CHAPTER X.

MUGHAL ARCHITECTURE.
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CHRONOLOGY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bâbar</th>
<th>. . .</th>
<th>A.D. 1526</th>
<th>Akbar</th>
<th>. . .</th>
<th>A.D. 1556</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humâyûn</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Jahângîr</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shîr Shâh Afghân</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>Shâh Jahân</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salîm Islâm Shâh</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Aurangzîb or ‘Âlamgîr</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—— dies</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Bahâdur Shâh</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TILL within half a century ago, a description of the style introduced by the Mughal emperors would have been considered a complete history of Muhammadan architecture in India. It is the style which was described by Roe and Bernier, and all subsequent travellers. It was rendered familiar to the public in Europe by the drawings of Daniell, in the beginning of last century, and, since Agra and Delhi became practically British cities, their buildings have been described, drawn, and photographed till they have become almost as well known as any found in Europe. It will take a very long time before even photography will render the mosques or tombs of such cities as Ahmadâbâd or Bijâpûr as familiar or as easily understood. Yet it is, perhaps, true to assert that the buildings of other dynasties, commencing with the mosques at the Qutb and at Ajmîr, and continuing till the last Dakhani dynasty was destroyed by Aurangzîb, make up a whole as extensive and more interesting, in a historical point of view, than even all that was done by the Mughals. On the other hand, however, there is a unity in the works of that dynasty, and a completeness in their history, which makes the study of their art peculiarly fascinating; and some of their buildings will bear
comparison, in some respects, with any architectural productions in any part of the world. Their buildings, however, are so original, and so unlike any of the masterpieces of art that we are generally acquainted with, that it is almost impossible to institute any comparison between them which shall be satisfactory. How, for instance, can we compare the Parthenon with the Tâj? They are buildings of nearly equal size and magnificence, both in white marble, both admirably adapted for the purposes for which they were built; but what else have they in common? The one is simple in its outline, and depending on pillars for its external adornment; the other has no pillars, and owes its greatest effects to its singularly varied outline and the mode in which its various parts are disposed, many of them wholly detached from the principal mass. The Parthenon belongs, it is true, to a higher class of art, its sculptures raising it into the region of the most intellectual branch of phonic art; but, on the other hand, the exquisite inlay of precious stones at the Tâj is so æsthetically beautiful as, in a merely architectural estimate, almost to bring it on a level with the Grecian masterpiece.¹

Though their value, consequently, may be nearly the same, their forms are so essentially different that they hardly look like productions of the same art; and in an art so essentially conventional as architecture always is and must be, it requires long familiarity with any new form, and a knowledge of its origin and use, that can only be acquired by constant study, which makes it very difficult for a stranger to realise the real beauty that often underlies even the strangest forms. When, however, these difficulties are conquered, it will probably be found that there are few among the Eastern styles that deserve more attention, and would better repay any study that might be bestowed upon them, than the architecture of the Mughals.

Some little interruptions are experienced at the beginning of the narrative from the interpolation of the reigns of Sher Shâh and his son Salîm or Islâm in the reign of Humâyûn. He was an Afghân by descent and an Indian by birth, and, had he been

¹ Adopting the numerical scale described in the introduction to the 'True Principles of Beauty in Art,' p. 140 ('History of Ancient and Medieval Architecture,' vol. i, pp. 5, 6), I estimated the Parthenon as possessing 4 parts of technic value, 4 of æsthetic, and 4 phonetic, or 24 as its Index number, the highest known. The Tâj I should on the contrary estimate as possessing 4 technic, 5 æsthetic, and 2 phonetic, not that it has any direct phonetic mode of utterance, but from the singular and pathetic distinctness with which every part of it gives utterance to the sorrow and affection it was erected to express. Its index number would consequently be 20, which is certainly as high as it can be brought, and near enough to the Parthenon for comparison at least.
left to follow his own devices, would, no doubt, have built in the style of architecture used at Agra and Delhi before his countrymen were disturbed by the Mughal invasion. We have, it is true, very little to tell us what that style was during the 170 years that elapsed between the death of Tughlaq Shâh and the first invasion of Bâbar, but it seems to have been singularly plain and solid, and very unlike the florid art introduced by the Mughals, and practised by Sher Shâh and his son apparently in rivalry to the new master of Hindustan. So little difference is there, however, between the architecture of Sher Shâh and of Akbar that they must be treated as one style, beginning in great sobriety and elegance, and ending in something nearly approaching to wildness and exuberance of decoration, but still very beautiful—in some respects superior to the chaste but feeble elegance of the later Mughal style that succeeded it.

There is, again, a little difficulty and confusion in our having no examples of the style as practised by Bâbar and Humâyûn. The well-known tomb of the latter king was certainly built by his son Akbar; Bâbar was buried near Kâbul, and no building known to be his has yet been identified in India. Yet that he did build is certain. In his own ‘Memoirs’ he tells us, “In Agra alone, and of the stone-cutters belonging to that place only, I every day employed on my palaces 680 persons; and in Agra, Sikri, Bîânâ, Dholpur, Gwâliar, and Koil, there were every day employed on my works 1,491 stone-cutters.”¹ In the following pages he describes some of these works, and especially a Baolî of great magnificence he excavated in the fort of Agra.² This was in the year 1526, and he lived to carry on these works for five years longer. During the ten years that his son retained the empire, we learn from Ferishta and other sources that he adorned his capital with many splendid edifices: one, a palace containing seven pavilions or audience halls—one dedicated to each of the planets, in which he gave audience on the day of the week dedicated to the planet of the day.³ There are traditions of a mosque he is said to have built on the banks of the Jamnâ, opposite where the Tâj now stands; and his name is so frequently mentioned in connection with buildings both at Agra and Delhi that there can be little doubt that he was a builder to as great an extent as the troubled character of his reign would admit of. But his buildings have perished, so that practically the history of Mughal architecture commences with the buildings of an Afghân dynasty who occupied the throne of India for sixteen years during the last part of Humâyûn’s lifetime.

¹ ‘Memoirs,’ translated by Erskine, p. 334.
² Lo. cit. pp. 341-342.
It is probable that very considerable light will yet be thrown upon the origin of the style which the Mughals introduced into India, from an examination of the buildings erected at Samarkand by Timur a hundred years before Bâbar's time (A.D. 1393-1404). Now that city is in the hands of the Russians, it is accessible to Europeans. Its buildings have been drawn and photographed, but not yet described so as to be available for scientific purposes, but sufficiently so to indicate the direction in which light may be expected. Though a frightful savage in most respects, Timur was possessed of a true Türkî love for noble architecture; and though he generally massacred the inhabitants of any town that resisted him, he always spared the architects and artists, and sent them to work on the embellishment of his capitals. Samarkand was consequently filled with splendid edifices, but, so far as can be judged from the materials available, more resembling in style those of Persia than anything now known to exist in India. The bulbous dome appears everywhere, and was not known at that time in India, unless it was in the quasi-Persian province of Sindh. Coloured tiles were the favourite mode of decoration, and altogether their style was gorgeous in the extreme as compared with the sobriety of the later Pathân buildings in India.

Sher Shâh, A.D. 1539-1545.

Certainly one of the most remarkable men who ever ruled in northern India, though his reign was limited to only five years' duration; and during that brief space, disturbed by all the troubles incident to a usurpation, Sher Shâh left his impress on every branch of the administration. The revenue system, the police, the army administration, all the great reforms, in fact, which Akbar so successfully carried out, were commenced, and to some extent perfected, by this usurper, as the Mughals call him. In architecture, too, which most concerns us here, he certainly pointed out the path by which his successor reached such eminence.

The most perfect of his buildings that I am acquainted with is the mosque in the Purânâ Kilâ or Kilâ Kohnâ at Delhi. The walls of this place were repaired by Humâyûn in A.D. 1533, and, according to the latest authorities, it is said to have been built by Sher Shâh in A.D. 1541 (Plate XXXII.). It is a single hall, with five openings in front through pointed arches of what we would call Tudor form, but beautifully varied in design, and

---

1 Cunningham, 'Reports,' vol. i. p. 222; vol. iv. p. 74; Curr Stephen's 'Archaeology of Delhi,' p. 190; Fanshawe's 'Delhi,' p. 228, from which the plate is taken.
arranged in panels carved with the most exquisite designs and ornamented with parti-coloured marbles. It is 168 ft. long by 44 ft. 6 in. wide, and about 44 ft. high. The brackets under the balconies are the precursors of the type so marked in the red sandstone palace in the fort at Agra; and the pendentives inside, below the dome, are effective. One important dome, pierced with twelve small windows, crowns the centre; it has, however, no minarets and no courtyard, but even without these adjuncts it is one of the most satisfactory buildings of its class in India.

In the citadel at Agra there stood when I was there, a fragment of a palace built by Sher Shâh, or his son Salîm, which was as exquisite a piece of decorative art as anything of its class in India. Being one of the first to occupy the ground, this palace was erected on the highest spot within the fort; hence our Government, fancying this a favourable site for the erection of a barrack, pulled it down, and replaced it by a more than usually hideous brick erection of their own. This afterwards became a warehouse, and looms, in whitewashed ugliness, over the marble palaces of the Mughals—a fit standard of comparison of the tastes of the two races.¹

Judging from the fragment that remains, and the accounts received on the spot, this palace must have gone far to justify the eulogium more than once passed on the works of these Pathâns—that "they built like giants, and finished like goldsmiths:" for the stones seem to have been of enormous size, and the details of most exquisite finish. It has passed away, however, like many another noble building of its class, under the ruthless barbarism of our rule. Mosques we have generally spared, and sometimes tombs, because they were unsuited to our economic purposes, and it would not answer to offend the religious feelings of the natives. But when we deposed the kings, and appropriated their revenues, there was no one to claim their now useless abodes of splendour. It was consequently found cheaper either to pull them down, or use them as residences or arsenals, than to keep them up, so that very few now remain for the admiration of posterity.

The tomb of Sher Shâh has been already described (ante, p. 218), as it is essentially Pathân in style. It was erected at his native place in Bihâr, to the south of the Ganges, far from Mughal influence at that time, and in the style of severe simplicity that characterised the works of his race between the

¹ As I cannot find any trace of this building in Keene's description of the fort in his book on Agra, I presume it must have been utilised since my day.

Unless it is the building he calls the Nobat Khana of Akbar's palace (26). I have never seen it in any photograph of the place.
times of Tughlaq and those of Bahlol Lodi (A.D. 1451-1489), the last really independent king of his line.

