BOOK VII.

INDIAN SARACENIC ARCHITECTURE.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

From a very early period in the world’s history a great group of civilised nations existed in Western Asia between the Mediterranean and the Indus. They lived apart, having few relations with their neighbours, except of war and hatred, and served rather to separate than to bring together the Indian and European communities which flourished beyond them on either hand.

Alexander’s great raid was the first attempt to break through this barrier, and to join the East and West by commercial or social interchanges. The steady organisation of the Roman empire succeeded in consolidating what that brilliant conqueror had sketched out. During the permanence of her supremacy the space intervening between India and Europe was bridged over by the order she maintained among the various communities established in Western Asia, and there seemed no reason why the intercourse so established should be interrupted. Unsuspected, however, by the Roman world, two nomad nations, uninfluenced by its civilisation, hung on either flank of this great line of communication, ready to avail themselves of any moment of weakness that might occur.

The Arabs, as the most impetuous, and nearest the centre, were the first to break their bounds; and in the course of the 7th century Syria, Persia, Egypt, and the north of Africa became theirs. Spain was conquered, and India nearly shared the same fate. Under Mu’awiah, the first Khalifah of the Umayyades, attempts were made to cross the Indus by the southern route—that which the Scythians had successfully followed a short time before. Both these attempts failed, but under Walid, Muhammad ibn Qâsim, A.H. 93 (A.D. 712), they did
effect a settlement in Sindh. It proved a barren conquest, however; for though a Muhammadan dynasty was established there, it soon became independent of the Khalifat, and eventually died out.

The supremacy of the Khalifat was as brief as it was brilliant. Its hour of greatest glory was about the year A.D. 800, in the reign of Harûn al-Rashîd. From that time decay set in; and after two centuries more the effeminacy and corruption inherent in Eastern dynasties had so far progressed as to encourage the Northern hordes to move.

During the course of the 11th century the Tartar hordes, who were hitherto only known as shepherds pasturing their herds on the steppes of Central Asia, made their appearance south of the Paropamisan range as conquerors; and for six centuries their progress was steadily onwards, till, in the year A.D. 1683, we find the Turks encamped under the walls of Vienna, and the Mughal Aurangzêb lord paramount of the whole of India Proper, while Egypt and all the intervening countries owned the rule of sovereigns of Turanian race.

The architecture of the nations under the Arab Khalifat has been elsewhere described, and is of very minor importance. 1 The ruling people were of Semitic race, and had no great taste for architectural magnificence; and unless where they happened to govern a people of another stock, they have left few traces of their art.

With the Northern hordes the case was widely different; they were of Turanian blood, more or less pure, and wherever they went their mosques, and especially their tombs, remain to mark their presence, and to convey an idea of their splendour. In order to understand what follows, it is necessary to bear in mind that the Semitic conquest, from Mecca as a centre, extended from the mouths of the Guadalquivir to those of the Indus, and left but little worthy of remark in architecture. The Turanian conquest, from Bukhârâ and Balkh as centres, extended from Constantinople to Katak, and covered the whole intervening space with monuments of every class. Those of the west and centre have been described in speaking of Turkey and Persia; 2 the Eastern branch remains to be discussed, and its monuments are those of which this work purports to be a description.

The Saracen architects showed in India the same pliancy in adopting the styles of the various people among whom they

1 Egypt showed little taste for architectural display till she fell under the sway of the Mamlûk Sultâns, A.D. 1250, and Saracen architecture in Persia practically.

2 A.D. 1026.
had settled which characterised their practice in the countries just mentioned. It thus happens that in India we have at least twelve or fifteen different styles of Muhammadan architecture: and if an attempt were made to exhaust all the examples, it would be found necessary to enumerate even a greater number. Meanwhile, however, the following thirteen divisions will probably be found sufficient for present purposes:—

1. The first of these is that of Ghasni, which, though not, strictly speaking, in India, had without doubt the most important influence on the Indian styles, and formed in fact the stepping-stone by means of which the architecture of the West was introduced into India, and it long remained the connecting link between the styles of the Eastern and those of the Western world. It would consequently be of the greatest importance in enabling us to understand the early examples of the style in India Proper, if we could describe this one with anything like precision, but for that we must wait till some qualified person visits the province.

2. Next to this comes the Pathan style of northern India (A.D. 1193-1554), spreading over the whole of Upper India, and lasting for about three centuries and a half. After the death, however, of 'Alau-d-Din Muhammad Shâh I. (A.D. 1316) the central power was at times so weak, that the recently conquered outlying provinces were frequently enabled to render themselves independent, and, when this was the case, exhibited their individuality everywhere, by inventing a style of architecture expressive of their local peculiarities.

3. One of the first to exhibit this tendency was the brilliant but short-lived Sharâf dynasty of Jaunpur (A.D. 1394-1476). Though existing for less than a century, they adorned their capital and other cities with a series of mosques and other buildings which are hardly surpassed by those of any city and district in India for magnificence, and by none for a well-marked individuality of treatment.

4. The style adopted by the kings of Gujerât during their period of independence (A.D. 1396-1572) was richer and more varied than that of Jaunpur, though hardly so original or marked by such individuality. They borrowed too much, physically as well as intellectually, from the architecture of the Hindûs and Jains, among whom they were located, to be entirely independent; but the richness of their style is in proportion to the Hindû details they introduced.

5. Malwa became independent in A.D. 1401, and between that date and A.D. 1569, when they were absorbed in the Mughal empire, her kings adorned their capital at Mandû with palaces and mosques of great magnificence, but more
similar to the parent style at Delhi than the two last-named styles, and wanting, consequently, in local individuality.

6. Bengal was early erected into a separate kingdom—in A.D. 1203—more or less independent of the central power; and during its continuance—till A.D. 1573—the capitals, Gaur and Malda, were adorned with many splendid edifices. Generally these were in brick, and are now so overgrown by jungle as to be either ruined or nearly invisible. They are singularly picturesque, however, and display all the features of a strongly-marked individuality of style.

These six divisions are probably sufficient to characterise the Muhammadan styles north of the Narbadâ. To the south of that river there are three well-marked styles.

7. First that of the Bahmanî dynasty. First at Kulaâr, A.D. 1347, and afterwards at Bidar, A.D. 1426, they adorned their capitals with edifices of great magnificence and well-marked individuality, before they were absorbed, in A.D. 1525, in the great Mughal empire.

8. Next to these was the still more celebrated 'Adil Shâhî dynasty of Bijâpur (A.D. 1490-1660). Their style differed most essentially from all those above enumerated, and was marked by a grandeur of conception and boldness in construction unequalled by any edifices erected in India.

9. The third southern style is that of the Qutb Shâhî dynasty of Golkonda, A.D. 1512-1672. Their tombs are splendid, and form one of the most striking groups in India, but show evident signs of a decadence that was too surely invading art at the age when they were erected.

10. One by one all these brilliant individualities were absorbed in the great Mughal empire, founded by Bâbar, A.D. 1526, and which, though practically perishing on the death of Aurangzîb, A.D. 1707, may be considered as existing till the middle of the 18th century, A.D. 1750. It is to this dynasty that Agra, Delhi, and most of the towns in northern India owe their most splendid edifices.

11. Before leaving this branch of the subject it may be expedient to enumerate the style of Moslem art existing in Sindh. Practically, it is Persian both in its form and the style of decoration, and must have existed in this province from a very ancient time. All the examples known of it, however, are comparatively modern, and bring us back, curiously enough, to the neighbourhood of Ghaznî, from which we started in our enumeration.

12. Leaving these, which may be called the true styles of Muhammadan architecture, we have two which may be designated as the bastard styles. The first of these is that of
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Oudh (A.D. 1756-1847). In its capital there are ranges of building equal in extent and richness to those of any of the capitals above enumerated; but degraded in taste to an extent it is hardly possible to credit in a people who so shortly before had shown themselves capable of such noble aspirations.

13. The style adopted by the short-lived dynasty of Mysore (A.D. 1760-1799), being further removed from the influences of European vulgarity, is not so degraded as that of Lucknow, but is poor and inartistic when compared with earlier styles.

In an exhaustive treatise on the subject, the styles of Ahmadnagar and Aurangâbâd, A.D. 1490-1707, ought, perhaps, to be enumerated, and some minor styles elsewhere. These have not, however, sufficient individuality to deserve being regarded as separate styles, and the amount of illustration that can be introduced into a work like the present is not sufficient to render the differences sensible to those who are not personally acquainted with the examples.

Even as it is, it would require a much more extensive series of illustrations than that here given to make even their most marked merits or peculiarities evident to those who have no other means than what such a work as this affords of forming an opinion regarding them. Each of these thirteen styles deserves a monograph; but, except for Bijâpûr, Ahmadabad, Jaunpur, and Fathpur Sikri, nothing of the sort has yet been attempted, and even the works in which this has been attempted hardly quite exhaust the materials for these cities available for the purpose. Let us hope that the deficiencies will be supplied, and the others undertaken before it is too late, for the buildings are fast perishing from the ravages of time and climate and the still more destructive exigencies and ill-advised interferences of the governing power in India.


2 Architecture of Ahmadabad. 120 Photographs by Col. Biggs, with Text by Sir T.C. Hope, I.C.S. and Jas. Ferguson. Small folio, Murray, 1866; The Muhammadan Architecture of Ahmadabad and Gujrat generally will be found described in detail in volumes vi. to ix. of the 'Archæological Survey of Western India' (1896-1905.)

3 'The Sharqî Architecture of Jaunpur, etc., with Drawings, etc., by Ed. W. Smith, edited by J. Burgess (1889).

4 The splendidly illustrated work on the 'Moghul Architecture of Fathpur Sikri,' by the late Edmund W. Smith, in four quarto volumes with 402 excellent plates (1894-1898), must not be overlooked. It treats exhaustively of the architecture of that one place; and his 'Moghul Colour Decoration of Agra' (1901) supplies some important architectural drawings.
CHAPTER II.

GHAZNĪ.

CONTENTS.

Tomb of Mahmūd—Gates of Somnāth—Minārs on the Plain

CHRONOLOGY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sabuktigīn, founder</th>
<th>A.D. 975</th>
<th>ʿAbdu-ʿl-Rasḥīd</th>
<th>A.D. 1048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūd</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>Ibrāḥīm</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masʿūd</td>
<td>1031</td>
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TOWARDS the latter part of the 9th century the power of the Khalifs of Baghdaď was sinking into that state of rapid decline which is the fate of all Eastern dynasties. During the reign of Al Moʿtamid, A.D. 870-891, Egypt became independent, and the northern province of Bukhārā threw off the yoke under the governor appointed by the Khalifah Nasr Ahmad, a grandson of Sâmān, a Tartar chief, who declared and maintained his independence, and so formed the Sāmānī dynasty. After the dynasty had existed about a century, Sabuktigīn, a Tūrkhīsh slave belonging to a general of one of the last of the Samanian kings, rendered himself also independent of his master, and established himself in Ghaznī, of which he was governor, founding the well-known dynasty of Ghaznavides. His son and successor, Mahmūd, A.D. 997-1030, is one of the best-known kings in Indian History owing to his brilliant campaigns in India, and more especially that in which he destroyed the celebrated temple of Somnāth.

On his return from an earlier campaign, in which he had sacked the town of Mathurā, we learn from Ferishta that the king ordered a magnificent mosque to be built of marble and granite, afterwards known by the name of the Celestial Bride. Near it he founded a university. When the nobility of Ghaznī perceived the taste of their king in architecture, they also endeavoured to vie with one another in the magnificence of their palaces, as well as in the public buildings which were
raised for the embellishment of the city. "Thus," continues the historian, "the capital was in a short time ornamented with mosques, porches, fountains, aqueducts, reservoirs, and cisterns, beyond any city in the East."¹

The plain of Ghazni still shows the remains of this splendour; and, in the dearth of information regarding Persian art of that age, an account of it would be one of the most

¹ Brigg's translation of 'Feriishtâ,' vol. i. p. 61.
interesting and valuable pieces of information we could receive. These ruins, however, have not been as yet either examined or described; and even the tomb of the Great Mahmūd is unknown to us except by name, notwithstanding the celebrity it acquired from the removal of its gates to India at the termination of our disastrous campaigns in that country.

The gates are of Deodar pine, and the carved ornaments on them are so similar to those found at Cairo, on the mosque of Ibn Tulun and other buildings of that age, as not only to prove that they are of the same date, but also to show how similar were the modes of decoration at these two extremities of the Moslim empire at the time of their execution.

At the same time there is nothing in their style of ornamentation that at all resembles anything found in any Hindū temple, either of their age or at any other time. There is, in fact, no reason for doubting that these gates were made for

---

1 It is very much to be regretted that not a single officer accompanied our armies, when they passed and repassed through Ghazni, able or willing to appreciate the interest of these ruins; and it is to be hoped, if an opportunity should again occur, that their importance to the history of art in the East will not be overlooked.

