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DRAVIDIAN TEMPLES.

CONTENTS.


When we turn from these few scattered rock-cut examples to the great structural temples of the style, we find their number is so great, their extent so vast, and their variety so perplexing, that it is extremely difficult to formulate any distinct ideas regarding them, and still more so, as a matter of course, to convey to others any clear idea on the subject. To any one at all familiar with the present status of the population of the province, the greatest wonder is how such a people could ever have conceived, much less carried out, such vast undertakings as these, and that so recently that some of the greatest and boldest were only interrupted by our wars with the French scarcely a hundred and fifty years ago. The cause of this, however, is not far to seek. Ever since we took possession of the country, our countrymen have been actuated by the most beneficent intentions of protecting the poor against the oppression of the rich. By every means we have sought to secure the ryot in his holding, and that he should not be called on to pay more than his fair share of the produce of his land; while to the landowner we have offered a secure title to what belonged to him, and a fixed income in money in lieu of his portion of the produce. To a people, however, in the state of civilisation to which India has reached, a secure title and a fixed income only means the power of borrowing on the occasion of a marriage, a funeral, or some great family festival, ten times more than the borrower can ever pay, and our courts as inevitably give the lender the power of foreclosing his mortgage and selling the property. During the century in which this process has been going on, the landed aristocracy have gradually disappeared, and the wealth of the country has passed into the
hands of the money-lenders of the cities. The aim of the
government may have been beneficent, and may produce the
greatest happiness to the greatest number; but in such a
community neither science, nor literature, nor art, have any
place, and religion itself becomes degraded by the status
of its votaries.

Before we interfered, the practical proprietorship of the
land was in the hands of a few princes or feudal lords, who
derived from it immense revenues they had no means of
spending, except in works of ostentation, which in certain
stages of civilisation are as necessary for the employment
of the masses as for their own glorification. In such a country
as India the employment of one-half of the population in
agriculture is sufficient to produce food for the whole, while
the other half are free for any employment that may be
available. A similar state of affairs prevailed apparently
in Egypt in the time of the Pharaohs, but with very different
results. The Egyptians had great and lofty ideas, and a
hankering after immortality, that impressed itself on all
their works. The southern Indians had no such aspirations;
they had no history to which they could look back with pride,
and their religion was an impure and degrading fetishism. It is
impossible that anything very grand or imposing should come
out of such a state of things. What they had to offer to their
gods was a tribute of labour, and that was bestowed without
stint. To cut a chain of fifty links out of a block of granite and
suspend it between two pillars, was with them a triumph of art.
To hollow deep cornices out of the hardest basalt, and to leave
all the framings, as if of the most delicate woodwork, standing
free, was with them a worthy object of ambition, and their
sculptures are still inexplicable mysteries, from our ignorance
of how it was possible to execute them. All that millions
of hands working through centuries could do, has been done,
but with hardly any higher motive than to employ labour
and to conquer difficulties, so as to astonish by the amount
of the first and the cleverness with which the second was
overcome—and astonished we are; but without some higher
motive true architecture cannot exist. The Dravidians had
not even the constructive difficulties to overcome which enabled
the mediaeval architects to produce such noble fabrics as our
cathedrals.

The aim of architects in the Middle Ages was to design
halls which should at the same time be vast, but stable, and
suited for the accommodation of great multitudes to witness
a lofty ritual. In their struggle to accomplish this they
developed intellectual powers which impress us still through
their works. No such lofty aims exercised the intellectual faculties of the Hindû. His altar and the statue of his god were placed in a dark cubical cell wholly without ornament, and the porch that preceded that was not necessarily either lofty or spacious. What the Hindû architect craved for, was a place to display his powers of ornamentation, and he thought he had accomplished all his art demanded when he covered every part of his building with the most elaborate and most difficult designs he could invent. Much of this ornamentation, it is true, is very elegant, and evidences of power and labour do impress the human imagination, often even in defiance of our better judgment, and nowhere is this more apparent than in these Dravidian temples. It is in vain, however, we look among them for any manifestation of those lofty aims and noble results which constitute the merit and the greatness of true architectural art, and which generally characterise the best works in the true styles of the western world.

Turning from these generalities to the temples themselves, the first great difficulty hitherto experienced in attempting either to classify or describe them was that so very few plans of them had been published. There are probably upwards of thirty great Dravidian temples, or groups of temples, any one of which must have cost as much to build as an English cathedral, some a great deal more; but of all these there were few of which, till lately, trustworthy plans were available. This is, of course, irrespective of some early examples of village temples, and, it may be, of some groups which have been overlooked. If these temples had been built like those of the Greeks, or even as the Christian churches in the Middle Ages, on one uniform plan, changing only with the progress of time, one or two plans might have sufficed; but the fact is that, in nine cases out of ten, the larger Dravidian temples are a fortuitous aggregation of parts, arranged without plan, as accident dictated at the time of their erection; and, without plans, no adequate idea could be conveyed to those who have not seen them.

In the south of the Bombay Presidency are some of the earlier examples of this style. Among these the great temple at Pattadakal, now known as Virûpāksha, we learn from inscriptions upon it, was built by Lokamahâdevî, one of the queens of the Chalukya king Vikramâditya II., who ruled from 733 to 747. It belongs, therefore, to the date formerly assigned to it on archaeological grounds, as having been erected during the 8th century.1 In plan it is almost exactly a duplicate

---

1: 'Archæological Survey of Western India,' vol. i. (1874) pp. 31 et seqq., and plates 38-40; 'Cave Temples of India,' pp. 450, 451; 'Indian Antiquary,' vol. x. pp. 162-169.
of the Kailas, as may be gathered from the annexed woodcut (No. 204).\(^1\) Antecedently to the discovery of their relative dates we could readily believe the southern temple to be the older of the two, but certainly not distant in date, and this has been fully confirmed by the results of more recent research.

Though not the oldest, this is the most important as well as the largest temple of this style in the Kanarese districts. It is the only one now in use in Pattadakal; the others, mostly of great age and interest, are used as dwellings or cattle-sheds. Four of the larger are all of the same style—the sikharas being all square pyramids, divided into distinct storeys, and each storey ornamented with imitation cells, alternately oblong and square. Their ornamentation is coarser or more archaic than that of the later Chalukyan style, and the domical termination of the spires is less graceful. They are wanting, too, in that general elegance of form and detail which are so characteristic of the latter, but are not without a purpose-like boldness of form, expression of stability, and a certain amount of grandeur, though this is more readily observable in the larger temples in the south of India than in those of Pattadakal. If we compare it with the more modern temples, however, it will be seen how much the latter lost by the gradually growing steepness of outline and attenuation of details. The more modern forms are not without a certain degree of elegance which is wanting in the more ancient, but in all the higher characteristics of design, the older are by far the finest examples.

The Virupaksha temple stands in an enclosure 224 ft. in length from east to west, and varying in width from 105 ft. in front with a large gateway on the east and a smaller one on the west (Woodcut No. 204). This court has been surrounded by small shrines or cells, some of which remain. The temple itself faces the east and has entrance porches also on the north and south sides. The hall or mandap measures 50 ft. 8 in. from north to south by 45 ft. 10 in. from east to west, and its roof is supported by sixteen massive pillars, each of one block

\(^1\) There are four photographs of this temple in the ‘Architectural Antiquities of Dharwar and Mysore,’ plates 54-57, and one in ‘Archæological Survey of Western India,’ vol. i. plate 38.
2 ft. 5 in. square and 7 ft. 5 in. high, crowned by deep bracke capitals. These piers are arranged in fours, as in Kailas templ
with pilasters against the walls. The lintels over them and the slabs of the roof, as well as the faces of the pillars, are covered with archaic sculptures, and the central square of the roof is filled by a great coiled Nāgarāja with five hoods, protected by a chhattrā, and two Nāginis with triple hoods are intertwined with his tail. This mandapa is lighted by twelve perforated stone windows—four in each wall,—an arrangement not found in modern temples. On the inner side of the hall stand two more square piers before the shrine, the doorway of which projects forward, forming a passage 10 ft. in length, into the cella which is 12 ft. square and contains the Saiva altar. A circumambulatory passage goes round this, lighted by two perforated windows in each outside wall.

Like all the early Dravidian shrines, it is built of very large blocks of stone closely jointed and without any cement. The representation of the south elevation in Woodcut No. 205, will convey a better idea than any description of the style and appearance of the structure which, though dilapidated, is still a striking and imposing example of the class. The base is elaborately carved; in large panels in the walls are numerous representations of Siva in various forms, and of other gods; and the horseshoe arch is as abundantly represented as in a Buddhist temple.

A little to the north-west of this is the temple of Sangamesvar—now much dilapidated, but quite similar in plan and detail, if somewhat smaller and not so carefully finished, the mandapa is much ruined, as shown in Woodcut No. 206. Its interest lies in the fact that it is older by perhaps thirty or forty years than the preceding, having been erected in the reign of Vijayāditya (697-733). A third large Dravidian temple stands somewhat to the east of north from this last, and is still plainer—probably unfinished in its sculptured ornamentation; and to the north-west of it is one of several deserted temples here built in the northern Hindū style. These last two are represented on Woodcut No. 309 (vol. ii.), which places the two forms in vivid contrast. The building there shown on the left is this Sangamesvar temple—a storeyed pyramid of Dravidian architecture—and that on the right a tower in the northern style. In both the base is generally of a cubical form, but in the northern with a slight projection on each face.

In a field outside the same village is an ancient Jaina temple
also in this style, and probably belonging also to the 8th century. On the east it has an open portico, 19 ft. wide by 20 ft. 3 in., the roof of which is supported on eight pillars standing on a low screen wall with four on the floor. The mandap or hall is 32 ft. 3 in. wide and 30 ft. 8 in. from east to west, having four square pillars on the floor and half pillars against the walls, with two round columns at the entrance to the lobby or ante-chamber of the shrine—all about equally spaced apart. The shrine is 8 ft. 11 in. wide by 9 ft. 9 in. deep, and is surrounded by a pradakshina passage. A peculiar feature is a stone ladder in the north aisle of the mandap leading to the roof, in the tower on which is an upper shrine, a common feature in most of the Jaina temples.\textsuperscript{1}

Though the temple of Mālegitti Sivālaya, outside the town of Bādāmi is but small, it is a characteristic example of the early Dravidian style, and is probably one of the earliest, if not the only one, now existing in so complete preservation. On this account it seems deserving of representation (Plate VIII.). The storeyed character of the sikhara is well defined, its whole style is that of the Māmallapuram raths, with a few sculptures in the panels, whilst the mandap is lighted by perforated windows on each side; and, as will be seen from the plan, Woodcut No. 207, it has a porch in front, facing east, supported on four very massive square pillars. The type of these latter indicates very distinctly that in age it is not far removed from the period when the caves were executed, whilst the similarity of pattern to those of the Virūpāksha temple at Pattadakal indicates a date about the 7th century—perhaps a century earlier than that of the great temple there.

At Aihole, the old Jaina temple known as the Meguti temple, has lost its sikhara, but is one of the oldest shrines in the Dravidian style for which we have a date, since it was completed in the reign of Pulikesin II. by Ravikṛṣṭa, a Jain, in A.D. 634–635.\textsuperscript{2} The arrangement shown in the plan, woodcut No. 208, is somewhat peculiar, the shrine being surrounded by eight small rooms, 8 ft. wide, in place of a pradakshina passage.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1} Archeological Survey of Western India, vol. i. p. 35, and plate 45.
\textsuperscript{2} ‘Indian Antiquary,’ vol. viii. p. 237.
\textsuperscript{3} Perhaps the three divisions in front of the shrine might be regarded as one apartment.
MÄLEGitti SAIva TEMPLE AT BADAMI, FROM S.E  (To face page 356, Vol. I)
There is an antarâla or vestibule, between the shrine and the Mahâ-mandapa; and the roof of the latter was supported by sixteen square piers. It faces north, and has had an upper shrine, as many Jaina temples have. These three examples illustrate the different styles of early southern temples.

