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EARLY TEMPLE ARCHITECTURE IN KARNATAKA AND ITS RAMIFICATIONS
FOREWORD

Karnataka, the traditional boundaries of which extended from the Godavari in the north, to the Kaveri in the south, has a rich heritage to boast of, in all fields of human activity — politics, religion, philosophy and literature. In the domain of architecture also it has a place of pride. The amazing cave temples at Badami, the structural monuments of Aihole and Pattadakal, rightly called the cradle of Indian Architecture, and those at Halebid, Belur, Somanathapura and Hampi, to mention only a few, are an open book as it were, unfolding the rise and growth of the glorious Karnataka architecture. With an artistic insight and scientific precision, the Kannada artist assimilated what was worthy in other styles, but developed an indigenous style of his own, which carried its influence to the neighbouring regions. The fine pieces of architecture show how the people were enjoying a prosperous period. The people and the government of the time must be taking keen interest in exhibiting their skills and working wholeheartedly with devotion to translate their designs and ideas into action. It requires a lot of patience and imagination to produce such architectural models.

The present work is a scholarly treatment of this aspect of early Karnataka architecture by an erudite Sanskrit scholar and a specialist in Archaeology and Architecture. I hope that this will serve as an incentive to our young scholars to pursue the study of this fascinating subject.

The Kannada Research Institute is doing creditable work in historical and epigraphical research and it has brought out more than fifty works of research value. Arranging research lectures by experts in different fields of indological research and publishing them in book form is a part of the regular programme of work of the Institute. I congratulate Dr. P. B. Desai; Director, Kannada Research Institute and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History & Culture, for this valuable work that he has brought to light. I hope this first volume in the new series of research lectures will be a forerunner to many such to follow in quick succession.

Yugadi,
19th March 1969
Karnatak University,
Dharwar.

Dr. A. S. ADKE
Vice-Chancellor.
PREFACE

We feel happy to present this monograph on temple architecture to the world of scholars interested in the subject. This comprises the subject matter of three research lectures delivered by the author at the Kannada Research Institute on the 16th, 17th and 18th February, 1968. The field of investigation covered herein is Early Karnataka Architecture and Its Ramifications.

The Karnataka Research Institute, forming an academic department of the Karnataka University, came into existence as an independent unit in 1938 to serve the need of a preliminary centre of Post-Graduate studies and research in Karnataka History and Culture and cognate subjects in the northern districts of the present Mysore State, formerly in the Bombay Presidency. It was precursor of the Karnataka University which was founded twelve years later in 1950. The Karnataka Research Institute is a broad-based cultural institution having no parochial affiliations as evidenced by its comprehensive educational activities.

The functions of the Institute in association with the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, now constituting a composite Post-Graduate Department of Karnataka University, range over a wide field. They are as follows: teaching the subjects of Ancient Indian History and Culture to the Post-Graduate M.A. courses in history, viz., Ancient Indian History, Epigraphy, Archaeology, Numismatics; Ancient Indian Political Thought and Institutions, Historical Method and Thought, History of the Vijayanagara Empire; training in Palaeography and Epigraphy for the Post-Graduate Diploma course in Epigraphy; maintenance of the Museum of Art and Archaeology; survey and collection of archaeological and epigraphical materials; collection of historical records and literary manuscripts; small scale archaeological explorations and excavations; publication of source materials, epigraphical volumes, documented history series, and literary works; arranging research lectures by renowned scholars and their publication. The total number of publications of the Institute to date is 52.
Pertaining to the last mentioned item, the plan generally adopted is as follows: The lectures are normally three, dealing with the various aspects of one principal theme of research on a suitable problem in historical and cultural studies. The text of the lectures is published in the form of a monograph soon after their delivery. Ten series of such lectures delivered from 1940 to 1953 have so far been published and are available to the scholars for study. Owing to some difficulties this activity was suspended for about twelve years in the past. It was again revived since 1966. During this latter period of revival, six series of lectures were delivered. The present is the first volume of the new series of research lectures to be published.

The author of these lectures, Shri K. V. Soundara Rajan, is a scholar of repute, well-versed in Sanskrit, Ancient Indian History, Archaeology and Epigraphy. He has toured extensively for intensive study all over the country. He has specialised in the early temple architecture of India with special reference to South India.

The early Karnataka Architecture is an absorbing study, rich with rewards. From the earliest period the creative genius of Karnataka artists has liberally contributed to the art treasures of India and picturesquely adorned their native land with their masterly products. From the sixth century onwards, with the rise of the mighty Chalukyas of Badami rises the splendour of Karnataka architecture which, flourishing through vicissitudes, attains its glorious climax during the spirited age of the Vijayanagara monarchs in the sixteenth century. In the course of these ten centuries and over, hundreds of exquisite temples and thousands of superb sculptures were erected throughout the length and breadth of its boundaries. The mysteries of this vast wonderland yet remain to be fathomed. No systematic survey and scientific study with true insight of these works of art have adequately been made so far.

The subject has been dealt with in a cursory fashion by James Ferguson in his History of Indian and Eastern Architecture in 1910. In The Chalukyan Architecture of The Kannara Districts published sixteen years later (1926) by Henry Cousens we obtain a better,
more critical and fairly comprehensive descriptive treatment of the theme. Coming forth three decades later (1956), Percy Brown with his discerning acumen made a substantial contribution in the field. His monumental survey *Indian Architecture* (Buddhist and Hindu periods) traces the genesis, evolution and growth of the art of temple construction on scientific lines. He rightly recognizes the distinctive characteristic features of Karnataka architecture which was an independent movement, an expression of the natural instincts and aspirations of the inhabitants of the region. Aholi where a variegated array of early shrines and temples is clustered, was a cradle town of Indian architecture. The plentiful harvest of temple architecture with its various modes and styles, emerging during the later periods, was an outcome of aesthetic experiments carried out in the early stages in this and the adjoining centres of Badami, Mahakuta and Pattadakal. Among other scholars who have made a study of Karnataka architecture partially or in special aspects, mention may be made of R. Narasimhachar and M. H. Krishna.

The present enquiry is a fresh approach to the subject. Its originality lies in the fact that it takes into account for the first time the hitherto untapped literary treatises, the Agamas and Silpa texts on the temple architecture. With this clue and applying the modern techniques of research, an illuminating appraisal of the origin and evolution of the early temple architecture of Karnataka is impressively presented here in minute details. Another welcome feature of this investigation is the systematic discussion of the subtle interrelations and impacts of the art movement of Karnataka on similar movements in other regions and our area. Noteworthy is the unconventional manner of explaining the familiar nomenclature Dravida, Nagara and Vesara. The terminology introduced to describe the three characteristic temple forms in Karnataka as Rekha-Nagara, Kadamba-Nagara and the southern Vimana, is a novel feature.

It is further pointed out that: the early Chalukyas were responsible for the orientation of the Sadasiva and Mahesa concepts of the images of Siva; Karnataka offered the cult of Ganesa to the deeper south; the vigorous and impressionistic Durga is a
special feature of Karnataka art. Karnataka, in art and architecture, was a unifying and rejuvenating bridge between the northern and the southern traditions. In line, the early Karnataka art is the best rendering, on the religious plane, of what was essentially a local ethos.

Leaving aside a few minor observations on which there is likely to be disagreement and divergence of opinion, the overall treatment of the author constitutes a positive landmark in the studies and researches on the early temple architecture of Karnataka and South India.

We are grateful to the author for having placed at our disposal the valuable results of his strenuous research and painstaking study in the subject. We are indebted to our esteemed Vice-Chancellor Dr. A. S. Adke for his interest in this Department and for having blessed this publication with his weighty Foreword. My colleagues Dr. S. H. Ritti and Dr. B. R. Gopal have shouldered the burden of seeing the work through the press. Miss Leela, Research Assistant, has prepared the Index. The attractive cover design is by the artist Shri R. S. Desai of this Department. We express our hearty thanks to them all.

15th March 1969

Department of Ancient Indian History & Culture and Kannada Research Institute.

P. B. DESAI

Professor & Director.
AUTHOR’S NOTE

I am indeed grateful to the Karnataka University, Dharwar and the learned Director of the Kannada Research Institute, Dr. P. B. Desai, for having invited me to deliver the lectures on South Indian architecture early last year. I chose the subject which is now presented in the following pages, in realisation of the fundamental contributions of the Karnataka area towards the study of early structural architectural motivations in ancient India. The region has a felicitous array of early stone temples, especially in the Malaprabha Valley, even whose iconography by itself has an exclusive scope for detailed treatment. I hope some scholar would surely be doing justice to it early.

I have tried to present the topics of my lectures in a concise manner, projecting, by and large, the architectural personality of the temples alone. I am hoping that the treatment and the tabulated notes that follow, would stimulate further fruitful studies in this premier art-nucleus of India.

I have also to thank the Karnataka University authorities for having brought out the book early.

Madras
1st March 1969.

K. V. SOUNDARA RAJAN
### LIST OF PLATES AND MAPS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I (a)</td>
<td>Jyotirlinga small temple, Aiholi, Bijapur District, Mysore State.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (b)</td>
<td>Jyotirlinga Small Temple, Aiholi, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Small shrine in the tank, Mahakut, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Mahakutesvara Temple, Mahakut, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Other temples, Mahakut, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Upper Sivalaya, Badami, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Lower Sivalaya, Badami, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Bhutanatha Temple, Badami, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Tarappagudi, Aiholi, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Ladkhan Temple, Aiholi, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Kontigudi, Aiholi, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Mallikarjuna Temple, Aiholi, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Megutí Temple, Aiholi, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Naganatha Temple, Nagaral, Bijapur District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Parvati Temple, Sandur, Bellary District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Taraka Brahma Temple, Alampur, Mahboobnagar District, Andhra Pradesh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Bala Brahma Temple, Alampur, Mahboobnagar District,</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Ramalingesvara and Bhimalingesvara Temples, Satyavolu, Kurnool District, Andhra Pradesh.</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Golingesvara Temple, Bicavolu, East Godavari District,</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>Sangamesvara Temple, Sangamesvaram, Kurnool District,</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Sangamesvara Temple, Pattadakal, Bijapur District.</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>Galaganatha Temple, Pattadakkal, Bijapur District.</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 1</td>
<td>South India: Early Architectural Nuclei and Variants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 2</td>
<td>South India: Incidence of temple styles (600-950 A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORIGINS AND FORMATIVE STAGES

In a land of many rivers that is India, Karnataka constitutes a territory which is plateau-land in physiromorphology, with the unique distinction of river systems cutting in all directions but essentially dividing the zone into three areas; viz., that (to the north) fed by the Krishna and its tributaries (the Varada and the Tungabhadra); that on its mid-eastern fringe which is inundated by the northward flowing North Pennar river system; and that, further south, fertilised by the Kaveri system. The locking by the Sahyadris and the Eastern ghats, on the southern part of the Karnataka plateau, together with the dominant Trap country which occurs to the north, made it an almost homogeneous terrain, and movement of people and art-impulses had inevitably followed this tri-furcated pattern. This had given rise to its typical Chalukya architectural siltam in the north, the Nolamba-Bana sablaye in the mid-east, and the typical western-Ganga style of the south. The individuality of the first and the last, and the fixed character of the second are also a direct sequel to the physical pattern. Thus, the art-heritage of the region, taken as whole, is polyglot to a degree, but follows a pattern already predetermined by the developments that took place in the northern tract, in the early sixth-seventh centuries A.D. Here, nature with its fine sandstone raw-material, and man with his well-nigh seven-century old familiarity with another soft medium, namely, Trap—found inadequate by now for structural temple-architecture—co-conspired to make the land the very cocoon, as it were, of the earliest temple modulations, while history almost anticipatingly overtook nature and man by witnessing the rise of one of the most venturesome, colourful and deeply religious Hindu dynasties of early India—the Chalukyas of Patagadhisthane, the present day Badami. By
a timing that was as meticulous as it was canny, the early chieftains to this throne, caught the opportunity by its fore-lock, and by the close of the sixth century A.D. had become the masters of all that lay between the Narmada and the Krishna, at least in Western Deccan. The erstwhile centres of Buddhist art quickly gave place to flourishing Brahmanical cave temples, whose sculptural wealth in their dim-lit interiors spoke in no uncertain terms of the religious revival already afoot. Suddenly, as it were, the Buddhist church and clergy are heard no more, and the Trinity, with their full protocol honours, were re-established by Puranic Hinduism, without tear or rancour. A silent revolution had taken place and with it Hindu architecture, of the structural order in stone medium, was born and baptised. This phenomenon was the product entirely of local circumstances and resources, and was rudimentary and functional to a degree in its initial stages. As the fledglings of the architect's fancy put forth wings, South India was, for the first time, provided with a three-fold temple fabric, of indigenous, outlandish, and of the archetypal forms respectively. Here, if anywhere, was the bed-rock of the Hindu temple formulation.

The opening scenes of this new drama are laid at Aiholi, Mahakut, and Badami, all on or near the Malaprabha and the first and last within 14 miles of each other, with the middle one midway but rather tucked away, at the head of a hill stream, into the lush valley. Kisuvolal—later better known as Pattada Kisuvolal or Pattadakal—had not yet been born to art. The busy town of Aiholi—Aryapura as it was perhaps called then—perhaps patronised the erection of the first sumptuous Chalukya structural temple, in what is now somewhat jarringly going by the sobriquet, Ladhkan. This ponderous, rudimentary and non-descriptive structural model has three main features to its credit: (1) the main structure is entirely closed all around and is no better than a civilian hall, whose interior symmetry is clear from the central square architrave over four free-standing pillars, resulting externally in a clerestory. The roofing of the other parts is of the slopy variety. (2) An entrance mandapa, mainly of the hall type and borne on transversely oblong rows of pillars is provided.
(3) There was probably no shrine-chamber, as such, originally and the present one should have come later to the main structure, but in its place at the very rear of the scheme. Against the backwall, most persuasively recalls the cave-temple model with its shrine at the rear extremity and a mandapa, like the one of Laddhan, in front, with a raised central stub in the axial strike, besides the aakhamandapa scheme, similar again to Laddhan in its essential lay-out and dimensions. These three features, together with the massive character of the pillars, their relative unsculptured or conventionalised but only engraved and embellished character, would show that the temple construction was still in the throes of evolution, and stability, utility, and imitation of erstwhile rock-cut tradition were all too evident. The temple could not thus be placed later than the last quarter of the sixth century A.D., and should have been close on heels of the earliest cave shrines at Badami. The model is local, empirical and atypical in so far as the main current of temple styles are concerned. But even this cannot be deemed as the earliest temple enterprise because its very forbidding dimensions are against its being a clumsy beginning. If we have to be content with modest models of this stage, rather than ambitious elaborations of them, we might as well accept two miniature temple-units in the so-called Jyotirlinga group. Both of these, close to each other and facing the same direction, are hardly better than a mandapa with closed walls and flat top, but are axially confronted by an open pillared hall—the samadavilasa—of identical dimensions, but whose pillars depict on their outer faces, a compendium of the religious iconography of the place and time, involving the dvarapala figures, the non-polarised Saiva-Vaisnava harmonisation, the dikpala carvings etc. Further, more than a bare suggestion of panel sculptures is attempted in the became of Kalavatini-Siva on the upper register of the wall of the temple under the cornice. The highly simplified character of the plinth, the presence yet of the saka channel or opening on its top moulding, the existence of a balustraded approach for the shrine—all these are pointers to the inchoate but deliberate experimentation at the shrine. To this stage, perhaps, is ascribable, the small mandapa-shrine with
mukhalingas in the tank at Mahakut. The Ladkhan is itself a perfected norm, well beyond the above stage, and should have carried its finite entity for a considerable while. If we are to search for its lineal sequel, we have only to turn to the coastal Konkana type of temple in mediaval times, persisting from Goa to Mangalore and showing the variant motifs of the converted pillar hall with slopy roof represented by Ladkhan, the railing type of relief members on the exterior of the sanctum and the open railings themselves in the circuit passage around, as the examples of Ketapi Narayana temple at Bhatkal, or the Vaital temple at Keri in Goa territory show. Ladkhan, thus, was not, after all, an aberration, but a rationalisation of the simple residential hall in the religious context, of the formative stages.

The main interest in Ladkhan, further, attaches to the two-fold fact that its present shrine is at the back wall—a fact largely simulated at Kontigudi also and it has an additional shrine chamber at present on the centre of roof. These two features bristle with possibilities regarding their relative priority. The indications such as the plain ashlar exterior wall on most of the rear side of Ladkhan as different from the pierced and grilled side walls would argue in favour of the back-wall shrine being reasonably early if not original indeed. If so, the corollary would be that the upper shrine on the roof is relatively later. If the fact that access to this roof shrine is provided by a stone-cut detached ladder placed in the mukhamandapa (through a corresponding square opening in the ceiling of the mukhamandapa, on the innermost bay), be any guidance, we might as well surmise that this roof shrine, as well as the mukhamandapa itself, came comparatively later. The corresponding unit on the roof at Kontigudi is not much different but is clearly a further evolution over that at Ladkhan into a datata superstructure, although the provision of a sala at the kara level of this unit, would seem to suggest that this unit was independent of the ground floor scheme and represented an upper shrine cell. In any event, the Ladkhan scheme would resolve itself roughly into the following stages:

a) original shrine at the back wall of the mandapa-type;

b) provision of the mukhamandapa and parapet;
the roof shrine and provision of access to it.

The authority for the provision of shrine in the roof in the form of a turret is perhaps based on such usages as Valahhti-prastha, mentioned in early texts. The Kontigudi scheme correspondingly would be coeval with (2) of above or much after, and its superstructure is more organic than that of Ladkhun and indeed represents a typical, evolved Chalukya southern simana roof—one of the few of its kind at Aiholi. The fact that the stone ladder is outside the floor mandapa might suggest:

(1) that there was no front porch to Kontigudi originally; and (2) that the roof shrine was indeed not a live part of the scheme and thus given deliberate access to only from outside. It is feasible to place Kontigudi ground floor nearly a century separated from Ladkhun structure while its upper floor could well have been an addition of the second half of the eighth century A.D., when structural simanas like the one near the dolmen in the Galaganatha group at Aiholi have come into being and were more or less transitional to the Rastrakuta efforts here, if not belonging to them squarely.