2 The sketch of the tomb published by Mr. Vigne in his 'Travels in Afghanistan,' gives too confined a portion of it to enable us to judge either of its form or detail. The gate in front is probably modern, and the foiled arches in the background appear to be the only parts that belong to the 11th century.

3 The tradition that these gates were of sandal-wood, and brought from Somnāth, is entirely disproved by the fact of their being of the local pine-wood, as well as by the style of decoration, which has no resemblance to Hindū work.
the place where they were found. If any other parts of the tomb are ornamented in the same style, it would be of great interest to have them drawn. It probably is, however, from the Jâmi' Masjid that we shall obtain the best picture of the arts of that day, when any one will take the trouble of examining it.

Two minârs still adorn the plain outside the city, and form, if not the most striking, at least the most prominent of the ruins of that city. Neither of them was ever attached to a mosque; they are, indeed, pillars of victory, or Jaya Stambhas, like those at Chitor and elsewhere in India, and are such as we might expect to find in a country so long Buddhist. One of them was erected by Mahmûd himself; the other was built, or at least finished, by Mas'ûd, one of his immediate successors.

The lower part of these towers is of a star-like form—the plan being apparently formed by placing two squares diagonally the one over the other. The upper part, rising to the height of about 140 ft. from the ground, is circular; both are of brickwork, covered with ornaments of terra-cotta of extreme elaboration and beauty, and retaining their sharpness to the present day.

Several other minârs of the same class are found further west, even as far as the roots of the Caucasus, which, like these, were pillars of victory, erected by the conquerors on their battle-fields. None of them have the same architectural merit as those of Ghazni, at least in their present state, though it may be that their ornaments, having been in stucco or some perishable material, have disappeared, leaving us now only the skeleton of what they were.

The weakness of Mahmûd's successors left the Indians in repose for more than a century and a half; and, like all Eastern dynasties, the Ghaznavides were gradually sinking to inevitable decay, when their fall was precipitated by the crimes of one of them, which were fearfully avenged by the destruction of their empire and capital by 'Alâû-d-Dîn Hasan, and their race was at length superseded by that of the Ghûri, in the person of Shihâbu-d-Dîn Muhammad ibn Sâm, in the year 1186.

Though centuries of misrule have weighed on this country since the time of the Ghaznavides, it is scarcely probable that all traces of their magnificence have passed away; but till their

1 An excellent representation of these gates will be found in the second edition of 'Marco Polo's Travels,' by Col. Yule, vol. ii. p. 390.

2 See translation of the inscription on these minârs, 'Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,' vol. xii. (1843), pp. 77, 78.

3 Two are represented by Dubois de Montpréux, 'Voyage autour du Caucase.'
cities are examined and photographed by some one competent to discriminate between what is good or bad, or old or new, we must be content merely to indicate the position of the style, leaving this chapter to be written when the requisite information shall have been obtained. In the meanwhile it is satisfactory to know that between Herat and the Indus there do exist a sufficient number of monuments to enable us to connect the styles of the West with those in the East. They have been casually described by travellers, but not in such a manner as to render them available for our purposes; and in the unsettled state of the country it may be some time yet before their elucidation can be accomplished.
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WITH all the vigour of a new race, the Ghūrians set about the conquest of India. After sustaining a defeat in the year 1191, Shihābu-d-Dīn again entered India in A.D. 1192, when he attacked and defeated Prithvirāja of Ajmīr. This success was followed by the conquest of Kanauj in A.D. 1193; and after the fall of these two, the capitals of the greatest empires in the north of India may be said to have been conquered before his assassination, which happened in A.D. 1206.

At his death his great empire fell to pieces, and India fell to the share of Qutbu-d-Dīn Ībak. This prince was originally a Türkīsh slave, who afterwards became one of Shihābu-d-Dīn's generals, and contributed greatly by his talents and military skill to the success of his master who had left him as his deputy in India in 1192. He and his successor, Altamsh, continued nobly the work so successfully begun, and before the death of the latter, in A.D. 1235, the empire of northern India had permanently passed from the hands of the Hindūs to those of their Muḥammadān conquerors.

For a century and a half after the conquest the empire continued a united whole, under Türkīsh, or, as they are usually called, Pathān dynasties. These monarchs exhibited a continued vigour and energy very unusual in the East, and not
only sustained and consolidated, but increased by successive conquests from the natives, that newly-acquired accession to the dominions of the faithful, and during that time Delhi continued practically the capital of this great empire. In the latter half, however, of the 14th century, symptoms of disintegration manifested themselves. One after another the governors of distant provinces reared the standard of revolt, and successfully established independent kingdoms, rivalling the parent state in power and in the splendour of their capitals. Still Delhi remained the nominal head at least of this confederation of states—if it may be so called—till the time when Bābar (A.D. 1526), the sixth in descent from Tīmūršāh, invaded Hindustan. He put an end to the Pathān sway, after it had lasted for three centuries and a half, and finally succeeded in establishing the celebrated dynasty of the Mughals, which during six successive reigns, extending over the extraordinary period of nearly two centuries (A.D. 1526-1707), reconsolidated the Muslm empire into one great whole, which reached a degree of splendour and of power almost unknown in the East.

Nothing could be more brilliant, and at the same time more characteristic, than the commencement of the architectural career of these Pathāns in India. So soon as they felt themselves at all sure of their conquests, they set to work to erect two great mosques in their two principal capitals of Ajmār and Delhi, of such magnificence as should redound to the glory of their religion, and mark their triumph over the idolaters. A nation of soldiers equipped for conquest, and that only, they had of course brought with them neither artists nor architects, but, like other nations of Turanian origin, they had strong architectural instincts, and having a style of their own, they could hardly go wrong in any architectural project they might attempt. At the same time, they found among their new subjects an infinite number of artists quite capable of carrying out any design that might be propounded to them.

In the first place, they found in the colonnaded courts of the Jaina temples nearly all that was wanted for a ready-made mosque. All that was required was the removal of the temple in its centre, and the erection of a new wall on the west side, adorned with niches—mīhrābs—to point out to the faithful the direction in which Mecca lay, towards which they were commanded in the Qurān to turn when they prayed. It is certain, however, that in India they never were content with this only. In the two instances at least to which we are now referring, they determined in addition to erect a screen of arches in front of the Jaina pillars, and to adorn it with all the richness and elaboration of carving which their Indian
subjects were capable of executing. Nothing could be more successful than the results. There is a largeness and grandeur about the plain simple outline of the Muhammadan arches which quite overshadows the smaller parts of the Hindō fanes, and at the same time the ornamentation, though applied to a greater extent than in any other known examples, is kept so flat as never to interfere with or break the simple outlines of the architectural construction. There may be other examples of surface-decoration as elaborate as this, but hardly anywhere on such a scale. Some parts of the interior of Sta. Sophia at Constantinople are as beautiful, but they are only a few square yards. The palace at Mashita, if completed, might have rivalled it, but it is a fragment; and there may be—certainly were—examples in Persia between the times of Khosroes and Hārūn al-Rashid, which may have equalled these, but they have perished, or at least are not known to us now; and even if they ever existed, must have been unlike these mosques. In them we find a curious exemplification of some of the best qualities of the art, as exhibited previously by the Hindūs, and practised afterwards by their conquerors.

DELHI.

Of the two mosques at Old Delhi and at Ajmīr, the first named is the earlier, having been begun some seven or eight years before the other, and is also very much the larger. It is, besides, associated with the Qutb Minār, and some of the most beautiful tombs of the age, which altogether make up a group with which nothing at Ajmīr can compare. The situation, too, of the Delhi ruins is singularly beautiful, for they stand on the gentle slope of a hill, overlooking a plain that had once apparently been a lake, but which afterwards became the site of three successive capitals of the East. In front are the ruins of Tughlaqābād, the gigantic fort of an old Pathān chief; and further north the plain is still covered with the ruins of Firozābād and Indrāpat, the capitals of the later Pathāns and earlier Mughals. Beyond that, at the distance of about

1 'History of Ancient and Medieval Architecture,' vol. i, pp. 440 et seqq.
2 Ibid., vol. i, pp. 401 et seqq.
3 Gen. Cunningham’s ‘Archæological Reports,’ vol. ii, p. 260. But though the inner court—the Qūwat-ul-Islām—at Delhi was the whole mosque as originally designed; yet before the death of Altamsh, who was the real builder of both, the screen of arches at Delhi had been extended to 380 ft. as compared with the 200 ft. at Ajmīr, and the courtyards of the two mosques are nearly in the same proportion, their whole superficial area being 72,000 ft. at Ajmīr, as compared with 152,000 ft. at Delhi.
10 miles, are seen the towers of Shâbjahânâbâd, the modern capital, and till 1857 the seat of the nominal monarchy of the Great Mughal. Still further north are situated the civil station and ruins of the old British cantonments. It is a fortunate circumstance that the British station was not, as at Agra, placed in the midst of the ruins, since it is to this that we owe their preservation. But for the distance, marble columns would doubtless have been taken for all purposes for which they might have been available, without regard to their beauty, and the interest of the ruins thereby annihilated. Even as it is, the buildings belonging to the celebrated Shâlimâr gardens, which were the only buildings of importance in the neighbourhood of the English station, have long since disappeared.

The general arrangement of the principal ruins will be understood from the plan (Woodcut No. 369), which was taken with great care, though the scale to which it has been necessary to reduce it prevents all its peculiarities from being seen. The disposition of the various erections may first be briefly explained:—The inner court on the west side is that of the original mosque of Qutbu-d-Dîn, which measures 142 ft. by 108 ft. within the corridors; and in the middle of its west half the Iron pillar stands. The main entrance is under a dome, about 20 ft. in diameter on the east side, along which runs a corridor supported on four rows of pillars, the back row being placed against the walls, and in the north and south ends are two-storied pavilions. The side corridors had each three rows of pillars with an entrance on each side, though the gateway and all the western portion of the corridor has quite disappeared. About 20 yards of the eastern half of the wall remain and part of the colonnade, the pillars of which are of much plainer patterns than those of the other sides.\(^1\) The west end of this court is the great screen wall, 8 ft. thick, with its gigantic arches forming the entrances into the mosque itself which stood behind it and was 135 ft. in length by 32 ft. deep, but is now a complete ruin—only some twenty-two of the tall columns that supported its roof being left. Outside the south-east corner of the court stands the Qutb Minâr, erected at the same time.\(^2\)

Shamsu-d-Dîn Altamsh, about A.D. 1225, extended the great

---

\(^1\) This colonnade and its back wall were, "with a strange want of discrimination, reconstructed" by Major R. Smith, Executive Engineer, early in last century, who used the pillars of Altamsh's extension in front of the eastern gate of the mosque, for the purpose. And even the windows of Qutbu-d-Dîn's work did not escape "re-arrangement at the same time."—Carr Stephen's 'Archaeology of Delhi,' p. 43 note.

\(^2\) The inscription on the east gateway of the mosque court gives its date as A.D. 1191 (or 1193), and another on the north entrance says it "was commenced" in 1196.—Cunningham, 'Archaeological Reports,' vol i. pp. 185-186.
screen both to the north and south by 119 ft., with five arched entrances in each section, which differ considerably in the details of their decoration as well as in size from those raised by

369. Plan of Ruins at Old Delhi. (From a Plan by the Author.) Scale 100 ft. to 1 in.

Qutbu-d-Din. These were to be the façades of two extensions of the mosque; and part of the back wall of the northern extension, with the positions of the central and one of the side mihrābs in it, still remain. Of the enlarged court, the south wall with its corridor still exists, but only a few pillars of the east corridor from which we learn that the enlarged court with
its colonnades would be about 370 ft. from north to south and
230 ft. from east to west, and so enclosing the Qutb Minâr.
The tomb of Altamsh was built just to the west of the north end
of the enlarged mosque.

Again 'Alûu-d-Dîn Khalji (1296 - 1316) projected further
extensions: he removed the east wall of Altamsh’s court about
155 ft., extending the south wall and its colonnade so as to
make the new court 385 ft. from east to west, and constructing
the beautiful 'Alâî-Darwâza on that side. Close to this gateway
is the small tomb of Imâm Muhammad 'Ali Zâmin, about 24 ft.
square, erected about 1535, of sandstone and marble. On the
north the Sultân projected doubling the previous court—making
it altogether over 700 ft. from north to south, and in this north
half he began the 'Alâî Minâr which was intended to be of
double the dimensions of the other; but besides this and the
piers for the façade of the extended mosque nothing more seems
to have been done in this north extension. 'Alûu-d-Dîn’s tomb
now in ruins is to the south-west of the enclosure.