**CONJIVARAM.**

Conjivaram, or Kâñchipuram, is a city where tradition would lead us to expect more of antiquity than in almost any other city of the south. About the middle of the 4th century, or soon after, Samudragupta claims to have overcome Vishnugopa, the Pallava king of Kâñchi; and about A.D. 640 Hiuen Tsiang visited Kâñchipura, the capital of Dravida, which he describes as a large city with ruins near it ascribed to Asoka. In the kingdom he speaks of “some hundred saṅghârâmas and 10,000 priests of the Sthavira school” of the Mahâyâna, and there were some eighty Hindû temples and many Jaina heretics.¹ Epigraphical research, as stated above (page 306), has brought to light the names of the Pallava sovereigns ruling here about the 7th century, and their contests with the Chalukyas of Bâdami and other powers. Pulikesin II. of Bâdami had invaded the Pallava kingdom about A.D. 630; Vikramâditya II., fully a century later, took Kâñchi, and has left an inscription in the Kâllâsanâtha temple; and again, about 870, it was taken by Krishna III., the Râshrâkûta sovereign.² When the rule finally passed out of the hands of the Pallavas into those of the Cholas, probably about the end of the 12th century, Kâñchipuram became the capital of the latter dynasty. Be this as it may, the two towns, Great and Little Conjivaram, possess groups of temples as picturesque and nearly as vast as any to be found elsewhere.

But by far the most interesting of the Conjivaram temples is a very early one known as Kâllâsanâtha standing in the fields to the west of the town.³ From its style when first seen by the editor in 1883, he at once placed it as about coeval with the “Seven Pagodas.” Fortunately it contains several original inscriptions, the translation of which has established the fact that it was erected by the Pallava king Rajasimha or Narasimhavishnu, the son of Ugradanda-Lokâditya, who was a contemporary of Vikramâditya I. of Bâdami (A.D. 655-680), so that Râjasimha must have ruled at Kâñchi in the second century.

¹ Beal’s ‘Buddhist Records,’ vol. ii. pp. 228-230, and ‘Life of Hiuen Tsiang,’ pp. 138-139.
³ Mr Sewell did not notice this temple in his ‘Lists of Antiquities’ (p. 178). Indeed the notice there given of the Conjivaram antiquities is unusually meagre. From Sir Walter Elliot’s MS. copies of inscriptions, four are noted (*Ibid.* p. 180) but without mention of the many earlier ones.
half of the 7th century. The temple is a Saiva shrine originally styled Rājasimhesvara, consisting of a vimāna and separate mantapam in a court surrounded by small cells, as shown in the plan, Woodcut No 209. At a late date the mantapam has been joined to the vimāna by an ardhamantapam, roofed on six pillars with the entrance on the south side, and the east face of the old mantapam is shut off by a wall with only a window through it. Further, an additional shrine has been inserted in the east wall of the court with a small porch and surrounding court; but this is evidently a very early addition, as are also, probably, the eight small shrines in front of the enclosure. The vimāna contains the usual Linga cell surrounded by a pradakshina passage; and round it are seven small attached shrines—with large Nandis between them—the three on the back facing west, and the others facing east. There are also two somewhat larger in front, by the sides of the entrance to the main cell. All these are occupied inside and sculptured outside by forms of Śiva, Pārvatī, and other devatas of the same cult, and form the temple into a complete Sivālaya—differing mainly in details of arrangement from what we have met with in the Kailās temple at Elūrā.¹ At the latter, too, the east end of the court is surrounded by a gallery or corridor containing fully forty Saiva sculptures, which are here represented by a series of small shrines quite round the court—all, except those on the east side, facing to the east and covered inside and out with Saiva imagery—mostly of Śiva and Pārvatī. The little shrines had all sikhāras over them appearing over the walls

¹ Ante, pp. 342ff.
VIEW OF MAIN SHRINE, KAILĀSANATHA TEMPLE, KĀNCHIPURAM (To face page 359 Vol. I)
of the court, and with a bull or Nandi and an elephant placed alternately between the spires. On the fronts next the court these cells have each two pillars supported by rampant Vyālis or horned lions in varied attitudes. The attached pillars at the corners of the cells round the main shrine are similarly supported; and the outer walls are ornamented by scores of pilasters, supported by the same conventionalised animals with riders on them. On the west side is a gopuram or gateway with a tower over it, but the entrance is blocked up—that on the east being alone used now. The roof of the old mantapam has been destroyed, but the style of the temple may be understood from the Plate No. IX., which, as was to be expected, is the same as that of the Mamallapuram Raths, already described, and gives us a typical example of the Dravidian style about A.D. 680.

A second example of this early Dravidian style is presented in the Vaishnava temple to the east of Conjivaram,

known as the Vaikuntha Perumāl temple. It stands in a court 79 ft. 2 in. wide and 108 ft. from east to west, but at 29 ft. from the east end it is contracted to 63 ft. 3 in. wide. To this is attached an entrance hall or portico 44 ft. 4 in. by 50 ft.—more modern than the rest, and roofed on twenty-four pillars. A pillared verandah runs quite round the inside

1 Vaikuntha is the heaven of Vishnu, who is usually styled Perumāl (the great one) in the Tamil country.
of the court, the walls of which are covered with sculpture. The outsides of the court walls are divided by pilasters on rampant Vyâls into bays in which are niches with sculptured pediments. The vimâna in the centre of the west portion of the court measures 47 ft. square over the walls, with a mandapam in front, having two rows of four pillars each across the floor. The shrine is of unusual arrangement, being of three storeys (Woodcut No. 210); round the lower are two passages, in the inner of which is a stair leading to the upper floor, and the outer has a door and two windows on each of the three exterior sides. On the first floor is a somewhat larger shrine with one covered passage or pradakshina, round it, and an open balcony on the roof over the outer passage of the ground floor. In the third storey is also a shrine with an open balcony round it over the roof of the first passage below. In the fourth storey there is again a chamber under the large octagonal dome that crowns the sikhara. The walls of the lower storey of the temple are divided by pilasters into panels filled with Vaishnava sculptures.

There are three or four other old temples of the same style at Conjivaram, but they are small and considerably ruined, and hardly come under our notice here.1

The more modern great Saiva temple of Ekâmranâtha at Great Conjivaram possesses some first-class gopurâms, though no commanding vimâna. The largest gopuram is on the south side of the outer enclosure, and has ten storeys and a large top; it was built by Krishnadeva Râya of Vijayanagar (1509-1530) and is 188 ft. high.2 It has, too, a hall of about 540 columns, several large and fine mantapâs, large tanks with flights of stone steps, and all the requisites of a first-class Dravidian temple, but all thrown together as if by accident. No two gopurams are opposite one another, no two walls parallel, and there is hardly a right angle about the place. All this creates a picturesque-ness of effect seldom surpassed in these temples, but deprives it of that dignity we might expect from such parts if properly arranged.

In Little Conjivaram is the Vaishnava temple of Varadarâja-swâmî or Arulâla-Perumâl, which—though smaller than the Saiva shrine—is the wealthier, being the principal seat of the Visishtâdwaitya school of Râmânuja. The principal gopuram

1 The editor is indebted to Mr. A. Rea of the Archeological Survey, who, with the consent of the Government, has favoured him with a proof of his volume on Pallava Architecture now in the press, on which the above remarks are based.
2 "The like model of these lofty towers elsewhere introduced, procured for them the designation of Rayer gobaram, or a tower after the Rayer's fashion—that is, a large and lofty tower."—W. Taylor's 'Oriental Historical Manuscripts,' vol. ii. p. 125; Campbell's 'Telugu Grammar,' introd. p. xii.
of seven storeys and about 100 ft. high is plain in style and not plastered over like so many others. Within, to the left, is a hall of pillars, carved in the style of the Vellore and other temples, with figures riding on horses or hippocripts. North of this is the usual Teppa-kulam or sacred tank and other buildings. Inscriptions of the beginning of the 13th century show that the temple was then in existence, and it is probably of still earlier date.

The Kāmākṣī temple, by its architectural style, suggests

that it is of considerable age, and an inscription of Harihara II. of Vijayanagar mentions the gift of a copper door for the

---

1 Kāmākṣi is a name of Durgā or Pārvatī, in the character of Manmatha or Muruga: in some parts of southern India the worship is connected with the Holi festival.
shrine in 1393, but till a survey with sufficient illustrations is published we cannot speculate on its age. Two miles south, in the hamlet of Tiruppadikunram, is a Jaina temple, dedicated to Vardhamâna, of which the shrine has an apsidal back—which is covered with sculptures of a somewhat superior character. It probably dates from, the 11th century, and contains inscriptions of Chola and early Vijayanagar kings—one commemorates a grant to it by the general of Bukka II. in 1387.

Another structure of some interest in connection with these early Dravidian temples is what is known to Europeans as the "Shore temple" at the "Seven Pagodas." Standing on a point of land that juts out into the sea, it has suffered much from high tides and sea air, and is seriously damaged. The surrounding walls of the court have been much ruined, but excavations made in 1884 revealed the lines of these where they had fallen, and of other buildings in the west half of the court. The plan (Woodcut No. 211) will show the disposition of the whole, and the photograph of the temple itself from the north-west (Plate No. X., Frontispiece) gives a view that makes the style intelligible. It may be somewhat later than the two earliest temples at Conjivaram, described above, but if so it can hardly be ascribed to a later date than the 9th century A.D. At present, it contains two shrines unsymmetrically disposed—the smaller, facing the west, being dedicated to Vishnu, and the larger, entered from the east, now contains the Saiva Lingam.1

TANJOR.

One great exception to the rule that the larger Dravidian temples are arranged as accident dictated is to be found at Tanjor. The great Pagoda there was commenced on a well-defined and stately plan, which was persevered in till its completion. As will be seen from the annexed diagram (Woodcut No. 212) it consists of two courts,² one a square of about 250 ft., originally devoted to minor shrines and residences; but when the temple was fortified by the French in 1777 ³ it was converted into an arsenal, and has not been re-appropriated to sacred purposes. The temple itself stands in a courtyard extremely well proportioned to receive it, being about 500 ft. long by half that in width, the distance between the gateway

1 The temple is sometimes called Sthalasayanaśwāmi, perhaps because in a chamber about 12 ft. long, behind the larger shrine, but accessible from it, is a gigantic figure of Vishnu lying on the floor.
² As the plan is only an eye-sketch, and the dimensions obtained by pacing, it must not be too much relied on. It is sufficient to explain the text, and that is all that is at present required.
³ Inscription on gateway.
OLD DRAVIDIAN TEMPLE AT MĀMALLAPURAM (Page 362)
(Frontispiece to Volume I)
and the temple being broken by the shrine of the Bull Nandi, which is sufficiently important for its purpose, but not so much so as to interfere with the effect of the great vimâna, which stands near the inner end of the court. The perpendicular part of its base measures 82 ft. square, and is two storeys in height, of simple outline, but sufficiently relieved by niches and pilasters. Above this the pyramid rises in thirteen storeys to the summit, which is crowned by a dome said to consist of a single stone, and reaching a height of 190 ft. The porch in front is kept low, and as will be seen from the woodcut (No. 213) the tower dominates over the gopurams and surrounding objects in a manner that imparts great dignity to the whole composition.

The great temple is dedicated to the worship of Śiva, as Bṛhättvāra, in the form of an enormous Linga, and everything in the inner courtyard belongs to the Śaiva cult. The outer gopuram is of much later date, and probably belongs to the early part of the 16th century, when Vaishnava ideas were more prevalent, and the mythological representations had become mixed; the smaller shrines in the court also belong to later dates. But, as one of the oldest and best preserved examples of Dravidian art, its date is of much archaeological interest. Strange to say, however, this date was long obscured by assertions that had no scientific basis. Thanks to Dr. Hultsch's careful translations of the long inscriptions, in old Tamil, that cover the base of the central shrine, this is no longer doubtful. The inscriptions enumerate the many gifts of gold images, vessels, and ornaments made to the temple by Rājarāja or Ko-Rajakesvarivarman, his eldest sister Kundavaiyar and others, in the 25th, 26th; and

---

1 The dimensions of this image are 16 ft. from muzzle to rump, by above 7 ft. across, 12 ft. 2 in. to top of head, 10 ft. 4 in. to top of hump, and 7 ft. 5 in. to top of back. It is composed of a single block of stone, I believe granite, but it has been so frequently and so thoroughly coated with oil, which is daily applied to it, that it looks like bronze. I tried to remove a portion of this epidermis in order to ascertain what was beneath, but was not successful. No other kind of stone, however, is used in any other part of the temple.
29th years of his reign; and these gifts were presented to "the stone temple of Rājarājēsvara" which, we are told, he "caused to be built at Tanjor". Now Rājarājadeva Chola, the son of Parāntaka II., became king in A.D. 985, and must have completed the temple some time before 1012; as it would take some years to build, we may safely assume that it was begun about the end of the 10th century, and completed about 1012.

