CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Historical, Religious and Archaeological Background

1. Historical Context

Four dynasties, which arose from the ruins of the Chola and later Chalukya empires, that is, the Yadavas of Devagiri, the Kākaṭiyas of Warangal, the Hoyasalas of Dvārakamadra and the Panḍyas of Madurai dominated the political scene south of the Vindhyas in the thirteenth century. These kingdoms were swept away by the irresistible might of the invading Islamic forces in the early fourteenth century. By A.D. 1328 the whole of south India was brought under the control of Delhi.

Soon however revolts broke out against the rule of Delhi. In the far south the independent sultanate of Ma'bar was set up in Madurai; it lasted from A.D. 1385 to 1378.1 Shortly after this the empire of Vijayanagara was born and in A.D. 1347 the Bahmani sultanate came into existence. Thus, the political vacuum in south India, caused by the destruction of the earlier Hindu kingdoms, resulted in the emergence of the Vijayanagara empire.

There is some difference of opinion among historians regarding the date of the founding of this empire. Although A.D. 1336 has been traditionally described as the foundational year, the year A.D. 1346 has also been suggested. It is likely that the emergence of Vijayanagara's statehood was a gradual process. The Sangama brothers, who may have risen to prominence sometime around or after A.D. 1336, slowly consolidated their authority and were firmly in power by A.D. 1346, when they celebrated the famous "festival of victory" at Sringeri.2

The Vijayanagara empire, up to A.D. 1565, was ruled by three dynasties—the Sangama (A.D. 1336-1485), the Sāluva (A.D. 1485-1505) and the Tuluva (A.D. 1505-1570) dynasties. The first king, Harihara I (A.D. 1336-1356), the eldest of the five sons of Sangama, ably assisted by his brother Bukka, built up within a few years a kingdom stretching from coast to coast. During the latter part of his reign the Bahmani kingdom was established beyond the Krishnā river and with this commenced an era of constant warfare, the doāb between the Tungabhadra and the Krishnā being a bone of contention between the Vijayanagara and Bahmani states.

A great achievement of the reign of Bukka I (A.D. 1356-1377) was the destruction of the Ma’bar sultanate by Kumāra Kampana, Bukka’s son. This is described in the Sanskrit poem Madhuravijayam by princess Gāngādevī.

Harihara II (A.D. 1377-1404) was the first ruler of the dynasty to assume the imperial title of Mahārājādhirāja. His reign saw the expansion of the Vijayanagara empire over the whole of south India to the south of the river Krishnā. The Vedaṭhāya, begun under Bukka I, was completed now and earned for Harihara II the epithet of Vaidikamārga-sṭhāpanāchārya.

On the death of Harihara II there was a dispute over the succession among his three sons, Virūpāksha I, Bukka II and Devarāya I. Ultimately Devarāya I secured the throne and ruled from A.D. 1406 to 1422. He was followed by his sons Rāmacandra and Virā Vijaya both of whom ruled for brief periods. Virā Vijaya was succeeded by his son Devarāya II (A.D. 1424-1446), the greatest of the Sangama rulers. Following his reverses in wars against the Bahmanis, Devarāya II introduced reforms in his army and employed Muslims, especially in the archery and cavalry. He was a scholar and author, and a liberal patron of the arts and literature.

The glorious rule of Devarāya II was followed by a period of decline and disruption during the reigns of Mallikārjuna (A.D. 1446-1465) and Virūpāksha II (A.D. 1466-1485). The weak rule of these two kings facilitated the rise to power of Sāluva Narasimha, governor of Chandragiri, who usurped the throne in A.D. 1485.

Sāluva Narasimha (A.D. 1485-1491) was an able ruler who set himself to restore the might and the prestige of the empire. He was succeeded by his minor sons Timma (A.D. 1491) and Immacī Narasimha (A.D. 1491-1505), who had,
as their regent, the Tulva minister Narasa Nāyaka and later his son Vira Narasimha. The latter assassinated the Šaluva emperor and assumed power. With this second usurpation the Tulvas attained the imperial throne. Vira Narasimha (A.D. 1505-1509), after a short reign, was succeeded by his half brother Krishnadevarāya.

Krishnadevarāya (A.D. 1509-1529) was not only the greatest king in Vijayanagara history, but also one of the most brilliant monarchs in medieval India. His armies were successful everywhere—against the Bahmani sultan, 'Adil Shāh of Bijapur and the Gajapati ruler of Orissa. Krishnadevarāya maintained friendly diplomatic relations with the Portuguese on the west coast. An accomplished scholar and poet in Sanskrit and Telugu, Krishnadevarāya wrote the Telugu work Amukkamlāyada. The noted Telugu poet Allasani Peddana was his poet laureate and at his court were the eight poets known as the ashta-dīggajas. Krishnadevarāya renovated dilapidated temples throughout his empire, built new ones and gave munificent gifts and grants to temples.

Achuytarāya succeeded his half brother Krishnadevarāya on the throne. Achuytarāya (A.D. 1529-1542) was a capable ruler and a liberal patron of arts and letters.

In the power struggle following Achuytarāya’s death, the faction led by Krishnadevarāya’s son-in-law, Rāmarāya, triumphed and Sadāśiva, nephew of the previous ruler, was placed on the throne, although Rāmarāya remained the de facto ruler as the regent.

Rāmarāya became entangled in the interstate rivalries of the Deccan Sultanates that had been formed after the disintegration of the Bahmani kingdom. As a result of alliances and wars, Vijayanagara regained the territory lost after Krishnadevarāya and even extended its limits beyond the Krishnā. But, in the long run, Rāmarāya’s policy proved disastrous. The Deccan Sultanates, alarmed at the growing power of Vijayanagara, buried their differences and in a joint action defeated Rāmarāya in the decisive battle of Rakkasa-Tangadi—also known as the battle of Talikōta—in January A.D. 1565. The capital city Vijayanagara was temporarily occupied and sacked by the allied Muslim armies. The Vijayanagara state never fully recovered from the catastrophe of Rakkasa-Tangadi; the northern parts of Kārṇāṭaka came under Muslim rule and Vijayanagara ceased being the imperial capital. The truncated empire lingered on in the south, under the Aravidu dynasty (A.D. 1570-1646), while its feudatories became independent one after the other. Rāmarāya had died in the battle, his brother Tīrūmala, the founder of the Aravidu dynasty, moved to Penugonda in the Anantapur district taking with him the puppet ruler Sadāśiva. Later, in A.D. 1592, the capital was shifted further south to Chandragiri in North Arcot district and in A.D. 1606 to Vellore.⁴

