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ALTHOUGH neither so beautiful in itself, nor so interesting either from an artistic or historical point of view as many others, the architecture of the valley of Kashmir has attracted more attention in modern times than that of almost any other style in India, and a greater number of special treatises have been written regarding it than are devoted to all the other styles put together. This arises partly from the beauty of the valley in which the Kashmiri temples are situated. The beauty of its scenery has at all times attracted tourists to its verdant snow-encircled plains, and the perfection of its climate has induced them to linger there, and devote their leisure to the investigation of its treasures, natural and artistic. In this respect their fate is widely different from that of temples situated on the hot and dusty plains of India, where every official is too busy to devote himself to such a task, and travellers too hurried to linger for a leisurely and loving survey of their beauties.

Apart, however, from this adventitious advantage, the temples of Kashmir do form a group well worthy of attention. When one or two spurious examples are got rid of, they form a complete and homogeneous group, extending through about five centuries (A.D. 600 to A.D. 1100), singularly uniform in their development and very local, being unlike any other style known
in India. They have besides this a certain classical element, which can hardly be mistaken, and is sufficient in itself to attract the attention of Europeans who are interested in detecting their own familiar forms in this remote valley in the Himalayas.

The earliest of the modern investigators of the subject were Messrs. Moorcroft and Trebeck, who visited the valley in 1819-1825. They were both acute and intelligent observers, but having no special knowledge of the subject, their observations on the architecture of the valley do not add much to our knowledge of its history.

They were followed by G. T. Vigne in 1833, who being an artist drew the buildings with wonderful correctness, so as to bring out the peculiarities of the style, and also to approximate their history with very tolerable exactness. About the same time Baron Hügel gave his impressions on the subject to the public, but in a manner much less critical than his predecessors.

In 1848, Captain (afterwards General Sir) A. Cunningham published in the 'Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society,' an essay on what he called the "Aryan Order of Architecture," but which was wholly devoted to that of Kashmir. It was illustrated by seventeen folding plates, containing map, plans, elevations, and views, and in fact all that was required for settling the history of the style, and, but for one or two unfortunate mistakes, would have left little to be done by his successors in this field of enquiry.

In 1866, the Rev. W. C. Cowie published in the same journal an essay on the same subject, as a supplement to General Cunningham's paper, describing several temples he had not visited, and adding considerably to our knowledge of those he had described. This paper was also extensively illustrated.

In consequence of all this wealth of literature, very little remained to be done, when in 1868 Lieutenant Cole, R.E., obtained an appointment as superintendent in the Archæological Survey of India, and proceeded to Kashmir with a staff quite sufficient to settle all the remaining outstanding questions. Unfortunately, however, Lieutenant Cole had no previous know-

---

2 'Travels in Kashmir, Ladak, Iskardo, etc.,' two vols. 8vo., London, Colburn, 1842; 2nd ed. 1844.
5 'Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society,' vol. xxxv. pp. 91-123.
ledge of Indian antiquities in general, and had not qualified himself by any special study for the investigation he was deputed to undertake. All, therefore, he could do was to adopt blindly General Cunningham’s dates, and in this there would have been no great harm, but, when he came across a temple which had escaped his predecessor’s attention, he arbitrarily interpolated it into the General’s series with a date of his own. As all these dates are given as if perfectly ascertained, without any of the reasoning on which they are based, they would, if accepted, lead to the most erroneous conclusions. Putting these, however, aside, Lieutenant Cole’s plans and architectural details were a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the subject, and with his photographs and those now available by others, enable those who have not had an opportunity of visiting the valley to form an opinion of their own, and with all these lights there seems little difficulty in ascertaining all the really important facts connected with this style.

The first and most misleading mistake that has been made with reference to Kashmiri architecture, was the assumption by General Cunningham that the enclosure to Zainu-l-‘Abidin’s tomb in Srinagar originally belonged to an ancient Kashmir temple. Lieutenant Cole boldly printed on his plates “probable date A.D. 400 to 500,” a mistake as nearly as may be of 1000 years, as it is hardly doubtful that it was erected for or by the prince whose name it bears, and who in A.D. 1417 succeeded his brother—their father being Sikandar, who bore the ill-omened nickname of Bhūtshikan, the idol-breaker. As will be seen from the woodcut (No. 139), it consists of a series of small pointed arches in rectangular frames, such as are very frequently found in Muhammadan art, and, though it occupies the site of an early temple, and parts may be much older, the peculiarities of the gateway and other parts are just such as are found in all contemporary Muslim art in India. All the mosques and tombs for instance at Ahmadābād, A.D. 1400-1572, are made up of details borrowed from the architecture of the Hindūs and Jains, and the bases of their minarets and their internal pillars can only be distinguished from those of the heathen by their position, and by the substitution of foliage for human figures in the niches or places where the Hindūs would have introduced images of their gods.

1 He boasted of having demolished all the temples in Kashmir. The tomb of his queen is constructed on a base, and with materials of Hindū shrines.—‘Calcutta Review,’ vol. liv. (1872), p. 27.
In this instance, however, there is no incongruity, no borrowed features; every stone was carved for the place where it is found. There are niches, it is true, on each side of the gateway, like those found at Mārtānd and other pagan temples; but like those at Ahmadābād they are without images, and the arch in brick which surmounts this gateway is a radiating arch, which appears certainly to be integral, but, if so, could not possibly be erected by a Hindū. With the knowledge we now possess, it is not likely that any one can mistake the fact, that this enclosure was erected in its present form, by the prince whose name it bears, to surround his tomb, in the Muhammadan cemetery of the city in which it is found.

Assuming this for the present, it gives us a hint as to the age of the other anomalous building in Kashmir—the temple that crowns the hill, called the Takht-i-Sulaimān, near the capital. Inside the octagonal enclosure that surrounds the platform on which the temple stands is a range of arches (Woodcut No. 140), similar to those of the tomb of Zainu-l-ʿAbidīn (Woodcut No. 139), not so distinctly pointed, nor so Saracenic in detail, but still very nearly resembling them, only a little more debased in style. At the bottom of the steps is a round-headed doorway, not, it is true, surmounted by a true arch, but by a curved lintel of one stone, such as are universal in the Hindū imitations of Muhammadan architecture in the 17th and 18th centuries. The same is the case in the small temples alongside, which are evidently of the same age. The temple too, itself, is far from having an ancient look. The one most like it, that I am acquainted with, is that erected by Chait Singh of Benares (1770-1781) at Rāmnagar, at the end of the 18th century. I know of no straight-lined pyramid of a much older date than that, and no temple with a polygonal plan, combined with a circular cell, as is the case here, that is of ancient date. The cell itself with the Linga is undoubtedly quite modern; and the four pillars in the cell, with the Persian inscriptions upon them, are avowedly of the 17th century. It is suggested, moreover, that they belong to a repair; my conviction, however, is, from a review of the whole evidence, that the temple, as it now stands, was

---

1 I cannot make out the span of this arch. According to the rods laid across the photograph (No. 4) it appears to be 15 ft.; according to the scale on the plan, only half that amount.


3 The polygonal basement, however, is constructed of remarkably massive blocks and without mortar, and must thus be relegated to an earlier period.—Stein’s ‘Rājatarangini,’ vol. ii. p. 290.
commenced by some nameless Hindus, in honour of Siva, during the tolerant reign of Jahângîr, and that the building was stopped at the date engraved on the staircase, A.H. 1069 (A.D. 1659), the first year of the reign of the bigot Aurangzeb. It was then unfinished, and has consequently remained a ruin ever since, which may give it an ancient look, but not such as to justify any one putting it 1879 years before what seems to be its true date.

If we may thus get rid of these two anomalous and exceptional examples, the history of all the remaining temples in the valley is more than usually homogeneous and easily intelligible. The date of the principal example—the temple at Mârtând—is hardly doubtful (A.D. 750); and of the others, some may be slightly older, but none can be carried further back than the reign of Ranâditya, in the 6th century, if the temple founded by him at Simharotsikâ still exist.¹ Nor can any one be brought down below, say 1000, which is the latest date we can possibly assign to that of Pâyer.² Between these dates, with a very little local knowledge, the whole might easily be arranged. Such a classification is, however, by no means necessary at present. The style during these six centuries is so uniform that it may be taken as one, for the purposes of a general history.

TEMPLES.

Before proceeding to speak of the temples themselves, it may add to the clearness of what follows if we first explain what the peculiarities of the style are. This we are able to do from a small model in stone of a Kashmiri temple (Woodcut No. 141), which was drawn by General Cunningham; such miniature temples being common throughout India, and copies of their larger prototypes.

The temple in this instance is surmounted by four roofs (in the built examples, so far as they are known, there are only two or three), which are obviously copied from the usual wooden roofs common to most buildings in Kashmir, where the upper pyramid covers the central part of the building, and the lower a verandah, separated from the centre either by walls or merely by a range of pillars.³ In the

¹ Stein’s ‘Râjatarangini,’ bk. iii. v. 462, and note; also note on vv. 453-454.
² Vigne regarded this temple as more modern than any of the others, whilst Cunningham ascribed it to the end of the 5th century. Vigne called the village Pâyech, which has been followed by subsequent writers; the real name is Pâyer—it is in the pargana of Siâvur.—Loc. cit. vol. ii. p. 473.
³ See drawing of mosque by Vigne, vol. i. p. 269; and also ‘Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,’ vol. xvii. (1848) pt. ii. p. 253, containing General
wooden examples the interval between the two roofs seems to have been left open for light and air; in the stone buildings it is closed with ornaments. Besides this, however, all these roofs are relieved by dormer windows, of a pattern very similar to those found in mediaeval buildings in Europe; and the same steep, sloping lines are used also to cover doorways and porches, these being virtually a section of the main roof itself, and evidently a copy of the same wooden construction.

