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Abstract

The following dissertation is a digital exploration of medieval South Indian sacred landscapes through the corporeal and material developments at a specific pilgrimage center. I focus both on how particular devotional experiences were structured through corporeal management of devotees, and on their connection to the ritual, social, and political life of a historicized sacred space. Corporeal experience is analyzed through an examination of devotee movement, accessibility, and sensorial engagement with the material world. The material world refers specifically to both the natural and built environment, including landscape features, spatial organization, and architectural design, and consequently provides information about social interaction within these spaces. This thesis does not engage with abstract or mythological landscapes, which remain to be reconstructed for the period of investigation, though associations of the mythological with places in the landscape are noted where known.

My spatial focus in this study is centered on the sacred Hemakuta Hill and the immediate surrounding area, in the imperial capital city of the Vijayanagara Empire, also called Vijayanagara, located in the Bellary District of Karnataka, India. My temporal focus is on the hitherto under-studied period of 600 CE to 1325 CE and the Early Imperial Phase years of the
Vijayanagara Empire (c. 1336-1400 CE). During this time, the Hemakuta Hill area was a liminal river pilgrimage site associated with death rituals and folk deities. It subsequently expanded to also become the primary cult center for the Sanskritic deity, Virupaksha.

Through the use of the spatio-temporal visualizing capabilities of ArcGIS, coupled with the immersive panoramic capabilities of Google Street View, I provide new insights into the development of the historic material world and ritual experiences in the Hemakuta Hill area, exposing the problems of homogenizing pre- and early imperial Vijayanagara architecture and sacred landscapes. The analytical methods I have created for this investigation recognize that a range of ritual needs and social situations are possible between a wide variety of actors, such as devotees, mourners, and worshipers, in addition to deities and ancestors who also had social and material presences of their own. Moreover, the spatial and structural patterns identified through my analysis have allowed me to distinguish a spectrum of additional group identities, local and non-local as well as elite and non-elite groups, with demonstrably distinct ritual, social, and political needs. These groups and their engagement with the landscape shaped the material world in the Hemakuta Hill area. These patterns also suggest that from 600 CE through 1325 CE and into the Early Imperial Phase, devotee corporeal experience was increasingly directed by dominant groups active in the sacred landscape with the intention of eliciting particular devotee ritual experiences.

By examining the development of the landscape and identifying when and where and how space was altered, the palimpsestual nature of an early medieval South Asian sacred landscape has also been made visible.
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Chapter 1

1 Socio-Political and Ritual Foundations for the Hemakuta Hill Area 600-1325 CE

1.1 Introduction

This thesis is a historical and material reconstruction of sacred space and associated physical-sensorial (corporeal) experiences in the Hemakuta Hill area (600-1325 CE) that developed into a core portion of the Vijayanagara Empire capital city. Using this data, I establish the religious importance of the location during this early period, which contributed to the importance of the later capital city as a pilgrimage site. I also show that the ritual and political strategies adopted by later Vijayanagara elites to legitimize their rule were likely established in this formative era. The setting for this research, centered on the earliest stone structures (architecture) built in the Hemakuta Hill area, offers an excellent setting for digital reconstruction and for exploration of how space, movement, the material world, and corporeal experience were regulated, and themselves shaped social and political relations in a ritually charged environment centered on pilgrimage. The digital methodology for this research, using a geographic information system and the open-access Google mapping platforms of Street View and Google Earth Pro, provides the organizational tools to identify distinct groups worshipping in and influencing the spatial-material world of the Hemakuta Hill area landscape. This suite of methods further permits the isolation of “invisible” and “visible” landscape features employed to enhance or channel devotional corporeal experiences.

The structures at the site reflect a steady development of the use of sacred space throughout this early period, reflecting changing ritual, social, and political needs as the center served as a liminal river pilgrimage site associated with death rituals and folk deities, and was expanded to also serve as the primary cult center for the Sanskritic deity Virupaksha. Most materially-identifiable innovations at the site occurred in reaction to and as an adaptation to site expansion. The extent to which the different cults, social groups, and religious values were able to coexist in the Hemakuta area points to a spirit of tolerance and inclusion, but the removal of some structures and paving over of spaces both suggest traces of conflict. The use of space
across the site progressed from planning that was characterized by an open and accessible nature that made use of topographic features to establish conceptually distinct ritual areas, to an ever-increasing appropriation, definition, and bounding of space through a range of novel architectural mechanisms. Attached to the different ways that sacred space was used were the intentions and interests of the sects, groups, and/or individuals that shaped the material world of the Pampa tirtha (pilgrimage) at this location. Through calculated uses of space and development of the material world of the Hemakuta Hill area, these actors were also manipulating and managing the corresponding corporeal experiences of other devotees. Piety and claims to the moral right to power were bedfellows for political aspirations that infiltrated the Hemakuta area most clearly by the late pre-imperial period with the increasing Sanskritization of the pilgrimage site (the term Sanskritization is discussed in Section 1.2.2).

Within this thesis I analyze devotee corporeal experience through movement, accessibility, and sensorial engagement with the material world. The material world refers specifically to both the natural and built environment, including landscape features, spatial organization, and architectural design, and consequently provides information about social interaction within these spaces. Ritual, also discussed as devotional activity, is differentiated here from religion in that ritual and devotion are behaviors and actions in space. Religion refers additionally to the abstract or mythological landscapes, and remains to be reconstructed for the period of investigation, though associations of the mythological with locations in the landscape are mentioned where known.

Early medieval Deccan urban history, architecture, town planning, or landscape design has not been adequately explored in terms of corporeal experience. In this research the term “corporeal experience” refers to the physical and sensorial engagement of the social body in space. As such, I have adopted and adapted measurements for quantifying space as they relate to social interaction from Hall’s (1966) work on proxemics. This approach is especially interesting in the particular setting of this sacred South Indian landscape where social interactions extended not just to devotees, but also to sacred structures and landscape features that had the potential to manifest the divine. I also employ concepts from space syntax to discuss sensorial and social engagements in space, such as physical and visual access (Hillier and Hanson 1984). By applying a body- and sensory-centered approach to space to the periods before the development
of the Vijayanagara capital city and throughout its early years, I identify the localized evolution of highly nuanced strategies of social and political maneuvering and influence. These strategies were expressed through the material world of sacred space, structures, and corporeal engagements, and were later adapted and co-opted on a larger scale tools as part of city planning for legitimation of the imperial rulers (Fritz 1985 and 1986; Sinopoli and Morrison 1995: 87-88).

Furthermore, the combination of proxemics and space syntax in a historical phenomenological reconstruction of the Hemakuta Hill supports the Saivite Tantric view of the body. The ideological foundation of Tantrism identifies the “cosmos as permeated by power (or powers), a vision wherein energy (sakti) is both cosmic and human and where microcosm and macrocosm correspond and interact” (Padoux 2002: 19). Therefore, the result of Tantrism is to transform and divinize the body to achieve salvation (Flood 2006:74; Morley 2008: 155), achievable through various methods such as yoga, action (kriya), proper conduct (charya), and knowledge (jnana). Together these methods are known as the ‘four feet’ (chatushpada) (Sears 2013: 52). In Tantric thought, the body, as a microcosm of the universe, was the ultimate reality and thus mediated the sensory world (Morley 2008: 155). Consequently, a historical phenomenological approach, informed by proxemics and space syntax analysis, to the Hemakuta Hill area’s history and development is appropriate: Tantric adepts, moving through the Hemakuta Hill area, were deeply aware and immersed in the sensory world that was the ultimate reality (Morley 2008: 155). Hence, my methodology reflects the particular Tantric approach to the body and the sacred.

My research links the nature of corporeality and the material world as space-specific phenomena, an innovation for medieval South Asian scholarship. Accordingly, this research extends to how space regulated and shaped social and political relations, and how such use of space changed over time. The founders of the Vijayanagara Empire were not establishing themselves on a blank spatial canvas but were stepping into an existing, increasingly politicized and Sanskritized landscape where they were able to co-opt the space-specific sacred resources already in place (Verghese 1995 and 2004:420). As I will show, such resources already had a developed history of exploitation by regional political figures.
Finally, this research is interdisciplinary and innovative through the use of multiple spatial analysis platforms to supplement the paucity of written primary source materials for the South Indian early medieval period in the Bellary District. Outside of religious literature and epigraphic sources, the material record is the largest primary resource for medieval South Indian-focused research. This spatial and material analysis is essential for the ongoing project of building a more holistic understanding of South Indian medieval social and political institutions and practices.

The following section of this chapter presents the contextual background to historically situate the Hemakuta Hill area, the area of the earliest recorded ritual activity at the site that would become the Vijayanagara capital city. The early occupation of the hill demonstrates its religious importance from c. 600 CE onwards. I begin by discussing the pre-imperial religious history of the Bellary District along with an introduction to key religious concepts, including the South Asian pilgrimage tradition and the association of rivers and death rituals, as is seen within the Hemakuta Hill area. This section is followed by an overview of the political context of the Bellary District throughout the seventh through thirteenth centuries, ending with the spatial organization of the site as a sacred and imperial capital city. My discussion of local pre-imperial, material religious and political developments is guided by available epigraphic evidence (Figure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase and Period</th>
<th>Abbreviated</th>
<th>Calendrical Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1, Period 1</td>
<td>P1:1</td>
<td>600-900 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1, Period 2</td>
<td>P1:2</td>
<td>1050-1100 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Period 1</td>
<td>P2:1</td>
<td>1100-1250 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2, Period 2</td>
<td>P2:2</td>
<td>1250-1325 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Imperial Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>1325-1400 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>From the Later Sangama Dynasty to the Tuluva Dynasty. 1400-1565 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1.1 Table of temporal divisions based on architectural phases, expect for the general designation of the Imperial Phase.*
1.4 in Section 1.2.3) and tied to larger South Asian historical narratives where possible. Temporal divisions in this chapter are discussed in terms of broad phases that correspond to architectural phases discussed in greater detail in the remaining chapters, as illustrated in the chart in Figure 1.1. These temporal divisions are divided into two phases that are further subdivided into two periods each. Together, the formative periods are twice as long as the entire rule of the Vijayanagara Empire, the Early Imperial Phase and the Imperial Phase, and this does flatten the early timeline under investigation. However, the flattening was inevitable through a periodization based on material changes observed through architectural styles and through the paucity of historical documents.

Chapter 2 outlines the theory and methodologies applied in this research, with a special focus on the digital techniques developed to track spatial and material patterns and to assess ground-based engagement with the landscape modeled from the perspective of devotees moving through space. The use of a geographic information system (GIS) created an environment in which interdisciplinary data could be stored, queried, visualized, and spatialized. The immersive 360-degree photography of Google Street View was captured along the primary paths of movements through the site. These images effectively provide the opportunity to examine the material features that were visually accessible to a devotee as their body moved through the space of the Hemakuta Hill area. This ground-level view permits the past “ritual body” (Catherine Bell 2010: 81-82) to be better assessed so that analysis can move towards an understanding of how space was differentially conceived, perceived, and lived (Soja 1989) by different “ritual bodies” visiting the pilgrimage site. This approach could be useful for other researchers engaging with aspects of space and corporeal experience.

Chapter 3, Understanding the Material Landscape of the Hemakuta Hill Area: 600-1325 CE, presents a detailed discussion of the material and spatial data drawing heavily on the published work of the Vijayanagara Research Project (VRP). The interdisciplinary VRP was comprised of an international group of scholars co-directed by Dr George Michell and Dr John M. Fritz in collaboration with the Government of Karnataka Department of Archaeology and Museums directed by Dr M.S. Nagaraja Rao (for a complete overview of the research carried out by the VRP see Fritz 2006). I am very grateful for their long term research, detailed publications, and scholarly openness. The architectural data digitized for my research in ArcGIS derive from
the architectural drawings done to a scale of 1:100 or 1:50, photographic survey work, and inventory lists published in the multivolume series “Vijayanagara: Architectural Inventory of the Sacred Center” (Michell et al. 2001, volumes 1-3). The detailed investigative fieldwork, architectural survey and analysis of the pre- and early Vijayanagara structures in the Sacred Center was conducted primarily by Phillip Wagoner for the VRP in the 1986 field season. Other specialists, such as architects and surveyors, added to this material to produce the Vijayanagara Monograph Series in the 1990s.

The first section of Chapter 3 introduces religious architectural history and technical architectural terms. The historical and material developments at the site are presented and assessed according to general spatial and architectural style changes. This historically-centered stylistic evaluation is organized according to four temporal divisions originally identified by Wagoner (1996: 143) based on spatial-architectural developments, cultic changes, and patterns of patronage. The data discussed in this chapter is divided into two phases, each of which are subdivided into two periods (see Figure 1.1, page 4). A series of structures that have not been dated nor interpreted as a part of the Vijayanagara’s architectural history are also examined in the phases to which I hypothesize they belong. Wagoner is one of the few authors to have addressed the early and medieval material record of the Vijayanagara landscape prior to the founding of the empire, and as such, his publications were instrumental for building this research. Chapter 3 thus draws heavily on Wagoner’s scholarly contributions to the VRP (Michell et al. 2001; Wagoner 1996) as well as his other publications (Eaton and Wagoner 2015; Wagoner 1986; 1991; 2001; 2004; 2007). Besides providing the foundational data of this chapter, these works are consistently interdisciplinary, bridging archaeology, architecture, and art history.

Chapter 4, A Spatial-Material and Corporeal Analysis of the Hemakuta Hill Area: 600-1400 CE, presents structural-spatial patterns identified in the material record through data analysis in ArcGIS, used both for visualization and for the storage of my database, presented in Appendix B. Sensorial engagements with the material world, as identified through movement and visibility analysis employing the immersive technology of Google Street View and Google Earth Pro spatial analysis functions, are incorporated in the discussion to develop a robust spatial-material and corporeal historic reconstruction of the past Hemakuta Hill area landscape.
Part of my reconstruction of the “ritual body” moving through space throughout the development of the site addresses material features in the landscape that are either visible or invisible. I am especially interested in how the knowledge of occluded or hidden features of the landscape possibly affected the experience of devotees. In addition, the identification of a range of groups is conceivable based on the material expression of their ritual, social, and/or political practices. An example is the difference between temple H.38 belonging to the folk god Bhairava that displays limited craftsmanship skills and architectural planning through a series of expansions throughout P1:1 to P2:2, versus the highly detailed and planned memorial temple of H.18 that was designed as a final product with no subsequent additions made. This chapter is organized according to the temporal divisions established in Chapter 3, with the addition of the subsequent Early Imperial Phase developments of key spatial and ritual resources in the study area, such as the Virupaksha Temple complex, entrance pavilions, and the path of movement through the original pilgrimage area.

Chapter 5 presents a summary of my conclusions, followed by the appendices. Appendix A contains a glossary of the technical South Asian architectural, religious and archaeoastronomical terms used in this thesis. Appendix B contains my architectural data tables, organized according to the temporal divisions established in Chapter 3.

1.2 Background

The city of Vijayanagara is located on the southern end of the Indian subcontinent in the arid to semi-arid province of Karnataka (Figure 1.2). It is located in a singular part of the Deccan Plateau landscape, amenable for agriculture and settlement construction while also in a highly defensible position along the course of the Tungabhadra River (Fritz and Michell 1987:108-109; Morrison and Sinopoli 1992:338). Distinctive high granitic outcrops provided readily available resources for the construction of shrines and temples P1:1 and into the Early Imperial Phase. During the time of the Vijayanagara Empire, from the Early Imperial Phase and onwards, the ferocity of the Tungabhadra River and the massive granite hills created a strategically defensible position, and the inexhaustible stone resources continued to provide the building materials necessary to construct the city (Brubaker 2003; Fritz 1986:47).
The imperial capital city of the Vijayanagara Empire was established by the Sangamas (1336-1485 CE) in the early to mid-fourteenth century CE, in 1336, and grew to become medieval South India’s largest urban center and “Hindu” empire. The Tuluva dynasty (1505-1565 CE) abandoned Vijayanagara as their capital city in 1565 CE (after defeat at the Battle of Talikota) to move their decimated empire to Andhra Pradesh under the terminal Aravidu Dynasty (1542-1646 CE). The city and political entity of Vijayanagara developed rapidly out of the politically tumultuous period of the thirteenth to mid-fourteenth centuries. During this period, the Delhi Sultanate, a state with primarily Muslim rulers in the north, was advancing into the Deccan Plateau, and absorbing kingdoms ruled primarily by Hindu kings. These small kingdoms were the product of approximately two hundred years of increasing fragmentation of regional empires and successive wars, as seen in the fragmentation of the Chalukya Empire into three successor states from 1163-1323 CE (the Yadava, Hoysala, and Kakatiya) (Karashina 2014: 172-174; Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 15-19). The Delhi Sultanate conquest spanned from 1296 CE by the Khalaji dynasty until 1327 CE under the ruler Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq (Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 26). From 1327, for two decades, the Sultanate established indirect
rule of land south of the Krishna River, and direct rule of the land to the north of the Krishna and Narmada Rivers (for an expanded discussion of the methods of rule over the Deccan Plateau see Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 27-32). From 1334 through the 1340s, the Delhi Sultanate’s control over the Deccan Plateau collapsed in a series of rebellions (Asher and Talbot 2014: 43; Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 27-28). The collapse of the Sultanate control left the south of India destabilized and without a trace of the former Chalukyan successor states, paving the way for the rapid and near simultaneous developments of several new polities, including the Vijayanagara Empire (Stein 2010).

In the period before the Vijayanagara Empire coalesced, however, the site of the future imperial capital city already served as a pilgrimage destination of increasing importance focused on the Hemakuta Hill area (Figure 1.3). It was dedicated to the local river goddess Pampa and subsequently also developed into a popular Saivite pilgrimage center focused on the orthodox god Virupaksha, an avatar of Siva. This blossoming religious setting was appealing to the politically ambitious as a setting for asserting socio-political influence to devotees worshipping at the site. It also presented opportunities for donors to add to or create new structures for the manufacture of ritual settings of intense corporeal experience.

1.2.1 South Asian Tradition of Pilgrimage

The Hemakuta Hill area is located on the banks of the Tungabhadra River where the river bends north, paralleling the location of the river pilgrimage site and sacred city of Kashi (also known as Banaras and Varanasi), similarly located at the point where the Ganges River arcs northwards. Wagoner has argued that the proto-type for the Hemakuta Hill area pilgrimage and ritual life was based on the much older tradition of pilgrimage to the River Ganges at Kashi (Wagoner 1996), where the salvific properties of the river goddess and her waters have drawn devotees for death-related rituals for over 2,500 years (Eck 1982: Location 140). The earliest information about the Hemakuta Hill area as a sacred landscape is based on limited epigraphic records plus the architectural remains of stone shrines and temples. The inscriptions provide evidence of the existence of a cult center from c. 600 CE, though the extant structures appeared much later, in the tenth century CE. Careful examination of both types of sources reveals a dynamic landscape used by local and non-local communities for death-related rituals, as detailed in Chapter 4. Gradually, the Hemakuta Hill area developed from a minor pilgrimage center focused on a river
goddess and her counterpart, into a major cult center of a Sanskrit god (part of the brahmanical pantheon), then into an imperial capital city with a burgeoning ritual and political foundation by the fourteenth century CE.

Ritual activity during Phase 1, 2, and into the Early Imperial Phase in the Hemakuta Hill area was centered on the space from the summit of a gently undulating granite shelf of Hemakuta Hill to the south shore of the Tungabhadra River (Figure 1.3). Pilgrims and local devotees crossed the length of the hill to the river to access memorial shrines and temples, moving from the south end of the site to the river in the north as part of the ritual movement prescribed by the material and conceptual development of the landscape (discussed further in Chapters 3 and 4). Pilgrimage, as the ritual movement of a devotee, is a distinctive form of travel and experience, existing outside of mundane life. It is a devotional act allowing the pilgrim/devotee to enter into a particular time and space corresponding to the tradition. With that in mind, my research includes a close examination of devotee movement throughout the site, in particular, how movement developed over time.

**Figure 1.3 Landscape Overview and Areas of the Vijayanagara Imperial Capital City.**
*Image from Google Earth Pro. Imagery date 2017.*
There is a vast body of religious and philosophical literature pertaining to South Asian Hindu religious traditions that attest to the importance of *tirtha-yatras* (pilgrimages) throughout South Asian history, a tradition accessible to the elite and non-elite alike to gain liberation from rebirth (*moksha*) and to achieve other benefits that particular pilgrimage centers offer. There are several reasons one would take a pilgrimage. Classically, the tradition of pilgrimage is considered within the framework of *tirtha* and *yatra* (Fuller 2004: 205). *Tirtha* literally translates as a “ford” or a “crossing place”, referring to the holy pilgrimage center as a space linking the divine and human worlds. As Eck (1981:324) points out, this “locative” aspect of Hindu piety is one of the oldest aspects of religiosity that can be traced, marked by a deep reverence for places and spaces. Reverence for sacred spaces can also easily be found in *yatra*, which refers to the act of pilgrimage and the journey in which one becomes a temporary renouncer — forsaking worldly endeavors and materialistic comforts in exchange for transformative spiritual pursuits (Fuller 2004: 209; Karve 1988; Stoddard 1997:45-46). *Tirtha* also refers to a single pilgrimage destination while *tirtha-yatra* can refer to a longer pilgrimage voyage in which multiple holy places are visited (Kulke and Rothermund 1998:138). In the corpus of Hindu archaeological research, there has yet to be a full examination of the journey half of *tirtha-yatra*. Instead, archaeologists have focused on the pilgrimage centers – the destination, or the *tirtha* (e.g. Mack 2011). Numerous ethnographic sources in Fuller (2004), however, have shown that to modern pilgrims in India, the journey and its experience are as significant as reaching the center. Filling this gap in current archaeological research is therefore critical to fully understand and articulate the role and the experience of Hindu pilgrimage through time and its role in the construction of sacred landscapes. My research does not look at the journey to the Hemakuta Hill area, however, it does examine movement within in the pilgrimage center.

A parallel can be drawn between the Pampa *tirtha* at the Hemakuta Hill area and other river pilgrimages. The verbal root of the noun *tirtha, tarati*, means “to cross” and in the vast majority of the cases where it is used in the Upanisads, the crossing refers to transformation and transition in a ritual or spiritual sense from this world, or the near shore, to the world of Brahman, or the far shore (Eck 1981: 329-331). Eck discusses how the first in-depth textual treatment of the *tirtha-yatra* in the Tirthayatra Parva of the Mahābhārata, echoed later in the Dharmasastras and Puranas, frames the *tirtha* and the sacrifice as equivalent in bestowing the same benefits; both are “crossings”. Sacrifice, however, was restricted to the elite with resources,
whereas the *tirtha* was accessible to all castes and sexes (Eck 1981: 337-338). Eck notes that the brahmanical tradition appears to have adopted the pilgrimage tradition by stating in Dharmasastric and Puranic texts that pilgrimage was equivalent to sacrifice (1981: 339). As such, this equivalency may have been an attraction for pilgrims to make the journey to the Hemakuta Hill area, once Virupaksha and the Sanskritization process of the site was in effect. Moreover, the liminal nature of the *tirtha* was confirmed as a place out of the ordinary, in that a *tirtha* was a space in which all devotees could worship together. The sense of social equality or *communitas* that the Dharmasastra presents was an ideal and scholars, such as Eck, caution that such egalitarianism in sacred spaces presented in texts most likely did not reflect reality (1981: 339). The liminal character of pilgrimage centers was nevertheless reflected in religious literature: “the *tirtha-yatra* is the rite; the place *is* the power” (Eck 1981:337-338, emphasis in original).

*Tirthas* are found in many different types of sacred areas across the subcontinent; most having their roots in indigenous place-centered traditions belonging to genii loci, especially rivers and fords, before they were Sanskritized, much as for the history of the Pampa-*tirtha*. Other places of *tirthas* include mountain sites (e.g. the Himalayas), coasts (e.g. Puri), forests (e.g. Naimisaranya), cities (e.g. Ayodhya), or a number of combined places in complex *tirtha* cycles (e.g. Shakta *pithas* of the goddesses). Nevertheless, the location of the Pampa-*tirtha* at the Tungabhadra River, the pilgrimage site symbolizing the river and the goddess Pampa, and the very nature of water that represents a transformative and purifying power, is comparable to Morrison’s (2009) interpretation of the manifold conceptualization of reservoirs that could harness the varied powers and potentialities of water in the landscape.

### 1.2.2 South Asian Sacred Rivers, River Goddesses, and Male Counterparts

The river goddess, one of a class of folk deities and the personification of a river, is traditionally associated with life and with the power of fecundity and purity across South Asia (Hegewald 2002: 38). Rivers themselves are typically and conceptually associated with the waters of the cosmic ocean. Before all of creation there was water, and from water a divine unity emerged (a
mountain) from which the phenomenal world was formed (Singh 2011: 5-46). In this way, waters are considered life-giving and generative. The purifying properties of waters, particularly of moving waters/rivers, were developed alongside the concepts of purity and pollution found in South Asian religions, as it relates in particular to physiology, the spirit, and social aspects of life (Hegewald 2002: 25). As such, methods and resources for water-based protection from pollution are fully developed and especially visible in sacred places in South Asia. One of the great purifiers is water, and sacred structures require access to water to perform ritual ablutions to rid the self of pollution, especially before one enters sacred space. Sacred structures are therefore associated with water, either with the bank of a river or lake (natural water features) and/or with tanks and wells (constructed water features), which have subsequently led to the development of a complex water architecture tradition (Hegewald 2002). River water is especially purifying in that it removes pollution and takes it away with its current.

Rivers, by their nature, provide the potential for charged settings, particularly as power of place is an important spiritual concept in South Asia, often the central reason for siting religious structures and establishing tirthas (Hegewald 2002: 23). As pilgrimage locations, tirthas are generally established at sites that were already charged locales; any structures built there do not make the tirtha, but they “partake in the sacredness of the site and contribute to it” (Hegewald 2002: 23). For example, one of the oldest living pilgrimage traditions in South Asia is located at the Ganges River, the tirtha at Kashi dedicated to the goddess Ganga. She is the personified Ganges River and became one of seven sacred centers across the subcontinent. Each center associated with one of the seven heavenly rivers became a powerfully sacred place where spiritual liberation (moksha) is attainable through the power of place and water. The pilgrimage tradition at Kashi on the Ganges River has been continuous from at least the sixth century BCE to the present (Eck 1982: 5). The Ganges itself, as a sacred place, is the proto-type for other sacred rivers across South Asia, together with Varanasi as the archetype for tirthas where liberation from the cycle of rebirth (samsara) is possible. Together they are invoked at rivers and river tirthas across the subcontinent. Eck (1982: 5) convincingly argues that the multiplicity of place that permeates South Asia translates to the “transposition of place” that permits the sacred power of a place to be present in more than one location at a time. Beyond the practical association of the water of rivers as sustaining life, the salvific power of sacred rivers is expressed in texts such as the Mahabarata, Ramayana and Puranas, among others (as identified
by Eck [1982]: Ramayana, Bala Khandha 38-44; Mahabarata III. 104-8; Bhagavata Purana IX. 8-9; Brhamavaivarta Purana II. 10; Devibhagavata Purana IX. 11.)

The Ganges, as a prototype for all sacred rivers in South Asia, is the River of Heaven and identified as female. The myth that the epics and literature presents is that she came down from Heaven to help King Bhagiratha save his deceased ancestors and enable them to pass over to Pitriloka (heaven/the world of the Fathers) (Eck 1982; Wagoner 1996: 149). Use of her waters in their funeral rites saved the souls of the ancestors by connecting the netherworld, where she accessed the burnt ancestors, to the earthly plain where she flows south from the Himalayas to Kashi, to heaven. The salvation of the souls through the water used in funeral rites as a nectar of immortality is discussed in terms of the Ganges providing life to the deceased (Eck 1982: 215-216). Through cremation, a sacrifice, the soul is born again into the realm of the ancestors (Davis 1988: 41). Both cremation and river water together transform death into a fertile event. According to Davis (1988), medieval ritual acts associated with cremation include offerings, libations, and bathing (discussed further in Section 4.2). For example, after the cremation of an individual (immediately after death and at particular times of the year), a series of shradhā, or food and drink offerings, are made by descendants to provide for the well-being of the deceased in their new life (Davis 1988: 41; Eck 1982: 375). Bathing occurred in a river where the descendants offered its water as libation, the nectar of immortality from the original sacred river (Eck 1982: 314).

The sacred geography of South Asia is conceptualized as being composed of networks of holy places, such as sacred centers and holy rivers (Sopher 1987). An example is the network of pithas (benches or seats) of the goddess Shakti (Fuller 2004: 44). These geographical locations are associated with goddesses and mark locations where, according to myths, body parts of Siva’s wife (Parvati as Sati) fell to earth after she killed herself and Vishnu cut up her body to bring an end to his destructive grief (Fuller 2004: 44). There are 51 or 108 of these pithas of the goddess, each of which manifests her power (shakti) and sanctity, but they are also concurrently seats of the local goddesses. For example, the city of Kashi is, indeed, associated with a shakti pitha and the local goddess Vishalakshi (an aspect of Parvati). This local goddess, Vishalakshi, was paired, through the medieval Tantric tradition, with a male deity, Bhairava (Eck 1982: 173).
Bhairavas are a class of deity known as the “terrible” or “frightful ones” in service to Siva, but are also seen to be a fearsome manifestation of Siva, worshipped as a separate deity (Eck 1982: 190). They are often guardians of temples and of gateways but the most well-known Bhairava is located at Kashi: Kala Bhairava (kala meaning “death” and “fate”). Kala Bhairava of Kashi has taken on the duties of Yama, the god of the dead, and consumes the sins that the dying shed at the tirtha so that they may attain liberation. At the Pampa tirtha in the Hemakuta Hill area, the local Bhairava appears to have functioned in a similar fashion in that he was paired with the local goddess/Shakti Pampa, as was customary in medieval Tantric traditions (Wagoner 1996:149). Their relationship is spatialized through their placement at the site as well. The temple associated with Bhairava, himself associated with death, is located in the south end of the site where the inauspicious and ritually impure are placed. The river goddess Pampa and her temple are located in the northern and more auspicious end of the site. From the south end of the site where pilgrims and devotees enter into the sacred Hemakuta Hill space, the Bhairava acts as guardian to the goddess and, channeling her power, does her bidding. The presence of this local Bhairava is noted early at the Hemakuta Hill site, by Phase 1, Period 1 (600-900 CE), earlier than any mention of the Sanskrit deity Virupaksha, and this Bhairava’s role did not detract from the goddess Pampa’s ritual authority. This first indication of a cult involving a male counterpart to Pampa (being Bhairava) comes from an inscription (Figure 1.4, ID 2) dated to 1014 CE, in which only part of the epigraph is left, but in which “Mahakaladeva of Pampa” is mentioned (Wagoner 1996: 145). In this inscription, this death god is noted to be in a subordinate relationship to Pampa. He is named as Mahakaladeva, the violent manifestation of Siva associated with destruction and death, with similar qualities as the Maha-bhairava who functions as the god of death at Kashi (Wagoner 1996: 149).