Most historians writing about the nature of the Vijayanagara polity emphasize that it was a Hindu empire, acting as a bulwark against the southward expansion of Islam. It is assumed that the empire “came into existence for (1) the purpose of saving South India from being completely conquered by Muhammadans, (2) to save Hindu religion and give it a chance for its natural development, at least in this corner of India without molestation from outside agencies, and (3) to save for India as much of its culture and learning as was possible.”⁵ “The empire was founded for the protection of Dharma.... In the whole range of South Indian history an instance of an empire founded with the purpose of giving protection to a religion irrespective of different sects, has yet to be discovered.... Religion did not mean ... Saivism alone or Vaishnavism alone, but it embraced all the systems of religious thought.”⁶ “In matters spiritual the policy was the protection of Dharma understood in its widest sense; in matters social, it was the protection of the various kṣaṭiyāma dharmas...i.e., the peaceful observation of the rules of conduct as enjoined by the castes to which one belonged.”⁷ The Vijayanagara rulers claimed to be followers of Purvada maRVida (ancient constitutional usage).⁸

This traditional notion regarding the essence of the Vijayanagara state has been challenged by others. According to Stein, “this kind of interpretation stems from a modern nationalist sentiment and an only slightly older indoligism.”⁹ Earlier writers have interpreted titles such as “supporters of dharma” or “upholders of the ancient constitutional usage” too literally. Such titles constitute an important part of the tradi-
tional pedigree of the kings of ancient India and "protection of dharma" formed part of the coronation oath of the Hindu kings. It is true that wars against the Bahmaní sultans were frequent. But their cause was more political and economic rather than religious. It was but a revival of the ancient feud that had existed between the Deccan and south India under the earlier Hindu sovereigns, e.g., between the Chalukyas of Badami and the Pallavas, the Chalukyas of Kalyani and the Cholas, the Yadavas and the Hoysalas. Besides, the major victims of the Vijayanagara arms were not always the Muslims. The expansion and maintenance of the Vijayanagara empire also necessitated military expeditions against less powerful Hindu rulers, such as the Sanghabuvayas, the Redjis of Kondivai, the Velamas and the Gaipaties. Also, Muslim soldiers played an important part in the successes of the Vijayanagara army.

Therefore, the Hindu nature of the Vijayanagara state should not be overstressed. However, it must be accepted that the empire did create conditions for the defense of Hindu culture and institutions and it succeeded in limiting the expansion of Muslim power in the Deccan for over two centuries. During this period the outlook of the Hindus of the south developed into an orthodoxy in social and religious matters. The encouragement of religion by the Vijayanagara monarchs, as revealed by the numerous inscriptions, included promotion of Vedic and other studies, support of brahmanas, generous patronage extended to mathas and temples, pilgrimages to religious places and celebration of public rituals.

Under the patronage of the early Vijayanagara sovereigns, notably Bukka I, a syndicate of scholars, headed by Sanyana, undertook the prodigious task of commenting upon the Samhitás of all the four Vedas and many of the Brhamagpas and Aranyakas. A codification of the philosophical systems was effected in the Sarvadaršana-sangraha. Lands in villages and sometimes entire villages were granted to individual scholars or to groups of brahmanas. Achyutarāya’s dāna (gift) of Anandanidhi by which he made “Kuberás of the brahmanas” is recorded in different temples within the capital and elsewhere in the empire. Among the dānas, the gift of the weight of a man in gold or pearls, the tulāparuṣha-dāna, was considered especially meritorious. Devarāya I performed the tulāparuṣha in gold in the capital city and Achyutarāya that of pearls in Kāñchi at the Varadarāja-svāmi temple. Krishnadevarāya in the course of the Orissan campaign performed this ceremony at the Amarasvāra temple at Amarāvati.

Gifts to ascetics and sectarian leaders by the monarchs was common. Thus, Krishnadevarāya granted a number of villages to the Madhvāsa sage Vyāsārāya. Endowments to mathas encouraged religious learning and activities. The Advaita matha at Śṛṅgeri was the recipient of many royal grants; an inscription of Harīhara II lists the benefactions to the matha made by him and his predecessors.

The Vijayanagara rulers encouraged pilgrimages within their own empire, possibly to integrate the different language zones within the realm. Besides, visits to the northern sacred sites had become increasingly difficult due to the occupation of north India by the Muslims. The important pilgrimage centres were: Chidambaram, Virupakṣam, Kālahasti, Tirupati, Kāñchi, Srisailam, Tiruvaṉamalai, Harīhara, Āhobilam, Sangamesvara, Srirangam, Janahakėvaram, Kumbhakonam, Mahānadi, Gokarpam, Ramesvaram and Anantásayam. Several of these were considered to be substitutes for the northern pilgrimage sites, for instance, a visit to Ēkāmranātha in Kāñchi was equivalent to a visit to Vārānasi. The Vijayanagara rulers themselves often undertook pilgrimages.

Inscriptions are scattered throughout south India which record the benefactions to temples by the Vijayanagara rulers. The emperors and their subordinates built hundreds of new temples, repaired or made extensive additions to several old ones, settled disputes among temple servants and endowed the temples richly with lands (known as devadāna lands), money, taxes due to the state and jewels for the daily worship or for new festivals that were instituted. Such favours extended to Śaivaite, Vaishnavite and Jaina institutions. Besides state support, temples also enjoyed wide patronage from private donors such as rich individuals, sectarian leaders, professional guilds and communal groups.

The celebration of public rituals was an im-
important royal function. For it was believed that flourishing festivals would strengthen dharma, establish the presence of divine powers in the kingdom and stimulate the cosmic flow of gifts and fertility.\(^{23}\) During this period the most important of these rituals preserving cosmic order was, undoubtedly, the annual nine-day Mahānavami festival. Paes has left a vivid account of this festival,\(^ {25}\) a careful perusal of which makes clear that the festival, although basically religious in character, had political, economic, social and military significance. The focus of the ceremonies was upon the reigning king and the revitalization of his kingdom and his realm.\(^ {26}\) The various rites of this festival reveal that the king and the deity (being worshipped) were at least homologous, if not equal.\(^ {27}\)

The patronage of religion, especially the royal celebration of public rituals such as the Mahānavami, highlights the fact that in Vijayanagara system the relationship between kings and gods was one of partnership. “Sovereignty is conceived as shared between powerful humans (Rajas) and powerful deities (Devas); the sovereignty of neither is complete; the sovereignty of both, together, is perfect.”\(^ {28}\) Although the king himself was not seen as divine, kingship frequently was and the great royal rituals were attempts to bring into being this divine analogy.\(^ {29}\) The transactions between kings, temple deities, priests and sectarian leaders point to a relationship of mutual interdependence. There was a triangular relationship linking them.\(^ {30}\) The priests made offerings to and performed services for the gods, the gods preserved the king, his kingdom and his subjects and the king protected and awarded material rewards to the temples, the priests or sectarian leaders. Thus, while the temples and sectarian leaders bestowed honours and blessings on the king, the ruler in turn conferred on them protection and riches. Even though the kings were not conceived to be gods, kings manifested divinity and maintained divine order in the world. Prosperity, fertility, success in war, the right relationships between the castes and other groups—all resulted, ultimately, from royal activity.\(^ {31}\)

2. Religious Situation in South India

The centuries just prior to the foundation of the Vijayanagara empire and the period of this study were marked by intense religious activity in south India. In order to understand the history of the religious traditions in the city of Vijayanagara, a survey of the important sects and revivalist movements during this age and the religious affiliations and attitudes of the Vijayanagara kings is essential.

