fully illustrated in the first volume of the Survey of Western India.

Though not one of the largest, it is still a fine cave, its verandah measuring 70 ft., with a depth of 50 ft., beyond which is a simple plain cell, containing the altar for the image. At one end of the verandah is the Narasinha Avatâra; at the
other end Vishnu seated on the five-headed serpent Ananta. The front pillars have three brackets each, of very wooden design, all of which are ornamented by two or three figures, generally a male and female, with a child or dwarf—all of considerable beauty and delicacy of execution. The inner pillars are varied, and more architectural in their forms, but in the best style of Hindū art.¹

Compared with the style of art found at Amarāvatī, on the opposite coast, it is curious to observe how nearly Buddha, seated on the many-headed Nāga,² resembles Vishnu on Ananta in the next woodcut, and though the religion is changed, the art has hardly altered to such an extent as might be expected, considering that three centuries at least had probably elapsed between the execution of these two bas-reliefs. The change of religion, however, is complete.

Sometimes the Hindūs successfully conquered one of the main difficulties of cave architecture by excavating them on the spur of a hill, as in the Dhumar Lenā at Elūrā, and by surrounding them by courts, as there and at Elephanta and at Jogeswar; so that light was introduced on three sides instead of only one, as was too often the case both with Buddhist and Hindū excavations. These, though probably among the last, are certainly the finest Hindū excavations existing, if looked at from an architectural point of view. The Elūrā example is the larger and finer, measuring 149 ft. by 148 (Woodcut No. 329). That at Elephanta, though extremely similar in general arrangement (No. 330), is less regular in

¹ Burgess, 'Report on Belgam and Kaladgi,' plates 24–35. ² 'Tree and Serpent Worship,' plate 76; and 'Cave Temples of India,' plate 39.
plan, and also somewhat smaller, measuring only 130 ft. by 129 ft. It is easy to see that if these temples stood in the open they would only be porches, like that at Belûr (Woodcut No. 257), and numberless other examples, which are found everywhere; but the necessities of rock-cut architecture required generally that the cella should be placed inside the mandapa, or porch, instead of externally to it, as was always the case in structural examples. This, perhaps, was hardly to be regretted; but it shows how little the practice of cutting temples in the rock was suited to the temple-forms of the Hindûs, and we need not, therefore, feel surprised how readily they abandoned it when any idea of rivalling the Buddhists had ceased to prompt their efforts in this direction.

In the capitals of the pillars in these caves, as represented in the accompanying woodcut (No. 331) from the Elephantâ Cave, we find the perfected form of those ribbed cushion-capitals that are found at Bâdâmi and in so many other caves, dating from at least as early as the 6th century; but in these excavations it seems to have reached its fullest development and beauty of form. From its frequent recurrence of

---

1 Daniell's plan is not quite accurate, but sufficiently so for our purpose. See Cave Temples of India,' plate 79, and Archeological Survey of Western India,' vol. v. plate 37.
earlier and later date it has come to be considered the typical capital of early Indian architecture. It may be compared to the Doric order of classical art as, in the same way, the vase with foliage falling over it, as exemplified in the Râmerwara cave and elsewhere, may be regarded as an Oriental type of the Ionic order. This ribbed cushion form of capital also reminds us of the amalasâlâ crown to Hindû sikhara\(^1\) though we may be unable to say from what it has been derived, we can hardly escape the conviction that in their origin they are akin.

So far as I know, there is only one example where the Indo-Aryan architects attempted to rival the Dravidian in producing a monolithic exterior. It is at a place called Dhamâr, in Rajputana, where, as already mentioned (ante, vol. i, pp. 165 and 200), there is an extensive series of Buddhist excavations. In order to mark their triumph over that fallen faith, the Hindûs, apparently late in the 8th century, drove an open cutting into the side of the hill, till they came to a part high enough for their purpose. Here they enlarged this cutting into a pit 97½ ft. by 67 ft., leaving a Vaishnava temple of elegant architecture standing in the centre, with seven small cells surrounding it, precisely as was done in the case of the Kailâs at Ellûrâ. The effect, however, can hardly be said to be pleasing (Woodcut No. 332). A temple standing in a pit is always an anomaly, but in this instance it is valuable as an unaltered example of the style, and as showing how the small shrines of Sivâlayas\(^2\)—which have too often disappeared—were originally grouped round the greater Saiva shrines. The value of this characteristic we shall be better able to appreciate when we come to describe the temples at Prambanan and other

\(1\) Ante, vol. i, p. 323.

places in Java. The Buddhists had their cells for priests and ascetics; the Jains filled their residential cells with images and made them little temples; and the Hindūs in their shrines made smaller cellæ for the attendants or family of the god.

One more illustration must conclude what we have at present to say of Hindū rock-cut temples. It is the temple of Panchâlesvara at Bhâmburðë near Poona, and is but little known, though much more appropriate to cave architecture
than most examples of its class. The temple itself is a simple pillared hall, with eight pillars in front, and possibly had originally a structural sikhara built on the upper plateau to mark the position of the sanctuary (Woodcut No. 334). The most original part of it, however, is the Nandi pavilion, which stands in the courtyard in front of the temple (Woodcut No. 333). It is circular in plan, and its roof—which is a great slab of rock—was supported by sixteen square pillars of very simple form—four within and twelve in the circumference,—of which four have now crumbled and fallen. Altogether it is as appropriate a bit of design as is to be found in Hindū cave architecture. It has, however, the defect—only too common in those Hindū excavations—that, being in a pit, it can be looked down upon; which is a test very few buildings can stand, and to which none ought to be exposed.

1 There is a similar temple at Āmbā near Mominābād, in the Haiderābād State. — *Archæological Survey of Western India,* vol. iii. p. 50, and plates 33, 34.

2 *Cave Temples of India,* p. 426 and plate 69.