The city of Kashi, located on the banks of the original sacred river Ganges and the seat of the goddess, is also the first of sixty-eight places that Siva’s linga self-manifested (Eck 1982: 94, 107). The Hemakuta Hill area was identified as having a self-manifesting linga as well, and is counted among the original sixty-eight self-manifesting (svayambhu) lingas Svayambhu lingas are described as appearing in communities that have extreme devotion (discussed further in Chapter 4) (Garimella 2002: 33). The myth of the appearance of such a linga is traditionally built into the sthala purana (site story) of the site, as svayambhu lingas attracted donations and devotees. Though the earliest available sthala purana for the Hemakuta area was written later in
the imperial period, possibly the fifteenth century CE (Garimella 2002: 33-34), the linga manifestation was most likely a part of an original narrative composed earlier that also explained the marriage of Pampa to Virupaksha and her Sanskritization. Tying a minor and local deity to a manifestation of Siva was part of a process observed at other early medieval sites (e.g., Tanjavur and Madurai) that underwent the process of ‘regalization’ by “ambitious warriors and local chieftains” to stimulate urbanization (Stein 2010: 118-119).

The term Sanskritization was developed by anthropologist M. N. Srinivas in 1952 to explain the historical process of caste mobility through which local non-Sanskritic Hindu traditions (beliefs and practices) are re-constituted and absorbed into a larger “Sanskritic Hindu” tradition. Srinivas (1965: 75) defines Sanskrit Hinduism as “Hinduism which transcends provincial barriers and is common to the whole of India”. It is a tradition with a suite of shared elements found across the subcontinent. Fuller (2004: 25) notes a list of these elements, many of which have been found to be problematic, including the foremost role of brahmans, the worship of Siva and Vishnu, and the sacrality of rivers. This dichotomization of South Asian society, between Sanskritic and non-Sanskritic traditions, has since been found by anthropologists to be an oversimplification of practices that vary substantively (Fuller 2004: 26). Similarly, in the 1950s, Redfield and Singer conceptualized “little traditions” and a “Great Tradition” (1954) of the subcontinent that conceptualize rural and Hindu folk traditions which were transformed and absorbed into a larger urban-based ritual and literary ones. Despite conceptual difficulties and shortcomings, Sanskritization has been used in a meaningful way to discuss the particular South Asian phenomena of local deities and associated practices transformed and being absorbed by Sanskritic deities (Hiltebeitel 1993; Sontheimer 1989). As such, the identification of Sanskrit and non-Sanskrit traditions in the Hemakuta Hill area is used herein as a heuristic device primarily to identify change at observable points in time and places in space that coincided with the first appearance of a Sanskritic deity. Likewise, Sanskritization is used to discuss the transformation, or rather the expansion of the indigenous river goddess Pampa’s identity through a new relationship with Virupaksha, a form of Siva. In this case, Pampa’s association with a pan-Hindu god, Siva, makes her accessible to a wider audience at a moment when her pilgrimage was expanding. The concept, however, is not used to comment on caste practices or devotee (local) social mobility in the way that Srinivas designed it to imply: “Sanskritization is generally accompanied by, and often results in, upward mobility for the caste in question” (Srinivas
1967:7). Rather, observing points of connection, interaction, as well as divergence between ritual practices are of great utility in reconstructing the development of the Hemakuta Hill area sacred space.

Further evidence of the importance of the river and water at the Hemakuta Hill area are found in motifs on structures from the earliest period. The primary motifs featured on structures throughout Phase 1 consists of imagery that evokes the life-giving nature of the river goddess and water, indicating that the site’s main function and symbolism were based on the purifying and fertile nature of a river pilgrimage that continued on into the Sanskritic Phase 2. Featured on door jambs are vases (purna) and featured on lintels are Gajalakshmis, images of the goddess Lakshmi seated on a lotus and flanked by elephants. Both motifs are associated with abundance, spiritual and material prosperity, and ultimately with ideas related to water. The vase, or water pot, is pervasive in South Asian art and architecture, stemming as a concept from the Vedas and adopted by the Brahmanical tradition. In aesthetics and poetic theory, the purna vase signifies fullness and perfection, and by extension, is an auspicious symbol (Baumer 2001:429-463), typically being filled with water and featured in representations of the goddess Ganga (Hegewald 2003: 39). (For a complete discussion of the development and the concept of the purna in South Asian art, see Baumer [2001].) The lintel decorations include lotus flowers, which are water born and associated with the creative energy of water, a symbol of enlightenment, and the elephant, an auspicious animal closely identified with water (Hegewald 2003: 33-34). Though motifs in general are somewhat rare on the Phases 1 and 2 structures, particularly the earliest shrines, the water pot is regardless present, indicating that, much like the river goddess, the life-giving and prosperous nature of the riverine site was central to the function of the tirtha.

1.2.3 Inscriptions as a Source of Data

Ancient and medieval South Asian inscriptions provide a rich source of information for the interpretation of the meaning and uses of past places and their changing histories. Indeed, South Asia has one of the largest epigraphical records in the world (Salomon 1998: 1-6). The inscriptions found at or referring to the Hemakuta Hill area are thus an important source of data for my research, although a limited source for Phases 1 and 2 (see Figure 1.1 for phase dates plus Figure 1.4 and Appendix C for inscriptions).
Figure 1.4 Table of donative inscriptions referencing or at the Hemakuta Hill area.

During the early medieval period (seventh to thirteenth century) inscriptions at the site of Vijayanagara and in South Asia in general play an invaluable role in shedding light on the people invested in the site, on physical and political developments, and on dominant practices and ideologies. South Asia, outside of the Persianate cosmopolis, can be characterized by its abundance of inscriptions, particularly the type found on temple walls or in a religious structure’s vicinity (Stein 1960). Conversely, non-Persianate South Asia is also generally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Year CE</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Location of Epigraph</th>
<th>Sources for Inscriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>Iriva-Nolambadhiraja</td>
<td>Not at Vijayanagara. Location unknown.</td>
<td>SII, IX i, No. 79, 11. 10-11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Nolamba chief Udayadityadeva: royal patron</td>
<td>Not at Vijayanagara. In Bagali, Bellary District.</td>
<td>SII, IX i, No. 80, 1. 12; No. 81, U. 16-17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>Maiduna Chaudayya, a Sinda chief</td>
<td>At Vijayanagara in the Hemakuta Hill area, in the Manmatha tank area. On M.11.</td>
<td>SII, IV, No. 260.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>~0-100</td>
<td></td>
<td>At Vijayanagara, outside the Hemakuta Hill area. Inside the Royal Center. Located on the Mahanavami-dibba.</td>
<td>ARIE, 1975-76, no. B 94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>Chalukya of Kalyana king</td>
<td>In the Vijayanagara region, in nearby town of Anegondi on a tank dedicated to Pampa.</td>
<td>Patil and Patil 1995, No. 45: xv, 13; QJMS, VII, Ins. No. X.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
characterized by its limited types of other written materials that would be useful for piecing together quotidian, non-elite, and un-idealized history. The body of inscriptions related to the development and history of the Hemakuta Hill area at Vijayanagara are religious donative inscriptions, most of which were found in the vicinity of religious structures. The content of the inscriptions and the language and script employed vary at Vijayanagara, though for Phases 1 and 2 the language generally used is Kannada, as used locally, and the content typically includes the date of donation, the identity of the donor, the nature of the donation contents, and the deity to whom the donation is made. The table in Figure 1.4 lists all the published inscriptions from Phases 1 and 2 which I could locate from the Hemakuta Hill area or that mention the Pampa pilgrimage site, including the location of the inscription. These inscriptions mainly come from volumes of epigraphy: Epigraphia Carnatica (EC), Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy (ARIE), Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy (ARSIE), and The Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society (QJMS).

These few inscriptions for the Hemakuta Hill area dating to Phases 1 and 2 are exceptionally valuable as they aid in constructing a chronology of site development, and give clues as to the activities and nature of religious activities at the site that the structures alone cannot provide. Both their content and location provide information. During this early period in the Hemakuta Hill area, space was marked by very few individuals through donative inscriptions and associated patronage of structures. However, inscriptions were dedicated only when figures with political aspirations and with the means to make a significant contribution necessitating and/or worth being recorded took an interest in the site.

Inscriptions were meant to have a human audience of readers. The particular placement of the inscriptions found in situ in the Hemakuta Hill area, typically outside of shrines and outside the sightline of murtis (images of a deity), suggests that devotees were intended to be the primary visual consumers of the objects and texts, not the gods. For example, ID 4 is located on a mandapa wall of M.11 and ID 10 is located on vC gateway that all devotees moving the through the Hemakuta Hill area during Phases 1 and 2 would have observed. The exception to a visible placement being inscription ID 5, located on a pillar in the royal memorial temple H.18 to which the general devotee would not have had access. For those inscriptions positioned in publicly visible areas, even if their content was not read by all devotee passerby’s, as most
devotees would have been illiterate, the presence and length of inscription would still have made an impact on devotees. The physical presence of inscribed material on or in association with structures changed the physical experience of the sacred space and the information the embodied actor acquired from an engagement with the setting by their presence alone. In addition, the source and patron of spatial changes (such as having new structures, additions, embellishments, or religious activities commissioned or supported through patronage) would have been known to local pilgrims and devotees and the Hemakuta Hill area, particularly during Phase 1 when the site was a small-scale and local cult center. Similar to temple embellishments and architectural arrangements, donative inscriptions were placed to be experienced and to transmit information in a sacred space informing and guiding ritual actions and movement. As a special symbolic vehicle, they also convey particular information to the knowledgeable viewer. As such, inscriptions in space, though not read by all (inscriptions from Phases 1 and 2 were written in the local language of Kanada, though ID 10 inscribed Sanskrit), symbolized patronage, influence, and religious piety. There is little that materially differentiates inscriptions in that ID 2 through 10 were inscribed on stone slabs. However, ID 5 was inscribed on a temple pillar and ID 1, located in the Kurnool District of Andhra Pradesh, is the only example of an inscription written on a copper plate. The length of inscriptions does noticeably increase after the twelfth century and represents a shift in patronage and investment by local devotees (see Section 1.4.1). However, further general epigraphic patterns regarding material, content, locational aspects of the inscriptions associated with the Pampa tirtha are limited, primarily due to the restricted number of epigraphs, but are discussed in this research according to their associated phase (see Section 3.4.4, 3.4.5, and 3.4.6.3).

1.3 Religious Context of the Vijayanagara Area: Ninth Century to the Fourteenth Century CE

Four significant Saiva schools developed in South Asia from the second century BCE into the common era: Pasupata (encompassing the Kalamukha and the Kapalika sects that have disappeared), Vira Saivism, Saiva Siddhanta, and Kasmir Saivism (Connolly 2014: 183). The earliest identifiable religious sects in the Hemakuta Hill area are two of these new Saiva schools: the Saiva Siddhanta (hereafter referred to as Siddhanta) and the Kalamukhas. Both sects were branches of Agamic, Tantric Saivism. However, the Siddhanta ritual tradition developed within
an established Kalamukha milieu. During Phase 1, the first identifiable religious group performing priestly activities in the Bellary District were Saivite Kalamukha ascetics (Lorenzen 1971; Verghese 1995: 4-8). Priestly activities in the Hemakuta Hill area were also primarily the purview of the Kalamukhas before the Virupaksha-associated brahman community arrived in Phase 2, associated with the Siddhantas (Garimella 2002 and see inscription ID 4 in Appendix C). However, it is unclear what early Saivite sect was present and oversaw the religious life of the site before P1:2 and before the Kalamukhas established an architecturally and ritually identifiable presence in the Hemakuta Hill area. Inscriptional and architectural evidence, discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, indicate that the Kalamukha ascetics appear to have been present in the Bellary District as early as the late ninth century CE and through the Imperial Phase.

The Kalamukhas are known to have contributed significantly to education by establishing highly influential scholarly institutions during the eleventh and twelfth centuries elsewhere in South India, such as the Kodiya-matha of the Kedaresvara temple in Balligave (Verghese 1995:5). At Vijayanagara, however, there are no physical traces of mathas associated with the Kalamukha ascetics believed to have overseen and participated in the religious life of the site (Garimella 2002; discussed further in Chapter 4). It is noteworthy, however, that Kalamukha mathas and asramas were traditionally built of perishable materials (Verghese 1995: 116), making their identification outside of epigraphic evidence extremely difficult. Mathas, as a broad South Asian institution, were attached to a temple and fulfilled many roles for local communities, including serving as monasteries for ascetics. (For detailed discussion on the role of mathas and ascetics in medieval South Asia see Verghese 1995; Sears 2007 and 2014.) Mathas were also centers for learning and fulfilled the religious and intellectual needs of local communities, providing instruction in the religious tenets of their denominations. The larger, brahmanical counterpart (agraharas) to the matha was heavily supported by later Vijayanagara imperial rulers (Sears 2007; Verghese 1995: 115, 117-118), and the twelfth-century construction of the Virupaksha temple and ancillary structures, such as feeding houses for the brahman, are the first architectural evidence for the presence of major religious communities at Vijayanagara.

As for the Kalamukha ascetics, their presence in the Hemakuta Hill area continued on through Phase 1 and into the Early Imperial Phase, though they did not remain the only ritual specialists at the site. There was most likely friction, at least on an ideological level, from Phase
(from the twelfth century CE) onwards, when new religious and ritual influences were imported with the deity Virupaksha and an associated brahman community. The Later Chalukya patronage and administration of the area during the tenth through eleventh centuries CE (transition between P1:1 and P1:2), including their support of the local *matha* that was most likely under the control of the Kalamukhas, evaporated only seventy-five years after the inscription of ID 8 (Figure 1.4, and Appendix C, 1076 CE,), when their empire disintegrated (mid-twelfth century, P1:2). A major social and ideological revolution followed the disintegration, which included resistance to the strict social hierarchies based on brahmanical religious ideas. These brahmanical ideas subsequently led to the alienation of the masses of the poor in 1160 CE (Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 14). This revolution, the Virasaiva reform movement (also known as the Lingayat movement and part of a broader Bhakti movement in South India [Thapar 2002: 348-396]), was centered on a rejection of Vedic traditions and monopolization of ritual knowledge by the brahmans, as well as the rejection of the fundamental form of temple-worship structure dominated by the brahmans, which distanced Saiva worshippers from their god (Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 14). From what is known of religious life at the Pampa-*tirtha* up to the twelfth century CE (up to the end of P1:2 and prior to the introduction of Virupaksha and the associated Saiva Siddhantas), the Kalamukha sect apparently presided over the religious needs of the community from at least P1:2 up to the appearance of the Virupaksha cult and associated brahman community, at which point the two groups shared the Hemakuta Hill area religious space and ritual needs of the community. The Kalamukhas continued to play a role at the site until the early fifteenth century; at this later time, they were most likely “absorbed by the reformist Virasaiva religion” (Verghese 2000: 5). Indeed, during the early part of their rule, the first imperial dynasty at Vijayanagara, the Sangama dynasty, patronized both Kalamukha gurus and the Virasaiva reformists (also referred to as the Lingayat sect based on the *lingas* the followers wear) (Verghese 2000:5).

Siddhanta developed in north India in the sixth century CE, spreading southwards, as a system of thought and ritual practice based on Sanskrit Saiva Tantric (or Agamic) literature. (Tantra refers to the key scriptures of revelations of a tradition that replaces Vedic traditions and rites.) By the ninth century, Siddhanta was established as distinct religious order (Garimella 2002: 43; Troy 1974). Epigraphic evidence suggests that the Siddhantas were established in the Deccan, Andhra Pradesh, and Tamil areas as early as the tenth century, receiving royal patronage
of the Cholas and potentially serving as rajagurus (royal priests) (Troy 1974: 79). From the twelfth century onwards, Siddhanta continued to flourish primarily in Tamil speaking areas (Sanderson 1974: 79) and their architectural traditions influenced the elongated axial development of the Virupaksha temple at Vijayanagara (Garimella 2002).

The Siddhantas confined their cult and conduct to resemble non-Tantric orthodoxy, seen especially in their maintenance of caste distinctions and brahman priesthood (Sanderson 1995: 78). As such, they practiced dualistic theology, maintaining proper ritual action as dictated by the Saiva Agamas, and accepting orthodox (Vedic and Brahmanical) norms such as divisions between pure and impure. They also believed that upon liberation the soul would attain equality with Siva (Davis 1991: 27; Garimella 2002: 43-44; Sanderson 1995: 17), unlike the nondual views of the Kalamukhas who held “that the substance of the universe and its effient cause are one and the same” (Sanderson 1995: 16). (For further discussion of the Saiva Siddhantas see Richard Davis, *Ritual in an Oscillating Universe* [1991].)

Like the Siddhantas, the Kalamukhas were influential in the early period of the empire as several inscriptions reference the head of their priesthood, Kriyasakti, establishing a relationship with the Vijayanagara rulers from 1347 to 1431 CE (Lorenzen 1972: 162-163). The Kalamukha guru, Kasivilasa Kriyasakti Acarya, was even given the title of rajaguru or kula-guru (family preceptor) of Harihara II through possibly to Devaraya II (Lorenzen 1972: 163). Lorenzen (1971; 1972) and Sanderson (1995; 2009) are the major scholars who examined the non-Saiddhantika (or non-Saiddhanta) sects of Tantric Saivism. Lorenzen’s work focuses on the Kalamukhas and Kapalikas within the South Indian context and their traditions based exclusively on epigraphic research. Sanderson discusses the nature of the Tantric ritual belonging to the non-Saiddhantikas, from Kashmir (1995). Some scholars, such as Lorenzen, argue that the non-Saiddhantikas (the Saiddhantas and the non-Saiddhanta systems are two branches of Saiva tantric system that can be identified within the branch of Saiva initiates known as the Path of Mantras [mantramarga] [(Flood1996: 154-173; Sanderson 1988: 664-690]) in Karnataka may have migrated from Kashmir (Lorenzen 1972: 106-109). Sanderson’s detailed work on the non-Saiddhantika ritual life provides much insight into the nature of the rituals of the Kalamukhas (and the Kapalikas), although to what extent the non-Saiddhantikas Saiva schools within Karnataka borrowed from each other, such as the Kalamukhas borrowing rituals from the Pasupatas, remains unclear.
According to the work done by Garimella (2002: 47-49) and Verghese (2004: 422), Smarta brahman controlled ritual life at the Virupaksha temple complex under the early Sangama rulers, the first imperial ruling dynasty of the Vijayanagara Empire. However, it was not the Smarta brahman group that initially arrived with the Sanskrit deity Virupaksha in the twelfth century CE; this was the Saiddhantas (expanded discussion supporting their presence is in Garimella 2002). The Smarta brahmans belonged to an Advaita matha in Srngeri (Garimella 2002:47-49; Verghese 2004: 422), a pilgrimage center that the Sangamas and later dynasties patronized (Verghese 1995: 8). The sage Vidyaranya is tied to a version of Vijayanagara’s the founding myth that gained acceptance through the work of N. Venhataramanayya in 1929 (discussed by Wagoner 2000) and the work of N. Sastri in 1946 (2002). This version of the imperial foundation features the brothers Harihara and Bukka forcibly converting to Islam, through which they gained power from the Delhi Sultanate to administer over the Kampili province, only to renounce Islam and return to Hinduism through the aid of sage Vidyaranya. This outdated, yet still popular version, often referred to as the ‘hare and the hounds’, is found in works such as Schwartzberg (1992: 198), Thapar (1978: 323-234), and Verghese (2004 and mentioned in her 2000 publication with caution and noting that inscriptive evidence does not support the account [2000:41]). It is a composite of several lines of evidence with incorrect inferences inserted by Venhataramanayya and Sastri that continues to be propagated. The evidence has since been reinvestigated by Wagoner (2000) and consists of contemporary donative inscriptions, contemporary Persian and Arabic histories, and sixteenth-century Sanskrit narratives. The popularized ‘hare and the hounds’ version reproduces the historiographic problem of framing medieval South Asia in terms of a Hindu/Islamic divide through Harihara and Bukka’s conversion and apostasy trope, one of the key details of the foundation myth that has been identified as absent from all sources (Wagoner 2000), which consequently and incorrectly paints Vijayanagara as the “Hindu bulwark against Muhammadan conquests” (Sewell 1992:1). Additionally, it places the historical figure of the sage, Vidyaranya, as central in the foundation of the city, empire, and the Advaita matha in Srngeri that the Sangama brothers visit in 1346 CE. Kulke (1985: 128) and Clark (2006: 208) have disproven Vidyaranya’s involvement in the foundation of the capital city and have identified that he was projected back in time; his first concrete appearance in an inscription dates to 1375 CE.
In sum, the religious climate of Hemakuta Hill during Phases 1 and 2 and the Early Imperial Phase, including the foundation of the empire, was characterized by a diversity of sectarian affiliations as new religious groups arrived and established locations of worship. Additionally, early imperial rulers of the Sangama dynasty patronized many groups, establishing affiliations with Saiva Siddhanta gurus, Smarta brahmans, and Kalamukha gurus.

1.4 Political History of South India and the Vijayanagara Area: 600-1325 CE

Politics and power were deeply infused with religion in medieval South Asia. When I use the term politics here, it does not exclude ideas and events that are of a religious nature; in fact, religion and politics were symbiotic and not separate from each other. Most notably, the symbiosis of the political and the sacred were expressed in ideas about the origins and maintenance of kingship, in the acquisition of political power, and in architecture, whether it be the organization of space or the construction of religious places. From this perspective, social and political prestige could be gained by the financial and social ability to command resources necessary for construction of structures and the commission of an inscription. The political context is thus essential for my discussion of religious architecture, especially at Vijayanagara.

In the past, discussions focused on religious division and the encounters between major groups, such as Muslims and Hindus, have not captured the nuances and textured relationships that existed. Studies that frame medieval South Asian history around the Hindu-Muslim division stem from colonial and pre-colonial history; this approach was perpetuated through works as late as the 1990s by authors such as Samuel Huntington (discussed further by Eaton and Wagoner [2014] and by Huntington [1996] as the ‘clash of civilisations’). Consequently, discussion based on oppositions and binary divisions has prevented research from engaging with a subcontinent that was deeply multisectarian, and from examining the strategies that subsequently developed for such “encounters”. This dissertation is influenced by Eaton and Wagoner’s (2014) approach, (terminology and methodology), permitting an interpretation of material culture change over time and space through particular attention to fluid boundaries, borrowings, and reactions between groups and sects.
In Wagoner and Eaton’s discussion (2014), the intersection of and interaction between what they term the Persian Cosmopolis and the Sanskrit Cosmopolis is vital for understanding imperial period Vijayanagara, but their specific terminology is less useful during Phase 1 and 2 of the site. For this reason, a non-binary and dynamic approach to the Deccan and its institutions is brought to the forefront, critical for discussing constructions of identity and politics on smaller scales than empire/cosmopolis, particularly as religion, or ideas of the sacred, were profoundly inter-mingled with politics. Eaton and Wagoner’s (2014) focus on manifestations of power, memory and architecture for investigating the Deccan material landscape is replaced with themes to which my particular dataset relates: devotee corporeal experience, both built (architectural) and natural features affecting this experience, and the change through time of engagement with the sacred space encapsulated by the Hemakuta Hill area.

1.4.1 Political Context in the Tenth to Fourteenth Centuries CE: From the Later Chalukya Empire to the Delhi Sultanate

The following summarizes the political setting of Phases 1 and 2 of the Vijayanagara polity and imperial capital city region in the larger context of South Asian political history from the tenth to the fourteenth century. Political events prior to the tenth century seem to have had little impact at the Hemakuta Hill site, as far as I could determine, based on the lack of extant structures for analysis. This section focuses on the polities of the Cholas, the Western Chalukya of Kalyana (referred to as the Later Chalukyas), the Hoysalas, and the Kakatiya and their role in the historical development of South India and the Vijayanagara area (Figure 1.5). For further expanded discussion of historical overviews of South Asia see Kulke and Rothermund 1998 and Stein (1998). My discussion of the local-scale political and religious history for this period is heavily based on the available donative inscriptions that mention or were commissioned at the site of Vijayanagara. These inscriptions are especially relevant as they typically identify the individual/group, time period, and donation proffered by devotees on pilgrimage. As a common type of epigraph from medieval South Asia, their content is fairly standardized: they record the items, land, and/or money donated by a named patron, the year of the donation, and the purpose of the donation. An abbreviated table of inscriptive data referenced in this thesis is located in the table in Figure 1.4 (above), in an extended table in Appendix C, and are referred in the text through an assigned identification number; e.g., inscription ID 2 (my numeration system).
During the early medieval period, two powerful imperial dynasties came to amass territory and control the Deccan Plateau: the Sanskrit-based Chalukya Empire (at their height from the tenth to mid-twelfth century CE), which has also been referred to as the Kalyana Chalukyas, the Later Chalukyas, or the Western Chalukya Empire; and the Persianate-based Delhi Sultanate (twelfth to fourteenth centuries CE). Throughout this early medieval period, however, politics in the Deccan were characterized by a series of competing states and empires emerging and falling, particularly within the Bellary District (see Figure 1.5). Control of my research area was claimed by a series of Deccani states: the Later Chalukyas, the Yadavas, the Kakatiyas, the Hoysalas, and the local Sinda, Nolambas, and Kampili states. Sinopoli (2003: 66)
points out that the nature and character of the control these “claimants” had over the Bellary District is not clear, especially with regards to the larger states that incorporated local groups into their administrative structures. As will be discussed, the material presence of the Sinda and Kampili polities in the Hemakuta Hill area is evident, through inscriptions, patronage, and structures, thereby allowing an examination of their use of this space for religio-political purposes. However, the co-optation of these local elites by the larger states/empires is enigmatic, particularly as they are responsible for the early material development of the site onto which the Later Chalukya and Hoysalas chiefs imposed their political and religious agendas. The following section will address the use of the sacred Hemakuta Hill area space and material culture by local elite and the somewhat-local polities, such as the Sinda and the Kampili.

The Later Chalukya polity was centered in the area between the Tungabhadra and Krishna Rivers, much like their earlier but separate predecessors, the Badami Chalukyas (~543-753 CE), who also ruled from the southwestern part of the Deccan plateau (Eaton & Wagoner 2014: 4). The inscription ID 1, dated to 689-690 CE, provides information on the activities of the Early Chalukyas of Badami (6th to 9th centuries CE [Michell 2013]) as a part of the earlier history
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Figure 1.6 Pre-Vijayanagara Polities and Places Mentioned of the table in Figure 1.5.
of the Vijayanagara area. Inscription ID 1 is the earliest mention of the Pampa pilgrimage destination, though there is little known of the material nature of the site to which it refers as it dates to approximately two hundred years before the first of the existing stone structures were built on the north side of the Tungabhadra River. This inscription is a record of a religious donation made by the Early/Badami Chalukya ruler Vinayaditya (696-733 CE), in association with a pilgrimage made to the Pampa tirtha following a successful military campaign (Wagoner 1996). Vinayaditya’s area of control encompassed most of Karnataka and areas of Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh, which he ruled from his capital Badami approximately 130 km to the northeast of Vijayanagara. Inscription ID 1 records the donation made for his pilgrimage to the Hemakuta Hill area, inscribed on a copper plate that was placed in Togurshode, Kurnool District of Andhra Pradesh, approximately 225 km to the east-north-east of Vijayanagara. The decision not to commemorate his visit and piety with an inscription at the Pampa tirtha itself indicates that there was little interest on the part of the Badami rulers in the site or in the visitors/devotees of the pilgrimage site. Instead, their pious actions were meant to be displayed to a targeted audience in Andhra Pradesh, where the Badami were extending their power. The donation consisted of land gifted to a Vedic scholar from an unknown location, though most likely also not from the Hemakuta Hill area as there are no records of brahmans in the area until the twelfth century CE; the exact location of the land is not known as part of the inscription is missing, what remains is “To…du” (Wagoner 1996: 155). It can be surmised that as the inscription and the person receiving the gift were not located at the Pampa tirtha, and the site was likely visited through convenience of location post-battle, the Pampa pilgrimage was a stop of convenience and the king had little interested in the structurally-undeveloped site.