It is not quite clear how much of the tomb was built by himself, or how much by his son Salim, who certainly finished it. Salim also built the Salimgarh on an island in the Jamnâ, which Shâh Jahân afterwards connected by a bridge with his palace in New Delhi. Whether, however, he erected any buildings inside is not certain—nothing at least now remains of any importance. Generally he seems to have carried on and completed his father’s buildings, and between them they have left a group of architectural remains which, if collected together and illustrated, would form an interesting chapter in the history of Indian-Muhammadan styles.¹

AKBAR, 1556-1605.

It would require a volume to describe all the buildings erected by this remarkable man during his long reign of forty-nine years, and a hundred plates would hardly suffice to make known all their peculiarities. Had Akbar been content to follow in the lines of the style invented by the Pathâns and perfected under Sher Shâh, it might be easy enough to follow the sequence, but nothing in his character is so remarkable as the spirit of tolerance that pervaded all his acts. He seems to have had as sincere a love and admiration for his Hindû subjects as he had for those of his own creed, and whether from policy or inclination, to have cherished their arts as much as he did those that belonged exclusively to his own people. The consequence is a mixture throughout all his works of two styles, often more picturesque than correct, which might, in the course of another half century, have been blended into a completely new style if persevered in. The spirit of tolerance, however, died with him. There is no trace of Hinduisn in the works of Jahângir or Shâh Jahân, and Aurangzib would have been horrified at the suggestion that arts of the infidels could influence anything he did.

One probably of his earliest works was the mausoleum, which he erected over the remains of his father, Humâyûn, at Delhi. Though it certainly was finished by Akbar, it was commenced by his widow, Háji Begam Maryam-makâni, and

¹ It is not quite clear how much Rhotâsgarh owes its magnificence to Sher Shâh, how much to Akbar; both certainly built there, and on the spot it might easily be ascertained how much belongs to each. Unfortunately the British "converted the beautiful Dwân Khâna, of which Daniell published a drawing, into a stable for breeding horses." — Hamilton’s ‘Gazetteer,’ sub voce.
completed in 1565, at a cost of fifteen lähks of rupees; for, as frequently remarked in the previous pages of this work, the great architectural peculiarity of the Tartar or Mongolian races is their tomb-building propensity, in which they are so strongly distinguished from the Aryan, and also from the great Semitic families, with whom they divide the greater part of the habitable globe. Nowhere is this more forcibly illustrated than in India—where the tombs of the Pathâns and Mughals form a complete and unbroken series of architectural monuments from the first years of the Moslim invasion to the present hour.

The tombs of the Pathâns are less splendid than those of the Mughals; but nevertheless the whole series is singularly interesting, the tombs being far more numerous than the mosques. Generally speaking, also, they are more artistic in design, and frequently not only larger but more splendidly decorated than the buildings exclusively devoted to prayer.

The princes of the Tartar races, in carrying out their love of tombs, made it the practice to build their own in their lifetime, as all people must who are really desirous of sepulchral magnificence. In doing this they rejected the Egyptian mode of preparing dark and deep chambers in the heart of the rock, or of the massive pyramid. The Tartars, on the other hand, built their sepulchres of such a character as to serve for places of enjoyment for themselves and their friends during their lifetime, and only when they could enjoy them no longer they became the solemn resting-places of their mortal remains.

The usual process for the erection of these structures is for the king or noble who intends to provide himself a tomb to enclose a garden outside the city walls, generally with high crenellated walls, and with one or more splendid gateways; and in the centre of this he erects a square or octagonal building, crowned by a dome, and in the more splendid examples with smaller and dome-roofed apartments on four of the sides or angles, the other four being devoted to entrances. This building is generally situated on a lofty square terrace, from which radiate four broad alleys, generally with marble-paved canals, ornamented with fountains; a mosque is an essential adjunct; the angular spaces are planted with cypresses and other evergreens and fruit-trees, making up one of those formal but beautiful gardens so characteristic of the East. During the lifetime of the founder, the central building is called a Bâra-dârî, summer house or festal hall, and is used as a place of recreation and feasting by him and his friends.

At his death its destination is changed—the founder's remains are interred beneath the central dome. Sometimes his favourite
wife lies beside him; but more generally his family and relations are buried beneath the collateral domes. When once used as a place of burial, its vaults never again resound with festive mirth. The care of the building is handed over to priests and faqirs, who gain a scanty subsistence by the sale of the fruits of the garden, or the alms of those who come to visit the last resting-place of their friend or master. Perfect silence takes the place of festivity and mirth. The beauty of the surrounding objects combines with the repose of the place to produce an effect as graceful as it is solemn and appropriate.

Though the tombs, with the remains of their enclosures, are so numerous throughout all India, the Tâj Mahall, at Agra, is almost the only tomb that retains its garden in anything like its pristine beauty, and there is not perhaps in the whole world a scene where nature and art so successfully combine to produce a perfect work of art as within the precincts of this far-famed mausoleum.

The tomb of Humâyûn Shâh, the first of the Mughals who was buried in India, still stands tolerably entire among the ruins of Old Delhi, of which indeed it forms the principal and most striking object (Plate XXXIII.). It stands well on a large square platform, 22 ft. in height, adorned with arches, whose piers are ornamented with an inlay of white marble. The tomb itself is an octagonal apartment, 47 ft. 4 in. across, crowned by a dome of white marble, of very graceful contour externally. Four sides of the octagon are occupied by the entrances; the other four smaller octagonal apartments, 23 ft. wide, are attached; these project from the façades of the central bays on each face, and the amount of white marble on them, gives them prominence. In the corner rooms are the tombs of Hâjî Begam and some nine others of the royal race. These apartments make up a building nearly square in plan, about 155 ft. each way, with the angles slightly cut away.¹ Its plan is in fact that afterwards adopted at the Tâj (Woodcut No. 433), but used here without the depth and poetry of that celebrated building. Its most marked characteristic, however, is its purity—it might almost be called poverty—of design. It is so very unlike anything else that Akbar ever built, that it is hardly possible it could have been designed by him. It has not even the picturesque boldness of the earlier Pathân tombs, and in fact looks more like buildings a century at least more modern than it really is. It is, however, as will be seen from the photograph, a noble tomb, and anywhere else must be considered a wonder.

¹ In the upper storey of the building round the drum supporting the dome, are rooms and pavilions once occupied by a college, long since deserted.
To illustrate the architecture of the day, however, it may be preferable to take the contemporary tomb of Muhammad Ghaus\textsuperscript{1} at Gwâliar, which was erected during the early part of Akbar's reign, and is a singularly interesting example of the tombs of the period. It is a square, measuring 100 ft. each way, exclusive of the hexagonal towers, which are attached to the angles (Woodcut No. 421). The chamber of the tomb itself is a hall 43 ft. square, with the angles cut off by pointed arches so as to form an octagon, on which the dome rests. Around this square building is a gallery, 20 ft. wide between the piers, enclosed on all sides by a screen of the most exquisite tracery in pierced stone-work with a projecting porch on each face (Woodcut No. 422).\textsuperscript{2}

On comparing this with the tomb of Sher Shâh at Sahsarâm, which in many respects it resembles to a considerable extent, it will be seen that it marks a considerable progress in tomb-building during even the short period that elapsed between the erection of the two. There is an inherent weakness in an octagonal form as compared with the square, that even the Pathâns never quite successfully conquered; and the outward screen of trellis work is far more elegant than the open arcade of the Sahsarâm tomb. Something may be due to the fact that Gwâliar was a city where building of an ornamental character had long been going on, and where consequently a superior school of masons and architects may always have existed, while Sahsarâm was a remote country village, where these advantages were unknown. But be this as it may, the progress is such in so short a time, that we can only ascribe it to the invigorating

\textsuperscript{1} Muhammad Ghaus al 'Alam of Gwâliar, died in 1562.—Blochmann's 'Ain-i-Akbarî,' vol. i. pp. 457f.

\textsuperscript{2} The plan is taken from one by Gen. Cunningham ('Report,' vol. ii. plate 91). He omits, however, these square projections. I have added them from the photographs.
touch of Akbar's genius, which was afterwards to work such wonders.

One of the most remarkable and characteristic of Akbar's buildings is the old or Red Palace in the Agra fort, so called from being constructed entirely of red sandstone, unfortunately not of very good quality, and consequently much of its ornament has peeled off. Though most probably erected by Akbar, it goes by the name of the Jahângîr Mahall, and lies on the south side of the Anguri Bâgh and the Khâss Mahall or Palace which is probably largely due to Shâh Jahân. The Red Palace is a square building, measuring 249 ft. by 260 ft. In the centre is a courtyard, 71 ft. by 72 ft., on either side of which are two halls facing one another. The largest, 62 ft. by 37 ft., has a flat ceiling of stone, divided into panels, and supported by struts of purely Hindû design, very similar to those used in the palaces of Mân Singh and Vikrama Shâhi at Gwâliar. Every
feature around this court is indeed of pure Hindû architecture. No arches appear anywhere, but the horizontal style of construction everywhere. The ornamentation, too, which is carved on all the flat surfaces, is of a class used by Akbar, but not found in the buildings of others. Indeed, throughout this palace arches are used so sparingly, and Hindû forms and Hindû construction prevail to such an extent, that it would hardly be out of place at Chitor or Gwâliar, though it still bears that impress of vigour and originality that he and he only knew how to impress on all his works.¹

It is, however, at Fâthpur-Sîkri, 22½ miles south-west from Agra, that Akbar must be judged of as a builder. During the whole of his reign it was his favourite residence. He apparently was the first to occupy the spot, and apparently the last, at least, to build there, no single building being identified as having been erected by any of his successors.

Akbar seems to have had no settled plan when he commenced building there. The original part of the building seems to be the Mahall-t-Khâss, a block of building measuring about 270 ft. by 390 ft. and therefore of larger dimensions than the Red Palace in the fort of Agra. It has two large courtyards, however, and the buildings that surround it are very inferior in richness of design and ornamentation. This, however, is far more than compensated for by the courts and pavilions that he added from time to time. There is the Diwân-t-Khâss, or private audience-room, a square building with a throne consisting of an enormous flower-like bracket, supported on a richly-carved pillar;² a peristylar building, called his office (Daftar-Khâna), very similar to one he erected at Allahábâd, to be mentioned hereafter; a five-storeyed open pavilion, all the pillars of which are most richly carved; and long colonnades and walls connecting these with one another. The richest, the most beautiful, as well as the most characteristic of all his buildings here are three small pavilions, said to have been erected to please and accommodate his three favourite sultânás: hence called Bîrbal’s daughter’s Mahall;³ Maryam-zamânt’s House, appropriated to the daughter of Râja Bihârî Mall and mother of Jahângîr, which was known as Sonahlà Makân or “Golden House” as having been entirely gilt; and the palace of the Rûmî or Turkish Sultânà – Akbar’s first wife – Sultânâ Ruqayyah Begam, a daughter of Mîrzâ Hindál, the emperor’s uncle: it is

¹ There is a plan of this palace, in General Cunningham’s ‘Reports,’ vol. iv., plate 13.
² A cast of this throne is in the South Kensington Museum.
³ Bîrbal was a favourite wit and court bard, but no mention is found of his having a daughter, and the house is usually spoken of simply as Bîrbal’s palace.
miscalled by the guides Jodh-Bâi's.¹ They are small, but it is impossible to conceive anything so picturesque in outline, or any building carved and ornamented to such an extent, without the smallest approach to being overdone or in bad taste. The two pillars shown in the annexed woodcut, are from a cast from the last-named pavilion, which is now in the South Kensington and other Museums. It is, perhaps, the most elaborate of the three; but the other two are generally in better taste.