To understand the architecture, it is necessary to bear in
mind that all the pillars are of Hindû, and all the walls of
Muhammadan, architecture.

It may possibly be questioned to what extent the pillars now
stand as originally arranged by the Hindûs. But it seems
certain that they have all been re-arranged by the conquerors.
And it is quite evident that the enclosing walls were erected
by the Moslims, since all the stringcourses are covered with
ornaments in their style, and all the openings possess pointed
arches, which the Hindûs never used. On the whole, it thus
seems that the entire structure was re-arranged in the form we
now see it by the Muhammadans. The celebrated mosque
at Kanauj was originally a Hindû or Jain temple, and is re-
arranged on a plan precisely similar to that of the mosque of
'Amru at Old Cairo. The roof and domes are all of Jain architecture, so that no trace of the Moorish style is to be seen
internally; but the exterior is as purely of Muhammadan
architecture. There is another mosque at Dhâr, near Mandû, of
more modern date, and, doubtless, a re-arrangement of a Hindû
or Jain temple. Another, in the fort at Jaunpur, as well as other
mosques at Ahmadâbâd and elsewhere, all show the same system
of taking down and re-arranging the materials on a different plan.
If, therefore, the pillars at the Qutb were in situ, the case would
be exceptional; but I cannot, nevertheless, help suspecting that

1 'History of Ancient and Medieval
Architecture,' vol. ii. Woodcut No. 977
(p. 526).
2 Gen. Cuunningham found an inscrip-
tion on the wall recording that twenty-
seven temples of the Hindûs had been
pulled down to provide materials for this
mosque ('Archæological Reports,' vol. i.
the two-storeyed pavilions in the angles, and those behind the screen, may perhaps be as originally erected; but to this we will return when speaking of the Ajmir mosque, where the Hindû pillars are probably all re-arranged. It is quite certain, however, that some of the pillars at the Qutb are made up of dissimilar fragments, and all were placed where they now stand by the builders of the mosque. It may, however, be necessary to explain that there could be no difficulty in taking down and rebuilding these erections, because the joints of the pillars are all fitted with the precision that Hindû patience alone could give. Each compartment of the roof is composed of nine stones—four architraves, four angular and one central slab (as explained in diagram No. 174, vol. i., p. 314), all so exactly fitted, and so independent of cement, as easily to be taken down and put up again. The same is true of the domes, all which being honestly and fairly fitted, would suffer no damage from the process of removal and re-erection.

The section (Woodcut No. 370), of one half of the principal colonnade (the one facing the great series of arches) will explain

370. Section of part of East Colonnade at the Qutb, Old Delhi. Scale 25 ft. to 1 in.

its form better than words can do. It is so purely Jaina in arrangement, that it should, perhaps, have been mentioned in speaking of that style; but as forming a part of the earliest mosque in India, it is more appropriately introduced in this place. The pillars are of the same order as those used on Mount Abu (Woodcut No. 284), except that those at Delhi are much richer and more elaborate. Most of them probably belong to the 11th or 12th century, and are among the few

p. 176). This, however, proves little, unless we know what the temples were like which were destroyed for this purpose. Twenty-seven temples like those at Khajuraho, excepting the Ghantai, would not provide pillars for one half the inner court. One temple like that at Rânpur near Sûdai would supply a sufficiency for the whole mosque, and though the latter is more modern, we have no reason for supposing that similar temples did not exist before Muhammadan times.
specimens to be found in India that seem to be overloaded with ornament. There is not one inch of plain surface from the capital to the base, except the pillars behind the screen, and some others which may belong to older buildings. Still the ornament is so sharp and so cleverly executed, and the effect, in their present state of decay and ruin, so picturesque, that it is very difficult to find fault with what is so beautiful. In some instances the figures that were on the shafts of the pillars have been cut off, as offensive to Muhammadan strictness with regard to images; but on the roof and less seen parts, the cross-legged figures of the Jaina saints, and other emblems of that religion, may still be detected.

The glory of the mosque, however, is not in these Hindū remains, but in the great range of arches of the screen wall on the western side, extending north and south for about 385 ft., and consisting of three greater and eight smaller arches; the central one 22 ft. wide and 53 ft. high; the larger side-arches 24 ft. 4 in., and about the same height as the central arch; the smaller arches, which are unfortunately much ruined, are about half these dimensions (Woodcut No. 371). The central part of this screen, 147 ft. in length, forming the mosque proper, is ascribed to Qutbu-d-Dīn after his return from Ghaznī. Behind this, at the distance of 32 ft., are the foundations of the wall that formed the back of the mosque, but was only intended, apparently, to be carried as high as the roof of the Hindū pillars it encloses. It seems probable that the Hindū pillars between the two screens were the only part proposed to be roofed in 1196, since some of them are built into the back part of the great arches, and all above them is quite plain and smooth, without the least trace of any intention to construct a vault or roof of any sort. Indeed, a roof is by no means an essential part of a place of prayer; a wall facing Mecca is all that is required, and in India is frequently all that is built, though an enclosure is often added in front to protect the worshippers from interruption. Roofed colonnades are, of course, convenient and ornamental accompaniments, yet far from being indispensable.

The history of this mosque, as told in its construction, is as curious as anything about it. It seems that the Afghan conquerors had a tolerably distinct idea that pointed arches were the true form for architectural openings; but they left the Hindū architects and builders whom they employed to follow their own devices as to the mode of carrying out the form. The Hindūs up to this time had never built arches—nor, indeed, did they for centuries afterwards. Accordingly, they proceeded to make the pointed openings on the same principle upon which they built their domes. They carried them up in horizontal
courses as far as they could, and then closed them by long slabs meeting at the top, the construction being, in fact, that of the arch of the aqueduct at Tusculum. The same architects were employed by their masters to ornament the faces of these arches; and this they did by copying and repeating the ornaments on the pillars and friezes on the opposite sides of the court, covering the whole with a lace-work of intricate and delicate carving, such as no other mosque, except that at Ajmir, ever received before or since; and which—though perhaps in a great measure thrown away when used on such a scale—is, without exception, the most exquisite specimen of its class.
known to exist anywhere. The stone being particularly hard and good, the carving retains its freshness to the present day, and is only destroyed above the arches, where the faulty Hindū construction has superinduced premature decay.

The Qutb Minār, or great minaret at the south-east corner of the first mosque, is 48 ft. 4 in. in diameter at the base, and, when measured in 1794, was 242 ft. in height. Even then, however, its capital was ruined, so that some 10 ft., or perhaps 20 ft., must be added to this to complete its original elevation. It is ornamented by four boldly-projecting balconies; one at 97 ft., the second at 148 ft., the third at 188 ft., and the fourth at 214 ft. from the ground; between which are richly-sculptured raised belts containing inscriptions. In the lower storey the twenty-four projecting ribs which form the flutes are alternately angular and circular; in the second circular, and in the third angular only. Above this the minār is plain, and principally of white marble, with belts of the same red sandstone of which the three lower storeys are composed (Woodcut No. 372).

It is not clear whether the angular flutings are copied from some peculiarity found in the minarets at Khurāsān and further westward, or whether they are derived from the forms of the temples of the Jains. The

1 'Asiatic Researches,' vol. iv. p. 313. Its height, according to Gen. Cunningham, is (after the removal of the modern pavilion) 238 ft. 1 in.—'Archæological Reports,' vol. i. p. 196.

2 On the basement storey are six bands of inscriptions—the lowest contains the designation and titles of Qutb-ud-Dīn Ishak (1206-1210); the second, the titles and praise of Muhammad ibn Sām (1193-1206); the third, a verse from Sura 59 of the Qurān; the fourth as in the second; the fifth, 97 Arabic names of God; and the sixth a verse from Sura 2 of the Qurān. The place for the call to prayer was upon the second storey.—Carr Stephens, 'Archæology of Delhi,' pp. 58 ff.
forms of the bases of the minarets at Ghazni appear to lend probability to the first hypothesis; but the star-like form of many temples — principally Jaina—in Mysore and elsewhere (ante, vol. i., pp. 439 et seqq.) would seem to countenance the idea of their being of Hindu origin. No star-like forms have yet, however, been found so far north, and their destruction has been too complete for us to hope that they may be found now. Be this as it may, it is probably not too much to assert that the Qutb Minar is the most beautiful example of its class known to exist anywhere. The rival that will occur at once to most people is the campanile at Florence, built by Giotto. That is, it is true, 30 ft. taller, but it is crushed by the mass of the cathedral alongside; and, beautiful though it is, it wants that poetry of design and exquisite finish of detail which marks every moulding of the minar. It might have been better if the slope of the sides had been at a higher angle, but that is only apparent when seen at a distance; when viewed from the court of the mosque its form is perfect, and, under any aspect, is preferable to the prosaic squareness of the outline of the Italian example.

The only Muhammadan building known to be taller than this is the minaret of the mosque of Hasan, at Cairo;¹ but as the pillar at Old Delhi is a wholly independent building, it has a far nobler appearance, and both in design and finish far surpasses not only its Egyptian rival, but any building of its class known to me in the whole world. This, however, must not be looked at as if erected for the same purposes as those usually attached to mosques elsewhere. It was designed, but perhaps not solely, as a place from which the mu‘azzin should call to prayers, though its lower gallery was used for that purpose, but probably also as a tower of Victory—a Jaya Stambha—in fact an emblem of conquest, which the Hindús could only too easily understand and appreciate.

At the distance of 470 ft. north of this one a second minar was commenced in 1311, by ‘Alau-d-Din Khalji, of twice its dimensions, or 254 ft. in circumference. It was only carried up to the height of 75 ft. above the plinth, and abandoned, probably in consequence of the death of its founder in 1316.²

The date of all these buildings is known with sufficient exactness from the inscriptions which they bear,³ from which it

² It has been supposed that it was erected in memory of Qutbu-d-Din Bakhtiyar Kaki of Ush, a notable Muhammadan Prí or saint, who died here in 1235—Raverty’s ‘Tabaqát-i-
³ Násiri,’ pp. 621-622, notes. The tomb or Dargah of Khwajah Qutb Sahib stands about three furlongs S.S.W. from the minára.
appears that the inner court was enclosed by Shihâbu-d-Dîn. The central range of arches (Woodcut No. 371) was built by Qutbu-d-Dîn; the wings by Altamsh, whose tomb is behind the

northern range, and the Qutb Minâr was either built or finished by the same monarch; they extend, therefore, from A.D. 1196 to 1235, at which date they were left incomplete, probably in consequence of the death of the last-named king.
One of the most interesting objects connected with this mosque is the iron pillar which stands in its courtyard (Woodcut No. 373). It stands 22 ft. above the ground, and as the depth under the pavement is now ascertained to be only 20 in., the total height is 23 ft. 8 in.\(^1\) Its diameter at the base is 16.4 in., and at the capital 12.05 in. The capital is 3½ ft. high, and is sharply and clearly wrought into the Persian form that makes it look as if it belonged to an earlier period than it does; and it has the amalaka moulding, which is indicative of considerable antiquity. It has not, however, been yet correctly ascertained what its age really is. There is an inscription upon it, but without a date. From the form of its alphabet, Prinsep ascribed it to the 3rd or 4th century;\(^2\) Bhaub Daji, on the same evidence, to the end of the 5th or beginning of the 6th century.\(^3\) My own conviction is that it belongs to one of the Chandra Rajas of the Gupta dynasty, either consequently about A.D. 370 or A.D. 415.

Taking A.D. 400 as a mean date—and it certainly is not far from the truth—it opens our eyes to an unsuspected state of affairs to find the Hindús at that age capable of forging a bar of iron larger than any that have been forged even in Europe up to a very late date, and not frequently even now. As we find them, however, some centuries afterwards, using bars as long as this lât in roofing the porch of the temple at Kanârak (ante, p. 107), we must now believe that they were much more familiar with the use of this metal than they afterwards became. It is almost equally startling to find that, after an exposure to wind and rain for fourteen centuries, it is unrustted, and the capital and inscription are as clear and as sharp now as when put up fifteen centuries ago.\(^4\)

---

1 It is a curious illustration how difficult it sometimes is to obtain correct information in India, that when Gen. Cunningham published his 'Reports' in 1871, he stated, apparently on the authority of Mr Cooper, Deputy Commissioner, that an excavation had been carried down to a depth of 26 ft., but without reaching the bottom. "The man in charge, however,"—témoin oculaire—"assured him that the actual depth reached was 35 ft."—Vol. i. p. 169. He consequently estimated the whole length at 60 ft., but fortunately ordered a new excavation, determined to reach the bottom—côte qui côte—and found it at 20 inches below the surface.—Vol. iv. p. 28, plate 5. At a distance of a few inches below the surface it expands in a bulbous form to a diameter of 2 ft. 4 in., and rests on a gridiron of iron bars, which are fastened with lead into the stone pavement.