Following the Badami Chalukyas (ruling from ~543 to 753 CE), the Rastrakutas controlled the Bellary District until replaced by the Later Chalukyas (ruling from 973 to 1189 CE). The Rastrakuta polity was centered in Karnataka, ruling from Maharashtra (Stein and Arnold 2010: 125), though we have no inscriptions in the Hemakuta Hill area associating them with worship or patronage of the site. Pampa’s shrine is constructed using the Rastrakutaidiom, though the idiom does not necessarily imply Rastrakuta patronage and may simply reflect the use of a Rastrakutaworkshop (Hardy 2001: 189-190). These Rastrakuta kings were able to expand their territory significantly from the eighth to tenth centuries and controlled a significant portion of the peninsula from south of the Deccan to the Gangetic plain (Stein and Arnold 2010: 146).
During the rule of the Rastrakutas and the Later Chalukyas, there was consistent tension with the Cholas, another power to the far southeast in the agriculturally rich Kaveri delta (Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 4; Karashima 2010: 121). The Chola Empire (850-1279 CE) was centered in southern Tamil Nadu and reached its zenith under the rulership of Rajaraja I (985-1015 CE). Under his rule, the Chola expanded south, west, and north, and became the largest pre-Vijayanagara polity up until the late twelfth century (Sinopoli 2003: 69). The historians Stein (1980) and Hall (1980) have conducted extensive research on the Chola Empire.

The next set of inscriptions that mention the Pampa pilgrimage are ID 7 and 8 from 998 and 1076 CE respectively, from the transition between P1:1 to P1:2 and the early years of P1:2. They date to approximately three to four hundred years after ID 1, and they are contemporaneous with the earliest structures still preserved at the Hemakuta site, although these inscriptions were located elsewhere in the Vijayanagara region. ID 7 and ID 8 are records of donations made at the Pampa tirtha: ID 7 records a land grant to a minister of a Chalukyan king, and ID 8 records a gift to teachers of a matha by a minister of Vikramanditya (Patil and Patil 1995: 13, 108). These inscriptions demonstrate the interest of the Later Chalukya rulers and their ministers in the Hemakuta Hill site. Historically, the Later Chalukyas are first visible in South Asian epigraphical records as feudatories of the Rastrakuta state. By 973 CE, they became an independent state and a new dynasty (Sinopoli 2003: 70) and established their capital city at Kalyana (now known as Basavakalyan and approximately 370 km to the north of Vijayanagara). The imperial status of the Later Chalukyas was consolidated by the rule of Someshvara I (~ 1043-1068 CE), the sixth dynastic ruler (Sinopoli 2003: 4). At its zenith, Later Chalukya control reached across the Deccan plateau, led by Vikramaditya VI (~ 1076-1126 CE).

Inscription ID 7 was found at the Lakshmi temple near Anegondi, on the north side of the Tungabhadra River, and it records a land grant by one of the earlier and lesser known Later Chalukya kings, Irivabedanga Satyasraya (also called Ahavamalla), to one of his ministers (Patil and Patil 1995: xv, 13; Sastri 2002: 198). As for inscription ID 8, the original location is unknown, but it was moved during the Vijayanagara imperial period and was physically incorporated into a Vijayanagara imperial structure for festivals located in the Royal Center of the capital city, the Mahanavami-dibba (Patil and Patil 1995: xv, xxiv and xiii; Verghese 1995: 116). The content of inscription ID 8 marks the beginning of the Chalukyan rulership of
Vikramanditya (crowned emperor Vikramanditya VI and in power from 1076 to 1126 CE), after the new emperor defeated his brother, Somesvara II, earlier that year (Karashima 2014: 124; Sastri 2002: 198). The ascension to the Chalukya throne by Vikramanditya VI concludes an almost ten year war that had divided the empire between the two brothers after the death of their father in 1068 CE (Karashima 2014: 124). The inscription also records a religious donation, this one made by a Later Chalukya elite minister under the rule of Vikramanditya IV, gifting an annual donation to teachers of a local Hemakuta Hill area *matha* (religious school and monastery) (Verghese 1995: 116). The size of the yearly gift to the teachers of the *matha* listed in ID 8 suggests a sizable *matha* (religious) community already established at the Pampa-*tirtha* (Verghese 1995: 116). This inscription implies that the *matha* was in place, even before the first materially visible religious community can be identified, though the Kalamukha ascetics are known to be established in the area (Garimella 2002; Lorenzen 1971 and 1972; Verghese 1995: 116). However, the first materially visible religious community in the Hemakuta Hill area are the brahmans attached to the Virupaksha cult, identifiable through auxiliary structures at the Virupaksha Temple and in the content of inscription ID 4 (discussed further in Chapters 3 and 4).

Visible in inscriptions 7 and 8 is the local administrative elite of the Later Chalukyas, whose presence references the polity’s investment and interest in the area itself. The local administrative elite of the Later Chalukyas invested in the site and its devotees, as implied by their decision to offer epigraphs at the site itself. The nature of the donations indicate that the Later Chalukya rulers supported their administrators and fortified their relationship with the state through a land grant, although the exact nature of the role and duties of these local ministers in the imperial administration is unclear. They also promoted the educational mandate of the center through donation of the *matha*. The investments and donations commemorated in ID 7 and 8 do not indicate that the Later Chalukyan rulers were pursuing individual (or dynastical) political ambitions, however, in contrast to the ambitions reflected in later architecture and inscriptions in Phase 2. The shrines and temples built during the time that the Later Chalukyans patronised building in the Vijayanagara area remained fairly uniform and restricted in size and form, and as such were likely not displays of their own power/piety, nor that of the local ministers in whom they were invested. Aggrandizement of individuals or groups at the Pampa pilgrimage site through acts of intense patronage, including construction of architecture, did not characterize the site before the twelfth century. Instead, Wagoner (1996) has interpreted the choice of marking
the pilgrimage site itself with an inscription as reflecting a relationship between the donor and
the deities at the site. Inscriptions would have also served as visual (non-verbal) cues (markers)
to the devotees and local community moving through the site, signaling a spectrum of other
information, such as political ambitions. Much of this information would have been accessible
regardless of audience literacy, as discussed in Chapter 4.

Although the Pampa pilgrimage site was modest before the twelfth century, it still
developed into a religious center with a *matha*, in part thanks to investments by patrons such as
the administration of the Later Chalukyas. Though the exact original location of inscription ID 8
is unknown, it was almost certainly within the local area. Such inscriptions intensified the
experience of the ritual landscape. As such, they can be interpreted as material culture that
played an active role in a dynamic social and political dialogue, much the same as did shrines
and temples, especially after the twelfth century CE. The epigraphs signaled their donor’s piety
and influence in the area, and their political affiliations. The investment of the Later Chalukyas
as seen in ID 7 and 8 contrasts with epigraphs ID 1, 2, and 3 that were not left at the site but
register the donation and pilgrimage of their associated rulers (Badami Chalukyas for ID 1, 689-
690 CE; and Nolamba chiefs for ID 2 and 3, 1014 and 1018 CE). It can be surmised that these
rulers opted to promote themselves in other settings that they valued more than the pilgrimage
site in the Hemakuta Hill area.

At the same time that the Later Chalukyas were invested in the local elites of the Pampa
pilgrimage area, there was the concurrent presence of another polity, albeit more localized and
smaller: the Nolamba chiefs Iriva-Nolambadhiraja and Udayadityadeva, as represented in
inscriptions ID 2 and 3, dated to 1014 and 1018 CE respectively (see Figures 1.4 and 1.5 and
Appendix C). Their precise relationship with the Later Chalukya local administrators (ministers)
remains unknown. The Nolamba chiefs commemorated their visits to the Pampa *tirtha* with two
inscriptions of religious necessity for the soldiers that died in a nearby battle; they most likely
were performing death rituals for the fallen (Wagoner 1996: 153). Their capital of Hemavati
(Anantapu District, Andhra Pradesh) is located approximately two hundred kilometers to the
south of the Hemakuta Hill area; however, ID 3 records the visit by chief Udayaditya to the
Pampa-*tirtha* after a military campaign, at which point he travelled from his nearby encampment
at Kampili, approximately eighteen kilometers southwest from the site (Wagoner 1996: 151). ID
3 was not erected in the Hemakuta Hill area. Rather, it was established at the nearby town of Bagali, Bellary District, and records a donation made of food offerings to a deity, Kalidevasvami of Bagali. Though the Later Chalukya capital is significantly farther from Pampa-tirtha than the Nolamba capital to the tirtha (~370 km versus ~200 km respectively), it was the Chalukyas and their administrative elite that marked the Pampa-tirtha landscape directly.

The Nolamba dynasty flourished in South India from the eighth through eleventh century (Cohen 1992: 7), and into the thirteenth century (Michell 2013), first as feudal chiefs of the Gangas, then of the Rastrakutas. When the Rastrakutas were replaced by the Later Chalukyas, the Nolambas became largely independent of other dynasties (Cohen 1992: 7). The Nolambas first became visible in the eighth century CE as they settled in parts of Chitradurg and Tumkur districts in Karnataka as well as in Anantapur district in Andhra Pradesh, all of which were districts to the south-east and south of the Hemakuta Hill area. At their height, the Nolambas ruled over central Karnataka and southern Andhra Pradesh, including Mysore, Bangalore, Mandya, and Kolar, from their capital of Hemavati (Cohen 1992: 7; Vijailakshmi 2006: 241). At the point that they visited Pampa-tirtha and mentioned their visits in ID 2 and 3, it is unclear if the Nolambas were feudatories of the Later Chalukyas or were functioning independently. Regardless, they were not invested in the site in the same capacity as the Later Chalukyas (ID 7 and 8). Their patronage is demonstrated through inscriptions ID 2 and 3, which expresses their ritualistic and likely political attention to the town and god of Bagali even though their ritual needs were fulfilled by their pilgrimage to the Hemakuta Hill area (Wagoner 1996: 153).

1.4.2 Hoysalas, Sindas, and Kampili: Twelfth to Fourteenth Centuries CE

During the twelfth century, a period characterized by major ritual changes at the site, political developments on a much larger scale were occurring across the Deccan. With the dissolution of the Later Chalukya Empire, three successor regional kingdoms that were once feudatory to the empire developed in distinct “ethno-regional” linguistic areas and their ascendancy reconfigured the political map of South Asia from 1163 to 1323 CE (Figure 1.7). The Kakatiya kingdom emerged in Telangana, subjugating most of the Telegu-speaking regions including coastal Andhra Pradesh and the eastern Deccan (Wagoner 2014: 15). The Yadava kingdom emerged in the Marathi-speaking regions of the north. The Hoysala kingdom emerged in the south,
expanding into the Kannada-speaking regions. As new research focuses on the smaller Deccan-based polities, as opposed to the larger Chola Empire (situated in the Tamil area to the south of the Hoysalas), the smaller polities are found to have influenced the political and economic practices of the later Vijayanagara Empire to a greater degree than had been previously understood (see Stein 1989).

Figure 1.7 South India: Later Chalukya, their successor regional kingdoms and their Capitals, and the Cholas (based on Eaton and Wagoner 2013: 17). Image from Google Earth Pro. Imagery date December 2013.

The Kakatiyas, the Yadavas, and the Hoysalas were first historically visible in epigraphs as feudatories of the Later Chalukyas. The Kakatiyas are first mentioned in 956 CE, but by 1160 CE they declared their independence from the Later Chalukyas, and subsequently expanded their territory and agricultural core (Sinopoli 2003: 71-73) through mechanisms such as building irrigation systems and establishing agricultural settlements (Parabham Sastry as cited in Sinopoli 2003: 72). Their presence at the Hemakuta site is not documented in any local epigraphic sources, as is also true for the Yadavas.
The Hoysalas emerged in the eleventh century as a feudatory polity under the Later Chalukyas. They were likely rulers of a small polity in the Kannada-speaking area under the jurisdiction of the Later Chalukyas (Sinopoli 2003: 73). Their capital city was located approximately 280 km south of the Vijayanagara area, at Dvarsamudram (now Halebid, Hassan District). They quickly grew in power and territory throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Although they remained as feudatories to the Later Chalukyas, they obtained, or at least proclaimed, imperial status by 1150 CE, as declared in titles used in epigraphs (Derrett 1957: 209-211 in Sinopoli 2003: 73). By 1200 CE, the Hoysalas no longer recognized the suzerainty of the Later Chalukyas (Muddachuri 1972: 61 in Sinopoli 2003: 73), and their patronage at the Pampa pilgrimage is apparent soon after this in inscription ID 10, 1236 CE. In fact, not long after they became an independent kingdom, Vira Someshwara, ruler of the Hoysalas from 1235 to 1263 CE, gifted money to feed and support the work of the temple’s brahmans (ID 10) at the quickly budding pilgrimage site, newly centered on the orthodox god Virupaksha. The addition of Virupaksha expanded and shifted the ritual purview of the site away from death and local deities; instead, Virupaksha-Siva added a dimension of the “great tradition” (Wagoner 1996: 159) associated with pan-Indian gods. Consequently, Virupaksha-Siva became a subject of devotion and investment of non-local elite to the site, beyond the Later Chalukyas and their ministers. ID 10 is associated with the new ritual life of the site both in content and placement. The inscription itself is located on an ancillary structure of the Virupaksha temple, the northern gateway leading from the Virupaksha space into the area with Pampa’s temple, and as such would have been highly visible to devotees moving through the pilgrimage space – much like the earlier Sinda inscription ID 4 located on Pampa’s temple and associated with the major development of the site as discussed below. Like the Later Chalukyas (ID 2 and 3), the Hoysalas directly invested in the religious and educational life of the site through the support of the brahmans.

It should be noted that before and during the material investment of these Hoysala imperial rulers at the site, local elite had already begun to invest in religious structures and to display their patronage within the landscape to the devotees visiting the site. For example, following the presence of the Nolamba chiefs and the Later Chalukya administrators in the eleventh century, and roughly contemporaneous with the Hoysalas, another local and non-imperial group appeared in the epigraphic history of the site in the twelfth century: the Sindas.
Inscription ID 4 (1199 CE) is a donative inscription in Kannada by the Sinda chief Maiduna Chaudayya, feudatory to the Sinda king, Srivirakalidevarasa. Chaudayya led a new current of local, politically ambitious patrons at the site who heavily invested in the material and ritual landscape of the Pampa pilgrimage. This trend followed on the heels of the transition of the site to a Virupaksha-Pampa pilgrimage. The site was now more accessible to non-locals through the presence of Virupaksha, as a deity associated with the broader South Asian god Siva, but pilgrimage still offered salvific properties (primarily death-related) through the presence of Pampa. Pampa’s newly appointed role as wife to Virupaksha also exemplified the Sanskritization of the site. The Sindas invested in the site at a greater level than even the Later Chalukyas, coinciding with the concurrent ritual expansion at the site. Architecturally, this was expressed primarily in the development of the Virupaksha temples and ancillary structures, some of which are listed in inscription ID 4. These building are described in detail in Chapter 3.

It is at this time (the twelfth century) that larger geopolitical changes on the subcontinent, such as the fall of the Later Chalukyas and rise of their successor states, permitted the development of a distinct microregional identity for the Bellary District. This is reflected in inscriptions dated to 1173 and 1181 CE providing new, specific names for the area, such as “Ballakunde-nadu” and “Doravadi-nadu” (Epigraphica Indica, XIV, No. 19A in Wagoner 1996: 163). Chauddya’s inscription (ID 4, 1199 CE) signals the first of two local powers that worked to develop the Hemakuta Hill area. Inscription ID 4 records his patronage, as a local chief of the Sindas of Kurugodu, ruling fifty kilometers to the east of the Hemakuta Hill area. The physical inscription was installed on the most public structure at the site, on Pampa’s temple, and Wagoner’s (1996: 163-165) careful translation and analysis of ID 4 sheds light on certain points of political and ritual interest. ID 4 contains the first mention of Virupaksha in the Hemakuta Hill area, but confirms that the pilgrimage site was shared with Pampa and the other primary deity of the site, Bhairava/Mahakaladeva. More importantly, the manner in which Pampa is referenced in the text indicates that her identity and role was altered by this time. Chaudayya refers to her as “Pampambika”, which is a cognomen of the pan-Indic goddess Devi, derived from the Vedas as representing the active female counterpart to the male Deva. The Vedic Devi goddess as counterpart to the Deva god is epitomized by the Sanskrit goddesses, Parvati to the god Siva and Lakshmi to the god Vishnu. Pampa is identified from this point forward as conjugally paired with Deva/lord Virupaksha (Wagoner 1996: 161).
The inscription lists a long line of donations to the deities of the site, including those made by Chauddya, which has aided Wagoner in associating temples with deities in his AISC and VRP work (discussed in Chapter 3). Chauddya thus demonstrates his deep financial and religious investment in the Hemakuta Hill area and its deities in ID 4, including a land grant for brahman meals, a pot-finial, roads, a bell, a tripod stand, an incense pot, an ambulatory, sandalwood paste, and more (Patil 1992:131; Patil and Patil 1995:28, no. 97; Rajasekhara 1985:102; Wagoner 1996: 162). Even if a devotee could not read Kannada, the inscription, being large, lengthy, and prominent, would impress all devotees at the tirtha. It might also have been possible that inscriptions were read aloud for the illiterate. In addition to the list of gifts, Chauddya recognizes that the tirtha was also powerful through its connection to the soteriological powers of the river/Pampa, which fits well with the contemporaneous Sinda tradition of memorial cults based in Kurugodu, particularly as they are associated with royalty. ID 4 states that Chauddya established a memorial linga to his Sinda overlord, Rachamallesvara, a very public and clearly political act of piety to him. Unfortunately, the location of the linga has not been identified. The inscription also reveals that Chauddya was related to an officer of the Sinda king Srivirakalidevarasa. The officer was part of a contingent protecting the Hemakuta Hill area from nearby Matanga Hill (the highest point in the landscape), which suggests that there was a large enough permanent and/or pilgrimage community to warrant armed warriors stationed here, to maintain the Sinda hold of the site and “keep order” in an administrative fashion (Wagoner 1996: 165).

Another Sinda chief, Mummadi Singeya Nayaka, known for successfully fighting against the Yadavas and the Hoysalas to maintain the Sinda’s hold on Ballakundu around the turn of the thirteenth century CE, most likely built one of the remaining memorial shrines at the site (Wagoner 1996: 166). The two memorial shrines that the Sindas constructed on Hemakuta Hill (discussed in Chapters 3 and 4) reflect an architectural tradition they imported to the site from Telangana, the previous location of their royal cult of memorial temples, and so are built in an already perfected form at the site (Wagoner pers. comm.; Wagoner 1996: 166).

Approximately a century after the Sinda inscription was erected at the site, another local chieftain marked the landscape with his patronage. The Sinda polity ceased to exist sometime by the end of the thirteenth century, and the Bellary District (Ballakunde-nadu) came under the
control of the Kampili chiefs. The first of these chiefs was Mummadi Singeya Nayaka (1280-1300 CE) who was succeeded by his son, Kampila-raya (1300-1327 CE) (Wagoner 1996: 166-167). Both father and son successfully resisted the Yadavas, though Kampila-raya eventually accepted a feudatory position to the Yadavas, and later to the Hoysalas. Like the rest of the Deccan polities, they too were overthrown (1327 CE) by the Delhi Sultanate, albeit later than the Yadavas (1313 CE). Inscription ID 5 (undated but erected between 1300-1327 CE) records Kampila-raya’s direct investment in the site through the construction of a memorial shrine built for (royal) family members. Unlike the Sindas, the Kampili’s devotion was not directed directly to Virupaksha. Instead, their patronage of the site was likely motivated by a river (Pampa)’s power as place of pilgrimage to venerate the deceased.

Overall, developments in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries show that figures with greater means and political motives, both local ambitious chieftains and regional imperial leaders, invested and used the Hemakuta Hill site in novel (new for the site) and very conspicuous ways that affected lasting material change at the Pampa tirtha, most likely in an attempt to influence the local and newly expanded devotee base visiting the site through their conspicuous displays of piety. Material investment in the site also provided an avenue for kin-based hierarchical maneuverings through the donation of funerary/memorial monuments and rituals (see Chapter 4 for further discussion). As Garimella (2002: 83-85) points out, this is also true of the early, pre-twelfth century phamsana memorial shrines built throughout the Bellary District, particularly at the Sinda capital of Kurugodu. In contrast, the uniform shrines, temples, and epigraphs (or lack thereof) that typified the Hemakuta site during this early pre-twelfth century period do not display distinct individual ambitions and innovations, even when the Later Chalukyas were investing in the site through local elite ministers (ID 7 and 8). It is not until the twelfth century and onwards, particularly with the Sindas and the Hoysalas, that the Hemakuta site is used as a location for such targeted donation, as conveyed by both inscriptions (see ID 4, 5, and 10) and structures (the Virupaksha temple and associated structures from Phase 2, Periods 1 and 2).

1.4.3 The Imperial Period: Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries CE

By 1328 CE, the Later Chalukya successor states and local ruling families in the Bellary District had all fallen under the sway of the Delhi Sultanate led by Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq
(1325-1351 CE), a new imperial power based in northern India led mainly by Turkic Muslims who brought the Persian cosmopolis into the Deccan (Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 26). The sultan deployed two distinct forms of government over the Deccan: areas north of the Krishna River were put under direct rule, while areas south of the Krishna River were put under indirect rule. (See Eaton and Wagoner [2014: 27] for a detailed description of the administrative methods deployed by Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq.) The southern Deccan was left under the care of the Hoysalas, though their kingdom dissolved in the 1320s as their subordinate chieftains declared independence with their own armies. These chieftains were called upon by Tughluq to serve the Delhi Sultanate as regional commanders (amirs), though their loyalty waned by the 1330s CE (Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 28). The northern direct rule area of the Deccan fell into disorder somewhat more slowly than the south, continuing to be ruled by the Dehlhi Sultanate during the 1330s and 1340s. Zafar Khan was crowned in 1347 as the first sultan of the new Bahmani Empire (Zafar Khan was crowned as ‘Ala al-Din Hasan Bahman Shah), emerging from the first and second generation of Muslim migrants that the Delhi Sultanate had brought to colonise the south as part of the direct rule program. Meanwhile, in the southern Deccan (specifically southern Karnataka), one of the chieftains, Harihara Sangama, along with his five brothers and an army, continuously conquered territory throughout the 1330s and 1340s. By 1344 Karnataka was under their control and in 1347, Virupaksha at the Pampa pilgrimage site was declared the Sangama family deity and they the site’s protectors (Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 28, 31).

The new state controlled by the Sangamas, which became known as the Vijayanagara Empire, grew to dominate the south of the subcontinent. The Bahmani Sultanate grew to engulf the northern Deccan and ruled from Gulbarga, Karnataka, approximately 275 km north of Vijayanagara city. These two powers were separated by a contested zone delineated by the Krishna River. Both states grew to express themselves through their associated cosmopolises, through “trans-regional, visual idioms, language, and literature” (Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 31), as passed down from either the earlier and successful Delhi Sultanate (for the Bahmani Sultanate) or the Chalukya Empire (for the Sangamas of the Vijayanagara Empire).

As Verghese (1995: 1) points out, the establishment of the state and consolidation of power was not a quick process. The traditional date for the founding of the Vijayanagara Empire
is 1336 CE or 1346 CE (1346 CE is the date for the ‘festival of victory’, celebrated at the Srngeri matha for military conquests of the Sangama brothers [Clark 2006: 202-204]). The polity was ruled initially by Harihara I (1336-1356 CE), followed by his brother Bukka I (1356-1377 CE), however, it was not until the third ruler came to power, Harihara II (1377-1404 CE), that the rulers assumed imperial titles such as Maharajadhiraja. It was also under Harihara II’s rule that the empire was stable enough to accomplish significant expansions far into the south of India (Verghese 1995: 1). The site of the city and the home of the first ruler, Harihara I, was in Anegondi, immediately to the north of the Tungabhadra River, as indicated by inscriptive evidence. Harihara I’s brother, Bukka I, moved the city to the south side of the river (Verghese 2000: 41), a strategic move for protection from incursions by Bahmani Sultanate forces that became systemic during the Sangama period (1336-1485 CE). At the new polity’s stronghold, Bukka I constructed large fortified walls with gateways around the administrative and military headquarters. These fortifications came to later contain the Royal Center when the population at the site exceeded the capacity within the walls during the reign of Harihara II (Verghese 1995: 10).

Researchers of the site have divided the Vijayanagara area into four functional zones (Figure 1.3), with the zone immediately south of the river identified as the Sacred Center, encompassing the Hemakuta Hill area and continuing to develop throughout the Imperial Phase with new religious structures (see Verghese’s [2011] discussion of the composition of the Sacred Center). Further to the south is the Urban Core, encompassing several major hills, ridges, and valleys, and circumvallated by a major fortification circuit. Within the Urban Core, in the southwest of the area, sits the Royal Center that initially served as the heart of the city until Harihara II’s reign. During his reign the population increased remarkably, at which point the structures and the surrounding fortifications of the larger Urban Core were erected. The first Sangama-sponsored temple was constructed in the city under Harihara II’s rule, a Narashima temple constructed in 1379 CE outside of the Hemakuta Hill area, which also introduced Vaishnavism to the city’s ritual landscape. After this, temples were continuously added to the city, more under some rulers than others, but by the reign of Devaraya II (1424-1446 CE) the basic form of the city under Sangama rule was in place. The city plan used roads, architecture placement, and landscape features to generate cosmic order and elite legitimation (Fritz 1985).
A set of three configurational properties - centrality, alignment with the cosmos, and the throne of the sacred king - were employed (Fritz 2006). The central placement and alignment of the king’s own temple, the Ramachandra Temple, provides the centrality of king through his temple, though this did not occur until the fifteenth century under the rulership and patronage of Devaraya I. Prior to Devaraya’s rule, the capital city still centered itself on the Sacred Center. In the later Imperial Phase, the royal temple dominated the subsequent conceptual and spatial organization of city space, but the axis of spatial organization was still based on alignments with Matanga Hill in the Sacred Center, as explored extensively by Malville and Fritz in their archaeoastronomical investigations of the site (Malville and Fritz 1993; 1996; 2006 a and b; Malville 2015). The oldest established axis of orientation or structural alignment to a local landscape feature is to Matanga Hill, situated east of the ritual structural node centered on Hemakuta Hill, the focus of my research.

The cardinal axes generated by the placement of king’s temple and nearby throne organized and connected the king to other features in the city and wider landscape. Such features are of mytho-religious importance, particularly those associated with events from the Ramayana, which again associates the king with the god Rama. Such sites lie along the north-south axis of the Ramachandra temple: 1.9 km north beyond Matanga Hill is the Kodandarama temple (where Rama crowned Sugriva), and further from that the axis aligns with Rsyamukha Hill (where Sugriva fled with Hanuman), then Anjenadri Hill (the birthplace of Hanuman) on the north side of the Tungabhadra Hill (Fritz 1985: 267). None of these sites are visible from the Ramachandra temple, though they can be identified from the summit of Matanga Hill, the highest point in the city. From his temple in the mythologically-charged, central, and righteous landscape, the king espoused his might and right to rule over the empire and his subjects. The element of space, as a resource, was therefore a key mechanism of power that greatly influenced the development of the city. The placement and alignment of major architectural features in the city are discussed extensively by Fritz (1986; 1989; 1991) and other authors who participated in the VRP (Fritz and Rao 1984; Malville and Fritz 1993a, 1993b, 1996, 2006).

Under the second ruling dynasty of the Vijayanagara Empire (Figure 1.8), the Saluvas (1485-1505 CE), little changed in the city with regards to architectural development although suburbs and fortifications continued out into the landscape (see Brubaker 2004 and the
Metropolitan Survey as summarized by Sinopoli and Morrison 2007). By the fifteenth century the city grew to over 15 km² and was home to upwards of 100,000 inhabitants (Sinopoli 2003: 79). Under the third ruling dynasty of the Vijayanagara Empire, the Tuluvas (1491-1570 CE), and particularly under Krishnadevaraya (1509-1529 CE) who was one of the greatest Vijayanagara rulers, the city blossomed with the construction of new temple complexes and temple suburbs, and Krishnadevaraya and his queens were patrons of additions made to existing temple complexes, including the Virupaksha temple complex in the Hemakuta Hill area. It was also during his reign that the most detailed European traveler accounts were created, particularly by the Portuguese visitor Domingo Paes, providing historians with eyewitness accounts of festivals and details of the city during the sixteenth century CE (Sewell 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vijayanagara Dynasties</th>
<th>Dates CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sangama dynasty</td>
<td>1336-1485 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saluva dynasty</td>
<td>1485-1505 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuluva dynasty</td>
<td>1491-1570 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aravidu dynasty</td>
<td>1542-1646 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.8 Table of Vijayanagara Dynasties.**

The Phase 1 pilgrimage complex in the Hemakuta Hill area became a powerful symbol that Vijayanagara rulers attempted to harness as a legitimation tool, as can be seen through the “iconic reuse” (Wagoner 2007) of particular Phase 1 inscriptions. For example, one of the sixteenth century Vijayanagara rulers re-used the inscription ID 8. (It is unclear which rulers were responsible for each of the construction phases of the Mahanavami-dibba platform inside the imperial Royal Center at Vijayanagara [Brubaker 2004: 155].) ID 8 was originally commissioned by a Later Chalukya king to record his religious donation at the site when it would most likely have been overseen by local Kalamukha ascetics (see Figure 1.4; also discussed further below). By appropriating the inscription, the Vijayanagara ruler connected himself to the historical memory of the Later Chalukyas, who were idealized for their successful control of the
Deccan for approximately five hundred years (Wagoner 2007:1). Another remarkable example of imperial reuse of Later Chalukyan materials at Vijayanagara is the assemblage of the Imperial Phase Bhuvanesvari shrine located in the Virupaksha temple complex built in the Hemakuta Hill area. This goddess’s temple openly displays Later Chalukya architectural elements from dismantled tenth-eleventh century Late Chalukya structures, while being embedded within the sixteenth century CE temple complex belonging to the imperial and patron deity of the Vijayanagara kings, Virupaksha (Wagoner 2007). Wagoner (2007) discusses this re-use of Chalukyan materials by the Vijayanagara emperors, and notes that this ‘Chalukyan revival’ permitted the Vijayanagara ruler to link himself to a distant point in time in the site history, thus naturalizing his right to rule. In addition, the Late Chalukya Empire was admired by the Vijayanagara rulers not only because they were militarily and politically successful, but also for the status they held based on the prestige of the emperor Vikramanditya. He became a ruler of mythological proportions through a series of well-crafted texts (Bilhana’s Vikramankadeva Carita, Vijnaneshvara’s Mitaksara, and his own son’s work, the Manasollasa) that established him as a perfect imperial and cosmic ruler (see Eaton and Wagoner 2014: 6-9).