The pillars which support the porticoes, and the one on which the model stands, are by far the most striking peculiarity of this style, their shafts being so distinctly like those of the Grecian Doric, and unlike anything of the class found in other parts of India. Generally they are from three to four diameters in height, diminishing slightly towards the capital, and adorned with sixteen flutes, rather shallower than those of the Grecian order. Both the bases and capitals are, it is true, far more complicated than would have been tolerated in Greece, but at Pæstum and in Rome we find, with the Doric order, a complexity of mouldings by no means unlike that found here. These peculiarities are still more evident in the annexed representations of two pillars, one found in Srinagar (Woodcut No. 142), which is a far more highly ornamented example than the last, but equally classical in its details, and, if anything, more unlike any known examples of true Hindū architecture. The other (Woodcut No. 143) is from Shâdipur, and is perhaps more modern; the diameter of the pillar is 13½ in., and the upper fillet of the abacus is 20½ in. square. Nowhere in Kashmir do we find any trace of the bracket capital of the Hindūs, nor of the changes from square to

Cunningham’s paper on the subject, from which this woodcut is taken. These miniature models of temples occur here and there throughout Kashmir: on the Pir-Panjāl road between Supiyan and Rāmūh, is one; another is at Kohil near Pīyer; a third is built into the embankment of the Nālī Mar canal; two in the Srinagar lake that are often submerged; and one photographed by Major Cole (‘Illustrations of Ancient Buildings,’ No. 44), near the Jāmi Masjid. In these there is an interior cell scarcely a foot square; but near the village of Pattan are two such models which are not hollowed out, the place of the doorway being represented by a small carved panel.—‘Calcutta Review,’ vol. liv. p. 26.
octagon, or to the polygon of sixteen sides, and so on. Now that we are familiar with the extent of classical influence that prevailed in Gandhāra (ante, p. 217) down to about the 5th century, we have no difficulty in understanding whence these quasi-Grecian forms were derived, nor why they should be found so prevalent in this valley. It adds, however, very considerably to our interest in the subject to find that the civilisation of the West left so strong an impress on the arts of this part of India that its influence can be detected in all the Kashmiri buildings down to the time when the local style perished under Muhammadan influence in the 14th century. Although, therefore, there can be no mistake about the forms of the columns in the architecture of Kashmir being derived from the classical styles of the West, and as little doubt as to the countries through which it was introduced into the valley, it must not be overlooked that the classical influence is fainter and more remote from its source in Kashmir than in Gandhāra. Nothing resembling the Corinthian capitals of the Jamālgarhī monastery are found in the valley. The classical features in Kashmir are in degree more like those of the Mānikyāla tope and the very latest examples in the Peshāwar valley. The one style, in fact, seems to commence where the other ends, and to carry on the tradition for centuries after it had been lost in the country from which it was introduced.

The fact, however, of a quasi-Doric order being currently used in the valley from the 8th to the 12th century, renders it probable that if remains of greater antiquity had been preserved,
we should have found that it was introduced at a much earlier period, or about coeval with the appearance of the Corinthian order of the Gandhāra monasteries. As both were evidently derived from the same source, it seems most unlikely that there should be any break in the continuity of the tradition.

No example of the Doric order has yet been found in Gandhāra, but, as both Ionic and Corinthian capitals have been found there, it seems more than probable that the Doric existed there also; but as our knowledge is still somewhat limited, we ought not to be surprised at any deficiencies in our series that may from time to time become apparent.

There is still one other peculiarity of this style to account for. This is the trefoiled arch, which is everywhere prevalent, but which is not to be accounted for by any constructive requirement. Now at Takht-i-Bahai and at 'Alī Masjid we meet with trefoiled arches, over niches for sculptures,¹ and in

\[ 144. \text{Restoration of Vihāra Cells on the west side of the Court of Takht-i-Bahai Stūpa.} \quad \text{Scale about 13 ft. to 1 in.} \]

...the gablets from Gandhāra stūpas, such as that represented in Woodcut No. 123 (p. 216), the frames are of this form. And round the stūpa court at Takht-i-Bahai most of the small shrines or cells were roofed by a sort of double dome—a smaller one set upon a larger and flatter one (Woodcut No. 144); and if we conceive a vertical section made of one of these cells, it will be perceived that the outline would be just that of Woodcut No. 123, or such a trefoil as is every-

¹ Foucher, "L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra," tome I, p. 199, fig. 80, and pp. 19, 201, figs. 2 and 81.

where prevalent in Kashmir. Or, if we refer to Woodcut No. 60 or to 72,1 the section of the cave at Ajantā, which it represents, affords a similar outline; and, as in Kashmir and everywhere else in India, architectural decoration is made up of small models of large buildings applied as decorative features wherever required, it is by no means improbable that the trefoiled façade may have been adopted in Kashmir as currently as the simple horse-shoe form was throughout the Buddhist buildings of India Proper. All these features, however, mark a local style differing from anything else in India.

MĀRTĀND.

By far the finest and most typical example of the Kashmiri style is the temple of Mārtānd, situated about 5 miles east of Islāmābād, the old capital of the valley. It is the architectural lion of Kashmir, and all tourists think it necessary to go into raptures about its beauty and magnificence, comparing it to Palmyra or Thebes, or other wonderful groups of ruins of the old world. Great part, however, of the admiration it excites is due to its situation. It stands well on an elevated plateau, from which a most extensive view is obtained, over a great part of the valley. No tree or house interferes with its solitary grandeur, and its ruins—shaken down apparently by an earthquake—lie scattered as they fell, and, unobscured by vegetation, they are the most impressive remains of early Kashmiri architecture; nor are they vulgarised by any modern accretions. Add to this the mystery that hangs over their origin, and a Western impress on its details—unusual in the East—but which calls back the

1 See also Woodcut No. 80. On the Toran attached to the rail at Bharaut are elevations of chaitya halls, shown in section, which represent this trefoil form with great exactness.—Cunningham, 'Stips of Bharhat,' plates 6 and 9.
memory of familiar forms and suggests memories that throw a veil of poetry over its history more than sufficient to excite admiration in the most prosaic spectators. When, however, we come to reduce its dimensions to scale (Woodcut No. 145), and to examine its pretensions to rank among the great examples of architectural art, the rhapsodies of which it has been the theme seem a little out of place.

The temple itself (Woodcut No. 146) is a very small build-

![Image of Temple at Martand, from the East. (From a Photograph.)](image)

ing, being only 60 ft. in length by 36 ft. in width. The width of the west façade, however, is eked out by two wings or adjuncts, which make it about 60 ft., thus making its length and breadth about equal. General Cunningham also estimated its height, when complete, at 60 ft.—making the three extreme dimensions equal; but this is only conjectural.

The roof of the temple has so entirely disappeared that Baron Hügel doubted if it ever possessed one. General Cunningham, on the other hand, had no doubts on the subject,¹

---

and restored it in stone on his plate No. 14. The absence, however, of any fragments on the floor of the temple that could have belonged to the roof, militates seriously against this view; and, looking at the tenuity of the walls and the large voids they include, I doubt extremely if they ever could have supported a stone roof of the usual design. When, too, the plan is carefully examined, it will be seen that none of

![Central Cell of Court at Martand. (From a Drawing by Gen. A. Cunningham.) Scale, 10 ft. to 1 in.](image)

the masses are square; and it is very difficult to see how the roof of the porch could, if in stone, be fitted to that over the cella. Taking all these things into consideration, my impression is, that its roof—it certainly had one—was in wood; and knowing how extensively the Buddhists used wooden roofs for their chaitya halls, I see no improbability of this being the case here at the time this temple was erected.

The courtyard that surrounds and encloses this temple is, in its state of ruin, a more remarkable object than the temple itself. Its internal dimensions are 220 ft. by 142 ft.,¹ which are respectable, though not excessive; they are not much

more than those of the temple of Nemináth at Gírñár (Woodcut No. 280), which are 165 ft. and 105 ft., though that is by no means a large Jaina temple. On each face is a central cell, larger and higher than the colonnade in which it is placed (Woodcut No. 147), but even then only 30 ft. in height to the summit of the roof, supposing it to be completed, and the pillars on each side of it are only 15 ft. high, which are not dimensions to go wild about, though their strongly-impressed Grecian aspect is certainly curious and interesting.

General Cunningham broached "a suspicion that the whole of the interior of the quadrangle was originally filled with water to a level within one foot of the bases of the columns, and that access to the temple was gained by a raised pathway of slabs, supported on solid blocks at short intervals, which connected the gateway flight of steps with that leading to the temple. The same kind of pathway must have stretched right across the quadrangle from one side doorway to the other. Similar pathways still exist in the Shálimár gardens, as passages across the different reservoirs and canals. On the outside of the quadrangle, and close by the northern side of the gateway, there is a drain by which the surplus water found its exit, thus keeping the surface always at the same level. The temples at Pándrethan Lédar, and in the Bárámûla Pass, are still standing in the midst of water. A constant supply of fresh water was kept up by a canal or watercourse from the River Lambadari, which was conducted alongside of the mountain for the service of the neighbouring village of Simharotsiká," etc. "The only object," the General goes on to remark, "of erecting temples in the midst of water must have been to place them more immediately under the protection of the Nágas, or human-bodied and snake-tailed gods, who were zealously worshipped for ages throughout Kashmir."¹ But for this hypothesis there is no sufficient basis, for there are no springs on the arid plateau where the temple stands, and the old irrigation canal from the Lidar could not have served the purpose. Moreover, the temple was undoubtedly dedicated to Súrya-Náráyan or Vishnu-Súrya; and the polycephalous snake-hoods over some of the abraded figures on the walls are only indicative of Súrya or Vishnu.²

The 'Rájatarangini' distinctly states that the "wonderful temple of Máróndha with its massive walls of stone within a

¹ Loc. cit. p. 273. Temples were very frequently placed beside springs (Nágas), which were enclosed in separate walled basins. — Stein, in 'Vienna Oriental Journal,' vol. v. p. 347. The Pándrethan and Bárámûla temples have been flooded by the rise of their surroundings.

² As an example we may refer to the figure of Vishnu in Cave III. at Bâdâmi. — 'Archæological Survey of Western India,' vol. i. plates 25 and 30; or Le Bon, 'Les Monuments de l'Inde,' p. 149.
lofty enclosure” was built by King Lalitāditya-Muktāpīda, who ruled about A.D. 725 to 760. Jonarāja, a Kashmir chronicler of the first half of the 15th century, tells us that Sikandar Shāh Bhūtshikan (1393 - 1416) destroyed the image, and probably he wrecked the temple itself. The court, however, had been used as a fortification in Jayasimha’s reign, A.D. 1128 to 1149.

Unfortunately, the stone of which the temple is built is of so friable a nature that the sculptures are now barely recognisable, but, so far as can be made out from such photographs as exist, the principal figures in the niches have snakehoods, which are recognised adjuncts of certain forms of Vishnu (Woodcut No. 148). Any one on the spot, with a competent knowledge of Hindu mythology, could determine the character of these sculptures; but no one has yet visited it with the preparation necessary to settle this and other uncertain points regarding the architecture and mythology of the place. A monograph, however, of this temple would be a work well worthy of any pains that might be bestowed upon it by any Indian archaeologist; for, besides its historical and Mythological importance, many of its details are of great beauty, and they have never been drawn with the care they so well merit (Wood-

---

1 Gen. Cunningham, loc. cit. p. 263, misinterpreting this passage (‘Rājatarangini,’ bk. iv. v. 192, and iii. v. 462), ascribed the temple to Rāṇāditya, and the enclosure only to Lalitāditya Simharotikā, where Rāṇāditya built a temple to Mārtanda in the 6th century, cannot now be identified.