It is not necessary, therefore, to consider Ladkhun and Kontigudi as a related effort, notwithstanding the superficial similarities that one sees in them now, and this is also emphasized by their differences, such as the totally closed character of the former and the partially closed twin entry points of the latter; the difference between the superstructural features of the two; in the interior pillar and door frame details, and their art-values. The thing, however, to be admitted is that in their ground floor plan and structure they are remarkably close, and their superstructure also was a related effort, perhaps similar originally in both, but later reconstructed into its present form in Kontigudi. This last mentioned detail is clear from the typically Rastrakuta or later-to-post-Chalukyan features of the hara of Kontigudi roof and the fact that the interior of this marapita-hara provided for a saka at the vedika level for draining storm water.

It is significant here to note that in the Meguti temple at Aiholi and in the Upper Sivalaya at Badami, we have an attempt to keep a second hollow chamber over which the repetitive and
shorter upper talas rise. Thus, their effort is inchoate and allied. All this would have to be dated up to 634 A.D., the clearly known age of Meguti. Even at Mahakut, the Mathuravara and the Mallikarjuna as succeeded in the Malegitti and Lower Sivalaya of Badami, are rather unsuccessful attempts to give a clarity to the talas at the topmost talas particularly on the topmost talas. Obviously the impact of the Pallavas, after 640 A.D., at Badami should have given the critical momentum to siman models in the Karnataka country, and this change is only too patent, as seen in the Bhutanatha temple at Badami, or in the Pattadakal temples, both of which are admittedly after the Pallava interregnum in early Chalukyan history. At Aiholi itself, the Ladkhan, Kontigudi archa-type was followed by Chikkigudi and Gaudargudi models (in which the separate sanctum was hatched-on to the mandapa format) at the time when elsewhere at Badami and Mahakut structural temples had already been improved to form a cognate superstructural arrangement. Thus, we seem to have first, a rather heavy, cumbersome outline of the elevational rise of temples in their committedly local sloppy roof-mandapa type of ground floor, preceding at Aiholi, coeval with early finite stage at Mahakut and Badami in the pre-642 A.D. phase, and then, a confident and coherent formulation of the temple unit in the second empire of early Chalukyas, after the sack of Badami by Narsimha Pallava. All this only shows that the architectural enterprises of the early Karnata phase going on in the various art centres, like Aiholi, Badami, Mahakut, Nagaral etc., was amorphous in texture, as a result of which many variant experiments were afoot before the head-on-impact of two great art-forces, the Chalukyan and the Pallava, resulted in a fruitful harmonisation and consolidation of their respective art-meters. But here we are truly anticipating.

Soon after the early formative phase itself, we find a sudden fanning out of architectural essayings in compact structural models, and it is reasonable to presume that we are now well and truly in the very apogee of early Western Chalukyan history, in the victorious decades of Mangalesha and Pulakesi II. We have now a glimpse of the new horizons seen around Mahakut and
the capital Badami itself. It is no insignificant fact that while the Badami phase, at its earliest, also specialised in cave temples, there was co-extensive activity in the cave as well as the structural forms only at Aiholi, ostensibly because the trade guild, the Aiholi-500 had already been prominent in the patronage of art and religion in a big way. The early tripod stand on which the crucible of Chalukyan art was laid to produce unparalleled amalgams of early temple formulations, in conformity to the emergent Agamic codes, is to be witnessed at Mahakut, Badami, and Aiholi. The land assimilated the multiplicity of concepts and art-impulses steadily acquired by the imperial sweep of the Badami throne over extensive territories south of the Vindhyas. The sandstone cliffs at or near the triple cities provided an almost inexhaustible supply of the raw material and the industrious mercantile guilds of Aiholi had apparently the matching financial resources for this laudable enterprise in the realms of art. Thus at one stroke, the chisel of the architect assembled as many as five different forms of temples whose mediaeval elaborations—unquestionably profound—and whose sculptural decor—indubitably solute—would concern us less here than the formal enunciations of the temple of god in the earlier stages. The Makutesvara temple at Mahakut at the vanguard, followed by the Malegitti Sivalaya at Badami, Upper and Lower Sivalayas at the same place, the Hucchinnalligudi and its ilk at Aiholi, the Mallikarjuna and its variants at the same town, the Durga temple again at Aiholi, the Mallikarjuna temple at Mahakut, culminating in the Bhutanatha at Badami, the Virupaksha and the Papanatha at Pattadakal, by now Pattada Kshauvalal, these form a veritable galaxy of temple styles variously of the nagara-tekha-prasada, the Kadamba-nagara or the Pillha deul, and the triple facets, such as the Dravida, Nagara and Vesara, of the southern vastra forms respectively. These were the finest that ever studded one and the same circumscribed region in India.

At this stage, we may be permitted to digress on the elements of evolving early architectural concepts in the Deccan—the mind behind the hand reducing formal art to abstract symbolism on the one side and clothing this subtle core with a physical garb—an
index of perfect concord between the craftsmen and the clergy. Much of the early manuals on architecture deals with a diffuse, visionary, spectra of elevational perspectives—called by different imaginative labels based squarely on ground plans which were five-fold fundamentally. These basic forms or geometric patterns comprise the square, the octagonal, and the circular, to which were added the ellipse and the rectangle. These were called Vairaj, Trivistasa, Kaita, Manika and Puspaka. The square was undoubtedly the most versatile of the series and the ellipse, the most rehrna and thus seemingly archaic (drawn from the bamboo and wood prototype). After an early phase of development when the elliptical form appears to have been much in preference as seen at Nagari in Rajasthan, Bhuta in Madhya Pradesh, Kausambi in U.P. and Rajigir and Barabar hills in Bihar (of structural timber and stucco character in the former, two, vestigially preserved, and of rock-art style in the last mentioned in a prevailing fifth-second centuries B.C. context), the Buddhistic era most insistently exploited a variant of the ellipse, namely, the apse, in its virtually countless chaitya edifices, of rock-cut as well as brick-and-stucco pedias.

In all these cases, both elliptical-swelled and apsidal, the common feature is that the sides are truly linear and not curved and thus actually they should be classified as oblate, than elliptical. Further, the fact that this linear character of the sides would dismember the figure into a rectangle and a semi-circle (attached to it on both sides or on one side only), would show how precisely these have been termed in the silpa texts as Deyana-critta, whereas the term Kukkutanda-sahrasa also sometimes met with, should be more appropriate to the ellipse. The deyana-critta or flat ellipse should have risen as an amalgam of circle and rectangle, and even structurally it is seen that the internal division of the plan occurs only at the correct junction between the semi-circle and the rectangle. An interesting corollary in actual ritual slant of the garba within such temples is that the pitha or pedestal on which is placed the deity (iconic or aniconic, as the case may be) is usually also elliptical or circular. In the corresponding case of the apsidal Saiva temples of the deep southern country, it is seen that the
language itself gets a reciprocal apsidal section vertically by a sheer straight front and topward curving rear, or is indicated appropriately by a protruberance (or budhada) on the front, like a pura-
sikhara—symbolic of the apse-shape of the garha. There are copious examples of such usage, not till now sufficiently appreciated or even documented and known. The dhyana-citta plan is employed in architectural style even to the superstructures of rectangular shrines, in which case, these should serve as the replica of the (now lost) original roofs over many an ancient elliptical brick and timber structure, some of which have been enumerated above as occurring in Northern India in pre-Christian times. Among the earliest such in the south would be the innermost shrine proper of the temple complex of Ranganatha at Srirangam.

It has been stated that the Buddhist craftsmen almost appropriated to themselves after this formative stage, the circular and apsidal forms. They, thus, made original contribution to the familiarisation of the apse in its structural elevation, interior as well as exterior and even lent the germ-idea to the sanctum form in an apsidal shrine as seen, for example, in the Mahayana Chaitya Cave No. 29 at Ajanta. When the resurgent Brahmanism took over the country in the fourth century A.D., almost everywhere it immediately organised a compact group of alternative shrine forms to develop from—first in the brick medium itself, and within two centuries in the stone medium also, structural as well as rock-cut and monolithic. These forms are the cubical, the circular, the octagonal and the rectangular, apart from the apsidal, and the first-mentioned among these alone admitted of a two-fold variation, viz., the curvilinear northern variety (that one may designate as the Nagara-sikhara-prana) and the truly southern vesans form of the nagara class—meaning that which has, amidst other features, a square sikhara. It could be readily seen that this compendium of temple forms found acceptance over an area covering almost entire Southern India, an outstanding example of which is to be seen, for instance, in the early Pallava monoliths at Mahabalipuram near Madras, of the Nagara, Dravida, Vesana (Gajapershtha-apsidal), tala (rectangular) and kutagara (incipient curvilinear Nagara form). In the Karnataka country, the Dravida (Makara-
vara, Mahakut) Nagara (Upper Sivalaya, Bhatami), Vetara (Durga temple, Aiholi), the nagara-rekha-prasada (Hueshimalligudi, Aiholi) and the many oblong shrines at Aiholi (like Gaudargudi, or Temple No. 11 in the village) became the familiar and vigorous expressions of the same formulations. The Kadambha-nagara variety of stepped and multi-tiered superstructure, exemplified by Mallikarjuna and Galaganatha of Aiholi, and the western group at Mahakut became an affiliated abstraction of the Nagara-rekha-prasada as cross-fertilised with the southern storeyed form and thus retained its intrinsic merit of being an indigenous model in the coastal Konkan tract. Its inherent values are manifest in the lack of sabanata, despite the use of amaata for the top as well as the karna-bhuvi in some cases as at Aiholi, and the abbreviation this model makes of the quadrantal or slopy kapata and roof slabs. The slopy roofed character itself is primarily the bequest of the monsoon-ridden west coast tract, to structural architecture of Karnataka under the Chalukyas and, in its displayed provenance, prevailed as far afield as the lower Krishna-Tungabhadra doab in the present day Andhra Pradesh, as at Alampur, Satyavolu and Mahanandi (under Eastern Chalukya patronage), thereby clinchingly asserting the cultural dominance of the indigenous Karnataka structural milieu. The heart of the Eastern Chalukyan kingdom along the east coast in the Godavari-Krishna delta country was, however, more germane in its architectural essaying with the deep southern Pallava-Pandyar norms, and had no great use for the sloppy roof device which had no roots in that region.

Having somewhat oversimplified but not, one would hope, underestimated the vivacity and verve of the early Chalukyan craft-potential in Karnataka homeland, we might dwell briefly upon some of the favourite structural manipulations its architects were fond of—the like of some of which is not generally met with, either in the deep south or in the northern plains.

To start with, the early Karnataka temples reveal an avowedly bandhara (or closed inner circuit passage) for the truly southern types of temples also—a feature which is more in line with the

1 Conscnt——Chalukya Architecture, pl. XXIII.
curvilinear Nagara-tekha-prasada of Upper India, than with the more-southerly ones. The distinction between a mere cellular organism of the ground floor, intended more to widen the base for rather heavy and multistoried superstructure (as in the deep south), rather than a deliberate means of distinguishing the sanctum from the outer enclosure wall of the temple proper, is to be noticed by the provision of the plinth mouldings to the inner sanctum exterior in addition to the outer surrounding wall, although the former is almost likely ever to remain ill-illuminated. This provision is not met with in this form in the southern temples, as at Kanchi etc. of the Pallavas, although the shrine lay-out here is of the pseudo-sanibara character with the purpose of kalatika-karma (or corbelling) of the successive walls for widening the base, as already mentioned above. It is in fact of an entirely different ilk, and has a direct relationship with the bhaja-bhittii, sthupa, antara-bhittii and the prahapolti (of the garbhagriha)—a basic structural concept involved in the truly southern vimana form. Contrastively, the Karnataka idiom revelled in providing the cells with a closed circumambulatory up-to a stage, diversifying it with the open sanctum type (with open prataksma premises) as well, as at Huchapayagudi etc. In fact one may see in the process, a slow displacement of the sloppy roof, which was originally all around the sanctum, and then restricted to one side of the sanctum, and ultimately to the front part of the sanctum alone (now relieved of any encumbrance and showing its full stature from plinth to stage unhindered). In the ultimate analysis, in conformity to the sophisticated innovations of other regional styles, the sloppy roof almost completely disappeared from any part of the front mandapa-complex as well, and became a specialised archetypal adjunct to the Kalambo-nagara alone and its coastal variations up-to the medieval times, as already hinted earlier. Thus, the personality of the temple composition was steadily unstripped of the rather bohemian apparel it was accoutered with in the formative stages, and was spelled out into coherent and rationalised elevational and layout designs. In effect, from the functional folk-base, the “mansion of the gods,” in the north Karnataka country rises to a conventionalised but independent structural
corpus, as illustrated by the Lokesvara temple, Pattadakal (a Nagaragopura), the Lower Sivalaya of Badami (a Darasida-rumana), the Mallikarjuna shrine at Pattadakal (a Vesara-rumana), and the Mallikarjuna temple at Mahakut (a Nagaragopura-rekha-prasada). The stage was well set then for its further transformations in a rising magnificence of body dimensions, of sculptural opulence, and of iconographic profundity—the unmistakable hall-marks of a mediæval devolution.

A second feature, typically Karnataka, is the pierced windows and doors of the outer walls of the temple, around the sanctum and in the front mandapa. These jala-vatayanas and ghana-dvāras of the sīra texts, lend themselves to graceful ornamental motifs, besides tending to lighten the fabric of the wall scheme. It is one of the characteristic features of a Chalukyan temple, and outside north Karnataka, they are under loan in the Ganga-Nolamba-Bana tracts also, as we shall see later. It should be borne in mind that these latter areas were in language, culture and affinity largely integral with the early Western Chalukyas, although their regionalism was a direct product of environmental factors and local political impacts, making them stylistically (in architectural matters) serve as buffers between the Karnataka-Aurilia and the southern Pallava-Pandyas traditions, and thus equally aligned with both. While the jala-vatayana is more ubiquitous, the grilled false door (ghana-dvāra) on the cardinal points of the main shrine placed on the outer wall of its covered circuit, has a typical character and are spread on the eastern wing of the Chalukyas also; as insistently adopted at Alampur, Sangamesvara, Chevrolu, Drakharama etc, in slightly variant forms abbreviating in themselves basically the sarvatobhadra concept of shrine composition.

A third element, differentiating the Nagaragopura-rekha-prasadas of the Karnataka from their counterparts in northern India, is the provision of a typical prastara or entablature mouldings over the brief cornice or eave in the form of a cyalasari course, before the node over the sima-kata, of the curvilinear superstructure proper begins. Internally, it obviously represents the architrave or clerestory of the garbhagriha, formed by two attira beams with a
bold sāntaḥ in between, dividing the shell of the sikhara from the false ceiling of the cella proper. This feature is unknown in the northern Indian temples but corresponds to the typical pustaka with vyaparā and in some cases, the pahara also, of the southern style.

Another and indeed inherent trait of the Karnataka zone is the sukanasa projection on the front side of the superstructure, forming, as it were, a gable roof for the antechamber or maha-mandapa in front of the garbha-griha. Its diagnostic and indigenous character is more than sustained by the fact that this feature consistently occurs in the Rakha-naagara-prasadas as well as in the Nagara-Vista-cimānas of the southern form also. These are not, however, found employed on the Divadā-cimānas of the early Chalukyas, but are applied even in this category by the succeeding Rāstrakutas, as most convincingly displayed in the great Kailasa monolith at Ellora. Thus, these form a most outstanding element of the architectural personality of the Deccan in the centuries of Chalukya-Rāstrakūta rule. They are so much in contrast with their studied absence in the Vīrama forms of the more southerly regions, like those of the Gangas, Pallavas, Pandyas etc., and even in the eastern wing of the Chalukyas themselves in the Godavari-Krishna Delta. The surmise seems to be valid that this sukanasa feature is primarily on loan in the Chalukyan country from the northern Indian regions where in all the regional styles, it was more or less an universally prevalent feature, especially under the Gujara-Pratiharas of Rajasthan, Malva, and the northern plains. But its actual shape had been somewhat modified in the Karnataka usage. Its dimensions could be of equal, half, or one third of the garbha width according to tihe texts, and examples of all these three are available.

A more sophisticated diversity of the early Karnataka temples from the more southerly ones in Andhradesa and Taminnad, is the preference for the simple, vertically drooping pātasma course in the lower part of the plinth, in place of the rectangular jāmāra moulding, and the employment of jāpata as the very uppermost important moulding of the plinth, as against the pātaka, which takes this place in the south. Of course, these features are, in
some rare contexts, appropriated by the southern dynasties also, as by the Pallavas in the unique and early case of the Dharmaraja ratha at Mahabalipuram, and by the Western Gangas at Kam
daiahalli in one of the temples of the Panchakutubasti group, and by the Pandyas and the Cholas as well (more in the former), and almost becomes a norm in the Vijayanagara period. But it is only in the Karnataka area proper that these two characteristics are incessantly and widely prevailing from the very beginning, and form a common element both of the Nagara-rakha-prasada as well as the simha forms.