3 'Journal Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society,' vol. x. p. 63. Dr Fleet in 'Inscriptions of the Early Guptas,' pp. 139f. gives a revised version. It bears a posthumous inscription in eulogy of the conquests of a king Chandra as to whose date or dynasty nothing is stated.

4 There is no mistake about the Meharault pillar being of pure iron. Gen. Cunningham had a bit of it analysed in India by Dr. Murray, and another portion was analysed in the School of Mines here by Dr. Percy. Both found it pure malleable iron without any alloy.
TOMBS BEYOND THE COURTYARD AT GOLKONDA
RAUZA OF IBRĀHĪM ʿĀDIL SHĀH II., AT BIJĀPŪR

MOSQUE OF SHER SHĀH IN PURĀNĀ KILĀ, DELHI
TOMB OF THE EMPEROR HUMĀYŪN, NEAR DELHI

TOMB OF NAWĀB SAFDAR JANG, NEAR DELHI
DECORATION OF THE PIERS INSIDE THE NAN-PAYÂ TEMPLE, MYINPAGÂN
WINDOW OF NAN-PAYÀ
TEMPLE, MYINPAGÂN

THE PITAKAT-TAIK, PAGÂN
THE ĀNANDA TEMPLE, PAGĀN.
As the inscription informs us, the pillar was dedicated to Vishnu, there is little doubt that it originally supported a figure of Garuda on the summit, which the Muhammadans of course removed; but the real object of its erection was as a dhwaja or standard of the god Vishnu and to record the "defeat of the Vāhlikas, across the seven mouths of the Sindhu," or Indus. It is, to say the least of it, a curious coincidence, that eight centuries afterwards men from that same Baktrian country should have erected a Jaya Stambha ten times as tall as this one, in the same courtyard, to celebrate their victory over the descendants of those Hindūs who so long before had expelled their ancestors from the country.

Immediately behind the north-west corner of the mosque stands the tomb of Altamsh, the founder. Though small—being a room 29 ft. 6 in. square inside, with walls 7½ ft. thick and doors on the four sides—it is one of the richest examples of Hindū art applied to Muhammadan purposes that Old Delhi affords, and is extremely beautiful, though the builders still display a certain degree of inaptness in fitting the details to their new purposes. The effect at present is injured by the want of a roof, which has long since disappeared. In addition to the beauty of its details it is interesting as being the oldest tomb known to exist in India. He died A.D. 1235.  

---

1 Can these Vāhlikas be the Indo-Skythians by overthrowing whom the Guptas must have risen to power? In Sanskrit literature, by Vāhlikas the people of Baktria or Balkh are usually understood.

2 Carr Stephen's Archæology of Delhi, pp. 74-75; Fanshawe's Delhi Past and Present, pp. 269, 270.
A more beautiful example than even this is the 'Alât-Darwâza, shown on the left hand of the plan (Woodcut No. 369). It was erected by 'Alâû-d-Din Khaljî, and the date 1310 is found among its inscriptions. It is, therefore, about a century more modern than the other buildings of the place, and displays the so-called Pathân style at its period of greatest perfection, when the Hindû masons had learned to fit their exquisite style of decoration to the forms of their foreign masters. Its walls are decorated internally with a diaper pattern of unrivalled excellence, and the mode in which the square is changed into an octagon is more simply elegant and appropriate than any other example I am acquainted with in India (Plate XXIX.). The pendentives accord perfectly with the pointed openings in the four other faces, and are in every respect appropriately constructive. True there are defects. For instance, they are rather too plain for the elaborate diapering which covers the whole of the lower part of the building both internally and externally; but ornament might easily have been added; and their plainness accords with the simplicity of the dome, which is indeed by no means worthy of the substructure. Not being pierced with windows, it seems as if the architect assumed that its plainness would not be detected in the gloom that in consequence prevails.

This building, though small—it is only 56 ft. 9 in. square externally, and with an internal apartment only 34 ft. 6 in. in plan—marks the culminating point of this Pathân style in Delhi. Nothing so complete had been done before, nothing so ornate was attempted by them afterwards. In the provinces wonderful buildings were erected between this period and the Mughal conquest, but in the capital their edifices were more marked by solemn gloom and nakedness than by ornamentation or any of the higher graces of architectural art. Externally it is a good deal damaged, but its effect is still equal to that of any building of its class in India. It was copied, with some modifications, in the gateway to the fine Khairpur Mosque, near Safdar Khân’s tomb, erected under Sikandar Lodî in 1494.

AJMİR.

The mosque at Ajmîr (Woodcut No. 375) was commenced apparently in the year 1200, and was certainly completed during

1 Major Raverty has shown that the name of "Pathâns" does not apply to the first six dynasties of Sultâns of Delhi, who were "Turkish slaves, Khaljîs, Jats, low caste Hindûs and Sayyids." We owe the blunder to the translators of Fírâûshâ. — Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. xliv. pp. 24 et seqq.

2 From Fanâshâye’s ‘Delhi,’ p. 270.

the reign of Altamsh, A.D. 1211-1235. According to tradition, it was finished in two days and a half; hence the only name by

which it is now known—the "Arhai din ka Jhompra," which, if it means anything, can only apply to the clearing away of the Hindū temples and symbols, to provide materials for the erection of a magnificent mosque to the glory of the iconoclast conquerors and their self-exalting creed of Islām. It stands on the outskirts of the city at the base of Tārāgadh hill. Like the remains at Old Delhi, the entire plan is Moslim, whilst the columns and roofs are the spoils of Hindū temples. At first sight the plan, with its large cloistered court, bears a resemblance to that of a Jaina temple; and the octagonal arrangement of the pillars for the support of the roofs, might seem to support the comparison. But like many others elsewhere this formed an enclosure, about 262 ft. square outside, with towers at the corners, to be surrounded on the north, east, and south sides, by open cloisters raised on Hindū pillars, now almost quite

2 Tod, in his 'Annals,' treats it simply as a Jaina temple, without referring to any possible alterations, except additions made by Moslim architects, vol. i. p. 779, see also his plate, which is singularly correct.
3 General Cunningham's measurements and his plan do not agree. He gives the outside length from north to south as 272 ft. 6 in., and next page the exterior length of the mosque as 259 ft.; but the plan makes the outside dimensions equal, whilst his measurement from east to west is 264 ft. 6 in.
ruined. The principal entrance is, of course, on the east side, but there was another on the south with a projecting porch. The north side is built close to the scarped rock of the hill. The open court would be about 200 ft. wide by 175 ft. to the front of the Masjid on its west side, which is the only part now standing; and Woodcut No. 376 shows all that now exists of the mosque itself. No tower at the north-west corner probably ever existed, whilst that at the south-west has been the shrine of a small Hindú temple of which the sikhara was demolished; but the small bastions on the east corners of the court are Muhammadan and of the same plan as the turrets over the central piers of the screen. The corridor on the east has been rebuilt but of much less width than is shown on the restored plan; of the north corridor there is no trace, and only the wall of the south one is left. What remains, however, is sufficient to show that, if completed, it must originally have been a singularly elegant specimen of an early Indian mosque. The roof extends only over six of the front piers, or about 141 ft., beyond which about 54 ft. at each end is quite open and even unpaved. Behind the screen piers the area of the mosque is 40 ft. 8 in. deep. The roof is supported by four rows of lofty shafts and another of pilasters (or pillars built into the back wall)—70 in all—each formed of three superimposed Hindú pillars. These are arranged as in Jaina and Hindú temples so as to support on eight pillars each the roof and its five domes, or rather, conical roofs, which are all that exist.¹

The glory, however, of this mosque, as of that of the Qutb, is the screen of seven arches with which Altamsh adorned the courtyard (Woodcut No. 377). Its dimensions are very similar to those of its rival. The central arch is 22 ft. 2 in. wide; the two on each side 13 ft. 3 in., and those at the ends 13 ft. 4 in. and 12 ft. 8 in. Each arch is surrounded by three lines of

¹ The outer form of these early domes, in conformity with their interiors, being conical, was regarded as ugly, and the Archaeological Survey replaced them a few years ago by "better shaped hemispherical ones."
writing, the outer in the Kufic and the other two in Arabic character, and divided from each other by bands of Arabesque ornament boldly and clearly cut, and still as sharp as when first chiselled. In the centre the screen rises to a height of 56 ft., and on it are the ruins of two small minarets 10½ ft. in diameter, ornamented with alternate circular and angular flutes, as in the lower storey of the Qutb. It is not clear whether anything of the same sort existed at Delhi—probably not, as the great minâr may have served for that purpose, and their introduction here
looks like an afterthought, and the production of an unpractised hand working in an unfamiliar style. Wherever and whenever minârs were afterwards introduced, preparations for them were always made from the foundations, and their lines are always carried down to the ground, in some shape or other, as in true art they ought to be. This solecism, if it may be so called, evidently arose from the architects being Hindûs, unfamiliar with the style; and to this also is due the fact that all the arches are constructed on the horizontal principle. There is not a true arch in the place; but, owing to their having the command of larger stones than were available at Delhi, the arches are not here crippled, as they were there before the repairs.

It is neither, however, its dimensions nor design that makes this screen one of the most remarkable architectural objects in India, but the mode in which it is decorated. Nothing can exceed the taste with which the Kûfî and Tughrâ inscriptions are interwoven with the more purely architectural decorations, or the manner in which they give life and variety to the whole, without ever interfering with the constructive lines of the design. As before remarked, as examples of surface-decoration, these two mosques of Altamsh at Delhi and Ajmîr are probably unrivalled. Nothing in Cairo or in Persia is so exquisite in detail, and nothing in Spain or Syria can approach them for beauty of surface-decoration. Besides this, they are unique. Nowhere else would it be possible to find Muhammadan largeness of conception, combined with Hindû delicacy of ornamentation, carried out to the same extent and in the same manner. If to this we add their historical value as the first mosques erected in India, and their ethnographic importance as bringing out the leading characteristics of the two races in so distinct and marked a manner, there are certainly no two buildings in India that better deserve the protecting care of Government; the one has received its fair share of attention; the other has, till quite lately, been most shamefully neglected, and most barbarously ill-treated.¹

**Later Pathân Style.**

After the death of 'Alâu-d-Dîn (A.D. 1316) a change seems to have come over the spirit of the architects of the succeeding Tughlaq Shâhî and Sayyid dynasties, and all their subsequent buildings, down to the time of the Afghan Sher Shâh, A.D.

¹ Owing to the Muhammadan part being better built and with larger materials, the mosque is not in the same ruinous condition as that at the Qutb was before the repairs of some thirty-five years ago. There is, so far as I can judge, no building in India more worthy of the attention of Government than this.
1539, exhibit a stern simplicity of design, in marked contrast
to the elaborate ornamentation with which they began. It
is not clear whether this arose from any puritanical reaction
against the quasi-Hinduism of the earlier examples, or from
any political causes, the effect of which it is now difficult
to trace: but, certain it is, that when that stern old warrior,
Tughlaq Shâh, A.D. 1321, founded the New Delhi, which still
bears his name—Tughlaqâbâd—all his buildings are char-
acterised by a severe simplicity, in marked contrast with those
which his predecessors erected in the capital that overlooks
the plain in which his citadel is situated. His tomb, which
was finished at least, if not built, by his successor, instead of
being situated in a garden, as is usually the case, stands by
itself in a strongly-fortified citadel of its own, surrounded by
an artificial lake. The sloping walls and almost Egyptian
solidity of this mausoleum, combined with the bold and massive
towers of the fortifications that surround it, form a model of a
warrior's tomb hardly to be rivalled anywhere, and in singular
contrast with the elegant and luxuriânt garden-tombs of the
more settled and peaceful dynasties that succeeded.

The change, however, of most interest from a historical
point of view is, that by the time of Tughlaq Shâh's reign,
the Moslems had worked themselves entirely free from Hindu
influence. In his buildings all the arches are true arches; all
the details invented for the place where they are found. His
tomb, in fact, would be as appropriate—more so, indeed—if
found in the valley of the Nile than on the banks of the
Jamanâ; and from that time forward Muhammadan architecture
in India was a new and complete style in itself, and developed
according to the natural and inevitable sequences of true styles
in all parts of the world.

It is true, nevertheless, that in their tombs, as well as in
their mosques, they frequently, to save themselves trouble, used
Hindu materials when they were available, and often with the
most picturesque effect. Many of these compound edifices are
composed of four pillars only, surmounted by a small dome;
but frequently they adopt with the pillars the Jaina arrange-
ment of twelve pillars, so placed as to support an octagonal
framework, easily moulded into a circular basement for a dome.
This, as before observed, is the arrangement of the tomb at
Mylassa, and the formative idea of all that is beautiful in the
plans of Jaina and northern Hindu buildings in India.