2 Stein, ‘Rājatarangini,’ vol. i. introd., p. 88, and bk. iv. ver. 192. Lalitāditya was a great patron of Vaishnavism, but he also countenanced Buddhism, which flourished in Kashmir in the 8th century, and built a vihāra at Parihasapur with a colossal image of Buddha, and another vihāra and a stūpa at Hushkapur, bk. iv. verses 188, 200, 203.
cut No. 149). As the typical example of a quasi-classical style, a perfect knowledge of its peculiarities would be a landmark in the history of the style both before and after its known date.

The site of the ancient city of Parihasapura, where Lalitaditya erected four Vaishnava temples and a Buddhist vihāra, was discovered by Dr. Stein, in 1892, near the village of Divar, with the ruins of half-a-dozen temples, said to have been destroyed by Sikandar Shāh—the remains of the spacious courts that had surrounded them being still traceable. In 1896, many of the stones, till then in situ, had been removed and broken up by contractors for road-metal.¹

AVANTIPUR.

Next in importance to Mārtānd, among Kashmiri temples, are those of Avantipur, now Vāntipor, on the right bank of the Jehlam, halfway between Srinagar and Islāmābād, all erected certainly within the limits of the reign of Avantivarman, the first king of the Utpala dynasty, and who reigned from A.D. 855 to A.D. 883. The stone with which they are erected is so friable, and the temples themselves are so ruined, that there might be a difficulty in ascertaining to what religion they were dedicated if the ‘Rājatarangini’ were not so distinct in describing this monarch as conducting himself as a follower of Śiva, whilst he had been brought up as a worshipper of Viṣṇu,² and naming these temples as dedicated, one—built before his accession—to the latter, and after that event, the temple of Avantīśvara to Śiva.

The two principal ruins stand in courtyards of nearly the same size, about 200 ft. by 160 ft. or 170 ft. internally. One has pillars all round, like Mārtānd, and almost identical in design and dimensions. The other is asty lar, but the temple itself was much more important than in the first example.³

¹ Stein’s ‘Rājatarangini,’ vol. ii. pp. 300-303.
² Ibid., bk. v. verses 43-45.
³ Plans of these temples with details are given by Cunningham, plates 17 and 18, and by Lieut. Cole with photographs, plates 20 to 27, and 2 to 5 for details. Mr. Cowie also adds considerably to our information on the subject. The dimensions quoted in the text are from Lieut. Cole, and are in excess of those given by General Cunningham. The
The central shrines of both have been reduced to heaps of stones, and it is now impossible to determine which was the Vaishnava and which the Saiva shrine. Of the smaller temple, owing to part of the court having been long since silted up, there are more remains than of the other, from which every pillar has been removed, possibly by Shâh Jahân and other Mughal emperors, for their summer palaces and Shâlimâr gardens near Srinagar. Portions of the gateways of both still remain.\(^1\)

The characteristic that seems most clearly to distinguish the style of the temples at Mârtând from that of those at Avantipur is the greater richness of detail which the latter exhibit; just such a tendency, in fact, towards the more elaborate carvings of the Hindû style as one might expect from their difference in date. Several of these have been given by the three authors to whose works I have so often had occasion to allude, and to which the reader is referred; but the annexed fragment (Woodcut No. 150) of one of its columns is as elegant in itself, and almost as interesting historically, as the Doric of the examples quoted above, inasmuch as if it is compared with the pillars of the tomb of Mycenae\(^3\) it seems difficult to escape the conviction that the two forms were derived from some common source.

At all events, there is nothing between the Peloponnesos and Kashmir, so far as we now know, that so nearly resembles it.

At Sankarapurâ, now Patân, between Srinagar and Bârâmûla, Sankaravarman (A.D. 883-902) the son and successor of Avantivarman, with his Queen Sugandhâ, erected two Saiva temples which still exist, though the corridors that doubtless once enclosed their courts have disappeared. Like most other Kashmiri temples they consisted only of a shrine or vimâna, without mandapa, but had recessed porches forming small chapels on three sides. Sankaravarman is said to have brought the materials for his buildings here from Parihâsapura, about 7 miles off.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Cunningham, loc cit, pp. 276 et seqq., and plate 17; Bernier's 'Travels A.D. 1656-1668' (ed. 1891), p. 400.

\(^2\) 'History of Ancient and Mediaeval Architecture,' vol. i. Woodcut 125, p. 244.

\(^3\) Gen. Cunningham has given descriptions and outline plans of these
Bhaniyār or Buniār.

At a place near the remote village of Buniār or Bhaniyār, on the road between Ùrf and Naoshahra, there stands one of the best-preserved temples in the valley. During long ages of neglect, silt and mud had so accumulated as to half bury the place. It was, however, excavated a good many years ago by orders of the Mahārāja, and hence its nearly perfect state.\(^1\) Its dimensions are less than those of the temples last described, the court being only 145 ft. by 120 ft., but, except from natural decay of the stone, it is nearly perfect, and gives a very fair idea of the style of these buildings. The trefoiled arch, with its tall pediment, the detached column and its architrave, are as distinctly shown here as in any other existing example of a Kashmiri colonnade, and present all those quasi-classical features which we know were inherited from the neighbouring province of Gandhāra. The central temple is small, only 26 ft. square over all; the cell is 13½ ft. square inside with walls over 6 ft. thick, supported on a basement 4 ft. high, and its roof is now covered with wooden shingles; but whether that was the original covering is not certain. Looking, however, at the central side-cell of the colonnade (Woodcut No. 151),

\(^1\) Cole, 'Ancient Buildings,' p. 23,
it seems doubtful whether General Cunningham was justified in restoring the roof of the temple, or of the central cell at Mârtând in stone. My impression rather is, as hinted above, that the temple-roof was in wood; that of the side-cell in stone, but flat.

At a place called Wâniyat or Vângath—32 miles from Srinagar, near the sacred Haramukh peaks—are two groups of temples, together about seventeen in all, which were carefully examined and described by the Rev. Mr. Cowie,1 and plans and photographs are found in Lieutenant Cole's book.2 They differ somewhat from those we have been describing, inasmuch as they do not seem to have been enclosed in colonnaded courts, and each group consists of one large and several smaller temples, unsymmetrically arranged. The larger ones are 30 ft. and 32 ft. square in plan over all; the smaller 10 ft. or 12 ft. They are of various ages, and the two principal temples are most probably those of Bhûtesa in the east group, and Jyeshtha in the other.3

There are no inscriptions, nor any historical indications that would enable us to fix the date of the Wâniyat temples with certainty, and the stone has decayed to such an extent that the details cannot be defined with the precision necessary for comparison with other examples; but whether this decay arises from time or from the nature of the stone there are no means of knowing.4 This Tirtha at Haramukh was famous from very early times, and we learn that Lalitâditya-Muktâpûda built here a stone temple to Jyeshtha in the 8th century, and made gifts to the Bhûtesa temples. The Jyeshtha shrine is thus probably among the earliest. Early in the 11th century the temples were plundered, after which they were probably restored and modernised by Uchahala (A.D. 1101-1111), and again plundered by hillmen before 1150. They would almost certainly suffer also at the hands of Sikandar Shâh at the end of the 14th century.

Among the remaining examples, perhaps the one that most clearly exhibits the characteristics of the style is that at Pândrethan, about 3 miles from Srinagar (Woodcut No. 152). It still is a well-preserved little temple, standing in the middle of the village, and is in all probability the Vaishnava temple built during the reign of King Pârthva (A.D. 906-921) by his

2 Illustrations of Ancient Buildings in Kashmir,' pp. ii ff., plates 6 to 11.
3 Stein's 'Râjatarangini,' bk. v. vv. 55-59 and note, and bk. i. v. 107, note.
4 Lieut. Cole, basing his inferences on certain similarities he detected between them and the temple on the Takht-i-Sulaimân, which he believed was erected B.C. 220, ascribed their erection to the first century after Christ.
minister, and named Meruwardhana-swāmin.¹ It now stands in the water of a shallow pool that occupies the former courtyard. Originally, it seems to have had a third storey or division to its roof, but that has fallen; the lower part of the building, however, exhibits all the characteristic features of the style in as much perfection as almost any other known example. It consists of a shrine only, 11 ft. 7 in. square inside, with doors on all four sides, and the inside roof covered with sculpture.

One last example must conclude our illustrations of Kashmiri architecture. The temple at Pāyər, though one of the smallest, is among the most elegant, and also one of the most entire examples of the style (Woodcut No. 153). Its dimensions are only 8 ft. square for the superstructure, with a door on each side, and 21 ft. high, including the basement; but with even these dimensions it acquires a certain dignity from being erected with only six stones—four for the walls and two for the roof.² It stands by itself on a knoll, without any court, or any of the surroundings of the older temples, and is dedicated to Siva. It would be interesting if its date could be ascertained, as it carries with it that of the cave of Bhaumajo or Bumazu, and of several other temples.³ Vigne, from its perfect preservation says 'ten stones,' adding four for the tympana over the doors.

² Cunningham, loc. cit. p. 256; Growse
³ 'Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,' vol. xxxv. pp. 100 et seqq.; and Stein's 'Rājatarangini,' bk. vi., vv. 177, 178, note. It is probably the same as the temple of Bhimakesava built (950-958 A.D.) by Bhima Śahi, King of Kābul or Udabhānda.
regarded it as the most modern of the series, and Cunningham, founding on a mistake, argued for its being a temple erected by Narendrâditya, before the end of the 5th century. It is evidently much later than Mârtând, and may be ascribed, architecturally, with some confidence to the 10th century.

In order to write a complete monography of the Kashmiri style, we ought to be able to trace it to a much earlier period. We know that it was influenced by that of Gandhâra, from which it was not distant, and from which it was subject to invasion.

There were among the Gandhâra vihâras as we now know, buildings with sloping stone roofs, and that all along the Himâlayas, these double and triple roofs, sloping to four sides—

¹ 'Râjatarangint,' bk. iii. ver. 383; the temple of Narendraswâmin referred to was undoubtedly Vaishnava, and this upsets his argument, for the Pâyer temple is Saiva; svâmin is the invariable termination of the names of Vaishnava shrines in Kashmir.
known as "for four waters"—have always been in common use.\footnote{1}

We learn from tradition that in the time of Asoka, B.C. 250, missionaries were sent to convert the inhabitants of the valley to the Buddhist faith, and that, at a later date, the Turushka king Kanishka ruled over Kashmir, and was a patron of the Buddhist religion; and we know that in the 7th century Hiuen Tsiang found Buddhism, if not the only religion, at least one of the dominant cults of the people. The details he mentions, and the fact of his lingering here for two whole years (A.D. 633 and A.D. 634) to study its forms and scriptures, proves how important this religion then was.\footnote{2} More than a century later (A.D. 759), U-k'ong, another Chinese Buddhist, reached Kashmir, and spent fully four years in literary study, and visiting the sacred sites and monasteries, stating that he found more than three hundred convents, and many stūpas.\footnote{3} But scarcely any vestige of a chaitya or of a vihāra has yet come to light; and though there are mounds which may contain stūpas, it is most improbable that they will contain any architectural forms that may be of use for our purposes.\footnote{4} All the ancient monasteries seem to have been destroyed on the decline of the religion.