The Saluva and Tuluva dynasties also transferred the city’s ritual focus away from the Sacred Center to the Vitthala temple complex and surrounding area which was likely constructed by the Saluvas. Indeed, the Vitthala temple was still under construction for the addition of two gopuras in the complex when the city was sacked in 1565 CE, after the Battle of Talikota. The city was not totally destroyed, but it was largely abandoned thereafter. After the fall of the empire, religious life did not continue at any of the large temple complexes belonging to the Vaishanava cults that the imperial powers introduced to the site (Verghese 2004: 430). Worship did continue in the Hemakuta Hill area, however, at the Virupaksha temples and at two shrines from Phases 1 and 2, and continues to this day (Kotecha 1982). The last imperial rulers of Vijayanagara, the Aravidu dynasty, did not survive long without their base of power at the city. The final rulers moved from city to city while losing their feudatories, moving from Penukonda to Chandragiri to Vellore until they were without power (Verghese 2004: 419).

During the Imperial Phase, urban form and material practices of legitimization were generated through the organization and manipulation of space to (re)iterate and compound the ties of the rulers to the sacred. This is clearly visible through imperial architectural programs,
such as the use and placement of the Ramachandra temple by Devaraya I. These associations and elite architectural decisions have been made visible through spatial analysis by the VRP. To what extent visitors to the city space during the Imperial Phase could observe these spatial associations is not clear, nor is how the spatial associations developed over time. We do not know if different groups/individuals (by caste and gender) may have had differential access to particular spaces, such as hierarchical spaces in the Virupaksha temple complex (Garimella 2002), or who would have had knowledge of spatial associations that were not visually observable. Much of the spatial ordering and many of the alignments would have been imperceptible, regardless of how critical it was in the generation of cosmic order and imperial legitimation. Intriguing work on these topics remains to be done.

My research focuses on the earlier periods, when associations and alignments were being developed, in the original sacred core of the Hemakuta Hill area. My research will provide a sense of religious development and change prior to the imperial development of the site, across several periods of changing political control. I investigate the perception and corporeal experience of a range of devotees as they moved through the Hemakuta Hill site, giving special interest to the identification of landscape feature alignments, including when and where they were observable. This allows me to examine observable or restricted information within the overall spatial narrative of this sacred landscape. My research identifies shifts in devotee corporeal experience as a dynamic and potent text for scholars to understand how embedded ritual experience was important in nuanced relationships between the built environment and sociopolitical relations in a ritually charged environment, particularly as these experiences may have differed between a wide range of sects and social groups. The methodological and theoretical approaches I applied to Phases 1 and 2 and the Early Imperial Phase are presented in the following chapter.
Chapter 2

2 Theory and Methodology

2.1 Theoretical Direction

My interpretation of the social production of space through corporeal experience and manipulation in the Hemakakuta Hill area aligns with a recurrent and prominent theme in critical geography (Soja 1989; Lefebvre 1991; Downs 1997), as well as in anthropological (Basso 1996) and archaeological studies interested in phenomenology (Anderson and Stoddart 2007; Fogelin 2006; Shaw 2009 and 2013; Tilley 1994). Place-making, perception, and experience are also central to my research, as are the importance of natural features in conjunction with the built landscape. The humanist geographers Lefebvre (1991) and Soja (1996) analyze social space as composed of three interwoven strata, understood in a trilectic relationship: conceived, perceived, and lived (Lefebvre 1991), or first, second, and third spaces (Soja 1996). Conceived space (Soja’s secondspace) refers to spaces as planned and built according to those developing and designing space, i.e., representations of space and spaces of representation. Perceived space (Soja’s firstspace) identifies space as being experienced and embodied and filled with social and non-verbal symbols and signs, i.e., physical space. Finally, lived space (Soja’s thirspace) embodies “complex symbolisms” (Lefebvre 1991: 33) that bridge the spatial practices and representations to the imagined and the physical. Space is conceived, experienced, and perceived; place and identity (the self and/or group) as both subject and object are created and reconfigured. Thus, lived space (thirspace) is an access point to understanding the place-making of a people wherein intense experiences in “spaces of representation” lead to possible moments of heightened consciousness, resistance, and/or transformation.

While the archaeological investigation of space has largely been concerned with conceived space (Soja’s secondspace), examination of past human perception (Soja’s firstspace), as phenomenological exploration, was first introduced and championed by British prehistoric landscape research in the 1990s. (See, e.g., Barrett 1990; Bradley 1991; Thomas 1991 and 1993; Tilley 1994; and discussed as a theoretical zeitgeist that resonated with the empirical and romantic sensibility of British archaeologists in Johnson 2006: 125-130.) Phenomenological
archaeology was subsequently received with some criticism, for we cannot directly reconstruct past minds and embodied histories nor directly equate the archaeologists’ experience with those of past peoples (Brück 2005). Furthermore, phenomenological approaches were criticized for their ahistoric view of the past and for assuming that bodies and experience transcend cultural contexts (discussed further below). Nevertheless, this first wave of phenomenological archaeologists were pioneers in considering human agency in the interactions of people and space/structures, a theoretical advance vis-a-vis earlier “structuralist theories which tended to focus on the inherent and ‘essential’ meanings of the built environment” (Shaw 2013: 62-63). A second generation of phenomenology-inspired (or adjacent) archaeological research has approached perception and corporeal experience in a range of creative ways, aided largely through space-centered avenues of inquiry. A few such examples include Letesson and Vansteenhuyse’s (2006) analysis of the role of visual perception, experience and social implications of architecture in Bronze Age Crete; Fogelin’s (2006) parallel approach to the Buddhist landscapes of Thotlankonda, Andhra Pradesh; as well as Swenson’s (2012) use of Soja’s tharspace theory to identify how ritually charged spaces took part in personal and social transformations among the Moche Huaca Colorada in the Jequetepeque Valley, Peru.

Lefebvre’s (1991) conceptual triad of space is ideal for analyzing the ritual and political development of the increasingly dynamic site of Hemakuta Hill prior to the fifteenth century CE, an area with few written primary sources but many monumental structures (in this case, large scale religious structures such as temple complexes or temples with subsidiary structures) built before and during the reign of the early imperial rulers of the Vijayanagara Empire. For example, examining space as conceived permits the partial identification of individuals and groups in the Hemakuta Hill area through their use of space as observed in architectural placement and configuration. These patterns gesture to a group’s particular needs for ritual activity and their desired corporeal experiences of devotees. The idealized intentions of such “privileged actors” (Lefebvre 1991: 12) are observable through pattern identification in the architectural and spatial data sets. The production and reproduction of human physical and social relationships in space are of interest here, in addition to examinations of the social life of shrines and temples themselves as independent actors, an approach particularly relevant to the South Asian religious context as discussed in Chapter 3. Moreover, examining the corporeal experience of the devotee within the Hemakuta space draws the analytical gaze to perceived space, namely the space that is
“embodied, modified, and experienced in practice” (Swenson 2012: 4). While discussing past perceptions (perceived space) of past peoples is problematic, fundamental spatial and structural constraints point to basic corporeal, physical, and sensorial possibilities (or experiences) of a body moving through and/or acting in space, particularly in a ritualized place with a narrower range of prescribed practices. Employing historically-developed phenomenological analysis of space (analysis that includes a temporal component), informed by conceived space (idealized and planned space), permits an investigation that moves beyond description and inventory (Lefebvre 1991: 7). An analysis that extends to lived space (thirdspace) can account for the subtle and not-so-subtle cues for patterns and changes in spatial organization and ritual practices, particularly as many of the devotees at the site have left little to no material footprint in the material culture of the site, and most “privileged actors” were restricted as well. Key to understanding this nearly silent and hitherto understudied part of the history of the Hemakuta Hill area is the use of an innovative (non-traditional) theoretical approach to lived space that can suitably address the nature of the site, a death-related pilgrimage space. Identifying the Hemakuta Hill area as lived space, or potential thirdspace for devotees, permits me to explore ideas beyond the mapping of architecture and natural features, and to instead examine spatial and temporal aspects of identity and experience.

The binaries typical of archaeological work, such as material versus symbolic, mental versus material, public versus private, female versus male, object versus subject, need to be transcended to allow an examination of the dynamic and creative space (a thirdspace) inherent in death-related pilgrimage sites such as the Hemakuta Hill area. As a thirdspace, the Hemakuta Hill area enabled mourners and devotees to observe, reject, deconstruct, and negotiate categories of identity, place, and time. Indeed, places associated with the dead worldwide have been well-established as spaces of heightened reflection and embodiment for mourners and devotees, and linked to an intensified time of social and self-reconfiguration for the dead, the community, and for individuals (van Gennep 1960; Hertz 1960; Turner 1967).

In addition to Lefebvre’s theory on spatial trialectics, I draw on Catherine Bell’s (2010: 81-82) work on ritual theory and practice to consider how a sacred landscape, such as the Hemakuta Hill area, was understood by and affected a devotee. Bell’s point of entry is through the consideration of how the ritual performances of movements and corporeal experiences, both
extreme and subtle, can structure and forge relationships with material culture and settings. By emphasizing how and what people do in sacred spaces, through ritualized actions, we can mobilize practice theory to access past ‘ritual bodies’, movements, and space in the archaeological record. Likewise, we can also access aspects of the ‘socialized body’ of a traveler, in that travel is a geographical and a social phenomenon strongly tied to cognitive perceptions of landscape, as well as the relationship of social spaces to physical places, and socio-cultural regulations for mobility in relation to age, gender, and class. Mechanisms such as shared narratives, as well as shared spatial and sensory experiences, can be examined as triggers for the creation of social space (Mills and Walker 2008).

As my application of spatial software analysis of the landscape is phenomenological in orientation, coupled with my interpretations based on GIS, I have worked to establish a methodology that overcomes phenomenology’s weakness. My analysis avoids the pitfalls of imposing ahistoric and/or disembodied actors moving through a landscape. Instead, I adopt measures to produce agents that are immersed in a historical context (see Chapter 4); in other words, I am producing historical phenomenology. Such a historically situated phenomenology was initially called for by Thomas (1991), a sentiment echoed by Weismantel (2015), who challenges the earlier archaeological perspectivism to overcome ahistorical and abstractionist limitations and to instead ground phenomenological research as materialist and historical. The goal of a historical and materially grounded phenomenology (Shaw 2013: 63; Thomas 1991; Weismantel 2015) is to account for individual and group agency, as well as the meaning and evolution of experience of specific structures and sites. Contextualizing the history of pilgrimage traditions, as opposed to a traditional analytical approach preoccupied with only one instance in time, will also allow for a methodology to reconstruct how religious meanings may have been transformed according to corporeal and sensual traditions. Moreover, by contextualizing the material world of pilgrimage spaces according to Weismantel’s successful phenomenological-inclusive “new” perspectivism approach, wherein we see “humans as actors and makers who co-create the world together with other beings and things”, the active role of both humans and deities within the Pampa tirtha can be facilitated. My historical and material phenomenological approach will be “aware of and responsive to the historical contingencies” (Weismantel 2015: 142), identities, and relationships between actors throughout the Hemakuta Hill area during the period of study.
2.1.1 Practice Theory

The principal body of data I use to investigate these topics for Phases 1 and 2 and the Early Imperial Phase of the Hemakuta Hill area is the architectural record, characterized by limited, small scale and/or primarily austere architecture. These temples and shrines are also, with few exceptions, relatively limited in terms of their symbolic expression, as is typical of architectural and sculptural ornamentation and design in this region and time period compared to other contemporary religious architectural traditions, such as the earlier Rastrakuta temples (approximately 8th to the 10th centuries CE) found at Badami, Aihole, and Pattadakakal (Hardy 1995) and the proceeding Karnata Dravida temples built by the Later Chalukyas throughout northern Karnataka and in the neighboring region of Kalyana (Wagoner 1986 and 2007). The paucity of historical sources as well as the nature of the built environment of the area and period in question means that there is insufficient information about the “symbolic, mythic, and doctrinal” religious aspects of the Hemakuta Hill area, to undertake the type of investigation that a more structuralist and religion-focused approach would require (Fogelin 2007: 57). In addition, due to the substantial material, political, and devotional changes that this area is known to have gone through (discussed in Chapter 1), a focus on practice that examines how rituals were creative, reactive, and malleable with the development of the site (as discussed by Bell 1992, 1997) is necessary. Due to the sacred nature of a pilgrimage center, it is understood that practices that occurred in the Hemakuta Hill area were ritualized, and the relationships between groups of actors (or individuals), including humans and deities, is identifiable for my research. The implication of these assumptions is that ritual actions do not passively reproduce or express social order and systems of power, as was suggested in the dated research of Binford 1971 and Tainter 1975. Instead, I analyze changes and continuities of ritual action and devotee experience, as observed in the material world, in terms of the intentions of those who were able to manipulate the Hemakuta Hill area and the devotee’s experience of this space (Fogelin 2007: 57-59), acknowledging that both the manipulator and the devotee were potentially creative and/or resisting actors in the sacred landscape. However, changes in the composition and spatial organization of the material world are not limited to identifying changes of power relationships (domination and resistance) within a community and between devotees active at the site. Rather,
changes in the behavior of the actors or would have been observable by their contemporaries and by me in the present. Additionally, changes in behavior were part of a larger process, in “relationship to the entire field of social action” (Swenson 2015: 340), particularly those materialized and enacted at a pilgrimage center connected to death, memorialization of ancestors, and salvation. The primary actors at the pilgrimage center, both those making changes to ritual space and those practicing therein, would have been individuals, families, and communities undergoing a transformation and/or negotiation of identity in the face of loss; “identity is never fixed and circumscribed but is a property of contextually shifting relationships” (Brück 2009: 14).

Much like other archaeological sites encompassing mortuary ritual environments, such as cemeteries and burial mounds, the Pampa tirtha was also a site for funerary and/or memorial rituals, in addition to being a landscape in which the deceased was represented, memorialized, and/or propitiated. As such, these loci were sites involved in the creation, confirmation, and negotiation of identity and social orders through ritual practices (Fogelin 2007: 64). The range of ritual activities occurring at the Pampa tirtha does not directly correlate to other types of mortuary landscapes in that it is archaeologically unclear how or if there were rituals involving the body of the deceased on site at this pilgrimage center. In addition, there is an absence of any physical remains of the deceased, suggesting that primary or secondary burial activities primarily took place off site, though this is archaeologically unclear and discussed further in Chapter 4. Ritual actions involve the devotee engaging with a range of deities that necessitate different devotional intentions and rituals from the devotee. Consequently, the devotee engages with different corresponding spaces, corporeal, and social experiences. The ritual complexity of the Pampa tirtha is that the site was associated with death, but importantly, also with salvation and life through the goddess. Consequently, the theoretical approach I am taking for the analysis of the Hemakuta Hill area material world focuses on practice theory, which emphasizes actions, the body that experiences and executes the actions, and the spaces in which actions are being practiced.

Research focused on ritual and associated architecture has been explored through archaeological analysis for a range of periods and places, particularly for the British Neolithic and Bronze Ages (Bradley 1990; Owoc 2000 and 2005; Smith and Brookes 2001). Alongside
such research are also inquiries into the role of experience in ritual space and architecture (Bradley 1998 and 2000; Fogelin 2003, 2004, 2006; Howey & O’Shea 2006; Moore 1996; Tilley 1994, 2008). Both lines of investigation have deep roots in the work of the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and his concept of ‘habitus’ (1977, 1980), Foucault’s concept of ‘discipline’ (1977), as well as Anthony Giddens’ theory of structuration (1984), all of which theorize place and society as acting on each other. Another important theoretical influence on contemporary archaeological research into experience in ritual space is the use of ritual practice developed by Catherine Bell (1992). Bell combines ritual action with Bourdieu’s practice theory (1977); the intentional act of ritual is therefore a ‘ritualization’ of action, composed of “embodied knowledge and experience” (Berggren and Stutz 2010: 176), that consequently structures the world and relationships linking actors and materials. Her work has influenced such research as Fogelin (2007), Johansen (2014), Swenson (2007 and 2008).

2.2 Material World and Pattern Analysis within the Landscape

In archaeological and anthropological research, the material world is frequently referred to as objects, technology, artifacts, and material culture or simply material (Knappett 2014:4701), often interchangeably. Such terms, depending on how they are defined and interpreted, can belie a theoretical impulse to reduce the importance of the material world by emphasizing ideas or beliefs. Terms such as artifact, object and material culture have their own set of implications and can limit the range of “material” that can be used for consideration. For example, terminology used to describe material can unintentionally exacerbate a dichotomy between data that are built versus data that are natural features. The human versus nature dichotomy is limiting and inappropriate for any research, particularly landscape investigations. Past research at Vijayanagara has successfully avoided the pitfalls of favoring built over natural features, and theoretically provides for the interconnectivity and relational aspects of the material world, and so has advanced our understanding of the Vijayanagara landscape in ways relevant to a spectrum of disciplines beyond archaeology or art history. For example, city planning is discussed in Fritz (1985); landscape design and archaeoastronomy is discussed in Malville and Fritz (1993; 1996, 2006a, 2006b) and Malville (2015); and the connection between water features, farming, and landscapes of devotion is discussed in Morrison (2012).
Adopting an approach to space inspired by the material and by experience highlights the relationality between built features and the material world, while providing a sense of process and emphasizing a necessary consideration of natural features (Knappett 2014:4702). Accordingly, this research follows three main avenues of interrogation for accessing the organization and experiences of a body in space through a material-based investigation, as demonstrated in Zitzewitz’s (2015) work on temporality and bodily experience in the Karachi landscape. These avenues include “the material present of the built environment; the social and political significance of imaginaries; and the bodily experience of things” (Zitzewitz, 2015:1). By focusing on the earlier period, before the majority of the imperial monumental structures within the area were erected (such as temple complexes), the small-scale structures of the site are given primacy, a somewhat neglected aspect of Vijayanagara research. Consequently, I look forward to following and incorporating an emerging theoretical movement, New Materialism, into the next stage of my research, especially as I extend into other time periods. New Materialism examines space as part of a dynamic and shifting relationship inherent to social processes and spatial dialectics (Witmore 2014), similar to Weismantel’s (2015) material and historical perspectivism. A New Materialism approach seeks to form non-dualistic or relational ontologies that are also experience-centric, correcting a tendency within practice theory, which is also experience-centric but has a tendency to emphasize relationships of power (Bell 1992; Fogelin 2007: 58). New Materialism, “a useful way of understanding the conjunction or intersection of the social and the material, without the former swallowing the latter” (Knappett 2007:20), is exciting as a new approach to explore in the context of a sacred space, particularly in that it promotes the “foregrounding of things” (Hodder in Witmore 2014: 228) and the “richness of encounters with things” (Edgeworth in Witmore 2014: 225), leading to the potential for unforeseen aspects of the Vijayanagara landscape to be revealed.

2.3 Analyzing the Material World and the Experience of Space

Space is used in my research as a key element for examining how humans organize themselves and their ritual activities as social beings, and how these activities can in turn imbue space with meaning and value. I examine space in terms of scale, from the overall composition and organization of the Hemakuta Hill area to the scale of a shrine. I also recognize that spatial scales can act together to inform how a body engages with space (bodily movement and sensorial
perceptions) and in potential ritual experiences. I have therefore given consideration to the intentional ordering of scales, and how they could inform corporeal and ritual experience. How individual spaces function together, not as isolated separate entities (Koch 2005), is significant to understanding the devotee experience of the Hemakuta Hill area pilgrimage site.

According to space syntax theory, when space is ordered from continuous space into discrete units, it is referred to as configured (sensu Bafna 2003: 18). These units form the basis of space syntax analysis and the first step is to identify each of the units of interest. Identifying each different type of space encourages the observer to interpret how spaces may have been employed by the users. Attention to configured space permits an approximation of the visual and/or physical accessibility to spaces through their physical attributes, which can often be correlated to social accessibility. In other words, configured spaces can be restricted or open to varying groups of people. In addition, configured space can speak to the intended uses and meanings of each type of space. In my research, three scales of space are analyzed: the ritual space of individual structures (depending on the size, configuration, and type of structure, this space may vary); the organizational spaces of groups or clusters of structures (called terraces as a heuristic device in this research); and the sacred space of the entire Hemakuta Hill area.

Common criticisms of quantitative spatial analyses employed in archaeological deliberations, such as space syntax analysis and least cost path analysis, are that space is systematizing and value is accorded based on modern perspectives and dominant operative ideologies (Morrow 2009: 7; Shaw 2013: 63). In addition, analysis takes place on incomplete models of space, due mainly to the inescapable deteriorating nature of archaeological sites and the frequent paucity or lack of literary and historical sources that can aid in filling in the missing pieces of a site lost through time and environmental deterioration. Fortunately, in South Asia for the early medieval period, there is an extensive Sanskrit literary tradition of technical manuals, long established by oral traditions (Mills 2011: ii) that dictated terms and regulations for establishing and creating new temples from a ritual and managerial perspective. Although not entirely prescriptive, they are very helpful guidelines for an analysis of uses of ritual spaces at this time.
For South Asian non-Muslim traditions at this time, conspicuousness and inconspicuousness, or visual accessibility of material features in a sacred landscape, are most aptly conceptualized in terms of *darsan*, the sacred act of beholding. *Darsan* refers to the visual correspondence between a devotee and a deity (as an image/murti in a shrine or as the structure that houses the icon), as well as between a devotee and a king. And as *darsan* is an integral part of visiting a pilgrimage site in South Asia (Eck 1986), assessing visual accessibility as devotees move through religious structures and features in my spatial analysis recognizes the importance and weight of that experience particular to a pilgrimage context.

A particular methodological challenge of the Hemakuta Hill area is the qualification and description of distinct spaces that compose the pilgrimage center. The sacred landscape is not composed of the well-defined areas typical of an urban context in which distinct spaces (neighborhoods) are identifiable through street and building networks. The use of space in the Hemakuta Hill area is uneven and characteristically diverse across the site and through time. As such, I have adopted space syntax investigation for analysis where possible and appropriate, by means of descriptive investigation, as the use and development of space permits.

On a more positive note, unlike most archaeological space syntax work (Fisher 2009; Shapiro 2005; Stöger 2011; Thaler 2005; and many more), the Hemakuta Hill area presents an unusual case study, as the vast majority of the structures to be examined are still relatively whole due to excellent preservation of the site after its almost complete abandonment in 1565 CE. What looting that did occur at the site was targeted and minimal, indicating politico-religious tensions between Saivas and Vaishnavas (Rao 2014), and does not affect the material of this study. Therefore, the overall use of past space is observable in the extant stone architecture. Exceptions are some editing of structures through removal or paving over of possible shrines (such as M.7A and M.11A, discussed in Chapter 3), as well as the placement of structures so as to obstruct external architectural details (e.g., see M.9 and M.10 in Chapter 3). In general, however, use of Hemakuta Hill area shrines and temples is reflected in their form and their location in space in relation to natural and built features of the site. The form and location of structures, mainly shrines and temples, allows for a digital reconstruction of the site that can also assess physical and visual accessibility, on the site scale and per structure.
Another helpful development for my research is the recent mapping of the Hemakuta Hill area by Google Street View which occurred after my own field visit to the site in May 2012. As discussed in Section 2.6.1, the immersive panoramic capabilities of Google Street View allows the researcher to move through space as a capable, healthy, adult body, the type of body moved through space to capture the images. Google Street View can be used to identify difficult and overlooked spaces, specifically on the terrace scale (discussed in Section 2.4), that have been heretofore unnoticed. Such defined spaces may not be revealed through spatial cluster analysis, so I have additionally sought to identify them through emplacement and use of topography. These distinct spaces are substantiated in Google Street View, through the digitization process in ArcGIS, and through any other architectural and contextual details available from the Architectural Inventory of the Sacred Center (AISC) reports (Michell and Wagoner 2001), as discussed in Chapter 4.

Investigating the role of the material world in religious, social, and political relations as manipulated through sacred experience in space is challenging. Pioneering archaeological works have brought a range of architectural approaches, centered mainly on proxemics and line-of-sights, to the investigation of space and the role of architecture in sociopolitical process and have proved fruitful while operating with far less written and extant material evidence than is available for the medieval period of South Asia (e.g., Fisher 2009; Moore 2006; Shapiro 2005). Unlike most archaeological settings that provide the researcher only with disparate or partial pieces of evidence to explore the effects of architecture on the lives of inhabitants, Vijayanagara consists of a remarkably preserved stone-built environment set in granitic topography. Piecing together the history of the site before the empire is difficult due to the limited types of structures, nature of the site, and the smaller and non-elite populations who contributed to its early development, though elite patronage does increase through time, as outlined in Chapter 1. As the imperial period progresses, the capital city of Vijayanagara presents a complex archaeological palimpsest of religious and state-sanctioned projects including buildings, roads, plumbing, fortifications, and so on, which can be assessed to demonstrate how the powerful and wealthy patrons of the empire marked and used space within the city, as well as how the religious history of the site grew and changed. This rare and full picture of structures in the Vijayanagara area is at odds with the types of settings archaeologists commonly examine, in which there is no guessing where the walls or doorways were when attempting to understand how space regulated
and was regulated by users. Ephemeral dwellings, shops, stalls, and other structures belonging to lower class individuals, as in most archaeological urban sites, have not been identified in the Vijayanagara landscape. These sections of the populations are known to be present during the Imperial Phase (from the later Sangama dynasties onwards), primarily through contemporary literature (Dallapiccola and Kotraiah 2003), but also through analysis of earthenware ceramics excavated or surface collected from various regions of the site (Sinopoli 1993; Mack 2002), although none associated with known religious structures. The non-elite population practicing in the Hemakuta Hill area during the earlier periods are simply not as visible, given the lack of texts and excavations.

Framing an investigation of social interaction and behavior in space from the viewpoint of non-static individual(s)/groups is at the heart of many fruitful archaeological publications (Fogelin 2004; Bradley 2000; Carmichael et al. eds. 1994; Ashmore and Knapp 1999; Tilley 1994). These works and my own hold that space is not static, that it changes over time, and that social and/or political groups may move through and communicate through the use of space in different ways. As such, there are many ways in which space can be experienced (Bender et al. 1997; Bender 1998; Fogelin 2004: 73-74; Ashmore and Knapp 1999: 17-18).

It is not possible to “know” all of the different perceptions and experiences of space, as Fogelin (2006: 74) rightly discusses. Many of the differences in perception of space are dictated through social codes that permit and restrict actions based on age, gender, and social class, but also through the sheer fact that each body and mind has its own corporeality, history, and attitudes affecting movements, meanings, and experience (Ashmore and Knapp 1999: 16). The differences between individuals and groups may be amplified or there may be attempts to dissolve interpersonal boundaries through the particular experiences choreographed into spatial ordering. These latter are the sorts of experiences that spatial analysis especially purposes to identify. The intended corporeal experiences and social interactions of devotees as orchestrated by dominant groups can thus be identified through spatial analysis. The spatial and temporal patterns that were present in the Hemakuta Hill area indicate that space was a resource used in increasingly complex and diverse ways into the Imperial Phase, with the potential of affecting social interactions and religious corporeal experiences. Space, as a resource, was bound to rules
for social activity, providing analysts with a schema that structured past behavior (Ferguson 1996: 10; Fisher 56; Shapiro 2005).

Fisher (2007: 57), Shapiro (2005: 5-6) and others (e.g. Lawrence and Low 1990) have remarked on the varied and separate approaches toward spatial analysis in different disciplines, such as archaeology, anthropology, architecture, urban planning, and cognitive sciences. Fisher’s (2007; 2009) methodology for overcoming such limitations is the integration of a range of methods to interpret the specific historical context of Late Bronze Age Cyprus. These include an initial space syntax analysis using structuration theory, plus an integrative approach that blends the analytical methods from several disciplines, such as symbolic and psychological studies of the built environment. This type of integrative and case study-specific methodology analyzes space for correlations between nonverbal cues embedded in architectural features, embellishments, and artifacts, cues that impart information related to behavioral rules and actions. A nonverbal communication approach was initially designed by Rapoport (1990) and also permits the identification of correlations between the built environment and isovists and viewsheds.