The glory, however, of Fathpur-Sikrî is its mosque, which

¹ Jodh-Bâi was the daughter of Udayasimha of Jodhpur and wife of Jahângîr.
is hardly surpassed by any in India (Woodcut No. 424). It measures about 544 ft. east and west, by 474 ft. north and south over all. The mosque itself, 288 ft. by 66 ft., is crowned by three domes. In its courtyard, which measures 359 ft. 10 in. by 438 ft. 9 in., stand two tombs: that of Salim Chishti, wholly in white marble, and the windows with pierced tracery of the most exquisite geometrical patterns—flowing tracery is a subsequent invention. It possesses besides a deep cornice of marble supported by brackets of the most elaborate design, so much

424. Mosque at Fathpur-Sikrī. (From a Plan by Lieut. Cole, R.E.)

so indeed as to be almost fantastic—the only approach to bad taste in the place; the other tomb, that of Islām Khān, is soberer and in excellent taste, but quite eclipsed by its surroundings.¹ Even these parts, however, are surpassed in magnificence by the southern or Buland ("Lofty") gateway (A),² measuring 130 ft. by 88 ft. in plan, and of proportionate

¹ Shaikh Islām Khān was a grandson of Shaikh Salīm Chishti and married a sister of Abūl Fazl. He was made governor of Bengal in 1608 and died in 1613.

² The gateway B on the east side, is called the Badshāhi or Royal gateway; it is much smaller, though it faces the mosque.
dimensions in height (Woodcut No. 425). It was completed
in 1575. As it stands on a rising ground, when looked at
from below, its appearance is noble beyond that of any portal
attached to any mosque in India, perhaps in the whole world.
This gateway may also be quoted as a perfectly satisfactory
solution of a problem which has exercised the ingenuity of
architects in all ages, but was more successfully treated by the
Saracenic architects than by any others.

It was always manifest that to give a large building a door
at all in proportion to its dimensions was, to say the least of
it, very inconvenient. Men are only 6 ft. high, and they do
not want portals through which elephants might march. The
Greeks never ventured, however, to reduce the proportionate
size of their portals, though it may be they only opened the
lower half, and they covered them, in almost all instances,
with porticos to give them a dignity that even their dimensions
failed to impart.

The Gothic architects tried, by splaying their deeply-
embowed doorways, and by ornamenting them richly with
carving and sculpture, to give them the dignity that was
indispensable for their situation without unnecessarily increasing
the size of the openings. It was left, however, for the Saracenic
architects completely to get over the difficulty. They placed
their portals—one, or three, or five, of very moderate dimensions
—at the back of a semi-dome. This last feature thus became
the porch or portico, and its dimensions became those of the
portal, wholly irrespective of the size of the opening. No one,
for instance, looking at this gateway can mistake that it is a
doorway and that only, and no one thinks of the size of the
openings which are provided at its base. The semi-dome is
the modulus of the design, and its scale that by which the
imagination measures its magnificence.

The same system pervades almost all the portals of the
age and style, and always with a perfectly satisfactory result—
sometimes even more satisfactory than in this instance, though
it may be in less proportionate dimensions. The principle
seems the best that has yet been hit upon, and, when that is
right, failure is as difficult as it is to achieve success when the
principle of the design is wrong.

Taking it altogether, this palace at Fathpur-Sikri is a romance
in stone, such as few—very few—are to be found anywhere; and
it is a reflex of the mind of the great man who built it more
distinct than can easily be obtained from any other source.  

1 The architecture of Fathpur-Sikri has
been admirably surveyed and illustrated by
the late Mr. Edmund W. Smith,—in four
"parts" or volumes, with over 400 plates
and photographs, of which about 320 are
excellent architectural drawings,—pub-
lished by the Government of the North-
Western Provinces, Allahabad, 1894-97.
Conf. G. Le Bon, 'Les Monuments de
l'Inde,' pp. 213-218, figs. 341-355.
Allahābād was a more favourite residence of this monarch than Agra, perhaps as much so as even Fatehpur-Sīkri; but the English having appropriated the fort, its glories have been nearly obliterated. The most beautiful thing was the pavilion of the Chālīs Sītān, or forty pillars, so called from its having that number on the principal floor, disposed in two concentric octagonal ranges, one internal of sixteen pillars, the other outside of twenty-four. Above this, supported by the inner colonnade, was an upper range of the same number of pillars crowned by a dome. This building has entirely disappeared, its materials being wanted to repair the fortifications. The great hall, however, still remains, represented in the annexed woodcut (No. 426). It was turned into an arsenal; a brick wall was run up between its outer colonnades with windows of English architecture, and its curious pavilions and other accompaniments removed; and internally, whatever could not be conveniently cut away was carefully covered up with plaster and whitewash, and hid by stands of arms and deal fittings. Still its plan can be made out; a square hall supported by eight rows of columns, eight in each row, thus making in all sixty-four, surrounded by a deep verandah of double columns, with groups of four at the angles, all surmounted by bracket capitals of the most elegant and richest design, and altogether as fine in style and as rich in ornament as anything in India.

Perhaps, however, the most characteristic of Akbar's buildings is the tomb he commenced to erect for himself at Sikandara, about 5 miles north-west from Agra, which is quite unlike any other tomb built in India either before or since, and of a design borrowed, as I believe, from a Hindu, or more correctly, Buddhist, model. It was completed in 1613, and is said to have
been twenty years in building. It stands in an extensive
garden, approached by one noble gateway. In the centre of
this garden, on a raised platform, stands the tomb itself, of a
pyramidal form. The lower storey measures 320 ft. each way,
exclusive of the angle towers. It is 30 ft. in height, and pierced
by ten great arches on each face, and with a larger entrance
adorned with a mosaic of marble in the centre (Woodcuts
Nos. 427, 428).¹

On this terrace stands another far more ornate, measuring
186 ft. on each side, and 14 ft. 9 in. in height. A third and
fourth, of similar design, and respectively 15 ft. 2 in. and 14 ft.

¹ No plan or section of this tomb has
ever, so far as I know, been published,
though it has been in our possession for
nearly a century. Those here given are
from my own measurements, and, though
they may be correct as far as they go, are
not so detailed as those of such a monu-
ment ought to be, and would have been,
had it been in the hands of any other
European nation.
6 in. high, stand on this, all these being of red sandstone. Within and above the last is a white marble enclosure 157 ft. each way, or externally just half the length of the lowest terrace, its outer wall entirely composed of marble trellis-work of the most beautiful patterns. Inside it is surrounded by a colonnade or cloister of the same material, in the centre of which, on a raised platform, is the tombstone of the founder, a splendid piece of the most beautiful arabesque tracery. This, however,

is not the true burial-place; but the mortal remains of this great king repose under a far plainer tombstone in a vaulted chamber in the basement 35 ft. square, exactly under the simulated tomb that adorns the summit of the mausoleum.

At first sight it might appear that the design of this curious and exceptional tomb was either a caprice of the monarch who built it, or an importation from abroad (Woodcut No. 429). My impression, on the contrary, is, that it is a direct imitation of some such building as the old Buddhist vihāras which may have existed, applied to other purposes in Akbar’s time. Turning

1 The diagram is probably sufficient to explain the text, but must not be taken as pretending to be a correct architectural drawing. There were parts, such as the height of the lower dome and upper angle kiosks, I had no means of measuring, and after all, I was merely making memoranda for my own satisfaction.
back, for instance, to Woodcuts Nos. 89 and 193, representing the great rath at Māmallapuram, it will be seen that the number and proportion of the storeys is the same. The pavilions that adorn the upper storeys of Akbar’s tomb appear distinct reminiscences of the cells that stand on the edge of each platform of the rock-cut example. If the tomb had been crowned by a domical chamber over the tombstone, the likeness would have been so great that no one could mistake it, and my conviction is that such a chamber was part of the original design. No such royal tomb remains exposed to the air in any Indian mausoleum; and the raised platform in the centre of the upper cloister, 38 ft. square, looks so like its foundation that I cannot help believing it was intended for that purpose. As the monument now stands, the pyramid has a truncated and unmeaning aspect. The total height of the building now is a little more than 100 ft. to the top of the angle pavilions; and a central dome 30 or 40 ft. higher, which is the proportion that the base gives, seems just what is wanted to make this tomb as beautiful in outline and in proportion as it is in detail. Had it been so completed, it certainly would have ranked next the Tāj among Indian mausolea.\footnote{1}

\textbf{Jahāngīr, A.D. 1605-1628.}

When we consider how much was done by his father and his son, it is rather startling to find how little Jahāngīr contributed to the architectural magnificence of India. Partly this may be owing to his not having the same passion for building which characterised these two great monarchs; but partly also to his having made Lāhor the capital during his reign, and to his having held his court there in preference to Agra or Delhi, from 1622 till his death in 1628.\footnote{2}

Among the buildings of Jahāngīr’s reign, the Jahāngīrfī Mahall, already mentioned, in the fort at Agra, is ascribed to

\footnote{1} Eleven plates of the beautiful coloured work are published in ‘Photographs and Drawings of Historical Buildings’ (Griggs, 1866).

\footnote{2} After the above was written, and the diagram drawn (Woodcut No. 428), I was not a little pleased to find the following entry in Mr. Finch’s journal. He resided in Agra for some years, and visited the tomb for the last time apparently in 1609, and after describing most faithfully all its peculiarities up to the upper floor, as it now stands, adds: “At my last sight thereof there was only overhead a rich tent with a Semailanie over the tomb. But it is to be inarched over with the most curious white and speckled marble, and to be seceded all within with pure sheet gold richly inwrought.”—‘Purchas, his Pilgrims,’ vol. i. p. 440.