We now know sufficiently the forms and age of the Gandhāra monasteries \(\text{(ante, pp. 211 et seq.)}\) to supply most of the missing links connecting the Kasmīrī style with that of the outer world; but till the temples in the Salt Range, and other little-frequented parts of the Panjāb are examined, we shall not know all that we desire. Meanwhile the annexed woodcut (No. 154), representing a temple at Malot, in the Jehlam district, shows how nearly the Panjābi style resembled that of Kashmir.\footnote{5} There are the same trefoil-headed openings; the fluted pillars, with quasi-classical bases and capitals; and a general similarity of style not to be mistaken. There is another temple very similar, but smaller, at Katās, 12 miles north-west from Malot; a Buddhist stūpa—still intact till 1882—when, under Gen. Cunningham's instructions, one of his assistants dug into it and razed it to the ground. It had been constructed along with a vihāra, by Lalitāditya early in the 8th century.—Lawrence's 'Valley of Kashmir,' p. 163; Stein's 'Rājatarangint,' bk. iv., note on v. 188.

\footnote{1} Fouche, 'L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra,' pp. 116, 131-136.

\footnote{2} Beal, 'Life of Hiuen Tsiang,' pp. 68-72; Julien, 'Vie de Hiouen Tisang,' pp. 91-96.

\footnote{3} Dr. Stein has succeeded in identifying the localities referred to by U-k'ong in his 'Notes on Ou-k'ong's Account of Kasmīr' (Wien, 1896). See also 'L'Itinéraire d'Ou-k'ong (751 - 790) traduit et annoté par M. Sylvain Lévi et Ed. Chavannes' in 'Journal Asiatique,' ix. sér. tome vi. (1895), pp. 341-384.

\footnote{4} Near Ushkkürthe ancient Hushkapura, on the Jehlam, opposite to Bārāmūla was a Buddhist stūpa—still intact till 1882—when, under Gen. Cunningham's instructions, one of his assistants dug into it and razed it to the ground. It had been constructed along with a vihāra, by Lalitāditya early in the 8th century.—Lawrence's 'Valley of Kashmir,' p. 163; Stein's 'Rājatarangint,' bk. iv., note on v. 188.

\footnote{5} It appears from Hiuen Tsiang, that in the 7th century the northern Panjāb was subject to Kashmir.—Beal, 'Buddhist Records,' vol. i. pp. 136, 143, 147, and 163; 'Life of Hiuen Tsiang,' p. 192.
both are near Pind Dādan Khān, and there are others in the neighbourhood, which may form a connecting link between the Kashmiri temples and other varieties of style in the Himalaya region.

So many and so various are the points of interest connected with the style of the ancient buildings in Kashmir, that they deserve much fuller illustration than is compatible with the scope of the present work. Though not magnificent, they are very pleasing and appropriate examples of art, and they have this advantage over most of the Indian styles, that Kashmir possesses, in the 'Rājatarangini,' what may be said to be the only Indian history in existence,¹ and Dr. A. M. Stein's admirable edition and translation of that work has done much to fix the dates of many of the buildings and to supply a basis for a scientific and historic treatment of the whole.

¹ See ante, p. 8.
The earliest references to the religious beliefs of Kashmir connect them with the worship of Nāgas or serpent deities, supposed to preside over springs, lakes, and rivers; hence they correspond closely with the classical Naiads or Potameids. Numerous temples were erected to them at all the more famous springs, and to these the earliest and more popular pilgrimages were made, and continue to be even till the present time. Even the Muhammadan Kashmirians pay superstitious and hardly obscure reverence to them; the “ziārats” or shrines of their Pirs or saints are largely fixed at the old sacred spots, and sometimes they seem to have been the native shrines appropriated by the ruling caste.¹ The Nāga divinities were accepted by the Buddhists and worked into the mythology of the Mahāyāna school. Until the 6th century Buddhism was probably the predominant religion of the country. Mihirakula, a White Hūn—whose coins indicate that he was a Saiva—acquired the sovereignty about A.D. 530, and was a bitter persecutor of the Buddhists, at the same time fostering the Brahmanical cult. When Hiuen Tsiang visited the country in the 7th century, Buddhism seems to have considerably revived. The kings of the Kārkota and Utpala dynasties were tolerant, and, as we learn, built Buddhist vihāras as well as Hindū temples, and U-k’öng, who reached Kashmir in A.D. 759—probably in the reign of Lalitāditya-Muktāpida—speaks of the Buddhist establishments as being numerous and very flourishing.² By the 14th century, however, the Hindū rulers had become weak and effete, and a military adventurer from the south murdered Kotā Rāni, the widow of the last sovereign, A.D. 1339, and usurped the legal power as Shāh Mīr. The immigration of foreigners that followed rapidly led the way, under the new Moslim dynasty, to the general conversion of the people to the Musalmān religion, and by the end of the century this had become an accomplished fact.

As Muhammadanism rose in power the old temples were either destroyed, as under the iconoclastic zeal of Sikandar Shāh, 1393 to 1416, or they were neglected and fell to ruin; after that we have only the tomb of Zainu-l-‘Abidīn and the temple on the Takht-i-Sulaimān that can be classed as examples of the style, though the latter can hardly even claim a title to that affiliation.

¹ It seems not improbable that the Ziārat of Pir Hājī Muhammad Sāhib at Srinagar, may represent the Rana-swāмин temple of Randhītya, erected in the 6th century; the Bumu temple also is now regarded as the Ziārat of Hába Bānadin Sāhib.—¹ Rājatarangini, bk. iii., vv. 453-454, note, and bk. vi., vv. 177, 178, note.
² We read of the iconoclast Harsha (1089-1101) sparing two colossal images of Buddha: one in Srinagar, and the other at Parihāsapur—probably the establishment by Laliūditya in the 8th century.—¹ Rājatarangini, bk. viii., vv. 1097, &c., and bk. iv., vv. 200.
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Any one looking at the map, and the map only, would probably be inclined to fancy that, from their similarity of situation and surroundings, the arts and archaeology of Nepāl must resemble those of Kashmir. It would not, however, be easy to make a greater mistake, for there are no two provinces of India which are more diametrically opposed to one another in these respects than these two Himalayan states. Partly this is due to local peculiarities. The valley of Nepāl proper—in which the three old capitals, Patān, Bhātgāon, and Kāthmāndu, are situated—is only about 15 miles north and south, by 20 east and west. It is true, the bulk of the population of the Gurkha state live in the valleys that surround this central point; but they are sparse and isolated communities, having very little communication with each other. Kashmir, on the other hand, is one of the most beautiful and fertile valleys in the world, measuring more than 100 miles in one direction and more than 70 in another, without any ridges or interruptions of importance, and capable of maintaining a large population on one vast, unbroken fertile plain.

Another point of difference is, that Kashmir never was a thoroughfare. The population who now possess it entered it from the south, and have retained possession of it—in all historical times, at least—in sufficient numbers to keep back any immigration from the north. In Nepāl, on the contrary, the bulk of the population are of Tibetan, or Mongol origin from the north, left there apparently in their passage southward; and, so far as we can gather from such histories as exist, the southern races who are found there entered the valley in the beginning of the 14th century, and never in such numbers as
materially to modify the essentially Turanian character of the people.

Nepál also differs from Kashmir from the fact that the Muhammadans never had possession of their valley, and never, consequently, influenced their arts or their religions. The architectural history of the two valleys differs, consequently, in the following particulars,—In Kashmir we have a Buddhist period, developing by the 8th century into an original quasi-classical style, that lasted till it, in its turn, was supplanted by that of the Moslem in the 15th century. In Nepál we have no succession of styles—no history in fact—for we hardly know when any of the three religions was introduced; but what we find is the Vaishnava, Saiva, and Buddhist religions existing side by side at the present day, and flourishing with a rank luxuriance unknown on the plains of Bengal, where probably their exuberance was checked by the example of the Moslems, who, as just remarked, had no influence in the valley.

Owing to the principal monuments in Nepál—except the older chaityas—being modern, and to the people being too poor to indulge in such magnificence as is found on the plains, the buildings of Nepál cannot compare, as architectural objects, with those found in other parts of India. But, on the other hand, the very fact of their being comparatively modern gives them an interest of their own, and though it is an exaggeration, it is a characteristic one, when it is said that in Nepál there are more temples than houses, and more idols than men;¹ it is true to such an extent that there is an unlimited field for enquiry, and even if not splendid, the buildings are marvellously picturesque. Judging from photographs and such materials as are available, I have no hesitation in asserting that there are some streets and palaces in Kāthmāndū and Bhātɡāon which are more picturesque, and more striking as architectural compositions, than are to be found in any other cities in India.² The style may be called barbarous, and the buildings have the defect of being principally in wood; but their height, their variety of outline, their wealth of carving and richness of colour, are such as are not to be found in Benares or any other city of the plains.

The real point of interest in the architecture of Nepál to

¹ The towns of Kāthmāndū, Pātān and Bhātɡāon, which are within a short distance of one another, are crowded with sacred edifices—Buddhist, Saiva, and Vaishnava. The number of these shrines is estimated at 2000.
² We have now further illustrations in 'Le Népal, étude historique d'un Royaume Hindou,' par Sylvain Lévi, 3 tomes, Paris, 1905-1908; Dr. G. Le Bon, 'Voyage au Népal' in 'Tour du Monde,' 1886, 1er. sem.; and 'Les Monuments de l'Inde,' pp. 223-246, and figs. 364-398.
the true student of the art lies in its ethnographic meaning. When fully mastered, it presents us with a complete microcosm of India as it was in the 7th century, when Hiuen Tsiang visited it — when the Buddhist and Brahmanical religions flourished side by side; and when the distinctive features of the various races were far more marked than they have since become under the powerful solvent of the Muhammadan domination.

From all these causes I believe that if the materials existed, and it were possible to write an exhaustive history of the architecture of the valley of Nepal, it would throw more light on most of the problems that are now perplexing us than that of any other province in India. It only, however, can be done by some one on the spot, and perfectly familiar not only with the Nepalese buildings, but with all the phases of the question;¹ but even then its value would be more ethnographic than aesthetic. If this were an ethnographic history of architecture, to which the aesthetic question were subordinate, it would be indispensable that it should be attempted, however incomplete the materials might be; but the contrary being the case, it must suffice here to point out the forms of the architecture, merely indicating the modes in which the various styles are divided among the different races.

