

modern North Indian temple is the result of the iconoclasm of Aurangzeb. More probably the builders followed the earlier tradition.

In South India the case was different. Here Brahmanic Hinduism had a longer existence, and the resources of the powerful local dynasties were devoted to temple-building. But even here these splendid buildings show the course of their development in the smallness of the central shrine. Many of them, like Seringham, for instance, grew up round a petty village shrine by a process of incrustation, one grand court, or boundary wall, or gateway being added by the piety of successive generations. In the same way the magnificent Egyptian temple of Karnak grew by successive additions to the original nucleus. The parent shrine, in fact, was considered too holy to be moved, and the god, like the men who worship him, desires privacy. Further there is in Hinduism no congregational worship like that which fills the cathedrals of Europe. It is only when the god deigns to go abroad in procession that his votaries, as a body, have a chance of observing and venerating him. The devotion paid at the ordinary temple is a personal not a congregational act. The Brahman acts as proxy for the worshippers, and needs no space for his ministrations. The permanence of the original petty shrine round which the temple grew is secured by the feeling that to demolish the existing house of the god would destroy the merit of the original builder, and bring no gain to the restorer. The god, who in by-gone days took shelter in the rude manhir or pillar-stone of a half-forgotten race, still abhors the sound of hammer and chisel, and prefers to abide, as he was wont to do, in the uncarved stone or shabby cell. This incrustation of buildings round a petty shrine is also a characteristic of modern Buddhism. The great pagoda at Pegu is said to have been originally only one cubit high.

The most primitive temple is found in the rude erections of the forest tribes. In the highlands of Central India the Bhil or Gond sometimes raises a rough straw shed over the fetish stone or rude image stained with red ocre which represents the tribal god. More usually he is content to pile these stones of fetishes under the shade of a sacred tree, and here the simple worship is performed.

But it is not from shrines like these that the modern temple was developed. Some have held that the temple had its origin in the tomb or relic-shrine of the Buddhists, and the case at

Jhansi, noticed by General Sleeman, has been quoted as an example.

"The family of the chief," he says, "do not build tombs, and that now raised over the place where the late prince was burned is dedicated as a temple to Siva, and was made merely with a view to secure the place from all danger of profanation."

This may account for the origin of some temples, but the explanation of growth of the modern temple lies in another direction.

The Chayits, or cave temple, of the Buddhists has been regarded by some authorities as the parent of the modern temple. These remarkable structures are distributed in a curious way, nine-tenths of those known being in the Bombay Presidency. As for the remainder, there are two unimportant groups in Bengal, those of Behar and Cuttack; one in Madras, and some insignificant examples in the Panjab and Afghanistan. They have no connection with similar constructions in Egypt, and their distribution is determined simply by the suitability of the rock formation for excavations of this kind.

The Chaitya in character presupposes a still older style of wooden building, the details of which, in construction and carving, it closely follows. This is specially the case with the Brahamical cave-temples, which generally copied buildings, while the Buddhist caves were always caves and nothing more. In form the Chaitya much resembles the Basilica of Europe. There is a long, lofty nave, with ogival roof, terminating in a semi-circular apse, which forms a choir occupied by an altar or relic-shrine. Two lateral aisles meet behind the choir. What would be the west end of a Christian cathedral has a great horseshoe window, and beyond it an imposing façade, with wooden galleries and balconies for musicians. So careful were the Buddhist builders to follow the tradition of a wooden structure, that they even inserted an inner carved roof. The finest of these Chaityas is that of Karli, the date of which is fixed by Mr. Fergusson at 78 B.C.; but the series really starts from the time of Asoka, about 250. That at Badami was built in the seventh century of our era. In such examples the animal capitals show a strong foreign, probably Persian, element.

"The Hindu temples," says General Cunningham, with perhaps some exaggeration, "are generally a sort of architectural pastry, a huge collection of ornamental fritters huddled together, either with or without keeping, while the Jain temple is usually a vast forest of pillars, made to look as unlike one another as possible by some paltry differences in their petty details."