Similarly, the integrative method I designed for this research involves the examination of nonverbal cues in the built environment such as choices in the development of architectural forms over time, as well as the inter-relationships of particular forms with the surrounding landscape. Visual and physical alignments between objects (allocentric) and from subjects to objects (egocentric) are also assessed (Section 2.5), without prioritizing an analytical focus on viewsheds as is common in GIS-based archaeological research (Fisher 2009; Llobera et al. 2011; Papdopoulos and Earl 2014). Viewsheds are the geographic areas that are visible from one particular position in space. By analytically prioritizing the visual relationship between two points in space, the visual accessibility between subjects and/or objects, the concept of darsan further informs my methodology. This focus on darsan appropriately contextualizes my research, given the importance of this exchange of vision between devotee and deity that was sought on pilgrimage in South Asia.
2.4 Conceptualized Space: Structural-Spatial Nodes as Terrace Spaces

The Hemakuta Hill area was a conceptually and physically delineated space containing a series of distinct spaces and a range of human/divine interactions that I have identified through spatial investigation using ArcGIS. As the site develops through Phase 1 and into the Early Imperial Phase, more nuanced terminology was needed to differentiate further spatial clustering that this research identifies, as noted in my discussion of scales of analysis above. I have adopted the terms ‘terrace’ to discuss these distinct spatial-structural nodes at the middle scale. This term is employed instead of other terms such as ‘plaza’ or simply ‘node’, because both are beset by conceptual limitations. Moore (1996: 789) defined plazas, as used in Andean archeological examples, as “simple unroofed, nondomestic areas that are recognizable elements in the built environment… culturally defined spatial settings for diverse public interactions that may be sacred or mundane”. Even though a similar proxemic, or interactive and performative aspect of ritual space applies to my middle-scale spatial-structural areas (terraces), the term ‘plaza’ is misleading for it implies that these areas were open for public interaction. While the Pampa tirtha may have included areas suitable for public interaction, particularly if they were used for funerary rituals, they were not fundamentally places for congregation. The objective at a South Indian pilgrimage site is to engage with however, the divine, primarily for individual worship, through darsan with a deity and/or ancestor worship. Public worship as a group or community was not intended to be the primary activity at many structures in the Hemakuta Hill area, such as at memorial shrines built for private, kin-based ancestral worship. Group/community worship may have been accommodated outside the characteristically small structures of the earliest periods (shrines and minor temples), particularly for funerary activities, as well as at the larger scale temples built during the later periods under investigation. As the shrines and minor temples are not large enough to accommodate group or ritually complex devotional activities, the investigation of the adjacent open spaces as extensions of built ritual structures is necessary. The term ‘node’ is not used as it does not sufficiently convey a sense of the landscape features of the Hemakuta Hill area. ‘Node’ implies a place where people can enter from all directions and with no boundaries to meet; in contrast, ‘terrace’ implies directionality and a bounded space and is more suited for the types of spaces under consideration.
Each identified terrace has been examined for built and natural features, for non-verbal cues, and for evidence for the expected corporeal experience of a devotee worshipping in the terrace space or at neighboring terraces, including movement, and visual and physical accessibility. I also analyzed how a terrace relates to surrounding terrace spaces, and functions within the larger pilgrimage center, as part of a network, multi-scale analysis. Through the digitization process in ArcGIS, terraces were also assessed in terms of size, relative location in space (orientation, height/z axis, and distance to surrounding landscape and other built features), and topological relationships, as well as physical and visual access (viewshed analysis). If visual accessibility could not be determined through ArcGIS, Google Street View was used. Using this methodology, I have been able to trace the devotee corporeal experience for pilgrims through a planned path of ritually prescribed movement in the Hemakuta Hill site as they moved into, worshipped or passed through, and moved out of these distinct spaces identified as terraces.

The degree to which the terraces, like the plazas in Moore’s work (1996), were established and modified for public and divine interaction provides an avenue for assessing ritual behaviour and the religious, social, and political relations and ambitions that are spatialized and materialized at the site. My objective has been to make inferences regarding the types of interactions people had with each other and with religious structures, based on the material composition and form of the terrace space in question. The nature of the terrace and associated structures, often located in a microtopographic feature, can embody a group’s ideology in addition to producing, transforming, and reproducing social patterns. Therefore, I have differentiated the terrace units of space identified through spatial analysis as being distinct conceptual and experiential spaces within the larger Hemakuta Hill area. They use natural features of the terrain together with architecture for spatial organization, including design choices such as orientation, as well as visual and physical access to and from structures. These spatial and structural choices signal a terrace space, distinct from its surrounding area. In addition, the design of these areas seems to have created an intentional spatial character which was meant to produce a specific type of devotee corporeal experience as is discussed throughout Chapter 4.
2.5 Space Syntax: Access and Configuration Analysis

Spatial configurational analysis, or space syntax theory, began with the publication of *The Social Logic of Space* in 1984, a pioneering work by Hillier and Hanson. The foundation of their theory holds that society has an intrinsic spatial aspect and that spatial configuration is informed by social rules and ideas – as opposed to space being purely form and society being content (Hillier and Hanson 1984: 9). In this way, the discussion of how space and society interact is one that is dynamic and active. The manipulation of space (acted upon) can consequently influence those worshipping (inhabiting) in it.

I employ concepts and applications found in space syntax, especially those related to the investigation of human perception and movement and how they affect spatial layouts, as heuristic devices for spatial analysis. The limited scale of the Hemakuta Hill site in terms of space and the relatively small number of structures does not require graph analysis (space as redescribed in abstract format for topological analysis) through the use of space syntax software, such as DepthmapX or JASS. The number of structures, the number of clusters of structures, as well as the number of convex (open) spaces within a shrine or temple are all limited for my period of study. As such, complex applications unpacking the relationships between the spaces of interest and devotees are not necessary. Space syntax concepts and application are used for their descriptive capabilities, and not as interpretive devices, particularly for describing changes in the use of space at the structural/building scale and for inter-structural spatial organization. As such, the particular dataset of the Hemakuta Hill area from P1:1 to P2:2 allows me to historically identify and describe the built environment through the application of access and configuration concepts found in space syntax. (The term configuration denotes the transformation and ordering space into discrete and connected units through inhabitation [Bafna 2003: 17].)

Successful archaeological examinations of social structures and interactions in space are typically centered on architectural structures. The topological properties (spatial configurations) within buildings that manipulate individual movement, awareness, and encounter can be identified through an approach developed by Hillier and Hanson (1984) called gamma analysis, or access analysis in the works by Ferguson (1996), Fisher (2009), and Shapiro (2005). Gamma analysis was part of a field of architectural studies called space syntax, established in the 1970s by Hillier and Hanson, that examines the relationship between human behavior and the built
environment. The terrace spaces in the Hemakuta Hill area provide a unique ritualized and sacred setting for the exploration of interaction and experience in a pilgrimage destination. According to South Asian tradition and pilgrimage research, echoed in the broader field of the anthropological study of pilgrimage (Coleman 2002), the devotee enters into a sacred time and scape in the pilgrimage center, both physically and conceptually distant from his or her mundane life. Concurrently, distance and detachment from everyday life, needs, and behavior is recognized by adopting the identity of a “temporary renouncer” (Fuller 2004: 209).

Archaeological research examining the structuration and use of space, on any scale, typically has to strategize and account for missing material, including such features as routes and/or structure that provide data into accessibility, ordering, and movement (Llobeora et al. 2011). This is less of an issue in this area and time of study, as discussed above, due to the high level of preservation and integrity of artifacts that order space. The experience of movement and the location of endpoints in the Hemakuta Hill landscape can thus be identified and discussed with relative confidence in terms of how space was configured and manipulated. Most spatial analysis software, such as geographic information systems, provide the tools to perform spatial analyses from an allocentric perspective that codes “relative to external features of the environment” (Vasilyava and Lourenco 2012:353). Such a perspective is useful, but is much more revealing when coupled with information from the egocentric perspective that Street View provides, the perspective tied to an observer. Both sets of tools are discussed in the following section.

Access analysis is best used to examine the connection of bounded spaces (Hillier and Hanson 1984); bounded spaces generally comprise rooms separated or interlinked by walls with solid walls and doorways. This is methodologically problematic for analyzing a wider range of spaces, such as the terraces in my research and the temple complexes that develop later in the Imperial Phase. For temple complexes, there are many spaces that are not formally bounded but are signaled as separate in other physical and visual ways. Such spaces are not formally bound by solid walls, but often by more permeable edges, such as pillars with distinct entrance morphologies. As such, I used access analysis as a stepping stone rather than a formal method for discussing access to terrace areas and structures with permeable access spaces like porches. Fortunately, the religious structures examined in my research are not formal temple complexes,
even though one of these early period shrines did later develop into an Imperial Phase complex. Rather, the simple shrines and temples of my period of study are typically unambiguous and simple structures consisting of one to two architectural spaces (porch, antarala, mandapa) that are placed before the garbha-grha (inner sanctum sanctorum) to which a devotee does not have access. Likewise, the network of terrace spaces are placed in linear progression northwards down the Hemakuta Hill to the river. All devotees pass through and have access to all of them as they move through the defined sacred space of the pilgrimage destination – moving from south to north, from the top of the sacred Hemakuta Hill to the river further north of Pampa’s shrine/temple.

The space syntax concepts of access and configuration permit the exploration of human movement and possible decision-making within the Hemakuta Hill space, on multiple scales. Abstracted topological graph representations of space are axial lines, convex spaces, and isovists (Al Sayed et al. 2014: 11-14). Section 2.3 above described the importance of investigating the inter-relationship of spaces and scales of space, particularly in terms of how they can function together to affect devotee experience. As such, the Hemakuta Hill area can be interrogated (descriptively) through space syntax as a network composed of distinct parts that operate independently and as part of whole, a method suited to answering my research questions. By isolating distinct structural-spatial nodes as terraces within the Hemakuta Hill area, and by treating each as distinct spaces with their own qualities for producing, transforming, and reproducing types of embodied interaction with others (devotees and/or deities), a much richer understanding of the social complexities and early history of this pilgrimage center can be achieved.

2.6 Proxemic Analysis

Levels of distance between people according to the types of physical and nonverbal communication possible have been established by Hall (1996) and are called proxemics. I have adopted these levels of interpersonal space interactions as a means of qualifying the types of ritual interaction possible according to the particular attributes of a terrace space. Proxemics is ideally suited for qualifying and analyzing intimate space; scales include Intimate/Private, Personal, Social (Near Phase), Social (Far Phase), Public (Near Phase), and Public (Far Phase), as shown in Figure 2.1. I have used proxemics to discuss spatial organization within a terrace
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proxemic Threshold</th>
<th>Intimate (Private)</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social (Near Phase)</th>
<th>Social (Far Phase)</th>
<th>Public (Near Phase)</th>
<th>Public (Far Phase)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>0-0.45 m</td>
<td>&gt;0.45-1.2 m</td>
<td>&gt;1.2-2.15 m</td>
<td>&gt;2.15-3.65 m</td>
<td>&gt;3.65-7.6 m</td>
<td>&gt;7.6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch</td>
<td>Can touch easily; accidental contact possible</td>
<td>Can reach out and grasp extremity at near phase; cannot touch beyond c.0.75 m</td>
<td>2 people can pass an object back and forth by both stretching (up to c.3 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral/Aural</td>
<td>Soft voice; intimate style</td>
<td>Conventional modified voice; casual or consultive style</td>
<td>Loud voice used when speaking to group</td>
<td>Full public-speaking voice; frozen style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Vision</td>
<td>Details of eyes, finest hairs visible; vision can be distorted or blurred</td>
<td>Details of face clearly visible</td>
<td>Can see head hair clearly; wear on clothing apparent</td>
<td>Fine lines of face fade; lip movement seen clearly</td>
<td>Eye colour not discernable; smile vs. scowl visible</td>
<td>Difficult to see eyes or subtle expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60° Scanning Vision</td>
<td>1/3 of face; some distortion</td>
<td>Takes in upper body</td>
<td>Upper body and gestures</td>
<td>Whole seated body visible</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whole body has space around it in viewshed; postural communication becomes important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200° Peripheral Vision</td>
<td>Head against background visible</td>
<td>Head and shoulders visible</td>
<td>Whole body visible</td>
<td>Other people seen if present</td>
<td>Other people become important in vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.1 Proxemics table adapted from Fisher 2009:300, based on Hall 1966.**

when there are variabilities in the distances between structures (Section 3.4.1.2, 3.4.3.1, 3.4.6.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3.1). Hall’s measurements of distances for perception, communication, and interaction are a method for estimating “innate distance-related behaviours in humans” (Wheatley 2014:124) based on human sensory capabilities and social norms. These distances can be easily digitized around features in a geographic information system. While Hall’s measurements do not account for awareness and cultural differences in social norms, for my research, proxemics provided an initial means to measure and to group the ritual and social
interactions possible within and around structures and terraces. Such ritual interactions would have colored devotee behavior and experiences, and so were likely an important factor in the organization of the Hemakuta Hill space.

2.7 Digital Methodology

I assembled a digital landscape in Esri’s ArcMap, rendering a 2D map of structures of interest and topographic features with associated attribute data that could be stored and queried. I first obtained satellite imagery and a DEM to which the imagery could be rectified to minimize distortion and increase the accuracy of the imagery, before digitizing the site features. I investigated of the material world of the Hemakuta Hill area phase by structural phase, through a diachronic analysis of digitized material features of the landscape including both architectural features and natural features, from microtopographic features to larger landscape features such as entire hills and rivers. A diachronic analysis permits for spatial and temporal patterns and processes to be identified and visualized in ArcMap. Rendered features were based on published data including site plans/maps and measured drawings, architectural descriptions, and photographic records from the Vijayanagara Research Project (VRP), particularly from *Vijayanagara: Architectural Inventory of the Sacred Centre* (Michell and Wagoner 2001). The placement of these features in space as well as the identification and digitization of microtopographic natural features was done through satellite data acquired from Google Maps, Google EarthPro, and GeoEye-1 imagery. (At the time of my research, Google Maps and Google EarthPro were using imagery for the Hemakuta area from CNES/Astrium (2017), which is comparable in resolution to the pansharpened, orthorectified GeoEye-1 imagery.)

The remote sensing imagery used was pansharpened GeoEye-1 (2012), orthorectified with ASTER global digital elevation model (GDEM) version 2, providing imagery of 15 to 30 meter resolution. Aster’s GDEM version 2 has an accuracy of 1 arcsecond, or 30 meters; for further information see [https://asterweb.jpl.nasa.gov/gdem.asp](https://asterweb.jpl.nasa.gov/gdem.asp). This digital elevation model is a grid of thirty meters spacing of elevation information; that is, one elevation reading is recorded every thirty meters. Generally, a DEM would be ideal for studying the microtopographic features of a landscape, as discussed by Forte (2000: 200-201). However, a DEM for the area of interest for this research is based on thirty meter grids which are too coarse for my research. The Contour lines were generated from the GDEM but the resolution was again too coarse for the purposes of
this research. There was a higher resolution DEM available for purchase, the 8 meter Advanced Elevation Series (AES) DEM; however, the cost was far outside of my funding capabilities (approximately $1,500USD). LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging), radar-type terrain data with a greater precision than digital elevation models, is not yet available for the area. The datum used is WGS84, projection is UTM 43N, and units are in meters.

Geoeye-1 imagery was also supplemented with similar resolution imagery from Google Maps and Google Street View for identifying structures and topographic features of limited visibility. (The term “structure” refers to built structures, or architecture.) Non-remote sensing data used in digitization of site features consist of site plans from the VRP publications at a scale of 1:400, and architectural and archaeological drawings that range from 1:20 to 1:200. Drawings were made of structural plans, elevations, and sections of structures.

Each individual structure and natural feature was digitized as its own polygon in shapefiles organized by phase. Data associated with individual features can consequently be individually stored and queried in attribute files. Minor discrepancies in the placement of some architectural features have been noted in the digitization process, in that some of the published survey plans are not always true to the orthorectified imagery. Small spatial errors are, however, being eliminated in the process of creating the Vijayanagara Archaeological Atlas by John Fritz and Surendra Kumar (forthcoming).

2.7.1 Google Street View

Although I was able to make a reconnaissance visit to Vijayanagara in May of 2012, I was fortunate that Google expanded its Street View project to include Vijayanagara soon after this. The entire Hemakuta Hill area and the path past the Manmatha Tank structures were captured in July 2015 (among many other landscape features) and made accessible through Google platforms for the public by the beginning of 2016. The paths that have been recorded can be seen in Figure 2.2, highlighted in bright blue. Google Street View can be accessed through Google Maps and Google Earth and consists of a series of panoramic images that are stitched together to provide 360 degree views from eye level horizontally and 180 degree view vertically. The viewer can move through the paths that the photographer has taken, almost seamlessly transitioning (through proprietary processing algorithms) through each single 360-degree location by clicking on points.
in the field of view to be transported to the imagery closest to the desired point in space. For this action to happen, a depth map must be generated that stores orientation and distance data for possible points in the area of the image (Anguelov et al. 2010: 35). Such a sophisticated system began in 2006 simply as a Google-sponsored project at Stanford University called CityBlock (http://graphics.stanford.edu/projects/cityblock), through the co-founder of Google, Larry Page. It became available for public use as Street View in the U.S. in 2007 under the name still in use, Google Street View. The Google Street View project has grown exponentially in geographical coverage and technology each subsequent year, to the point that they had mapped hundreds of cities across twenty countries by 2010 (Anguelov et al. 2010: 32). The list of places captured has significantly grown since then, and updated lists of sites covered by country can be found on their website, https://www.google.com/streetview/understand/. The initial and most common method for capturing imagery was through cameras of a range of generations (eight high resolution cameras initially then reduced to one camera to allow for more vehicles to be sent out

![Google Street View paths available for the Hemakuta Hill area as of July 2015. Image from Google Maps. Imagery date 2016.](image)
for recording), lasers (for recording the distance between each location where images are taken),
and a GPS (to situate where in space the images were being taken). These equipments were
strapped to the roof of vehicles and connected to a computer inside the vehicle (Anguelov et al.
2010: 33), and were first used to capture American streets from the street level. Many subsequent
generations of Google Street View vehicles have been deployed with ever advancing technology,
including scanners for generating 3D imagery. In addition, methods for recording imagery off
roads have been developed, as was used in the Vijayanagara landscape, as well as other
UNESCO World Heritage sites.

As a tool for this research, Google Street View has facilitated remote access to ground
level visibility of the site, a “humanistic perspective” (Llobera 1996: 612), permitting the
identification of “invisible” landscape features not discernible through the remote sensing or
published data available for the Vijayanagara area, such as the microtopographic feature of the
South Terrace and the sightline from the mandapa of H.36 towards the Virupaksha temple
complex at the foot of the Hemakuta Hill. These types of features guided, oriented, and were
perceptible to a devotee moving through space. This element of perspective constitutes an access
point for exploring ritual experience in a space known to be sacred to the groups creating and
living in it in the early medieval period. Perspective is absent from a fixed, bird’s eye-view plan
or GIS-generated map. Street View provides the opportunity to emplace a mobile body as the
center of perspective which traditional GIS spatial analysis, based mainly on map layers, does
not afford (Llobera 1996: 613). Microtopographic cultural and invisible features that have been
found to structure the site could be observed through the virtual interactions with the landscape
made possible by Street View. In this way, GIS was used to record spatial-temporal footprints of
features (built and natural), while Street View allowed for spaces to be “active agents” as
opposed to simply “passive media” (Llobera 1996: 614). In other words, I was able to combine
these two approaches to investigate how the landscape of the Hemakuta Hill area played a
major role in shaping the devotee’s corporeal experience and the spatial organization of the site.

I recognize the fact that the terrain of 1,100 to 600 years ago was not identical to the
present day, an obvious shortcoming of Street View. For example, there is now significant
sediment built up around the H.38 and H.40 temples, so that ground level in the past would have
been lower than it is at present around these temples. Visibility obstructions through ground level
change are less of an issue on the granitic surface of the Hemakuta Hill in most cases, though, due to low rates of soil development typical of pre-Cambrian granitoid inselbergs and outcrops (Porembski et al. 2016:2829). Also, in the past the area to the west of the Manmatha Tank and between the tank and the river was most likely covered with larger vegetation such as trees. Any other vegetation on the Hemakuta Hill, however, would have been very low growing plants and/or grass, due to the limitations on soil formation.

The disadvantages of Google Street View are that it prioritizes darsan, the act of seeing, for engagement with the ritual landscape. Throughout Phases 1 and 2, darsan may have been less significant in ritual actions and for experiencing a sacred space between sects and across time, though this is unclear. Ways of seeing through Google Street View are also historically situated and the photographic technology that it presents is from a viewpoint of a healthy modern adult, most likely male, who moved through the Hemakuta Hill space in 2015. While the photographs frame and produce images from a particular modern body, it is recognized that it is not the same as a medieval body and alone, Street View images do not capture other sensory, haptic, or tactile experiences. As such, Street View images are used to explore the visual field but this is, significantly, informed by my own physical field experience in the landscape and qualified with topographic and environmental information derived from geospatial data where possible.

2.8 Disentangling Spaces

The exploration of the virtual space of the Hemakuta Hill area with ArcMap capabilities allowed me to investigate how the built environment developed over time in ways additional to architectural stylistic changes, particularly through sensorial engagements. Past space syntax and architectural theory research has demonstrated that individuals experience and move through space in different ways (Hillier 1996; Read and Budiarto 2003; Koch). The use and development of terrace spaces in the Hemakuta Hill area supports this position. The overall ritual experience of devotees is nested in levels of spatial experience within the overall framework of a death-associated pilgrimage site, to varying degrees over time. Movement through the sacred space of the site, from south to north, involved passing through an increasingly complex network of spaces, or terraces, that are connected by a south to north path of movement through the site. This indicates that the directed flow of movement, gestured by the path, ordered the landscape.
The effects of movement on humans and their relationship to landscapes, particularly as space is understood and appropriated, has been highlighted by anthropologists such as Llobera (Llobera et al. 2010). Similarly, Ingold (2000; 2009) discusses the temporalities of the landscape. Both scholars are interested in space as a common human mechanism worthy of archaeological investigation.

Thanks to the nature of the topography, my case study is encompassed in a small, clearly defined landscape in which the role of movement in ordering space for social-experiential purposes is an inferable phenomenon. As discussed in Chapter 3 and 4, in this landscape, a network of linking ritual spaces became the foundation for the spatial development of structures and the unifying properties of movement. In modern ethnographic accounts of the Virupaksha temple complex, Kotecha (1982) explicitly remarks on the fundamental nature of ritual movement in the life of the temple, as well as in the architectural development of the complex, and its relationship with the surrounding landscape. In effect, this movement acted as an act of worship of the site, in a similar fashion to the documented imperial and modern circumambulation of the Hemakuta Hill area, which functioned to define and integrate the space within. The linear trajectory across the hill most likely was not the only prescribed form of movement-worship occurring at the site in Phases 1 and 2, though it is a path that we know connected ideas of death (south) to life (north), and may have also been entangled with ideas of social transformation in the event of death.

The role that the built environment had in developing, maintaining and generating social, political and religious relations is largely overlooked in the literature of historic South Asia, with obvious exceptions in the works by scholars such as Eaton and Wagoner (2014), Fogelin (2006, 2003, 2011, 2012, 2014), Morrison (2009), and Shaw (2009, 2013). I revisit and analyze the long published but neglected work by Wagoner in the AISC, examining the use and development of space and the material world. Addressing an apparent gap in the vast body of Vijayanagara-based research, I have focused my research on the earliest component of the city to be developed. My research demonstrates that the Hemakuta Hill area was not made up of two main conceptual and spatial nodes of religious architecture, as commonly discussed (e.g. Fritz 2006: 22; Verghese 1996; Wagoner 1996); rather, the Hemakuta Hill area and the Manmatha Tank area are far more
nuanced in their organization. Digitizing the landscape allowed me to identify, or disentangle, the terraces of shrines and temples with their own internal logic.

2.9 Conceptual Framework for Research

The analysis to follow in Chapters 3 and 4 is not a stylistically-focused examination of religious structures and sculptures in the Vijayanagara landscape; it explores instead the structural uses of space to gain new insights about the ritual material world and the corporeal experience orchestrated in ritual spaces during the more obscure early periods of the Hemakuta Hill area. Like other Vijayanagara-based research, it is critical to be able to wear many different disciplinary hats for a robust interpretation. Specialists such as Wagoner, Michell, Fritz, Verghese, Branfoot, Patil, Sinopoli and others have demonstrated the effectiveness of multi-disciplinary research in allowing the researcher access to the wide range of available evidence for creating meaningful South Asian research. Everything above ground in the core area of the Vijayanagara site has been extremely well recorded through the work of the Vijayanagara Research Program (VRP), though the material associated with Phases 1 and 2 have not been as fully explored as those of the Imperial Phase. As mentioned, to investigate these earlier periods, I have created a GIS database of material and spatial data generated by mapping, digitizing, and exploring remote sensing and other published data. The physical structures of temples and shrines are the most abundant source of published data types for the area and periods of interest, and as primary sources are the chief building blocks and most easily recognizable aspects of South Asian sacred spaces. But as I will demonstrate, they are only one facet of medieval sacred space to be considered in unpacking the meanings and experiences planned into such landscapes.

I have developed two diagrams of systematic groupings related to material features in the Hemakuta Hill landscape (Figures 2.3 and 2.4). These diagrams show how systematics has been deployed as a tool for ordering nominal data (categories with no inherent order) examined for patterns, similarities, differences, and correspondences within this research. The classifications in Figure 2.3 present the spectrum of meaning in the material landscape, which became the foundation for Figure 2.4 that presents an expanded taxonomic classification of the material world of ritual features identified in this research. The identified classes, with their own sets of attributes, are observable and distinct features in the landscape.
My purpose in creating a classification of the ritual material world was not to establish a chronological or stylistic typology for artefacts or architecture such as the ‘Deccan style’, or ‘Islamic style’. Rather, I aim to help identify the multivocal nature of concepts and the range of materials that were brought together to form and inform this South Asian early medieval sacred landscape. In addition, these classifications are intended to reveal the origins and foundations of later imperial strategies and decisions for the spatial development of the Vijayanagara capital city, particularly as a tool for religio-political legitimation. It is my hope that my multispectral and corporeal approaches to past spaces, will be of use to other South Asian researchers interested in the material world, as a model to fully engage with the constructed and natural world.

As surmised or identified through later literature from and that described the Hemakuta Hill area, I initially identified broad categories of material that had a spatial and possibly ritual or religious component that could be captured for analysis (Figure 2.3). These categories were subsequently expanded to produce a systematic typology (Figure 2.4) that encapsulated a full spectrum of the material world of the Hemakuta Hill area. The classes of meaning in Figure 2.3 are the following: constructed landscape features, epigraphic features in the landscape, natural features of the landscape, spatial association in the landscape, and mythological associations in the landscape.
Figure 2.4. Phenomenological features explored in the dissertation.
The epigraphic and architectural feature data, as classified in Figure 2.4, were used to populate an Excel database (see Appendix C for inscriptions and Appendix B for architectural data tables) and were digitized/spatialized in ArcGIS for querying. The natural features and spatial associations listed in Figure 2.4 were identified through spatial analysis of the landscape in ArcGIS or by using the suite of spatial analysis tools available through Google Street View and Google Earth. These natural features remained a relatively static part of the Hampi-Vijayanagara landscape, though spatial relationships with the man-made features were not static. As such, these correspondences have been identified as developing, expanding, and creating a palimpsestual landscape of seen and unseen information and meanings, discussed in detail in Chapter 4. The class of “mythological associations in the landscape” in Figure 2.3 was removed for the more detailed classification of Figure 2.4, as it was found that concrete identification of material features of mythology in the Phases 1 and 2 landscape was problematic. Texts that specifically discuss sthala puranas (myths of place) are dated to the later Imperial Phase, as discussed in Section 3.4, and may not present a landscape as it was understood for the earlier periods.

The architectural and epigraphic databases were built up of details extracted from a range of VRP and VRP-associated specialist publications. Over the course of the work done by the VRP, from 1980 to 2002, many different types of material culture were examined, spanning from portable artefacts to built landscape features. To effectively work with the variety of this material, the VRP chose not to use a rigid classification or naming system and instead developed a system based on probable general function, coupled with physical differences that the researchers believed to be significant (Fritz 2006: 39), which could then be further sub-classified. Materials or artefacts are divided into groups as being object, feature, area, or text, in a similar way to my systematics illustrated in Figure 2.4. For my research, the classes of Figure 2.4 are identified based on their role (suspected and confirmed in this research) as elements of the ritual material world of the Hemakuta Hill area. In contrast, the organization and research goals of the VRP necessitated that their artefact groups allow for much broader project needs and a wider scope of artefacts and contexts, both temporally and spatially, so that an accessible classification system for a wide range of types of scholarly questions and lines of investigation would be
possible. For example, to discuss the composition of the imperial city of Vijayanagara and its elements of urbanism, the project established several conceptual divisions such as boundaries and routes (walls, gateways, roads and waterworks), sacred art (temples, shrines and sculpture), platforms and palaces (secular or civic buildings) and Islamic-styled forms (towers, pavilions and stables) (Fritz 2006: 39). The VRP terms for the individual categories of features and artefacts are generally adopted in this research, but limited to the categories in the conceptual framework is presented in Figure 2.4. This data is explored in the next two chapters across the early time periods addressed by my research.
Chapter 3

3 Understanding the Material Landscape of the Hemakuta Hill Area: 600-1325 CE

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the historical and material developments of the Hemakuta Hill area are assessed, in part, through the spatial and architectural style changes of stone monuments within the identified sacred area. Stylistic evaluations of the structures that provide the foundation for a historicized discussion of Phases 1 and 2 are based on the architectural work of VRP specialists, in particular, the work of Wagoner (1991; 1996) and Patil (1991). The early structures of the area are stylistically less elaborate than the later temple complexes and the architectural innovations for which the Vijayanagara Empire became celebrated. The plain style of Phases 1 and 2 religious structures were, however, only part of an assortment of mechanisms used for religio-political purposes. My analysis of the use of these structures, of the sacred space of the Hemakuta Hill area, and of devotee corporeal ritual experience sheds a light into the murky early period of Hemakuta Hill area history. In addition to providing new insights into the religious history of the region, I also use this data to examine the use of religious patronage in aspiring to social and political status. As discussed below, patrons of Phases 1 and 2 religious structures manipulated devotee corporeal and interactive experiences in the Hemakuta Hill area according to group and/or individual ritual needs. A similar religio-political strategy was subsequently adopted by Vijayanagara imperial rulers (from the Sangama through the Tuluva dynasties) as a part of their quest for royal legitimation. City planning as used as a one of several mechanisms for royal legitimation is discussed by Fritz (1985 and 1986) and Fritz and Michell (1987).