In an even more subtle and symbolic manner, the Chalukyas in the Karnataka area, consistently preferred only a square linga-pitha in the sanctum of a Siva temple, and are followed in this practice by their eastern, Vengi wing, by the Western Gangas, the Nolambas, the Banas, the Kadambaras, and in the deep south by the Pandyas. On the contrary, the Rastrakutas had very early in their career, as from the Kailasa, Ellora onwards (or even in their cave phase itself as in the Dasavatara cave), opted for the circular plan for the linga-pitha (apparently as a synonym of the term Ratha for circular and Brahma for square and Vishnu as octagon as employed in the silpa texts—to the codification of which they gave great boost), and in the lower southern India, the Pallavas practically adopted the same practice from the stage they actually start using the aniconic linga, which was only from around the second quarter of the eighth century A.D. Before that, either no linga (or aniconic form) was in vogue, or a dharaniga type was more in demand, as in the times of Raja Simha, and this seemingly continued even in the reign of Nandivarman II Pallavanalla. They do, however, occasionally, under submission either to peripheral impacts or to silpa injunctions, employ square or octagonal linga-pithas, as in the Pralayakalesvara temple at Pennadam (South Arcot District) or Visalesvara temple at Ramakrishnamaharajapet near Tiruttani respectively. Fundamentally, the square linga-pitha is a bequestical of the early Chalukyas of Karnataka, and is followed by the entire western flank down to the Cape Comorin in this way. It was perhaps symbolic of the omni-facial
character of the divine personality, as rooted in the sarvatobhadra tradition, oriented along the cardinal directions.

It would be fruitful at this stage to peep into the veiled mystery of the apparent diversity of forms obtaining variously at Badami, Mahakut, Aiholi and Pattadakal. These four were, doubtless, the chief nurseries of the so-called early Chalukyan architecture which is, indeed, tantamount to the early architecture of Karnataka. Of these, again, the three first mentioned are more closely involved with the very birth and inception of this art and should be deemed as its cradles. But we do note a surprising disparity in the creations of these places. On a rough chronological sequence of their earliest creations of temple form, we should place Aiholi as the earliest, Mahakut closely following it, Badami in the wake of the latter, and finally Pattadakal, closely in trail, as an extrovert and extravagant showplace of the royal coronation city. In this order, we should now assemble the archetype-typical models designed by the architect-guilds of each of these places—as, indeed, their variety seems to warrant. Aiholi is prolific but none-the-less rudimentary, embryonic, and comprehensive, taking in its stride, the formative, atypical coastal-residential model (as in Laidhun), the Rēka-nagara-prasada, its Kadamba-nagara variant, the Nagara and Vesara-cimāna of the southern style, to the exclusion significantly of the Dravida-cimāna form, or to be more specific, the octagonal sikhara type capping a southern temple type.1 It is at Mahakut that we see the use of this Dravida-sikhara also in the mixed bag. Here, the types noted are the southern cimāna, mainly of the Dravida form, the Rēka-nagara type, and the Kadamba-nagara model (largest in number relatively). And at Badami, we find an almost exclusive application of only the southern cimāna types wherein, again, the Dravida and Nagara-cimānas are preponderant, without any model of the Vesara type. The very close resemblance of the Dravida-cimāna superstructure of Badami with that of the corresponding Mahakut type, would seem to suggest that these are of two very closely

1 This would exclude only the Meguti temple, devoid of its superstructure, which could have perhaps carried an octagonal or a square sikhara, consistent with its early age.
succeeding stages, although the *sandhara* character of the latter and the *srandhara* character of the former (Malegitti), not unmixed with a *sandhara* (Lower Sivalaya) type as well would seem to point to the relative posteriority of the Badami enterprise. Thus dispositioned, we seem to be led to the special significance of the southern *simha* type alone prevailing and even in it the *Dravida* and the *Nagara* forms alone at Badami, the metropolitan capital of the realm, and this would seem to be susceptible to the following speculations:

Since even in the Vaisnava cave-exavation at Badami, dated 578 A.D., there is Lanjiavara (perhaps standing for the village Nandikesvara close to Mahakut) mentioned, the existence of considerable activity, in the form of temples specifically at Mahakut, which should have actually formed an integral revenue part of Lanjiavara, is seemingly self-evident. This is, of course, corroborated by the pillar inscription of Mangalesa originally in front of Makutesvara temple (perhaps as a *nimisha-tambha*), and now in the Bijapur Museum. It is not necessary to discuss here the question whether this pillar was an integral part of the Makutesvara temple as it stands today, but it would be legitimate to infer that the original Makutesvara temple was of stone alone and not perhaps much different in its model from its present day form. Thus at Mahakut, there were temples including, at least, Makutesvara, by about the close of the sixth century A.D. How far earlier we do not know at present. Additionally, the Makutesvara temple was obviously a *Dravida-simha* from the start—its later indiscriminate renovation of fabric not fortunately having impaired with its basic style and form.

The Lower Sivalaya (which, after all, might not be a Sivalaya, but for Visnu) at Badami followed this plan, and led logically, within a decade or two, to the Malegitti Sivalaya. This was just the period when there were considerable bones to pick for the early Chalukyas with the Pallavas of Kanchi, and in this process between the ascension of Pulakesi II (c. 610 A.D.) and his own liquidation at the hands of the flamboyant Narasimha I Pallava (Mamalla) in c.642 A.D., resulting in the garrisoning of Vatapi by the victorious Mamalla for nearly 12 years upto the revival of the
Chalukyan throne under Vikramaditya from 655 A.D., there should have been a subdued but fruitful era of give and take, in the field of art and architecture between the Pallavas and the Chalukyas, and one might not be far wrong in supposing that the very conception of the perfected Dravida-śāstra might have been a compendious borrowal from the former by the latter, notwithstanding the other disparate features of regional or local character that tend to show them apart. Two interesting facts seem to reinforce this proposition which, it would be obvious, is of a fundamental and momentous nature. At Mamallapuram, the earliest experimentations in the monolithic models portray the octagonal, apsidal and rectangular forms, to the exclusion of the square. The use of square in the Draupadi ratha, is to be viewed, in a different light, as the inchoate Nagarā-svēkahā-prasāde type rather than a southern śāstra form, and should not detain us here, at any rate. The first indubitable and convincing employment of the rā्मākārnamā (or square) śākhā for a southern śāstra is in the Valayankuttai and the northern Pidari rathas and these are obviously late Mamall and after, and are well entrenched in the last quarter of the seventh century A.D. The occurrence of the Nagarā-svēkahā reliefs in the bas-relief of Arjuna’s Penance and in the Ramanuja mandapa would not affect the argument very much. If we turn now to Badami itself, the Upper Sivalaya there, being the earliest nagara type of śāstra in that city—the Bhutanatha, being relatively later, though the finest, finite, southern śāstra in all respects—and this Upper Sivalaya temple is not merely a novel experimentation, but also quite obviously well prior to the sack of Badami by Mamall, c. 642 A.D., and got ruined perhaps during the holocaust, it is a rather atypical śāstra form which dispenses with the śāstra completely in all its talas in the main śāstra although, retaining as it does the yākṣa lay-out itself, not germane to the southern śāstra of the evolved kind—it shows the śāstra parapet on the outer enclosure walling. It also does not use the svēkahā. The odds are clearly in favour of Mamall’s artisans who having had a look at this impressive temple and carrying this germ idea to their native land, but under inevitable obligations to their own local idioms, were able to show
the model in reliefs and also to create the Valayankuttai and the northern Pidari rathas. If this argument is considered reasonable, as it seems to be, we then have important impacts of this element on the Chalukya-Pallava architectural concordance. Simply stated, while the southern Dravida-simana was rarer in Karnataka centres of art like Alibari and starts occurring at Mahakuta and in the early Badami stage, and is, perhaps, a borrowing from the Pallava domain where it was seemingly familiar already during the closing years of Mahendra and early years of Mamalla, correspondingly, the square Nagara-sikhara for the southern simana was, to the same degree, unfamiliar to the Pallavas till the time of Mamalla's return to his homeland after his epoch-making encampment at Badami, and was conceivably drawn from the exquisite Upper Sivallaya specimen, lending itself in due course into the creation of the Valayankuttai and the north Pidari ratha—almost at the same time as the Bhutanatha temple itself was being executed at Badami. This would give a date between c.660-675 A.D. for Bhutanatha temple there, while correspondingly, a date such as c.665 downwards should be predicated for the Valayankuttai and Pidari ratha, making these, acceptably clearly pre-Rajasimha in age and character. An important sequel to these transactions, was the rising popularity of the square sikhara in the southern simana type, destined to prevail long over a very extensive area outside Karnataka and especially outside Pallava realm (where it had only a short span of life), almost amounting to a diagnostic Pallavism, as in the Ganga, Bana, Kadamba, Irulkoval and the north Pandya zones, making all these appropriately the inheriters from Karnataka of this significant formal mutation in architectural enterprises of the South. The deep south, no doubt, continued the pristine, octagonal or Dravida-simana—as a fillip to its own inherent individuality—as in the later Pallava (under Rajasimha and early stage of Nandivarman II), entire south Pandyan and Ganga creations as at Mahbalipuram, Kanchi Kalugumalai, Sivalapperi, Tirukkurtunudi, Vijayamangalam, Kamadahalli etc. variously in which last mentioned place in the Panchakutabasti, there was almost an up-to-date display of the entire gamut of elevational elements of the three southern simana types.
II

STANDARDIZATION OF ARCHE-TYPES

The Western Chalukyan empire in the Karnataka region, and its complementary wing in the eastern Deccan under the collateral Eastern Chahukyas of Vengi under Kuya Vannuvardhana, the brother of Pulakesi II, and after, saw the flowering of an impressive variety of temple forms, in the medium of sandstone, the abstractions of which in the matter of plans and superstructural symbolism was dealt with above. The type-specimens of complete temples conforming to one or the other varieties could not be clearly drawn out, since almost every temple was a variant in itself and spoke well for the liveliness and scope of the imagination of the architect. The Ladkhan-type was itself varied into the Chikkigudi and the Gaudargudi. The Huchinalligudi and Hucchappayyagudi into the variants like Tarappagudi, Chakkara-gudi, Siddanakolla temple (away from the village, upstream Mallikarjuna into Galaganathha, Megudi temple into Melgudi at Halli, 12 miles from Bagalkot), to mention only the pre-Rashtrakuta developments. Most of these, unlike Upper Sivalaya and Malegitti Sivalaya of Badami, have pranala for the external discharge of abhiyaka water. In most cases, these are on the topmost mouldings, namely, the kapata and prati, thus testifying to the fact that the plinth is a functional platform, and that the temples were primarily constructed straightforward in stone. The earliest pranala or sala arrangement, as seen at Mahakut is a type by itself wherein an oblong or square opening was cut just into the thickness of the wall, over the topmost moulding, on the central niche of the northern wall, the statuary of the niche actually rising just above this opening. This feature is not usually found outside Mahakut, and is indeed formative in its character.

The elements of the Western Chalukyan temple would resolve
themselves into the plinth, the wall, the interior (including the sanctum) and the superstructure. The plinth has almost invariably an *upama,* *padma,* *vitta,* *tripatta* and multifloral being other varieties) *kumuda,* *kantha,* *kapota* (with the *kantha* showing a frieze of miniature sculptures in some of the earlier examples) and followed by a *yulavari* rarely, and *prati* in all cases. There is a comparative rarity of *apapitha,* but it is not entirely unknown, as seen from the Durga temple. The actual disposition here of the *apapitha,* however, is a via-media between the *jagati* terrace of the *Rekha-nagara* temples of northern India and the true *apapitha* of the lower south India. The plinth serves as a solid platform and the entire internal level of the shrine is well set on it, with a slight elevation notable for the *garbha-griha* floor.

- The walls of the temple are usually closed with a number of pierced windows placed externally within *makara-torana* reliefs, and set at the junctions between the *garbha,* *sahhamandapa* and *agramandapa.* Where it is *sandhara,* the exterior wall has a regular porched grill (*ghata-devara*) on the cardinal *khadga,* projecting rather in a subdued way. This holds good in the western and middle Chalukyan region only, for the *Rekha-nagara* or *Kadamba-nagara* type, but not for the southern *vimana* types, which, however, are provided with well projected porches on the *sahhamandapa.* In the eastern Chalukya region, however, this feature is seen borrowed from the southern *vimana* type as well now and then. The interior is almost invariably divided into a central nave and two side aisles and the relatively earlier temples alone have a porched *agramandapa,* while the subsequent ones end abruptly on the front and have only a door frame with carvings on them. The interior ceiling is well decorated only in the central nave which has an architrave and clerestory, while the side ceilings are of the slopy roo-f type and do not take any ornamentation. Even in the *Rekha-nagara* temples, there is no desire to carve out *vimana* forms known to such a temple-order of Northern India. On the other hand, there is almost a set pattern of sculptural decor of the nave ceiling, comprising either full-dress panels of the Trinity and their *murtis,* or a grid pattern scheme whose central part shows the main deity of the shrine and the remaining
show the dikapala. The use of mere large lotus medallions or nagasagni motifs for ceiling slabs are also equally common. Generally, there is no tendency to introduce an antarala or aridhamandapa, the actual internal scheme being the integration of what is truly a square open mandapa with a peripheral circuit and central raised sannas, into a longitudinal or axial scheme of nave and aisles. Thus, immediately outside the garbha-griva, there is a single-bay width which is not, truly, the antarala.

In fact, a very characteristic structural situation in the evolved Western Chalukyan temple is the integration of the garbha-griva and aridhamandapa into one unified scheme, so that the inter-connexion between the two is effected within the cela chamber in its front part by side plasters and a kind of corbelled and heavy beam members running transversely. In the earlier temples, however, whether of the Rekha-sagara or the southern emuna type, this feature is absent, although in the case of the latter, the conventional thickening of the wall to accommodate the garbha-griva, or antara-bhitti and aridhamandapa wall is followed, as is indeed the norm in deep south. In its most refinatory form, it is seen in Makutesvara at Mahakut where just outside the sanctum, only two engaged pillars are placed to serve the purpose of the dividing line between the garbha and the aridhamandapa. The front mandapa with its nave and aisles follow beyond. The integrated garbha and aridhamandapa would naturally be rectangular axially in its lay-out and this is certainly not its true form, nor is it permissible to have an axially oblong garbha-griva for any temple. The anomaly is got over by the fact that externally the Rekha-sagara-sikhara is resting only on the square main part of the garbha while the front extension of the same carries overhead the sannas serving as the roof of the aridhamandapa or antarala. This feature itself is distinctive from the southern usage where, firstly the sannas are almost invariably absent and further the garbha and its superstructure form an entity, uninterfered by any other part of temple structure. The typical examples of the combined garbha and antarala forming a single cela chamber basically, are to be seen at Pattadakal in the Kashivisvesvara and Galaganatha, and this is indeed to be taken as one of the indices of a later stage of evolution of the
regional style. While, certainly, the pilasters of the side-walls corresponding to the free-standing pillars of the central nave and supporting the load of the slopy roof, are done away with in some later specimens, they do not really form any stylistic break chronologically speaking. The idea is more to provide greater moving space around and to make the interior wall purely ashlar, while its own exterior is to be well embellished with plinth, torana, kalyanambhas, niches, angaas etc. An almost similar outlook is noticed in respect of the cells also, where internally the variation is from free-standing pillars near the corners to engaged columns or pilasters on the corners, and these also are dispensed with in some others. The exterior of the cells, however, has its own lay-out consistent with its rekha-angaas type or 'southern' simhas type. While in the latter, the angaambha line is kept straight always, with projections and recessions of the karna and bahula occurring within this line, in the former these are often of the ratha or off-setted type.

The sanctum of the Chalukyan temple, as elsewhere, has a most significant element, since that is where the deity is consecrated. It is here that the early Chalukyas, (along with, perhaps, the coastal Bhoja-Maurya, and Kadamba traces) set the pace for a meaningful systematisation of the silpa discipline which should have already been pervasively experienced. Unlike the early Pallava device of a Somaskanda panel on the back wall being the main object of worship in the sanctum, the Western Chalukyan region established the linga already in its rock-cut phase, as at Ellora, Elephanta, Jorgeswari etc. following the practice already seen in Central India or Malwa as in the Udayagiri caves near Bihla, and in doing that displayed a range of practices related to the actual installation of the deity. It thus took the form variously, of either a detachable shaft (linga) inserted in a monolithic pitha, or a totally monolithic linga and pitha or as in the structural stage, a detachable pitha as well as linga. There was an invisible unity in this triple variation, namely, that the linga shaft had actually only two parts, the lower square-sectioned (oblong) part, and the upper circular sectioned (cylindrical) part. In the jargon that came to be adopted later, they have only the
Brahma-bhaga, and the Rudra-bhaga without the intervening Vima-
bhaga. This character is not reproduced in any later linga, either 
in Karnataka of the time of the Rastrakutas, or in the south, of 
the time of the Pallavas, although Pandyas are nearer to this in 
their early specimen. The pitha is invariably square in all the 
Chalukyan examples, and changes into the circular form only 
in the Rastrakuta stage, as seen in the Caves XV and XVI at 
Ellora. Thereafter, the Rastrakuta cave temples start utilizing 
the circular shape only and are followed in this respect, in the 
south by the later Pallavas, Muttaraiyars, Iruppukonda and the 
Cholas. In Karnataka as well as in Andhradesa (under the 
Eastern Chalukyas), however, as a result of the undercurrent of the 
Chalukyan influence, we find the distinctive usage of the 
square linga-pitha alone.

In fact it could be averred without any possibility of contra-
diction that the entire Karnataka and Andhradesa, even in the 
succeeding stages, as in Nalambavadi and Gangavadi, and 
even in the peripheral Perum-Banappadi (of Brihat-Banas) took, 
with facility, to this square linga-pitha, and this preference was 
carried almost up to the very tip of the peninsula, thanks to the 
initiative of early Pandyas, in whose country, it would be very 
difficult to find out even stray specimen of the circular linga-pitha.

If cultural vogue and preference could be firm and uncompro-
mising, here is indeed a convincing example of its operation. The 
Pandyan country spread this vogue even in its cultural colony 
across the Mannar gulf, namely, Ceylon.