\footnote{3} His father, Akbar, had also kept his court here for fourteen years, from 1584 to 1598: and had repaired the fort and built the Akbari Mahal in the east end of it, and a Dīwan-i-‘Amm, now demolished, also the Akbari Gate as the principal entrance. Examples may still be seen at Lāhor of the architecture of his time, though defaced by subsequent alterations.
the first years of his reign; the fine gateway to the Sarâ'e

at Nûrmahall, 16 miles south of Jâlandhar, was erected in
1620, the Shálímâr gardens and summer houses near Srínagar were built about 1624; the tomb of Anârkâlî in the town of Lâhor; and in the fort he added to Akbar's buildings the eastern Khwâb-gah, marked in the accompanying plan (Woodcut No. 430); and the Motî Masjid of white marble, with three domes, which, though comparatively plain, is architecturally interesting. The Khwâb-gah or sleeping apartments were in a quadrangle about 140 ft. in length, with a lofty pavilion in the middle of the north side—then overlooking the Râvî—and at the corners two chambers with Hindû pillars richly carved. On the other three sides the area was surrounded by a colonnade, on pillars of red sandstone with bracket capitals carved with figures of elephants, peacocks, and conventional animals, similar to what we find in the Red Palace at Agra. But these and nearly all the buildings in the fort have met with no respect, but have been entirely altered to suit the conveniences of military life.

To the south of Jahângîr's palace Shâh Jahân erected his Dîwân-i-Ámm, and on the west an extension of the palace, the smaller Khwâb-gah in which is an elegant pavilion of marble arches and open lattice work which long did duty as a garrison church. At the west end of the north front of the fort is what is known as the Samman Burj, containing the Shish Mahall—the work of Shâh Jahân and Æurangzib, added to by the Sikhs, and the Naulakhâ pavilion a costly erection inlaid in pietra dura with flowers in precious stones. The square on the west of the fort, called the Hazuri Bâgh, enclosing the Bârahdîr of Ranjit Singh, gives entrance to the Badshâhi Masjid erected by Æurangzib in 1674, to which reference will be made below.

The great mosque in the city of Lâhor is that of Wazîr Khân built in 1634 by Hakîm 'Álîmu-d-Din, Sûbahdâr of the Panjáb under Shâh Jahân. It is in the Persian style, covered with enamelled tiles, and resplendent in colours, but not very graceful in form. Its brick walls are covered with beautiful inlaid work called kashi, a kind of mosaic of glazed pottery.

Jahângîr's own tomb at Shâhdara, about 6 miles north of Lâhor, was raised by his queen, the accomplished and imperious Nûr-Jahân, and was worthy of his other buildings, but it has suffered as much as the others. The tomb is in the middle of a large walled garden about 540 yards square, extending to 60 acres, originally with gateways on each side—

---

1 Photographed in Cole's 'Buildings in the Panjáb,' plates 1 and 2.  
2 From a native plan of the Fort in the time of Ranjit Singh.—Cole, ut sup.  
3 Samman is from musamman—octagonal. Tradition reports a lofty octagonal tower here.  
4 This inlaid work is described by J. L. Kipling, with a coloured view of the fine gateway and some details, in 'Journal of Indian Art and Industry,' vol. ii. p. 17, and plates 16-18.
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that from the court of the Sarâ'e on the west having a marble arch and being about 50 ft. high. The mausoleum in the centre stands on a low plinth, 25 ft. square, and itself consists of a terraced platform, 209 ft. square and about 20½ ft. high, with octagonal minarets of three storeys above the terraced roof, surmounted by white marble cupolas, and rising 85 ft. from the plinth. It is surrounded by arcades, having a central arch flanked by a doorway and five other arches on each side; the arcades have behind them forty rooms in all, through one of which on each side a passage leads through other two oblong apartments into the tomb chamber, which is thus enclosed in nearly solid walls of masonry 56 ft. thick on all sides. The sarcophagus is of white marble, inlaid with pietra dura work and stands in an octagonal chamber of 26½ ft. diameter and about 21 ft. high. On the roof over this is a raised platform 53 ft. square with a tessellated marble pavement, the marble parapet of which was carried off by Ranjit Singh, but has now been restored.1 The building is of red sandstone inlaid with marble, and the details are all in excellent taste, but the long low façade between the minars is not architecturally very effective.

On the west of this is the Sarâ'e, and beyond it the octagonal tomb of Āṣaf Khân, the brother of Nûr-Jahân, who died in 1641, and across the railway is that of the queen herself—both stripped by Ranjit Singh of their marbles and inlaid work.2

At the other end of his dominions also he built a splendid new capital at Dacca, in supersession to Gaur, and adorned it with several buildings of considerable dimensions. These, however, were principally in brick-work, covered with stucco, and with only pillars and brackets in stone. Most of them, consequently, are in a state of ruinous decay; marvellously picturesque, it must be confessed, peering through the luxuriant vegetation that is tearing them to pieces but hardly worthy to be placed in competition with the stone and marble buildings of the more northern capitals.

There is one building—the tomb known as that of I'timâd-daulah—at Agra, however, which belongs to this reign, and though not erected by the monarch himself, cannot be passed over, not only from its own beauty of design, but also because it marks an epoch in the style to which it belongs. It was erected by Nûr-Jahân, in memory of her father, who died in

---

1 There is a plan of the tomb and garden, but to a very small scale, among Major Cole's plates in Griggs' 'Photographs and Drawings of Historical Buildings,' plate 68. The elevation and section with coloured details (plates 69-76) are to adequate scales however.

2 Thornton's 'Lahore' and Syad Muhammad Latif's 'Lahore' give detailed accounts of the place.
1621, and was completed in 1628. It is situated on the left bank of the river, in the midst of a garden surrounded by a wall measuring 540 ft. on each side. In the centre of this, on a raised platform, stands the tomb itself, a square measuring 69 ft. on each side. It is two storeys in height, and at each angle is an octagonal tower, surmounted by an open pavilion. The towers, however, are rather squat in proportion, and the general design of the building very far from being so pleasing as that of many less pretentious tombs in the neighbourhood. Had it, indeed, been built in red sandstone, or even with an inlay of white marble like that of Humâyûn, it would not have attracted much attention. Its real merit consists in being wholly in white marble, and being covered throughout with a mosaic in "pietra dura"—the first, apparently, and certainly one of the most splendid, examples of that class of ornamentation in India.¹

It seems that in the early part of the 17th century Italian artists, principally, apparently from Florence, were introduced into India, and, it has been said they taught the Indians the art of inlaying marble with precious stones.² At Fathpur-Sikrê, examples occur of "inlay" as well as of "overlay," and in the gateway of the Sikandara tomb inlaid work is quite prevalent; but in the time of Shâh Jahân it became the lead-

¹ For details of the decoration, see E. W. Smith's 'Mogul Colour Decoration of Agra,' pp. 18-20; and plates 64-77; 'Photographs and Drawings of Indian Buildings,' plates 12-30; or 'Journal of Indian Art and Industry,' vol. vi. pp. 90-94, and plates 59-66.

² Although this was for a time hardly doubted, no very direct evidence was adduced to prove that it was to foreign—Florentine—artists that the Indians owe the art of inlaying in precious stones generally known as work in "pietra dura." Austin or Augustin de Bordeaux is the only European artist whose name can be identified with any works of the class. He was employed by Shâh Jahân at Delhi, and is supposed to have executed that mosaic of Orpheus or Apollo playing to the beasts, after Raphael's picture, which adorned the throne there, and was long in the Indian Museum at South Kensington, but was taken back and restored to its place by Lord Curzon.

In 'The Nineteenth Century and After,' vol. iii. (1903) pp. 1036ff. Mr. E. B. Havell, of the Calcutta School of Art, has shown reason for ascribing this inlaid work to Arab and Persian origins, pointing to the "elaborate scrolls of conventional Arabian design," and the familiar Persian motifs, "such as rose-water vessels, the cypress," etc., which characterise the art.

Up to the erection of the gates to Akbar's tomb at Sikandara in the first ten years of Jahângrî's reign, A.D. 1605-1615, we have infinite mosaics of coloured marble, but few specimens of "inlay." In I'timâd-ud-daulah's tomb, A.D. 1615-1628, we have both systems in great perfection. In the Tâj and palaces at Agra and Delhi, built by Shâh Jahân, A.D. 1628-1668, the mosaic has disappeared, being supplanted by the "inlay." It was just before that time that the system of inlaying called "pietra dura" was invented, and became the rage at Florence and, in fact, all throughout Europe; but though during the reigns of the two last-named monarchs Italian artists were in their service, there is no definite evidence that they held influential posts, whilst artists from Shiraz, Bagdad, Samarkand and Kanauj are mentioned as of high reputation during the erection of the Tâj Mahall,—most probably designed by 'Afl Mardan Khan, a Persian refugee.
ing characteristic of the style, and both his palaces and his
tombs owe their principal distinction to the beauty of the
mode in which this new invention was employed.

It has been doubted whether this new art was really a
foreign introduction, or whether it had not been invented by
the natives of India themselves. The question never, probably,
would have arisen had one of the fundamental principles of
architecture been better understood. When we, for instance,
having no art of our own, copy a Grecian or Roman pillar,
or an Italian mediaeval arch in detail, we do so literally,
without any attempt to adapt it to our uses or climate; but
when a people having a style of their own wish to adopt
any feature or process belonging to any other style, they do
not copy but adapt it to their uses; and it is this distinction
between adopting and adapting that makes all the difference.
We would have allowed Italians to introduce with their mosaics
all the details of their Cinque-cento architecture. The Indians
set about reproducing, with the new materials and processes—
wherever they came from—the patterns which the architects
of Akbar had been in the habit of carving in stone or of
inlaying in marble. Every form was adapted to the place
where it was to be used. The style remained the same, so
did all the details; the materials only were changed, and the
patterns only so far as was necessary to adapt them to the
smaller and more refined materials that were to be used.¹

As one of the first, the tomb of I’timâd-ud-daulah was certainly
one of the least successful specimens of its class. The patterns
do not quite fit the places where they are put, and the spaces
are not always those best suited for this style of decoration.
But, on the other hand, the beautiful tracery of the pierced
marble slabs of its windows, which resemble those of Salim
Chishti’s tomb at Fathpur-Sikri, the beauty of its white
marble walls, and the rich colour of its decorations, make up
so beautiful a whole, that it is only on comparing it with the
works of Shâh Jahân that we are justified in finding fault.

SHÂH JAHÂN, A.D. 1628-1658.

It would be difficult to point out in the whole history of
architecture any change so sudden as that which took place
between the style of Akbar and that of his grandson Shâh
Jahân—nor any contrast so great as that between the manly

¹ Something of the same sort occurred
when the Turks occupied Constantinople.
They adapted the architecture of the
Christians to their own purposes, but
without copying. Vida ‘History of
Ancient and Medieval Architecture,’
vigour and exuberant originality of the first, as compared with
the extreme but almost effeminate elegance of the second.
Certainly when the same people, following the same religion,
built temples and palaces in the same locality, nothing of the sort
ever occurred in any country whose history is now known to us.