1 Hultsch's 'South Indian Inscriptions,' vol. ii. pp. 8 and 68. Conf. 'Archaeology in India,' p. 25.

2 It is only within the last few years that we have been able to obtain anything like a correct list of the Chola
Besides the great temple and the Nandi porch there are several other smaller shrines in the enclosure, one of which, dedicated to Subrahmanya or Kārttikeya, a son of Śiva’s, is as exquisite a piece of decorative architecture as is to be found in the south of India, and though small, almost diverts our admiration with the temple itself (Woodcut No. 214). It is built behind an older shrine, which may be coeval with the great temple as originally designed. But this is evidently of more recent date,—probably two centuries more modern than the principal temple. The woodcut No. 215 of one of the piers in the verandah in front of the temple, when compared with that given below (p. 387), from Tirumal Nāyyak’s chaultri, shows at a glance that they belong to about the same period,
and this may be assigned with confidence to the 17th century. The central pillar is alternately square and octagon, with shafts attached on the two side faces, and the whole very richly ornamented.

The Tanjor temple in 1758 was besieged in vain by Lally from where now the district Court stands, and in 1771 the English besieged and took it. Many of the sculptures show traces of these sieges, and after the last the temple was turned into a camp for thirty years. In 1801-1802 Raja Sarfoji had it purified and re-consecrated.¹

There is another temple at the village of Gangakondapuram, 38 miles to the north-east of Tanjor, and 20 miles south-west from Chidambaram, that, so far as is yet known, must be at least as old as that at Tanjor, if not older, and of which it would be very desirable to have a complete survey, as it is said to retain even more of its original purity of design than the latter.²

TIRUVÁLÚR.

The temple at Tiruválúr in Tanjor district,³ about 15 miles west of Negapattam, contrasts curiously with that at Tanjor in the principles on which it was designed, and serves to exemplify the mode in which, unfortunately, most Dravidian temples were aggregated.

¹ Dr. A. Burnell in an article, 12th November 1877.
² From ‘Technical Art Series,’ 1894.
⁴ At Tiruvaillur, in Chingalpat district, is a Vaishnava temple dedicated to Vira-rághava.
The nucleus here was a small village temple (Woodcut No. 216), drawn to the same scale as the plan of Tanjor in Woodcut No. 212. It is a double shrine, dedicated to Valmikesvara or Siva and his consort, standing in a cloistered court which measures 191 ft. by 156 ft. over all, and has one gopuram in front. On the south is a shrine of Tyâgarâja-swâmi. The central shrine is said to belong to the early years of the 15th century; but there are some defaced inscriptions of Râjarâja I. and Râjendra Chola (A.D. 985-1018) on the small shrine of Achalesvara, which may be the oldest portion now existing; otherwise there is nothing to distinguish it from the ordinary temples found in every village. It, however, at some subsequent period became sacred or rich, and a second court was added, measuring about 470 ft. each way, with two gopurams, higher than the original one, and containing within its walls numberless little shrines and porches. Additions

were again made at some subsequent date, the whole being enclosed in a court 957 ft. by 726 ft.—this time with five gopurams, of which those on the west and east or front are respectively 101 and 118 feet high, and containing several
subordinate shrines. When the last addition was made, it was intended to endow the temple with one of those great halls which were considered indispensable in temples of the first class. Generally they had—or were intended to have—1000 columns; this one has only 807, and almost one-half of these mere posts, not fitted to carry a roof of any sort. There can, however, be very little doubt that, had time and money been available, it would have been completed to the typical extent.

The general effect of such a design as this may be gathered from the bird's-eye view (Woodcut No. 217). As an artistic design, nothing can be worse. The gateways, irregularly spaced in a great blank wall, lose half their dignity from their positions; and the bethos of their decreasing in size and elaboration, as they approach the sanctuary, is a mistake which nothing can redeem. We may admire beauty of detail, and be astonished at the elaboration and evidence of labour, if they are found in such a temple as this, but as an architectural design it is altogether detestable.

**Srīrangam or Seringam.**

The temple which has been most completely marred by this false system of design is the great Vaishnava temple at Srīrangam, 2½ miles north of Trichinopoly, which is certainly the largest, and, if its principle of design could be reversed, would be one of the finest temples in the south of India (Woodcut No. 219, p. 371). Here the central enclosure is quite small and as insignificant as that at Tiruvāḷur, and except that its dome is gilt has nothing to distinguish it from an ordinary village temple. The plan (Woodcut No. 213) of the inner four courts will explain its arrangements. The fourth enclosure, however, is the most magnificent. It encloses the hall of 1000 columns (8), which measures some 500 ft. by 138 ft. The number of columns is eighteen in front by sixty-three in depth, and 953 altogether. They consequently are not spaced more than 10 ft. apart from centre to centre; and as at one end the hall is hardly over 10 ft. high, and in the loftiest place only 20 ft., and most of the pillars being spaced nearly evenly over

---

1 The plan is from Capt. Cole's, reproduced in 'India: Photographs and Drawings of Historical Buildings' (Griegas, 1896), plate 53. References to the plan, Woodcut No. 215: A, South, or Kurat Alwar Gopuram; B, East, or Vellai Gopuram; and C, North, or Nachiyārpanadi Gopuram, of the fourth court; D, Vaikuntha Gopuram of the second court; E, the shrine, which, curiously enough, is circular; F, Chandan mantapam; G, Yajna Sālat; H, Garuda mantapam; I, Sri-pandārā mantapam; J, Sūrya-pushkārāni; K, Rāmaśvāmi temple; L, Vaikunth temple; M, Chandrapushkārāni; N, Dhanvantari temple; O, O, Vāsudeva Perumāl temples; P, Narasimha Perumāl temple; Q, Q, Granaries; R, Ranganāyaki temple; S, The Thousand Pillar mantapam; T, Seshagiri-rāo mantapam; U, Ranganvilāsam mantapam; V, Kurat-Alwar temple; W, W, Krishna temples; X, Elephant stables; Y, Kada-kili mantapam.
218. Plan of Srirangam Temple—the four inner courts. Scale 200 ft. to 1 in.
the floor, it will be easily understood how little effect such a building really produces. They are, however, each of a single block of granite, and all carved more or less elaborately. A much finer portico stretches across the third court of the Jambukesvara temple from gopuram to gopuram; the pillars in it are much more widely spaced, and the central aisle is double that of those on the sides, and crosses the portico in the centre, making a transept; its height, too, is double that of the side aisles. It is a pleasing and graceful architectural design; the other is only an evidence of misapplied labour. The Seshagiri-rão Mantapam (T), to the south of the preceding, is the most elaborately carved hall in the temple. It is supported by pillars with rearing horses and other figures in front, similar to those in the Madurã temple, and is probably of about the same age—or the middle of the 17th century. The Gopuram (B), on the east side of this court is 146½ feet in height, and is one of the finest in the temple.

The three outer enclosures have nothing very remarkable in them, being generally occupied by the Brâhmans and persons connected with the temple. Each, however, has, or was intended to have, four gopurams, one on each face, the superstructures are of brick, and some of these are ornamented in plaster of considerable magnificence. The outer enclosure is, practically, a bazaar, filled with shops, where pilgrims are lodged, and fed, and fleeced. The wall that encloses it measures 2,521 ft. by 2,865 ft., and, had its gopurams been finished, they would have surpassed all others in the south to the same extent as these dimensions exceed those of any other known temple. The unfinished southern gopuram, leading to the river and Trichinopoly, measures 130 ft. in width by 100 ft. in depth; the opening through it measures 21 ft. 5 in., and twice that in height. The four jambs or gateposts are each of a single slab of granite, more than 40 ft. in height, and the roofing-slabs throughout measure from 23 ft. to 24 ft. Had the ordinary brick pyramid of the usual proportion been added to this, the whole would have risen to a height of nearly 300 ft. Even as it is, it is one of the most imposing masses in southern India, and probably—perhaps because it never was

1 A plan and section of the Thousand-pillared mantapam and six plates of pillars are given in the 'Journal of Indian Art and Industry,' vol. viii. (1899), plates 89-95, and the same with two others, in 'India: Photographs,' etc. ut supra, plates 54-62.

2 The innermost court, enclosing the temple, measures 240 ft. from north to south by 181 ft. from east to west; the second 426 ft. by 295 ft.; the third 767 ft. by 503 ft.; the fourth 1,235 ft. by 849 ft.; the fifth which, with the remaining two, is occupied by houses, measures 1,653 ft. by 1,270; the sixth 2,108 ft. by 1,846 ft.; and the seventh is 2,521 ft. over all at the south end and about 2,485 at the north, by 2,865 ft. in length. 'Madras Manual of Administration,' vol. iii. p. 833; and Major Cole's plan.
quite finished—it is in severe and good taste throughout. Its date, fortunately, is perfectly well known, as its progress was stopped by its being occupied and fortified by the French during our ten years' struggle with them for the possession of Trichinopoly; and if we allow fifty years for its progress, even this would bring the whole within the limits of the 18th century. The other three gopurams of this enclosure are in the same style, and were commenced on the same scale, but not being so far advanced when the work was stopped, their gateposts project above their walls in a manner that gives them a very singular appearance, and has led to some strange theories as to their design.

Looked at from a distance, or in any direction where the whole can be grasped at once, these fourteen or fifteen great gate towers cannot fail to produce a certain effect, as may be gathered from the view in Woodcut No. 219; but even then it can only be by considering them as separate buildings. As parts of one whole, their arrangement is exactly that which enables them to produce the least possible effect that can be obtained either from their mass or ornament. Had the four great outer gopurams formed the sides of a central hall or court, and the others gone on diminishing, in three or four directions, to the exterior, the effect of the whole would have been increased in a surprising degree. To accomplish this, however, one other defect must have been remedied: a gateway even 150 ft. wide in a wall nearly 2000 ft. in extent is a solecism nothing can redeem; but had the walls been broken in plan or star-shaped, like the plans of Chalukyan temples, light and shade would have been obtained, and due proportions of parts, without any inconvenience. But if the Dravidians had it in them to think of such things, it was not during the 17th and 18th centuries, to which most things in this temple seem to belong. The shrines and inner prakāras, however, must be of much earlier date, for we find Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, about 1254, making large gifts and additions to the temple; and in 1371 Kampana Udayiyan of Vijayanagar was engaged repairing it.*

As mentioned above, the great Vaishnava temple of Srīrangam owes all its magnificence to buildings erected during the reign of the Nāyyak dynasty, whose second capital was Trichinopoly, and where they often resided. Within a mile to the east, however, of that much-lauded temple is another, dedicated to Siva, under

---

1 A drawing of it was published in my 'Picturesque Illustrations of Indian Architecture.' It has since been frequently photographed.