The polarisation of the Chalukyan architecture of Karna-
taka into the Western and the Eastern dynastic ramifications is 
itself a matter of considerable significance. It is generally accepted 
now that Kulaja Vamuvardhana, the brother of Pulakesi II 
was firm on the Eastern Andhra saddle by the second quarter of 
the seventh century A.D., and the line that he started there got 
into meaningful action, in so far as architectural patronage of 
structural temples is concerned, from about the time of Narendra 
Mrigaraja, followed by his son Gunaga Vijayaditya. This means 
that the main period of the structural architectural flowering of 
this region is from the opening of the ninth century A.D. and after.
The reason for this, which would not immediately concern us here, would have to be sought for in the remarkable and extensive rock-enterprise in this region directly attributable, on many grounds, to the same Eastern Chalukyas. Indeed, the rock-cut art of this region appears to have gone on in relatively interior areas uninterruptedly up to the campaigns of Rastrakuta Govinda III, although from the cult point of view they are merely the expressions of evolved temple organisation in the rock-cut medium, the emphasis being more on iconography than on the cave plan. The truly structural architectural phase of the Eastern Chalukyas that followed saw the finite continuity of this iconographic mainstream, but the temple model was distinctive and varied, as stated at the outset, from the norms that were evolving in Karnataka itself under the Western Chalukyas and the succeeding Rastrakutas. The primary character of these eastern Andhra idioms was that it was predominantly a southern vimana model. Northern Rajha-magar models, under Eastern Chalukyan patronage are to be seen only in certain parts of Kurnool and in adjacent northern Mahaballigrama Districts of Andhra Pradesh or further west, but not in the eastern zone. In fact, Kurnool region almost functions as a dividing line, since both southern and northern temple forms were reared side by side, an example of the former being Sangameswara, while of the latter may be mentioned Mahanandhi and Satyavolu. The elements of the former are a prevailing chaturanga or square sikara with the kara on the top tala and only the animal cognizance along the corners in a few. In addition to the above two stylistic orders, the third variant namely the Kadamba-magar type is also seen in this zone, as at Bandi Tandraipadu and Panchalingala (both near Kurnool), but they have undergone a queer transformation, namely, that instead of the tiered and alternatively recessed sikara, capped by an anuadaka of globular form as in the standard variant, it had cross-fertilised here with the prevailing southern vimana type, and had become a mere stepped tower (representing successive talas) capped by a gria and square sikara with a kalana on. Indeed, one sees a prolific occurrence of this variety in this middle zone, as at Papa-nasnam, near Alampur. It is only to be surmised that in this
last-mentioned place, this had become standardised in the later-Chalukyan phase and becomes a popular regional type, in much the same way as the tiered simple variety with upraised lotus petals along the edges also with a square **śikhara** and additionally the **ākāraṇa** as well, becomes a very characteristic type in the Kadamba country itself as at Hangil, Belagami, and later in countless other places in the Vijayanagara stage of history. This development thus is in fact early mediaeval and would not concern us directly here. It is, however, implicit that in a place like Panchalingala (Kurnool District), which has early Chalukyan inscriptions and a **śandara** temple layout suited to the typical **Rekha-nagara** type similar to Alampur temples, the present stepped **śikhara** was obviously a mediaeval renovation and replacement of the original truly **Rekha-nagara** or, more plausibly, **Kadamba-nagara** **śikhara** whose prototype is that of Mallikarjuna at Aiholi or Madhukeshvara at Banavasi.

The fact that this advanced early Chalukyan period coincides with the era of religious consolidation and **Agamic** codification is suggested by the manifestation of the **Rekha-nagara**, the southern **śimana**-type of the square, rectangular and the apsidal categories and so on, in one and the same place, as seen by the miniature experimentations at a number of sites like Satyavolu, Mahanandi, Elevaranam (from excavations) etc. In the last mentioned place, we have inscriptive evidence to show that these perhaps belong to the seventh-eighth centuries A.D., and from the point of view of architectural modelling, they seem to evidence an interplay of the truly southern **śimana** types, even among themselves. This is interestingly brought out by the fact that in an apsidal model of a shrine from this place the front of the superstructure, instead of showing a **mukha-patti** of the avāla, has the flanged front facet of a **cakrasāra-śikhara** of the southern **śimana**—a rather unique combination. These miniature specimens from Elevaranam are now in the State Archaeological Museum at Hyderabad.

The powerful art and religious patronage seen in Karnataka around the seventh-eighth centuries A.D. with its polarised eastern (Andhra-Karnata) wing under the Vengi Chalukyas went on from one innovation to another within the framework of the
regional norms, by now fast crystallising, and assisted the overall stabilisation of architectural essayings in the entire south, and facilitated also a meaningful interaction of regional styles. It must be stated here that, at this time, the lower south was deeply engaged in its own commitments in temple building and had achieved considerable cohesion already. As narrated earlier, the Draida type of southern vimana order would appear to have been the special and original contribution of the deep south to the Deccan, and this is proved, amidst other things, by the fact that the earliest productions in the monolithic and structural temple form are of the Draida type with octagonal sikhara, as with the early Pallavas; and further, the lower part of Tamilnad, in the Pandyan kingdom especially, is almost exuberantly made up of the Draida-vimana model, characterised at Kalugumalai (c. 800 A.D. or earlier). This is also the case in the lower western flank with the Gangas, as at Kambadahalli, Sravanabelgola, Vijayamangalam etc. There appears to be no doubt that this Draida-vimana was indeed the type-model of Tamilnad and its environs at the earliest level. The relative rarity of the octagonal sikhara in Karnataka and Andhradesa and the comparative preponderance of either the Nagara-vimana type (with chaturanga or square sikhara) or the Vesara type (or apsidal or hemispherical sikhara form) or the Rekha-nagara-prasada type would itself indicate this differential distribution and an implied priority of the progenitor models in the respective zones. It is in this context that is to be interpreted the all-too-frequent intercourse in peace and in war of Karnataka and Andhra, under the Chalukyas (Western and Eastern) and the Rastrakutas subsequently, with the southern Pallavas, in which the Pandyas, Banas, Gangas etc., took a ready if somewhat less historically conspicuous part, resulting in a diversification of the art trends from their pristine regional virtuosity, producing a gamut of pleasant combinations, to the degree up to which they were exposed to the impacts and influences of these neighbouring regional sub-styles. Thus, indeed were born the substyles Western Ganga, Bana, Nolamba, Vaidumba and Eastern Gangas (Kalinga), on the one hand, and Mattaraiyar and Irukkuvel and Chera substyles in the deep south, on the other. All these, it would be
turned, come within the sphere of Pallava-Pandya-Chola nuclei or southern vimana influences, while the central and upper Indian art-nexus of the sixth-seventh centuries A.D., primarily stands for the northern (Rakha-nagara) sphere of influence. Between the two, Karnataka with its prime centres around Aiholi, Badami, and Pattadakal, and at Ellora in the Western India, and in the middle and eastern Andhra zones (as in the Kurnool and Mahboobnagar districts and Krishna-Guntur districts respectively) offered its own special contribution through an early assimilation and regeneration of the Rakha-nagara-prasada and the "southern" vimana orders, giving rise to almost a fresh set of idioms, typical of the region, but integrating and polarising the trends already, imbited. The respective archetypes of this new movement would have to be seen at Aiholi and Pattadakal on the one hand, at Alampur and Satyavolu in middle country and at Chebrolu and Bicavolu in eastern Andhra tract. Its ramifications fanned out up to Sandur in Bellary District where on the top of the hill we have a clumsily renovated early Karnataka temple model of the southern vimana type, going now by the name of Parvati shrine locally. The archetype of the home zone would be delineated first in some detail, before we could pass on to a consideration of the extent of indebtedness that Ganga, Nolamba and Bana substyles had to the Karnataka formulations.

Pattadakal, notwithstanding its early mention as the village Kauvoolal in Chalukyan inscriptions (as for instance, that of Mangalesa on a pillar, now in Bijapur Museum, originally found in front of Makutesvara temple at Mahakuta), did not ostensibly attain any special importance as the venue of intéressant temples before the time of Chalukya Vikramaditya I when the fortunes of the Badami throne were restored after the Pallava occupation. The Sangamesvara temple at Pattadakal, called Vijayesvara, should perhaps be attributed to Vijayaditya (696-735) on inscribed evidence. The Papanatha shrine at the same place is quite obviously much earlier and was probably one of the first batch of temples coming up at Pattadakal in the reign of Vikramaditya I. Karlasiddesvara, at the northern end of the present temple group here, was also seemingly one of these earliest, overal
with Papanatha or even slightly preceding it. The fact that
these two occupy the fringes of the present village, while most
of the remaining ones are in a compact and close group would
seem to uphold the thesis that the centre of greatness shifted around
Sangamesvara and Lokesvara (Virupaksha) in the first half of the
eighth century A.D. Kasivisvesvara was perhaps the very last
among the Chalukyan creations here, while, in all probability,
Chandrasekhara on the one hand and the Jain temple of the
village on the road to Nandikesvar on the other, were post-Chalukya
and Rashtrakuta productions. The Papanatha temple is archaic
to a degree in its combination of the hara parapet of the southern
vimana usage of the early Chalukyas with the truly andhara and
Raksha-ragini shrine lay-out. The rather subdued sukanasi, the
petite sikhara outline, the incipient pillared porch projection on
the cardinal points of the sanctum on the outer wall, the rather
straight and unrelieved line of mahamandapa and rangamandapa
strike the disequilibrium between the carved exterior and the
inadequate pierced windows of the two front halls; all support
its early stage at Pattadakal. Sangamesvara is indeed equally
distinctive as an early stage of the southern vimana characterised
by the unique lack of karnakutas, but only the sela in the uppermost
tala-hara of the superstructure—a feature which was further
played upon in Virupaksha itself, by not showing the sela and
displaying only the karnakutas of the top tala-hara. Sangamesvara
in every respect is a direct evolutionary stage, though with a
probable chronological gap, after upper Sivalaya of Badami.
Another distinction of it in tune with Upper Sivalaya—a feature
which is shared by Bhutanatha temple at Badami—is the absence
of the akasa, which is such a typical concomitant of all other
southern vimanas at Pattadakal and Ellora. This tends to
show that there was a distinctive auxiliary pattern, influenced
strongly by the southern Tamil nad tradition, working on the
Karnataka matrix at this time, facilitated by the political see-saw
tussle between Chalukyas and Pallavas. In tune with the delib-
erate variations experimented at Pattadakal should also be
listed variably, the usage of the circular or sara sikhara for the
Mallikarjuna temple close to Virupaksha, the strong influence
of the Gurgara-Prathihara art in the Kasivisvesvara temple sakama and main shrine elevation, and the rather dominating and massive character of the sikhara piece of Galaganatha with its relatively plain exterior wall and large panel carvings on the cardinal points of the inner shrine circuit, making it ascribable to the close of the early Chalukyan experimentation in the second quarter of the eighth century A.D. The last was also, by and large, perhaps the largest Rekha-nagara-prasada known at Pattadakal, although much of its ranganandapa and basal terrace had disappeared.

The Alholi situation in the second half of the seventh and the first half of the eighth century A.D. is somewhat more diffuse, since local idioms continued to have a greater sway there for a while. Huchchimalligudi, Huchchapayyyagudi, Durga temple and Mallikarjuna would all have been complete already before this phase and the new ventures were probably Tarappagudi, Naranagudi, Saddapagudi, Siddamakolla, on the side of the Rekha-nagara model, Gaudargudi and Galaganatha on the Kadamba-nagara side and Navidadanagudi alone on the southern vimana type; Huchchapayyatamatha, rectangular shrined temples just across the sand on the way to Galaganatha from the village, and the small group near Chikkigudi, would all, on the other hand, pertain to the degenerate local ashlar, cut stone idiom in a state of atavism, emphasising slopy roofs and improvised shrine arrangements of single or multiple type within. Alholi witnessed a state of transition in the first half of the eighth century A.D. from the preponderance of Rekha-nagara temples to those of the southern vimana type and these latter have been given a special boost by the Kavarakutus from the close of the eighth and early ninth century A.D., resulting in such piles as the Jain group near the school, and the Galaganatha eastern group near the dolmen. It should perhaps be at this time that the superstructure of Kontigudi should have arisen in its present form, added to what might have looked like a mandapa shrine of the degenerate type, just referred to above. At a subsequent time, the Kadamba-nagara mode gained ascendancy, in a transmuted and stylised sikhara model, with the nakasana becoming increasingly more prominent and massive and the multiple shrines also becoming common. These are indeed of
the late Rastrakuta or early Kalyana Chalukya stage, whose
archetypes are to be seen in Maddinagudi and in some among
the surrounding temples of Brahmanical and Jaina affiliations.
They are more profuse in the tracts of the Kadamba feudatories
ruling from Goa, Hangal, Banavast, and subservient to the Kalyana
Chalukyas.

Farther afield, in the mid-lower Deccan, the provincial
Andhra-Karnata territories have the Bakha-nagara style, with the
bias for a sandhara lay-out of more than one circuit sometimes
with ghana-devara of grill type having weak porch projections,
dominating the scene, although nirandhara groups are also common.
The former are exemplified at Alampur ranging in age between
the second half of the seventh century A.D. to the end of the eighth
century A.D. in their primacy, while the latter are to be seen at
Satyavolu and Mahanandi, towards the close of the same period.
In these latter, the sukhanasa becomes massive with a large Tandava
Siva tabhara on the kulu depression. It would seem that there
was still no lack of inventive skill among the guilds of artisans,
and these are notable in the southern simasa productions at
Alampur itself, as in the Taraka Brahma, and at Sandur in the
Parvati temple. The former is certainly not much earlier than
the beginning of the eighth century A.D., while the latter could
be placed in the middle of the eighth century A.D. These are
very significant landmarks stylistically of the Chalukya-Karnata
models, as impinging on the peripherial tracts, because the Eastern
Chalukya idioms proper in the Andhradesa, even in the contact
zone around Kunool district where Satyavolu and Mahanandi
are located, were of a typical fabric, quite distinctive from the
Western Chalukya trends. The most notable absence in these
would be that of sukhanasa in any of the Eastern Chalukya or
(Andhra -Karnata) temples of the southern simasa type, and in this
respect seemingly in a collateral succession of the norms seen at
Badami, Nagaral, and Parpadakal (Sangamesvara). These are,
however, predominantly again sporting only a chaturra (square)
sikhara but carry forth the grill windows, the kapota-panjara, the
plinth-modes, and the projecting porch wings etc., of their western
compers, grafting these elements to a prevailingly southern
The archetypes are to be seen at Sangamesvara temple near Siddhesvaram in Kurnool District, at Pondugala and Chelrodi both in Guntur District, and at Biccavolu in East Godavari District. It is this refreshing differentiation between the architectural formulations of the areas ruled by the collateral kinsmen of the Badami line in Andhra Pradesh, that vindicates alike the supremacy of the imagination and local skill of the artisan-guilds, and the deep-rooted traditional bias in favour of the southern summa order in lower eastern Andhra Pradesh bordering on the Tamil country. The entire area (of coastal Andhra) from Srikakulam District downwards to Guntur and Nellore Districts is a solid southern sphere on architectural considerations, and acted in unison with the southern zone covering the entire Tamilnad, its western peripheral tract and lower Mysore area ruled by the Ganges, Nolambas, and Banas. A look at the chart (Fig. 1) would make this amply clear. These southern dynasties are seen in temporal affiliation with all the three prevailing political foci of the eighth century A.D., namely, the Kannada-speaking western Chalukya, the Andhra-based Eastern Chalukya, and the Tamil speaking Pallava. There was a remarkable degree of interrelationship among these larger powers as well as the smaller vassal potentates. For instance, the Kadambas and the Nolambas had their matrimonial ties with almost every one of the important kingdoms of Tamilnad and Karnataka. The Banas were virtually a peripatetic group extending their links from the western uplands of Chittoor, Nellore and Kolar districts to North Arcot of Tamilnad. The Ganges of Tallad again had close ties with the Pallavas, the Pandyas, the Banas and the Chalukyas and, later with the Cholas also. The Vaidumbas, again, were like the Banas occupying a part of the strategic hill valley approach from Karnataka to Tamilnad across Cuddapah, Chittoor and Kolar Districts, and were so acknowledged as the border vassals by Tamil kings as well as the Karnataka rulers. In such a context, the brisk manner in which the amalgamation of art impulses took place in these tracts should not occasion any surprise. The archetypes of the Nolambas are to be seen at their old capital Hemavan or Henjeru in Anantapur District, of the Banas at Nandi and
Gudimallam, of the Vaidumbas at Kalakada and Attirala, of the Western Gangas at Sravanabelgola, Kambadahalli, Vijayamangalam etc., and the Eastern Gangas at Mukhalingam and Srikurum. The last mentioned being again a border territory, was open to the powerful impact of the Kalinga style of the Rakshamgara as well as the pitha-deul (akin to Kadamba-nagara) categories already entrenched there. But the southern smana style, all the same, got a foothold there as at Srikurum in the best Karnataka style with the octagonal aikhara, lack of makanaya, lack of ila in the top talare, having the hari parapet all around the temple unit in its front mandapa roof and having pierced windows and relief carvings on the exterior wall. We are not much concerned here with the local inflexions of the subsequent stages of this temple here under the Eastern Gangas and the Kakatiyas. The existence of the pitha-deul type, affiliated to Kalinga order (as at Vaital deul of Bhubaneshwar) at Mukhalingam, in the Madhukesvara temple as well as in the Bhimeswara temple in the village while the Somasvara temple in the same place outside the village is a typical Kalinga Nagara-rekha-prasada would also, in comparison, with a similar situation in Western India with Kadamba-nagara, Chalukya-Rakshamgara and smana orders, fully sustain the polyphylar variation of the temple-building norms in South India, by which the same zone, under adventitious circumstances reveal multiple models. This would incidentally mark out some of these zones as primary or nuclear tracts of inception of temple formulations in their formative stages.