The physical setting of this research is a granitic hill located in the Bellary District of Karnataka, on the Deccan Plateau (Figure 1.2 and 1.3). The Hemakuta Hill area, not including the area of construction at the northern foot of the hill, measures approximately 300 meters long from north to south and 150 meters wide (Michell 1992:425). The hill itself is a gently undulating granite shelf, with soil accumulation in some slight depressions. Other depressions act
as pools for natural springs or for precipitation; in addition, there are granitic boulders clustered on the eastern edge of the hill. Altogether, the granitic face of the hill creates a setting characterized by micro-topography. The hill transitions, almost seamlessly, into a vegetated terrain with soil accumulation that connects to the river 200 meters to the north. The structures of the Manmatha Tank group within the larger Manmatha Tank area is located on this flat terrain at the northern foot of Hemakuta Hill (Figure 1.3 and 3.1). In sum, the Hemakuta Hill contains and is surrounded by a wide range of distinctive microtopographic features that are visually distinct areas, though they are unified through the granitic terrain and its connection to the Tungabhadra River. Both during and after the time period under study, the Hemakuta Hill area was understood to be a sacred landscape by visitors and local residents.

Figure 3.1 Google Earth Pro Satellite imagery of the Hemakuta Hill area. Imagery date March 2018.

The primary and normative axis of movement that devotees used to traverse the granite shelf of Hemakuta Hill was prescribed by the natural undulations of the surface and accentuated by additions of stairs and gateways supplemented throughout Phases 1 and 2 and the Early
Imperial Phase (see Figure 3.2). A depression at the summit, concealed by the gentle hill crests surrounding it, was the southern-most space of the hill used in Phases 1 and 2. The south side of the hill was not used in Phases 1 and 2 and is characterized by irregularly spaced large boulders and uneven granitic outcrops with a gentle slope. The slope on the west side of Hemakuta Hill is abrupt and steep, making a western route up the hill an unlikely path. The summit of the hill is best accessed via the east side of the hill. The east side of the hill is composed of large granitic boulders, most of which form a large mound near the south end of this east side. There is a

Figure 3.2 Site plan, including structures and paths of movement from Phases 1 and 2.
natural path around the south end of the boulder mound that leads to the crest of the hill. The northern base of the hill is located 200 m south of the river. The entire irregularly-shaped area of the Hemakuta Hill surface that housed religious structures is now delineated by a low wall that also follows the natural rock features, built during the Imperial Phase with several access gateways; no such wall existed during my period of study. The wall does not include structures built at the northern foot of the slope, which is to say that the Virupaksha Temple complex and the Manmatha Tank area are not subsumed into the imperial walled area.

As mentioned in Chapters 1 and 2, the architectural setting for Phases 1 and 2 of my study has been little studied for this area. Navigating the highly complex and metaphysical tradition of South Asian religious architecture and its associated meanings is a challenging task even for the comparatively simple style of Phases 1 and 2 Bellary District structures, and there has been limited analysis of the pre-Vijayanagara development of the Hemakuta Hill area (Bellary District). Most of the work to date has been by specialists employing techniques from a hybridization of art history (encompassing architecture) and history with an infusion of archaeology, as seen in the pioneering work of Wagoner (1991; 1996; AISC), Patil (1991) and Garimella (2002). This combination of approaches has proven successful for examining the material world of the South Asian past and as such, I will also be employing a mixed methodology of archaeology and historical analysis informed by art history and architecture.

The approach used involved a specialization in art and architecture as well as the metaphysical ideas that “make sense” and that are tied to architectural forms (Hardy 1996:4). By describing South Asian religious architectural traditions as metaphysical in this context, I mean that they encompass the philosophical, theological and mythological systems at play (Hardy 2016:112). In contrast, as an archaeologist approaching the study of a highly developed architectural tradition, the form and use of space over time are my primary focus, rather than the aesthetic and symbolic developments in architectural morphology of primary interest to other specialists. Nevertheless, accessing significant information from religious structures such as changes manifested in form, function, and the use of landscape, necessitates the modified adoption of the existing architectural terminology and its materially associated “systemic belief-pattern[s]” (Meister 1986:33). Meister here refers to “a consistent and integrated set of beliefs
that had formal implications for the Hindu temple…a language of form through which a system of belief could be expressed” (1986: 33). Overall, the architectural terminology employed in my research was adopted from specialists such as Wagoner (1991; 1996), Meister (1976; Meister et al. 1983), and Hardy (1995; 2001; 2012; 2016), who defined and identified their concepts as closely as possible to the original “native” Sanskrit terms for best interpretive purposes (Wagoner 1986:31; Meister 1986).

In this chapter I will first outline the general nature and development of ritual architecture in this region and South Asia more broadly. I will then discuss the specific architecture of the Hemakuta Hill region, phase by phase. Later sections will detail the material development of the Hemakuta Hill area from a spatial perspective with a focus on the broad categories of size, location, and access, together with a general discussion of style and material composition. My discussion follows the construction phases identified by Wagoner (1996), starting with Phase 1, Period 1, seventh to ninth century (ca. 600-900 CE) (Figure 3.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Phase and Period</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Calendrical Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1, Period 1</td>
<td>P1:1</td>
<td>600-900 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1, Period 2</td>
<td>P1:2</td>
<td>1050-1100 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Period 1</td>
<td>P2:1</td>
<td>1100-1250 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2, Period 2</td>
<td>P2:2</td>
<td>1250-1325 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Imperial Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>1325-1400 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(the Vijayanagara Empire was established in 1336 CE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Phase</td>
<td>From the Later Sangama Dynasty to the Tuluva Dynasty</td>
<td>1400-1565 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.3 Table of chronology.*
3.2 Historical Background for the Development of South Asian Hindu Temple Architecture

Shrines and temples developed relatively late in terms of the life cycle of Hinduism. Temple morphologies began to formalize as an architectural tradition during the Gupta period, 350-500 CE, embodying and performing according to a Hindu religious need. This early period of architectural codification coincided with the crystallization of a recognizable form of Hinduism in the form of the worship of a personal deity in addition to the emergence of the Hindu pantheon (Hardy 2016:113). Myths featuring Siva, Vishnu, and the Goddess were recorded from an oral tradition during the Gupta period, and were recorded in the Puranas, the first documents showing a recognizable form of Hinduism written initially in Sanskrit and then in local vernaculars.

Monumental architecture constructed from the second and first centuries BCE by the Jains and Buddhists (religions that developed in the sixth century BCE as a rejection of Vedic religions and sacrifice) deeply influenced the form that Hindu structures developed in subsequent centuries (Michell 1988:18). Together, Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain architectural and artistic traditions shaped the long-term South Asian landscape as places of worship as they moved from perishable materials (timber with thatch roofs) to stone architectural traditions (Michell 1988:18; Hardy 2012:106). There is little evidence of pre-stone Hindu temples, although early wooden forms are thought to be visible in relief carvings from Buddhist monuments and traceable through early morphologies of Hindu shrines (see Hardy 2012 for further discussion). The Gupta Period saw the emergence of the stone Hindu temples that would come to exemplify the architectural tradition of Hindu cults.

The symbolic and architectural traditions of Hinduism have formative roots going as far back as the Vedic and early post-Vedic periods (ca. 1500-500 BCE) (Meister 1986:33). By the twelfth century BCE, the Rig Veda (the earliest of four Vedic religious texts written in an early form of Sanskrit) was already in a written form that was edited and refined. This compilation of sacred hymns and verses marks the beginning of a lineage of texts that shaped and informed later South Asian religions. Most importantly here, the Vedic texts have had a lasting effect that can be seen in Hindu material culture through a system of symbolism employed in temple
architecture and adornment (Michell 1988:16). A key defining attribute of the Vedic religion was ritual sacrifice. According to Davis (1995:11) overview of the history of Hinduism, in general the sacrificial rituals served, in part, as a means for generating and maintaining cosmic and social order in addition to being a political tool of priestly and ruling groups to legitimize authority (“during the Vedic period the fundamental laws of the universe were identified with the laws of the sacrifice”, Lingat [1973:3 in Lubin 2010:31]). The brahmans featured in the early Vedas were those who “fashioned and recited hymns” (Davis 1995: 11). Leading up to the sixth century BCE, however, the development of large South Asian kingdoms collectively known as the Mahajanapadas coincided with increased occupational specialization. From the later Vedic texts of this period the brahmans become identifiable as a non-producing and hereditary class of ritual specialists who instructed in Vedic knowledge. This priestly group formed one of the four institutionalized varna hierarchical social classes that crystallized in the late Vedic period. The brahman class was often followed by or could follow the kshatriya class that was composed of warriors and rulers. Both the brahmans and the kshatriya classes were above the vaisya class (merchants) who was subsequently above the sudra class (servants). Central to the material culture of the Vedic rituals performed by the brahmans were sacrificial altars whose plan was based on a cosmogonic myth found in the Rig Veda, the earliest Vedic text, that of the primeval being (Kramrisch 1977: 46-61). Altars were square in plan to represent the square mandala, or sacred diagram, with protective deities assigned to the squares (Meister 1986:37). The symbolism of the square representing the cosmos was embodied in temple forms through adoption of the altar diagram, appropriated as the vastupurusamandala and seen in the very early Hindu architecture of the sixth century, including houses, temples, and palaces (Meister 1986: 37; 2003:253).

It wasn’t until the period from approximately 400 CE to 700 CE that Hindu temple architecture took shape as architects sought to devise methods and forms that could best encapsulate religious traditions of Hinduism. Instructional vastu-sastra texts, a type of silpa-sastra or instructional manual, provided instructions for temple architects (Hardy 2012: 102; Meister 1986:37). The earliest of these were the sixth-century Brhatsamhita by Varahamihira (primarily discussing astronomy), as well as chapters in the Puranas and epic literature (Hardy 2012:102; Michell 1988: 78). These treatise expound and have at their heart definitions of
categories, rules, and types of structures that are brought together and hybridized to create new permutations of architectural types (Hardy 2012).

The earliest *Vastu-Sastra* texts present one architectural tradition of temple style; however, from the seventh century CE onwards, the religious landscape of South Asia was populated by temples that had developed into two types, one that had developed in the southern part of the subcontinent and the other in the north (Hardy 2012:105). By the time that treatises on architecture were documenting this division of styles, such as in the eleventh century CE *Samaranganasutradhara* text from Malwa in central India (Hardy 2012: 102), the southern tradition was referred to as Dravidian architecture and the northern as Nagara (or Indo-Aryan) (Hardy 2012:101). To add to this complexity, the ways in which terminologies and typologies were used in *vastu-sastra* texts were not consistent, and for the time period of Phases 1 and 2, there are no recovered architectural texts specifically discussing the tradition and typologies of Phases 1 and 2 temples in the Bellary District (Wagoner 1986: 32).

The northern and southern architectural traditions have their own respective linguistic “kit[s] of architectural parts and ways of putting these together” and as such, they have their own sets of vocabulary and grammar (Wagoner 1986: 32). The style of roof was the primary feature that distinguished the northern and southern traditions. From early on, southern temples had stepped pyramidal roof towers (Figure 3.4), while northern temple architecture predominantly had curved spires (Figure 3.5) (Hardy 2012: 101). It is noteworthy that a sharp division between architectural traditions is not articulated in all *Vastu-Sastra* texts. Rather they are simply presented as two of the many architectural types possible; the two architectural languages provide a foundation from which combinations of architectural compositions could emerge as formal types of shrines (*vimana*) (Hardy 2012: 102).

The architectural language that developed in Karnataka was the Dravidian (Dravida) type, which also thrived separately in Tamil Nadu, flourishing in Karnataka from the seventh to thirteenth centuries (Hardy 1995:5). The group in the Karnataka area is termed the Karnata Dravida architectural language and within this group there further developed the Rastrakuta idiom, identifiable in the Phase 1 temple, M.7.
Figure 3.4. Elements of a Southern/Dravidian temple elevation. Image from Google Street View, view north of the Chalukyan Sangameshwara Temple. Image captured 2017.
Figure 3.5. Elements of a Northern/Nagara Temple Elevation. Image from Google Street View, view south of the Kandariya Mahadeva Temple, located in Khajuraho, Chatapur District, Madhya Pradesh. Dated to circa 1030 CE. Image captured 2014.
Researchers have further divided these South Asian religious architecture languages into ‘modes’. A mode captures a series of features that create an overall shape and combination of structural components (Hardy 2012:105). The modes, found within both of the South Asian temple architectural languages, generally include the Latina, the Valabhi, the Phamsana, the Shekhari, and the Bhumija (Hardy 2012:105). The Phamsana mode, the dominant architectural mode used during Phases 1 and 2 in the Hemakuta Hill area, can be difficult to categorize. Hardy notes that this mode can, at times, be considered as being of neither the northern nor southern architectural language and yet it can borrow from both, standing as its own language (Hardy 1995:9). Such is the case with the Phamsana architecture in the Hemakuta Hill area, in that the structures present a local interpretation of this mode/language (Wagoner 1996:143). The identifying characteristic feature of these structures, characteristic of both the Karnata Dravida language and Phamsana mode, is the stepped superstructure of receding storeys (tala) over the vimana (shrine) (Hardy 1995: 41). According to Hardy (1995:42), one of the properties of a vimana that can be used for classification is the number of talas it has: one-tala, two-tala, etc. In these stories (tala), the mouldings of the wall and entablature of the ground level may be repeated in increasingly smaller scale (Sears and Wagoner n.d.).

These two architectural modes, however, can be differentiated by the remarkably stark elaboration of Phamsana structures, specifically in the mouldings of the upper and crowning portion of the temple/shrine (vimana). In contrast the Karnata Dravidian Rastrakuta idiom of M.11 (and later structures such as M.7) is more elaborate. The Rastrakuta idiom is a regional idiom developed during and by the Rastrakutas that was centered primarily at Ellora, Maharashtra, during the late eight century CE (Hardy 2001: 181).

Overall, the core visual differences between these two types of structures built in Dravida language or Phamsana mode in the Phases 1 and 2 Hemakuta Hill area were based on the composition of the mouldings that comprised the horizontal elevations of the shrine (vimana): base, walls, and superstructure. The character and content of the moulding help define the different architectural typologies. In addition, each band had its own associated symbolism and meaning (Hardy 1995). The basic elevation of a Dravidian vimana is composed of at least six mouldings including the superstructure (see Figure 3.4). A more detailed analysis of mouldings
and sub-mouldings is discussed by Hardy 1995; 2001; 2016). As shown in Figure 3.4, these six mouldings are (1) the base or plinth (*adhisthana*), (2) the wall (*pada*), (3) the entablature (*prastara*) composed of three elements including (4) the beams supported on the tops of the walls (*uttara*), (5) the overhanging/downward curving lower edge of a roof (*kapota*), and (6) a decorative frieze. Following the entablature moulding group is a recess (*griva*) followed by the crowning dome-shape of the superstructure (*sikhara*), representing a mountain (discussed below). Lastly and most often missing today is the finial (*stupi*) of the structure that sits atop of the *sikhara*. This dissertation discusses those elements that are pertinent for identifying sectarian and patron groups, types of rituals, and corporeal experiences.

The physical and spatial properties of religious architecture, dictated through South Asian temple tradition encoded in the *silpa-sastra* texts, varied across South Asia and over time. Regardless of the differences in composition of these temples, though, the symbolism of their forms was intended to materialize a microcosm, a manifestation of the divine (Kramrisch 1986:165; Hardy 1995:4), and other Vedantic philosophies (Hardy 1995: 3-6). The earliest extant copies of the *silpa-sastra* texts were based on a pre-existing and well established oral tradition (Mills 2011; Hardy 2001:180). They were designed to provide information to a religious officiant so that he would have the tools to design and build a structure that was ritually effective, while also including mythological context for design choices and core spatial concepts (Hardy 2001: 180). The texts were not written for or by architects, however, and this leaves the historian without written information related to structural decisions made by builders. Textual rules and guidelines include consecration rituals, directions for worship (*puja*), and technical (*silpaic*) details for temple design.

Within the set rules for designing a temple or a shrine, there did exist room for innovation and variation, based on the needs and desires of the designer (Indorf 2004:178). These choices, unique to each site, can be indicative of the politico-religious and ritual life of a landscape. Two overarching trends guiding architectural design of temple forms can be distilled from the literature, trends that transform the temple into a dynamic space that attracts deities and replicates the cosmos (Indorf 2004: 178). The first is the use of sacred mathematics, or proportional measurement, to reflect and imitate the structure of the universe. The second is the
axes of the temple design that radiates outwards, out beyond the temple, as discussed in the next section.

The basic form of the temple prescribed the circuit of circumambulation and guided the devotee through space to make the transition from profane to sacred, out of the light of day and into the dark of the sanctum sanctorum. Darsan, beholding the divine (image of the divine) and being beheld by the divine, necessitated a line of sight between devotee and idol, even as the devotee could not enter into the idol’s home, the garbha-grha. Visual connection with the divine was a controlled component of worship in sacred architecture; communing with the god/goddess’ image housed in the sanctum sanctorum was ordered and restricted through architecture and through regulations upheld by priests.

3.3 Architectural Components of the Vimana (Shrine)

The conceptual and typological heart of all the South Indian Hindu religious structures is the sanctum that houses the idol, variously described as the shrine or vimana. This central area is the house of the deity, where he/she dwells and is embodied (Hardy 2012:101; Michell 1988:62). Modest temples typically consist of a vimana (shrine) inside of which is the garbha-grha (sanctuary) and an antarala (antechamber) that links to a mandapa (hall). Vimanas (shrines) as an independent structure consist of fewer divisions of space than a temple but they do include a garbha-grha and can include an antarala. When the interior space of the vimana (shrine) is divided in this way, so that the murti (idol) is in its own small and differentiated sanctuary space (garbha-grha), then worship by devotees is focused outside of the garbha-grha, but often still facing and receiving darsan from the deity, similar to worshipping in the space of a mandapa (hall) connected to an antarala of a temple. If the interior space of a vimana (shrine) consists of an undifferentiated space, simply a garbha-grha, then the garbha-grha and vimana became one and the same and worshippers prayed outside of the structure (Bharne and Krusche 2015:101-102, 196) and circumambulated the vimana (shrine) from the outside (Figure 3.6). In contrast, temples (composed of more than a vimana, antarala, and a mandapa) will typically have a circumambulation path constructed inside the structure (pradakshinapatha), around the inner sanctuary (garbha-grha). Generally, shrines and temples also have a porch or an antarala that differentiated the entryway, marking the transition from the outside to the inside and from
profane to sacred space; “as the devotee approaches this center, all the external layers of gates, courtyards, and circulation routes serve to remind one of the earthly limitations obscure [sic] a higher reality” (Bharne and Krusche 2014: 93). In general, though, these thresholds were not necessarily designed to function as gathering places (Hardy 1995:16, 126).

The resulting structural temple tradition is one designed to fulfill the devotional needs that were functionally different from the congregational needs of a mosque or church. Priority was given to personal worship centered on movement and visibility, or darsan, with the idol housed in the inner sanctum and most holy point of the structure (the garbha-grha). Worship was a dynamic process executed through movement inwards, towards the sacred core of the garbha-grha (whether moving inside or outside of a religious structure), and clockwise, taking in all eight directions and the axes of energy of the cosmos. This pattern of movement mirrors the devotee’s focus; Hardy (1995) calls this the devotee’s “aspiration”. Focus was channeled through architecture, both by means of progressions of increasingly sacred inner space (in temples) and through the organization of exterior mouldings; the trajectory of focus was inwards to the garbha-grha and up to the point above the finial (topmost elevation of the temple proper), or Bindu. Kramrisch (1977:176) notes that this Bindu point above the finial is the structure’s “Highest Point, the limit between the unmanifest and the manifest”. It marks the point of “creative energy of the universe from which everything has evolved” (Bharne and Krusche 2015:93). Such lines of architectural and divine focus were built into the structure through organizational axes that also reflected the cosmos. There was a longitudinal axis running into the structure through the door frame and at a right angle was the transverse axis that met at the centerpoint of the interior of the vimana. From this central point diagonal axes ran to the corners of the structure, accounting for all eight directions (Figure 3.7). From the central convergent point, a vertical axis ran straight up through the vimana (shrine) and through the stupi (finial) to the Bindu. Thus, through the production of vertical and horizontal axes that link the two most sacred points of the vimana, the inner-most space with the idol and the point just above the stupi (finial), the architecture produces the cosmic axis mundi and the representation of Mount Meru, the support of the universe (Michell 1988: 70). Furthermore, this axis is reinforced through the vastupurusamandala cosmic diagram that the vimana was also founded upon (Hardy 1995:17).
Conversely, the directions of manifestation radiate downwards and outwards through architectural composition (Hardy 1995: 50). Kramrisch and Hardy emphasize that the function of the innermost space of the garbha-grha/vimana, where the vertical and horizontal axes met, formed part of a continuous process that “manifest[ed] the presence within” of the god (Hardy 1995: 17; Kramrisch 1977:165) and manifested aspects of the universe in a “ceaseless cosmogony” (Hardy 1995:20). (See Hardy (1995) for further discussion of the methods by which architecture was used to present movement of the divine manifestation and devotee aspiration.)
My spatial and corporeal investigation of how a body would have moved and/or gathered and interacted with others in ritual space is centered on several steps: isolating the intended space for ritual actions, identifying the ritual focus of a devotee, and assessing the types of rituals a space could accommodate (individual, communal, or corporate). I also take into consideration that the energy radiating from the vimana (shrine) could be a substitute for a direct sight of the idol for the devotee or for the deity when reconstructing ritual activities in space (Bharne and Krusche 2015:102). In a similar fashion to the temple or shrine embodying a process and event of divine manifestation, as opposed to an object that is static in essence, so too was the devotee an active partner in the relationship between the god and him/herself through darsan. The active and reciprocal role of the devotee to the deity is captured by the term darsan, entailing the exchange of gazes between the image of the deity and the devotee. The devotee was not a passive spectator who visited the temple or shrine. He/she was a seer and he/she, in turn, was seen. Through movement and sight the devotee was never in a passive state in the Hemakuta landscape.

Another important spatial aspect of temple or shrine architecture involves decorative embellishments. During Phases 1 and 2, a limited canon of motifs were used for decorative embellishment. When present, these were restricted to door frame areas and lintels, further marking the importance of spatial transition. Door jambs were typically encircled by concentric bands that could be left plain or could contain sculptural motifs, though the latter was not common with the structures under examination in my research. Likewise, lintels typically were plain or contained a divine image. When decorative motifs were used they included symbols of auspiciousness that would have been recognizable to all: a range of vegetation types, including creepers and lotus flowers; Gajalakshmi (the goddess Lakshmi, associated with spiritual and physical wealth, seated on a lotus and flanked by elephants); dvarapalas (shrine guardians); and kalasha vases. All of these symbols evoke ideas of fertility, plenty and life. The most commonly used of these elements in the structures discussed here is the vase, placed at the base of door jambs, and often associated with an image of Gajalakshmi on the lintel, as seen in Figure 3.8 from the Mula Virupaksha temple. (Note that capturing images of the kalasha vases on door jambs through Google Street View and through the VRP plates is often difficult due to poor preservation or because architectural additions hide the motifs and details of the entryway, and
thus have not been captured.) The vase image itself has been described as “the womb, which conceals within it the mystery of the birth of the cosmos” (Agrawala 1965: 6), although since the vases are typically depicted overflowing with vegetation or water – a symbol developed from the Vedas (Baumer 2001:446) and referred to as the “vase of plenty”, or the purna kalasha, a reference to fertility or plenty - the reference to fertility or plenty maybe wider than this womb association. This vase motif continued to be used throughout the imperial era and is found out into the surrounding landscape, frequently documented on structures associated with reservoirs throughout the Vijayanagara region (Morrison 2012). These reservoir structures were mechanisms of transformation, both transforming the landscape for agriculture and also political tools for creating economic surpluses; they were also thought of as religious structures, akin to temples and shrines (Morrison 2012).

![Image of kalasha vase motif into Mula Virupaksha temple](image)

**Figure 3.8. Google Street View of doorway with kalasha vase motif into Mula Virupaksha temple. Image capture April 2017.**

In the reminder of Chapter 3, I discuss in detail the religious architecture of the Hemakuta Hill area from the earliest structures and up to 1325 CE, phase by phase, as in chronology table in Figure 3.3.
3.4 Architecture and the Ritual Nature of the Hemakuta Hill Area through Time

The detailed ritual life of the site during Phas 1, Period 1 (600-900 CE) and earlier, including the exact rituals and myths, is not clear due to the lack of written sources (Wagoner 1996:14). However, there are fundamental and core rituals of early medieval South Asian traditions with known spatial facets that can help researchers understand the development of this landscape during the early periods of the site. For example, active religious structures (excluding memorial shrines as discussed in Section 4.1.6) had one or more priests to oversee the care of a housed deity. For temples, depending on the scale of the temple, the deity had daily and/or seasonally recurring rituals that were performed by local religious figures, such as priests and ascetics. These rituals were performed regardless of the deity or structure type and size. The daily rituals were performed in the *garbha-grha*, where priest acted as the link between the worshiper and the worshipped (Bharne and Krusche 2012:196). Devotees worshipped outside of the *garbha-grha* and only in very rare cases did they ever enter into the inner sanctum. For temples, ritual activity took place in the *mandapa* (pillared hall). For shrines, devotional activities took place outside of the *vimana/structure*. Where an antechamber was present, it was conceptually, architecturally and ritually used as a threshold. The *antarala* (antechamber) separated the outside world from the *garbha-grha* and can be identified through plain exterior walls (Bharne and Krusche 2014: 98). In other words, offerings were left on/in the threshold. If there was no *antarala*, the doorframe area could be used. In general, offerings were proffered at the threshold of the shrine and it is there that the devotee received sacred water and an offering of food from the priest (Bharne and Krusche 2014: 98).

If part of the body of ritual activity at a shrine included circumambulation then the devotee circumambulated (*pradakshina*) the exterior of the structure in a clockwise direction. Circumambulation at a temple could take place around the exterior of the structure plus around the inside of the temple and around the *garbha-grha* if it has a *pradakshinapatha*. Circumambulation does not seem to have been performed for memorial shrines, as discussed below. Circumambulation is a ritualized and “symbolic act of veneration” (Bharne and Krusche 2012:202) and can also take place on larger scales than around a single shrine/temple; the act of
encircling can extend to be part of devotional actions that ritually activate sacred space (Kotecha 1982: 73-76) and re-enact mythological events (Wagoner 1991: 142). Kotecha’s ethnographic accounts of the modern ritual life of the Virupaksha temple complex mentions one bi-annual ritual in particular that involves the ritual activation of the sacred space of the Hemakuta Hill area. The ritual itself is known as *Giri Pradakshina* and consists of a processional circumambulation of the entire hill area, out to the river and back to Virupaksha temple with Virupaksha idols, priests and devotees (Figure 3.9). The path taken reaffirms the view of the Hemakuta Hill area as a unit of ritual space and one that is in fact ritually re-activated through movement (circumambulation).

The identification of thresholds of sacred spaces is challenging when such thresholds are not delineated by constructed features, such as walls or gateways. At a large temple with a compound wall, the spatial and conceptual boundary materializing sacred space is evident (Bharne and Krusche 2012:196). Upon entering into this non-mundane space, the devotee followed prescribed actions that would allow him or her to achieve closeness to the deity. However, no religious structures large enough to have a walled courtyard (*prakara*) were constructed in the Hemakuta Hill area until the Imperial Phase. Moreover, the majority of structures at the site in P1:1 were shrines. Thus, natural features most likely formed the threshold of the sacred space for the group of structures comprising the Pampa *tirtha*, undefined by the constructed boundary characterizing larger temples. The later *sthala purana*, written between the eleventh (Filliozat 1978:63) and sixteenth centuries (Das 2006), discusses the conceptual and sometimes physical gateways that a devotee was prescribed to circumambulate before entering into the Pampa *tirtha*, located in a five to eight kilometer radius around the center of the pilgrimage area. How far back in time this much larger conception of sacred space existed is not verifiable. The sacred space of the Hemakuta Hill area may have been conceptualized on scales larger than the immediate area of the Hemakuta Hill, but this has not been identified for the earliest phases of the Pampa *tirtha*. Over the course of Phases 1 and 2, however, the relationships of structures to the surrounding space did change.
Figure 3.9 Giri Pradakshinapatha, the modern circumambulation path around the Hemakuta Hill area. Image from Google Earth Pro. Imagery date 2018.
For analytical purposes, the Hemakuta Hill area sacred space can be discussed at various scales: the micro-scale consists of the area reaching from the hill to the Tungabhadra River, and forms the primary focus of this research; the meso-scale consists of large and visible landscape features that are immediately visible from the Hemakuta Hill area (mainly features mentioned in variations of the sthala puranas); and the macro-scale encompasses landscape features in the area that are not visible from the Hemakuta Hill area (Fritz 1985; Fritz and Malville 1993; 1996 a &b; Malville 2015). Features at the meso- and macro-scales became critical landscape anchors and alignments during the imperial period, used for generating/creating cosmic order as prescribed in sastric texts (Kramrissch 1980; Yano 1986). These larger landscapes were invested with mythological worth, used for organizing an imperial city that legitimized imperial rulership. Prior to the Early and Imperial Phases, the macro Vijayanagara landscape, including spaces such as the Malyavanta Hill, does not provide structural evidence that it was part of the Pampa pilgrimage space. However, I have identified spatial relationships that were still within the meso-scale and simultaneously not visible. Such relationships imply that there were categories of knowledge at the site beyond what could visually be observed. Note that a devotee did directly experience meso-scale spatial relationships visually, but not at the macro scale. It is uncertain what, if any, corporeal cues in the Hemakuta Hill area during Phases 1 and 2, may have been associated with the areas beyond the meso-scale without further fieldwork.