2 See the inscriptions from the temple in 'Epigraphia Indica,' vol. iii. pp. 7ff.; vol. vi. pp. 324, 330; and vol. vii. pp. 176, 177.
the title of Jumbukēśwara, which, though not so large as that dedicated to Śrī Ranganātha, far surpasses it in beauty as an architectural object. The east gateway of the outer enclosure is not large, but it leads direct to the centre of a hall containing some 250 pillars. On the right these open on a tank fed by a perpetual spring, which is one of the wonders of the place.\(^1\) The corresponding space on the left is occupied by about 470 columns: these together form the Thousand-pillared mantapam. Between the gopurams of the second enclosure is a very beautiful portico of cruciform shape, leading to the door of the sanctuary, which, however, makes no show externally, and access to its interior is not vouchsafed to the profane. The age of the courts of this temple is somewhat earlier than that of its great rival, and being all of one design, they probably were begun and completed at once, and from the simplicity of its parts and details must be earlier than the great buildings of Tirumalai Nāyya. In fact an inscription on the south wall of the second prākāram is dated in the tenth year of Jatāvarman Sundara Pāndya, who began to reign in 1251;\(^2\) and, though the outer enclosures were subsequently added—probably as late as A.D. 1600—the nucleus of the buildings must be about as old as the 12th century, and possibly even two centuries earlier.\(^3\)

One of the great charms of this temple, when I visited it, was its purity. Neither whitewash nor red nor yellow paint had then sullied it, and the time-stain on the warm-coloured granite was all that relieved its monotony; but it sufficed, and it was a relief to contemplate it thus after some of the vulgarities I had seen. Now all this is altered. Like the pagodas at Rāmēśvaram, and more so those at Madurā, barbarous vulgarity has done its worst, and the traveller is only too fully justified in the contempt with which he speaks of these works of a great people which have fallen into the hands of such unworthy successors.

**CHIDAMBARAM.**

The Saiva temple at Chidambaram in South Arkot district is one of the most venerated, and has also the reputation of being one of the most ancient temples in southern India. It was there, therefore, if anywhere, that I at one time hoped to find some remains that would help to elucidate the history of the style. It was, besides, so far removed from any capital city or frequented haunt of man that one might hope to find its original form unaltered.

---

1. The view in this temple in my ‘Picturesque Illustrations of Indian Architecture,’ No. 21, is taken from the corner of this tank.


It is old, but, probably, not older than the Tanjor and Gangaikondapuram temples. The Kongadesa Rajaikal relates a legend of Vira Chola Rayar who “one day saw on the seashore the Sabhāpati of Chidambaram (Siva), attended by Pārvati, dancing and beating the damaruka (a kind of drum); he therefore expended great sums of money in building the Kanaka, or Golden Sabhā.”

A little farther on, it is said, “Arivari-deva (A.D. 985) observing that his grandfather had built only a Kanaka-Sabhā to the Chidambaram deity, he built gopurams, maddals (enclosures), madapanas (image-houses), sabhās (holy places or apartments), and granted many jewels to the deity.” Though this work is not at all trustworthy, yet from an inscription we learn that Viranārayana or Parāntaka I., early in the 10th century, covered the hall with gold, or erected the Kanaka-sabhā. There is also in the temple an inscription of Rājadhirāja I. (1018 to 1052) which may be regarded as evidence that the two inner enclosures, BB, at the west end of the tank (Woodcut No. 220) were in existence in the 10th century.

They, indeed, measuring about 320 ft. square, appear to have been the whole of the original temple, at least in the 10th and 11th centuries. On the whole, I am inclined to believe that this inner temple is really the one referred to in the above extract as far as supported by the inscription. The temple of Pārvati, C, on the north of the tank, was added afterwards, most probably in the 14th or 15th century, and to that age the great gopurams and the second enclosure also belong. The north gopuram, 140 feet high, is ascribed to Krishnadheva, about 1520, whilst that on the east has inscriptions of Sundara Pāndya about 1250. The hall of 1000 columns, E, was almost certainly erected between 1595 and 1685, at which time, we learn from the Mackenzie MSS., the kings of the locality made many donations to the fane. It was then, also, in all probability, the outer enclosure was commenced; but it never was carried out, being in most places only a few feet above the foundation.

The oldest thing now existing here is a little shrine in the inmost enclosure (opposite A in the plan). A porch of fifty-six pillars about 8 ft. high, and most delicately carved, resting with light; (4) at Kālahasti in N. Arkat, the “vayu-lingam,” of which the lamp vibrates with the wind; and (5) this at Chidambaram is the “ākāśa-lingam,” of ether—having no material representation.
on a stylobate, ornamented with dancing figures, more graceful and more elegantly executed than any others of their class, so far as I know, in southern India. At the sides are wheels and horses, the whole being intended to represent a car, as is frequently the case in these temples. Whitewash and modern alterations have sadly disfigured this gem, but enough remains to show how exquisite, and consequently how ancient, it was. It is the Nritya or Nritta Sabhā, the hall of the dance, in allusion, probably, to the circumstance above mentioned as
leading to the foundation of the temple,\(^1\) as well as to the chief idol of the temple—Natesa.

In front of the central shrine is one of very unusual architecture, with a tall copper roof, which, I have no doubt,

represents or is the golden or Kanaka-sabhā above referred to, and in front of this is a gopuram and pillared porch, making up what seems to have been the original temple. The central

\(^1\) The Nāṭhukottai Chettis, who manage (or mismanage) the temples, propose to move this Nritya Sabha to make room for the extension of a new cloister they are now making.
temple is dedicated to Natēra or Siva as god of the dance, and is a plain wooden building standing on a stone pavement; but behind it an apartment of polished black stone has recently been added, part of the roof of which is formed of gilt plates. The outer enclosure, with the buildings it contains, are, it appears, of later date.

The temple of Pārvatī, C, is principally remarkable for its porch, which is of singular elegance. The preceding woodcut (No. 221) gives some idea of its present appearance, and the section (Woodcut No. 222) explains its construction. The outer aisles are 6 ft. in width, the next 8 ft., but the architect reserved all his power for the central aisle, which measures 21 ft. 6 in. in width, making the whole 50 ft or thereabouts. In order to roof this without employing stones of such dimensions as would crush the supports, recourse was had to vaulting, or rather bracketing, shafts, and these brackets were again tied together by transverse purlins, all in stone, and the system was continued till the width was reduced to a dimension that could easily be spanned. As the whole is enclosed in a court surrounded by galleries two storeys in height, the effect of the whole is singularly pleasing.

Opposite to this, across the Śivaganga tank, is the Rāja-sabhā or hall of 1000 columns, E, similar in many respects to that at Srīrangam, above described, but probably slightly more modern. It is about 197 ft. wide by 338 ft. in length. Here the pillars are arranged twenty-four in front by forty-one in depth, making 984; but in order to get a central space, four in the porch, then twenty-eight, then two, and again twenty-four have been omitted, altogether fifty-eight; but, on the other
hand, those of the external portico must be added, which nearly balances the loss, and makes up the 1000. It must be confessed this forest of granite pillars, each of a single stone; and all more or less carved and ornamented, does produce a certain grandeur of effect, but the want of design in the arrangement, and of subordination of parts, detract painfully from the effect that might have been produced. Leaving out the pillars in the centre is the one redeeming feature, and that could easily have been effected without the brick vaults, formed of radiating arches, which are employed here—another certain proof of the modern age of the building. These vaults are certainly integral, and as certainly could not have been employed till after the Muhammadans had settled in the south, and taught the Hindûs how to use them.

Although this temple has been aggregated at different ages, and grown by accident rather than design, like those at Tiruvâlûr and Srîrangam just described, it avoids the great defect of these temples, for though like them it has no tall central object to give dignity to the whole from the outside, internally the centre of its great court is occupied by a tank, round which the various objects are grouped without at all interfering with one another. The temple itself is one important object, to the eastward of it: the Pârvatî temple, another on the north, and forms a pleasing pendant to the 1000-columned châvari on the south. On the north side of the Pârvatî another temple (D) was commenced (Woodcut No. 220), called the Pândyanâyaka-kovil, with a portico of square pillars, four in front, and all most elaborately ornamented, but in such a manner as not to interfere with their outline or solidity. For long it stood in an unfinished and ruined state, but has of late been restored. This temple was dedicated to Shânmukha or Subrahmanya; but we cannot feel sure of its age. From its position, however, and the character of its ornamentation, there seems little doubt that it belongs to the end of the 17th and first half of the 18th century. From its style, however, I would be inclined to ascribe it to the earlier date. The main buildings are enclosed within high walls of dressed granite; outside are four "car streets," 60 feet wide; and the whole area belonging to the temple is about 39 acres.

A large portion of the innermost area, which is historically the most important, has of recent years been undergoing elaborate restoration and important additions at the hands of the Nâthukottai Chettis, that unfortunately will quite obliterate much that is most important for archaeology. They are adding a wide cloister intended to run all round the enclosure, but the
Vaishnava Amman temple stands in the way of this, and the Chettis have been interdicted from removing it. This court contains also the Chita-sabhā or central shrine—a plain wooden building, as already mentioned, on a stone platform. In it Siva is represented as Natarāja or Natesa. Behind is the bedroom for the idol—a new structure of polished black stone.

The special Lingam of the temple is supposed to be the Ākāsa or “ether” lingam, which is said to stand behind the idol with a curtain and string of Bilva leaves suspended in front of it. In front of the Chita-sabhā is the Kanaka-sabhā, also of wood, where the daily worship of the Natarāja is performed. Almost adjoining is the temple of Vishnu or Ranganātha. Besides these and the Nṛttasabhā already mentioned, is the Deva Sabhā used as an office, and near it a small building or old shrine, believed to be the original structure, round which the rest of the temple has grown.¹

RāMESVARAM.

If it were proposed to select one temple which should exhibit all the beauties of the Dravidian style in their greatest perfection, and at the same time exemplify all its characteristic defects of design, the choice would almost inevitably fall on that at Rāmesvaram, in the island of Pāmbām² (Woodcut No. 224). In no other temple has the same amount of patient industry been exhibited as here, and in none, unfortunately, has that labour been so thrown away for want of a design appropriate for its display. It is not that this temple has grown by successive increments like those last described; for it was finished on a settled plan, as undeviatingly carried out as that at Tanjor, but on a principle so opposed to it, that while the temple at Tanjor produces an effect greater than is due to its mass or detail, this one, with double its dimensions and ten times its elaboration, produces no effect externally, and internally can only be

¹ Francis, 'Gazetteer of South Arcot,' vol. i. pp. 270, 271.
² Strictly speaking—the temple that till recently was here—for, like Chidambaram and other Saiva temples in southern India, the Nāthukottai Chettiars (one of their number having got the management into his hands), have set about demolishing it, and it is reported that already almost the whole of the interior or oldest portions have been pulled down, and are to be replaced by erections in a nondescript style of building. Mr A. R. Gopalaiyar manfully opposed the manager in the Courts, but in vain; they would not interfere with the manager’s plans, though he leased out the temple property to his own relatives, or destroyed the statues of former patrons and benefactors of the temple to substitute those of his wealthy caste fellows, that they may have the merits accruing to temple building hereafter.
224. Plan of the Great Temple at Ramesvaram, before 1905. Scale 168 ft. to 1 in.

A Gandhamadana old temple.
B Great Gopuram and entry to the second Prakaram.
C Small Gopuram for the Amman shrine.
N North, S, South, and W, West gopurams.
seen in detail, so that the parts hardly in any instance aid one another in producing the effect aimed at.