Like that of so many other countries of India, the mythic history of Nepal commences even before the Kaliyug, and among its pre-historic visitors are mentioned Vipasyī and the other five Buddhas that preceded Sākyamuni, together with Manjūrī Bodhisattwa, Svyayambhū—the self-existent, Siva as Parñapatī, Vishnu, and other gods of the Hindu Pantheon. These do not concern us: tradition adds that Asoka visited the valley and built five chaityas, one in the centre of Patān and the others at the four cardinal points round it, which are still pointed out. We come to historical fact in the 5th century A.D. when we meet with the earliest inscriptions.² They belong to the later kings of the Lichchhavī dynasty,

¹ Nepal is fortunate in having possessed in the late Mr. Brian H. Hodgson one of the most acute observers that ever graced the Bengal Civil Service. At the time, however, when he was Resident in the valley, none of the questions mooted in this work can be said to have been started; and he was mainly engrossed in exploring and communicating to others the unsuspected wealth of Buddhist learning which he found in Nepal, and the services he rendered to this cause are incalculably great. Nor did he neglect the architecture, as the numerous drawings in his collections bear witness.

whose ancestors seem to have come from Vaisālī and estab-
lished themselves in Nepāl, and who seem to have been some
of them Vaiśnavas and others Saivas. Their inscriptions
apparently range from late in the 5th century till into the
7th, when Amsuvārman founded a new dynasty, and possibly
employed a Tibetan era in his inscriptions.

Buddhism had no doubt got a strong foothold among the
Newars at an early date—not improbably in the time of
Aśoka; but about the end of the 5th century, or soon after,
we hear of the patriarch Vasubandhu in his old age going
on a mission to Nepāl with 500 disciples, and founding
monasteries and making converts.

The Newars had entered the country from the north, and
were undoubtedly of Tibetan origin. Like most of the
Himālayan tribes they were snake-worshippers, and the
Buddhist missionaries who visited them accepted their legends
and made them part of their system. Hindū emigration into
the valley must have begun early, and the kings of the long
dynasty that ended about A.D. 600 all bear Hindū names,
whilst their inscriptions indicate that they worshipped the
Hindū gods. The Amsuvārman or Thākuri dynasty were
Vaiśyās like Harshavardhana, and were succeeded by other
Rājput families. In 1097 Nānyadeva from Tīrūt invaded
and subjugated the country, and again in 1324 Harisimha,
of the same race—fearing the invasion of the Muhammadans
under Ghyāsuddīn Tughlak—moved up from Simraun in the
Tirai and, overcoming the petty chiefs, assumed the govern-
ment. But his dynasty does not appear to have ruled for a
long period, and the four chief towns—Bhātgāon, Banepa,
Patān, and Kāthmandū had each their own princes till the
year 1768, when a weak sovereign having called in the assist-
ance of a neighbouring Gurkha Rāja, he seized the kingdom,
and his successors still rule in Nepāl. They apparently were
originally of the Magar tribe, but having mixed with the
immigrant Hindūs, call themselves Rājputs, and have adopted
the Hindū religion, though in a form very different from that
known in the plains, and differing in a manner we would

1 The dates range from 386 to 578 of an undefined era. There are difficulties
in supposing the Saka era to be meant, and M. Sylvain Lévi assumes a Lichch-
havi era beginning A.D. 111. The inscriptions are in classical Sanskrit, and
testify to the literary culture of the country at that age.—‘Népal,’ tome ii.
pp. 112, 114.
2 M. Sylvain Lévi supposes he started an era of his own from A.D. 595, or
eleven years before Harsha’s.
3 The traditional connection of the Newars with the Nayyars of Malabar
is only a myth of Brahmanical invention in order to get over caste difficulties.
Sylvain Lévi, ‘Népal,’ tome ii. p. 324f.
scarcely be inclined to expect. When the religion of the destroyer was introduced into a country that professed the mild religion of Buddha, it might naturally be supposed that its most savage features would be toned down, so as to meet, to some extent at least, the prejudices of the followers of the religion it was superseding. So far from this being the case in this instance, it is said that when first introduced the gods were propitiated with human sacrifices, till warned in a dream to desist and substitute animals.\(^1\) Besides this, the images of Durgā or Kālī, though hideous and repulsive enough in the plains, are ten times more so in Nepāl, where Tantric rites and sorcery prevail as in Tibet; and, in fact, throughout there is an exaggeration of all the most hideous features of the religion, that would lead to the belief that it found a singularly congenial soil in the valley, and blossomed with unusual exuberance there. So far, too, as the architecture of the Saiva temples in Nepāl is concerned, it seems to indicate that the worship came into the valley from the north, rather than from the plains of Bengal. The architecture of the temples of Vishnu, on the contrary, seems evidently to be an offshoot of the art of the plains.

### STŪPAS OR CHAITYAS.

The Buddhist chaityas must be regarded as the oldest monuments in Nepāl. Four of them are ascribed to Asoka, who is said to have visited the valley and built one in the centre of Patān, and others at the four cardinal points round the city.\(^2\) They were not called stūpas, since they contained no relics, but are strictly chaityas or monuments intended to call forth pious thoughts. The chaityas of the cardinal points still exist intact in their great outlines; and their general appearance, as M. Sylvain Lévi remarks, does not contradict the tradition:—a hemispherical mound of earth, covered by a revetment of brick, surrounded by a plinth also of brick which serves as a circular path. Four chapels perhaps of later date are placed round the dome at the four points of the compass and joined to it—each containing the image of one of the four "cardinal" Buddhas.\(^3\) These chaityas still preserve the form of the earliest Buddhist monuments. The plinth is the only feature of an architectural

---

1 Buchanan Hamilton, 'Account of the Kingdom of Nepāl,' pp. 35 and 211.
2 Oldfield's 'Sketches from Nepal,' vol. ii. p. 246; D. Wright's 'History of Nepāl,' p. 116; and Sylvain Lévi, 'Népal,' tome i. pp. 263 and 331.
3 See ante, p. 230 note. The Buddhas are: Amitābha on the west; Amoghasiddha on the north; Aksobhya on the east; and Ratnasambhava on the south. The Asoka chaityas and all the largest temples have also a shrine for Vairochana to the right of Aksobhya's; his proper place is in the centre of the chaitya.
kind, but still rudimentary, which modified the rough outline of the primitive stūpa; but the lofty spire of brick and masonry, with its thirteen discs representing chhatras or umbrellas, is a development of much later date, which has even been changed into a solid cone or pyramid.¹

After these, the two most important Buddhist monuments in the valley of Nepāl are those of Swayambhūnāth and of Bodhnāth;² the former beautifully situated on a gentle eminence about half a mile from Kāthmāndū, the latter at Bodhnāth about three and a half miles east from it; it is greatly reverenced by the Tibetans under the name of the Ma-gu-ta chorten.

¹ Sylvain Lévi, ‘Népal,’ tome pp. 1, 2.
² A view of this chaitya forms the frontispiece of Buchanan Hamilton’s volume; it also figures in Wright’s ‘History of Nepal,’ plate ix. p. 100; Oldfield’s ‘Sketches from Népal,’ vol. ii. p. 260; and in Sylvain Levi’s ‘Népal,’ tome i. p. 151, from a photograph.
No very precise information is to be had about the date of either, but, in their present form at least, they are not the oldest in the valley. According to Brian H. Hodgson, there are several low, flat, tumuli-like chaityas, with very moderate chhatrāvalis or finials, which are older, and may be of any age; but, as will be seen from the previous woodcut (No. 155), that at Swayambhûnâth is of an irregular clumsy form, and chiefly remarkable for the exaggerated form of its tee or finial. This is, in fact, the most marked characteristic of the modern Tibetan chaitya, which in China is carried frequently to such an extent that the stūpa becomes evanescent, and the chhatrāvalī or spire changes into a nine or thirteen storeyed tower. This chaitya stands on a narrow plinth projecting about 2 ft. from the face of the dome; and the five shrines of the Dnyâni Buddhâs, built partly into this plinth, were constructed by Râja Pratâpa Malla in the 17th century.

The great Bodhnâth chaitya is ascribed to King Mânadeva of the 6th century, as also to a Tibetan Lama, named Khasa, of later date. It is raised on three successive platforms or terraces, together about 45 ft. high, on which stands the great dome, 90 ft. in diameter and rising another 45 ft., and over this is the pyramidal brick spire, reconstructed in 1825-1826, and of about the same height. These chaityas are so subject to periodical repairs and “restorations” that it is hard to say how much of them is original.

In Mr. Hodgson’s collection there are nearly one hundred drawings of chaityas in Nepâl, all different, most of them small, and generally highly ornamented; but none of them grand, and none exhibiting that elegance of form or beauty of detail which characterises the buildings of the plains. From a low, flat mound, one-tenth of its diameter in height, they rise to such a tall building as this, which is a common form, bearing the name of Kosthakar (Woodcut No. 156), in which the chaitya is only the crowning ornament, and between these there is every conceivable variety of shape and detail. Among others, there is a four-faced lingam of Siva, with a corresponding emblem with four Buddhâs; and altogether such a confusion of the two religions as is scarcely conceivable.

By far the most characteristic and beautiful temples of the

---

1 For a detailed account of this chaitya and its surrounding shrines, see Oldfield’s ‘Sketches from Nepal,’ vol. ii. pp. 219-246.

2 In an upper room of a small temple on the west of it is preserved a perpetual flame as a symbol of Adi-Buddha, which is believed to have been derived from heaven. It is tended by a family of Tibetan lamas, in two cauldrons half-filled with ght, on which the lighted wicks float. If by any mischance it should be extinguished, it must be renewed from another similar flame preserved at the temple of Khâsa Bodhnâth.

3 The legend of its erection is given in Waddell’s ‘Lamaism,’ pp. 315-317; conf. S. Lévi, ‘Le Népal,’ tome i. p. 151.
Nepalese are those possessing many storeys divided with sloping roofs. They are unlike anything found in Bengal, and all their affinities seem with those in Burma or China. Usually, they seem to be dedicated either to Vaishnava or to Saiva worship, but in the temple of Mahābuddha at Patān, Sakyamuni occupies the basal floor, Amītābha the second storey, a small stone chaitya the third, a Dharmadhātu Mandala or relic shrine the fourth, and a Vajra-dhātu Mandala the fifth or apex Mandala the fifth or apex of the building, which externally consists of a small chūdāmani, or jewel-headed chaitya.