One example must suffice to explain the effect of these
buildings (Woodcut No. 378). It is at Sipri, about 70 miles
south-south-west from Gawliar. At first sight the dome looks
rather heavy for the substructure; but the effect of the whole
is so picturesque that it is difficult to find fault with it. If all the materials were original, the design would be open to criticism; but, when a portion is avowedly borrowed, a slight want of balance between the parts may be excused.

There are several examples of tombs of this sort at the Bakariyā Kund in Benares, evidently made up from ancient materials;¹ and, indeed, wherever the Muhammadans fairly settled themselves on a site previously occupied by the Hindus, Jains, or Buddhists, such combinations are frequent; but no attempt is ever made to assimilate the parts that are Muhammadan with those belonging to the Hindu style which they are employing; they are of the age in which the tomb or mosque was built, and that age, consequently, easily recognisable by any one familiar with the style.

The usual form of a Pathan tomb will be better understood from the following woodcut (No. 379), representing a nameless sepulchre² among the hundreds that still strew the plains of

² Cunningham says it is ascribed to Mubarak Khan Pathan; Mr Fanshawe assigns it to Muhammad Shāh IV., who died 1443, but to whom Sayyid Ahmad ascribes another octagonal tomb to the north-east of the mosque.—Cunningham's 'Archeological Reports,' vol. xx. pp. 158, 159; and Fanshawe's 'Delhi,' p. 244.
Old Delhi. It stands at the village of Khairpur, about 3 miles south from the Ajmir gate of Delhi, and on the south-west of the mosque. It consists of an octagonal apartment, 31 ft. 10 in. inside diameter, surrounded by a verandah following the same form—the base being 72 ft. 2 in. in diameter—each face being ornamented by three arches of the stilted pointed form generally adopted by the Pathâns, or rather Sayyids, and it is supported by rectangular pillars, which are almost as universal with them as this form of arch. It is a form evidently borrowed from the square pier of the Jains, but so altered and so simplified, that it requires some ingenuity to recognise its origin in its new combination.

Another octagonal tomb, to the north-east of the mosque, is built in the same style and of almost exactly the same dimensions; and the tomb of Mubârak Shâh II. (murdered in 1434) at Kotila or Mubârakpur, about a mile and a half south of Khairpur, is also of the same pattern and size. It is the earliest of those in the later Pathân style.¹

This series of tombs closes with that of Sher Shâh (1539-

¹ A plan is given in Cunningham's 'Archæological Reports, vol. xx. plate 35.
1545) (Woodcut No. 380), the most illustrious of his race. It is situated on a terrace 30 ft. high and about 300 ft. square, in the middle of a large tank, near Sahsaram, in Shâh-âbâd, and, from its locality and its design, is now a singularly picturesque object (Woodcut No. 381). Its dimensions too are considerable. Its base is an octagon, 56 ft. on each side externally, or 135 ft. in diameter. A gallery, 10 ft. 2 in. wide, surrounds the central apartment, which is surmounted by a large dome 71 ft. in diameter, beneath which stands the tomb of the founder and of some of his favourite companions in arms.

On the exterior, the terrace on which it stands is ornamented

1 Cunningham's 'Archaeological Reports,' vol. xi. p. 135.
by bold octagonal pavilions in the angles, which support appropriately the central dome, and the little bracketed kiosks between them break pleasingly the outline. In the same manner the octagonal kiosks that cluster round the drum of the dome, and the dome itself, relieve the monotony of the composition without detracting from its solidity or apparent solemnity. Altogether, as a royal tomb of the second class, there are few that surpass it in India, either for beauty of outline or appropriateness of detail. Originally it was connected with the mainland by a bridge, which fortunately was broken down before the grand trunk road passed near. But for this, it would probably have been utilised long ago.\footnote{In the ‘Journal of Indian Art and Industry,’ vol. v. pp. 49, 50, and plates 58-64, the late Mr. E. W. Smith has given a carefully illustrated account of a ruined tomb at Kālpi, known as the Chaurāsi Gumbaz. It is 115 ft. sq., the central apartment being 40 ft. sq., surrounded by a double corridor of forty groined areas, the roofs supported on massive piers.}

The mosques of these Sultāns bore the same aspect as their tombs. The so-called Kala or Kalān Masjid in the present city of Delhi, and finished, according to an inscription on its walls, in A.D. 1387, is in a style not unlike the tomb (Woodcut No. 379), but more massive, and even less ornamented. This severe simplicity seems to have been the characteristic of the latter part of the 14th century, and may have been a protest of the more puritanical Moslim spirit against the Hindu exuberance which characterised both the 13th and the 15th centuries. A reaction, however, took place, and the later style of Delhi was hardly less rich, and certainly far more appropriate for the purposes to which it was devoted than the first style, as exhibited in the buildings at the Qutb.

This, however, was principally owing to the exceptional splendour of the reign of Sher Shāh, who, however, is so mixed up both in date and in association with the earlier Mughals, that it is difficult to discriminate between them. Though Bābar conquered India in A.D. 1526, his successor, Humāyûn, was defeated and driven from the throne by Sher Shāh in A.D. 1540, and it was only in A.D. 1555 that the Mughal dynasty was finally and securely established at Delhi. The style consequently of the first half of the 16th century may be considered as the last expiring effort of the Pathāns, or the first dawn of that of the great Mughals, and it was well worthy of either.

At this age the façades of these mosques became far more ornamental, and more frequently encrusted with marbles, and always adorned with sculpture of a rich and beautiful character; the angles of the buildings were also relieved by little kiosks, supported by four richly bracketed pillars, but never with
minarets, which, so far as I know, were not attached to mosques during the so-called Pathán period. The call to prayer was made from the roof; and, except the first rude attempt at Ajmér, I do not know an instance of a minaret built solely for such a purpose, though they were, as we know, universal in Egypt and elsewhere long before this time, and were considered nearly indispensable in the buildings of the Mughals very shortly afterwards. The Patháns seem to have regarded the minár as the Italians viewed the Campanile, more as a symbol of power and of victory than as an adjunct to a house of worship.

The body of the mosque became generally an oblong hall, with a central dome flanked by two others of the same horizontal dimensions, but not so lofty, and separated from it by a broad, bold arch, the mouldings and decorations of which formed one of the principal ornaments of the building.

The pendentives were even more remarkable than the arches

![Pendentive from Mosque at Old Delhi. (From a Sketch by the Author.)](image)

for elaborateness of detail. Their forms are so various that it is impossible to classify or describe them; perhaps the most usual is that represented in Woodcut No 382, where the angle is
filled up with a number of small imitations of arches, bracketing out one beyond the other. It might seem probable that this scheme of decoration was based on the honeycomb or stalactite vault used by the Arabs in Spain; but here the pendentive is differently constructed from the Arab pendentives, which are curved in plan, whilst this is simply a corner bracket.¹

If it were not that the buildings of the earlier Sultâns are so completely eclipsed by the greater splendour of those of the Mughal dynasty, which succeeded them in their own capitals, their style would have attracted more attention than has hitherto been bestowed upon it; and its monograph would be as interesting as any that the Indian-Saracenic affords. In its first period the style was characterised by all the richness which Hindû elaboration could bestow; in the second by a stern simplicity and grandeur much more appropriate, according to our ideas, to the spirit of the people; and during the latter part of its existence, by a return to the elaborateness of the past; but at this period every detail was fitted to its place and its purpose. We forget the Hindû except in his delicacy, and we recognise in this last development one of the completed architectural styles of the world.

¹ R. Phéné Spiers, 'Architecture—East and West,' pp. 34-35.
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It was just two centuries after the conquest of India by the Moslems that Khwâja-i-Jahân, the Sûbahdâr or governor of the province in which Jaunpur1 is situated, assumed independence, and established a dynasty which maintained itself for nearly a century, from A.D. 1394 to about 1479, and though then reconquered by the sovereign of Delhi, still retained a sort of semi-independence till finally incorporated in the Mughal empire by the great Akbar. During this period Jaunpur was adorned by several large mosques, three of which still remain tolerably entire, and a considerable number of tombs, palaces and other buildings, besides a fort and bridge, all of which are as remarkable specimens of their class of architecture as are to be found anywhere in India.

Although so long after the time when, under 'Alâ'u-d-Dîn and Tughlaq Shâh, the architecture of the capital had assumed something like completeness, it is curious to observe how imperfect the amalgamation was in the provinces at the time when the principal buildings at Jaunpur were erected. The principal parts of the mosque, such as the gateways, the great halls, and the western parts generally, are in a complete arcuate style. Wherever, indeed, wide openings and large internal

1 Jaunpur is about 40 miles north-west from Benares. Its architecture is treated in detail in 'The Sharqī Architecture of Jaunpur' (1889) illustrated by 74 plates from the drawings of the late Edmund W. Smith, of the Archaeological Survey.
spaces were wanted, arches and domes and radiating vaults were employed, and there is little in those parts to distinguish this architecture from that of the capitals. But in the cloisters that surround the courts, and in the galleries in the interior, short square pillars are as generally employed, with bracket capitals, horizontal architraves, and roofs formed of flat slabs, as was invariably the case in Hindū and Jaina temples. Instead of being fused together, as they afterwards became, the arcuate style of the Moslems stands here, though in juxtaposition, in such marked contrast to the trabeate style of the Hindūs, that some authors have been led to suppose that the pillared parts belonged to ancient Jaina or Buddhist monuments, which had been appropriated by the Muhammadans and converted to their purposes.\(^1\) The truth of the matter appears to be, that the greater part of the Muhammadans in the province at the time the mosques were built were Hindūs converted to that religion, and who still clung to their native fūms when these did not clash with their new faith; and the masons were almost certainly those whose traditions and whose taste inclined them much more to the old trabeate forms than to the newly-introduced arched style.

As we shall presently see at Gaur, on the one hand, the arched style prevailed from the first, because the builders had no other material than brick, and large openings were then impossible without arches. At Ahmadābād, on the other hand, in an essentially Jaina country, and where stone was abundant, the pillared forms were not only as commonly employed as at Jaunpur, but were used for so long a time, that before the country was absorbed in the Mughal empire, the amalgamation between the trabeate and arcuate forms was complete.

The oldest mosque at Jaunpur is that of Ibrāhīm Nāīb Bārbak the general of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq, in the fort, which we learn from an inscription on it, was completed in A.D. 1377.\(^2\) It is not large—externally 130 ft. north and south—and consists of a central block of masonry, with a large archway, of the usual style of the Muhammadan architecture of the period, and five openings between pillars on either hand. The front row of these pillars is double, they are of various designs, the outer

---

1 The first to suggest this was the Baron Hügel, and the idea was taken up by the late Mr Horne and Rev. M. A. Skerring. There may have been some Jaina or Hindū buildings at Jaunpur of the 13th or 14th centuries that were utilised by the Muhammadans, but nine-tenths at least of the pillars in these mosques were made at the time they were required for the places they now occupy.

2 Mr Blochmann read the date 778 A.H. ('Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,' 1875, p. 14), Khairu-d-dīn in his ‘History of Jaunpur,’ translated by F. Pogson (p. 41) read this date as 798 A.H. or 1396 A.D.
pillars being square and the inner round, and richly sculptured,

383. Plan of Western Half of Courtyard of Jami' Masjid, Jaunpur. (From a Plan' by the Author.) Scale 200 ft. to 1 in.

384. View of south lateral Gateway of Jami' Masjid, Jaunpur. (From a Drawing by the Author.)

and were evidently taken from some temple that existed there,
or in the neighbourhood, before the Moslim occupation, but they seem to have exhausted the stock, as scarcely any other such are found in the mosques built subsequently.\textsuperscript{1}

There are three great mosques still standing in the city; of these the grandest is the Jāmi’ Masjid (Woodcuts Nos. 383, 384), which was commenced by Shāh Ibrāhīm, A.D. 1438, but not completed till the reign of Husain Shāh A.D. 1452-1478. It stands on a platform raised from 16 to 20 ft. above the ground level and consists of a courtyard 217 ft. 4 in. by 211 ft. 6 in., on the western side of which is situated the range of buildings forming the mosque, the central area covered by a dome 39 ft. 8 in. in diameter, in front of which stands a gate pyramid or propylon,\textsuperscript{2} of almost Egyptian mass and outline, rising to the height of 86 ft. This gate pyramid by its elevation supplied the place of a minaret, which is a feature as little known at Jaunpur, as it was, at the same age, in the capital city of Delhi. On each side of the dome is a compartment, 44 ft. 7 in. by 25 ft. 4 in., divided into two storeys by a stone floor supported on pillars; and beyond this, on each side, is an apartment 39 ft. 7 in. by 49 ft. 3 in., covered by a bold pointed vault with ribs, so constructed that its upper surface forms the external roof of the building, which in Gothic vaults is scarcely ever the case. Each compartment has three mīhrābs in the back wall, that is fifteen on the ground floor, with two in each of the upper rooms. The three sides of the courtyard were surrounded by double colonnades, two storeys in height internally, but with three on the exterior, the floor of the courtyard being raised to the height of the lower storey. On each face was a handsome gateway; the southern one is represented in Woodcut No. 384, which gives a fair idea of the style. The greater part of the eastern side of the court with the entrance on that side and the upper storeys of the other cloisters, are said to have been destroyed by Sultān Sikandar Lodī in his displeasure at the ingratitude of Husain, 1499-1510; though there is also a story of their being taken down at a very much later date.