The only part of the temple, outside the central prâkâram, at least, which is of a different age from the rest, is a small vimâna, known as Gandhamâdhânesvarâ (A), of very elegant proportions, that stands in the garden, on the right hand of the visitor as he enters from the west. It has, however, been so long exposed — like the temple on the shore at Mâmallapuram—to the action of the sea-air, that its details are so corroded they cannot now be made out, and its age cannot consequently be ascertained from them. It is safe, however, to assert that possibly it may be of the 11th or 12th century. Its dimensions may be roughly 50 ft. in height, by 34 ft. in plan, so that it hardly forms a feature in so large a temple. From the bulls that occupy the platform in front, and from its name, it is evident it was originally dedicated to Siva, as the central temple apparently is, though the scene of Râma’s most celebrated exploit, and bearing his name.¹

Externally the temple is enclosed by a wall 20 ft. in height, and possessing four gopurams, one on each face, which have this peculiarity, that they alone, of all those I know in India, are built wholly of stone from the base to the summit. The western one (W) alone, however, is finished, and owing apparently to the accident of its being in stone, it is devoid of figure-sculpture—the plaster casts that now adorn it having been added in recent times: it is 78 ft. in height. Those on the north and south (N and S) are hardly higher than the wall in which they stand, and are consequently called the ruined gateways. They are, however, of comparatively modern date, and, in fact, have never been raised higher, and their progress was probably stopped in the beginning of the last century, when Muhammadan, Marâthâ, and other foreign invaders checked the prosperity of the land, and destroyed the wealth of the priesthood. The eastern façade of the second prâkâram has two entrances and two gopurams; the smaller, C, to the south of the large one and leading into the Pârvati temple, is finished. The larger one (B in the plan) is ascribed to Sadyaka Tevar Dalavâ, who was the Setupati about 1640, but it never was

¹ In the north, the affix suddhi to the names would indicate a Vaishnava cult, but not so here where the chief images—Râmâlngēsvarāswāmin and Pârvatâvardhih in the central temples, and Visvanâthaswâmin and Visâlākshī in the secondary shrines, are all essentially Saiva, and the Linga occupies the chief cell. The shrine of Sambhâpata— a name given to Siva at Chidambrâram—is ascribed to Dalavâ Setupati. For an account of the ritual of the Râmâvaram temple, see ‘Indian Antiquary,’ vol. xii. (1883), pp. 315-326.
carried higher than we now see it. Had it been finished,\(^1\) it would have been one of the largest of its class, and being wholly in stone, and consequently without its outline being broken by sculpture, it would have reproduced more nearly the effect of an Egyptian propylon than any other example of its class in India.

The glory, however, of this temple resides in its corridors. These, as will be seen by the plan, extend to nearly 4000 ft. in length. The breadth varies from 17 ft. to 21 ft. of free floor space, and their height is apparently about 30 ft. from the floor to the centre of the roof. Each pillar or pier is compound, 12 ft. in height, standing on a platform 5 ft. from the floor, and richer and more elaborate in design than those of the Pārvatī porch at Chidambaram (Woodcut No. 221), and are certainly more modern in date.

The general appearance of those corridors may be gathered from the annexed woodcut (No. 225), but no engraving, even on a much more extended scale, can convey the impression produced by such a display of labour when extended to an uninterrupted length of 690 ft. None of our cathedrals are

\(^{1}\) There is a view of it in the Atlas of plates that accompanies Lord Valentia's travels; not very correct, but conveying a fair idea of its proportions.
more than 500 ft., and even the nave of St Peter's is only 600 ft. from the door to the apse. Here the side corridors are almost 700 ft. long, and open into transverse galleries as rich in detail as themselves. These, with the varied devices and modes of lighting, produce an effect that is not equalled certainly anywhere in India. The side corridors are generally free from figure-sculpture, and consequently, from much of the vulgarity of the age to which they belong, and, though narrower, produce a more pleasing effect. The central corridor leading from the inner enclosure is adorned on one side by portraits of the Setupati rajas of Râmânâd in the 17th century, and opposite them, of their ministers. Even they, however, would be tolerable, were it not that within the last few years they have been painted with a vulgarity that is inconceivable on the part of the descendants of those who built this sâne. Not only they, however, but the whole of the architecture has first been dosed with repeated coats of whitewash, so as to take off all the sharpness of detail, and then painted with blue, green, red, and yellow washes, so as to disfigure and destroy its effect to an extent that must be seen to be believed. Nothing can more painfully prove the degradation to which the population is reduced than this profanity. No upper class, and no refinement, now remains, and the priesthood are sunk into a state of debasement.

Assuming, however, for the nonce, that this painting never had been perpetrated still the art displayed here would be very inferior to that of such a temple as, for instance, Halebîd in Mysore, to be described further on. The perimeter, however, of that temple is only 700 ft.; here we have corridors extending to 4000 ft., carved on both sides. It is the immensity of the labour here displayed that impresses us, much more than its quality, and that, combined with a certain picturesqueness and mystery, does produce an effect which is not surpassed by any other temple in India, and by very few elsewhere.

But for the wilful destruction of the inscriptions (less than fifty years ago), we might have had the whole history of this temple.¹ The central shrines are built of a dark hard lime-

¹ The Pandâram or manager of the temple raised a suit against the Zamindâr of Râmânâd to deprive him of the hereditary right of patronage and supervision of the temple. It was conducted on the Pandâram's part by one Appâru Pillai, who destroyed the old inscriptions and forged others, inserting them in the walls, and then produced copies and translations of them as evidence against the claims of the Râmânâd Setupatis. The suit was appealed to the Privy Council, but, on such evidence, was given in favour of the forgers, and the Zamindârs were deprived of their right to appoint the Dharmakartas or have any share in the management of the temple which their ancestors built and had so richly endowed.
stone, differing from that employed in the rest of the building, and are ascribed to a Setupati named Udaiyân, early in the 15th century.¹ To him also is ascribed the west gopuram and surrounding walls;² but they probably belong to the time of Sadayaka Tevar Udaiyân, early in the 17th century. The first prâkâram or enclosure, containing the older shrines, measures about 190 ft. by 307 ft., and outside this—excepting the old vimâna—the style is so uniform and unaltered that its erection could hardly have lasted beyond a hundred years; and if so, it must have been during the 17th century, when the Râmnâd râjâs were at the height of their prosperity, and when their ally or master, Tirumalai Nâyyak, was erecting buildings in the same identical style at Madurâ, that the second prâkâram, measuring 386 ft. by 314 ft., was completed by Raghunâth Tirumalai, about 1658, the south half of it having been built by his predecessor. Vijaya Raghunâth Tevar (1709-1723), erected some buildings in the Amman temple, with the mandapa in front, in which are statues of himself and of his father Kadamba Tevar; and in 1740 Muttu Raghunâtha began the third prâkâram, 690 ft. in length by 435 ft. from east to west, which was completed by Muttu Râmalinga Tevar in 1769. The central shrine may probably belong to the 15th or 16th century, but all the enclosing courts had been erected within 170 years after the end of the 16th century, and endowed exclusively by the family of the Setupati chiefs of Râmnâd. It is one of the last great works of Hindûs, and the last addition to it is the finest of all.

MADURÂ.

If the native authorities consulted by the late Professor Wilson in compiling his Historical Sketch of the Kingdom of Pândya could be relied upon, it would seem that the foundation of the dynasty ought to be placed some centuries before the Christian Era.³ Even, however, if this is disputed, the fact of the southern part of the Peninsula being described as the "Regio Pandionis" by classical authorities, is sufficient to prove that a kingdom bearing that name did exist there in the early centuries of the Christian Era. Their first capital, however, seems to have been Korkai, near Cape Comorin.⁴ The story of Kulâsekhara founding the dynasty, and the fabulous incidents

¹ It is said he was aided in the work by a Singalese king or chief named Parârâja Sekhara, under whose supervision the stones were hewn and fitted at Trînâkamalai.
² He is said to have been assisted in this work by a rich merchant and his wife from Nâgûr, whose statues surmount the eastern wall.
⁴ Ante, p. 304.
with which the tale is adorned, is one of the favourite legends of the south, and is abundantly illustrated in sculptures of Tirumalai Nâyyak's chaultri and in other buildings of the capital.

For our present purposes it is not worth while to attempt to investigate the succession of the dates of the seventy-three kings who are said to have succeeded one another before the accession of the Nâyyak dynasty, in 1559, inasmuch as no building is now known to exist in the kingdom that can claim, even on the most shadowy grounds, to have been erected by any of these kings. It may have been that, anterior to the rise of the great Chola dynasty, in the 10th and 11th century, that of Madurâ may have had a long period of prosperity and power; but whatever they did build has been destroyed or so altered that its existence cannot now be identified. After that, for a while they seem to have been subjected to the Ballâla dynasty of Mysore, and the same Muhammadan invasion that destroyed that power in 1310 spread its baneful influence as far as Râmnâd, and for two centuries their raids and oppressions kept the whole of southern India in a state of anarchy and confusion. Their power for evil was first checked by the rise of the great Hindû state of Vijayanagar, on the Tungabhadrâ, in the 14th century, and by the establishment, under its protection, of the Nâyyak dynasty by Virwanâth Nâyyak, in the 16th. After lasting 177 years, Mûnakshî, the last sovereign of the race—a queen—was first aided, and then betrayed, by Chanda Sâhib the Nawâb of the Karnatik, who plays so important a part in our wars with the French in these parts.

It may be—indeed, probably is the case—that there are temples in the provinces that were erected before the rise of the Nâyyak dynasty, but all those in the capital, with the great temple at Srirangam, described above, were erected or extended during the two centuries of their supremacy, and of those in the capital nine-tenths at least were erected during the long and prosperous reign of the seventh king of this dynasty, Tirumalai Nâyyak, or as he is more popularly known, Trimal Nâyyak, who reigned from 1623 to 1659.¹

Of his buildings, the most important, for our purposes at least, is the celebrated Vasanta or Pudu Mantapam,² known as 'Tirumalai's chaultri,' which he built for the reception of the

² Fortunately this chaultri is also one of the best known of Indian buildings. It was drawn by Daniell in the end of the 18th century, and his drawings have been repeated by Langles and others. It was described by Mr. Blackadder in the 'Archeologia,' vol. x. p. 457; and by Wilson, 'Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,' vol. iii. p. 232. Volumes of native drawings exist in some collections containing representations of every pillar. A model in bronze of a porch exists at South Kensington Museum, and it has been abundantly photographed.
presiding deity of the place, who consented to leave his dark
cell in the temple and pay the king an annual visit of ten
days’ duration in the hot month of May, on condition of his
building a hall worthy of his dignity, and where he could
receive in a suitable manner the homage of the king and his
subjects. As will be seen from the plan (Woodcut No. 226)
the hall is 333 ft. long by 105 ft. in width, measured on the
stylobate, and consists of four ranges of columns, all of which
are different, and all most elaborately sculptured. An elevation
of one is given (Woodcut No. 227), but is not so rich as those
of the centre, which have life-sized figures attached to them,
and are even more elaborate in their details. In this instance
it will be observed that the detached bracketing shaft at
Chidambaram has become attached to the square central pier, and instead of the light elegance that characterised that example, has become a solid pier, 5 or 6 ft. in depth—richer certainly, but far from being either so elegant or so appropriate as the earlier example.

The view of the interior (Woodcut No. 228) gives some, but only a faint, idea of the effect. The sides are now closed with screens; but in effect, as in detail, it is identical with the corridors at Râmesvaram, where the light is abundant.

As the date of this hall is known—it took twenty-two years to erect it, 1623 to 1645—it becomes a fixed point in our chronology of the style. We can, for instance, assert with perfect certainty that the porch to Pârvatî's shrine at Chidambaram (Woodcut No. 221) is certainly anterior to this, probably by a couple of centuries, and, with equal certainty that the corridors at Ramesvaram are contemporary.

From the history of the period we learn that the rajas of Râmnâd were at times independent, at others at war with the Nâyyaks; but in Tirumalai Nâyyak's time they were either his allies or dependants; and the style and design of the two buildings are so absolutely identical that they must belong to the same age. If the king of Madurâ had indeed been allowed any share in making the original design, that temple would probably have been a nobler building than it is; for, though the details are the same, his three aisled hall leading to the sanctuary would have been a far grander feature architecturally than the single-aisled corridors that lead nowhere. The expense of one of the single-aisled corridors at Râmêsvaran, almost 700 ft. long, would have been about the same as the triple-aisled chaultri at Madurâ, which is half their length. Consequently the temple must have cost between three and four times as much as the chaultri; and the actual cost must have been immense when we consider the amount of labour expended on it, and that the material in both is the hardest granite.