Some of the idioms that help us in seeing a link between Karnataka norms and the features employed in some of these southern substyles (like the Gangas, Nolambas, Banas etc.) are the use of free-standing pillars, conversion of the urdhvanandapa from the mahamandapa, the closed walled mahamandapa with rectangular pierced windows and decorated exterior walls by way of pilasters, torana-niches etc., the abrupt front side of the mahamandapa without a mahamandapa porch (which was a characteristic feature of the early phase of the Western Chalukyan art in Karnataka but followed only in the Andhra-Karnataka zone of Alampur and not at all followed in the eastern Andhra area), the replacement
of the southern practice of free-standing _divarapala_ by the more preferred use of jambas and lintel embellishment wherein deities in a _tallem_ are on the lintel, floral devices are on the jamba (upper part) and _divarapala_. Ganga-Yamuna and attendance are on the lower jambas, the invariable use of the octagonal or square _sikhara_ alone and very rarely of the circular _sikhara_ (except at an innovation), and above all the immutable attachment of the square _anga-pitha_ in the sanctum. While it would appear that the Vadamba and the Banas were less liable to use all these features in the temples and were architecturally ambivalent absorbing the southern as well as Karnataka _vimana_ models, the Gangas and Nolambas were more steadfast in this adherence. In the later Chalukyan devolution from the tenth century A.D. onwards, notwithstanding the remarkably sophisticated regional variations into main Karnataka, Kadamba (or Kuntala) and Hoysala (Gangavadi) moulds the matrix was unswervingly southern though the _vimana_ is sometimes assiduously fostered that the temple perspective has adopted the _Rekha-nagara_ pharaseology. A luxury unknown to the pure southern _vimana_ that was consciously adopted in these later devolutions would be variously the _samanta_, the _jagati_ terrace, and the depiction of the _nara_, _gaja_ _yata_, and _anasas_ etc., in some of the temples, as in the Hoysala classics at Halebid and Somanathpur, and the feverish ornamental exuberance employed to activate the otherwise placid square or simply offset plinth into a gyrating and dynamic haven for the divinity enshrined within. This tendency had caught on in the whole of the Deccan, as with the Yadavas, Kakatiyas etc., under the northern _Rekha-nagara_ aegis, in the mediaeval times. But in the Karnataka area, this mediaeval Hoysala pure temple elevation in its constituent limbs was ending with a _sikhara_ and not an _amalaka_, and thus was of the _makara_ southern order, though its overall slant was, more after the prevailing Kadamba model (dealt with in these earlier pages) than the true southern type. While analytically it conformed thus to the southern _vimana_ order, it synthesised the inherent elements of the southern _vimana_ and _Nagara-rekha-pratisara_, and far from becoming castes, emerged unscathed from this exercise, into a refreshing novel _vimana_, which
would have pleased the lapidary as much as the architect. It was the very ultimate in aesthetic sublimation, and was for its own period what the Kailasa monolith of Ellora constituted for the earlier rock-cut era.
III

CANONICAL AND AESTHETIC ELEMENTS

A

Adhiathana and linga in sanctum

Unlike the deep southern Indian experimentations in architecture, the use of a brick and stucco material for the ground sata and superstructure or the latter alone was apparently unheard of in Karnataka. The earliest activity, after the cave-art phase, was thus confidently initiated directly in the sandstone medium, and a regular plinth of stone displaying the mouldings—by now slowly gaining usage and preference in each region—was the norm. This is a very significant factor because, if the plinth could be of moulded stone courses, the question of the wall and the superstructure alone being of brick might not arise. It certainly did not in Karnataka. Even in the further Southern India, a brick temple never normally had a stone plinth except in rare instances—to be explained further down—due either to the fact that cut stone architecture (in granite) had not made any significant headway by then, or for the more obvious and tangible reason that a brick structure has a firmer bonding in mortar, and thus would not have called for any specially heavy stone foundation. Either way, the sequel to it was that the sanctum where the image of god was enshrined, had to be at the top level of this stone plinth, whereas had the temple been of brick it would not have been much higher than the surrounding ground level or the prakara floor level. Only if the temple is erected on a terrace of its own, things might have been different, but early Chalukyan temples in this respect were of the southern tradition and not given to a built-up jagati terrace around the shrine proper, as used to obtain in Northern India from the Guptas and the Gurjara Pratiharas downwards.
An interesting rule enjoined by the Agama and silpa texts is that the image of the deity in the sanctum should correspond in its raw-material to that of the temple itself. By this procedure, a brick temple should have invariably a stucco image, or alternatively a wooden image, but not certainly a stone image, be it an icon or a linga. It is on this principle that ancient brick temples, when later converted into stone temples, have a reconsecrated, new stone image contemporary with this stone construction. The corollary to this injunction is that a stone temple should not have any icon or (anicomic) linga, other than stone. Acting on this corollary, sometimes, a temple though erected on a stone plinth, and if required to rise in many talas in brick and if enshrining an original sanctified wooden image which is not to be changed into any other medium, has never been rebuilt later in stone but only repaired or conserved in the brick medium itself. All this is fully borne out by countless examples in Tamil country, and go to suggest how canonical injunctions had been meticulously preserved in the South. The Karnata area, however, cut the gordian knot, as it were, by ubiquitously utilising sandstone, from the beginning, and thus was always entitled to a stone image or linga in the sanctum. This image, however, was either fixed in a regular pitha (or pedestal) or raised over the floor with only a semblance of a pindika or ridged border around it on the floor. The former is the more common feature and it is seen that this pitha was invariably square in outline, and carries the characteristic mouldings of a Chalukya temple plinth, like the padma, kunala, kantha and kapata. At the same time, conformity to Agamas had led them sometimes to adopt a variant shape, as in the case of Durga temple at Aiholi, where this pitha is circular, seemingly because the shrine itself is apsidal. This is a feature which is even more sedulously followed in the South, where in many post-Agamic temples, the sikhara shape almost fixes the shape of the pitha on which the deity or linga stands, an octagonal sikhara thus having an octagonal pitha in the sanctum, a circular sikhara endowed with a circular or elliptical pitha, and a square sikhara square pitha. These should give us an insight into the prevalence of the Agama mandate in these regions and help us sometimes even for chrono-
logical fixation, either of the temple or of the Agamas, when the age of the temple is known by other means. In early Chalukya temples of Karnataka, even the linga is distinctive and is broadly divisible into early and evolved stages, the earlier ones, whether rock-cut (as at Ellora, Elephanta etc.) or structural, have only the square-sectioned lower half (designated as the Brahma-bhaga in the later texts) and the circular-sectioned and cylindrical shaped upper part (to be called the Rudra-bhaga), unlike the evolved lingas which have an intermediate octagonal part (called Vima-bhaga). These early Chalukya lingas have an additional feature sometimes, (as in all the cases at Ellora and Elephanta) of being bulged and heavy in their upper end and rather leaner and constricted at the waist, just above the pitha. Such lingas are designated as the ara-lingas, and ıspa facto connote a proto-Agamic or early usage. The ara type could, alternatively, be of the tapering end part and heavy basal part also, as seen at Arvalem (Goa) and in certain cases of cave temples in South Tamilnad and Kerala. Thus, the pioneering character of the early Chalukyan cult concepts for linga in the sanctum and the pitha on which images are erected, is well upheld. This very usage of the terms Brahma, Vima and Rudra for square, octagonal and circular, is of universal currency in Agamic texts, even for describing parts of pillars of such cross-sections. Obviously, they derive themselves from the original names of basic shapes (already dealt with earlier) such as Vama for square, Karina for circular and Trikuta for octagonal—this Trikuta apparently standing for the world of Vima.

III. Orientation of linga

The position of the linga with reference to its pitha was never fixed originally by devices which obtain later, like the Brahmanaldi, the parasuraram etc. Two reasons are implicit in this, namely, the popularity of the sarvabhadra-Siva shrine and image, abstracted from the Mahavira concept of the god involving four heads, Agna, Vamadeva, Talpura, and Sadajanta on four cardinal points, and linga on the top. This icon with a four-door sanctum (as exemplified at Elephanta) would not require any fixed orientation. Secondly, the very origin of the linga has no direct relationship with what it turned out to be in the pre-medieval times—a phallic
analogue—and had essentially a pillar concept wherein the madhya-
and parvanatra lines might not be opposite. Even in the
evolved pre-mediaeval linge, it is possible to posit that these lines
have an essential functional character of delineating the orientation
of the linge—which is otherwise cylindrical, in any given shrine.
For, an image in a sanctum, according to the Agama, should have
the feature of orientation. This is why these lines rise from the
very base of the linge and are up towards the upper centre. If
phallic archetype was intended, these lines should have been
restricted to the uppermost zone of the linge shaft.

(iii) Mahesa

Talking of the Mahesa concept and sarnatobhayaka shrine unit,
the early Chalukyas had indeed been responsible for the Sadana
as well as the Mahesa concepts. In this, the latter always showed
the Vamadeva part on the proper left and Aghora on the proper
right. This is what we see at Elephanta and in the textual source.
But at Ellora in the post-Chalukyan and Rashtrakuta stage (as in
the Ganesh Lena group, Lankesvara etc.) we have quite a large
number of Mahesa images wherein the Aghora is to the proper
left and Vamadeva to the proper right. This, by its studied repeti-
tion, will have to be taken as having a direct relationship at
Ellora to the western orientation of the entire row of cave shrines.
The Agama period essentially purports to base its propositions
for an east-facing temple—the most normal and suitable direction
for a temple. When the temple, of necessity, does face only west,
a rotation by 180° appears to have taken place in the Mahesa icon,
resulting in the placing of Aghora to proper left and Vamadeva to
proper right. In such a case, the central figure itself would not
indeed be Tutparusa, but Sadpyajata. This special and unique
transformation of the Mahesa orientation is also repeated elsewhere
in one of the Eastern Chalukya cave groups at Bhairavakonda
in Nellore District, where, again, the Mahesa panel is carved on
the back wall of the sanctum behind linge, as at Ellora. Inci-
dently, this feature occurs in the north also in Mewar (Rajasthan)
as at Chitorgarh, where two temples—Samiddhesvara and Adhish-
tanatha—have Mahesa panels in the sanctum, and these facing
west, follow the laterally transposed arrangement mentioned
above for the Rastrakuta specimens at Ellora. In the Eastern Chalukyan country itself, this Rastrakuta impulse is carried forward to the structural architectural stage of the ninth-century A.D. also, as seen in the Sangamesvara temple at Siddhesvara in Kurnool district, where a seated Maha figure is found in a niche on the back wall of the sanctum. It only shows an aspect of the diffusion, characteristic of cult images, notwithstanding handicap in the path of their dissemination.

[iv] Sukanasa

The Karnataka temple style was the first to adopt, again, the sukanasa feature. It would not need much argument to show, as already done earlier, that this feature was germane only to Rakho-nagara-prasada, and not to the talachandras of a southern simana. Thus, when the early Western Chalukyas utilised it, they had deliberately employed them for the Rakho-nagara temples primarily, but occasionally to the southern order that they initiated. Here, however, they were very particular to design it in such a way that it might harmonise with the tala-pattern of the simana model. For this purpose, they adopted the talo-simana design of an alta-simana for the sukanasa pattern and erected it at the roof level, in front of the prastara of the ground talas. They showed also the southern simana models without the sakanasa, cf. Upper Sivalaya, Malegitti Sivalaya, Bhutanaisha, Makutewar and Mallikarjuna at Mahakut, Sangamesvara of Pattadakal etc. They did not adopt the sukanasa in the Kadamba-nagara type as well, as the Mallikarjuna and Galaganatha temples at Aiholi and the western (rear) row of temples near the tank at Mahakut, would show. Thus they had the deliberate intention of integrating the northern feature of sukanasa in their temples, although in the truly southern simana this was used only optionally. This option was followed by Rastrakutas also as at Ellora (Kailasa and Chihota Kailasa), and was continued in later Chalukyan and Hysala sub-styles as well, as an ubiquitous feature. Needless to say, a few other northern characteristics were also integrated with the southern simana by them like the jagati terrace, the animal-and-human-frieze dharar of the plinth, as narrated already in an earlier section. The reason why the sakanasa was made a
characteristic feature by the Western Chalukyas would seem to stem directly from the impact of the northern temple forms on the Chalukya matrix more incessantly than the southern, the latter largely happening only after the overpowering of the Badami throne temporarily by the Pallavas. It would be seen that the Eastern Chalukyan wing deliberately and scrupulously avoids the akasa feature in its temples, and in this, it is only bearing testimony to its closeness to the southern sannata tradition, as already adumbrated in the Tamil country and disseminated to its environs. Adoption of the akasa in a truly southern sannata in the heart of the Tamil country had also occasionally taken place, as in the Nageswara temple, Kumbakonam, and in a modified form, in the temples at Tanjore and Gangaikondacholapuram. It should be stated that the akasa is stylistically more germane to the slopy-roofed side aisles and the flat central clerestory roof, and should have mainly owed itself to this character, whereas the garba and ardhamandapa unit which is invariably the lay-out in an early southern sannata of the deeper south India would not have the artistic scope, nor function, for the akasa on the ardhamandapa roof. We are, thus, in a position to detect two viable but coincident traits of sannata models, with as well as without the akasa, within the early Karnataka architectural complex itself, a feature, as already stated, which was optionally employed in the Kadamba-sagara model also, in a like manner.

v) Sikara variations

The most spectacular manifestation of the Karnataka temple order is the differentiation of its sikara idiom. It utilizes the Rasava-sagara curvilinear sikara, the Kadamba-sagara variant with amalaka on top but without (or with) akasa, and the southern sannata forms with octagonal (Dravida), square (Nagara) and circular or apsidal (Vesava) sikara forms. Of course, it could be established that the Dravida-sikara form of the latter group is the oldest. This early Dravida-sikara temple of Karnataka also shows the presence of the kara at the very top tala, as well as kasi in three-fourth relief against the corner facets of the sikara, rising from the corners of the griha-śindii. This feature, though in mild variation and manifest clumsiness, is typologically closer to the
'Mamalia' stage of temples in Tondaimandalam, as at Mahabalipuram. In the early square sikha type of Karnaataka, however, bharas have been entirely dispensed with, as in the Upper Sivalaya at Nargaral or only the bharas or taliars are shown, as in Virupaksha and Sanganeswara respectively at Pattadakal. This square bharas type became the norm in the Eastern Chalukyan complex, particularly the ones like Upper Sivalaya, as seen at a number of places like Bieavolu, Draksharama etc. But the bharas in all these cases where the bharas are shown, are entirely of the arpita or the applique variety, and practically not a single instance exists of the anarpita variety. This would mean that these superstructural towers with their bharas were practically to serve as one tower unit cohesively, and made the basal width of the wall of the cartha rather unduly heavy and massive. They had only the stone sima model but not necessarily the earlier brick and timber sima models, owing to the dominance of the Buddhist brick Chaitya-Stupa form earlier in this region. These conceivably were restricted only to the lower southern part of the peninsula.

The anarpita bharas of the southern type, however, deliberately divides the plan into bahubhiti, alindra, antara-bhitti, and grihapinda and where there is only one wall, as in a nirnadhala lay-out, manages to raise the superstructure by corbelling, and it is owing to this reason, that it had initially had only brick and stucco superstructure which it directly imitated in stone later, by the mastery achieved in granite stone-cutting, in adventurous localities. This, by itself, would show that the sima order of the Karnataka country was a derived product and not of the primary character, as in the early Pallava-Pandy-Chola regions. This is of great significance.

B

The Chalukya architectural style is well supported by its own sculptural art which embellishes the temple exterior. The sculptural art, however, had an edge over structural architecture, owing to its continuous usage in the cave art phase, unlike in the Brahmanical cave temples as in the earlier Buddhistic caves. This explains why in the cave temples of Ellora, Elephanta, Badami etc., the sculptural art is conspicuous though not dominant.
The Brahmanical cave art of the Chalukyas, in one sense, could be said to have set the pattern for the relative arrangement of architectural and sculptural decor of the temples, since the cave temple has merely to be turned inside out, for its conversion into structural model with its carved wall panels. This would also justify why the art of the figure-carving had already its classification by the time the architect had been struggling with his earliest free-standing structural temple of a complete unit and modest proportions. Also, the freedom that the sculptor had for carving surface in cave art style was not there in a structural temple, where the architectural outline, its longitudinal strike, elevational profile and disposition of the wall-constituents like pilasters, grill windows, niches etc. would have a clear priority over the iconographic ornamentation. This is patent even in a primarily sculptured enterprise like the monolith Kailasa at Ellora, where, by any standard, it would be admitted that it is the architecture that dominates the scene. The sculpture, notwithstanding its profusion as well as conceptual profundity, had to be billeted out on the extraneous locations, and not so much on the main temple interior and exterior. Thus, in the early Chalukya structural temple itself, we see a disciplining of the sculptor’s role developing, as a sequel to which, carvings both decorative as well as figural, are very unobtrusively harmonised with the temple form: on the railings, pillars, grill windows, plinth friezes etc. Only niche-sculptures have a well-planned or pre-meditated stamp, but otherwise any sculptured surface ornamentation was fully taxing the ingenuity of the sculptor, for selecting suitable space. The Virupaksha temple at Pattadakal or the Durga shrine at Aihole is an ideal case in point, where the exuberance of the sculptor had, notwithstanding the ponderosity of the structural body, been well manifest, and in the process is almost mantled or engraved on even the mouldings and other structural limbs of the temple. The size of these secondary carved figures had somewhat become diminutive or even reduced to mere cameos or caricatures, but the style had not suffered any deterioration.

Indeed, as a logical culmination of this enforced disciplining of carved exuberance, the medieval Hoysala or later Chalukyan
temples of Karnataka, burst out into a complete fusion of decorative exterior and structural fabric of the temple. This development, in this intensity, is nowhere else found in the south, since the rise of canonical injunctions and treatises had generally the effect of polarising architecture and iconography into two independent and isolated entities, resulting in the purely ritual rule of the figure sculptures on the specified points of compass on the walls and bestowing an austere splendour on the architectural framework. It was a direct bequeathal perhaps of the Chalukya art which was, from its inception, never utterly divorced of its teochastic for figure carving—which was its very life breath—that the early temples thus are dexterous essays in the balance of the two.