The smallest of the mosques in the city is the Lāl Darwâza or Red Gate, which stands to the north-west of the city.\textsuperscript{3} It is in the same style as the others; and its propylon—represented in Woodcut No. 385—displays not only the bold massiveness with which these mosques were erected, but shows also that strange admixture of Hindū and Muḥammadan architecture

\textsuperscript{1} A view of this mosque will be found in Kittoe's 'Indian Architecture,' plate 2, and a plan in Cunningham's 'Archaeological Survey Reports,' vol. xi. plate 31.

\textsuperscript{2} It is partially seen in Woodcut No. 384; but for plans, elevations, sections, and details, see 'Sharqī Architecture of Jaunpur,' pages 52-63, and plates 43-73.

\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Ibid.} pp. 43-51, and plates 26-40.
which pervaded the style during the whole period of its continuance. The Masjid measures 168 ft. 6 in. in length inside by 35 ft. 4 in. from front to back, whilst the court is about 132½ ft. from east to west, by 130¼ ft. from north to south, surrounded by corridors about 17½ ft. wide on the sides, and

16 ft. at the east end. The propylon is 45 ft. wide over all at the base and 49 ft. high.

Of all the mosques remaining at Jaunpur, the Atala Masjid, completed in 1408, is the most ornate and the most beautiful. The colonnades surrounding its court are five aisles in depth, the outer pillars, as well as those next the court, being double square pillars. The four intermediate rows are single square pillars, supporting a flat roof of slabs, arranged as in Hindū temples. It is also two storeys in height, the lower storey
being occupied by three inner aisles belonging to the court, the fourth forming a series of cells opening outwardly, with a verandah supported by the outer row of pillars. All this is so like a Hindū arrangement that one might almost at first sight be tempted, like Baron Hügel, to fancy it was originally a Buddhist monastery. He failed to remark, however, that both here and in the Jāmi' Masjid the cells open outwardly, and in the latter are below the level of the courtyard of the mosque—an arrangement common enough in Muhammedan, but never found in Buddhist, buildings. Its gateways, however, which are the principal ornaments of the outer court, are purely Saracenic, and the western face is adorned by three propylons—the central one 73 ft. 6 in. high by 64 ft. 6 in. wide at the base, and two smaller, each 31 ft. 3 in. high and 23 ft. 6 in. wide, —similar to that represented in the last woodcut, but richer and more beautiful, while its interior domes and roofs are superior to any other specimen of Muhammedan art I am acquainted with of so early an age. They are, too, perhaps, more striking here, because, though in juxtaposition with the quasi-Hinduism of the court, they exhibit the arched style of the Saracenic architects in as great a degree of completeness as it exhibited at any subsequent period.¹

The other buildings hardly require particular mention, though, as transition specimens between the two styles, these Jaunpur examples possess a simplicity and grandeur not often met with in this style. An appearance of strength, moreover, is imparted to them by their sloping walls, which is foreign to our general conception of Saracenic art, though at Tughlaqâbâd and elsewhere it is carried even further than at Jaunpur. Among the Afghâns of India the expression of strength is as characteristic of the style as massiveness is of that of the Normans in England. In India it is found conjoined with a degree of refinement seldom met with elsewhere, and totally free from the coarseness which in other countries usually besets vigour and boldness of design.

The peculiarities of this style are by no means confined to the capital; they prevail at Ghâzipur, and as far north as Kanauj, while at Benares the examples are frequent. In the suburbs of that city, at a place called the Bakarîyâ Kund,² there is a group of tombs, as mentioned above, and other build-

¹ 'Sharqī Architecture of Jaunpur,' pp. 3 et seqq. and plates 29 to 40. A few of the pillars are from Hindū temples.
² If the buildings of the Bakarîyâ Kund had been found within 20 miles of Ahn.âdâbâd where there are dor-ws exactly like them they would hardly have deserved a passing remark. Any one familiar with the style would have assigned them a date—A.D. 1450, or thereabouts—and would hardly have troubled himself to enquire who built them, they are so like all others of the same age.
ings belonging to the Moslims, which are singularly pleasing specimens of the Jaunpur style, and certainly belong to the same age as those just described.

The kingdom of Jaunpur is also rich in little tombs and shrines in which the Moslims have used up Hindû and Jaina pillars, merely rearranging them after their own fashion. These, of course, will not bear criticism as architectural designs, but there is always something so indescribably picturesque about them as fairly to extort admiration. The principal example of this compound style is a mosque at Kanauj known popularly as "Sītā-ki Rasot," "Sītā's Kitchen." It seems to be a Jaina temple, rearranged as a mosque, in the manner described at pp. 68, 69. It measures externally 133 ft. by 120 ft. The mosque itself has four rows of fifteen columns each, and three domes. The cloisters surrounding the courts are only two rows in depth, and had originally sixty-eight pillars, smaller than those of the mosque. Externally it has no great beauty, but its pillared court is very picturesque and pleasing. According to an inscription over its principal gateway, its conversion was effected by İbrāhîm Shâh of Jaunpur, A.D. 1406.1

At a later age, and even after it had lost its independence, several important buildings were erected in the capital and in other towns of the kingdom in the style of the day; but these are perhaps scarcely of sufficient importance to require notice in such a work as the present.

1 General Cunningham's 'Reports,' vol. i. p. 287. From this I learn that shortly before 1857 the pillars surrounding the court on three sides had been removed since I saw them in 1836.
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Of the various forms which the Saracenic architecture assumed in India, that of Ahmadābād may probably be considered as the most elegant, as it certainly is the most characteristic of all. No other form is so essentially Indian, and no one tells its tale with the same unmistakable distinctness.

As mentioned above, the Muhammadans, in the 1st century of the Hijra, made a brilliant attempt to conquer Sindh and Gujârat, and apparently succeeded; but the country was so populous, and its civilization so great, that the invaders were absorbed, and soon disappeared from the scene.

Mahmûd of Ghaznî next overran the province, but left no permanent mark; and even after the fall of Delhi (A.D. 1196) Gujârat maintained the struggle for independence for about a century longer, till ’Alâ’u-d-Dîn, in 1297, wrested the country from Karna Wâghelâ and appointed provincial governors. Muhammad Shâh III. Tughlaq, in A.D. 1391, had appointed Muzaffar, a converted Rajput, of the Tak clan, to be his viceroy. This, however, was on the eve of the troubles caused by the invasion of Timûrlang, and Muzaffar assumed independence in 1396, but, mutato domino, Gujârat remained as independent as before.

The next two centuries—during which the Ahmad Shâhî dynasty occupied the throne—were spent in continual wars and
struggles with their refractory vassals and the neighbouring chiefs. On the whole, however, their power may be said to have been gradually on the increase till the death of Bahâdur, A.D. 1536, but they never wholly subdued the rebellious spirit of their subjects, and certainly never converted the bulk of them to their faith. As a consequence of this, the principal buildings with which this chapter is concerned are to be found in the capital and its immediate proximity. Beyond that the Hindús followed their old faith and built temples as before; though in such larger cities as Dholkâ, Cambay or Bharoch the Muhammadans, of course, possessed places of worship, some of them of considerable importance, and generally made up from pillars borrowed from Hindús buildings.

In Ahmadâbâd itself, however, the Hindús influence continued to be felt throughout. Even the mosques are Hindús, or rather Jaina, in every detail; only here and there an arch is inserted, not because it was wanted constructively, but because it was a symbol of the faith, while in their tombs and palaces even this is generally wanting. The truth of the matter is, the Hindús kingdom of Gujarât had been in a high state of civilisation before its subjugation by the Muhammadans, and the remains of their temples at Sidhpur, Patân, Modherâ, and elsewhere testify to the building capacity of the race, and the Muhammadans had forced themselves upon this race. The Chaulukyas, however, conquered their conquerors, and forced them to adopt forms and ornaments which were superior to any the invaders knew or could have introduced. The result is a style which combines all the elegance and finish of Jaina or Chaulukyan art, with a certain largeness of conception which the Hindús never quite attained, but which is characteristic of the people who at this time were subjecting all India to their sway.

The first seat of the Muhammadan power was Anhilwâd, the old capital of the Gujarât kingdom, and which, at the time it fell into their power, must have been one of the most splendid cities of the East. Little now remains of all its magnificence. Ahmad, the second king, removed the seat of power to a town called Kârnâvati, afterwards known as Ahmadâbâd, from the name of its second founder, and which, with characteristic activity, he set about adorning with splendid edifices. Of these the principal was the Jâmī' Masjid, which, though not remarkable for its size, is one of the most beautiful mosques in the East. Its arrangement will be understood from the next plan (Woodcut No. 386). Its dimensions are 382 ft. by 258 ft. over all externally; the mosque itself being 210 ft. by 95 ft., covering consequently about 20,000 sq. ft. Within the mosque itself are 260 pillars, supporting fifteen domes arranged symmetrically,
the centre three alone being somewhat larger and considerably higher than the others. If the plan is compared with that of the

temple at Rânpur (Woodcut No. 288), which was being erected about the same time under Kumbha Rânâ, within 160 miles of Ahmadâbâd, it will afford a fair means of comparison between
the Jaina and Muhammadan arrangements of that day. The form of the pillars and the details generally are practically the same in both buildings, the Hindū being richer and more elaborate. In plan, the mosque looks monotonous as compared with the temple; but this is redeemed, to some extent, by the different heights of the domes, as shown in the elevation (Woodcut No. 387), and by the elevation of each division being studiously varied. My own feeling is in favour of the poetry of the temple, but there is a sobriety about the plan of the mosque which, after all, may be in better taste. Both plans, it need hardly be remarked, are infinitely superior to the monotony of the southern halls of 1000 pillars. The latter are remarkable for their size and the amount of labour bestowed upon them; but it requires more than this to constitute good architecture.

The general character of the elevation will be understood from the Woodcut No. 387, but unfortunately its minarets are gone. When Forbes¹ drew it, they were still standing, and were celebrated in Eastern story as the shaking minarets of Ahmadābād; an earthquake in A.D. 1819 shook them too much, but there are several others still standing in the city from which their form can easily be restored.

The plan and lateral extension of the Jámi' Masjid are exceptional. The usual form taken by the mosques at Ahmadābād was that of the Rānī Rupawanti or Queen's Mosque in the Mīrzapur ward, and consists of three domes standing on twelve pillars each, with the central part so raised as to admit light to the interior (Woodcuts 388, 389). The mode in which this was effected will be understood from the annexed diagram (Woodcut No. 390). The pillars which support the central domes are twice as high as those of the side domes, and two rows of dwarf columns stand on the roof to make up the

¹ See plate in Forbes’ 'Oriental Memoirs,' vol. iii. ch. xxx.; or 'Archaeological Survey of Western India,' vol. vii. p. 30.
height. In front of theseinternally is a solid balustrade, which
is generally most richly ornamented by carving. Thus arranged,
it will be perceived that the necessary amount of light is intro-
duced, as in the drum of a Byzantine dome, but in a more artistic
manner. The sun's rays can never fall on the floor, or even so
low as the head of any one standing there. The light is reflected
from the external roof into the dome, and perfect ventilation is
obtained, with the most pleasing effect of illumination without
glare. In order further to guard against the last dreaded con-
tingency, in most of these mosques a screen of perforated ston-
ework was introduced between the outer dwarf columns. These
screens were frequently of the most exquisite beauty, and in
consequence have very frequently been removed.