The façade of this hall, like that of almost all the great halls in the south of India, is adorned either with Vyâlis—monsters of the lion type trampling on an elephant—or, even more generally, by a group consisting of a warrior sitting on a rearing horse, whose feet are supported on the shields of foot soldiers, sometimes slaying men, sometimes tigers. These groups are

---

1 According to Wilson the mantapam was begun in the second year of Tirumalai's reign, and completed in twenty-two years, at a cost of upwards of a million sterling. But one of the Oriental Historical Manuscripts states the cost of it at a lâkh of Pons or £20,000, and that it was finished in seven years, 1626-1633.
View in Tirumalai Nayak’s Chaultri, Madura. (From a Photograph.)
found literally in hundreds in southern India, and, as works exhibiting difficulties overcome by patient labour, they are unrivalled, so far as I know, by anything found elsewhere. As works of art, they are the most barbarous, it may be said the most vulgar, to be found in India, and do more to shake one's faith in the civilisation of the people who produced them than anything they did in any other department of art. Where these monstrosities are not introduced, the pillars of entrances are only enriched a little more than those of the interior, when the ornamentation is in better taste, and generally quite sufficiently rich for its purpose.

Immediately in front of his chaultri, Tirumalai Nāyyak commenced his Rāya gopuram, which, had he lived to complete it, would probably have been the finest edifice of its class in southern India. It measures 174 ft. from north to south, and 117 feet in depth. The entrance through it is 21 ft. 9 in. wide; and if it be true that its gateposts are 57 ft. in height, that would have been the height of the opening.\(^1\) It will thus be seen that it was designed on even a larger scale than that at Srīrangam, described above, and it certainly far surpasses that celebrated edifice in the beauty of its details. Its doorposts alone are single blocks of granite, carved with the most exquisite scroll patterns of elaborate foliage, and all the other carvings are equally beautiful. Being unfinished, and consequently never consecrated, it has escaped whitewash, and alone, of all the buildings of Madurā, its beauties can still be admired in their original perfection.

The great temple at Madurā is a larger and far more important building than the Vasanta mantapam or Chāwadi. It possesses all the characteristics of a first-class Dravidian temple, and, as its date is well known, it forms a landmark of the utmost value in enabling us to fix the relative date of other temples (Woodcut No. 229).

The sanctuary (A) is dedicated to Siva, under the name of Sundaresvara, and this clearly points to its having been founded by one of the Pāndya princes who bore the name of Sundara, of whom there were four during the thirteenth century. The shrine of the goddess (B) is consecrated to Mīnākshi.\(^2\)

The city and temple fell to the Muhammadians in 1324, who plundered it mercilessly, and it was only recovered by the Vijayanagar sovereign in 1372 when Hindū worship was

---

1 Most of these particulars, regarding the temples, are taken from Capt. Lyon's description of his photographs of the places. He devoted twenty-four photos to this temple, of which the negatives are now in the India Office.

2 Mīnākṣī means "fish-eyed"; but, with the first vowel short, it would mean "bright-eyed." Traditionally she was the wife of Sundara, but as a goddess is the same as Pārvati, the goddess wife of Siva.
Plan of Madura Temple. Scale 200 ft. to 1 in.¹

¹ Key to the plan:—A Temple of Sundaresvar; AA Pudu mantapam; B Shrine of
restored. The temple itself certainly owes all its magnificence to Tirumalai Nāyyak, A.D. 1623-1659, or to his elder brother, Muttu Virappa, who preceded him, and who built the Minākshī Nāyyak mantapam, said to be the oldest thing now existing, outside the shrines. The Kalyāṇa mantapam is said to have been built in A.D. 1707, and the Tatta Sudhi in 1770. These, however, are insignificant parts compared with those which owe their origin to Tirumalai Nāyyak.

The temple itself is a nearly regular rectangle, two of its sides measuring 720 ft. and 729 ft., the other two 834 ft. and 852 ft. It possessed four gopurams of the first class (I. II. III. IV.), and six smaller ones (VI. to XI.) ; a very beautiful tank (L), surrounded by arcades; and a hall of 1000 columns (Q), whose sculptures surpass those of any other hall of its class I am acquainted with. There is a small shrine (J), dedicated to the god Sabhāpati, which occupies the space of fifteen columns, so the real number is only 985; but it is not their number but their marvellous elaboration that makes it the wonder of the place, and renders it, in some respects, more remarkable than the chaultrī about which so much has been said and written. I do not feel sure that this hall alone is not a greater work than the chaultrī; taken in conjunction with the other buildings of the temple, it certainly forms a far more imposing group.

Tinnevelly.

Though neither among the largest nor the most splendid temples of southern India, that at Tinnevelly will serve to give a good general idea of the arrangement of these edifices, and has the advantage of having been built on one plan, and at one time, without subsequent alteration or change. Like the little cell in the Tiruvāḷūr temple (Woodcut No. 216), it has the singularity of being a double temple, the great square being divided into equal portions, of which the north one is dedicated to the god Śiva, the south half to his consort Pārvatī. The following plan (Woodcut No. 230) represents one of the halves,
230. Half-plan of Temple at Tinnevelly. (From a Plan in the possession of the Royal Asiatic Society.) Scale 100 ft. to 1 in.
which, though differing in arrangement from the other, is still so like it as to make the representation and description of one sufficient for both.

The general dimensions of the whole enclosure are 580 ft. by 756 ft., the larger dimension being divided into two equal portions of 378 ft. each. There are three gateways to each half, and one in the wall dividing the two; the principal gateway faces the east entrance to the temple, and the lateral ones are opposite each other. An outer portico precedes the great gateway, leading internally to a very splendid porch, which, before reaching the gateway of the inner enclosure, branches off on the right to the intermediate gateway, and on the left to the great hall of 1000 columns—63 ft. in width by about 520 ft. in depth.

The inner enclosure is not concentric with the outer, and, as usual, has only one gateway. The temple itself consists of a cubical cell, surmounted by a vimâna or spire, preceded by two mandapas, and surrounded by triple colonnades. In other parts of the enclosure are smaller temples, tanks of water, gardens, colonnades, etc., but neither so numerous nor so various as are generally found in Indian temples of this class. The inscriptions go back to the first half of the 13th century.

The great 1000-pillared portico in the temple is one of the least poetic of its class in India. It consists of a regiment of pillars 10 deep and extending to 100 in length, without any break or any open space or arrangement. Such a forest of pillars does, no doubt, produce a certain effect; but half that number, if arranged as in some of the Chalukyan or Jaina temples, would produce a far nobler impression. The aim of the Dravidians seems to have been to force admiration by the mere exhibition of inordinate patient toil.

Kumbakonam.

If the traditions of the natives could be trusted, Kumbakonam—one of the old capitals of the Chola dynasty—is one of the places where we might hope to find something very ancient. There are fragments of older temples, indeed, to be found everywhere, but none in situ. All the older buildings seem to have been at some time ruined and rebuilt, probably on the same site, but with that total disregard to antiquity which is characteristic of the Hindús in all ages as it is of our modern “restorers.” One portico, in a temple dedicated to Śrī-Rāma, is very like that leading from the second to the third gopuram in the temple of Jumbukeswara, described above, but, if anything, it is slightly more modern. There is also one fine
231. Gopuram at Kumbakonam. (From a Photograph.)
gopuram in the town, represented in the woodcut (No. 231). It is small, however, in comparison with those we have just been describing, being only 84 ft. across and about 130 ft. in height. Those of Srīrangam and Madura have, or were intended to have, at last double these dimensions.

It is, however, a richly-ornamented example of its class, and the preceding woodcut conveys a fair impression of the effect of these buildings generally. It is not old enough to be quite of the best age, but it is still not so modern as to have lost all the character and expression of the earlier examples.

**VELLOR AND PĒRŪR.**

Although the temples at Vellore and at Pērūr, near Koimbatur, can only rank among the second class as regards size, they possess porticos of extreme interest to architectural history, and are consequently worthy of more attention than has been bestowed upon them. That at Vellore, however, is unfortunately situated in the fort occupied by the British, and has consequently been utilised as a store. Walls have been built between its piers, and whitewash and fittings have reduced it to that condition which we think appropriate for the noblest works of art in India. Enough, however, still remains to enable us to see that the Kalyāna mantapam here, though not one of the most elegant, is one of the oldest porches in the south. As will be seen from the woodcut (No. 232), the Vyālīs and rearing horsemen are clearly and sharply cut, and far from being so extravagant as they sometimes are. The great cornice, too, with its double flexures and its little trellis-work of supports, is not only very elegant in form, but one of those marvels of patient industry, such as are to be found hardly anywhere else. There are many such cornices, however, in the south: one at Avadaiyār-kōvil, in Tanjor district, is deeper and more elaborate than even this one. The outer facing there is said to be only about an inch in thickness, and its network of supports is more elaborate and more delicate than those at Vellore, though it is difficult to understand how either was ever executed in so hard a material. The traditions of the place assign the erection of the Vellore mantapam variously to the year 1350, and according to other accounts to about 1485. The bracket shafts (Woodcut No. 233) are similar but even more elegant than those in Pārvati's porch at Chidambaram; but they are—some of them at least—attached to the pier by very elegant open-work, such as is found in Pratāpa Rudra's temple at Worangal (Woodcut No. 252), or in the windows at Halebid. As both these examples are earlier than 1300, it
might seem that this one was so also, but it is difficult to feel certain when comparing buildings so distant in locality, and belonging to different styles of art.

The date of the porch at Perur (3 miles south-west of Koimbatur) is ascertained within narrow limits by the figure of a sepoy loading a musket being carved on the base of one
of its pillars, and his costume and the shape of his arm are exactly those we find in contemporary pictures of the wars of Aurangzib, or the early Mārāthas in the beginning of the 18th century. As shown in Woodcut No. 234, the bracket shafts are there attached to the piers as in Tirumalai Nāyyak’s buildings, and though the general character of the architecture is the same, there is a coarseness in the details, and a marked inferiority in the figure-sculpture, that betrays the distance of date between these two examples.

Slight as the difference may appear to the unpractised eye, it is within the four centuries that include the dates of these two buildings (1350 to 1750) that practically the whole history of the later Dravidian temple architecture is included. For it is safe to assert that nine-tenths, at least, or more, of those, which are now found south of the Tungabhadra, were erected or largely extended and rebuilt between these dates.

The earlier works of the seven centuries that elapsed between the carving of the rocks at Māmallapuram and the erection of the Vellor pagoda have almost totally perished. But during that period, a style was elaborated and so fixed that it should endure for five centuries afterwards, with so little change, and with only that degradation in detail, which is the fatal characteristic of art in India.

It seems impossible that the horsemen, the Vyālīs, and above all, the great cornice of double curvature, shown in the woodcut (No. 232), could have been brought to these fixed forms without long experience, and the difficulty is to understand how they could ever have been elaborated in stone at all, as they are so unlike lithic forms found anywhere else; yet they are not wooden, nor is there any trace in them of any of their details being derived from wooden architecture, as is so evidently the case with the Buddhist architecture of the north. One suggestion that occurs to me is that they might be derived from terra-cotta forms. Frequently, at the present day, figures of men on horseback larger than life, or of giants on foot, are seen near the village temples made of pottery, their hollow forms of burnt clay, and so burnt as to form a perfect terra-cotta substance. Most of the figures also on the gopurams are not in plaster as is generally said, but are also formed of clay burnt. The art has certainly been long practised in the south, and if we adopt the theory that it was used for many ornamental purposes along with wood or stone, it will account for much that is otherwise unintelligible in the arts of the south. But we may further suppose that the broad sloping slabs of the earlier temples having no level bed to rest on the wall head, and being apt to slide down,
33. Compound Pillar at Vellore.
(From a Photograph.)

334. Compound Pillar at Perur.
(From a Photograph.)
the curved form was devised to secure a flat rest on the wall and at the same time that the wall or roof above might have a flat plate on which to rest; and besides the outward curve afforded a better opportunity for supporting it upon brackets.

The loss of the earlier structures that would have made all this clear is largely due to the Muhammadan raids in the beginning of the 14th century, when these iconoclasts spared no shrine they found on their marches. What escaped them was either "restored" beyond recognition by zealous Hindū princes and temple builders, or is now in the innermost enclosures, inaccessible to any European capable of judging of their style and age. The few old shrines at Conjivaram, noticed above, and some scattered and neglected ruins do remain, and are very instructive; the desideratum is that adequate surveys of them are so slow in being published.

VIJAVANAGAR.

The dates above quoted will no doubt sound strange and prosaic to those who are accustomed to listen to the childish exaggerations of the Brāhmans in speaking of the age of their temples. There is, however, luckily a test besides the evidence above quoted, which, if it could be perfectly applied, would settle the question at once.