Nowhere is the contrast between the two styles more strongly
marked than in the palace of Agra—from the red stone palace
of Akbar or Jahângîr, with its rich sculptures and square Hindû
construction, a door opens into the white marble court of the
haram of Shâh Jahân (1638-1648), with all its feeble prettiness,
but at the same time marked with that peculiar elegance which
is found only in the East. The court is not large, 170 ft. by
235 ft., but the whole is finished with the most elaborate care.
Three sides of this are occupied by the residences of the ladies,
not remarkable for size, nor, in their present state, for archi-
tectural beauty; but the fourth, overhanging the river, is
occupied by three white marble pavilions of singular elegance.

As in most Moorish palaces, the baths on one side of this
court were the most elegant and elaborately decorated apart-
ments in the palace. The baths have been destroyed, but the
walls and roofs still show the elegance with which they were
adorned.¹

Behind this, in the centre of the palace, is a great court,
500 ft. by 370 ft., surrounded by arcades, and approached at
the opposite ends through a succession of beautiful courts open-
ing into one another by gateways of great magnificence. On
one side of this court is the great hall of the palace—the
Dîwân-i-‘Amm—208 ft. by 76 ft., supported by three ranges
of arcades of exquisite beauty. It is open on three sides, and
with a niche for the throne at the back.² Behind it are two
smaller courts, the one containing the Dîwân-i-Khâss, or private
hall of audience, the other the haram. The hall in the former
is one of the most elegant of Shâh Jahân’s buildings, being
wholly of white marble inlaid with coloured stones, and the
design of the whole being in the best style of his reign. It
consists of an open colonnade and an inclosed room behind,
and measures 65 ft. in length by 34 ft. and 22 ft. high. The
carving is beautiful, and the flowers inlaid in the white marble
with red carnelian and others are of fine effect.

¹ The great bath was torn up by the
Marquis of Hastings with the intention
of presenting it to George IV., an in-
tention apparently never carried out; but
it is difficult to ascertain the facts now,
as the whole of the marble flooring with
what remained of the bath was sold by
auction by Lord William Bentinck, and
fetched probably 1 per cent. of its
original cost; but it helped to eke out
the revenues of India in a manner most
congenial to the spirit of its governors.
² Both care and money are now
expended liberally for the protection and
maintenance of such old buildings that
remain in the province.
One of the most picturesque features about this palace is a marble pavilion, in two storeys, that surmounts one of the circular bastions on the river face, between the haram and the Dīwān-i-Khāss. It looks of an earlier style than that of Shāh Jahān, and if Jahāngīr built anything here it is this. On a smaller scale, it occupies the same place here that the Chalis Sītūn did in the palace at Allahābād; and exemplifies, even more than in their larger buildings, the extreme elegance and refinement of those who designed these palaces.  

PACAL AT DELHI.

Though the palace at Agra is perhaps more picturesque, and historically certainly more interesting, than that of Delhi, the latter had the immense advantage of being built at once, on one uniform plan, and by the most magnificent, as a builder, of all the sovereigns of India. It had, however, one little disadvantage, in being somewhat later than Agra. All Shāh Jahān's buildings there seem to have been finished before he commenced the erection of the new city of Shāh Jahānābād with its palace, and what he built at Agra is soberer, and in somewhat better taste than at Delhi. Notwithstanding these defects, the palace at Delhi is, or rather was, the most magnificent palace in the East—perhaps in the world—and the only one, at least in India, which enables us to understand what the arrangements of a complete palace were when deliberately undertaken and carried out on one uniform plan (Woodcut No. 431).

The palace at Delhi, which is situated like that at Agra close to the edge of the Jamnā, is a nearly regular parallelogram, with the angles slightly canted off, and measures 1600 ft. east and west, by 3200 ft. north and south, exclusive of the gateways. It is surrounded on all sides by a very noble wall of red sandstone, relieved at intervals by towers surmounted by kiosks. The principal entrance or Lāhor Gate (I) on the west faces the Chāndni Chauk, a noble wide street, nearly a mile long, planted with two rows of trees, and with a stream of water running down its centre. Entering within its deeply-recessed portal, you find yourself beneath the vaulted hall (K), the sides of which are in two storeys, and with an octagonal break in the centre. This hall, which is 375 ft. in length over all, has very much the effect of the nave of a gigantic Gothic cathedral, and forms the noblest entrance known to belong to any existing palace. At its

1 Perfect plans of this palace exist in the War Department of India. Without such plans it is very difficult to make any description intelligible. That in Keene's "Handbook of Agra," though useful as far as it goes, is on too small a scale and not sufficiently detailed for purposes of architectural illustration.
inner end this hall opened into a courtyard, 350 ft. square, from the centre of which a noble bazaar (F, G) extended right and left, like the hall, two storeys in height, but not vaulted. One of these led to the Delhi gate (H) on the south, the other, which I believe was never quite finished, to the garden. In front, at the entrance, was the Naubat Khâna (A), or music hall, beneath which
the visitor entered the second or great court of the palace, measuring 550 ft. north and south, by 385 ft. east and west. In the centre of this stood the Diwán-i-'Āmm (B), or great audience hall of the palace, very similar in design to that of Agra, but more magnificent. Its dimensions are about 200 ft. by 100 ft. over all. In its centre is a highly ornamental niche, in which, on a platform of marble richly inlaid with precious stones, and directly facing the entrance, once stood the celebrated peacock throne, the most gorgeous example of its class that perhaps even the East could ever boast of. Behind this again was a garden-court; on its eastern side was the Rang Mahall (C), or painted hall, containing a bath and other apartments.

This range of buildings, extending 1600 ft. east and west, divided the palace into two nearly equal halves. In the northern division of it were a series of small courts, surrounded by buildings apparently appropriated to the use of distinguished guests; and in one of them overhanging the river stood the celebrated Diwán-i-Khāss (D), or private audience hall—if not the most beautiful, certainly the most highly ornamented of all Shāh Jahān's buildings. It is larger, certainly, and far richer in ornament than that at Agra, though hardly so elegant in design; but nothing can exceed the beauty of the inlay of precious stones with which it is adorned, or the general poetry of the design. It is round the roof of this hall that the famous inscription runs: "If there is a heaven on earth, it is this, it is this," which may safely be rendered into the sober English assertion, that no palace now existing in the world possesses an apartment of such singular elegance as this.

Beyond this to the northward were the gardens of the palace, laid out in the usual formal style of the East, but adorned with fountains and little pavilions and kiosks of white marble, that render these so beautiful and so appropriate to such a climate.

---

1 When we took possession of the palace every one seems to have looted after the most independent fashion. Among others, a Captain (afterwards Sir John) Jones tore up a great part of this platform, but had the happy idea to get his loot set in marble as table tops. Two of these he brought home and sold to the Government for £500, and placed in the India Museum. No one can doubt that the one with the birds was executed by Florentine, or at least Italian artists; while the other, already mentioned, which was apparently at the back of the platform, is a bad copy from Raphael's picture of Orpheus charming the beasts. As is well known, that again was a copy of a picture in the Catacombs. There Orpheus is playing on a lyre, in Raphael's picture on a violin, and that is the instrument represented in the Delhi mosaic. Even if other evidence were wanting, this would be sufficient to set the question at rest. It certainly was not put there by the bigot Aurangzib.

2 It was broken up and carried off by Nādir Shāh in 1739.

3 South of this and between it and the Rang Mahall is the Samman-burj, projecting from the line of the walls. At the north end is the Shāh Burj and at the south the Aāld Burj.
The whole of the area between the central range of buildings to the south, and eastward from the bazar, measuring about 1000 ft. each way, was occupied by the haram and private apartments of the palace, covering, consequently, more than twice the area of the Escorial, or, in fact, of any palace in Europe. According to the native plan I possess, which I see no reason for distrusting, it contained three garden courts, and some thirteen or fourteen other courts, arranged some for state, some for convenience; but what they were like we have no means of knowing. Not one vestige of them now remains. Judging from the corresponding parts of the palace at Agra, built by the same monarch, they must have vied with the public apartments in richness and in beauty when originally erected, but having continued to be used as an abode down to the time of the mutiny, they were probably very much disfigured and debased. Taste was, no doubt, at as low an ebb inside the walls of the palace during the last hundred years as it was outside, or as we find it at Lucknow and elsewhere; but all the essential parts of the structure were there, and could easily have been disencumbered from the accretions that had been heaped upon it. The idea, however, of doing this was far from entering into the heads of our governors. The whole of the haram courts of the palace were swept off the face of the earth to make way for a hideous British barrack, without those who carried out this fearful piece of Vandalism, thinking it even worth while to make a plan of what they were destroying or preserving any record of the most splendid palace in the world.

Of the public parts of the palace all that now remains is the entrance hall, the Naubat Khana, the Diwan-i-Amm and Khass, and the Rang Mahall—long used as a mess-room—and one or two small pavilions. They are the gems of the palace, it is true, but without the courts and corridors connecting them they lose all their meaning and more than half their beauty. Situated in the middle of a British barrack-yard, they look like precious stones torn from their settings in some exquisite piece of Oriental jeweller's work and set at random in a bed of the commonest plaster.  

1 It ought in fairness to be added that, since they have been in our possession, considerable sums have been expended on the repair of these fragments.

2 The excuse for this deliberate act of Vandalism was, of course, the military one, that it was necessary to place the garrison of Delhi in security in the event of any sudden emergency. Had it been correct it would have been a valid one, but this is not the case. Without touching a single building of Shâh Jahân's there was ample space within the walls for all the stores and matériel of the garrison of Delhi, and in the palace and Saltgarh ample space for a garrison, more than doubly ample to man their walls in the event of an émeute. There was ample space for larger and better ventilated barracks just outside the palace walls, for the rest of the garrison, who could easily have gained the shelter
Tûj Mahâll.

It is a pleasure to turn from this destroyed and desecrated palace to the Tûj Mahâll, which even more, perhaps, than the palace, was always the chef-d'œuvre of Shâh Jahân's reign (Woodcut No. 432). It, too, has been fortunate in attracting the attention of the English, who have paid sedulous attention to it for some time past, and keep it now, with its gardens, in a perfect state of substantial repair.

No building in India has been so often drawn and photographed as this, or more frequently described; but, with all this, it is almost impossible to convey an idea of it to those who have not seen it, not only because of its extreme delicacy, and beauty of material employed in its construction, but from the complexity of its design. If the Tûj were only the tomb itself, it might be described, but the platform on which it stands, with its tall minarets, is a work of art in itself. Beyond this are the two wings, one of which is a mosque, which anywhere else would be considered an important building. This group of buildings forms one side of a garden court 880 ft. square; and beyond this again an outer court, of the same width but only half the depth. This is entered by three gateways of its own, and contains in the centre of its inner wall the great gateway of the garden court, a worthy pendant to the Tûj itself. Beautiful as it is in itself, the Tûj would lose half its charm if it stood alone. It is the combination of so many beauties, and the perfect manner in which each is subordinated to the other, that makes up a whole which the world cannot match, and which never fails to impress even those who are most indifferent to the effects produced by architectural objects in general.