There are three or four mosques at Ahmadábād, built on the
same pattern as that last described, but as the style progressed
it became more and more Indian. The arches in front were
frequently omitted, and only a screen of columns appeared,
supported by two minarets, one at each angle. This system
was carried to its greatest extent at Sarkhej, about 5 miles
from the city. Muhammad Sháh, in A.D. 1446, commenced
erec ting a tomb (A on Woodcut No. 391)\(^1\) here, 102 ft. square,
in honour of Ahmad Ganj Bakhsh, the friend and adviser of his
father. The style of these buildings may be judged of from the
woodcut (No. 392, page 235), representing the pavilion of sixteen
pillars in front of this tomb (I in Woodcut No. 391). They are
of the usual simple outline of the style—a tall, square base;

\(^1\) For a measured plan to three times this scale, see ‘Archaeological Survey of
Western India,’ vol. vii. plate 56.
the shafts square, and with no ornament except a countersinking on the angles, and crowned with a moderately projecting bracket-capital. The building is roofed with nine small domes, insignificant in themselves, but both internally and externally forming as pleasing a mode of roofing as ever was applied to such a small detached building of this class. The mosque (D), 141 ft. by 65 ft. inside, was completed in A.D. 1451, and Mahmúd Begarah added afterwards a tomb for himself (B), 74 ft. square, and one for his wife Rájabâi (C). With their accompanying palaces and tombs these make up one of the most important groups in the neighbourhood. The whole are constructed without a single arch; all the pillars have the usual bracket capitals of the Hindús, and all the domes are on the horizontal principle. In the large tomb an attempt has been made to get a larger dome than the usual octagonal arrangement would admit of, by placing it on twelve pillars, but not quite successfully. The duodecagon does not accord with the substructure, and either wider spaces ought to have been introduced or a polygon of a greater number of sides employed. The mosque is the perfection of elegant simplicity, and is an improvement on the plan of the Jâmi' Masjid. There are five domes in a line,
as there, but they are placed nearer to one another, and though
of greater diameter the width of the whole is less, and they
are only two ranges in depth. Except the Moti Masjid at Agra,
to be described hereafter, there is no mosque in India more
remarkable for simple elegance than this.

Besides these larger mosques there are several smaller ones
of great beauty, of which two—those of Muháfiz Khán and the
Rání Siprí—are pre-eminent. The
end elevation of the first, built in
1492, is by no means happy, but its
details are exquisite and it retains
its minarets, which is too seldom
the case.¹ As will be seen from the
woodcut, as well as from those of
the Jâmi and Queen’s Mosques
(Nos. 387 and 389), the lower part
of the minarets is of pure Hindú
architecture; all the bases at
Ahmadâbâd are neither more or
less than the perpendicular parts
of the basement of Hindú or Jaina
temples elongated. Every form
and every detail may be found at
Chandrâvati or Ābû, except in one
particular—on the sides of all
Hindú temples are niches contain-
ing images. This the Moslim could
not tolerate, so he filled them with tracery. We can follow
the progress of the development of this form, from the first
attempt in the Jâmi’ Masjid, through all its stages to the
exquisite patterns of the Queen’s Mosque at Mirzapur. After a
century’s experience they produced forms which as architectural
ornaments will, in their own class, stand comparison with any
employed in any age or in any part of the world; and in doing
this they invented a class of window-tracery in which they were
also unrivalled. The specimen below (Woodcut No. 394), from
a window in the desecrated mosque of Sidi Sayyíd in the
palace enclosure (the Bhadr) will convey an idea of its elabora-
teness and grace.² It would be difficult to excel the skill with

¹ The finials of all the early domes
and minârs in Gujarât bore the pippal
leaf; but when this mosque was repaired
by the public works about thirty years
ago, the Turkish crescent was substituted.
The Turks themselves only assumed the
symbol at Constantinople, after its capture.

² Ibid. vol. vii. pp. 41 et seqq., and
plates 46 to 51.
which the vegetable forms are conventionalised just to the extent required for the purpose. The equal spacing also of the subject by the three ordinary trees and four palms, takes it out of the category of direct imitation of nature, and renders it sufficiently structural for its situation; but perhaps the greatest skill is shown in the even manner in which the pattern is spread over the whole surface. There are some exquisite specimens of

![Image](394) Window in Sidi Sayyid's Mosque at Ahmadabād. (From a Photograph by Colonel Biggs.)

tracery in precious marbles at Agra and Delhi, but none quite equal to this.

Above the roof of the mosques the minarets are always round towers slightly tapering, as in the mosque of Muhāfiz Khān (Woodcut No. 393); relieved by galleries displaying great richness in the brackets which support them as well as in the balustrades which protect them. The tower always terminates in a conical top relieved by various disks. They are, so far as I know, the only minarets belonging to mosques which surpass those of Cairo in beauty of outline or richness of detail, excepting those of the Rānī Sīnarī mosque, which are still more beautiful. Indeed, that mosque is the most exquisite gem at Ahmadabād, both in plan and detail. It is without
arches, and every part is such as only a Hindû queen could order, and only Hindû artists could carve.¹

**TOMBS.**

Knowing the style, it would not be difficult to predicate the form of the tombs. The simplest would be that of Ābū Turāb—an octagonal dome supported on twelve pillars, and this extended on every side, but always remaining a square, and the entrances being in the centre of the faces (Woodcut No. 395). The difference between this and the Jaina arrangement is that the latter is diagonal (Woodcut No. 179, vol. i.), while these are square. The

![Diagram of Monuments](image)

superiority of the Hindû mode is apparent at a glance. Not, it is true, in so small an arrangement as that last quoted, but in the tombs at Sarkhej (Woodcut No. 391), the effect is so monotonous as almost to become unpleasing. With the Jains this never is the case, however numerous the pillars may be.

Besides the monotony of the square plan, it was felt at Sarkhej—as already pointed out—that the octagonal dome fitted awkwardly on to its supports. This was remedied, to a great extent, in the tomb of Sayyid 'Usmân, built in A.D. 1460 by Mahmûd Begarah. In this instance the base of the dome is a dodecagon, and a very considerable amount of variety is obtained by grouping the pillars in twos and fours, and by the different spacing (Woodcut No. 396). In elevation the dome looks heavy for the substructure, but not so in perspective;

¹ by convey an impression of the beauty of these mosques, the reader is referred to the drawings and photographs in vols. vii. and viii. of the 'Archaeological Survey of Western India,' and the photographs in Fergusson and Hope's 'Architecture of Ahmedabad,' etc. (1866).
and when the screens were added to enclose the central square, it was altogether the most successful sepulchral design carried out in the pillared style at Ahmadâbâd.

Towards the end of their career, the architects of Ahmadâbâd evinced a strong tendency to revert to the arched forms generally used by their brethren in other countries. For Sayyid Mubârak, one of Mahmûd Begarah's ministers, a tomb was built in 1484, near Mahmûdâbâd, which is wholly in the arched style, and remains one of the most splendid sepulchres in India.¹ He also erected at Batwâ, near Ahmadâbâd, a tomb over the grave of a saint, which is in every respect in the same style. So little, however, were the builders accustomed to arched forms, that, though the plan is judiciously disposed by placing smaller arches outside the larger, so as to abut them, still all those of the outer range have either fallen down, or, as has been suggested, were never erected, and the whole is very much crippled, while the tomb without arches, that stands within a few yards of it, remains entire. The scale of the two, however (Plan, No. 398), reveals the secret of the preference accorded to the arch as a constructive expedient. The larger piers, the wider spacing, the whole dimensions, were on a grander scale than could be attained with beams only, as the Hinduś used them. As the Greeks and Romans employed these features, any dimensions that were feasible with arches could be attained by pillars; but the Hinduś worked to a smaller modulus, and do not seem to have known how to increase it. It must, however, be remarked that they generally used pillars only in courts, where there was nothing to compare them with but the spectator's own height; and there the forms employed by them were large enough. It was only when the Moslims came to use them externally, and in conjunction with arches and other larger features, that their diminutive scale became apparent.

It is perhaps the evidence of a declining age to find size becoming the principal aim. But it is certainly one great and important ingredient in architectural design, and so thought the later architects of Ahmadâbâd. In their later mosques and buildings they attained greater dimensions, but it was at the expense of all that renders their earlier style so beautiful and so interesting.

Besides the buildings of the classes above enumerated, there are several smaller objects of art at Ahmadâbâd which are of extraordinary beauty. Among these are several baolls, wârs, or deep wells, with broad flights of steps leading down to them, and ornamented with pillars and galleries to as great an extent

¹ Described further on, p. 244, Woodcuts Nos. 400 and 401.
as some of the largest buildings above ground. It requires a personal experience of the grateful coolness of a subterranean

aptment in a hot climate to appreciate such a class of buildings, and in the rainy West we hardly know how valuable water may become.¹

¹ For an illustrated account of some of the Wāvs at or near Ahmadābād, see 'Archaeological Survey of Western India,' vol. viii. pp. 1-6 and 10-14; at Mahmūdābād, vol. vi. pp. 46, 47; and in North Gujrat, vol. ix. pp. 37 ff. and 112 ff.
Another object of architectural beauty is found in the inflow and outflow sluices of the great tanks which abound everywhere around the city. Nowhere did the inhabitants of Ahmadâbad show how essentially they were an architectural people, as in these utilitarian works. It was a necessity of their nature that every object should be made ornamental, and their success was as great in these as in their mosques or palaces.

BUILDINGS IN THE PROVINCES.

In addition to the numerous edifices that adorn the capital, there are, as hinted above, several in the provincial capitals that are well worthy of notice. Among these the Jâmi' Masjid at Cambay or Kambhât, is one of the most splendid. It was erected in A.D. 1325, in the time of Muhammad II. ibn Tughlaq, and is only inferior to that of the capital in size. It measures over all 200 ft. by 210 ft., and its internal court 120 ft. by 135 ft. Except being somewhat smaller in scale, its plan and arrangements are almost identical with those of the Altamsh Mosque (Woodcuts Nos. 375, 376) at Ajmîr: but, when it is looked into, it would be difficult to conceive two buildings more essentially different than these two are. The screen of arches at Cambay, only three in number, are plain even to baldness, and low, in order to fit the dimensions of the Hindû or Jaina pillars of the interior. These latter are all borrowed from desecrated temples, and in this instance certainly rearranged without much attention to congruity or architectural effect. Still the effect is picturesque, and the parts being employed for the purposes for which they were designed, there is no offensive incongruity anywhere.

One of the most remarkable features in this mosque is the tomb, which its founder, 'Umar bin-Ahmad al Kâzarûnî, in 1333, erected for himself. It stands in an enclosure about 49 ft. wide along the south end of the court, is wholly composed of Hindû remains, and is two storeys in height, and was crowned with a dome 37 ft. in diameter. The parts, however—borrowed, apparently, from different buildings—were so badly fitted together that, after standing some three centuries, it fell in, and has since remained a ruin, singularly picturesque in form and exquisite in detail, but a monument of the folly of employing building materials for any purpose but that for which they were designed.¹

There is another mosque at Bharoch, not unlike this one in design but smaller, being only 135 ft. over all north and south,

¹ For an account and drawings of the Cambay Mosque, etc., see 'Archæological Survey of Western India,' vol. vi. pp. 23-29 and plate 17 to 24.
and it has—now, at least—no courtyard; but some of its details, borrowed from Hindū temples, are very beautiful.¹

About 80 miles south-east from Ahmadābād is Chāmpānīr, which was subjugated by Mahmūd Begarah in 1484 and made his new capital. Here he erected a Jāmi’ Masjid, which was finished in 1508 and may fairly be regarded as architecturally the finest in Gujarāt. It measures outside 178 ft. from north to south by 216 ft. from west to east. The court in front had

¹ 'Archeological Survey of Western India,' vol. vi. pp. 20 et seqq. and plates 2-16.
open arcades on three sides, now much ruined, and was entered from minor porches on the north and south with a larger and richly carved one on the east front. The mosque itself is in tolerable preservation and of large size, being 169 ft. 6 in. in length by 81 ft. inside the walls, and, like that at Ahmadâbâd, it has three rows of domes but quite differently arranged. There are, as will be seen from the plan (Woodcut No. 399), four domes in the front and back rows and in the middle only three, but disposed opposite the spaces separating the domes in the other rows. By this peculiar arrangement these eleven domes, each 20 ft. 6 in. in diameter, provide for seven mihrâbs or qiblas in the west wall. There are five arched entrances—the central one, as usual, being the loftiest and double the width of the others. On each side of it rise the minârs to a height of 100 ft., and the façade wall, for a width of 51 ft., is raised to a height of nearly 50 ft. The central dome, with the area within the entrance, rises behind this to a height of three storeys with their two galleries. At the four corners of the mosque are turrets 50 ft. high, carved up to the roof level, but above they are plain and have a rather clumsy appearance.\(^1\)

There are also two very beautiful mosques at Dholkâ, a city 23 miles south-west from Ahmadâbâd. One of them, known as Hilâl Khân Qâzi’s, measures inside the walls 142 ft. from north to south, by 147 ft., inclusive of the Masjid, which is 35 ft. deep. It has three arches in the central and higher part of the façade, and a smaller opening—for a perforated stone window, in each wing. It was erected in 1333, and has two small turrets over the front, a fine marble minbar or pulpit, a beautiful roof of panels taken from Hindû temples, and a remarkably fine porch and doorway at the entrance to the court.\(^2\) The second is the Jâmi’ Masjid, measuring 142 ft. from north to south inside,
also with five domes—three in the middle of the façade, and one in each of the wings. It was erected about 1485, with minarets on each side the central arch of a pattern similar to those at Ahmadābād. A third mosque, erected in 1361 almost entirely of materials from Hindū temples, is known as the Tānkā Masjid.1

The most beautiful, however, of these provincial examples is the tomb at Mahmūdābād, of its class one of the most beautiful in India (Woodcuts Nos. 400 and 401). It was erected in the reign of Mahmūd Begarah, A.D. 1484, for Mubārak Sayyid, one of his ministers. It was under the same sovereign that the tomb of Qutbu-l ‘Alam was erected at Batwā, described above (Woodcut No. 398), and is said to have been designed by the same architect. This is, however, a far more successful example, and though small—it is only 94 ft. square, exclusive of the porch—there is a simplicity about its plan, a solidity and balance of parts in the design, which is not always found in these tombs, and has rarely, if ever, been surpassed in any

---

1 'Archaeological Survey of Western India,' vol. vi. pp. 32f. and plates 28-34; pp. 36f. and plates 50-54.
tomb in India. The details, too, are all elegant and appropriate, so that it only wants somewhat increased dimensions to rank among the very first of its class. Its constructive arrangements, too, are so perfect that no alterations in them would be required, if the scale had been very much increased.