This temple is perhaps the most elaborately carved in the valley. It is about 75 feet high, and of unusual shape in Nepāl. It was built about the close of the 16th century, by a Buddhist Newar, named Abhaya-rāja, who in the reign of Amara Mallā had gone on pilgrimage to Bodh-Gayā, and brought back plans or a model of the Mahābodhi temple, and, with his family, began to construct this model of it.1

One of the most elegant of the sloping roofed class is the Bhawāni temple at Bhātgāon, represented in the woodcut (No. 157). It was built in 1703 by Bhūpatīndra Mallā to enshrine a secret Tantric goddess, which to this day is not allowed to be seen. It is five storeys in height, but stands particularly well on a pyramid of five steps, which gives it a greater dignity than many of its congeners.2 Another at Patān,

1 Wright, 'History of Nepal,' p. 204; Oldfield, 'Sketches from Nepal,' vol. i., plate at p. 272, and vol. ii. p. 269.
2 The stair up these five stages is guarded by pairs of colossal figures; below are two athletes, above them two elephants, than two lions, two tigers, and at the top the goddesses or demons —Singhī and Vyūghtī. The temple itself is mostly of wood.
Devi Bhawani Temple, Bhaktapur. (From a Photograph.)
dedicated to Mahâdeva, is seen in the centre of the woodcut (No. 158). It is only two storeys in height, but has the
same characteristic form of roof, which is nearly universal in all buildings, civil or ecclesiastical, which have any pretension to architectural design. The temple on the left of the last cut is dedicated to Krishnâ, and will be easily recognised by any one familiar with the architecture of the plains from its sikhara or spire, with the curvilinear outline, and its clustering pavilions, not arranged quite like the ordinary types, but still so as to be unmistakably Bengali.

About 3 miles east from Kâthmându, on the right bank of the Bâgmatî stream, is the sacred village of Pasupati—the Bênares of the Nepalese worshippers of Siva. The place consists almost entirely of temples and chapels of stone and wood, and is sacred to Pasupati or Siva as the god of beasts. A general view of the village is given in the woodcut (No. 159). On the right is prominent the double roof of the great temple of Pasupatinâth—the most venerated Linga shrine of the Saivas in Nepál. Its doors are overlaid with silver carved in the style of those in the palace at Bhâtgâon and at Patân. The trisula of the god may be seen to the right of the temple as well as on its summit; but the great Nandi or bull that rests in front of the shrine is hid by the surrounding buildings. Close by it is the place where widows are burnt as Sâts along with the bodies of their dead husbands; and the little chapels along the side of the river are commemorative of the more notable. None of the temples here are of any antiquity, most of them—if not all—dating since the beginning of the 17th century.¹

One other example must complete our illustration of the architecture of Nepál. It is a doorway leading to the darbâr at Bhâtgâon, and is a singularly characteristic specimen of the style, but partaking much more of China than of India in the style of its ornaments (Woodcut No. 160, p. 285). It is indeed so like an archway in the Nankau Pass, near Pekin—given further on—that I was at first inclined to ascribe them to the same age. The Chinese example, however, is dated in 1345²; this one, according to Mr Hodgson, was erected as late as 1725, yet their ornamentation is the same. In the centre is Garuda, with a seven-headed snake-hood; and on either hand are Nâgas, with seven-headed hoods also; and the general character of the foliaged ornaments is so similar that it is difficult to believe in so great a lapse of time between them; but I cannot question Mr Hodgson’s evidence. Since he was in Nepál the building on the left-hand side of the cut has

¹ Sylvain Lévi’s ‘Le Népal,’ tome i. pp. 357-366. The illustration (No. 159) is from G. Le Bon’s ‘Monuments,’ p. 245.

Parupati—General view of the temples and the burning ghāt.
Doorway of Darbār, Bhātgradon. (From a Photograph.)
been "improved." His drawings show it to have been one of the most picturesque buildings in the valley. It certainly is not so now.

In speaking of the architecture of Kanara (vol. ii., pp. 76, 77, 83), he similarity that existed between that of that remote province and the style that is found in this Himalayan valley will be remarked; and scarcely any one can look at the illustrations referred to, especially Woodcuts Nos. 303 and 306, and not perceive the similarity between them and the Nepalese examples, though it might require a familiarity with all the photographs to make it evident, without its being pointed out.

WOODEN TEMPLES.

In the Himalayan districts between Kashmir and Nepal, in Kullu, Chamba, Kangra, and Kumāon, there are a vast number of temples, regarding which it would be extremely interesting to have more information than we now possess. They are all in wood, generally Deodar pine, and, like most buildings in that material, more fantastic in shape, but at the same time more picturesque and more richly carved than buildings in more permanent and more intractable materials. What we now know of them, however, is mainly derived from photographs, taken without any system, only as pictures, because the buildings were either picturesque in themselves or so situated as to improve the landscape. No one yet has thought of measuring them, nor of enquiring into their age or traditions; and till this is done it is impossible to treat of them in anything like a satisfactory manner.

General Sir A. Cunningham in his Report for 1878-1879 made some mention of the temples he visited at Barmāwar, Chaitrārī, and Chambā; but beyond stating to what divinities they were severally dedicated, and the inscriptions found, his remarks on the architecture are of the briefest.1 In 1902 and in 1903, the provincial archaeological surveyor visited the same places, but in search of epigraphical materials, and the chief addition of an architectural nature was a number of photographs, which, without plans and descriptions made on the spot, do not help us.

In 1883 the late Mr. Wm. Simpson read to the Royal Institute of British Architects a paper on ‘Architecture in the Himalayas,’ in which he brought to notice that most of the houses in the hill country between the Satlaj and the Ganges valley are built of wood and stone; timber being used in

1 Archaeological Survey Reports,’ vol. xiv. pp. 110-114.
alternate layers to bind the courses of stone together.\footnote{\textit{Transactions of the Royal Institute of British Architects, Session 1882-1883,} pp. 635-fig.} Upon this base of wood and stone stands the real dwelling which is altogether of wood, and on beams it overhangs the more solid structure beneath, and provides the dwelling with a verandah. The gable line of the pointed roof is not straight, but has an angle in it, making it steeper above, where protection was most indispensable, whilst the slope diminished over the external parts, that is in the eaves where leakage was least to be dreaded. This gives a Chinese look to these Himalayan houses.

That this style of structure is not devoid of a certain picturesqueness may be judged from a sketch of a Hindu temple at Chergaon (Woodcut No. 161), on the Satlaj above Sarahan.

\begin{center}
\textbf{161.} Hindu Temple at Chergaon in Chamba. \\
(From a Sketch by the late Mr. W. Simpson.)
\end{center}

It illustrates, too, the form to which the sikhara is reduced in such a building; and it may be noted that the corners of the projecting roofs are ornamented with quaint forms of gargoyles, sometimes representing the form of a bird stuck on the snout of a saurian or serpent.

Whenever this chapter of Indian architectural history comes to be written, it will form a curious pendant to that of the wooden architecture of Sweden and Norway, the similarities between the two groups being both striking and instructive. It cannot be expected that any ethnographical or political connection can be traced between peoples so remote from one another which could influence their architectural forms; but
it is curious to observe how people come independently to adopt the same forms and similar modes of decoration when using the same materials for like purposes, and under similar climatic influences. Although it may consequently be impossible to trace any influence that the people of the Himâlayas could have exerted on the peoples of the northwest of Europe, it is by no means clear that in these wooden structures we may not find the germ of much that is now perplexing us with regard to the earlier forms of Hindô stone architecture. Like Buddhist architecture, there can hardly be a doubt that much of it was derived from wooden originals, and it is difficult to see any locality where wooden styles were likely to be earlier adopted and longer practised than in those valleys where the Deodar pine is abundant, and forms so excellent and so lasting a building material.

An exploration of these valleys, would, no doubt, bring to light many curious monuments, which would not only be interesting in themselves, but might throw considerable light on many now obscure points of our enquiries. One monument, for instance, was discovered by Major Godwin Austen near the foot of the Nâga hills in Asâm, which is unlike any other known to exist anywhere else.¹ The temple—if temple it may be called—consists of a long corridor, about 250 ft. in length and 21 ft. wide, the roof of which was supported by pillars richly carved, spaced 15 ft. to 21 ft. apart;

¹ The following particulars are taken from a paper by Major Austen in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. xlili. pt. 1., 1874, pp. i-6.
but its most remarkable features are two rows—one of sixteen, the other of seventeen monoliths—standing in front of this. The tallest is 15 ft., the smallest 8 ft. 5 in., the general range being from 12 to 13 ft. in height, and 18 to 19 ft. in circumference. No two are exactly alike, though all have a general similarity of design to those represented in the preceding woodcut (No. 162), which may be considered as typical of the style. Another similar monolith was found a small distance off, measuring 16 ft. 8 in. in height, and 23 ft. in circumference.

The natives were quite unable to give any account of these curious monuments, nor is it easy to guess why they were placed where they are. So far as I know, no similar monument exists anywhere, for the pillars seem perfectly useless, though attached to two rows of stones that may have borne a roof; otherwise they look like those rows of rude stone monuments which we are familiar with in this country and in Brittany, but which a more artistic people may have adorned with rude carvings, instead of leaving them quite plain, as our forefathers did. As for their carving, the only things the least like them, so far as I know, in India, are the pillars in the temple at Mūdabidri (Woodcut No. 305), and in other places in Kanara, but there the pillars are actual supports of roofs; these are round-headed, and evidently never were intended for any utilitarian purpose.

Judging from the gateway and other remains of the town of Dimāpur, in which these pillars are found, they cannot be of any great age. The gateway is of the Gaur type, with a pointed arch, probably of the 16th or 17th century; and, if Major Austen’s observation is correct, that the sandstone of which they are composed is of a friable and perishable nature, they cannot be of any remote antiquity.

It would be very interesting if a few more similar monuments could be found, and Āsām is one of the most promising fields in India for such discoveries. When Hiuen Tsiang visited it, in the 7th century, it was known as the kingdom of Kāmrup, one of the three principal states of Northern India, and continued populous and important till the Pathān sovereigns of Delhi attempted its conquest in the 15th century. Owing to the physical difficulties of the country, they never were able to succeed in this attempt; but they blockaded the country for many years, and, cut off from the rest of the world, the savage hill tribes on either hand, aided by famine, so depopulated the country that the jungle overpowered the feeble remnant that survived, and one of the richest valleys in the world became one of the most sparsely inhabited. When the jungle has again been cleared, and rendered fit for human population, there can be little doubt but that the remains of
many ancient cities will be found. Captain Dalton has
given an account of the ruins of Gauhati, which was almost
certainly the ancient capital of the province. "Its former
importance," he says, "is well attested by the immense extent
of its fortifications, and the profusion of carved stones which
every excavation of the modern town brings to light. The
remains of stone gateways and old stone bridges are found
both within and without the old city walls." 1 Captain Hannay
gives a view of one of these bridges. Like all the rest, it is
constructed without arches, on the horizontal principle, 2 but it
may be as old as the time of the Chinese Pilgrims. Besides
these, other ruins have been found and described, in more or
less detail, in the pages of the "Journal of the Asiatic Society
of Bengal." When more fully known they will certainly be of
considerable historic and ethnographic value, though they hardly
can compare with the vast monuments of such provinces as
Orissa or Gujarāt, and other parts of India Proper.

TIBET.