The plan and section (Woodcuts Nos. 433, 434) explain sufficiently the general arrangement and structural peculiarities of the tomb or principal building of the group. The raised platform on which it stands is 18 ft. high, faced with white marble, and exactly 313 ft. square. At each corner of this terrace stands a minaret 133 ft. in height, and of the most exquisite proportions, more beautiful, perhaps, than any other in India. In the centre of this marble platform stands the mausoleum, a square of 186 ft., with the corners cut off to the extent of 33 ft. 9 in., the façade rising 92 ft. 3 in. from the platform. The centre of this is

of the palace walls in the event of any sudden rising of the citizens.

The engineers, it would seem, perceived that by gutting the palace they could provide at no trouble or expense a wall round their barrack-yard, and for this or some such wretched motive of economy the palace was sacrificed!

1 A plan of this garden, with the Tûj and all the surrounding buildings, will be found in the ‘Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,’ vol. vii. p. 42.
View of Tāj Mahal. (From a Photograph.)
Plan of Tāj Mahal, Agra. (From a Plan by the Author.) Scale 100 ft. to 1 in.

Section of Tāj Mahal, Agra. Scale 110 ft. to 1 in.
occupied by the principal dome, 58 ft. in diameter and rising 74 ft. above the roof or 191 from the platform, under which is an enclosure formed by a screen of trellis-work of white marble, a chef-d'œuvre of elegance in Indian art.\(^1\) Within this stand the tombs—that of Arjumand Bâno Begam, styled Mumtâz Mahall, in the centre, and that of her husband Shâh Jahân on one side. These, however, as is usual in Indian supulchres, are not the true tombs—the bodies rest in a vault, level with the surface of the ground (as seen in the section) beneath plainer tombstones, placed exactly underneath those in the hall above.

In every angle of the building is a small domical apartment of two storeys in height, 26 ft. 8 in. in diameter, and these are connected, as shown in the plan, by various passages and halls.

The light to the central apartment is admitted only through double screens of white marble trellis-work of the most exquisite design, one on the outer, and one on the inner face of the walls. In our climate this would produce nearly complete darkness; but in India, and in a building wholly composed of white marble, this was required to temper the glare that otherwise would have been intolerable. As it is, no words can express the chastened beauty of that central chamber, seen in the soft gloom of the subdued light that reaches it through the distant and half-closed openings that surround it. When used as a Bârahâr, or pleasure palace, it must always have been the coolest and loveliest of garden retreats, and now that it is sacred to the dead it is the most graceful and the most impressive of the sepulchres of the world.

This building, too, is an exquisite example of that system of inlaying with precious stones which became the great characteristic of the style of the Mughals after the death of Akbar. All the spandrels of the Tâj, all the angles and more important architectural details, are heightened by being inlaid with precious stones, such as agates, bloodstones, jaspers, and the like. These are combined in wreaths, scrolls, and frets, as exquisite in design as beautiful in colour; and, relieved by the pure white marble in which they are inlaid, they form the most beautiful and precious style of ornament ever adopted in architecture; though, of course, not to be compared with the intellectual beauty of Greek ornament, it certainly stands first

---

\(^1\) From its design I cannot help fancying that this screen was erected after Shâh Jahân's death. It is not mentioned in Bernier's account ("Travels," Constable's ed. p. 298). It certainly looks more modern, and is reported to be so. It is said that the sarcophagus of the empress was originally surrounded by a screen of gold, studded with gems. The apartment had two silver doors, said to have cost 127,000 rupees, which were carried off and melted by Sûrajmal's Jâts when they sacked Agra in 1761.
among the purely decorative forms of architectural design. This mode of ornamentation is lavishly bestowed on the tombs themselves and the screen that surrounds them, though sparingly introduced on the mosque that stands to the west of the Tāj, or on the fountains and surrounding buildings. The judgment, indeed, with which this style of ornament is apportioned to the various parts is almost as remarkable as the ornament itself, and conveys a high idea of the taste and skill of the Indian architects of that age.

The long rows of cypresses, which line the marble paths that intersect the garden at right angles, and are backed up by masses of evergreen foliage, lend a charm to the whole which the founder and his children could hardly have realised. Each of the main avenues among these trees has a canal along its centre studded with marble fountains, and each vista leads to some beautiful architectural object. With the Jamnā in front, and this garden with its fountains and gateway behind; with its own purity of material and grace of form, the Tāj may challenge comparison with any creation of the same sort in the whole world. Its beauty may not be of the highest class, but in its class it is unsurpassed.

Though neither so magnificent nor so richly ornamented as some of his other buildings, the Motī Masjid or Pearl Mosque, which Shāh Jahān erected in the fort of Agra, 1646-1653, is one of the purest and most elegant buildings of its class to be found anywhere (Woodcut No. 435). It is not large, measuring only 187 ft. by 234 ft. over all externally; and though raised on a lofty stylobate, which ought to give it dignity, it makes no pretensions to architectural effect on the outside; but the moment you enter by the eastern gateway the effect of its courtyard is surpassingly beautiful. The whole is of white marble, and the forms all graceful and elegant. The only ornament introduced which is not strictly architectural, is an inscription in black marble, inlaid in the frieze of the mosque itself. The courtyard is nearly a square, 154 ft. by 158 ft. On three sides it is sur-
rounded by a low colonnade 10 ft. 10 in. deep; but on the west, by the mosque itself, 159 ft. by 56 ft. internally, which was accessible at both ends from the private apartments of the palace. It opens on the court by seven arches of great beauty, and is surmounted by three domes of the bulbous form that became universal about this time (Woodcut No. 436). The woodcut cannot do it justice, it must be seen to be appreciated; but I hardly know, anywhere, of a building so perfectly pure and elegant, or one that forms such a wonderful contrast with the buildings of Akbar in the same place.

The Jāmi’ Masjid at Delhi begun in 1644 but not finally completed till 1658, is not unlike the Moti Masjid in plan, though built on a very much larger scale, and adorned with two noble minarets, which are wanting in the Agra example; while from the somewhat capricious admixture of red sandstone with white marble, it is far from possessing the same elegance and purity of effect. It is, however, one of the few mosques, either in India or elsewhere, that is designed to produce a pleasing effect externally. As will be seen from the woodcut (No. 437), it is raised on a lofty basement, and its three gateways, combined with the four angle towers and the frontispiece
and domes of the mosque itself, make up a design where all the parts are pleasingly subordinated to one another, but at the same time produce a whole of great variety and elegance. The mosque itself is 201 ft. in length by 120 ft., and is flanked by two minars 130 ft. high, formed in alternate vertical stripes of sandstone and white marble, and crowned by light marble pavilions. Its principal gateway cannot be compared with that at Fathpur Sikri (Woodcut No. 425); but it is a noble portal, and from its smaller dimensions more in harmony with the objects by which it is surrounded.

It is not a little singular, looking at the magnificent mosque which Akbar built in his palace at Fathpur Sikri, and the Moti Masjid, with which Shâh Jahân adorned the palace at Agra, that he should have provided no place of worship in his palace at Delhi. The little Moti mosque that is now found there was added by Aurangzib, and, though pretty enough in itself, is very small, only 60 ft. square over all, and utterly unworthy of such a palace. There is no place of prayer, within the palace walls, of the time of Shâh Jahân, nor, apparently, any intention of providing one. The Jami Masjid was so near, and so apparently part of the same design, that it seems to have been considered sufficient to supply this apparently anomalous deficiency. It stands in the market place facing the Delhi gate of the fort on a platform about 11 ft. high, reached by steps in front and on the south side, but the great gateway in front was pulled down by the British during the Mutiny. It occupies but a small area—130 ft. by 100 ft.—and has five entrances. Its three domes, without necks, are a sort of compromise between the earlier flat dome and the tall form, subsequently introduced. They are of red sandstone with zigzag bands of white marble circling round them, not without beauty, if appropriate to the building on which they are placed. The mosque was built for, or in honour of, Jahân Ârâ Begam, the noble and accomplished daughter of Shâh Jahân, in 1644-48.

AURANGZÎB, OR 'ÂLAGIR, A.D. 1658-1707.

There are few things more startling in the history of this style than the rapid decline of taste that set in with the accession of Aurangzib. The power of the Mughal empire reached its culminating point in his reign, and there were at least no external signs of decay visible before the end of his reign. Even if his morose disposition did not lead him to spend much money on palaces or civil buildings, his religious fanaticism might, one would think, have led him to surpass his predecessors in the extent or splendour of their mosques or religious establishments.
This, however, is far from being the case. He did, indeed, as mentioned above, pull down the temple of Visvesvar, at Benares, in order to erect a mosque, whose tall and graceful minarets still form one of the most prominent features in every view of the city. After the shrine of Siva at Benares, the great temple of Kesava Deva or Krishna at Mathurā was the most sacred in Hindustan. It had been erected, or rebuilt, by the famous Bir-Singh Bundelā during the reign of Jahāngīr at a cost of thirty-three lākhs of rupees; and immediately after the destruction of the Visvesvar temple in 1669, “his religious Majesty” ordered this also to be levelled to the ground and a vast mosque, about 170 ft. in length, to be erected on the platform.

It was not, however, from any love of architectural magnificence that this was done, but to insult his Hindū subjects and mark the triumph of Islām over Hinduism. The mosques themselves are of no great magnificence, but, except that at Lāhor, none more important was erected, so far as I know, during his reign.

The Jāmi’ or Bādshāhī mosque at Lāhor, which is entered from the west side of the Hazūrī Bāgh (Woodcut No. 430), was erected in 1674 from the proceeds of the estates of his eldest brother Dārā Shikoh, whom he had put to death in 1659. The gateway from the Hazūrī Bāgh, raised on a lofty platform set on arches, is an imposing structure of red sandstone and marble. In a chamber above this archway are preserved certain “relics” of Muhammad and his family. The mosque itself, erected under the supervision of Fidā‘ Khān Koka, the emperor’s foster-brother, is a building of considerable merit and the latest specimen of the Mughal architectural style. It has three domes of white marble and very pleasing form, and in this and the general arrangements of the façade it is almost a copy of the Jāmi’ Masjid at Delhi, but the marble ornamentation of the great central arch and the front arcade is very inferior in detail; and the minarets, instead of terminating the façade, are quite plain octagonal towers, placed at the corners of the court about 175 yards apart. They are, as usual, of three storeys, but their cupolas had to be removed after an earthquake in 1840.