The tomb itself is surrounded by a screen of perforated stone-work of the very finest tracery, and with its double verandah aids in giving the sepulchral chamber that seclusion and repose so indispensable in a mausoleum.  

1 'Archæological Survey of Western India,' vol. vi. pp. 45f. and plates 1, 71 to 75. For a fuller account of the Muhammadan architecture of Gujarat with numerous drawings and photographs, vols. vi. to ix. of the same Western India Survey may be consulted.
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CHRONOLOGY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sultán Dîlâwar Ghûrî</th>
<th>A.D. 1401</th>
<th>Sultán Ghiyâs Shâh Khaljî</th>
<th>A.D. 1475</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sultán Hûshang Ghûrî</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>Sultán Nâsîr Shâh</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Ghaznî Khân</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>Sultán Mahmûd II.</td>
<td>1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmûd Shâh I. Khajî,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mâlûwâ incorporated with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coteemp. Rânâ Kumbhâ of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gujarât</td>
<td>1530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitor</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>—— annexed by Akbar</td>
<td>1569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ghûrî dynasty of Mandû attained independence about the same time as the Sharqîs of Jaunpur,—Sultán Dîlâwar, who governed the province of Mâlûwâ from A.D. 1387, having assumed the title of Shâh in A.D. 1401. It is, however, to his successor Hûshang, that Mandû owes its greatness and all the finest of its buildings. The state continued to prosper as one of the independent Moslim principalities till A.D. 1530, when it was incorporated with Gujarât, and was finally annexed to Akbar’s dominion in A.D. 1569.

The original capital of the state was Dhâr, an old Hindû city, about 24 miles northward of Mandû, to which the seat of government was transferred after it became independent. Though an old and venerated city of the Hindûs, Dhâr contains no evidence of its former greatness, except two mosques erected wholly of Hindû remains. The principal of these, the Jâmî’ Masjîd, has a court yard measuring 102 ft. north and south, by 131 ft. in the other direction. The mosque itself is 119 ft. by 40 ft. 6 in., and its roof is supported by sixty-four pillars of Hindû architecture, 12 ft. 6 in. in height, and all of them more or less richly carved, and the three domes that adorn it are also of purely Hindû form. The court is surrounded by an arcade containing forty-four columns, 10 ft. in height, but equally rich in carving. There is here no screen of arches, as at the Qûtâb or at Ajmîr. Internally nothing is visible but Hindû pillars, and,
except for their disposition and the prayer-niches that adorn the western wall, it might be taken for a Hindu building. In this instance, however, there seems no doubt that there is nothing in situ. The pillars have been brought from desecrated temples in the town, and arranged here by the Muhammadans as we now find them, probably before the transference of the capital to Mandu.

The other mosque is similar to this one, and only slightly smaller. It has long, however, ceased to be used as a place of prayer, and is sadly out of repair. It is called the Lat Masjid, from an iron pillar which lay half-buried in front of its gateway. This is sometimes supposed to have been a jayastambha or pillar of victory, like that at the Qutb; but this can hardly be the case. If it were intended for an ornamental purpose, it would have been either round or octagonal, and had some ornamental form. As it is, it is broken into three pieces, the longest measuring 24 ft. 3 in., the end being about 11 in. square, but above 2 ft. from it, is about 10½ in. square; the second section is 11 ft. 7 in. long, about three-fourths of which is square and the remainder octagonal; and the third piece is of 7 ft. 6 in. and octagonal with the exception of a circular collar at the end.¹ My impression is, that it was used for some useful constructive purpose, like those which supported the false roof in the Sun-temple at Kanárak (ante, page 107). There are some holes into it, which might tend to make this view of its origin probable. But, be this as it may, it is another curious proof of the employment of large masses of iron by the Hindus at a time when they were supposed to be incapable of any such mechanical exertion. Its date is probably that of the pillars of the mosques where it is found, and from their style they probably belong to the 10th or 11th century.

The site on which the city of Mandu is placed is one of the noblest occupied by any capital in India. It is an extensive plateau, detached from the mainland of Malwa by a deep ravine about 300 to 400 yards across, where narrowest, and nowhere less than 200 ft. in depth. This is crossed by a noble causeway, defended by three gateways, and flanked by tombs on either hand. The plateau is surrounded by walls erected on the brink of the cliff—it is said 28 miles in extent. This, however, conveys a very erroneous idea of the size of the place, unless qualified by the information that the walls follow the sinuosities of the ravines wherever they occur, and many of these cut into the hill a mile or two, and are only half a mile across. The plateau may be

4 or 5 miles east and west, and 3 miles north and south, most pleasingly diversified in surface, abounding in water, and fertile in the highest degree, as is too plainly evidenced by the rank vegetation, which was tearing the buildings of the city to pieces or obscuring them so that, till quite lately, they could hardly be seen.

The Delhi gate on the north of the fortifications by which they are entered, has been a fine lofty structure, though now much ruined: it also is purely Pathân in style, but unusually elegant in proportions and decoration.

The finest building in the city is the Jâmi' Masjid, commenced by Hûshang Shâh, the second king, who reigned from A.D. 1405 to A.D. 1434, but it was only finished by Mahmûd Shâh I. in 1454. Though not very large, it is so simple and grand in outline and details, that it ranks high among the monuments of its class. Its dimensions are externally 290 ft. from east to west, exclusive of the porch on the east—which projects about 55 ft.—by 271 ft. from north to south.

Internally, the courtyard is almost an exact square of 162 ft., and in other respects the four sides of the court are exactly similar, each being ornamented by eleven great arches of precisely the same dimensions and height, supported by piers or pillars, each 10 ft. high, of one single block of red sandstone. The only variety attempted is, that the east side has two arcades in depth, the north and south three: while the west side, or that facing Mecca, has five, besides being ornamented by three great domes, each 42 ft. in diameter.

As will be seen on the plan (Woodcut No. 402), these large domes are supported each by twelve pillars.

The pillars are all equally spaced, the architect having omitted,
for the sake of uniformity, to widen the central avenues on
the intersection of which the domes stand. It follows from
this that the four sides of the octagon supporting the dome,
which are parallel to the sides of the court, are shorter than
the four diagonal sides. Internally, this produces a very
awkward appearance; but it could not have been avoided
except by running into another difficulty—that of having
oblong spaces at the intersections of the wider aisles with the
narrower, to which the smaller domes must have been fitted.
Perhaps, on the whole, the architect took the less inconvenient
course of the two.

The interior of the court is represented in Woodcut No. 403,
and for simple grandeur and expression of power it may, perhaps,
be taken as one of the very best specimens now to be found in
India. It was, however, fast falling to decay, and a few years
ago considerable repairs were executed on it and others of the
Mandû monuments at the expense of the Dhâr state.

The tomb of the founder, which stands behind the mosque,
though not remarkable for size, is a very grand specimen of
the last resting-place of a stern old Pathân king. Both inter-
ually and externally it is reveted with white marble, artistically,
but not constructively, applied, and consequently was in many
places peeling off. The light is admitted by the doorway and
two small windows by the sides of it, and by three perforated marble screens on the north side, so that the interior is not more gloomy than seems suitable to its destination.

On one side of the mosque is a splendid Dharmasāla or hall, 230 ft. long, supported by three ranges of pillars, twenty-eight in each row. These are of a pattern purely Hindū; only on the capitals the kṛttimukha or horned gorgon face, so frequent in Hindū decoration, has been hewn into a group of leaves of the same outline; and on the north side is a porch, of which the pillars and style are purely Hindū.

The palaces of Mandū are, however, perhaps even more remarkable than its mosques. Of these the principal is called Jahāz Mahall or “water palace,” from its being situated between two great tanks—almost literally in the water, like a “ship.” It is a massive structure, the eastern façade being about 360 ft. long and 40 ft. in height, in the centre of which is the arched entrance, faced with marble, and still in fair preservation; over it is a projecting cornice supported on brackets, above which is a bracketed balcony under an oblong pavilion. In the front of the lower storey on each side are five arches under a deep overhanging cornice, and over each end of the façade is a domed pavilion. On one side is a ruined wing of the palace branching off from it; and on the opposite side were other apartments and a stair leading up to the roof. Seen from the west, where it overhangs the lake, this is altogether a striking building. Its mass and picturesque outline make it one of the most remarkable edifices of its date; very unlike the refined elegance afterwards introduced by the Mughals, but well worthy of being the residence of an independent Pathān chief of a warrior state.

The principal apartment is a vaulted hall, some 24 ft. wide by twice that length, and 24 ft. in height, flanked by buttresses massive enough to support a vault four times its section. Across the end of the hall is a range of apartments three storeys in height, and the upper ones adorned with rude, bold, balconied windows. Beyond this is a long range of vaulted halls, standing in the water, which were apparently the living apartments of the palace. Like the rest of the palace they are bold, and massive to a degree seldom found in Indian edifices, and produce a corresponding effect.

On the brink of the precipice overlooking the valley of the Narbadā is another palace, called that of Bāz Bahādur, of a lighter and more elegant character—built apparently by Nāsiru-d-Dīn Khaljī in 1509, but even more ruined than the northern palace—some portions of the courtyards and the cupolas over the colonnades are almost the only parts that
remain. On the hill above is what is known as Rûpamatî's Chhatri, still in fair preservation.

North of the Jâmi' Masjid stands the Hindola Mahall or Palace, which, with its massive masonry, is in rather better preservation than the others. The sloping, buttressed walls, projecting balconies and deep-set windows of this fine building present an appearance of great strength; and the great hall within, 88 ft. 6 in. long by 24 ft. wide and 38 ft. high, its roof supported on arches, was a splendid apartment. To the north of this were store-rooms below, and above the Zanâna apartments: and at some distance to the west are the large underground cisterns and tah-khânas, or hot-weather retreats of the Champa well or bault. These indicate the care and taste bestowed on such appendages of a Muhammadan palace 500 years ago.

The Nahâr Jharokhâ Palace is to the north of the Hindola Mahall, and also within the walled enclosure; and outside is Dilâwar Khân Ghûrî's mosque, the oldest in Mandû (1405), constructed of materials taken from Hindu shrines. It has, however, a simplicity of structure about it characterising it as a typical Pathân work.

About 80 yards to the south of the Jahâz Mahall is the Tawilî Mahall, a three-storeyed building, with its rows of lofty Saracenic arches below deep stone eaves and heavy windowless upper storeys. It lies across a beautiful foreground of water and ruins.

Scattered over the whole plateau are ruins of tombs and buildings of every class and so varied as almost to defy description. In their solitude, in a vast uninhabited jungle, they convey as vivid an impression of the ephemeral splendour of these Muhammadan dynasties as anything in India, and, if properly illustrated, would alone suffice to prove how wonderfully their builders had grasped the true elements of architectural design.

Here, as elsewhere, the available materials have exercised a marked influence upon the architecture; the prevalence of a red sandstone is emphasised in the piers of the Jâmi' Masjid—more than 300 of them being each of a single block of this material; and for more decorative purposes marble, both white and coloured, was freely used to revet the walls and piers. We have here a strictly arcuate style, without admixture of the general trabeate structural methods followed by the native Hindûs; and while at Jaunpur and Ahmadábad, at the same period, we find the strong influence of native methods copied in the Muhammadan architecture, at Mandû the borrowing or imitating of such forms seems to have been suppressed, and
the builders clung steadily to the pointed arch style, without any attempt, however, at groining—so successfully employed at a later period by the Mughal architects.¹