It would be extremely interesting if, before leaving this part
of the world, it were possible to compile anything like a satis-
factory account of the Buddhist style in Tibet, for it is there
that Buddhism exists at the present moment, in inexplicable com-
bination with Saivism and demon worship as the only religion,
and there only is it entirely and essentially a part of the system
of the people. We would gladly, therefore, compare the exist-
ing state of things in Tibet with our accounts of India in the
days of the supremacy of the same religion. The jealousy of the
Chinese, however, who are supreme over that nation of priests,
long prevented free access to the country, and it was only by the
expedition of 1903-1904, that Lhāsa was reached and its mysteries
made known to the public with abundance of photographic
illustrations. 3 But the reported architectural results are un-
important and present little that is novel. Relic worship, as an
essential element in Buddhism, is evidenced by the "shortens"
or stūpas 4 everywhere met with, especially near the monasteries,
and the splendid tombs of the Grand Lāmas at Tashi-lhunpo,

---

3 Capt. Turner, it is true, who was sent to Tashi-lhunpo by Warren
Hastings, published with his interesting narrative a number of very faithful views
of what he saw, but they are not selected from that class of monuments which is
the subject of our present enquiry.
4 Chorten, in Tibetan mChod-rten—
"relic receptacle," is equivalent to
dāgaba, chaitya or stūpa; they are of the
usual characters of shrines enclosing
relics, cenotaphs, and symbols of the
religion, and receive formal worship
from the priests and people.
Gândan, and in the Potala palace are special objects of worship. But as no country in the world possesses a larger body of priests in proportion to its population, and as these are vowed to celibacy and live together, their monasteries are more extensive than any we know of elsewhere—some containing 2000 or 3000 lâmas, and, if we may trust the information supplied to Mr. Rockhill, Debung Lamasery contains 9000, Se-ra 7000, and Gândan 4000.1

The Tibetan monasteries are not built with any regularity, nor grouped into combinations of any architectural pretension, but consist of long streets of cells, mostly surrounding small courtyards, three or four on each side. They are generally placed on sites chosen with taste—either on the tops of hills with a wide view round them, or in fertile valleys sheltered from the colder winds. They occupy large areas in order to accommodate the numerous population, and have the appearance of towns, consisting, as they do, of a large aggregation of separate dwellings for the monks, and surrounded by a high wall having four gates towards the cardinal points. Outside are the houses and shops of the tradesmen and shopkeepers. The houses are in the usual style of the country—the walls often with more or less batter—having the kitchen and storerooms on the ground floor and the living rooms on the upper storey, which has a flat roof forming a terrace. In the centre of the monastery is a large square for assemblies, in the middle of which stand the temple, library, meeting-hall of the authorities and mansion of the superior or abbot, distinguished by a painted band or frieze of reddish brown running round it under the eaves. The temples are rectangular stone buildings, commonly constructed on a general model, the walls often rough-cast in white with a broad band of red or yellow colour under the eaves. The roofs are formed of beaten clay or with tiles, on the middle of which is raised a sort of pavilion with a Chinese roof decorated with little gilt pyramids at the angles and apex. These temples have no windows, the only daylight being admitted by the doors. Inside they are divided longitudinally by two ranges of pillars into a nave and side aisles, as in the chaitya caves in India. The pillars and joists are painted yellow or bright red, and painted silks are hung from the roof. At the inner end of the nave is the altar or shrine with its three large images under the chhattra, and lighted by lamps. The aisles are supplied with cushions for the inferior lâmas or monks, and their walls are covered either with frescoed pictures or large paintings on silk of Buddhas, Jâtaka

1 'Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,' 1891, p. 278. Debung and Sera are both in the vicinity of Lhâsa, and dGâñdan—pronounced Gândan—is about 35 miles east from Lhâsa.
scenes, divinities, etc. Attached to the temple and scattered among the residences are numerous little chapels to the inferior gods, goddesses, and demons.

The introduction of Buddhism into Tibet is ascribed to King Sron-btsang-gam-po (629-650 A.D.), who married a Chinese and a Nepalese princess—both of them Buddhists. He is said to have built the monastery of Labrang in the centre of Lhāsa (A.D. 644), with perhaps the largest temple, as it is the most ancient in the country. His Chinese queen had brought with her a famous sandal-wood image of Sākyamuni and another of Ananda, and for these was erected, about 650, the Ramoche temple, a little to the north-east of Labrang.

The monastery of Potala¹ (Plate VI.) outside the city of Lhāsa, where the Dalai Lāma resides, seems to be of more magnificence than all the rest—the centre being occupied by a great block, dominating the others, which contains the temples, audience halls and chaityas of the Dalai Lāmas. It is known as the Red Palace, and on its roof are the gilded pavilions of Chinese style that render it so conspicuous in the landscape. It was built by the first Dalai Lāma, between 1642 and 1650, on the ruins of the ancient fortress of Sron-btsang-gam-po, on a hill in the west of Lhāsa rising about 300 feet above the plain. It is a great edifice of heavy though imposing aspect with its gilded roofs and bells surmounting the chortens or chaityas that enshrine the relics of the Dalai Lāmas since the middle of the 17th century. Inside it is richly decorated, and, besides the reception and state rooms and sanctuaries, it is said to contain about 10,000 chambers for its myriad occupants. Around this central palace are grouped a number of smaller ones, where the inferior members of this great ecclesiastical order reside; but of all this it is difficult to form a distinct idea without some better drawings than are at present available.

The Dalai Lāma, who resides in this palace, is believed by the Tibetans to be the living incarnation of the Bodhisattwa Avalokitesvara, and, in consequence, is the principal object of worship in Lhāsa. There are, however, four or five subordinate incarnations in different parts of Tibet and Mongolia, who,

¹ Huc, from a mistaken etymology, has "Buddha-la." The later Buddhists speak of three Potalas, as former residences of Avalokitervara—one at Tatta in the Indus delta, but Huien Tsang places it in the extreme south of India, if not in Ceylon (Beal, "Buddhist Records," vol. ii. p. 233), and it is probably the same as Sumanakitsu or Adam's Peak ("Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," N.S., vol. xv. p. 339); the second is P'u-t'o-shan among the Chusan islands; and the third, that at Lhāsa, the capital of the Dalai Lāmas since 1643. But there was another Chinese Potala, or an imitation one, at Je-ho or Cheng-tu Fu, about 110 miles north-east from Pekin. —"Journal of the Royal Geographical Society," vol. xxiii. (1904), p. 614; and vol. xxix. (1907), pp. 180 and 185.
though inferior to this one, are still objects of worship in the places where they reside, and by particular sects of Buddhists.\footnote{1}

It is this worship of a living, rather than of a dead deity, that marks the difference of the forms of Buddhism in India and Tibet. In the countries we have hitherto been describing no actual incarnation of a Buddha is believed to have taken place since the death of Sākyamuni though there have been many saints and holy men; in India, therefore, they have been content to worship images of the departed, or relics which recall his presence. In Tibet, where their divinity is still present among them, continually transmigrating, but never dying, of course such a form of worship is absurd; no relic of a still living god can logically exist, though this has probably never been thought of, and the chaityas of the Great Lāmas are honoured, and worshipped in the palace or monastery occupied by their successors.

The earliest monastery founded in Tibet is that of Sām-yas, about 35 miles south-east from Lhāsa, near the Sang-po river. It was established by a famous teacher, Padma Sambhava, who went from Bihār with other Buddhist teachers, about the middle of the 8th century. He is said to have modelled it after the great temple monastery of Otantapuri, near Nālanda, and it became the metropolis of the Red-cap order.\footnote{2} The monastery, with its large temple and four separate colleges, is enclosed by a circular wall about a mile and a half in circuit, and contains a notable library and the State treasury. Another Indian Pandit, named Atśha, came from the Vikramāśīla monastery about 1038 and restored the Lamaism of his time, establishing what afterwards became the Yellow-cap or Gelugpa order of Lāmas, which became the State church when its chiefs, the Dalai Lāmas, usurped the temporal power.

The monastery of Sākya, about 50 miles west-south-west from Shigatse, was founded in 1071. Its Grand Lāma was acknowledged by Khubilai Khān in 1270 as head of the church, and made tributary prince of Tibet. This position his successors maintained for a century, and the sect played an important rôle in the history of Tibet till the Gelugpas superseded it early in the 15th century. The establishment is said to contain the largest single building in Tibet; it is seven

\footnote{1}{The heads of the Pan-chhen Rin-poĉes of Tashi-lhunpo are regarded as perpetual incarnations of Amitābha. The Tārānātha Dalai Lāmas have their seat at Urga in Mongolia, whereas the late Lāma Pāpe fled.}

\footnote{2}{Otantapuri and Vikramāśīla monasteries were most probably among those destroyed by Muhammad Bakhtiyār Khalji about 1194.—'Jour. Asiat. Soc. Bengal,' vol. lvi. pt. i. p. 19, and vol. iii. (1907), p. 221; Grünewedel, 'Mythologie des Buddhismus in Tibet,' etc., p. 55; L. de Milloué, 'Bod-Youl ou Tibet,' pp. 281ff.; Elliot, 'History of India,' vol. ii. pp. 305f.}
storeys high, and has a spacious assembly hall. Its library is famous for its collection of Sanskrit and Tibetan manuscripts—probably all Buddhist.  

About the beginning of the 15th century Tsong-Khapa, a Lama of Kumbum, re-organised the sect founded by Atisha and re-named it the Gelugpa. His first monastery was that of Gándan, founded in 1409, about 30 miles east from Lhásá, of which he was abbot till his death in 1417. The chief object of veneration here is the lofty mausoleum of the founder, built of marble and ornamented with malachite and with a gilded roof. It encloses a stūpa said to be all of gold, in which is deposited the embalmed remains of the sage. One of Tsong-khapa's disciples founded Sera monastery about 2 miles north of Lhásá in 1417, in which are about 5500 monks. Depung, 3 or 4 miles west from Lhásá, is also a monastery of the Gelugpas, and contains fully 7000 inmates, mostly devoted to exorcism and magic. It was founded in 1414, and is said to be named or modelled after the early Indian monastery of Dhānyakataka or Amaravati. Within the enclosure is a large temple surrounded by four chapels, and a palace of the Lhásá Lama. Out of scores of other such establishments, we may mention Tashi-lhunpo, visited by Boyle and Turner in the end of the 18th century. It is in western Tibet, near Shigatse, about 140 miles west of Lhásá, was founded by Tsong-khapa in 1445, and contains about 3500 monks. It is the seat of the Pan-chhen Grand Lama, who is next to the Lhásá pontiff in dignity and influence. Here is the tomb erected by the Chinese emperor Kiu-long for the Lama Erdeni who died on a visit to Pekin in 1779. It is figured by Turner as is also the Go-ku-pea—some nine storeys high for the display of religious pictures.