Few things can show how steadily and rapidly the decline of taste had set in than the fact that when that monarch was

---

1 It was described in some detail by Tavernier, who saw it in 1650.—Ball’s translation of Tavernier’s ‘Travels,’ vol. ii. pp. 240ff. Bernier also mentions it in 1663.—‘Travels’ (ed. 1891), p. 284.

2 Elliot’s ‘History of India,’ vol. vii. p. 184. The idol—an image of Krishna—had just been removed by Rājasimha Rānā of Udaypur, and is now at Nathdwāra.

3 ‘Transactions Royal Institute of British Architects,’ N. Ser. vol. v. p. 66; G. Le Bon, ‘Les Monuments de l’Inde,’ p. 230 and fig. 358. This mosque was used by the Sikhs as a magazine, but was restored to the Muhammadans in 1856.
residing at Aurangābād between the years 1660-70 having lost his favourite wife, Rabia Daurānī, the tomb in honour of her memory—which is ascribed to her third son A‘zam Shāh—was intended, it is said, to reproduce an exact copy of Shāh Jahān’s celebrated tomb, the Tāj Mahall. But the difference between the two monuments, even in so short an interval, is startling. The first stands alone in the world for certain qualities all can appreciate; the second is by no means remarkable for any qualities of elegance or design, and narrowly escapes vulgarity and bad taste. In the beginning of the nineteenth century a more literal copy of the Tāj was erected in Lucknow over the tomb of one of its sovereigns. In this last, however, bad taste and tawdriness reign supreme. It is difficult to understand how a thing can be so like in form and so unlike in spirit; but so it is, and these three Tājes form a very perfect scale by which to measure the decline of art after the great Mughal dynasty passed its zenith and began its rapid downward career.

Aurangzīb himself lies buried in the court of the tomb of Shaikh Zainu-d-Dīn, at Khuldābād, a small hamlet just above the caves of Elūrā. The spot is esteemed sacred, but the tomb is mean and insignificant beyond what would have sufficed for any of his nobles. He neglected, apparently, to provide for himself this necessary adjunct to a Tartar’s glory, and his successors were too weak, even had they been inclined, to supply the omission. Strange to say, the sacred Tulsi-tree of the Hindūs once took root in a crevice of the brickwork, and flourished there as if in derision of the most bigoted persecutor the Hindūs ever experienced.

As before observed, Aurangzīb also made a few additions to the palace at Delhi; but during his reign many splendid palaces were erected, both in the capital and elsewhere. The most extensive and splendid of these was that built by his aspiring but unfortunate brother Dārā Shikoh. It, however, was converted into the English residency; and so completely have improvements, with plaster and whitewash, done their work, that it requires some ingenuity to find out that it was not wholly the work of the Anglo-Saxons.

In the town of Delhi many palaces of the age of Aurangzīb long escaped this profanation, but generally they are either in ruins or used as shops; and with all their splendour show too clearly the degradation of style which had then fairly set in, and which is even more apparent in the modern capitals of

---

1 Aurangzīb married Dilrās Bānū Begām, a daughter of Shāhnawāz Khān Safawī, in 1637, who bore to him five sons and four daughters.
Oudh, Haidarâbâd, and other cities which have risen into
importance during the last hundred years.

Even these capitals, however, are not without edifices of a
palatial class, which from their size and the picturesqueness of
their forms deserve attention, and to an eye educated among
the plaster glories of the Alhambra would seem objects of no
small interest and beauty. Few, however, are built of either
marble or squared stone: most of them are of brick or rubble-
stone, and the ornaments in stucco, which, coupled with the
inferiority of their design, will always prevent their being
admired in immediate proximity with the glories of Agra and
Delhi.

In a history of Muhammadan art in India which had any
pretensions to be exhaustive, it would be necessary to describe
before concluding many minor buildings, especially tombs,
which are found in every corner of the land. For, in addition
to the Imperial tombs mentioned above, the neighbourhoods of
Agra and Delhi are crowded with those of the nobles of the
court, some of them scarcely less magnificent than the mausolea
of their masters.

Besides the tombs, however, in the capitals of the empire,
there is scarcely a city of any importance in the whole course
of the Ganges or Jamná, even as far eastward as Dacca, that
does not possess some specimens of this form of architectural
magnificence. Jaunpur and Allahâbâd are particularly rich in
examples; but Patna and Dacca possess two of the most
pleasing of the smaller class of tombs that are to be met with
anywhere.

MYSORE AND OUDH.

If it were worth while to engrave a sufficient number of
illustrations to make the subject intelligible, one or two chapters
might very easily be filled with the architecture of these two
dynasties. That of Mysore, though only lasting forty years
—A.D. 1760-1799—was sufficiently far removed from European
influence to practise a style retaining something of true
architectural character. The pavilion called the Darya Daulat
at Seringapatam resembles somewhat the nearly contemporary
palace at Dig in style, but is feeble and of a much less
ornamental character. The tomb, too, of the founder of the
dynasty, and the surrounding mausolea, retain a reminiscence
of former greatness, but will not stand comparison with the
Imperial tombs of Agra and Delhi.

On the other hand, the tomb of Abû-l Mansûr Khân Safdar
Jang (1739-1754), the second of the Nawâb Vâzîrs of Oudh,
situated about 5 miles from the Qutb at Delhi, is not quite unworthy of the locality in which it is found. Though so late in date (A.D. 1756), it looks grand and imposing at a distance, but it will not bear close inspection (Plate XXXIV.). It stands in a large garden and is raised on a terrace, 10 ft. high and 110 ft. square, over arched cells. The tomb is about 60 ft. square, and in the general arrangements of the plan is not unlike that of Humâyûn. The central room, about 20 ft. square, contains the very handsome marble monument, highly polished though somewhat florid in design. The floor and lower portion of the walls are faced with marble, and it is roofed by a flattish dome at a height of about 40 ft. Round this apartment are four square and four octagonal rooms on the ground floor, with the like arrangement above.1 Respecting the whole, Mr. Fanshawe remarks:2 "If the decoration of the corner towers is not successful, the combination of white marble and fawn-coloured sandstone in the centre is pleasing. The plaster decoration of the interior is perhaps more degraded than anything else about the tomb." Even this qualified praise can hardly be awarded to any of the buildings in the capital in which his dynasty was finally established.

If mass and richness of ornamentation were in themselves sufficient to constitute architecture, few capitals in India could show so much of it as Lucknow. It is, in fact, amazing to observe to what an extent this dynasty filled its capitals with gorgeous buildings during the one short century of its existence, but all—or, with the fewest possible exceptions—in the worst possible taste. Whatever may be said of the Renaissance, or revival of classical architecture in Europe in the 16th century, in India it was an unmitigated misfortune. The unintelligent vulgarity with which the "Orders" are there used, by a people who were capable of such noble things in their own styles, is one of the most startling phenomena in the history of architecture.

One of the earliest buildings of importance at Lucknow, in the Italian style, is the Mansion of Constantia,3 built by General Claude Martin, as a residence for himself, and only completed after his death.4

1 Carr Stephen, 'Archæology of Delhi,' p. 278.
2 'Delhi Past and Present,' p. 246, from which the Plate XXXIV. is reproduced.
3 So called apparently from the motto "Labore et Constantia," adopted by the General, and written up in front of his house.
4 General Martin was born at Lyons in 1732, and died at Lucknow 1800. He commenced his career as a private soldier in the French army; but, in consequence of Lally's severity, deserted at the siege of Pondicherry, and joined the English service, in which he rose to the rank of Captain. He was transferred in 1776 to the service of the Nawâb of Oudh, and in 1796 was promoted to be Major-General. He left a considerable part of
The General was apparently his own architect, and has produced a design somewhat fantastic in arrangement, which sins against most of the rules of pure Palladian Art to an extent that would not be pardonable except in such a climate and under the peculiar circumstances in which it was erected. Notwithstanding this, there is something very striking in the great central tower, rising from a succession of terraced roofs one over the other, and under which are a series of halls grouped internally so as to produce the most pleasing effects, while their arrangement was at the same time that most suitable to the climate. The sky-line is everywhere broken by little kiosks, not perhaps in the best taste, but pleasing from their situation, and appropriate in the vicinity of a town so full of such ornaments as the city in whose proximity it is situated. Taken altogether, it is a far more reasonable edifice than the rival capriccio of Beckford, at Fonthill; and if its details had been purer, and some of those solecisms avoided which an amateur

his immense fortune (of about £300,000) to found educational establishments at Lyons, Calcutta, and Lucknow; but, owing to the length of his will, and his having drawn it up himself, in bad English, the principal part of his money was wasted in law expenses.
architect is sure to fall into, it really does contain the germ of a very beautiful design (Woodcut No. 438).

The founder was buried beneath in a dimly-lighted vaulted chamber in the basement of the great tower. His tomb is a simple, plain sarcophagus, standing on the floor, and at each angle a grenadier in full uniform stands with arms reversed, in an attitude of grief, as if mourning over the fall of his master. The execution of the monument, like everything about the place, is bad, but the conception is one of the finest that has been hit upon for a soldier's grave.

When new, this mansion must have been very striking. At all events, its effect on the Oudh sovereigns was most remarkable. For although their tombs, their mosques, and imâmbâras were still erected in the debased Saracenic style then prevalent, all the palaces of Lucknow were henceforth erected in this pseudo-Italian style. The Farhat Bakhsh built by Sa'ādat 'Ali Khân, the Chattar Manzil of Nasîru-d-Dîn Haidar, and numerous other buildings, display all the quaint, picturesque irregularity of the age of Francis I., combined with more strange details than are to be found in the buildings of Henry IV. These were far surpassed in grotesqueness by the Qaisar Bâgh of Wâjid 'Ali Shâh. This consisted of a great square of buildings surrounding an immense courtyard: the whole palace being in extent and arrangement by no means unlike the Louvre and Tuileries as joined together by Napoleon III. But instead of the beautiful stone of Paris, all was brick and plaster; and instead of the appropriate details of that palace, the buildings surrounding the great court at Lucknow are generally two storeys in height and singularly various in design, generally with pilasters of the most attenuated forms running through both storeys, between which Italian windows with Venetian blinds alternate with Saracenic arcades, or openings of no style whatever. These are surmounted by Saracenic battlements, and crowned by domes such as Rome or Italy never saw, and the whole painted with colours as crude as they are glaring. Inside there are several large and handsome halls, but all in the same bad taste as the exterior.