When in the beginning of the 14th century the Muhammadans from Delhi first made their power seriously felt in the south, they struck down the kingdom of the Hoysala Ballālas in 1310, and destroyed their capital of Halebid; and in 1322 Orangal or Worangal, which had been previously attacked, was finally destroyed, and it is said they then carried their victorious arms as far as Rāmnād. The Muhammadans did not, however, at that time make any permanent settlement in the south, and the consequence was, that as soon as the Hindūs were able to recover from the panic, Bukka and Harihara princes it is said of the deposed house of Orangal, gathered around them the remnants of the destroyed states, and founded a new state in the town of Vijayanagar on the Tungabhadra. An earlier city it is said had been founded there about the beginning of the 12th century, but only as a dependency of the Mysore Rāj, and there is consequently no reason for supposing that any of the buildings in the city (unless it be some of the small Jaina temples), belong to that period, nor indeed till the new dynasty founded by Bukka had consolidated its power, which was certainly not before the middle of the 14th century.
The city was finally destroyed by the Muhammadans in 1565, but during the two previous centuries it maintained a gallant struggle against the Bahmanî and Adil Shâhi dynasties of Kulbargâ and Bijâpur, and was in fact the barrier that prevented the Muslims from taking possession of the whole country as far as Cape Comorin.

Its time of greatest prosperity was between the accession of Krishna Deva, 1508, and the death of Achyuta Râya, 1542, and it is to their reigns that the finest monuments in the city must be ascribed. There is, perhaps, no other city in all India in which ruins exist in such profusion or in such variety as in Vijayanagar, and as they are all certainly comprised within the century and a half, or—at the utmost—the two centuries that preceded the destruction of the city, their analogies afford us dates that hardly admit of dispute.

Among those in the city the most remarkable is that dedicated to Vithobâ, or Vitthalaswâmin, a local manifestation of Vishnu. It was apparently begun by Krishna Deva, at least as early as A.D. 1513, and continued by Achyuta Râya, 1529-1542, and never was finished; and as inscriptions in it are dated in 1561 and 1564, recording grants of Sadâsiva, we might fairly infer that the works were stopped by the fall of the kingdom in 1565. The temple stands in a rectangular enclosure 538 ft. by 310, with gopurams on the east, north, and south sides. Outside the east entrance stands a lofty Dipdân pillar, and there are two pavilions of architectural merit in the court, besides other buildings. Round nearly the whole court ran a deep verandah or corridor with three rows of piers; but most of it is now ruined. The principal part of the temple consists of a porch or mantapam, represented in the woodcut, No. 236, page 403. It is wholly in granite, and carved with a boldness and expression of power nowhere surpassed in the buildings of its class. As will be observed, it has all the characteristic peculiarities of the Dravidian style: the bold cornice of double flexure, the detached shafts, the Vyâlîs, the richly-carved stylobate, etc. But what interests us most here is that it forms an exact half-way house in style between such porches as those at Vellor and Chidambaram, and that of Tirumalai Nâyyak at Madurâ. The bracket shafts are detached here, it is true, but they are mere ornaments, and have lost their meaning. The cornice is as bold as any, but has lost its characteristic supports, and other changes have been made which would inevitably have led in a short time to the new style of the Nâyyak dynasty.

The little building on the right is the car of the god, the base and principal storey being formed of a single block of granite, with movable wheels, but they are the only parts that
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Plan of Vitthalaswāmin Temple at Vijayanagar. (From a plan by Mr A. Rea.)

Scale 100 ft. to 1 in.
STONE CAR, AT THE TEMPLE OF VITTHALA, VIJAYANAGAR, 1881 (NOW DESTROYED)
It is shown in Plate XI. as it appeared before its brick tower was taken down. There are, besides, either

one or two pavilions, smaller, but similar in design to that represented in the woodcut, a gopuram, and other adjuncts, which would be interesting, if we had the means of comparing and describing them. ²

Although the temple of Vithala is certainly one of the most remarkable ruins in India, and there are other temples of great beauty and extent in the capital, it is not quite clear that it is there the chefs-d’œuvre of this dynasty are to be found, but rather at a place called Tadpatri about one hundred miles a little south of east from the capital. There are two temples there: the one now in use—the Chintala Tiruvengutcaswâmin temple—dedicated to Vishnu, is slightly the later of the two, having been built in the time of Timma Nâyudu, the local governor, and son (or grandson) of Râmalinga Nâyudu, governor in the early part of Krishna Deva’s reign, who began the Râmesvara temple here.³ The wonders of the place are two

1 The upper portion was of brick, but about twenty years ago, after an elaborate repair under the direction of Major H. Cole, the collector had it pulled down, lest it should crush the base, which had been cracked by fire. Similar stone cars exist at Tadpatri and other temples in southern India.

² As Dr G. le Bon remarks, Vijayanagar is well worthy of a complete monograph on its architecture, as the culmination of the style. ‘Les Monuments de l’Inde,’ pp. 161-162.

³ Inscriptions belonging to this Râmesvara temple are dated from 1507 to 1531.
gopurams belonging to the second, which is now a deserted temple on the banks of the river, about a quarter of a mile from the other. One of these was apparently quite finished, the other on the north never carried higher than the perpendicular part. In almost all the gopurams of India this part is comparatively plain, all the figure-sculpture and ornament being reserved for the upper or pyramidal part. In this instance, however, the whole of the perpendicular part is covered with the most elaborate sculpture, cut with exquisite sharpness and precision, in a fine close-grained hornblende (?) stone, and produces an effect richer, and on the whole perhaps in better taste, than anything else in this style (Woodcuts Nos. 237, 238). It is difficult, of course, to institute a comparison between these gopurams and such works as Tirumalai Nâyyak’s chaultri, or the corridors at Râmesvaram; they are so different that there is no common basis of comparison but the vulgar one of cost; but if compared with Halebîd or Belûr, these Tâdpatri gopurams stand that test better than any other works of the Vijayanagar Râjas. They are inferior, but not so much so as one would expect from the two centuries of decadence that elapsed between them, and they certainly show a marked superiority over the great unfinished gopuri of Tirumalai Nâyyak, which was commenced, as nearly as may be, one century afterwards.

About fifty miles still further east, at a place called Diguva Ahobalam, in Karnal district, there is a large unfinished mantapam in plan and design very like that of the temple of Vithobâ at Vijayanagar, but its style and details are much more like those of the Nâyyaks, though local tradition assigns it to Pratâpa Rudra about 1300. Traditions, however, usually refer to the original shrine, and if we are guided by style, it could hardly have been erected before the destruction of that capital in A.D. 1565. The dynasty, however, continued to exist for one or two centuries after that time, till the country was finally conquered by Tipu Sultan. The inscriptions have not yet been examined, but seem mostly to belong to the latter part of the 16th century.¹ Whoever may have built it, it is a fine bold specimen of architecture, and if the history of the art in the south of India is ever seriously taken up, it will worthily take a place in the series as one of the best specimens of its age, wanting the delicacy and elegance of the earlier examples, but full of character and merit.²

¹ Among the Mackenzie MSS. at Madras there are copies of the inscriptions and other notices of the Ahobalam temples.
² For long the temple of Vishnu on the hill of Tripetty or Tirupati, in North Arcot district, was reputed to be the richest, the most magnificent, as it was
237. Entrance through Gopuram at Tādpatrī. (From a Photograph.)
CONCLUSION.

The buildings mentioned, and more or less perfectly described, in the preceding pages are in number rather less than one-third of the great Dravidian temples known to exist in the province. In importance and extent they certainly are, however, more than one-half. Of the remainder, none have vimânas like that of Tanjor, nor corridors like those of Râmesvaram; but several have gopurams quite equal to or exceeding those mentioned above, and many have mantapams of great beauty and extent. Several—such as Avadaiyâr-Kôvil, Virâîlpuram near Vellor, Târamangalam in Salem district, Kurugodu in Bellâri, and others—possess features unsurpassed by any in the south, especially the first named, which may, perhaps, be considered as one of the most elegant of its class, as well as one of the oldest. It would, however, be only tedious to attempt to describe them without plans to refer to, or more extensive illustrations than are compatible with a work of this class. They are, however, worthy of more attention than has yet been paid to them, and of more complete illustration than has hitherto been bestowed upon them. Taken altogether, they certainly do form as extensive, and in some respects as remarkable, a group of buildings as are to be found in provinces of similar extent in any part of the world—Egypt, perhaps alone excepted; but they equal even the Egyptian in extent, and though at first sight so different, in some respects present similarities which are startling. Without attempting to enumerate the whole, it may be mentioned that the gopurams both in form and purpose, resemble the pylons of the Egyptian temples. The courts with pillars and cloisters are common to both, and very similar in arrangement and extent. The great mantapams and halls of 1000 columns reproduce the hypostyle halls, both in purpose and effect, with almost minute accuracy.

certainly the most sacred of all those in the Presidency. So sacred, indeed, was it declared, that no unbelieving foreigner had ever been allowed to climb the holy hill (2,500 ft. high) or profane its sacred precincts. In 1870, a party of police forced their way in, in pursuit of a murderer who had taken refuge there, and Mr J. D. B. Gribble, who accompanied them, published an account of what they saw in the ‘Calcutta Review’ in 1875 (vol. 1st. pp. 142-156). As he exclaims, “Another of the illusions of my youth destroyed.” The temple is neither remarkable for its size nor its magnificence. In these respects it is inferior to Conjivaram, Srârangam, and many others; and whatever may be done with its immense revenues, they certainly are not applied to its adornment. It is a fair specimen of a Dravidian temple of the second class, but in a sad state of dilapidation and disrepair. It was originally a Saiva temple, but was converted to the worship of Vishnu, by Râmanujâchârya, in the 12th century. For views of the Tirupati temples in the village below, see Dr G. Le Bon’s ‘Les Monuments de l’Inde,’ figs. 199-204.
The absence of any central tower or vimâna over the sanctuary is universal in Egypt, and only conspicuously violated in one instance in India. Their mode of aggregation, and the amount of labour bestowed upon them for labour's sake, is only too characteristic of both styles. There are, besides, many similarities that will occur to any one familiar with both styles.

Is all this accidental? It seems strange that so many coincidences should be fortuitous, but, so far as history affords us any information, or as any direct communication can be traced, we must for the present answer that it is so. The interval of time is so great, and the mode in which we fancy we can trace the native growth of most of the features in India seem to negative the idea of an importation; but there certainly was intercourse between Egypt and India in remote ages, and seed may then have been sown which possibly had fructified long afterwards.

A digression may be made in conclusion with reference to the famous monastery referred to (p. 171), as spoken of from hearsay, both by Fah Hian and Hiuen Tsiang. Its situation has long been a puzzle. The second pilgrim says it was built by one of the Andhra kings as a monastery for Nâgârjuna. It had lofty halls in five tiers, each with four courts and temples containing golden images of Buddha. But after a time the Brâhmans had ousted the Buddhists and, he adds, "the way of access to it was no longer known." The Tibetans works state that Nâgârjuna died at the great monastery of dPal-gyi-ri, a translation of Srî-Sailam or Srî-Parvata, both names of a very old place of pilgrimage on a rocky hill overlooking a gorge of the Krishnâ river, and which is one of the twelve Jyotir-lingas or great Saiva shrines of the Hindûs. The place is difficult of access, but was visited by Colonel Colin Mackenzie in 1794, and perhaps by four or five Europeans before 1886, when the editor made a hurried excursion to it. Mackenzie had mentioned the animals carved on the surrounding walls in a way that seemed to follow the arrangement described by Fah-Hian. Though beyond the limits of the Kosala kingdom, with which Hiuen Tsiang seemed to connect it, it was most probably within the early Andhra dominions.