A. Religious Developments

A towering figure in the Hindu renaissance of the early medieval era was the great Śaṅkara (A.D. 781-820). Relying on the Upanishads, the Vedānta Sūtras and the Gītā, Śaṅkara gave a definite shape to the monistic or non-dualistic school of Vedānta philosophy known as the Advaita system. The entire philosophy of this school was summed up by Śaṅkara in half a verse, “Brahman is real, the world is an illusory appearance; the individual soul (jīva) is Brahman alone, not other.” The non-duality of Brahman, the non-reality of the world, and the non-difference of the soul from Brahman—these constitute the essence of the teaching of Advaita.\(^ {32}\) The Śvetātmas are the followers of the Advaita philosophy of Śrī Śaṅkara. They worship five gods, Śiva, Viṣṇu, Devi, Śūrya and Gaṇeśa, together known as Pañchānanta, but they give preference mostly to Śiva.\(^ {33}\) The two important Advaita mathas at Śrīnagar and Kāśipura, besides a number of others, propagated the Śaṅkara religious system and the Advaita philosophy. Inscriptions from A.D. 1346 onwards reveal the close links between the Vijayanagara rulers and the former matha. Two copper plate grants record the gift of villages to the latter by Krishṇadevarāya.\(^ {34}\)

The Pāṣupata sect of Saivism and its offshoots, the Kāpālika and the Kālānukha, were important Saivite sects. The Pāṭupata sect is anterior to the Christian era, but in the second century A.D. it was reorganized by Lakulīṣa.\(^ {35}\) One great difference between the Advaitins and the Pāṣupatas appears to have consisted in the fact that while the former laid great stress on the Vedas, the latter did so to the Saiva Agamas. The Kāpālikas worshipped mainly the Kāpaḷīn form of Śiva and also Chāmuṇḍa.\(^ {36}\) This sect was present in south India from the seventh century onwards but by the fourteenth century it seems to have virtually
The sect was perhaps absorbed by the Śaiva āstika orders such as the Kānphatas and the Aghoris. By the time of the origin of the Vijnānagāra empire the Pāśupatas and the Kāpālikas appear to have lost their influence.

The Kālāmukhas were very popular all over south India between the ninth and fourteenth centuries. They were so called because of a black streak worn across the forehead. They worshipped Śiva as Mahakāla (the great destroyer) or as Bhairava and also the goddess Kāli. The Kālāmukhas have been misrepresented by many. The great philosopher, Rāmānuja, wrongly identified them with the Kāpālikas and this was accepted by R. G. Bhandarkar. The Kālāmukhas have made a great contribution, especially in the field of education. Balliśvara and Kuppatūr, both in the Shimoga district of Kannātaka, and Srīśālam in the Kurnool district in Andhra were the most influential centres of the Kālāmukhas. The Kālāmuka-maṭha of the Kedārārāma temple in Balliśvara was a very important and famous educational institution during the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. Some of the Kālāmukha priests also acted as rāja-gurus. Among them were Sāreśvarāsakti and Roodrasakti, both of Kuppatūr, and Yāmāsakti of Balliśvara. The names of the Kālāmukha ascetics mostly end in śāki, rāsi, abhāraṇa or Śiva. While the last three endings may be found in the names of persons of other Śaiva sects as well, that of śāki is particular to the Kālāmukha sect.

After the early fifteenth century we do not hear anymore of the Kālāmukhas. It is possible that the democratic Līṅgāyat sect (and the enlightened Advaita religion?) absorbed the Kālāmukhas and they practically disappear from history.

That the Kālāmukha sect was absorbed by the reformist Vīraśāva religion is indicated by the fact that many of the former Kālāmukha temples and maṭhas, including the Kedārārāma temple at Balliśvara, the Tīrūτēśvara temple at Gadag and the maṭha at Srīśālam, are now controlled by the Vīraśāvas. Even more significant, perhaps, is the fact that few Vīraśāvas are found in areas not formerly dominated by the Kālāmukhas.

Another school of medieval Hindu mysticism which flourished in the Deccan was the Nātha sampradāya, founded by Mātyēndranātha and Gorakhnātha. The followers of this school are known as the nāthas, yagisora kāṇphatas. They are votaries of Śiva and Śakti with a strong bias towards the Śakti tradition. They also worship the nine saints known as the nava nāthas and the eighty-four siddhas. The fifteenth century Telugu work, Nava nāṭhar charitra, by Gaurājana, mentions members of this sect in Andhra. Srīśālam was an important centre of this cult and it was also popular in coastal Kannātaka during this period. Pietro della Valle, who passed through Mangalore in A.D. 1623, gives a detailed account of the Nātha monastery at Kadire.

Another important Śaiva school was that of the Tamil Śaiva-Siddhānta. It is based on the Vedas, the twenty-eight Śaivagamas and their Upagamās and the mystical poems of the Śaiva saints of south India, the sixty-three nāyikas. Tamil Śaivism is neither pure Advaita, nor is it Dvaita or Viśishṭadvaita. It is a doctrine by itself.

The Śivāvaita school was spearheaded by Śīkanta in twelfth century A.D. His work, Śīkanta Bhashya, was commented upon by that versatile sixteenth century scholar Apaya Dikshi. Except in minor details the Śivāvaita is not very different from the Śaiva-Siddhānta.

The Vīraśāva reform of the twelfth century A.D. spread rapidly from Kannātaka to Andhra and Tamil Nādu. The Vīraśāvas are also called the Līṅgāvaita on account of the līṅga that the followers of this sect wear on their person. Besides the Vedas, the Agamas and the Purānas, the Vīraśāvas accept the authority of the sixty-three Tamil Śaiva saints whom they refer to as the purātanas (ancients) and the 770 later Vīraśāva saints. Tradition asserts that this sect is very old that it was founded by five āchāryas, Ėkōrāma, Pānḍūrāṇadīva, Rēṇukā, Darukā and Viśvārūḍhā. But the real founder was Basava, the minister of Bijjala (A.D. 1162-1167), the Kalachuri king. The Vīraśāvas consider Basava to be the incarnation of Nandi.