A detached building called the Begam Kothî is a better specimen of the style than anything perhaps in the Qaisar Bâgh itself, but it cannot either be called a favourable specimen of Italian Art, or a successful adaptation of the style to Oriental purposes, though it has a certain amount of picturesqueness

---

1 Āṣafu-d-daulâ had wished to buy the building for 100 lâkhs of rupees, and to prevent its confiscation by the native court after his death, General Martín had his tomb prepared in it. The mutineers in 1857-58 occupied the building, and they opened his tomb and scattered the bones. The tomb was restored in 1865.
which to some extent redeems its other defects (Woodcut No. 439). Like all the other specimens of Oriental Italian Architecture, it offends painfully, though less than most others, from the misapplication of the details of the Classical Orders.

Of course no native of India can well understand either the origin or motive of the various parts of our Orders—why the entablature should be divided in architrave, frieze, and cornice—why the shafts should be a certain number of diameters in height, and so on. It is, in fact, like a man trying to copy an inscription in a language he does not understand, and of which he does not even know the alphabet. With the most correct eye and the greatest pains he cannot do it accurately. In India, besides this ignorance of the grammar of the art, the natives cannot help feeling that the projection of the cornices is too small if meant to produce a shadow, and too deep to be of easy construction in plaster in a climate subject to monsoons. They feel that brick pillars ought to be thicker than the Italian Orders generally are, and that wooden architraves are the worst possible mode of construction in a climate where wood decays so rapidly, even if spared by the white ants. The consequence is, that, between his ignorance of the principles of Classic Art on
the one hand, and his knowledge of what is suited to his wants
and his climate on the other, he makes a sad jumble of the
Orders. But fashion supplies the Indian with those incentives
to copying which we derive from association and education; and,
in the vain attempt to imitate his superiors, he has abandoned
his own beautiful art to produce the strange jumble of vulgarity
and bad taste we find at Lucknow and elsewhere.

The great caravansarais which the Calcutta Bâbus and the
native Râjâs have erected for their residences in Lower Bengal
are generally in this style, but with an additional taint of
vulgarity. But perhaps the most striking example of it all is a
pavilion which was erected within the palace at Delhi by the
last king. It stood behind, and was seen above, the great
audience hall of Shâh Jahân, in which once stood the celebrated
peacock throne, and is one of the noblest and most beautiful
apartments of its class in any palace in the world. Over this,
on entering the palace, you saw a little pavilion of brick and
plaster, which its builder assumed to be the Doric Order, with
Italian windows and Venetian blinds. The building was painted
green, the frieze red, and the ornaments yellow!—the whole in
worse taste than the summer-house of a Dutch skipper, as seen
overhanging a canal in Holland. Contrasted with the simplicity
and elegance of the white marble palace beneath, it told, in a
language, not to be mistaken, how deeply fallen and how
contemptible were the late occupants of the throne, as compared
with their great ancestors of the house of Timur, who ruled
that mighty empire, and adorned its cities with those faultless
edifices described in the previous part of this work.¹

Even at Lucknow, however, there are some buildings into
which the European leaven has not penetrated, and which are
worthy of being mentioned in the same volume as the works of
their ancestors. Among these is the great Imâm-bâra,² which,
though its details will not bear too close an examination, is still
conceived on so grand a scale as to entitle it to rank with the
buildings of an earlier age. It was built by Asafu-d-daulâ, the
fourth Nâwâb, as a relief work during the famine of 1784.

As seen by the plan of the Imâm-bâra (Woodcut No. 440),
the principal apartment is 162 ft. long by 53 ft. 6 in. wide. On
the two sides are verandahs, respectively 26 ft. 6 in. and 27 ft.
3 in. wide, and at each end an octagonal apartment, 53 ft. in
diameter, the whole interior dimensions being thus 263 ft. by

¹ 'History of the Modern Styles of
² Or Imâm-bârt, a building in which
the Moharram festival is celebrated and
commemorative services of the deaths of
'Ali and his sons Hasan and Husain are
held; and their Ta'zias or shrines are
preserved in it. Under this Imâm-bâra
its founder was buried. It now serves as
an arsenal for the British garrison.
145 ft. This immense building is covered with vaults of very simple form and still simpler construction, being of a rubble or coarse concrete several feet in thickness, which is laid on a rude mould or centering of bricks and mud, and allowed to stand a year or two to set and dry. The centering is then removed, and the vault, being in one piece, stands without abutment or thrust, apparently a better and more durable form of roof than our most scientific Gothic vaulting; certainly far cheaper and far more easily made, since it is literally cast on a mud form, which may be moulded into any shape the fancy of the architect may dictate.

The earlier settlers in India felt themselves so completely expatriated and cut off from intercourse with Europe, that they adopted many of the habits and feelings of the people among whom they were dwelling. Among other peculiarities they seem to have been seized with a mania for sepulchral magnificence; and at Surat, Ahmadâbâd, and other early settlements on the West Coast, we find Dutch and English tombs of the 17th century which rival in dimensions and are similar in form to those of the Muhammadan princes of the day. It is true, when closely looked into, their details will not bear examination. Their builders had a notion that pillars should be round, and arches circular, and a hazy reminiscence of the Orders; but they could not draw them, and the natives could not realise what was wanted from imperfect verbal instructions. The consequence is, we find domes supported on twelve pillars of no style whatever, and native details mixed with something which has no name, in a manner that is perplexing, though often picturesque. Being all in brickwork and stucco, most of them are now falling to ruin; but that of Sir George Oxenden (died 1669) and his brother Christopher at Surat is still kept in repair, and would
make a sensation in Kensal Green. It consists of a cupola in memory of Christopher within the loftier and larger mausoleum of his distinguished brother, which is of two storeys, with a height of 40 ft. and diameter 25 ft.¹ (Woodcut No. 441). Some of the others, especially the older ones, are in better taste, and approach more nearly the native models from which they were all more or less copied.²

It would be a curious and instructive subject of speculation to try to ascertain what would have been the fate of Muhammadan architecture in India had no European influence been brought to bear upon it. The materials for the enquiry are not abundant, but we can perceive that the decadence had set in long before the death of Aurangzib. It is also evident

¹ Anderson's 'English in Western India,' p. 196; 'Journal Bombay Br. R. Asiatic Society,' vol. vi. pp. 146ff. The tomb of Baron H. A. van Reede, in the Dutch cemetery at Surat, is said to have exceeded the others in magnificence.
that in such buildings as were erected at Agra or Delhi during the lapse of the 18th century, even where no European influence can be traced, there is a feebleness and want of true perception, though occasionally combined with a considerable degree of elegance. There, however, the enquiry fails, because European influence made itself felt before any actual change had developed itself, but in remote corners the downward progress became apparent without any extraneous assistance. This is partially the case, as just mentioned, in Mysore; but there is a cemetery at Junagadh, in Gujarât, where there exists a group of tombs, all erected within last century, some within the last forty or
fifty years, which exhibit more nearly than any others I am acquainted with the forms toward which the style was tending. This style is not without a certain amount of elegance in detail (Woodcut No. 442). The tracery of the windows is frequently fascinating from its beauty, and all the carving is executed with precision and appropriateness—but it is all wooden, or, in other words, every detail would be more appropriate for a sideboard or a bedstead, or any article of upholstery, than for a building in stone. The domes especially can hardly be traced back to their grand and solemn form as used by the Pathân architects. The pinnacles are fanciful, and the brackets designed more for ornament than work. It is a style, in fact, broken loose from the true principles of constructive design, and when this is the case, no amount of ornament, however elegant it may be, will redeem the want of propriety it inevitably exhibits.

It is curious, however, and instructive, in concluding our history of architecture as practised within the limits of India properly so called, to observe how completely we have been walking in a circle. We began by tracing how, two hundred years before Christ, a wooden style was gradually assuming lithic forms, and by degrees being elaborated into a style where hardly a reminiscence of wood remained. We conclude with finding the style of Halebîd and Bijâpûr, or Delhi, returning to forms as appropriate to carpentry but as unsuited to masonry as the rails or gateways at Bharaut or Sânchi. It might some time ago have been a question worth mooting whether it was likely it would perish by persevering in this wrong direction. That enquiry, however, seems idle now, as it is to be feared that the death-blow will be given, as at Lucknow and elsewhere, by the fatal imitation of a foreign style.

CHAPTER XI.

WOODEN ARCHITECTURE.

CONTENTS.

Mosque of Sháh Hamadán, Srinagar.

Kashmír.

Turning for the nonce from this quasi-wooden style—which is only an indication of decadence and decrepitude—it would be pleasing if we could finish our narrative with the description of a true wooden style as it exists in Kashmír. The Jāmi' Masjid, in the city of Srinagar, is a large and important building, and if not so magnificent as some of those described in the preceding pages, is of great interest from being designed to be constructed in wood, and wood only. A knowledge of its peculiarities would, consequently, help us much in understanding many problems that arise in investigating the history of architecture in India. Unfortunately it is not a fashionable building, and of the 1001 tourists who visit the valley no one mentions it, and no photographer has yet set up his camera within its precincts.¹

Its plan is the usual one: a courtyard surrounded by cloisters of three arcades wide on the east side and four on the other three, its peculiarity being that all the pillars that support its roofs are of Deodar pine—not used, of course, to imitate stone or stone construction, but honest wooden forms, as in Burmese monasteries and elsewhere. The carving on them is, I believe, rich and beautiful, and though dilapidated, the effect is said to be still singularly pleasing.

There is one other mosque in the same city, known as that

¹ If Lieut. Cole, instead of repeating plans and details of buildings which had already been published by Gen. Cunningham, had given us a plan and details of this unknown building, he might have rendered a service all would have been grateful for. What I know of it is principally derived from verbal communication with Col. Montgomerie, R.E.
of Shâh Hamadân (Woodcut No. 443), which is equally erected wholly in wood, and though very much smaller than the Jâmi’

Masjid, is interesting, in the first place, because its roof is probably very similar to that which once covered the temple at Mârtând (Woodcut No. 146), and the crowning ornament is evidently a reminiscence of a Buddhist Hti, very much altered,
it must be confessed, but still not so very unlike some found in Nepál, at Swayambhûnâth (Woodcut No. 155), for instance, and elsewhere.

The walls, too, are of interest to us, because the mode in which the logs are disposed and ornamented resembles the ornamentation of the Orissan temples more clearly than any stone forms we can call to mind. The courses of the stone work in the tower of the great temple at Bhuvaneswar (Woodcut No. 315), and other temples there, produce so nearly the same effect, that it does not seem improbable they may have been derived from some such original. The mode, too, in which the Orissan temples are carved, and the extent to which that class of ornamentation is carried, is much more suggestive of a wooden than of a lithic origin.

These, however, are questions that can only be profitably discussed when we have more knowledge of this Kashmiri style than we now possess. When the requisite materials are available for the purpose, there are few chapters that will be of greater interest, or that will more worthily conclude the Architectural History of India than those that treat of the true and false styles of wooden art, with which the narrative begins, and with which it also ends.