The reports made to the pilgrims were evidently exaggerated or vague and misunderstood; and if Srî-Sailam were the site of

---

1 The Chinese syllabus by which Hiuen Tsiang represents its name may be transliterated as Bhramara-giri—"black bee mountain." He says it meant "black peak," which is equivalent to "Nalla-mallai," the name of the hills on the south of the Krishnâ river, to the west and south of Srî-Sailam in Karnal district.

this wonderful monastery, there are no traces of Buddhism there now. The earliest structures were possibly of wood, and the place has been often destroyed. It was near Chandraguptapur, the capital of an early kingdom of Sṛt-Sailam, occasionally mentioned in inscriptions.

The present temples stand within a rectangular enclosure about 630 ft. from north to south by 510 ft. from east to west,
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239. Plan of the Temples at Sṛt-Sailam.
Scale 150 ft. to 1 in.

with a slight extension on the west side and gopurams on the other three, all in the style of the 16th and 17th centuries, having the lower storeys in stone and the upper in brick—though stone is more easily procurable in such a locality. The temples are now dedicated to Mallikārjuna, a form of Śiva, and to Bhrāmamābhā or Mādhava and Pārvatī. The sculptures on the walls of the court are irregularly disposed in blocks in the upper four courses on the outer face. They are almost a counterpart of those on the walls of the Hazāra-Rāma temple at Vijayanagar, and belong to the same period. Indeed, one is led to suppose
that they were carved for the construction of a shrine rather than for the enclosure wall, into the upper courses of which they are now built in an irregular way.

From the plan (Woodcut No. 239), it may be inferred that when this wall was erected the court was considerably enlarged to the north and west. The temples inside are all mean and insignificant, and, though older than the outer enclosure, they are not of earlier date than the 16th century, and probably represent the shrines hurriedly restored after some raid of iconoclastic Muhammadans.\(^1\) The court is partly occupied by rows of corridors for the accommodation of pilgrims; but most of the buildings are in a state of decay and ruin.

---

\(^1\) So late as 1855 a band of Rohillas crossed from the Haidarabad territory and robbed the temple of jewels valued at Rs. 20,000, dug up the floors of the shrines, and destroyed the ancient images.
CHAPTER V
CIVIL ARCHITECTURE.
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Although the Dravidians were extensive and enthusiastic builders, it is somewhat singular that till they came in contact with the Muhammadans all their efforts in this direction should have been devoted to the service of religion. No trace of any civil or municipal building is to be found anywhere, though from the stage of civilisation that they had attained it might be expected that such must have existed. What is, however, even more remarkable is, that kingdoms always at war with one another, and contending for supremacy within a limited area, might have been expected to develop some sort of military architecture. So far, however, as is now known, no castle or fortification of any sort dates from the Pandya, Chera, or Chola days. What is still more singular is that they have no tombs. They seem always to have burnt their dead, and never to have collected their ashes or raised any mounds or memorials to their departed friends or great men. There are, it is true, numberless “Rude stone monuments” all over the south of India, but, till they are more thoroughly investigated, it is impossible to say whether they belong to the Dravidians when in a lower stage of civilisation than when they became temple builders, or whether they belong to other underlying races who still exist, in scattered fragments, all over the south of India.1 Whoever these Dolmens or stone circles may have belonged to, we know, at least, that they never were developed into architectural objects, such as would bring them within the scope of this work. No Dravidian tomb or cenotaph is known to exist anywhere.

When, however, the Dravidians came in contact with the Musalmans this state of affairs was entirely altered, in so far, at least, as civil buildings were concerned. The palaces, the kacheris, the elephant-stables, and the dependencies of the

1 What I know on this subject I have already said in my work on ‘Rude Stone Monuments,’ pp. 455 et seqq. Conf. ‘Archæological Survey of Western India,’ vol. i., p. 8, and plate; ‘Indian Antiquary,’ vol. iii. pp. 53-54, and 306-308; vol. v. pp. 159, 255; and vol. vi. p. 230.
abodes of the rājas at Vijayanagar and Madurā, rival in extent and in splendour the temples themselves, and are not surpassed in magnificence by the Muhammadan palaces of Bijāpūr or Bidar.

One of the most interesting peculiarities of these civil buildings is, that they are all in a new and different style of architecture from that employed in the temples, and the distinction between the civil and religious art is kept up to the present day. The civil buildings are all in what we would call a pointed-arched Moorish style — picturesque in effect, if not always in the best taste, and using the arch everywhere and for every purpose. In the temples the arch is never used as an architectural feature. In some places, in modern times, when they wanted a larger internal space than could be obtained by bracketing without great expense, a brick vault was introduced — it may be said surreptitiously — for it is always concealed. Even now, in building gopurams, they employ wooden beams, supported by pillars, as lintels, to cover the central openings in the upper pyramidal part, and these having decayed, many of the most modern exhibit symptoms of decay which are not observable in the older examples, where a stone lintel always was employed. But it is not only in construction that the Dravidians adhere to their old forms in temples. There are, especially, some gopurams erected within the limits of last century, which it requires a practised eye to distinguish from older examples; but with the civil buildings the case is quite different. It is not, indeed, clear how a convenient palace could be erected in the trabeate style of the temples, unless, indeed, wood was very extensively employed, both in the supports and the roofs. My conviction is that this really was the case, and its being so, to a great extent at least, accounts for their disappearance.

The principal apartments in what is called the palace at Madurā are situated round a courtyard which measures about 160 ft. east and west by 100 ft. north and south, surrounded on all sides by arcades of very great beauty. The pillars which support the arches are of stone, 40 ft. in height, and are joined by foliated brick arcades of great elegance of design, carrying a cornice and entablature rising to upwards of 60 ft. in height. The whole of the ornamentation is worked out in the exquisitely fine stucco called "chunnam" or shell lime, which is a characteristic of the Madras Presidency.¹

¹ For a fuller account of the palace, see a paper by Mr R. F. Chisholm in the 'Transactions of the Royal Institute of British Architects,' vol. xxvi (1875-1876), pp. 150ff. with plan and sections, from which the ground plan (fig. 240) is reduced, and the measurements have been taken from it. Details of the ornamentation are given by Dr G. Le Bon, 'Les Monuments de l'Inde,' figs. 233-235.
Swaraga Vilâsam or Celestial Pavilion, now used as the High Court of Justice. It measures 235 ft. from north to south by 105 ft. across, and is arranged very much on the plan of a great mosque with three domes—in fact, the whole structure, if not first erected as a splendid mosque, is marvellously like one. The large central dome is supported by twelve columns enclosing a square 64 ft. across. These columns are first linked together by massive Saracenic arches. Four similar arches are then thrown across
the corners, and the octagonal drum rises from these, pierced by a clerestory. Above this, at the cornice, 45½ ft. up, the octagon is changed to a circle and the dome rises, in the centre, to 75 ft. from the floor. At the north-west corner of the main building is placed the splendid hall shown in the annexed woodcut (No. 241), the two corresponding with the Diwan-i-Khass and Diwan-i-Amm of Muhammadan palaces. This one, in its glory,

must have been as fine as any, barring the material: most of the connected buildings, however, have long since disappeared. This hall itself is 125 ft. long by 69 ft. wide, and its height to the centre of the roof is 56 ft.; but, what is more important than its dimensions, it possesses all the structural propriety and character of a Gothic building. It is evident that if the Hindüs had persevered a little longer in this direction they might have

1 In this view "a more decidedly Saracenic character is given to the work than it actually possesses." Mr Chisholm's paper, ut sup., p. 161. The dimensions appear much exaggerated if we take the two small human figures as supplying a scale.
accomplished something that would have surpassed the works of
their masters in this form of art. In the meanwhile it is curious
to observe that the same king who built the chaultris (Wood-
cuts Nos. 226, 227, and 228), built also this hall. The style of
the one is as different from that of the other as Classic Italian
from Medieval Gothic; the one as much over ornamented as the
other is too plain for the purposes of a palace, but both among
the best things of their class which have been built in the
country where they are found.

The last dynasty of Tanjor was founded by Ekoji or
Venkâjâ, a half brother of Sivaji, the great Marâthâ chief,
during the decline of the Madurâ dynasty in 1674-1675. The
palace was probably commenced shortly afterwards, but the
greater part of its buildings belong to the 18th century, and
some extend even into the 19th.

It is not unlike the Madurâ palace in arrangement—is,
indeed, evidently copied from it—nor very different in style;
but the ornamentation is coarser and in more vulgar taste, as
might be expected from our knowledge of the people who
erected it (Woodcut No. 242). In some of the apartments
this is carried so far as to become almost offensive. One of
the most striking peculiarities of the palace is the roof of the
great hall externally. As you approach Tanjor, you see two
great vimânas, not unlike each other in dimensions or outline,
and at a distance can hardly distinguish which belongs to the
great temple. On closer inspection, however, that of the palace
turns out to be made up of dumpy pilasters and fat balusters,
and ill-designed mouldings of Italian architecture, mixed up
with a few details of Indian art! A more curious and tasteless
jumble can hardly be found in Calcutta or Lucknow.

The palace buildings at Vijayanagar are much more
detached and scattered than those either at Tanjor or Madurâ,
but they are older, and probably represent only some of the
detached and less important buildings of what existed previous
to the sack of the city in 1565, when the Musalmâns rased the
chief buildings to the ground. What still remains reproduces
more nearly the style of a Hindû prince's civil buildings, before
they fell completely under the sway of Moslim influence.
The remains of the palace consists of a number of detached
pavilions, baths, harems, and other buildings, that certainly
were situated in gardens, and may, consequently, have had a
unity we miss in their present state of desolation. One of
these pavilions is represented in the next woodcut (No. 243).
It is a fair specimen of that picturesque mixed style which
arose from the mixture of the Saracen and Hindû styles.

1 Briggs's translation of Ferishta's ' Mahomedan Power in India,' vol. iii. p. 131.
Examples of Indian civil architecture are so few in the south, that some notice may be included here of the old palace at Chandragiri, about 30 miles N.N.E. from Chittur in North Arkot district. It was from Chandragiri in 1639 that Sri Rangarāya, the last representative of the Vijayanagar dynasty, granted the British permission to erect the fort at Madras: six years later he was overthrown by Jamshid Qutb Shāh of Golkonda.1

The principal building now left, as shown in Woodcuts Nos. 244 and 245, presents a well-balanced façade of three storeys surmounted by turrets which pleasingly break the skyline. Each floor consists mainly of a pillared hall—the piers arched across both ways, corbelled at the angles and closed with flat domes. The floors have projections of 6 or 7 ft. beyond the face of the outer pillars and rest on stone corbels. On the north side the walls pierced by the arches are built of brick; but the vaults, especially in the lower storey, are worked

---

1 After the battle of Tālikot in 1565, the representatives of the dynasty made Pennakonda in Anantapur district their capital till 1592, when Venkatapati-Rāya removed to Chandragiri, where the family resided till 1645.
in stone from stone corbels. No ornament now appears above the basement, and how the exterior of the building was first finished it would be hard to say: we may be certain that it was originally much finer than it now exists.¹

Even the mixed style above mentioned, however, died out wherever the Europeans settled, or their influence extended. The modern palaces of the Nawâbs of the Karnatik, of the Râjas of Râmânad and Travankor, are all in the bastard Italian style, adopted by the Nawâbs of Lucknow and the Bâbus of Calcutta. Sometimes, it must be confessed, the buildings are imposing from their mass, and picturesque from their variety of outline, but the details are always detestable; first, from being bad copies of a style that was not understood or appreciated; but also, generally, from their being unsuited for the use to which

¹ Fuller details will be found in a paper illustrated by plans, elevations and sections, by Mr R. F. Chisholm, F.R.I.B.A., in the 'Indian Antiquary, vol xii. (1883), pp. 295-296.
they were applied. To these defects, it must be added, that the whole style is generally characterised by a vulgarity it is difficult to understand in a people who have generally shown themselves capable of so much refinement in former times.

In some parts of the north of India matters have not sunk so low as in the Madras Presidency, but in the south native civil architecture as a fine art is quite extinct, and though sacred architecture still survives in a certain queer, quaint form of temple-building, it is of so low a type that, as exemplified especially in the temples which the Nāthukottai Chettis are engaged in renovating or reconstructing, it would be no matter of regret if it, too, ceased to exist, and the curtain dropped over the graves of both, as they are arts that practically have become extinct.