This new faith is a departure from the ritualism of the Vedic traditions. The goal of human life is the union of the individual soul with the Supreme. This can be achieved by following the rules of the ashtāvaraṇa, the eight-fold spiritual aids, the pañcāchārya or the five-fold conduct and the shāsthrāṇa, the six-fold stages which lead one on the path of spiritual progress and perfection. Among the ashtāvaraṇa, the triad, the guru
(the spiritual guide), the linga (the mystic emblem of the Supreme) and the jāngana (the itinerant teacher) are the most important.

The Vīraśāvīva reform differed in many essentials from the Vaiṣṇava social practices. Thus, the Vīraśāivas allow widow remarriage and the burial of the dead; they do not follow sex and caste distinctions and neither do they wear the sacred thread. Basava emphasised the importance of labour, vegetarianism and the abstention from all intoxicants.

Vaishnavism received a great impetus in South India because of the work of the two great āchāryas, Rāmānuja and Madhava.51

Rāmānuja (A.D. 1017-1137), the great philosopher of Vaiṣṇavism, or qualified monism, followed a long line of Vaishnava thinkers in Tamil Nadu. Twelve poet-saints, the āṭhās (third to ninth centuries A.D.) had poured out their devotion in the form of songs. These were collected into what is called the Nāyāyīra-Krāmbadham. These songs constitute the basis of Vaiṣṇavism, together with the Upanishads and the Bhāgavata. The āṭhās were followed by a succession of āchāryas (teachers), the greatest of whom was Rāmānuja. According to his system, Vishnu is the Supreme deity, accompanied by Śrī or Lakshmi who represents divine grace. That is why the religion is called Śrī-Vaishnavism. In the place of the abstract, impersonal God or Nirguna Brahman of the Advaita school, Rāmānuja justified the need for a personal God, possessed of all good qualities (Saguna Brahman). He repudiated the doctrine of illusoriness of the material world and the finite self and postulated that Ultimate Reality is one, in which the material world and the finite self find a necessary place. He stressed the importance of bhakti (devotion) and prapatti (self-surrender) as means to receive the Lord’s favour. Śrī-Vaishnavism won many followers in Tamil Nadu. It also spread to parts of Karnataka following the conversion of the Hoysala king Vishnuvardhana by Rāmānuja.

In the early fourteenth century the Śrī-Vaishnava sect split into two groups—the Vairāgācāra, the northern or Sanskrit (Bhāṣya) school and the Tengalai, the southern or Tamil school. Vedanta Desika was the achārya of the former, while the latter was headed by Pillaī Lokāchārya and Manavāla Mahāmuni.

The Vadagalais favour the Sanskrit philosophical literature, while the Tengalais give more importance to the Tamil Prabandham. For the attainment of salvation, individual effort is the first step according to the Vadagalais (Markatanyaya or the monkey analogy), while for the Tengalais only surrender to the Lord is necessary (Mārjāranīyaya or the cat analogy). The Tengalais believe that, since God’s grace was spontaneous, sins could be committed without any reference to punishment; the Vadagalais reject this view. For the Vadagalais, Śrī is infinite and is a part and parcel of the Lord, but, the Tengalais relegate her to a lower position. The Vadagalais adhere strictly to the caste system, while the Tengalais contend that prapatti transcends all caste and creed barriers. Vadagalais consider that prostration should be made only to deserving persons like a guru, a brāhmaṇa, or the wife of the guru, etc., while the Tengalais perform the namaskāra to every Vaishnava of their school. There are some other minor differences: the Vadagalais enjoin the tonsure of widows while the Tengalais do not; the Tengalais are opposed to animal sacrifices, they do not ring the bell during pujā while the Vadagalais do.52 With regard to the nāmam, or the sacred mark worn by Śrī-Vaishnavas on their foreheads, the Vadagalais wear a U-like mark with a prominent curvature and the Tengalais have a different type with a distinct pāda projection at the bottom.53 Śrīraṅgam became the stronghold of the Tengalais and Kāñcipuram the centre of the Vadagalais.54

Madhvācārya (A.D. 1238-1317) preached the philosophy of Dvaita or dualism in Karnataka. The Dvaita system, while admitting two ultimate principles constituting Reality as a whole, regards only one of them (God) as Svetattra or Independent, the other, that is the world and souls, is Paratattra or Dependent. He stressed five types of differences or pāchābhedas; those between God and the soul, between God and matter, between matter and soul, between one soul and another soul, and between matter and matter. Madhva is supposed to have set up eight mathās in Udipi. It is, however, the three other mathās represented by a group of four disciples of Madhva—Padmanabha, Narahari, Madhava and Akshbhyta Tirtha and continued by their successors—which have made the most solid
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contribution to the propagation of Mādhvaism. Vāśāraya was a great Mādhva saint of the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries. Following the Dvaita philosophy of Madhvachārya a movement was started in Kārṇāṭaka in the fifteenth century, known as the Haridāsā movement, which greatly spread the cult of Viṣṇu.

Besides the Śaivite and Vaishnavite sects, there was also the Sākta cult. The Śāktas worship the Supreme Deity exclusively as a female principle. Its followers are of two schools, the Dakṣiṇāchārī (Walkers of the Right Way) and Vaiṣṇāchārī (Walkers in the Left Way). Side by side with the “greater” or Sanskritic sects of Saivism, Vaishnavism and Śāktism, there existed the “lesser” or non-Sanskritic cults of the popular or folk deities. Most of the grāmā-devatas are conceived of as supreme cosmic powers, but only as local deities with jurisdiction limited to the village. Most of these deities are female. The fertility cult and the predominant role of women in an agrarian economy perhaps were the reasons for this. Yellammas, Irukalamma, Polaladevi, Mukāmbikadēvi were some of the village deities worshipped during the period under review. The worship of snakes, represented by nāga-kāla, of sacred trees and of men and women who had died under heroic circumstances were also a part of popular religiosity.

For about fifteen centuries Jainism had been the dominant religion in this region. Its advent into Kārṇāṭaka is traditionally attributed to the migration of Bhadrabāhu and Chandragupta Maurya in the third century B.C. Jainism appears to have spread from the north, via Kaliṅga, to the Andhra region in the sixth century B.C. Throughout south India, for centuries, Jainism played a very significant role. But, the Hindu renaissance in Tamil Nādu led by the ādvīvatā of the nayanārs and the Saiva revival in Andhra struck a death blow to Jainism and it had virtually disappeared from these regions before the fourteenth century A.D. Its last stronghold in the south was in Kārṇāṭaka, where it had enjoyed much royal patronage under the Kalabahis, the early western Chālukyas, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Hoysalas. Even though the Viṣṇava movement resulted in the decline of Jainism, it continued to be fairly influential in Kārṇāṭaka during the period under review and it received patronage from the Vijayanagara rulers. However, by the sixteenth century the decline was irreversible and Jainism came to be mainly restricted to certain areas, such as the Tuluva country. Jainism in south India was dominated by the Digambara order. The Jaina sect was exclusive to Kārṇāṭaka.