3.4.1 The Material Development of P1:1

*Phase 1, Period 1: 600-900 CE (P1:1)*

The first non-perishable structures of the Hampi area date from the end of P1:1, from the ninth century CE. Based on architectural morphology they are religious structures (non-domestic) and are clustered on and at the base of one the five hills that came to be identified as sacred parts of the Vijayanagara landscape during the Imperial Phase (Das 2006). The material evidence of the pilgrimage (*tirtha*) site of the river goddess Pampa (*Pampakshetra* or Pampa *tirtha*) in the Hemakuta Hill area began with the construction of stone religious structures, nine of which are extant. Extant evidence for religious activity in the Hampi area for Phases 1 and 2 is concentrated at Hemakuta Hill, both on the hill and at the northern base leading to the
Tungabhadra River. This nucleus is the spatial focus of my research. The placement of the earliest structures and the conceptual development of the hill area, before and during the Imperial Phase, indicates that the Hemakuta Hill area was conceptualized as a distinct unit of sacred space. In addition, due to the geological nature of the hill area and its proximity to the river, it created a visually recognizable unit of space. As mentioned, the hill itself is a pre-Cambrian granitic outcrop that has very little to no sediment deposition and also has shallow undulations that provided areas for small pools of water filled by springs. These undulations also presented natural paths of movement and pockets of privacy or visibility that were, as will be demonstrated, strategically used for religious material developments of the site.

From the earliest point of construction, in P1:1, distinct spatial nodes within the Hemakuta Hill area were established, indicating the existence of conceptual groupings and intentional ordering of space from the beginning of stone construction. During this phase, there appeared two foundational nodes that organized the spatial development of the site for the remainder of the use-life of the Hemakuta Hill area. These two nodes form the most northerly and southerly spatial clusterings of the area and are referred to by the Vijayanagara Research Project as the Manmatha Tank group and the Hemakuta Hill group.

Based on inscriptional evidence dating back to 689-690 CE, we know that the earliest raison d’être of this site was as a local river pilgrimage spot associated with death. As discussed in Chapter 1, Section 1.4.1, the earliest inscription mentioning the Hemakuta Hill area as a pilgrimage destination, referred to as the Togurshode copper plate (ID 1, see Figure 1.4 and Appendix C), was found off site, at Togurshode, Kurnool District, in Andhra Pradesh. The inscription on the plate records the donations made by a distant ruler who undertook pilgrimage to “Pampa-tirtha” for death-related purposes after successful military campaigns in the area (Wagoner 1996:145). The inscription of ID 1 suggests that there was very little political investment or interest in the Hemakuta Hill area. The donation made by the ruler, the Early Western Chalukya king Vinayaditya I, was gifted to a scholar from the Kurnool District and the plate, promoting the king’s munificence through his religious donation, was mounted in Kurnool. As such, only minor information about the Hampi setting can be gathered from inscription ID 1; since there are no extant surface remains dating to before the ninth century, the inscription could
refer to any area along the Tungabhadra river, which was also known as Pampa. Regardless, the pilgrimage site would have been of local significance, associated with the river goddess Pampa, and it would have provided “services” associated with death that the leader of an army would find useful. In addition, as Wagoner (1996:145) suggests, worship at the Pampa tirtha would have focused solely on natural features and most likely perishable buildings. This view is corroborated by later inscriptions from P1:2, discussed below.

3.4.1.1 P1:1 Structures in the Manmatha Tank Area

The primary axis of spatial organization and by extension, of movement, in the Hemakuta Hill area was defined by two nodes of construction that took root in P1:1, one in the south on the summit of Hemakuta Hill and the other in the north near the Tungabhadra River. The most northerly spatial node is a cluster of shrines and temples built on a paved terrace that extends from the western side of the Manmatha Tank. There is a clear division of space between the granite outcrop of the hill proper and the foot of the hill where it leads to the river, from the termination of the slope and exposed granite to an area of increased of sediment deposition with low lying vegetation. In later times, the Virupaksha Temple complex came to mark this transition from hill to the terrain type leading to the river. During P1:1, however, the terrain change would have been visually remarkable, between the smooth grey and boulder-strewn stonescape of the hill and the comparatively lush, fertile green grassy terrain where the Manmatha Tank and its associated structures are positioned directly before the river.

Though there is no established date for the construction and development of the Manmatha Tank, the spatial organization of the earliest features of the Hemakuta Hill area suggests that it was present in at least a rudimentary capacity during P1:1. The structures that comprise the Manmatha Tank group of P1:1 are seven shrines clustered on its western side (Figure 3.9), plus the tank itself, the water feature that would have provided the necessary water for ritual needs. From published documentation of the site, it is unclear if the early Manmatha Tank group of structures was built on the paved terrace that is present today or if this terrace was a later addition (Michell and Wagoner 2001). The tank itself was most likely formalized during the Imperial Phase into the stepped structure as it appears today, with shrine facades including relief carvings, and a small gateway pavilion (AIC 149), as well as architectural elaborations and
a paved terrace (Michell and Wagoner 200: xvi; AISC: 139-140). The gateway pavilion does not share any architectural similarities to the other gateways built during Phase 2, such as H.36 (discussed below). The general consensus is that the tank was present in its approximate shape and location but without architectural elaboration during P1:1 and that it began its religious life as a natural pool.

It seems likely that this natural pool and other natural features drew inhabitants to the area as a focus for religious activities that developed by the ninth century to include stone temple constructions. There are several examples of such a process occurring at Banaras. For example, the well-known Durga temple is associated with the Durga kund (small lake or pool). The Durga kund at Banaras began as a small natural lake or pool and was later transformed, due to changing topography, into a manmade tank (Eck 1982: 50). Natural water sources that would have preceded a built tank were influential in siting religious structures, as water for ablution was essential for proper worship and the functioning of temples and shrines (Bharne and Krusche 2012:92-93; Michell 1988:68).

The ordering of space directing devotee movement and worship was sparse in this early phase, due to the limited development of religious architecture in P1:1. The site was comprised of shrines with simple plans limited to a garbha-grha with a porch or an antarala; unlike temples, the interior spaces were not articulated with a mandapa. The antaralas and the porches created a slight division of space between the devotional activities of non-ritual specialists and specialists. Non-specialist devotee rituals that took place on the porches of M.1, M.2, and M.5, together with the open antarala (an open antarala does not have its entrance walled in) of M.3 and M.11a were visible to the Hemakuta Hill area, particularly to devotees travelling along the path of movement. However, ritual activities occurring in the closed antaralas of M.8 and M.4b would not have been visible. There is little discussion in South Asian research regarding devotee worship at shrines, as opposed to inside temple space, but there is a clear preference for shrines to have visually accessibly spaces for devotional activities in P1:1. These structures are shrines M.1 through M.5, and M.8 and M.11, seen in Figure 3.10 along with the boundary of the final form of the Manmatha Tank (the original form of the tank is not known).
As mentioned, this group of structures during P1:1 were all shrines when initially constructed, although some have additions to become temple structures in later periods. M.1 through M.5 and M.8 are fairly uniform in that they were built using the relatively plain Phamsana mode in local granite and were built to face roughly east-south-east (except for M.5, which faces west) and were built of unarticulated masonry (walls or pada). The overall form of the Phamsana shrines of P1:1 are square in plan (ekanga), and the few with surviving superstructures are composed of receding stories with plain, downward curving eaves (kapota). The shrine is proceeded by either a pillared porch or an antechamber (antarala), separated by a doorway. Both spaces are approximately the same size (except for the addition of the long antarala of M.4b) and they anchored devotional activity for non-priests, assuming they were used

Figure 3.10 P1:1 Manmatha Tank Structures. Orientations of structures are approximations, taken from satellite imagery and architectural plans. Data tables and discussions of orientations are based on the recorded orientations from the AISC and are listed in Appendix B.
uniformly and consistently in the same way. M.11 is anomalous to the site in that it was built in the Dravidian Rastrakuta idiom with a dvi-anga plan and is the only structure built of non-local red sandstone; however, it was initially constructed with a simple open antarala, much like M.3. Doorways of either the inner shrine (manadapa) or of the antechamber (antarala), marking the important transition of types of space, are of a plain design for the Phamsana shrines. The doorways from the exterior to the antechamber are either “open” or “closed”. Both the “closed” doorways of the antechamber and the doorways of the garbha-grhas for all of the shrines consists of one to four plain concentric bands. If the door frame from the exterior to the antechamber (antarala) is “open”, such as in M.3 and M.11a, the front of the structure is simply open with corner pillars (AISC 410-141).

Superstructures located above the shrine are the largest and most distinctive element of these religious structures, and identify the form and potentially the function of the shrine or temple. In the Hemakuta Hill area there are two identifiable superstructure types. The Phamsana or “stepped pyramid” type (Wagoner 1986: 86) is primarily described with terms from the Nagara architectural language (for further detailed description of Phamsana structures and superstructures see Meister 1976). The Dravida type is discussed with the southern and Dravidian architectural language (see Section 3.2.1). However, the form of the Phamsana structures in the Hemakuta Hill area are of a local variation that borrows some Dravidian elements. The superstructure, when referring to forms built using the Dravidian language, consists of the moulding levels above the entablature (Figure 3.4) which includes one or more stories (tala), the griva (neck), the dome-shaped element that crowns the superstructure (sikhara) and the finial (stupi). If using the Nagara architectural language, the entire superstructure is the sikhara as it is not just a single crowning element as seen in the Dravidian language. (See Figures 3.4 and 3.5 that detail the elevation elements of southern and northern style superstructures.) Plain in comparison to the Dravidian structure M.11, the Phamsana tower (sikhara) that would have been found on the other shrines of P1:1 is composed of a series of stories that create a pyramidal superstructure and each cornice of the stories typically has a straight edge (Meister 1976: 167). These stories are referred to in the Nagara architectural language as bhumis. Phamsana stories (bhumis) become progressively smaller as they ascend in the superstructure, and the stories (bhumis) function to create a straight line. In contrast, Nagara
superstructures typically have a curved form. For both structure types, the horizontal moulding bands adorn the base (\textit{adhisthana}) below the superstructure, the walls (\textit{pada}), and the entablature (\textit{prastara}) (Wagoner 1986:65).

During Phases 1 and 2, the superstructures of religious architecture provided conspicuous distinctions between Dravidian and Phamsana forms of architecture, particularly in that only one structure within the Manmatha Tank group was built using a Dravidian architectural language. Consequently, the superstructures are a meaningful variable for investigation even though many have not been preserved from the Phamsana group of shrines; such is the case for M.1, M.3, and M.5 (AISC 140-141). In addition, M.8 has only a brick parapet (\textit{hara}) remaining (AISC 144). M.2 has a superstructure that consists of four stories (\textit{bhumis}) that Wagoner notes are “severely plain” (AISC 140). As a Phamsana structure, it was carved more roughly than the rest of the structure (chisel marks are visible) and is capped with a Dravidian-type double-flexed tower (\textit{sikhara}) (AISC 140). The superstructure of M.4 still is intact: there are two storeys (\textit{bhumis}), followed by a Dravidian-type tower (\textit{sikhara}) with a reflex-curve profile that is capped by a lotus (\textit{padma}) moulding, similar to a cyma recta (AISC 141), a projected moulding with a silhouette of a double curve (Moldings 2009).

Porch presence and space varies between the Phamsana shrines; however, most are roughly square in shape and are a continuation of the main axis of the shrine, which primarily orients east-south-east. M.1 and M.2 each have a four-columned porch leading off of the shrine (\textit{garbha-grha}); the M.1 shrine and porch are visible in Figure 3.12. The poorly preserved M.3 and M.8 shrines both have an antechamber (\textit{antarala}) before the shrine (\textit{garbha-grha}) in lieu of a porch. The antechamber of M.3 is open-fronted with no door frame (AISC 140), while M.8 does have a door frame between the exterior and the interior of the antechamber (AISC 144). M.4 also has an antechamber (\textit{antarala}), though based on differences in the fabric of the shrine (\textit{garbha-grha}) and the antechamber, the antechamber appears to be an addition made within P1:1. In Appendix B, M.4 is referenced as M.4a, the form of the original structure and it is unclear if it had an \textit{antarala} or a porch and M.4b, as the structure with the final addition of the long \textit{antarala}. The \textit{antarala} addition is unusual as it is the shape of a long rectangle (AISC 141). M.5 is unique in comparison to the other structures in this spatial group in that it faces west;
however, like M.1 and M.2 it too is fronted by a four-columned porch (AISC 141), the south-west corner of which is visible in Figure 3.12. Finally, a paved terrace was built on this section of the Manmatha Tank area, and appears to underlie at least several of the shrines in this node. Due to soil accumulation it is unclear if the terrace extended to the far south-west corner of the memorial shrine group and under M.3. The southerly half of this terrace may have been built with M.3 on it or perhaps up to it; M.3 was built on a higher (currently disturbed) level than its neighbors, M.2 and M.4. Dating the paved terrace is difficult. If the terrace was present for M.3 to be built onto, then it was constructed in early P1:1. If M.3 was built later than M.2 and M.4 then it can be assumed that the paved terrace was as well. If the terrace was built up to the elevation of the M.3 surface, then it could have been constructed at any later phase, much like the retaining wall (Figure 3.17), as will be discussed.

Figure 3.11. View North-west of M.11 in Google Street View, with the later period pillared mandapa in the foreground. Image captured July 2015.

The M.11 shrine (Figure 3.11) is quite different from the Phamsana shrines M.1 through M.5, and M.8, due to its architectural form, location, material for construction, date of construction, and the deity housed within. M.11 has been identified as the earliest stone religious structure in the Hemakuta Hill area, constructed in the ninth century CE (AISC xvii), and is one of only two examples of Dravida mode architecture built in the Rastrakuta idiom from Phases 1
and 2. This early date, suggestive inscrptional evidence in ID 4 (discussed in Chapter 4), and the current housing of the murti of Durga, all indicate that M.11 was Pampa’s original shrine. It is the only structure in the Hemakuta Hill area made of non-local sandstone. Though this structure is located adjacent to the Manmatha Tank, it is spatially distinct from the Phamsana shrines, which are nucleated approximately three meters to the south in close proximity to each other and developed as a separate node with their own internal spatial logic. In common with most of the Phamsana shrines, M.11 also faces in an east-south-east direction (100 degrees), as seen in Figure 3.10. The initial form of the M.11 structure consisted of a shrine (garbha-grha) with an interior in the dvi-anga (literally translates to “two members”) form with a narrow antechamber (antarala); a mandapa was added later (see Section 3.4.1.2). The dvi-anga form of the shrine, not represented in any of the Phamsana shrines, assumes a square plan that has an outward projection from the center on each side of the square structure (Morphology – South India Abbreviated 2008: 1-2). Above the plinth (adhisthana) of the shrine (garbha-grha), the angas (the corners that project from the plan) are embellished with pilasters. Above the entablature (prastara) sits the second story (tala) of the superstructure. The ground (first) story is replicated in smaller form as the second story (tala), as per Dravidian mode form. The superstructure is then capped with the neck (griva) and with a “square-sectioned” tower (sikhara) and a metal finial (stupi) (AISC 144-145).

The original form of the superstructure above the antechamber (antarala) is hidden beneath repairs in brick and cement (AISC 145). The outer door frame of the antechamber and the door jamb is sculpturally embellished into five bands with motifs that include lotus petals, vegetation, rampant lions, and colonettes. On each door jamb base there are three figures: a rampant lion, a female figure, and a door guardian (dvarapala) (AISC 145) meant to protect the sacred space inside the structure. This lintel is also embellished with the image of a fierce female deity (Durga) flanked by lions, while below her is a goddess with flanking elephants (Gajalakshmi). It is unclear if these door frame sculptural embellishments are from P1:1 or if they were added later in the life of the structure, especially as the door frame is composed of chloritic schist and not the non-local sandstone of the rest of the shrine. If it was a later addition, it was likely still constructed prior to the imperial period as the same chloritic schist was used in
a nearby shrine identified as the Bhuvanshvari shrine (ID 2), which was built (or at least assembled from pieces of other structures) during the tail end of P2:2 (AISC 124).

3.4.1.2 Spatial Associations and Proxemics of P1:1 Shrines in the Manmatha Tank Area

As mentioned above, the shrines M.1 through M.5 and M.8 are clustered tightly together (~18m x 15m), at what is now the south-west corner of the Manmatha Tank. All but one have very similar orientations of east-south-east that orient towards the tank, the rising sun, and the path of movement, ranging from 100 to 114 degrees; the exception is M.5, which faces west (Figure 3.10). None of these shrines are oriented so that they are directly open along the same axis as the shrine nearest them; each is slightly shifted in orientation so that there would be no direct axial line shared by its closest neighbor. The arrangement of M.1, M.2, and M.3 suggests that the process for orienting memorial shrines was variable. Additionally, the placement of shrines does not appear to be based on establishing a direct line of sight with the tank. M.1, M.2., and M.3 are in a rough line from east to west and they are all visible from the path of movement coming from the south towards the north and the river, before it enters into the Manmatha Tank area; that is, from the northern ridge of the hill and along the descent to the tank area. Once the path of movement begins to pass along the west side of the tank, however, neither the M.2 nor M.3 shrines are currently visible using Google Street View (Figure 3.12).

M.1 and M.2 are the two most southerly shrines of the Manmatha Tank group; the entrance of M.1 is oriented 114 degrees and M.2 is oriented 105 degrees. M.4 is located directly north of M.2, and the distance between the two structures is the width of M.3 (Figure 3.13). The eastern end of the open-ended antechamber (antarala) of M.3 reaches the back corners of M.2 and M.4, creating an enclosed space that would have been accessed by walking between M.4 and M.2. M.5 is located approximately 4.5 meters to the north of M.1. The north-eastern-most corner of the addition to M.4, the long antechamber (antarala), was built unusually close to the south-western-most pillar of the M.5 porch. This close and intimate relationship between the Phamsana shrines is captured in Street View Figure 3.12. Figure 3.12 is taken facing west and shows M.1, M.4, and M.5. Unlike the others, M.5 is oriented west and has a line of sight and axis that runs between M.4 and M.8. M.2, M.4, and M.8 are roughly arranged in a north-south line. This
extreme proximity and nucleation of the earliest shrines implies that rituals were closed (not open to public worship), as will be discussed further in the subsequent chapter. Inter-shrine proximity within this group appears to have been the primary factor in the spatial arrangement of these structures. As we shall see, the minor architectural variations and proximity between the Phamsana shrines visually and physically created a node of ritual sameness that the simple architectural language also conveys.

Figure 3.12. Google Street View Image, view towards west, of M.1, M.4, and M.5. Image captured July 2015.

Within the P1:1 spatial group of structures in the Manmatha Tank complex, construction and expansion of Phamsana temples was horizontally restricted; preference was given to building many shrines in close physical proximity to each other, while also not expanding into the space near M.11. In addition, there is no interruption of the spatial relationship between M.11 and the river to the north, or between its line of sight and the tank. Ostensibly, a sort of spatial buffer of approximately 7.3 meters was maintained in P1:1 around the oldest structure at the site, M.11 (AISC xvii). Thus M.1 through M.5 and M.8 (the Phamsana shrines) were nucleated together and apart from M.11 (Figure 3.13). This additional space around M.11 would have allowed for great numbers of devotees to worship and for structural expansion to possibly occur; it also allowed for greater visibility of activities and of the temple itself compared to the tightly clustered, plain Phamsana shrines.
As discussed in Chapter 2, Hall’s (1996) work on proxemics is the foundation of my charting of the communicative possibilities or affordances of space, as a cultural attribute, as is clearly tabulated in Figure 2.1 in Chapter 2. The experience of space is measured in terms of interpersonal communication according to levels of sensory or corporeal awareness, so that the different types of interactions based on distances can be identified (Hall 1966; Fisher 2009:170). As such, M.11 is located within Hall’s range of the Public (Near Phase >3.65-7.6 m) distance to other structures with contemporary dates. As there appears to be a difference between the spacing around M.11 and the much more intimate spacing between the Phamsana shrines, the
distances between structure types may reflect different aspects of the function or nature of the monuments. The spacing, when examined through a proxemics lens, does not necessarily need to refer only to the types of performance and social interaction possible between people, particularly as most ritual in this tradition would not have been congregational in nature. The

Figure 3.13 Proxemics Buffers of Manmatha Tank Complex P1:1.
spacing here may also have described the social interaction and relationships expressed between the monuments themselves. The larger buffer around M.11, if M.7A was not yet erected at this time, also visually reinforces the residing deity of M.11 (Pampa) as both physically and conceptually the mediator of the sacred space of the hill and the river.

In contrast, the Phamsana structures are positioned within the Intimate (0-0.45 m) or Personal Proxemic (>0.45-1.2 m) threshold (Figure 3.13). The proximity and intimacy of the spatial arrangement of these structures to each other alludes to an intimate relationship between the residing deities of the structures. In addition, the proximity of individuals worshipping in the same structure also emphasizes the intimacy between the participants due to the small size of the shrines. The intimacy is in fact a reflection of the Phamsana function as a memorial shrine, used by close (intimate) kin/family members of the commemorated deceased. (The designation of “memorial shrine” is discussed in Section 4.1.1.) As memorial shrines, they manifest not just the Essence of Siva, but also of the ancestor. Blackburn (1985) discusses the similar ritual treatment and transformation of ancestors to deities in folk religion in India, particularly through post-cremation rites among the Saora (1985). Her work illustrates how folk cults developed their ancestral worship into “a system of god worship” (1985: 269). By extension, the shrine served as the embodiment of the divine and the divinized ancestor. Thus, the intimacy of physical proximity between the shrines and therefore between the ancestors commemorated also suggests that these spatial relationships were a reflection of social relationships either between the deceased or between the living patrons.

3.4.1.3 P1:1 Structures in the Southern Hemakuta Hill Area

The spatial arrangement of the Manmatha Tank structural group, consisting of tightly placed structures nucleated to the west of the large Manmatha Tank and with direct access to the river to the north, contrasts with the placement of the only two P1:1 structures that were built on Hemakuta Hill itself. These two structures, H.38 and H.40, are situated at the furthest and most southerly portion of the crest of Hemakuta Hill (Figure 3.15). Not only are H.38 and H.40 the
Figure 3.14 P1:1 Site Layout with path of movement through the site.
southern-most of the early period structures, they also create a distinct south to north alignment for travel through the space of the entire sacred Hemakuta Hill area, heading northwards to the Manmatha Tank group, past the Phamsana and M.11 Dravida shrines along the west side of the Manmatha tank, and then further north to the river. The south to north site alignment and path of movement is marked on the layout plan in Figure 3.14. This visual and physical connection between the two terrace groups (H.38/H.40 and the Manmatha Tank group) and the river indicates that their relationship forms part of the larger ritual purpose of the sacred area.

Structures H.38 and H.40 are located in a slight depression in the topography of the hill summit that restricts the line of site; I refer to this area as the South Terrace. (See Section 2.4 for a discussion of the term ‘terrace’.) There was ample space on the summit of the hill that could have been used to provide excellent visibility of these buildings, the first stone shrines to be built on the hill. The builders of H.38 and H.40 instead chose a location that both concealed their presence from the surrounding landscape and concealed the major surrounding landscape features from these structures within their depression. It can be surmised that the location for H.38 and H.40 was chosen specifically for ritual activities that necessitated a private, contained, or perhaps introspective space. Google Street View images confirm that nearby landscape features are rendered partly invisible by the edge of the depression. The summit of sacred hills can be distinguished, but the river to the north and the terrain surrounding the hill and the depression are not visible; however, the far horizon can be seen to the west to and the north. Conversely, the devotees and their activities at the two shrines would not have been visible to individuals outside of this depression space, the South Terrace.

Like the shrines M.1 through M.5 and M.8 built in the Manmatha Tank group, these companion structures of H.38 and H.40 were also built in the Phamsana mode, with a plain square (ekanga) shrine (garbha-grha) plan (Figure 3.15). These structures were built seemingly as twins and are very similar to the other Phamsana shrines—they have a Phamsana superstructure of two receding levels and are capped with a square-sectioned Dravida-type tower (sikhara) with a double-curve profile. In addition, they are missing their finials (stupi) today. H.38 and H.40 were both originally constructed with an open two-columned porch (AISC 194, 197) and both the door frames between the antechambers (antarala) and the shrines (garbha-
grha) were embellished with three bands; the outermost band was sculpted into a continuous line of lotus petals, while the other bands were left plain. H.38 was subsequently expanded five times during Phases 1 and 2, but H.40 was left in its original form (Figure 3.15). A similar pattern is seen in the Manmatha Tank complex shrines; of the seven structures, only two, M.4 and M.11, were expanded in subsequent periods, though neither was renovated as many times as H.38.

Figure 3.15. Google Street View of H.38 (left) and H.40 (right), view east from west side of structures. Image captured July 2015.

H.38 and H.40 are also oriented west, like M.5 – an unusual choice of orientation for a religious structure when an east-south-east orientation was the norm for the other shrines in the Manmatha Tank complex (M.1 through M.4, M.8, M.11). An easterly orientation marked the most auspicious of directions for Hindu temples, especially on a symbolic level (Michell 1988), and all construction guides emphasize the auspiciousness of having the murti and temple entrance facing east so that it would receive the first morning light (Hardy 1995:16). Alignment with cardinal directions is noted in many texts (sastras and Agamas) and by many specialists (Hardy 1995: 16; Kramrisch 1977: 235; Hudson 1995: 309; Michell 1988:73) to be a primary guiding principle for spatial orientation of South Asian religious structures. Temples and shrines may be built facing any direction, however, and the choice is often dependent on the particular rites staged in the structure in question (Hudson 1995:309). It is not inauspicious for temples to
face west or south, but it is inadvisable for purity purposes for a temple to face north, as noted in the *Vaikhanasagama*, an early Vaishanava architectural treatise compiled during the fifth and seventh centuries CE (Kramrisch 1976:235).

Nevertheless, shrines and temples are typically oriented to the east, and when deviation from an easterly orientation is identified amongst a temple group, ritual and religious reasons for such a decision should be investigated. According to Vedic tradition, there are eight deities that are guardians of the cardinal and intermediate directions (*dikpalas*) (Kramrisch 1977:91; Michell 1988:32). H.38 and H.40 were the southern-most structures within the Hemakuta Hill area, creating an association with the directional guardian of the south, Yama, the god of death (Michell 1988: 44, 176). The south is also the direction associated with ancestors (Kramrisch 1977:92). The temples, oriented to face away from the rising sun and towards the darkness of the west, were most likely associated with death rituals and a death deity. Finally, the Togurshode plate inscription indicates (ID 1) that the Pampa *tirtha* was associated with death in some fashion, providing textual evidence for the spatial organization of these three westward-facing shrines.

The proxemics distance between H.38 and H.40 is not similar to the intimate arrangement between the Phamsana shrines in the Manmatha Tank area; H.38 and H.40 were constructed within the Public (Near Phase) distance of each other that ranges between >3.65 – 7.6m (see the table in Figure 2.1 for the Proxemic chart and Figure 3.16 for the Proxemic Buffer of H.38 and H.40). The greater space between the two similar shrines could be interpreted in terms of the west-facing shrines fulfilling different ritual needs than the Phamsana shrines in the Manmatha Tank area (see Chapter 4). There is, also, an element of privacy afforded to the shrines by the depression in which they were built, implying that privacy was also important. The ritual actions of devotees and the visibility of deities housed in the shrines, as well as the sound of personal prayers would have been muffled as soon as one traveled beyond the distance of the Public buffer (beyond 7.6 meters) and out of the depression to the rest of the *tirtha* to the north.

As discussed previously, the Hemakuta Hill area is a visibly identifiable and differentiated space based on the natural features of the area. In addition, the only major construction nodes during P1:1 define the southern and northern-most edges of this space,
indicating that the conceptualization of the Hemakuta Hill area, as a unit of sacred space for non-mundane experiences, was in place from the outset of P1:1 and was maintained into the Imperial Phase.

Figure 3.16. Proxemics Buffers of Hemakuta Hill P1:1.

3.4.2 Undated Structures

There are four structures in the Hemakuta Hill area that have not been dated nor interpreted as a part of the Vijayanagara’s architectural history due to their state of preservation. I examine them in this section for their possible structural-spatial roles in Phases 1 and 2. Further fieldwork and excavation could potentially provide more data to support the following interpretations. These identified, undated, and fragmented structures are illustrated in Figure 3.26. Two structures, M.7A and M.11A, have only the bottom course of stone blocks remaining, while M.9 and M.10
Figure 3.17 Undated structures of Manmatha Tank area.

are mostly complete except for their superstructure. Though their dates are unverified, they are discussed following the P1:1 section, 3.4.1, as it is my best estimate that they are from Phase 1
and Period 1 based on architectural and spatial patterns. Due to their spatial relationship with nearby structures, however, particularly M.11, the existence of the undated structures throughout all of Phases 1 and 2, needs to be carefully assessed.