While this situation was made more complex by the urge to carve out verily countless cameos of the Puranic, epic and other legendary myths and episodes, sometimes in a sequential or narrative pattern on the pillars or the plinth, the relative preponderance of aesthetics and perspective over functional or didactic carvings was never completely lost sight of. This meant that, on the one hand, the exterior pillars were always made to look elegant by large sized carvings of mithunas or couples on its lower part and its upper brackets, while in the interior, the pilasters had a similar scheme, the free-standing pillars alone showing the diminutive carvings and embellishments. The mithunas were, certainly, very inconspicuous and relatively less in the cave stage, and even where present, had occupied, as mentioned above for structural temples, only the facade pillars, or brackets of interior pillars. But now in the early structural temples, they had been rehabilitated and are to be considered as quantitatively forming one of the largest categories of sculptures in a temple. It is seen that even in a relatively simple temple with ashlar walls, the door frame with its Ganga-Yamuna motif was made very elaborate, the river goddesses made the cynosure of attraction and of disproportionately large size for this purpose. The ceilings similarly became the loci of a set pattern of the Trinity or for a grid-pattern scheme for the carvings of lokapalas etc. The mithunas were, undoubtedly, the result of a great volume of literature growing up.
the secular graces of femininity and the sophisticated approach of a Nagarakha towards ladies in society. They became, in effect, the back-drops, the perceptible mantle in which the ineffable but pervasive beatitude of divinity within the temple was wrapped, so that passing through one experience—the mundane, physical and fickle glamour—one attains the other—the ethereal and enduring communion with God.

There is an interesting aspect of some of these early Chalukya sculptures, namely, that they are carved in sīta on the temple walls often. Of course, this is a direct corollary to the soft stone medium, like sandstone which they adopted, wherein even architectural mouldings are carved not functionally but as composite blocks of stone which when reassembled would delineate the architectural constituents, in relief, but not in individual detachable parts. It is on this score that we have, in many early temples like Ladhkhan, the corner cantoning pilasters of outer wall, actually arranged in coursed blocks successively raised, the adjoining wall as well as the pilaster cut on the same common blocks. Again, at Sangamesvara at Pattadakal, the divinities detailed for being carved out on the wall sections of the ground floor have not, in many cases, been completed to this day and have only been blocked and roughed out. The question would arise if the temple could have been consecrated when these are so unfinished. The fact of the matter is that for the consecration of a temple, indeed the carvings of the exterior walls are not a necessary preconditions; the tower should be complete up to the *kalasa* point (the *kalasa* being the most important member, added only on the day of consecration and a temple without *kalasa* being unfit for worship at any time) and the sanctum being provided with the pedestal and the image duly carved according to specifications. The temple wall decoration could actually be completed simultaneously or in due course.

But, the very incomplete character of the carvings in the temple like Sangamesvara, while most of the remaining architectural parts of the superstructure are completed in detail, would show that it was the in sīta character of the blocks carrying the carved (or to be carved) figures that could have been the cause of this
lapse. While the temple wall had been duly erected and finished off, the carvings had not been able to keep pace with the progress and had been left incomplete and later, due perhaps to the lack of a sculptor who could really complete it in a way originally designed, they were allowed to stand as they are. However, in a temple like Virupaksha, the niches have blocks of stone which carry the carvings. These had obviously been carved separately and inserted at will and in time. In fact, quite a few of the sculptured slabs in this temple might not originally have belonged to the niche or to this temple. All the same, their very technique of being loose detachable stele, was conducive to their presenting always a finished appearance in the niche or presenting only an empty niche. This is a typically southern structural architectural feature although even here, monolithic temples had naturally in situ carvings. But in the Chalukyan country, early structural temples carried this practice of carving the sculpture in situ, due to the soft medium, and this placed the onus of completing the carvings on the sculptor, while the architect would have already assembled the very stone blocks which are to be carved, in their proper place, and thus completed his part of the assignment.

An unusual feature of the sanctum of early Chalukya cave temples is that by the side of the linga pitha, immediately below its water-chute projection is to be found a square or circular depression socket on the floor, apparently intended to collect the abhisheka water and to bale it out by normal process. This is, of course, the result of the shrine being a cave model, whereas in a structural temple, the carimarga would have led the abhisheka water in the sanctum, through a prasala outside the shrine wall. This feature of the cave model was so ubiquitousy followed in the subsequent Rastrakuta cave temples, and also in almost all the forty odd Pattiyai and Muttaraiyar cave temples of Tamil country that one is left without doubt about the great impact that early Chalukya cave temple style had over these regions. Added, especially, is the fact that the very character of carving the linga and the pitha both, or at least the pitha alone, in live rock in the sanctum was both an innovation that the Chalukyan cave temples
initiated for the first time, and was not found in vogue in any of the Pallava cave temples.

Invariably, the Karnataka temple is a unitary temple without any parivara shrines. The parivara-devata are all carved in various parts of the temple. Rarely, however, provision is made for a rectangular sañcetra shrine on the western side of the temple. The only case where a regular sañcetra (sixteen) parivara shrine lay-out is provided as part of the temple scheme is for Virupaksha temple at Pattadakal. Here, seemingly, the analogue was the Kailasanatha at Kanchi, although in the latter place, the parivara shrines, started perhaps from Mahendra II and finally completed up to the time of Paramesvaravarman II, are 64 in number, including the main shrine. All the same, we might take that the separate parivara lay-out element was essentially a southern innovation and was assimilated by the Pandya, the Muttaraiyars, and the Irukkuvela and later by the Cholas. The Rastrakuta king Krishna, again, followed a parivara lay-out in the Kailasa, only on this analogy, although in consideration of the rock-cut medium, he kept the number reduced to an astaparivara complex. We do have in the northern temple style in Malwa astaparivara unit at Dharwar. But it was obviously posterior to the Chalukya cave art phase and had thus no influence on it, but rather in the reverse direction was a borrowing from the Rastrakuta application of it at Ellora, notwithstanding the difference in temple style as well as religious affiliation, since it was Vaisnava in character. The pañcayatana, again suffers a similar fate. This is certainly not known in the Chalukyan region as well as in the deep south. But it is also attempted for the first time perhaps at Ellora, as seen on the southern roof top of Kailasa, just directly above the triple-storied cave, on the southern court. Its date is certainly within the Rastrakuta activity at Ellora, but very likely later to the Kailasa and perhaps of the time of Govinda III or Sarva-Arthavardhana in the early decades of the ninth century A.D. It combines the pañcayatana lay-out with a series of gopura-dvaras on the centre of the fully shown prakara wall feature—not germane to the northern pañcayatana type. It further actually shows the larger central shrine superstructural model as well as the corner ones of smaller alpa-rimana
size, abutting on the angles of the prakara, in the typically southern sima form. But then, it is well-known that the Rastrakutas had a built-in preference in architecture for the typical southern order, while yet imbued with a few Deccan features.

That the Karnataka art under the Chalukyas was a gulf bridging the northern and the southern orders of architecture is more than established by the present study. But the proclivity for certain northern trends in iconography, in preference to the southern, appears to be not so explicit. The reason for such a preference would seem to be the impact of the central Indian and west Indian region on Karnataka more directly than the south. This characteristic is, for instance, observed in icons like Mahishamardini, Umapahesvara, Ganesa etc., in the former, and the absence generally of a regular lalata-bimba on the lintel of the door frame of the garbha in the southern sima. In fact, southern temples have a very simple and plain door frame for the cela, without any carvings, except the dvaramukha and the trivikrama arch, in the cave stage, and without these two also in the structural stage, where these are shifted to the flanks of the ardhamandapa and mahamandapa entrance variously. The absence of Ganesa in the southern temples of the early Pallavas is particularly noteworthy. They occur for the first time in the temples of Rajaraja (c. 700-728 A.D.), while they are more prolific in the Pandyan cave temples earlier than this date as well as the later ones. Obviously, the borrowing of Ganesh cult had been effected through the Pandyan across Ganga country and transmitted northwards simultaneously or otherwise to the Tondaimandalam. In a similar way, the absence of Dakshinamurti in the Deccan is equally significant, but would be amenable to a more rational explanation. The iconic prototype corresponding to Dakshinamurti in the north would be Lakulisa. This latter has, broadly speaking, a dhyana pose, four disciples and yogic attire. In fact one might go further and state that the practice generally obtaining in the north (Gujarat, Rajasthan and Central India), places Lakulisa icon in a southern niche of the temple. Of course, there are separate temples for Lakulisa in the north (as at Eklingji, Rajasthan) and in Karnataka (as at Badami, also facing south, near Bhutanatha temple). This
analogy between Lakulisa concept of the north and the Dakinamurti icon of the south is more than superficial and is brought out in a fine synthesis, in the eastern Chalukyan zone where, as in the Nakulagudi at Bizzavolu—obviously named after Nakulesa-a corruption for Lakulisa—we have a figure in the southern wall niche of the ardhamandapa, which is a combination of the ardhaparyanka and utkirta pose of Dakinamurti and the lakshman and yuddhas of Lakulisa. Further south, in the very outskirts of Madras in the famous shrine of Tiruvorriyur we have an image, now going by the name of Goullisa, which is very likely that of Lakulisa and which though in dhyana-mudra and padmanana (both characteristic of Lakulisa) is apparently a replacement to Dakinamurti and is in a separate shrine. Of course, this place was also a great centre of Purnata Saivism. It is sustainable by other data of a similar kind in the region intervening between Karnataka and Tamilnad that a degree of fusion had been effected between Lakulisa and Dakinamurti. In any event, this should have been the context in which the latter icon never found any specific image in Karnataka and Deccan, and is to be taken as a distinctive and individualistic icon of the Tamil country.

The difference between the Durga-Mahisamardini of Karnataka and north on the one hand, and the southern peninsula is that, in the latter she is shown almost invariably as standing only on the head of the buffalo and with sankha and chakra in her hands, white in the former, she is seen grappling with the demon in buffalo form, out of the mouth of which his human form is also shown emerging. There are other variations and only one rare instance finds a repetition in three widely separated places, as at Mahabalipuram (Mahisamardini cave panel), Pattadakal (Virupaksha pillar scene), and Ellora (Kailasa gopura-dvara, inner wall face looking north), wherein Durga giving a vigorous battle riding on lion with the demon in human form but buffalo head standing in pratyatidha pose. It is very clear that these are mutually linked replicas, and quite reasonably the earliest of these is from Mahabalipuram where it is to be dated not later than the middle of the seventh century A.D.

Qualitatively, the early sculptural art of Karnataka is infor-
med by elemental emotion, soft and sensuous modelling and a graceful combination of apparel and jewellery, which gets sophisticated and accentuated in the Rastra-kuta stage. The southern (Pallava and early Pandya) art, on the other hand, is more sedate, of compressed modelling and with sparse drapery (where outlines alone are emphasised) and ornamentation. The raw materials—supple sandstone and grim granite—are perhaps responsible partly for this difference. Both are equally, however, the products of local ethos and are to be examined and initially appreciated only on the basis of local traditions in art and religion. Both the traditions were like a giant banyan tree with a multiplicity of shoots claiming a semi-independent status but well linked to the parent tree. Of these two, however, it was only the Karnataka region that imbied the Rekha-nagara of the north, the Kadamba-slopy roof and quadrantal sikara of the coastal west, and the vimana order of the south, and reared up, as it were, a new series of structural experimentations in stone, in all the three directions, with great success, elaboration and virtuosity. This emphasises the enormous imagination of the patrons and craft skill in the stone medium available in the Karnataka country in its formative stages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BHAVIHA</th>
<th>NAGARA</th>
<th>VESARA</th>
<th>SEKHA-NAGARA</th>
<th>KAHAMLA-NAGARA</th>
<th>REGIONAL STYLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mallikarjuna (Badami)</td>
<td>Umma temple (Abhili)</td>
<td>Umma temple (Abhili)</td>
<td>Umma temple (Abhili)</td>
<td>Umma temple (Abhili)</td>
<td>Western Chalukya (Gadag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallikarjuna (Badami)</td>
<td>Bhogavantasvaram (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Bhogavantasvaram (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Bhogavantasvaram (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Bhogavantasvaram (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Western Chalukya (Gadag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallikarjuna (Badami)</td>
<td>Patramukha temple (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Patramukha temple (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Patramukha temple (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Patramukha temple (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Western Chalukya (Gadag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallikarjuna (Badami)</td>
<td>Mahakuta temple (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Mahakuta temple (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Mahakuta temple (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Mahakuta temple (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Western Chalukya (Gadag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallikarjuna (Badami)</td>
<td>Western group (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Western group (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Western group (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Western group (Banavasi)</td>
<td>Western Chalukya (Gadag)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This classification is not exhaustive but acts as an indication of the variety and scope of the more well-known regional styles.
NOTES ON PLATES AND MAPS

I A and B 1. Nana (with place and District)

Middle group of the Jyotirlinga cluster, Aiholi, Bijapur District.

Mandapa (closed).

2. Type of structure
   Mandapa or pavilion type
   Ratha-agara-prasada
   Kala-maha-agara-cisana

Nil.

Mastika-bandha (Upana, Kambo, Kapota and fighters).

c. 575 A. D.

Provision of a mastika-bandha with sculptures of divinities, Trinity and Dvarapalas on the pillar faces. East facing.

Having a freemason channel cut with suck made on the kapota.

Frieze zone on the upper part of the bhima and schematic rafter course (ravakata) above the cornice. Probably with slopy roof and mastika on top.

Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.

Saiva.

3. Number of talas

4. Sarithara or swasthara

5. Plinth moldings

6. Apī

7. Special features

8. Dynastic gouping

9. Religious affiliation

II

1. Shrine in the tank. Mahakut, Bijapur District.

2. Mandapa (open).

3. Nil.


5. Mastika-bandha.

6. c. 575 A.D.

7. With mukhalingas in the centre of the mandapa; almost always immersed in water; Kraushthabha in orientation; with square massive pillars bearing stranga corbels, atticas, kapotas, slopy roof and mastika sila on top.

8. Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.

III

1. Mahakutesvara, Mahakuti, Bijapur District.
2. Vīmaṇa (of the Dronaṇḍa category).
3. Ėčṭāla.
4. Sandhara.
5. Upāna, padma, prita-kumuda, tanti, kaṭaṇa, cylindric and radi fritae.
6. c. 575-800 A.D.
7. The earliest known Dronaṇḍa-variant type in the Karnataka country with the special incipient feature of applied ṣeks around the gītes, in addition to the base of the top ṣekla. The base of the ground ṣekla is quite away from the superstructure leaving thus a wide corridor all around and the base continues along the fringes of the pranaṇḍapā also—a characteristic Chalukya feature. The niche sculptures on the front face of pranaṇḍopā with divinities, and dhanaṇḍapā on the abruptly vertical wall-face would show that the apanaṇḍapā porch was not integral with the original base, but came slightly later, as fully seen in the Mallikarjunā temple at the end of the south end of the same Mahakuti group. The character of the original base is not clear and the present one has only a pandalone enclosure at floor level around it.
8. Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.

IV

1. Other temples in Mahakut
(a) Mallikarjunā.
(b) Sangomavaraya.
(c) The western group along the north-south enclosure wall and flanking the Śāmasa, all facing east.
(d) The south-eastern group around the Śāmasa, facing north and were variably.
2. (a) Vīmaṇa of Dronaṇḍa category.
(b) Keke-naguna-pranaṇḍa.
(c) Kedanaṇḍa-naguna as well as Keke-naguna types, the former predominating.
3. (a) Dronaṇḍa.
(b) (d) Tal-naṇḍa different from Vīmaṇa types and comprises multiple themes, capped by anulata in all cases. All except (b) of less than medium size.
4. (a) Sandhara.
(b) to (d) Nuṇantarha.
5. (a) Like Mahakutesvara temple except for tripana-kumuda and absence of radi fritae.
(c) Mostly nāroka-nanda type, but in some cases with nāṛaka or multifaceted kumuda and a high fritae wall for the mahaṇḍapā.
6. c. 625-750 A.D.
7. A multiple assortment, but essentially confirming the prevalence.
of all these at an early date, though in varying stages. The absence
of the sashrasa for the Kadamba-nagaras as for the Venna type should
be noted. The Akasa-sparpa for the madhavandaja (which
has not yet become a wider unit) is also to be noted. The provisions
of, in most cases, a rectangular opening over the plinth on the
northern side as a safe or discharge of ablutions water, is an interesting
typical innovation.
8. Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.

V
1. Upper Sivalaya, Badami, Bijapur District.
2. Venna of the Nagara category.
3. Dutaas.
4. Simhavarna.
5. Upana, padma, bold jamha with sculptured frieze -depa and pati
on the outer wall—No corresponding mouldings on the inner wall
of the cells circuit.
6. c. 625 - 640 A. D.
7. The earliest Nagara-sumeru at Badami and to fact in the Chalukyan
country. It applies the elements of the Makutavesvara temple layout
for a Nagara-sumeru also on plan and outer wall which is carrying
a kara, apart from niche carvings, solo carvings on the plinth and
pierced windows of various designs, one of which is of radiating
fish-like spokes, imitated from Badami caves, in design. The super-
structure is the most significant and incident, with a large and high
second kala-khitti, and a telescoped pavana without kara as well as
the sana, and guta-pasha, in an indistinguishable stepping, capped by
an identifiable patha and square Lakshmi. The idea of the scheme
is to give elevation to the shrine, though only a small one.
8. Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.
9. Sarsri perhaps, though Vaisnava, the cannot be ruled out if the
carvings are any guidance.

VI
1. Lower Sivalaya, Badami, Bijapur District.
2. Venna of Dronis category.
3. Dutaas.
4. Simhavarna.
5. Inner wall has no mouldings.
6. c. 625-640 A.D.
7. A mood, half way between Mahakutesvara and Upper Sivalaya,
and clearly coeval with Mahagiri Sivalaya also, since both the latter
are at Badami. The archaic superstructural features common to
all the above mentioned, varying only in the vimana characteristic of Malegitti, and Nagara-simile type of upper Sivalaya, would suggest that there was no great time lag among all these experiments. The nature of the cella patha in this temple would suggest that it was not for Siva. Its steeper height and more restricted ground area might show that it was closely preceding Upper Sivalaya.

8. Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.

VII

1. Bhutanatha temple, Ballari, Bijapur District.
2. Vaisnavī of the Nagara category.
3. Tīrtha.
5. Upana, jagati, śivaśānti-dvaraka, kantaka, pattaka and pātra.
6. c. 650-700 A.D.
7. The most fine vimana type at Badami coming closest to the southern types in Tamil country (including the pattaka in place of kapota). The square sikhara, lack of base on the top moulding, rather steep elevation, lack of nāga projection of its sivasanasa, would all suggest that it had well succeeded the other temples at Badami and had occurred after the Pallava occupation of the place. Inscriptional evidence at the place would also place it in the second half of the seventh century A.D. The abhisheka-patha in its front, fringing the Agniya-tīrtha is a much later addition. The abrupt front passage point with a small shikara atop on two free-standing pillars originally, is the characteristic Chalukya feature. The linga in the sanctum is badly disturbed.
8. Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.

VIII

1. Tarappa gūḍa, Aiholi, Bijapur District.
2. Reka-gūḍa-ganana.
3. Not applicable.
5. Has variant forms of two gopura mixed in the kāma and kīśa of the aśekhara, the latter showing multilacelated kāmuna with heavy beam projections at intervals and the kāma have pāla and nūtra kāmuna, capped by kantaka, kāpota and pātra.
6. c. 875-900 A.D.
7. The type is a development over the Huṣchinnalligūḍa, but nearer to Huṣchappayyusgūḍa in many respects except that, it is built with more massive frame and greater confidence, but less of sculptural
ornamentation. It is likely to represent a new vogue, if its plinth features as above are any guidance, seen elsewhere, especially at Allepur. Its high plinth for a Nagara-bhuta-pouda not usually common elsewhere also would show that it is imitating form from a Dvaradhi-rama type. It is likely to be a plain and rather modest artistic production of a lesser pattern, but not otherwise too late in the Western-Chalukya series.

8. Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.

IX
1. Ladkhin, Alholl, Bijapur District.
2. Pavilion type.
3. Not applicable: but if its superstructural roof shrine of the same simple chamber type has any special significance, it is to be called a double shrine.
4. Nauhalin was far as the roof shrine is concerned. Has no special applicability in so far as ground chamber is concerned.
5. Megakallhulsa with agasa, padha, high kowha, kapotu and janti.
6. c. 550 - 600 A.D.
7. A very fine, well executed secular hall type of shrine which provides for the deity only against the back wall, which in conjunction it not so richly provided with grided sections, pierced windows etc., as is seen on the side walls. A sandhi-nula with narrow oblong strike and with self parapet, carrying para-pate design on the kowha and with sculptures on the pillars is on addition as is also the roof shrine. But the type became a different model, as effected in a composite way in Koraigudhi also without any direct integral connection with the ground floor. The hall type is notable only for its art motifs on the pillars, the ceilings etc. and the pillar and turbel types themselves. The model should have been almost coeval with the cave temple phase at Badami and was a more positive and large scale copy of its smaller attempts as in the Jyothirlinga grand.
8. Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.
9. Seemingly for Saiva use, though its present usage is a later replacement of an earlier one.

X
1. Kontigudi, Alholl, Bijapur District.
2. Pavilion or mandapa type.
3. No applicability.
4. — do —
5. Madakallhulsa type.
6. c. 675 - 800 A.D.
7. A model which was in simulation of Lakantham as far as it went and after quite a little interval as indicated by its variant use of doors, maha-mandapa, pillar details, sculptural values etc., and building even later still, a superstructure almost completely conforming to the southern Vennn type of the Rastrakuta period. It was perhaps a model structure which got truncated into its present form later and gives the freakish look entirely different from the outwardly harmonious look of Lakantham superstructure. It was perhaps a desire to imitate the southern Vennn type at a time when it had become very popular at Aiholi, which was perhaps not before the advent of the Rastrakutas, notwithstanding the early model like Meguti temple.

8. Early Western Chalukyas of Kalyana.

9. Surya, if its location of the shrine on ground floor is original.

---

XI

1. Mallikarjuna temple, Aiholi, Bijapur District.
2. Kalmanda-vanga type.
3. Not relevant, but the superstructure divided into seven nodes or 'umara.
5. Mahanandi type.
6. c. 630 - 700 A.D.
7. An early formulation of the finite Kalmanda-vanga type, empirical in its character with the combination of the typical superstructure, slopy roof and a higher element in the middle, lack of stance and presence of an amalaka over a curred gopura, and an apramandapa porch. The type in layout is similar to Hutkarnayagudi, but has no rather offices in the plinth and no niche on the wall. A more ornate type of the same is the Galagopala main shrine facing west.

8. Early Western Chalukyas of Baraduni.


---

XII

1. Meguti temple, Aiholi, Bijapur District.
2. Vennn type.
3. Not ascertainable, probably 'aitaka', on earlier or contemporary analogies.
4. Samhatra.
5. Uttarayana-kamala, kamala with sculptured gama frieze, kapota and prati.
6. c. 654 A.D., as implied by the foundation record of Pulakes II.
7. A landmark in history as well as architecture but unfortunately truncated in superstructure and dedicated to jaina religion. There is sufficient reason why this should be an early form which takes
after the Parvati temple at Nashana in Central India, for its composition, though the stylistic elements are local. It does not appear to be too close to Mahakutemvara or Malegutt Sivalaya but rather in its tall and raised form to either Lower Sivalaya, or Upper Sivalaya and chronology would also reinforce this. The tradition of Jain temples having an upper shrine in the second cela is seen at the earliest context only here.

8. Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.

XIII
1. Naganartha temple, Nagaral, Bijapur District.
2. Features of probably Nagara category.
3. Deciduous.
4. Sandhara.
5. Upana, padma, multiple fluted kumuda, gopura frieze rati and prati.
6. c. 675 - 725 A.D.
7. A compact and rather evolved type of temple, nearer in concept to Sangamesvara at Pattadkal which it would precede. Has a variety of sculptural delineation, harmonisation of wall features, layout, superstructure and interior. Has an agrasastika porch. In some of its plinth features, it has a link variously with Durga temple, Galaganatha, Tarappagudi etc.
8. Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.

XIV
1. Parvati temple, Sandur, Bellary District.
2. Viman type.
3. Upper part reconstructed in Kadamba-nagara style. Probably a earlier type originally.
5. Upana, high padma, ante, multifaced kumuda, gopura in the kumuda, kapota, and prati.
6. c. 700 - 725 A.D.
7. A southern outlier of the Chalukyan model on the border area of the Nolamba-Ganga tract. The scheme includes a nave and side aisles for the skambhas, absence of agrasastika and the abrupt front face having sloped and other niches—showing secular figures, recalling one of Mallikarjuna at Mahabal at the same time part of the shrine—and the superstructure has a temple form with separate kuta, in successive telescoped bhai and with a massive shikhara practically equal to the width of the garbhagriha and showing Tandava Siva relief in the bada. Cardinal niches show sculptured stele. The model 6, despite its size and difference in stambhaka, almost that of the Taraka-Brahma at Alampur and going with the advanced stage of Karnataka art seen at Pattadkal.
8. Early Western Chalukyas of Badami.
9. Siva. Though it is called Parvati temple, originally dedicated to Siva.

XV. 1. Taraka Brahma temple, Alampur, Mahaboobnagar District, Andhra Pradesh.
2. Prana type.
3. Severely tilted despite the dilapidated top part.
5. Upana, jagati, bhujchar-kambala, kamal, patika, and prati.
6. a. 700 - 750 A.D.
7. A singular column expression at Alampur of medium size, with rounded pattern and niche on cardinal directions on the wall, enclosed in a mukhaara. Superstructure is of the alpha-beta type, the padma mouldings boldly rendered. The mukhamantapa is a pillared porch. The cells has pillars on the corners of the wall, making it internally the atrophied mukhamanta scheme. The windows above it is as broad as the cells, but about half its thickness, and has Tandava Siva in the ratha.

XVI. 1. Bala-Brahma temple, Alampur, Mahaboobnagar District, Andhra Pradesh.
2. Rule: nagara punaka type.
3. The ratha has 3 nodas in it, capped by a square gaha-pudal, gaha, and flat globular mukhaara-mukha.
4. Udaykama.
5. Upana, jagati, kambala, hold kamal, patika, and prati.
6. c. 650 - 725 A.D.
7. Is typical of all the other temples (except Taraka Brahma) at Alampur, having a covered inner circuit around the cells, perched and gridded grahamata on the outer walls, and a pillared and plastered gaumukhamanta to the front having slopy side aisles and clerestoryed central nave. The ceiling of the nave has lotus medallion and sage spiral mouth and door frame outside has a series of overdoors and doorways, gana-pummas etc., on the base of the jamb, and Garuda on the talashika. It has also an agramukhamanta porch. Carvings in niches of the eight dikopola adorn the exterior wall of the gaumukhamanta and outside the structure circuit. The roof shows a well modulated rika and in 5 nodas, with a patika at the base; double gaha-pudal-padala on top; and a very tastefully exe-
cated ornaments complete with mahipata, adidepata and rukkhakara and side rumps with foliage design. The kesh has Tandava Siva.
9. Siva image.

XVII
1. (a) Ramalingeswara, and Bhimalingeswaram, temples Suryavara, Kurnool District, Andhra Pradesh.
2. Kaila-mangata.
3. The former is a larger unit with a loftier siders than the latter.
4. Nirmahara in both cases.
5. *Uttara* high *padma*, *krita-kamada*, *kantha*, *kujana* and *jasti*. *Uttara*, very bold and high *kantha* with *flicema* and *kujana*—being a *mauchhakama* and *jasti*.
6. c. 675 - 725 A. D.
7. Two very important examples of the contact zone of typical early Western and Eastern Chalukya temple models of Karnatakta. The *garbha* has pillars on the corners, and *valika* and *mahamandapa* have central and side sections. In (1) there is a later, larger, *vaiva-mandopa* also. The *mahamandapa* is in the *mahamandapa*. The superstructure shows pillars in *pattam*—a typical southern curtain feature—at the base of the *siders* and a fairly heavy side type of *mieha*, occupying almost the entire width of *siders*—in (2) and of *mahamandapas* in (1), which is narrower than *padma* as well as *mahamandapas*. Interesting inscribed information is regarding the *apattii* *pada* label found at a number of places like Vijayawada, Nagalrajapuram, Udupalil, Satmikona and farther north west at Bhokaradu near Ajanta—all datable to c. 700 A.D. and being a pilgrimage-recont of a Paraspati *Vapi*. The precincts of the temple have miniature shrine models at all types apart from a small upadha temple itself. In this respect it is similar to Mahanandi also in the same district, and recalls such miniatures found in Elloraian excavations near Nageshwarakonda.
8. Early Eastern Chalukya group.
9. Siva image.

XVIII
2. Vima type.
3. *Trikala*.
4. *Nirmahara*.
5. *Uttara*, *pada*, *krita-kamada* on the *kantha* and *vrica* on the *kantha* and elsewhere, *kantha*, *pattika* and *jasti*.
6. c. 850 A. D.
7. A typical Eastern Chalukya shrine with a tri-ratha layout of shrine proper and with niches in the sheda, kosa and very lines wall sections, with danta-mandalas below cornice, parasas, with yodhas and val, and an arbha-kara in the ventes-structure capped by a square sikha. The carvings are full of life and traditional stylistic features of the period.

8. Early Eastern Chalukya type of the time of Narasimhavarman or Gunaga Vijayaditya.


---

XIX

1. Rupala Sangamesvara temple, Sangamesvaran, Kurnool District, Andhra Pradesh.
2. Vimana type.
3. Chatraka raguna.
4. Yogabasa.
5. Utama, jagati, mitra-kusuma, kastha, yodhasri, pattika and jati.
6. c. 850 A.D.
7. Perhaps not the very few among the earliest Eastern Chalukyan structural temples of the limited variety completely preserved in its constituent parts, namely, cela, arahamandapa and mahamandapa. It has a square sikha and arbha-kara at every level. It is an all stone temple. It is provided with jala-sagaram on arahamandapa and mahamandapa, and gandhara on the mahamandapa central part with pillared porch on the outside. It has a mahamandapa with a lateral entrance and provided with bracketed self-like railing on the facing side, borne on free-standing carved jaga-pillars as in the case of gandhara. The scheme is nearer that of Satavahana though the latter is a Raka-nagara type. The iconography of the place is rich and varied, an outstanding example of which is the Mahesha figure in seated form in a niche on the rear inner wall of the cela—a hangover of its usage in the early Chalukya and Ikshavaku times at Elhara. Apparently it is the only known example of this kind in a structural temple of this region.
8. Early Eastern Chalukya type.

---

XX

1. Sangamesvara temple, Pattadakal, Bijapur District, Mysore State.
2. Vimana type.
3. Tritala.
4. Sambhara.
5. Utama, jagato, mitra-kusama, kastha, kagata, yodhasri, seli and pattika.
6. c. 700 A.D.
7. Perhaps one of the earliest vimana types at Pattadakal and called Vijayeswara in its records. In its santhes type, is like Virupaksha and Mallikarjuna. In its telangiya, it is nearer the southern
norm in being without salana, having an amalaka-lata. The
inflected sala also has a madhuka-sala alone but not the kasa. Interior
lay-out of akshamandapa is more like Bapamatha than Virupaksha.
Its wall carvings, madhva-limbu, and pillar features are less
sophisticated than Virupaksha. Its elevation rises in easy stages.
6. Early Western Chalukya of Badami.
7. Saiva image with laga on square plula preserved in sanctum and
with a sala cut at the kanda moulding, on the outer plinth of the
temple.

XXI
1. Galaganatha temple, Pattadakal, Bijapur District, Mysore State.
2. Rekha-sagara-prasada.
3. There are four nodules on the sikhara.
4. Samihara.
5. Upava, padma, antar, pritha-kaunda, after course projection or sav-
ma, khaja and poim.
6. c. 750 A.D.
7. A very sophisticated Rekha-sagara type with an elaborate outer wall
with grilled ghousdwaras raised over attributed mouldings of their
own, and a very spacious akshamandapa, now extinct. The inner
circuit is having massive slopy roofs and the sikhara has a kasa or
central khada ruling which is of receding and superimposed
adgama designs, giving it a curved and steep profile. The adgama
is largely missing, but would have risen to the third Mansi when
extant fully. The interior moulding, large panel carvings on the
khada, and the exterior styling with art motifs, are all minimum
necessary to emphasize the essentially architectural modulation
of the temple. Perhaps one of the latest temples built at Pattada-
kal.
8. Early Western Chalukya of Badami.
9. Saiva image (laga without plula extant).

MAP I

The map seeks to project the background of the broad formal division of
eyarchitectural delineations in South India—the northern Rekha-sagara
and the southern cinama respectively—and the important nucleating centres
wherein bold and pioneering experimentations in the harmonization as well
as the differentiation of these two main orders were vigorously displayed. These
nucleating zones, in the nature of things, were incidentally the result of the patron-
rage of certain outstanding regional dynasties and, in their turn, become more
or less models for inspiration for other stylistic formulations of a more local kind
initiated in areas under the subordinate chief and vamshal units. Thus, it could
be stated, for instance, that the Krishna-Tungabhadra valley was the richest
zone of not only the meeting ground of the two above-mentioned major orders, but also of the hybridisations thereof. And similarly the Kattamula, Nenamula, the Eastern Ganga, and to a lesser extent, the Western Ganga were either manifestations of the Karnataka style developed in the Krishna-Tungabhadra valleys, while correspondingly the Bana, the Vaidumba, and others in the deeper south like the Muttarayan, the Irnuvam, the Chera etc., and to a large extent, the Western Ganga, were the direct end-products of the southern crown order, as crystallised in the nucleating zones of this order. The map supplies the locale of these nucleating zones and the regional sub-styles, in addition to the outstanding sizes of all of them, and thus, is a compact picture of the empirical structure of early South Indian formal architecture, in terms of phystography and masonry.