Islam reached south India via the Arab traders who visited and settled along the west coast. With the Muslim invasions, the presence of Islam was felt for the first time throughout south India. During the Vijayanagara period, the employment of Muslim soldiers in the army resulted in the wider spread of Islam.

Although there were Christians in Malabār long before the period under survey, it was only with the coming of the Portuguese that Christianity spread to other areas. However, Christianity was restricted to a few pockets and its impact, therefore, was minimal.

B. Religious Affiliations of the Vijayanagara Rulers

Historians differ about the affiliations of the Vijayanagara sovereigns. Were the early Saṅgamas the disciples of Viṣṇurāma and the Śrīneri maṭha or of Kālāmukha gurus? To what sect did the later Saṅgamas belong? When did the shift from Saivism to Vaishnavism take place? Were the Saṅgamas and early Tuluvas Mādhvas or Śrī-Vaishnavas? When did Śrī-Vaishnavism gain predominance?

A careful study of the epigraphical and literary sources reveal that the rāja-gurus of the early Saṅgamas were Kālāmukhas. In this they were following the traditions of the Kārṇāṭaka monarchs, who from the middle of the eleventh century A.D had set the precedent of selecting their rāja-gurus from one or other of the famous Kālāmukha centres—Bāligāve, Kappattur or Śrīśāhilam. At the same time the kings showed great devotion to the Śrīneri Advaita maṭha and to its pontiffs Viṣṇurāma, Bhāratiyār and Viṣṇurāma, the last of whom came into contact with Vijayanagara only twenty years after its founding.

There are epigraphical and literary references to the Kālāmukha Kriṣṇākūṭa gurush from A.D. 1347 to 1442. At least three different Kriṣṇākūṭaśis were mentioned—Kāśīvīlaśa, Vaṁśīvīlaśa and Chandrabhūṣana. It is evident that the
first name in the full title is the personal designation of the guru and the second that of his office. Two inscriptions of A.D. 1347 refer to Kriyasakti as the guru of the famous minister Madhavamantrin.62 A stone inscription of Bukka I’s reign dated A.D. 1368 speaks of Kasivilasa Kriyasakti as the preceptor of this minister.63 During this same reign, in Madhiravijayam Gangadévi pays obeisance to guru Kriyasakti.64 A copper-plate grant of Harishara II dated A.D. 1378 mentions Kriyasakti as the kula-guru (family preceptor of the king).65 Another record of A.D. 1379 refers to the raja-guru Väñivilasa Kriyasakti.66 Two other copper-plate grants of 1398 and A.D. 1399 praise Harishara II as the worshipper of the feet of raja-raja-guru-pitamaha Kriyasaktideva.67 An inscription of A.D. 1410 refers to Dvararaya I as having received supreme knowledge from the favour of raja-guru Kriyasakti.68 In the same year in a grant of his son Vijaya-Bhupati, Kriyasakti is referred to as the guru.69 A grant was made by Dvararaya II in A.D. 1429 to certain brahmanas with Kriyasakti at their head.70 Another record of the same reign, dated A.D. 1431, mentions Kriyasaktideva.71 The record of A.D. 144272 referring to raja-guru Kriyasakti-Ojeya is the last epigraphical reference to these preceptors. Srinatha, the Telugu poet, relates of the presence of Chandrabhushana Kriyasakti in the court of Dvararaya II.73 After his reign no more is heard of the Kalamukhas.

The close relationship between the Sringeri monks and Vijayanagara is evident from A.D. 1346 onwards. Harishara I and his relatives in A.D. 134674 and Bukka I in A.D. 135675 paid homage to Vidyaranya and made land grants to Bharatitirtha. Harishara II was zealous in his devotion towards this matha and to Vidyaranya. In 1380 he confirmed all the previous grants.76 In A.D. 1384 he made a donation to two disciples of sage Vidyaranya.77 In 1386-87, after Vidyaranya’s death, the same ruler made a generous land grant near Sringeri in honour of the guru.78 Bukka II in A.D. 1406 gave an endowment for the renovation and proper maintenance of a library belonging to the matha.79 The gifts of land made by Dvararaya II in A.D. 143180 and by Mallikarjuna in A.D. 145181 show that the later Sañgama rulers continued to patronise the Sringeri matha. Such a relationship of the Vijayanagara rulers with the Sringeri gurus is not at variance with their having Kalamukhas as their family preceptors, for no exclusiveness existed at the time in the matter of paying respects to more than one venerable teacher.82

Viraśāivism was influential in the later Sañgama period. According to one school of thought Dvararaya II and his immediate successors were Viraśāivas,83 but there is no conclusive evidence to support this contention. Yet it is undoubtedly true that this sect enjoyed favour. The Chennabasav Purana by Virupaksha Pundita (A.D. 1584) informs us that Dvararaya II revered and patronised the Lingayat gurus Kerasthalada Viraṇa and Basasveśa and he even gave his daughter in marriage to the former.84 It is believed that 101 virakas (“the passionless ones”) propagated the religion in the empire. Among them were General Lakkapuṇa, the author of Śivatattva Chintāmānī and Chamarasa, who wrote Prabhulīṅguatlī.85

According to some historians the last Sañgama monarch, Virupaksha II, was converted to Śrī-Vaishnavism. This is based on the account in Prapannāmritam by Anantāchārya.86 It is not supported by epigraphical, archaeological or other literary evidences. Besides, the Prapannāmritam is a Śrī-Vaishnava hagiographical work of the seventeenth century. The historical accuracy of such a source is questionable. Hence, it is most likely that Virupaksha was a Śaiva like his predecessors.