Lastly, at Gyan-tsê on the route followed by our troops in 1904, is a large fortified monastery, itself forming a little town on the southern slope of a hill to the north of the fort. Its buildings, standing on the edge of the plain, rise in tiers, like a large amphitheatre round the great temple at their base. This temple, shown in Plate VII., is of interest from its form. It is locally known as Gándho-la—a name usually applied to the great temple at Bodh-Gayā, of which local tradition names this as being a model. It is about 100 ft. high,

---

1 Waddell's 'Lamaism,' p. 274.
2 As Amaravati and its monastic establishment had been deserted and disappeared a thousand years before this, the connection between the two is imaginary, as in the cases of Sam-yas and Gyan-tsê.
3 Turner, 'Account of an Embassy to the Court of Teshoo Lama' (1800), plates 11 and 12; 'Mission of Geo. Bogle to Tibet,' etc., pp. 96ff.
4 Gyan-tsê lies about 106 miles west-south-west from Lhásá, in latitude 28° 53' N., and longitude 89° 54' E.
5 This form reminds us of the Jainasamorapanas at Gînâr and Satrunjaya.
PLATE VII

GOLDEN TEMPLE AT GYAN-TSE
(From a Photograph by Lieut. F.M. Bailey)  (To face page 294, Vol. I)
with a circumference of 600 ft. at the base, and is built in five stepped terraces with recessed angles, on the plan of the vimânas of Indian temples. Above these is a circular drum of one storey, and over it a smaller square one surmounted by a spire of thirteen great rings of gilt copper crowned by a chhattras canopy of the same material. In the different storeys are numerous shrines to the different Buddhas, which are reached by inside stairs, and the terrace roofs of the successive storeys form a series of chaityânganas\(^1\) for the circumambulation of the different groups of cells.

From Sikkim, which is overrun by Lâmas, and has borrowed its architecture from Tibet, we may gain further acquaintance with the characteristic features of the style. The view (Woodcut No. 163) of the doorway of the temple at Tashiding is

163. Doorway in the Temple at Tashiding. (From Dr. Hooker's 'Himalayan Journals,' vol. i. p. 319.)

curious as showing a perseverance in the employment of sloping jambs, which we do not meet with in the plains of India, but is usual in Tibet.\(^2\) It will be recollected that this feature is nearly universal in the Bihâr and early western caves (Woodcuts Nos. 55, 58, and 64), but there we lose it. It may have con-

\(^{1}\) This term is used among Buddhists for the pradakshina path or terrace. Waddell's 'Lhasa and its Mysteries,' pp. 217, 229-232.

\(^{2}\) E. Schlagintweit's 'Buddhism in Tibet,' pp. 186ff., and Milloué, 'Bodou Youl ou Tibet,' pp. 279ff.
continued to be employed during the Middle Ages, though the examples have perished; but it is curious to find it cropping up here again after a lapse of 2000 years.¹

¹ It is found currently employed in the decorative sculpture of the Gandhâra monasteries, but rarely as a constructive feature. See Foucher, ‘L’Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhâra,’ tome i. pp. 107–108
Another view in the porch of the temple at Pemiongchi is also interesting, as showing the form of roof which we are familiar with in the rock examples, and also as illustrating the extent to which the bracket capital of India may be carried under the influence of wooden architecture (Woodcut No. 164). It hardly seems doubtful that the idea was originally derived from wooden construction, but was equally appropriate to masonic forms, and is used in masonry so judiciously by Indian architects that we lose sight of its origin in most instances altogether.

Interesting as these minor styles undoubtedly are from their variety, and valuable though they may be for the hints they afford us in understanding the history of the other styles, they never can be so important as the greater architectural groups that are found on the plains of India itself. A monograph of the styles of Kashmir or Nepal, or of the intermediate valleys, would be an invaluable addition to our knowledge; but hardly more is required in a general history than that their places should be indicated, and their general characteristics so defined as to render them recognisable. Even these minor styles, however, will become more intelligible when studied in connection with the Dravidian and northern styles, which are those it is next proposed to define and describe.

TEMPLES AT KÂNGRÂ.

Though a little out of their place in the series, there are two small temples in one of the Himâlayan valleys which it may be expedient to describe here before leaving this part of the subject, as their peculiarities will assist us in understanding much that has just been said, or that will be presently advanced. Besides this, they do not exactly fit into any other series, but they can hardly be passed over, as they possess what is so rare in Indian temples—an ascertained date.

The temples are situated in the village of Kîragrâma or Baijnâth, about 25 miles east of Kânpur, and two inscriptions in the larger of the two principal shrines record that it was built by two brothers, Manyuka and Æhuka, wealthy merchants, under Lakshmanachandra lord of Kîragrâma, and apparently brother-in-law of Jayachchandra, king of Jålandhara or Trigarta. The date is partly obliterated, but in all probability it was equivalent to A.D. 1204. This temple was dedicated to Siva-Vaidyanâtha, and consists of a mandap or hall, 20 ft. square inside, with four round pillars supporting the roof, and a shrine (pûrâ) for the Linga, 8 ft. square—separated from the hall by
a small antechamber. The inscriptions are in the mandap,
high up in the side walls, right and left from the entrance,—a most unusual posi-
tion for such records. They are trans-
p. 78, and 'Indian Antiquary,' vol. xx.
p. 154.

Over all this temple measures 51 ft. by
31, and stands in a walled enclosure about 120 ft. long and
60 ft. wide at the east end, and 75 at the west. This contains
some rooms for the priests with small temples along the north
side. But in 1786 it underwent a thorough repair at the hands
of Rāja Sansârachandra II., which has obliterated many of
its features; and to this repair it probably owes the porch with
its four pillars in front; but with the exception of the
balcony windows on each side, the walls were not, perhaps,
materially meddled with. The roof and spire, however, were
either rebuilt or so overlaid with plaster as to hide the original
work. The woodcut (No. 165) shows only the pillars of the
portico of the temple, with the Nandi kiosk in front and
a small temple of Jamadagni beyond. This latter, though
ruinous, is more interesting, because it has escaped the hand
of the spoiler. As will be seen from the woodcut, it has all
the features of a very old temple—great simplicity of out-
line, no repetitions of itself, and the whole surface of the
upper part covered with that peculiar horse-shoe diaper which
was so fashionable in those early days. It looks here as if
it must be copied from some brick or terra-cotta construction;
otherwise its repetition over a whole surface seems unaccount-
able. The amalaka stringcourses are subdued and in good
taste, and the crowning ornament well proportioned.

There is little doubt that the sikhara of the larger temple
was similarly adorned, but all its details are so completely
obliterated by the coating of plaster it has received that it
has lost its interest. The pillars, however, of its porch retain
their forms up to their capitals, at least. The architraves, as
may be seen from the woodcut, belong to the repair in 1786.
The shafts of the pillars are plain cylinders, of very classical
proportions, and the bases also show that they are only slightly
removed from classical design. The square plinth, the two
toruses, the cavetto or hollow moulding between, are all classical,
but partially hidden by Hindū ornamentation, of great elegance,
but unlike anything found afterwards. The capitals are, how-
ever, the most interesting parts, though their details are con-
siderably obliterated by whitewash. They belong to what may
be styled the Hindū-Corinthian order, though the principles on
which they are designed is diametrically opposed to those of
the classical order of the same name. The object of both—as
is well known—is to convert a circular shaft into a square
165. Temples at Kiragrâma, Kângrâ District. (From a Photograph.)
architrave-bearing capital in a graceful and pleasing manner. We all know the manner in which the Ionic and Corinthian capitals effect this; pleasingly, it is true, but not without effort and some little clumsiness, which it required all the skill and taste of classical architects to conquer. To effect this object, the Hindús placed a vase on the top of their column, the bowl of which was about the same diameter as that of the pillar on which it was placed, or rather larger; but such an arrangement was weak, because the neck and base of the vase were necessarily smaller than the shaft of the pillar, and both were still circular. To remedy these defects, they designed a very beautiful class of foliated ornament, which appears to grow out of the vase, on each of its four faces, and, falling downwards, strengthens the hollows of the neck and foot of the vase, so as to give them all the strength they require, and at the same time to convert the circular form of the shaft into the required square for the abacus of the capital. The Hindús, of course, never had sufficient ability or constructive skill to enable them to produce so perfect a form as the Corinthian or Ionic capitals of the Greeks or Romans; but it is probable that if this form were taken up at the present day, a capital as beautiful as either of these might even now be produced. It is, indeed, almost the only suggestion that Indian architecture seems to offer for European use.

It is by no means clear when this form of capital was first introduced. It first appears, but timidly it must be confessed, in such Buddhist caves as were excavated after the end of the and century:—as, for instance, in the Srí Yajña cave at Nāsik (Woodcut No. 105); in the courtyard of the Viswakarma, at Ellār (Woodcut No. 83); and in some of the later caves at Ajantā—the twenty-fourth for instance. It is found at Eran (Woodcut No. 166), among some fragments that I believe to be of the age of the Guptas, about A.D. 400, and it is currently employed in the middle group of Hindū caves at Ellār, such as the Rāvana-ka Khai, and other caves of that age, say about A.D. 600. It afterwards became frequent, almost universal, with the Jains, down to the time of the Muhammadan conquest. The following representation of one (Woodcut No. 167), from a half column of a temple in Orissa, shows it in a skeleton form, and therefore more suited to explain its construction than a fuller capital would do. On its introduction, the bell-shaped or Persepolitan capital seems to have gone out of fashion, and does not again appear in Indian art.

To return from this digression: there can be no doubt that the temple of Vaidyanātha is dedicated to Śiva, not only from the presence of the bull in front of it, in a pavilion of the same
architecture as the porch, but also because Ganesa appears among its integral sculptures. In the niche in the back

166. Pillar in porch of a Temple at Eran, of the Gupta age.

167. Capital of Half Column from a Temple in Orissa. (From a Lithograph.)

however, is the base of what has been a marble image of Mahâvîra, with an inscription in two lines telling that it was consecrated in A.D. 1240. This base must have been transferred to the Siva temple after the destruction of the original Jaina shrine, and probably owes its preservation and that of a figure placed over it, to the ignorance of the priests of Vaidyanâtha.\(^1\)

The temple second in interest is that of Siddhanâth at the west end of the town. It consists of a four-pillared hall and a shrine, measuring 33 ft. by 20 ft. over all, and with a sikhara about 35 ft. in height. It faced to the east, and had doorways on each side of the shrine leading into a pradakshina or circumambulatory passage.\(^2\) In a niche in the south wall there had been an inscription, long since illegible; but in the back or west wall was a figure of Sûrya; and the temple was most probably dedicated to the sun.

\(^1\) 'Epigraphia Indica,' vol. i. pp. 98 and 118-119, and compare p. 120. On it was placed a sandstone figure of Sûrya—perhaps from the Siddhanâth temple. A similar transference has occurred at Kot Kângrâ, where an image of Pârs-

\(^2\) The drawings of this temple in Cunningham's 'Archæological Reports,' vol. v. plate 44 are not correct.