MAP II

This map serves to present a visual picture of the regional archetypal models of the traditional temple styles in South India. It does not deliberately seek to categorise the mosaic, but only to compress the basic unitarian character of the style. It, however, displays the mutual co-existence of basically different archetypes in the contact-zones. It is these contact-zones that kept the conserving stylistic ensemble alive, by imaginatively hybridisations within the permissible degree and carried on the innovations from period to period. It is also needless to say that the zones of impact themselves gradually expanded and by the early-medieval times, the whole of Southern India largely, behaved as comprised of two basically compact areas of provenance for the temple format, thus implying the free movement of the larger imperial dynasties that governed then. In the ultimate analysis, it is this stylisation of the motif and its layout, that gradually brought about the stereotyped degeneration of the architectural personality of temples in late-medieval times.
GLOSSARY OF INDIAN ARCHITECTURAL TERMS

alinda: a deliberately left perambulatory space between the double walls of the sanctum resulting in an anarpita-hara. (see under hara).

alpa-vimāna: small one-storied vimāna; the parts are: adhipātana, bhuti or pāda, pratara, griva, tikkara and stāpi. Usually it is without a hāra.

anarpita-hara: the string of a sub-shrine or chapel miniature on the parapet of each lāla (see under hāra), shown fully in the round and separated from the pāda or wall of next lāla.

anapaha: hay or intercolumniation between pillars or space between pillars and pilasters.

anurabhiti: inner wall.

anuvāla: intermediate passage or room between outer mandapa and shrine.

anurāmendra: a pillared hall immediately in front of the principal shrine or distal half of a mandapa with two seriated pillars as in rockcut cave temples.

astā-parśvā: eight-fold shrine layout which includes the main shrine, the sāndi shrine and six other sub-shrines.

bāhya-bhuti: outer of the two cellular walls of the garbhagriha or sanctum.

bhadrā: the central unit of the layout plan is equivalent to the lāla or wagon-roof porch entrance, also sometimes called bhadrā lāla, or mukha-bhadrā.

dhāraṇī-sūtra: a plan formed by two linear sides and two curved ends, giving a flattened ellipse. This is the shape more in use than the oval or egg shape (kukkuṭānā).
gāthā- griha: shrine-cell or sanctum sanctorum.
ghanadārā: false-door; usually with grilled framework.
griha-pāindi: The coping slab, single usually, sealing the superstructure at griha or neck level. It is usually equal to and standing for the wall-space around the deity in the cella itself.
hāra: string of miniature shrines over each terrace (tala) of the storeyed vimāna consisting of kālas, kusūhar or lahas and pañjaras, inter-connected by cloister-lengths or in its place balustrades simulating cloisters (hārāśālān).
jaṅga: vertical moulding of the adhisthāna immediately above the upāna, oblong in shape and in a line with the vertical norm or māna-rūtra (main plumb).
jāla-vālāyanas: pierced windows.
kālalakārana: astylar, corbelling of the upper ends of the cellular circuit walls around the sanctum for making them serve as wide foundational bases of the superstructure.
Kadāma-nāgara: the variant primarily of the rēkhā-nāgara style in which the superstructural nodes are comprised of kāpāta and kusūtha each and are capped by a circular neck and analakāśa; often without sūkarāna.
kara-bhūmi: the corner features of the līkhara in a rēkhā-nāgara or northern temple comprising three parts each, capped by flattened and squarish analaka sīla in relief.
mukhopaṭṭi: the barge-board sheet of the nāṣika design, fixed in position by nail heads, and supported by the dandaśā scheme within the kāla.
nāla: chute or channel on the pitha of the deity or at the base of the sanctum wall, or on top or any level of the adhisthāna of the shrine, serving as
SMALL SHRINE IN THE TANK, Mahakan, Bijapur District
PARVATI TEMPLE, Sambor, Bellary District
GOLINGESVARA TEMPLE, Bieravolu, East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh.
an outlet for abhistika water of the cella; when provided with a projecting gargoyles unit visible outside is called a prastara.

nāśikā: (nose) projected arched opening (window).

nirandhāra: without a closed circuit around the cella.

panchāyatanā: a five-fold shrine layout, the minor four of which are on the edges of a large low terrace platform. More common in the northern order, are of the Śiva or Viṣṇu Panchāyatana type with appropriate deity-scheme.

parivāra-dvātās: also called dvāra dvātās or subsidiary shrine-units in a temple complex, auxiliary to the main deity.

pattika: projected top slab of the platform or abhisthāna in a line with the vertical norm or māna-cūtra, a major moulding of considerable thickness and found mostly in the southern vimāna order only, the Karnataca temples replacing it by a kapota moulding.

piliha-deva: the stepped or tiered super-structural or likhara arrangement, as in Kadamba-vidgara. The term is used in Kalinga style for the roof unit of the front majjapa called jagmohan there.

pudika: the basal plinth of a deity in the sanctum, sometimes represented by a simple ridging on the floor of square shape.

pranāla: see nīla.

prastara: entablature, consisting of the mouldings over the walls and pillars, viz., the attāra (beam) sajana, natikā, kapota, alinda or cyllasārī and astari and mounted by the nīla and followed by the kīta.

pratālīśha: complementary to ālīḍha—a pose of defiance to the adversary, in angular stance, body thrown back, one foot forward.
ranga-mandapa: equivalent to Nararanga—a large pillared hall at the outer part of the main temple unit under the shrine limit generally in later examples. Corresponds to maha-mandapa or southern vimana usage.

dala: shrine (vimana) of ayyadvara type (oblong on plan) with barrel-vault roof with a series of stūpis on its ridge.

sāndhāra: with closed or covered circuit passage around cela.

svaratōbdhra: open on all the four cardinal points, as regular shrine doors. A concomitant of the Mahēśa icon, conceptually.

vrkandha: the integral projection of the basal part of the superstructure derived from the term 'parrot's beak' and generally applicable only to northern order but used for both northern and southern styles in the Chāṇikya-Rāṣṭrakūṭa practice and thus serving a diagnostic purpose there.

talocchanda: the rhythm of the superstructural scheme.

udgama: the jālaśā unit, in the form of a nāsikā, crests niches in northern temples.

upagrīva: a supplementary part of the storeyed superstructural scheme in southern usage, introduced either to raise the height artificially, or as a mere device.

vedi: the parapet wall either on top of the cela or the rongamandapa (as in the northern usage). It is the limit in the latter of the sacred precincts of the garbha. Derived from the fire-altar usage. In railing form, it is called vediā.

vimana: upāndhi-stūpi-panyutum vimānam; whole shrine from base to finial; from upāna to stūpi, consist-
ziyāsaraṭha: the linear axial guide line, within which the plinth layout should be confined.

piṭāna: ceiling of the mandapa or room, plain in southern temples and very ornate in the Karnata & northern temples.

zyḍalācāri: the intersecting rafter course, either at plinth level, or in the entablature level, supporting at each stage, the load above it. Its ends, in stone architecture, are beautified by zyḍa and makara heads for aesthetic effect and protection of the terminals.

(This glossary is restricted to only those terms employed in this book)
INDEX

Key to abbreviations: ca., capital; ci., city; co., country; de., deity; di., division; do., ditto; f., family; l. king; l., locality; pl., place; ri., river; r.a., same as; te., temple; vi., village.

A

Aldhutanáthi, de., 38
Aghora, face of Siva, 37-38
Agrarandapa, 20
Aihole, vi., 2, 5-7, 10, 15, 18, 25, 27, 29, 36, 39, 42
Ajanta, 9
Alampur, vi., 10, 12, 24-25, 27, 30, 32
Aliana, 11, 41
Alpo-cinána, 39, 46
Amalaka, 10, 24
Amalásíra, 33
Anarpita, 41
Anarpita-bhitti, 41
Anarpita-bhíra, 5, 41
Ankana, 3, 21
Antarn-bhitti, 11, 21, 41
Antaríla, 21
Ardhikandapa, 13, 21, 32, 40, 47-48
Aradhaparyanka, vi., 48
Arjuna, 17
Arpita, 41
Arsha-linga, 37
Arvalém, vi., 37
Arvapura, r.a., Aihole, de., 1
Ashapurtíveda, 46
Aśtásíra, 33
Attirála, vi., 32

B

Bádami, 1-3, 5-7, 10, 12, 15-19, 27-28, 30-31, 40-41, 47
Bharya-bhíti, 11, 41
Bári, vi., 1, 12, 14, 18, 26-27, 31-33
Bánavási, vi., 25, 30
Bandi Tandrapádu, de., 24

Bhásar, hill, 8
Belgámi, vi., 25
Bhadrá, 20, 22
Bhuákal, pl., 34
Bhimésvara, vi., 32
Bhútunáthi, de., 6-7, 17-18, 28, 30, 47
Bhója, dy., 22
Bieavolu, vi., 27, 31, 41, 49
Brahma, de., 14, 37
Brahmabháya, 23, 37
Brahmanádi, 37
Bhítah-Báutas, dy., 23
Budháda, 9

C

Cape-comorin, 14
Ceylon, 23
Chaitya, 8, 41
Chakkaragudi, it., 19
Chandrasíkhara, it., 23
Chaturástra, 24, 26, 30
Chaturástra Síkhara, 25
Chebroli, vi., 12, 31
Chiéra, f., 26
Chhotás Kailása, 39
Chikkigudi, it., 6, 19, 29
Chiragart, 38
Chójar, dy., 14, 23, 27, 31, 41, 46

D

Dakshinámmáti, de., 47, 48
Dáivávátra cave, 14
Dhammar, vi., 46
Dhárlinga, 14
Dharanárája-ratha, 14
Dhánya-mudrás, 48
Dikpála, 3, 21
Draksharâma, vi., 12, 41
Draupadari-ratha, 17
Drâvida-sikharâ, 15, 47
Drâvida-nimâna, 12-13, 16-18, 26
Durgâ, it, 7, 10, 20, 29, 36, 42
Durgâ-Mahisâmarâini, d., 48
Devânapâla, 3, 33, 47
Devatala, 4
Dyausirâ-critâ, 8-9

E

Eastern-Châhukâya, it, 10, 19, 23-24, 26, 31, 39-41
Eastern Ganga, d., 26, 32
Elephantâ, 22, 37, 38, 41
Elâvaram, ci., 25
Ellora, d., 13-14, 22, 27-28, 34, 37-38, 41-42, 46, 49
Eklingâ, d., 47

G

Gajaprîsha, 9
Galagatâtha, it., 5, 10, 19, 21, 29
Gaâëśa, d., 47
Ganâsh Lena, 38
Ganga, d., 12-14, 18, 26-27, 31-23, 47
Gangalkondâchola-puram, ci., 40
Gangavâdî, d., 23, 33
Gangâ-Tanjâvantâ, 33, 43
Garbha, Garbha-grîha, 8-9, 11-13, 20-21, 40, 41
Gaudârgudi, it., 6, 10, 19, 29
Gandharva, 12, 20, 30
Gâa, 4, 30, 37
Gôdâvari, ci., 10, 13
Gôpura-âdâra, 46, 48
Goulisa, image, 48
Gôvinda III, Râhtrakûta k., 24, 46
Grôhapâdi, 11, 40-41
Grihâ, 24
Gûdîmâla, ci., 32
Guna-gâ-vijayâdityâ, Eastern-Châhukâya k., 23

H

Guptâ, dy., 35
Gûrjara-pratîhâra, do., 13, 29, 35

I

Halâbid, ci., 33
Halâjur, d., 19
Hângal, do., 25, 30
Hâra, 5, 17, 24, 28, 32, 41
Hoysala, d., 33, 39, 42
Huchchapayyaguûdi, it., 11, 19, 29
Huchchapayyamaha, do., 29
Huchchimallugudi, do., 7, 10, 19, 29
Hêmâyati, ci., 31
Henjâru, d., 31

J

Irukkudev, f., 18, 23, 26, 46
Îôna, face of Ísna, 37

K

Kadâlikâ-karaña, 11
Kadambas, f., 14, 16, 22, 25, 30-31, 33, 49
Kadamba-nâgara, 7, 10-11, 13, 20, 24, 29, 32, 39-40
Kadamba-nâgara-sikharâ, 25
Kânasiddhârâ, it., 27
Kailâsa, do., 8, 13-14, 34, 37, 39, 42, 46
Kailânâtha, do., 46
Kailâsapati-Ísiva, d., 3
Kâkatiya, dy., 32
Kalakâda, ci., 32
Kâalaia, 24, 44
Kalingâ, ci., 26, 32
Kajugumalai, ci., 18, 26
Mahākūṭa, do., 2, 4, 6-7, 10, 12, 15-16, 18-19, 21, 27, 39
Mahānandi, do., 10, 24, 25, 30
Mahāyāna-chaitya, 9
Mahéndra II, Pallava k., 18, 46
Mahēśa, do., 37, 39
Mahishamardini, do., 47-48
Makara-tūrana, 20
Makutēvāra, te., 6-7, 9, 16, 21, 27, 39
Malaprabha, rt., 2
Māleśītī Śivālaya, te., 6-7, 16, 19, 39
Mallikārjuna, do., 6-7, 10, 12, 19, 25, 29-29, 39
Māmallā, i.e., Narasimha I, Pallava k., 16-18, 41
Māmallapuram, rt., 17
Māṇḍapa, 2, 3, 6, 32
Mangāleśa, Chālukya k., 6, 16, 27
Maurya, dr., 22
Mēguṭi, te., 5-6, 19
Mēlguṇī, do., 19
Mithuna, 43
Mukhaltinga, te., 4, 32
Mukhamandapā, 3, 4
Mukhapāṭi, 25
Muttaraiyar, f., 23, 26, 43-46

N

Nāgaraka, 44
Nāgarāla, rt., 6, 30, 41
Nāgarā-ṛkha-śrāvaka, 7, 9-12, 14, 17, 32-33
Nāgarā-lahara, 17
Nāgarā-bhāva-cīmāna, 13
Nāgarā-cīmāna, 12, 20
Nāgari, rt., 8
Nāgēśvara, te., 40
Nakulaguṇī, do., 48
Nakulēśa, 48
Nāla, 19, 29
Nandi, rt., 31
Nandikēśvara, do., 16, 20
Nandimandapā, 3
Nandivarīma II, Pallavamalla, Pallava k., 14, 18.
Narasimha Pallava, dr., 6, 18
Nārāyanagudi, tr., 29
Nārēndra Mrigarāja, Eastern Chāluksa k., 23
Nāmādā, ri., 2
Nārika, 25
Nāvādyanagudi, te., 29
Nirandhāra, 16, 30, 41
Nolamba, dr., 1, 12, 14, 22-23, 26-27, 31-33
Nolambavāḍi, dr., 23
North Pemmar, ri., 1

P

Padma, 13, 20, 36
Padmāsana, pose, 48
Pallava, dr., 6, 9-11, 13-14, 16-18, 22-23, 26, 28, 31, 41, 47, 49
Panchākūṭabadi, tr., 14
Panchalingāla, m., 24-25
Panchāpatana, 46
Pāndyā, dr., 13-14, 18, 29, 26-27, 31, 45-47, 49
Pāpānāśānam, ri., 24
Pāpānātha, te., 7, 27-28
Paramēśvaravararāman, 11
Pallava k., 46
Periṣēr-dhānā, dr., 46
Pūrṣēkāri, 37-39
Pārvati, tr., 27, 30
Pāṣupata, Śaiva sect., 48
Pattadakal, m., 2, 6-7, 12, 15, 21, 27-30, 39, 41-42, 44, 46, 48
Pāṭikā, 13
Pennaḍam, ri., 14
Perum-Bānapādi, dr., 23
Piḍāri-ṛatru, 17-18
Pilka, 7, 32
Pīrīka, 36
Pondugula, ri., 31
Prayāḷaṅkēśvara, tr., 14
Prakṛta, 33, 47
Prandāla, 19, 45
Prastara, 12-13, 39
Pṛati, 19, 20
Pratyāṭūṭha, pose, 48

Pulakēśi II, Chāluksa k., 6, 16, 19, 23
Pārvaśikha, 9

R

Rājasimha, Pallava k., 14, 18, 47
Rāmakrishna Mahārājaper, ri., 14
Rangamandlapa, 28-29
Ranganātha, te., 9
Rēkha-nāgara-pradēṣa, 3, 5, 26-27, 29, 39
Rēkha-nāgara-sikhara, 21
Rudra, dr., 14, 37
Rudrabhāga, 23, 37

S

Śāntamundapa, 20
Śadvējātā, face of Śiva, 37-38
Sākkaraṅgudi, te., 29
Sālā, 9, 28, 32
Sāmakātāvarā, 17
Sālā-sikhara, 39
Sāndhāra, 10-11, 16-17, 20, 25, 28, 30
Śapōdur, ri., 27, 30
Sangāmēśvara, ri., 12, 24, 30, 39
Sangāmēśvara, te., 27-28, 31, 39, 41, 44
Śaptamātṛkā, dr., 46
Śaṅka Amogha VARSHA,
Rādhāprakāśa k., 46
Śarva Varūnābhadrā, face of Śiva, 12, 15, 37-38
Śatyavelu, ri., 10, 24-25, 27, 30
Śiddamakollā, te., 19, 29
Śiddhēśvara, ri., 31, 39
Śivalapperi, ri., 18
Sōmanāthapuru, dr., 33
Sōmēśvara, te., 32
Śravanabelgola, m., 26, 32
Śrīkūrma, pl., 32
Śrīrangam, dr., 9
Vaidumba, y., 26, 31-33
Vamanıja, 8, 37
Vaital, 4, 4
Valabhi-piśāda, 5
Valavanakurta, 17-18
Vāmālēva, de., 37-38
Varadā, ri., 1
Vārāmūrga, 45
Vātāpi, i.e., Badami, ri., 16
Vātāpyadhiṣṭhāna, de., 1
Vāti, 2
Vātikā, 5
Vengi, cu., 14, 19
Vėm-kūta, 12
Vēsara, 7, 9, 10, 26, 40
Vēsara-sikha, 20
Vēsara-Fimāna, 10
Vijayāditya, Chālukya ḍ., 27
Vijayanangalama, ṍ., 10, 26, 32
Vijayanagara, ṛ., 14, 25
Vijayēśvara, ṭ., 27
Vikramāditya, Chālukya ḍ., 17, 27
Fimāna, ṛ., 5-7, 9, 11, 13-17, 20-21, 25, 33, 39, 41, 47, 49
Vindhyā, 7
Virūpākṣha, ṭ., 7, 28, 41-42, 43-46, 48
Vītālēśvara, de., 14
Vinnu, 14, 46, 37
Vijayadhāra, 23, 37
Fritta, 20
Vīlā, 33
Vīlādhi, 12-13, 20

T
Tāla 6, 32, 35-36, 39-40
Talāchchhanda, 6, 39
Tāndava, 30
Tanjore, 40
Tāraka-Brahma, ṭ., 30
Tārappagudi, de., 19, 29
Tātpyrūṣha, face of Śiva, 37-38
Tirukkurungāli, ṭi., 18
Tiruttani, de., 14
Tiruvārīyār, de., 48
Tondaimandalam, ṭi., 41, 47
Tūrānā, 22, 32, 47
Tripāṭha, 20
Trivikrama, 8, 37
Tungabhadrā, ṛ., 1, 10

U
Udayagiri cave, 22
Udāgama, 22
Umaśāṃkha, de., 47
Upagriham, 13
Uśά, 10
Uśābhi, 20
Upper Śivālaya, ṭ., 5, 7, 10, 17, 19, 28, 39, 41
Ukṣa, 49
Uttira, 12