The shift to Vaishnavism occurred with the change in dynasty. Sāluva Narasimha was a devotee of Venkaṭēsvara of Tirupati and Narasimha of Ahobal. His guru was Kandādai Rāmānujaḻiyangīr, a prominent spiritual leader at Tirumalai and Tirupati.87 According to Śrī Vyāsayaṅgīcharitam by Somanātha, the Mādhva sage Vyāsārya was the raja-guru of Sāluva Narasimha, Tuluva Vira Narasimha, Krishṇarāya and Achyutarāya. Going by this account, it is claimed that these rulers favoured the Mādhva sect.88 But, without other corroborating evidences the assertion of Śrī Vyāsayaṅgīcharitam cannot be accepted. For, although Somanātha was a contemporary of the sage, he was also his devout disciple. Besides, his work, a chaitīpū-kāya, is replete with embellishments typical of this literary genre. No inscriptions refer to Vyāsārya’s influence over Sāluva Narasimha,89 or over Vira Narasimha. Many
epigraphs point to the great reverence of Krishnadevaraya for this guru. Still from this it cannot be definitely stated that the king was a Madhva. His relationship with the sage might have been more personal than sectarian. Inscriptions also refer to Sri-Vaishnava ascetics whom he venerated, such as Govindaraja, who is called his guru, and Venkata Tatāchārya. The king’s favourite deity was Venkateswara of Tirupati and his strong leaning towards Sri-Vaishnavism is revealed in the *Aruna-kambārāja*. Under the last Tejuva emperor, Sadasiva and his regent Ramaraya, Sri-Vaishnavism won an undisputed ascendancy; Pañchamatabhañjanam Tātāchārya was the guru of Ramaraya.

Harihara I and his successors had placed the realm under the protection of Sri Virupaksha and had adopted this name as their “sign-manual”. Despite the change in the sectarian affiliation there was no alteration in this till the Aravidu king, Venkata II, replaced “Sri Virupaksha” by “Sri Venkatesa” as the official signature.

The conscious effort at religious conciliation seen in the Jana-Vaishnava accord of Bukka I in A.D. 1368 was continued by the later rulers. For, despite their sectarian preferences, the Vijayanagara rulers, on the whole, adopted the deliberate policy of tolerance towards all sects, so as to incorporate them all within the polity. Thus, Devaraya II endowed the Sri-Vaishnava temples at Srinagaram and Tirumala, and favoured Jainas institutions in the capital and elsewhere. They employed Muslims in his army and allowed them to practise their religion freely. The Vaishnava Krishnadevaraya bestowed lavish grants and gifts on Saiva temples and Achyutaraya, on the occasion of his coronation, gave an equal number of villages to the temples of Ekambaranatha and Varadaraja at Kanči. Under Sadasiva and Ramaraya, however, although there was no persecution of Saiva institutions, the official patronage was primarily extended towards Sri-Vaishnava ones. This departure from the traditional policy had unhappy consequences.

3. The City of Vijayanagara

The City of Bidjanagar is such that the pupil of the eye has never seen a place like it, and the ear of intelligence has never been informed that there existed anything to equal it in the world. Abdur Razzak, the Persian ambassador to the court of Devaraya II. The city is situated in magnificent surroundings, the most striking element of which is the river Tuṅgabhadra that flows here in a north-easterly direction through rugged, rocky terrain, particularly inhumanly on the northern bank. The pinkish-grey granite boulders form fantastic shapes as though piled up by some mysterious spirit. To the south of the river are two ridges, separated by a valley, and low hills such as Hemakuta and Mataṅga. Immediately south of these the landscape changes, there are open valleys with isolated rocky outcrops, including Māhavanta. Gradually the hills disappear and the land becomes increasingly flat and open. The larger valleys are irrigated; the contrast between the stark rocks and the green, fertile valleys adds to the picturesqueness of the site.

The remains of the imperial city of Vijayanagara, popularly known as “the Hampi ruins”, are spread over an extensive area of about twenty-five square kilometres, from the village of Hampi in the north to Kāmatāpuram in the south (see Fig. 1). The outer lines of its fortifications and the suburban areas, however, include a much larger area from Anegondi in the north to the modern town of Hospet in the south.

The city was called Hosapattana, the “New City”, for some time. Later it came to be known as Vijayanagara the “City of Victory” and in the sixteenth century, it also came to be called Vīlāyānagara. Haripura, Pāripā-kṣethra, Bhāskara-kāśi, Pāripā-pura, Virupaksha-kṣethra, these are some of the other names by which the site is identified in inscriptions, though, perhaps, these refer more particularly to the sacred area on the south bank of the river and not to the entire metropolis. Besides Abdur Razzak, other visitors have left glowing accounts of the splendour of Vijayanagara. These include the Italian Nicolo Conti in the early fifteenth century, his compatriot Varthema in the beginning of the sixteenth and the Portuguese Duarte Barbosa, Domingo Paes and Fernão Nunis.

The Sangamas did not build the capital in an uninhabited desert land. The discovery of neoliths and handmade pottery at the site proves
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that the history of the Hanipi region dates back to the neolithic/chalcolithic times. 107 Buddhist occupation here appears to be limited to the first and third/fourth centuries A.D. is indicated by an inscription in Brāhmi characters found during excavations near the "King's Audience Hall" 108 and the more recent find in A.D. 1985 of five limestone slabs with elaborate reliefs. Epigraphical evidences show that this area was under the control of the various dynasties that ruled Kamataka successively, including the early western Chālukyas, 109 the Chālukyas of Kalyani, 110 the Hoysalas 111 and the Kampli chief. 112 Lingayat poets, such as Harîvâra and Râghavârâ, were active here in the twelfth century A.D. 113 This site, from pre-Vijayanagara times, has an unbroken tradition of sanctity. It is a place of pilgrimage hallowed by goddess Patîpâ and her consort Virûpâksha. Kâshîkândhâ of the Râmiyana is also believed to be close to Hanipi.

Although the popular tradition of the "hare and the hounds" 114 and some spurious inscriptions ascribe the foundation of the city to Harihara I and Vidyâranya, Vijayanagara became the imperial capital only during the reign of Bukka I. 115 Harihara I ruled from Anegondi on the north bank of the Tungabhadra. 116 An inscription dated A.D. 1349 of Harihara found in Anegondi 117 and the absence of all epigraphical or archaeological remains of his reign in Vijayanagara gives weight to this supposition. Paes refers to Anegondi as the "old capital". 118

A record of A.D. 1368 states that Bukkarâya was "on the throne of the new Vijayanagara" 119 and another of A.D. 1378 asserts that Bukka "built a splendid city, called the city of victory." 120 The "royal centre" was built during this reign; inscriptions from the site refer to two gates, the Sânhârada Hebbâgîlû (NS g) and the Somâvarâda Bâgîlû (NS s), in the fortification wall around this centre, as being "east of the city of Vijayanagara of Sri Vira Bukkarâya." 121

Under Harihara II the capital was already a well-developed city extending from the present Hanipi to Kamâlapuram. Near the former was built in A.D. 1386 a Śiva temple, 122 while close to the latter, in A.D. 1385, General Irugappa constructed the chaityâlaya of Kunthu Jinanâtha ("Gângîtâ" temple). 123 In the sixteenth century Krishnadâvâra shifted the royal residence to the newly built suburban area to the south of the main city. 124 He returned, however, to the city proper, for the celebration of public rituals. 125

To facilitate documentation at the site, the entire area has been divided into four functional zones—the "sacred centre", the "intermediate irrigated valley", the "urban core" and the "sub-urban centres". 126 The "sacred centre" is to the south of the Tungabhadra. Here, in the confined areas of flat land or at the summits of rocky outcrops, are located the largest temple complexes of the city, numerous smaller temples and shrines, sculptures and inscriptions. To the south of this is an "irrigated valley"; the paucity of buildings and potsherds here indicate that this was an agricultural zone. The "urban core" occupies a series of hills, ridges and valleys to the south of the agricultural zone. The greatest concentration of population was located here, as is revealed by the traces of residences, tanks, wells, roads, stairways, pottery and also of the remains of many small shrines and larger temples. This zone is surrounded by a complete circuit of fortification walls, broken only by well-defended gateways. In the south-west end of the "urban core" is the "royal centre" (also referred to as the "palace zone" or "citadel"), which had its own enclosure wall, only parts of which have survived. To the north, the "urban core" is bounded by the north ridge. In the east end of the north ridge and the north-east valley was the Muslim quarter. Beyond this zone, further south and west, as far as modern Hospet, were laid out the great residential suburbs. A few isolated temples in these are all that remain of the once populous "sub-urban centres".

The validity of such a division of the site into four parts has been questioned and it has been suggested that the site should be viewed as a whole. 127 However, it must be noted that the authors themselves do not consider this designation as definitive. 128 For the sake of convenience, and for want of a better terminology to differentiate between areas in this vast city, these terms have been used in this monograph.

What were the city's limits? In the time of Bukka I, as already seen, the "royal centre" within its own fortifications appears to constitute the city of Vijayanagara. In a later period
the “urban core” was viewed as the furthest extent of the city. Thus, Faes differentiates between ‘Crisnāpor’, the area around the Krishṇa temple, from ‘Bīmāna’ (Vijayanagara). From another point of view the city may be considered to embrace the whole site — “sacred centre”, “urban core”, and “sub-urban centres”. In this monograph, the city proper is assumed to comprise only the “sacred centre”, the “irrigated valley” and the “urban core”, where extensive field work has been carried out. In the “sub-urban centres” to the south and Anegunḍi to the north, which are included in the metropolitan area of the city, the field research has been restricted to the important monuments and remains.

Inscriptions and literary sources supply information about some of the quarters, suburbs, canals, markets, gates, etc., many of which date from the sixteenth century. The area around the Virupākṣha temple (NF w/1) was variously known as Virupākṣhapura or Hanippe, Pampākshetra,131 Pampā-pura132 or Bhāskarahsetra.133 The Viṭāla temple (NH a/1) was located in Vithalapura.134 On his return from the victorious Udayagiri campaign Krishṇadēvari installed the mūrti of Bālaśēkhara in the Krishṇa temple (NL m/4) in Krishṇapura.135 The area in which at present the A.S.I. office and the Traveller’s Bungalow are situated in Kāmalaṇḍapuram was called Kandāmarasayana-Pāla.137 Kāmalaṇḍapuram was known by that name at least from A.D. 1531 onwards.138 An inscription of A.D. 1541 mentions Kāmalaṇḍapuram and the big tank there.139 Gori-kalagan-grāma (village downwards of the tank)140 was, probably, the “Moorish quarter” of Faes;141 Hiriya Tirumalaraja, the brother-in-law of Aavyutāra, built the Tiruvengalāṉāṭha temple (NM t/1) in Aavyutāraṇāpura.142

Aavyutāraṇāpura was in Aavyutāraṇāpura.143 Other markets included the Krishṇapura-pēṭe,144 the Pedda-angadi-vidhi (big bazaar street) near the Mādhava temple (NR t/2)145 and the Kramaka-parṇāṇa-vidhi (pāṇi-supāri bazaar) in which the chaityākaya of Pārśvanātha (NS q/1) is situated.146

The so-called Turutta canal was originally known as the Hiriya Kāluve (big canal).147 The small canal, on either side of which there are stone plates (NW m), was called the Utada kāluve (canal for eating).148 Along the river, besides Pañpā-ṭūrthā, other sacred spots were Chakṣu-ṭūrthā (NG t)149 and Kōi-ṭūrthā (NG m).150

During the reign of Krishṇadevarāya the agraḥārātownship of Nāgadēvi-vipura was called after the king’s mother (modern Nāgēnahalli).151 Śāle-Tirumale-Māhārāya-pura152 (modern Anantaśāyanagudi) was built in A.D. 1524 in honour of the heir apparent. Tirumaladevi-ammana-ṭaṇḍu, named after the principal queen, forms the nucleus around which the town of Hospes has grown.153 During Aavyutāra’s reign the new suburbs of Varadadevi-amman-ṭaṇḍu extended from the Pattābhirāma (or Raghunātha) temple towards the Penugonda gate.154

The monuments within the city consist mainly of religious, civil and military buildings. The religious structures, such as the small shrines, large temple complexes and sculptures, provide the main source of information for this monograph.

While the bulk of the temples belong to the Vijayanagara period, a small proportion may be assigned to the pre-Vijayanagara times. These are mostly located in the original pilgrimage centre at the site, i.e., on the Hēmākūṭa hill and in and around the Virupākṣha temple complex. These early temples are built in the styles typical of the Deccan architecture—the Raṣṭrakūṭa, Kadamba and the late Chālukya/Hoysaḷa styles.155 The earliest temples, dating from the ninth to tenth centuries A.D., are in the Raṣṭrakūṭa idiom. There are at least two of these, the best example being the Duragā-devi temple near the Māmāthaka tank (NF w/25). There are many “Kadamba-style” temples on the Hēmākūṭa. These are characterised by the stepped, pyramidal stone superstructures, the open porches with overhanging eaves and the plain outer walls with a horizontal band of geometric designs in the middle.156 Some of these have triple shrines. The Bhuvanēsvari shrine within the Virupākṣha complex, with its fine lathe-turned chlorite columns and elaborate door-frame and ceilings, is in the later-Chālukya-Hoysaḷa idiom.

There are hundreds of small shrines and some large temple complexes within the city.
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dating from the Vijayanagara period. The
former, comprising only a cella or a cella and
porch or a cella, small mandapa and porch are
found all over the site, while the latter are
mainly restricted to the "sacred centre".

Two distinct strains are to be seen in the
Vijayanagara style of temple art and architecture—
the Karṇāṭaka tradition (of the
Rāṣṭraṅgūnas-later Chālukyas-Hoysalas) and the
Tamil traditions (of the Pallavas-Cholas-
Pāṇḍyas). The temple style of the Tamil region
satisfied the increasingly elaborate ritualistic
needs better than the Karṇāṭaka type of temple
with fewer components and smaller dimensions.
Thus, in the developed style of Vijayanagara
temple architecture the material used (granite,
with brick and mortar for the super-structures),
the general plan and the various auxiliary struc-
tures are mainly from the Tamil tradition, but
the sculptural themes and the decorative motifs
come from the Karṇāṭaka traditions.

A medium-sized temple in the city has a
garbhā-griha, a sūkranī (antechamber), an
antarālā (second ante-chamber) and a raṅga-
mandapa, all arranged axially.\textsuperscript{53} Larger ones
have in addition a closed pradakshinā
(circumambulatory) passage around the san-
tum and an open mahā-mandapa or mukha-
mandapa in front. Such temples stand within
one or more prākāras (courtyards). The auxil-
ary structures within the temple courtyard in-
clude the separate shrine for the goddess, the
kālīna-mandapa with the raised platform in
the centre for the reception of the deity and his
consort at the annual celebration of their mar-
rriage, the temple kitchen and store-rooms,
the hundred-pilledared hall for music and dance,
the shrines of the subsidiary deities or saints, the
pushkarnā or temple tank, the towering gopuras
and the ratha-viḍīhī chariot street. The temple
pillars are decorative. In the fourteenth and
early fifteenth centuries the kālīna-Chālukyan
pillar-type remained popular.\textsuperscript{54} The most
characteristic type of pillar is one in which the shaft
is cut into three square blocks, usually with
reliefs on each side, separated by sixteen and
octagonal sections. The composite pillars are a
sixteenth century feature. In these the central
shaft has either a rearing yālī/horse with the
rider in front or a cluster of columnettes at-
tached to it. In the chitrākhaṇḍa variety of
pillars the shaft is composed of a series of mini-
ature shrines, one over the other. The typical
Vijayanagara corbel is of the pushpā-podi-gai
variety. The wide roll cornice with a double
flexure is an important decorative element in
these temples.

The fourteenth century temples, such as the
PrasannaVirūpākṣa ("Underground") temple
(NQ y/1) and the Jaina temple of Khumthu
Janāṭha in the Deccan style. The early
fifteenth century Ramachandra temple (NR w/1)
is the first major construction in the city in the
imported southern style. During the fifteenth
century there was gradually a total absorption of
the southern influence into the characteristic
Vijayanagara style as can be seen from the
Madhava (NR t/2), Tiruvengalanatha (NX 1/1)
and Chandraśēkara (NX 1/1) temples within the
"royal centre". In the sixteenth century many
additions were made to existing temples and
new temples complexes were constructed.
The most important of these are the Virūpākṣa (NF
w/1), Khumthu (NL m/4), Tiruvengalanatha (NM
h/1), Vithala (NHA/1), Mālāvīya Rāghūnātha
(NT d/1) and Paṭṭābhirama.\textsuperscript{60}

A large number of non-religious themes—
soldiers on horseback, cloaws, acrobats, wres-
tlers, folk dancers, animals, and birds—are in-
corporated into the temple sculptures. The va-
riety of deities depicted, often not according to
the canonics texts, and the large number of non-
religious themes represented indicate innova-
tions in and new interpretations of the iconog-
raphical rules that guided artists in the early
periods.\textsuperscript{61} Besides the sculptures in the temples,
there are also a vast number of reliefs carved on
free-standing boulders and also a few monu-
mental statues.

Besides the Hindu and Jaina temples and
sculptures there are also remains of a number of
Muslim tombs, gravestones and at least two
mosques.

Contemporary with the religious monuments
are secular structures of different types. Among
these are some that employ easily recognisable
Islamic elements such as arches, domes, stucco
decoration and parapets. The most important
of these are the so-called "Lotus Mahāl" (NR t/3)
and the three watch towers in the "Zenana
Enclosure", the "Queen's Bath" (NW p/1), the
Octagonal Fountain (NW g/3), the "Guards"
Quarters” (NR p. 3) and the “Elephant Stables” (NR p. 3). A careful study shows that these buildings demonstrate an effective synthesis of different architectural styles. Despite using Islamic elements they are neither Muslim nor Hindu, but are typically Vijayanagara. This was an imperial style reserved for buildings connected with the king, court and army.162

Although no palace structure has survived intact, the recent excavations conducted at the site by the Archaeological Survey of India and the Directorate of Archaeology and Museums, Government of Karnataka, have exposed the basements of a number of courtyard residences. These follow an almost uniform pattern.163 Associated with the court life were other platforms such as the “King’s Audience Hall” (NW c/1) and the “Mahānāmavī Dībba” (NW d/1), also called the “House of Victory” or the “ Throne Platform.”

The city was fortified by circuits of defensive walls. According to Abdur Razzāk164 there were seven circles of fortifications, while Nikiṭi165 and Vathūma166 describe only three. The only more or less intact circuit wall is the one around the “urban core”. The names of some of the strongly defended gateways that controlled movement in and out of the city are provided by epigraphs, such as the Aresanakara Bulghilu (NJs), Udayagiri Bulghilu (Nv d) and Penugonda Bulghilu,167 the Kotisankaradevaru Bulghilu (NQ s & x)168 and the Bejakarana Bebbaghilu (NYe).169

The destruction of this rich and splendid city was sudden and dramatic. Following the climactic of Rakkasa-Tangadi, Vijayanagara was first looted by bands of robbers and then systematically plundered by the victorious Deccan armies. The large quantities of charcoal found during the archaeological excavations prove that parts of the city were burnt, while the mutilated sculptures render mute testimony to the iconoclastic zeal of the invaders. However, as Caeser Frederick relates, the city was not fully destroyed in A.D. 1565 and TirumalaRaya even attempted, though unsuccessfully, to restore it as the capital.170 No longer the setting of an imperial dynasty, the city soon fell into decay. Later treasure seekers171 and vandals added to the desolation of the city and the forces of nature completed the destruction begun by man.
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A number of examples can also be given of the damage wrought by treasure seekers or vandals at the site even during the past few years. One very recent example will prove that the destruction at Vijayanagara was not exclusively the work of the looters of A.D. 1565. In temple NG a/2 by the river there are three magnificent groups of portrait sculptures, with labels mentioning the names of the figures (see VPR 83-84, pp. 140-141 and plates XXI a and b and XXII a). These are the finest portrait sculptures at the site. Early in 1988, one of these groups (Ibid., Plates XXI b) was severely mutilated by some unknown persons. This was, indeed, a senseless and vicious act of vandalism.