3.4.2.1 M.7A

Today, M.7A consists of a single course of stone blocks that appears to outline a square chamber with an extension, possibly a shrine with a porch (AISC 143-144), that would have faced east-south-east, reflecting the structural trend of P1:1 (M.7A should not to be confused with the separate structure of the Naganandeshvara temple that was originally built and renovated in P1:2 with the VRP assignation of M.7a and M.7b). The remains of the M.7A structure are situated between the vimana of M.11 (P1:1 and renovated in P1:2) and the vimana of M.7 (P1:2) (see Figure 3.17), placing it primarily within the Personal proxemic threshold (>0.45 – 1.2 m) of both structures. The form and size of M.7A, if it was in fact a simple shrine with a porch, suggest that it was erected during P1:1, matching the form and orientation of that period as echoed by M.2, M.1, and M.4. M.7A’s placement in the Intimate to Personal proxemics threshold of other shrines (M.11A and M.11a) also replicates one of the P1:1 spatial organization patterns, the pattern seen that values physical proximity of structures over situating them with a buffer of space around them. After P1:1, Manmatha Tank area shrines do not reproduce this P1:1 structural and spatial pattern. There were only two documented shrine constructions during P1:2: the renovation of M.7 from a shrine (M.7a) to a temple (M.7b) and the creation of a very stylistically similar shrine of Gulaganji Madhava (VS), now incorporated into the Virupaksha Temple complex (Figure 3.19). As described in the following section, these two structures were not of the Phamsana variety, but were built using the Karnata Dravida language that boasts a dvi-anga vimana. It is noteworthy, however, that the temple M.7A does have a basement, indicating that it was constructed as an ekanga form, implying that it was originally a Phamsana shrine, unlike the P1:2 M.7(M.7a and M.7b) and VS. Two Phamsanashrines (M.13 and M.14) were constructed in the Manmatha Tank area in Phase 2 Period 1 (P2:1), though their similarities beyond a shared ekanga and Phamsana form end there. M.13 faced north, unusually, and M.14 was added to M.13 to form a double shrine at the end of P2:1 or soon after, possibly in P2:2.

Finally, one Phamsana shrine (NFr/7) was built in P2:2, facing west, but it is located outside of
the Manmatha Tank group of structures to the west, and is on the north side of the Manmatha Tank. Unlike M.7A, NFr/7 does not fit the P1:1 Phamsana model both in its placement in new node of ritual construction as well as its location outside of the Intimate or Personal proxemic range of any other structures. As such, it does not appear that M.7A was constructed during P1:2 or P2:2, rather it was constructed in P1:1 and a further discussion of the relationship between M.7A and M.11 is continued in Section 4.1.1. Dating M.7A to P1:1 further emphasizes that the northern boundary of structures in the complex was definitely marked by M.11. In addition, if M.7A dates to P1:1, it indicates that the neighboring M.11 shrine was not built with more space around it than I had previously thought and presented in the P1:1 discussion, although the subsequent dismantling of M.7A may have been done in order to deliberately create such an effect at only a slightly later time, as discussed below (Section 3.4.2.4). In some ways, such a building and dismantling would more strongly support my focus on the special status of M.11.

3.4.2.2 M.9 and M.10

A similar argument for the dating of two almost identical structures, M.9 and M.10, can be made as for M.7A (AISC 144). Both structures, M.9 and M.10, consist of a garbha-grha with a four-pillared porch, and both orient east-south-east, typical of P1:1 structures (easterly-facing shrines with a porch). Both now lack superstructures, and the only stylistic difference between the remaining portions of the two is that M.10 has a vase-shaped form (kalasha) carved at the base of the right door jamb. Similarly, the second renovation/addition to H.38 (H.38c), placed during P1:2, also has kalasha figures carved in the base of a door jamb. It is unclear if the shared motif is enough to establish a construction date for the two shrines of P1:2, or if they can be placed in P1:1 based on form.

M.9 and M.10 were built on the lower paved terrace upon which the rest of the Manmatha Tank structures were founded. They were built into and over by an undated retaining wall that is bisected by a staircase leading to the imperial-phase structure of a Vidyaranya matha (monastery) (NFv/6) (Figure 3.17 and 3.19). This wall effectively marks the western boundary of the Manmatha group as we know it; it disintegrates towards the north and transitions into a colonnade and terraced earth in the north-western corner of the area, as discussed in Section 3.4.3 (AISC 148). The colonnade is part of a large covered and raised space that links the area
around M.12, M.14 and M.13 but also overlays the space where the missing *vimana* of M.12 would have been, suggesting a later date than other spatial redactions, possibly a P2:2 date. Two sections of platform extend from the west retaining wall reaching eastward. The break between the two platforms leaves an open path into M.9 and M.10., suggesting that the two shrines predate the platforms.

### 3.4.2.3 M.11A

The northern half of the western platform (extending from the western boundary wall) was a later addition to the area since it was constructed so as to avoid blocking the passage into M.10. However, this platform does cover the remains of another undated structure, M.11A. There is only a basement level left of this structure, like M.7A; however, unlike M.7A, it is too fragmentary to interpret its shape. Like the other Manmatha structures, it also appears to be built on the paved terrace that defines the complex; if M.11A pre-dates the construction of the paved terrace, the terrace may have been built up to its edges. Wagoner (AISC 146) suggests that this basement is the remainder of two shrines or pavilions, including remnants of a column on the east end. The west end is mostly covered by the stones of the northern stone platform that extends eastwards from the retaining wall to the north of M.10 (Figure 3.17). Because there is so little left of M.11A, neither the identification of what it was, nor which end of the structure was the entrance is possible to discern. Thus the form of the basement is of little help in estimating a date for the original construction.

The organization of space around the structure is interesting and may provide information for dating. The eastern-most portion of M.11A is situated within a meter of the rear/west side of the back wall of M.11’s *vimana*, indicating that access to the interior of M.11A would have been impossible without a columned entryway (possibly a porch) if it was oriented on an easterly axis, as the other Manmatha Tank area structures were from P1:1 (except M.5, oriented west). If M.11A does or does not represent two shrines, faces east or west, then any *murti* housed inside would have received no light shining from the east into the structure, for an east-facing entrance would have been almost completely blocked through the very close proximity of the M.11 *vimana*. This would be a very inauspicious spatial arrangement for most deities. An orientation other than east would have been most probable if this building was a shrine.
Alternately, if M.11 is not the oldest structure at the site but was built after M.11A, M.11 may have been situated to impose itself and dominate M.11A. The placement of M.11 would have reduced the functionality and auspiciousness of M.11A and could thus be an indicator of religio-political changes at the site. In addition, both structures are in line with each other from east to west and angled on the same axis of orientation. This mirroring of orientation when in a tight east-to-west row happens nowhere else between P1:1 structures. P1:1 shrines that found themselves in an east-to-west row, such as M.1 and M.2, had one of the structures set askew from the other. Consequently, the symmetry between these two shrines (M.1 and M.2) was not physically or visually enforced in a way that a shared orientation would have accentuated, despite architectural similarities. The proximity of M.1 and M.2 was also not so close as to impede the entrance to either structure, contrary to the proximity seen between M.11A and M.11.

In addition, if a P1:1 and pre-M.11 date is considered for M.11A, then its western portion would not have blocked half of the entrance to M.10. Such blocking is also not found between other structures in the Manmatha Tank group, indicating that whatever M.11A was, it was most likely in place before M.10 – which I have given a P1:1 estimated date. There is evidence that both M.10 and M.9 continued to be valued in later periods as they were kept in place even though they were incorporated into the retaining wall that bounds the western side of the Manmatha group. If M.11A does not represent the remains of shrines but rather of pavilions, then it would have been the only example of such in the Hemakuta Hill area during the time from P1:1 to P2:2, making this less likely. Understanding the role of M.11A in the spatial development of the Manmatha area is troublesome, particularly with its unique placement at the rear of and in alignment with the oldest structure of the Hemakuta Hill area, M.11; however, the spatial organization of the structures surrounding it may suggest an earlier date than M.11.

3.4.2.4 Dismantling

At some point, M.7A was dismantled, possibly during P1:1. By P1:2, the visual symmetry and similarity between the neighboring M.7 (P1:2) and M.11 (with P1:2 addition) could be clearly seen. Without M.7A, a physical causeway running from the tank becomes possible between M.7 and M.11, and through the twin shrines M.9 and M.10. Beyond M.9 and M.10, to the west, was a residential area of the brahmans who arrived in the Hemakuta Hill area in P2:1 thanks to the
newly acquired Sanskritic god, Virupaksha. There is a post-Vijayanagara matha (NFv-6) in this P2:1 brahman area, to the west of the Manmatha Tank and Virupaksha Temple complex, to which the staircase in the retaining walls leads. During P2:1, the brahmans accessed the area through Gateway D, but it is unclear how the area of their residence was used prior to P2:1. The causeway between M.11 and M.7, and M.9 and M.10, would have led to this space as well and this may have been an important axis of movement at the site that these flanking structures were also used to maintain or to establish.

There appears to be a deliberate decision made between dismantling structures (M.7A and M.11A) and paving over spaces (the raised platform and colonnade seen in Figure 3.17). The distinction between the still visible basement of M.7A and the partially visible M.11A basements, as opposed to the complete covering up of the M.12 vimana is noteworthy. The very distinct treatments of unwanted structures or structural components can be read as a non-verbal message to devotees, likely of changing influences at the site. A deliberate dismantling of M.7A is highly probable, as opposed to the loss of the structure being due to poor preservation. The remaining structures with the poorest preservation in the Manmatha Tank area are those on uneven ground but are still standing, like M.3 situated on uneven terrain.

The treatment of M.9 and M.10 differed significantly from M.7A and M.11A. When the western retaining wall was built, instead of dismantling or paving over (physically and visually erasing) these small and most likely P1:1 shrines, they were left standing but incorporated into the retaining wall. They were either significant or perhaps not threatening enough to be physically dismantled or erased, but they were inconsequential enough that they could be visually absorbed into the wall, arguably taking away their autonomy, identity and visual accessibility compared to the other shrines. Their visibility was not enhanced as they merge into the retaining wall. The retaining wall and platforms to the north of M.10 and south of M.9 signal that further structures were not able to be built in those areas after the retaining wall and abutting platforms were built. If there were smaller dismantled structures under the platforms, then they were erased from memory. There does not seem to be any logical functional need for the platforms, other than the creation of a new, blank ground surface.
In contrast, M.7A and M.11A were almost completely dismantled. Physical and visual access across their footprint became possible. The basement course of both structures, almost parallel to the paved terrace, were left in place. The basements signaled that they once were present and the choice was made for their deconstruction. I would argue that leaving the basements rather than removing them acts, in effect, as a message of conflict and/or politico-religious changes. These removals most likely took place very early in the life of the Hemakuta Hill area, possibly pre-M.11 in early P1:1.

It is noteworthy, then, that one or more structures from the P1:1 or early P1:2 period were cannibalized to create the Bhuvaneshvari Shrine (VS) (visible in Figure 3.26), dated approximately to the tail end of P2:2 and assembled in part using pieces from other structures. VS is one of two shrines at the site to use grey-green chloritic schist. The other structure is M.11, which used the material sparingly in the *garbha-grha’s* door frame (M.11a). VS was assembled with reused parts of a very early shrine from the Chalukya era. As of yet, the only two identified disassembled and potentially early enough structures nearby are M.7A and M.11A. Traces of further shrines could be buried beneath the north or south platforms of the retaining wall, though without excavation it is not likely that further information into the structural history of the Manmatha Tank group will be uncovered, especially in light of the extensive recording done by the VRP.

In sum, through a close inspection of the undated structures in the Manmatha Tank group, there appears to have been some considerable redaction of built features, likely during the earliest period under investiation. The destructive nature of these redactions is unusual in comparison to the tradition of structure modification, addition, and incorporation visible at the site, such as the various uses of gateway vC in throughout the Early and Imperial Phases (discussed in Section 4.1.4). The implication is that there was political and/or religious changes at the Pampa *tirtha* early in the life of the site. In addition, the colonnade addition that links M.12 and M.14 during P2:1 suggests that there was editing of the site that took place around the time that the site was also undergoing a level of Sanskritization through the major addition of the Virupaksha cult, as will be discussed in Section 3.4.5.
3.4.3 The Material Development of P1:2

Phase 1, Period 2: 1050-1100 CE (P1:2)

The second period of building activity in the Hemakuta Hill area, from 1000 to 1100 CE, is characterized by the addition of two structures to the Hemakuta Hill and three structures to the nucleus of Phamsana shrines adjacent to the Manmatha Tank (Figure 3.18). In addition, there were renovations to three structures from P1:1. As seen in the earlier period, visually distinct architectural languages were deployed in religious structures, with the addition to the repertoire of the Rastrakuta mode of Karnata Dravida, and Vesara. In contrast to P1:1, the majority of structures were temples rather than plain shrines. As previously discussed, the distinction between a shrine and a temple is a matter of modern terminology, useful for classifying structures, and is adopted from the work by Michell and Wagoner in the Architectural Inventory of the Sacred Center (2001:xiv-xvii). The rudimentary form of a *vimana* (shrine) consists of a square or rectangular *garbha-grha* with an attached *antarala* (anterechamber) or a small porch (AISC xiv); these structures are found across the subcontinent and are the most basic form of a devotional space. Architecturally defined temples make their first appearance at the Hemakuta Hill area in P1:2. In P1:1, Phamsana memorial shrines were the favored form for religious structures and filled the religious needs of devotees at the Pampa *tirtha* (all of the memorial shrines were built in the ninth century CE). By P1:2, the needs of the devotees invested in the Hemakuta Hill area appear to be changing, as can be seen through the introduction and the favoring of the larger temple form over the simple shrine; this was done both through the construction of temples and the transformation of extant shrines into temple forms. The rudimentary form of a temple consists of a *garbha-grha* with an *antarala* (the basic form of a *vimana*) attached to an additional square or rectangular space called a *mandapa* (AISC xiv-xv) where worshippers gathered and prayed. Within the development of temple forms across South Asia there are a range of *mandapa* types that performed a variety of functions as extensions to the main shrine; these permitted the temple’s ritual and social needs to also grow in complexity. The simple *garbha-grha* plus *mandapa* temple form that appeared in P1:2 in the Hemakuta Hill area was composed of a simple columned hall or pavilion that was nearly four times larger than the internal dimensions of the *garbha-grha* (Bharne and Krusche 2014: 98). The columns
divided the space into bays, with the larger central bay acting as a distinct unit of space from the *vimana*. The *vimana* within a temple is the same as for a stand-alone shrine: it is composed of the inner sanctum sanctorum (*garbha-grha*) and the antechamber (*antarala*) (though there is not always an antechamber for very simple shrines), all of which is capped by the superstructure.

Figure 3.18 Site plan for P1:2.
This basic and popular form of a temple, composed of a *garbha-grha*, *antarala*, and *mandapa*, was also the traditional and most common form for a temple from the eighth century CE onward across the subcontinent (Bharne and Krusche 2015: 98), mirroring the development of increasingly elaborate rituals and festivals.

In the temples of P1:2, devotional activity performed by the priest was carried out in the *mandapa*. Not all *mandapas* are enclosed spaces; some are open with only the pillars/columns supporting the roof. Access to ritual space varied based on how or if the *mandapa* was enclosed. All of the structures in the Hemakuta area (except for H.38 permutations) had a *mandapa* aligned along the primary axis through the *garbha-grha*. Such alignment provides further transitional space from the exterior along the structural axial plain leading towards the sanctum sanctorum/shrine (Bharne and Krusche 2015: 98), the center of which, directly below the *sikhara* (representing Mount Meru), houses the representation of the deity. Mount Meru is considered to be the center of the physical, spiritual, and metaphysical world according to Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain traditions; it “is the seat of divinity and the World Mountain, symbol of the polar axis, the vertical which leads from the Centre to the Highest Point” (Kramrisch 1977: 182). This central space thus recreates the axis mundi, the central position of the universe where Brahma resides, based on the initial *vastupurusamandala* form used to plan the temple/shrine structure. (For an in-depth discussion of temple plans and use of *mandalas* see Kramrisch and Burnier 1986:19-85.) The exterior of the temple also marks the transition between spaces: the tiered roof of the temple is focused above the *garbha-grha* while over the *mandapa* there is a flat roof supported by beams and columns and is separate from the primary superstructure over the *garbha-grha* (Bharne and Krusche 2015:98; Hardy 1995: 35). Just as there are horizontal mouldings composing the elevation of a *vimana*, so too is the exterior of the *mandapa* articulated if it is enclosed with walls.

In sum, the formalization of the devotional space of a shrine and the extension of that sacred space through the addition of a new temple or expansion of a shrine to create a temple was the primary structural trend of P1:2. As such, this phase initiated the practice of *jirnodhara*: temple renovation and expansion as religious and architectural practice. Garimella (2002) wrote her doctoral dissertation on the practice of *jirnodhara* in the Vijayanagara area.
3.4.3.1 P1:2 Structures in the Manmatha Tank Area

Three new structures were built in the Manmatha Tank complex, continuing the spatial organizational trend present in the P1:1 Phamsana structures, and where inter-structure proximity continued to be of importance. Through stylistic analysis, Wagoner (1996: 145) was able to ascertain a more precise chronology of structural development during this period. The new

Figure 3.19 Manmatha Tank structures from P1:2.
structures added to this area, as seen in Figure 3.18, are M.7, M.12, and the Gulaganji Madhava Shrine (VS), all of which were built as temples rather than shrines. In addition, M.11 received structural additions to create a temple from this major shrine of P1:1.

The first building activity of the P1:2 period began with construction of the M.12 temple during approximately the mid-eleventh century (Wagoner 1996:145), located slightly north-west of M.11. It was built using the Phamsana language, though there is little left of the temple-proper from this phase. What does remain is the interior shell of an enclosed nine-bayed mandapa along with the doorway that would have led to a vimana. Attached to this mandapa shell is a later addition of a colonnade with four by three columns from the late thirteenth century (P2:2) (confirmed in pers. comm. with Wagoner). The entire structure, both the early mandapa and the later colonnade, are set apart from the surrounding shrines by having a raised floor level (AISC 146). What is left of the structure is oriented east-south-east (99° east of north), as is common for structures of the Manmatha Tank area. The central bay of the mandapa is considerably larger than other center bays of mandapas at the site, defined by a stone platform that supports four columns. The enclosing walls are defined by engaged columns with infill slabs, except in the south-west corner that is filled with rubble (AISC 146). The door frame that would have led to

Figure 3.20 Google Street View image, view from south-west of the P2:2 M.12 colonnade in the left foreground followed by M.13 and M.14. Image taken July 2015.
the vimana, or the antarala, is articulated with four concentric bands; the door frame to the colonnade, described as “crudely inserted” (AISC 146), has Saiva guardians at the base of the door jambs, lotus designs on an ornamental band facing the exterior, and Ganesha carved into the lintel blocks.

Stylistically, Wagoner places the mandapa of M.12 to the start of P1:2, around 1050 CE (1996:145; pers. comm.). In the AISC report, M.12 is discussed as being built in one phase, though this is not the case—the colonnade was attached later (the late thirteenth century CE, P2:2), after M.13 was constructed (P2:1). There is no mention in the AISC of whether the mandapa and colonnade were built separately, but it is clear that they were. The colonnade of M.12 was a later addition and expanded out towards the mandapa of M.11, and the colonnade was constructed to wrap around the south and west side of the M.13 shrine, as can be seen in Figure 3.18. It was also raised noticeably higher than the surrounding pavement and nearby structures, as is also visible in Figure 3.20. M.12 and M.11 were constructed on parallel axes and the spatial relationships between M.12 and M.14 are discussed further in P2:1.

The expansion of Pampa’s shrine, M.11, followed the construction of M.12. M.11 was expanded through the addition of a nine-bayed mandapa, thus conforming to the temple category. The mandapa is open and constructed of a local granite, whereas the original vimana is made of non-local sandstone; however, the color of stone would have been almost completely masked by whitewashing. Of the nine bays in the mandapa, separated by columns supporting the roof of the structure, the central bay consists of a slightly raised square platform now housing a contemporary statue of Durga (AISC 146).

Newly built in P1:2, the entrance of M.7, also referred to as the Naganandeshvara Temple, is oriented 106 degrees east of north (east-south-east). It is positioned directly south of the M.11 structure; both were constructed in the Karnata Dravida architectural language with a dvi-anga garbha-grha. M.7 was constructed in granite and in the Rastrakuta mode. An open nine-bayed mandapa is attached to the vimana (garbha-grha and a narrow antarala); however, Wagoner suggests that the mandapa was a later addition, possibly later in the period, based on a “clumsy jointing between the vimana and the mandapa” (AISC 142). Nevertheless, the structure is illustrated only in its final form in maps. Inside the garbha-grha today is a Siva-linga that is
actively worshiped as Naganandeshvara (Wagoner 1996:145). The original superstructure above the entablature (*prastara*) did not survive, but has been replaced with a brick and plaster pyramid superstructure with no articulation and a Dravida *sikhara*. The wall corners (*angas*) of the *garbha-grha* and the expanse of the *antarala* are articulated with pilasters.

The construction of the Gulaganji Madhava temple (VS) followed the initial construction of M.7. As it was absorbed as a part of the Virupaksha Temple complex, the exterior is not visible, but the interior suggests that it is comparable to the *vimana* of M.7, and most likely was of the Rastrakuta mode in the Karnata Dravida architectural language. This structure faces east; there is a *garbha-grha* with *antarala*, followed by a *mandapa* that most likely was originally open but was later closed in with walls with the construction of the Virupaksha Temple. Because the exterior is not visible, it is unclear if the *vimana* was of *ekanga* or *dvi-anga* shape; however, it does still house a *linga* and pedestal (*pitha*). The *mandapa* has four central columns. Separate from the corner columns of the north and south are the enclosing walls of the *mandapa*, suggesting a later date for the enclosure. The door frame of the *garbha-grha* is defined by an ornamental band with a creeper motif (scrolls of winding foliage [Dallapiccola and Verghese 1998:108]), pilasters, and worn door guardians (*dvarapala*) below the ornamentations (AISC 125). Gajalakshmi, the goddess Lakshmi seated on a lotus, flanked by elephants, is carved into the center of the door lintel.

### 3.4.3.2 P1:2 Structures in the Southern Hemakuta Hill Area

Throughout Phases 1 and 2, H.38 underwent five phases of addition construction. Though there are no exact dates for the renovations, Wagoner (AISC) has established that the final phase occurred by the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries, my P2:2. The development of the H.38 structure is indicated by letters that correspond to the renovation; the original form is H.38a, and each subsequent addition is listed alphabetically from H.38b through H.38f. The first renovation, H.38b, shown in blue color in Figure 3.21, was simply the enclosing of the porch with walls, thus turning it into an *antarala*, which added to the privacy of the structure. This was done after the ninth century, during the second half of my P1:1 or later. A new floor was laid down in the *garbha-grha* at this time, while the door frame of the new *antarala* maintained the austerity of the Phamsana mode as it was ornamented with a single raised and uncarved band (AISC 194).
seems likely that a *mandapa* was added to H.38 during P1:2 (H.38c, shown in green in Figure 3.22), much as the Manmatha Tank area shrines M.11 and M.7 were updated. However, the Manmatha Tank area shrines were given open, rectangular *mandapa*, while the *mandapa* of H.38 was enclosed, in the shape of a transverse rectangle, with no supporting free-standing columns. Instead, inside the *mandapa* of H.38 there are eight engaged columns projecting from the walls (AISC 195). The roof of the *mandapa* had a portion of its elevation removed during the final phase of construction when an ambulatory was added; however, part of the parapet course remains. The *mandapa* can be entered from the center of the north, west, and south walls through plain doors framed with a single raised band. The primary entrance of the three is the north entrance, which is flanked by projecting seats that are approximately one meter deep (see Figures 3.22 and 3.23). The other two entrances are distinguished from the north entrance by the lack of seating, but they have vases (*kalasha*) carved into the door jamb bases (AISC 195).

During P1:2 no other construction activity occurred at the top of the Hemakuta Hill. Instead, a new node of structures, H.9 and H.12, was established further north on the slope, towards Manmatha Tank, where today soil accumulation begins at the edge of the granitic outcrop of the hill (Figure 3.18). These two structures were positioned thirteen meters apart; H.9 is north and slightly west of H.12, and both would have been on the west side of the path of movement down the hill from H.38 and H.40 towards Manmatha Tank and the river. This new node of structures and ritual activity was dissimilar from the H.38/H.40 node in that there is excellent visibility to the surrounding landscape, including sacred hills: Matanga Hill to the east, as visible in Figure 3.24, and Anjaneya Hill across the river to the north. In addition, both structures were located adjacent to the natural path of movement down the hill and would have been visible on much of the path, even if they were not the devotee’s destination, unlike the H.38/H.40 node that would have been visible only upon entering and exiting the topographic depression. The Virupaksha Temple complex (not present during this phase and period) now completely blocks any line of sight and path of movement to Manmatha Tank and associated structures from Hemakuta Hill, but during P1:2 the positioning of H.9 and H.12 on the still elevated terrain of the hill would have afforded some inter-terrace visibility between these structures and the Manmatha Tank area. Currently, the identification of exactly which structures would have been inter-visible is imprecise due to the poor topographic data available. The
distance from the structural node H.9/H.12 to the Manmatha Tank area is approximately one hundred meters. H.12 is situated further back on a slight shelf on the hill than H.9. It is far enough back from the edge of the north slope of the hill that it would have been difficult, if not

Figure 3.21 Plan of H.38. Original H.38a and Addition H.38b.
Figure 3.22 Plan of H.38. Addition H.38c.

invisible, from the Manmatha Tank area. H.9 is the most northerly temple/shrine built on the slope of Hemakuta Hill. A cluster of shrines (H.3, H.4, H.6, and H.8) is located directly to the
north of H.9, but these shrines date later than Phase 2 and are located at the base of the terminus of the hill. However, the fact that H.12 was not built closer to the edge of the shelf overlooking the Manmatha Tank area suggests that inter-terrace visibility for H.9 was important. It is also interesting to note that unlike the Phamsana shrines of the Manmatha Tank area, these two structures were built with enough space between them (thirteen meters) to place them in the Public (Far Phase) on the Proxemics table (Figure 2.1.), much like the space between H.38 and H.40 (approximately eight meters).

H.9 temple is a unique architectural specimen in the Vijayanagara landscape in that it is the only example of the Vesara mode of Karnata Dravida architecture that was present in Karnataka from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, though H.9 displays what Wagoner terms

Figure 3.23 Google Street View, view towards south-east of the north entrance of H.38. Benches flanking north entrance from P1:2, H.38c addition, are visible. Image capture July 2015.
“proto-Vesara” elements (AISC 163). The term ‘Vesara’ implies a hybridity of styles (translated as ‘mule’). The Vesara form is similar to Nagara forms in that, typically, they both have square vimana plans with a superstructure that rises up in steps, though the moulding details reflect the Dravida architectural language (Hardy 2016: 125). Like many other structures in the Hemakuta Hill area, H.9 was initially built as a shrine with the later addition of a mandapa. It is unclear exactly when the mandapa was added to the antarala beyond that it was added during the Imperial Phase along with the construction of H.10, located directly to its north. Throughout Phases 1 and 2 H.9 remained a shrine, displaying a unique architectural mode for the landscape, an example contrary to P1:2 pattern of building temples. The shrine was composed of a dvi-anga garbha-grha that had an open-fronted antarala facing east (99 degrees east of north). The front of the antarala has buttresses extending from each side, giving an impression of a wider façade. Pairs of pilasters are located at each buttress, at the recessed portion of the antarala wall, and at each corner of the dvi-anga plan on the exterior. The superstructure, above the parapet (hara), rises one storey, replicating the pilasters and wall sections of the ground storey, capped with a square-sectioned sikhara and a now missing finial (stupi). Over the antarala is a shakanasa – a barrel-vaulted pediment that extends from the superstructure. The door frame of the garbha-grha has four concentric bands, the second of which is sculpturally embellished with colonettes while the entrance of the antarala is framed by the pilasters from the buttresses (AISC 162-164).

Figure 3.24 Google Street View image. H.9, view towards south-east, with Matanga Hill visible on the horizon. Image captured July 2015.
H.12 (Figure 3.25) was also unique in architectural design. The shrine was composed of a rectangular *dvī-ṅga*-planned *garbha-grha* with no porch or *antarala* at the shrine’s entrance. It is also the first in a series of structures to face north. The superstructure is capped by a barrel-vaulted *shala-sikhara* (*shala* is a pavilion) and the entire structure rests on a plain masonry platform that is approximately one hundred and fifty centimeters wider than the front of the shrine and fifty centimeters wider than the structure on the other sides (AISC 167). The original door frame is no longer in place. Visibility was of consideration in the planning of H.12 as identified through the raising of the shrine on an unusually tall platform; note that it faces the north, towards the river and Pampa’s shrine/temple (M.11). Visibility may have been intended for devotees to be seen or to see northwards or it may have been intended for the enshrined deity to have visual access to the north. Devotees and their actions would have been visible from H.9 and along the path down the hill, but visual or audible details would not have been perceptible due to distance and sensory limits.

![Figure 3.25 Google Street View. H.12, view from south-west. Image captured July 2015.](image)

The new structural terrace that H.9 and H.12 established presents an area that emphasized the desire for structural visibility to the surrounding topography. The strikingly different superstructures from the austere Phamsana group at Manmatha Tank and from H.38 and H.40 mark this group as interesting given the message that their unique form would announce in the landscape, a message that appears to have been related to ritual function: memorial and death-
related rituals versus non-memorial structures, as discussed in Section 4.1.1. Structural placement, orientation, and form most likely ensured an unobstructed view of the deity and the structure itself in the surrounding landscape, though not necessarily of the devotees.

3.4.4 Inscriptions Dating to P1:1 and P1:2

The earliest indication of the nature of religious activities in the Hemakuta Hill area hails from an inscription, ID 1, dated back to the early medieval period (broadly defined as extending from the seventh to the thirteenth century CE [Hawkes 2014]), which falls within my P1:1 (Figure 1.4.). This inscription, discussed in P1:1, mentions the Pampa tirtha and a religious donation made after a successful campaign by an Early Chalukya king in 689-690 CE. In terms of political history, such early inscriptions indicate that before the Vijayanagara Imperial Phase, the Bellary District was not an area invested by an imperial center or as an imperial center. Powerful kingships were based elsewhere and only ruled over the study area. Thus, although inscriptions such as ID 6 and ID 7 helps us understand the relationship between these kings and the area, the information provided in these inscriptions is more about the kings rather than the site. ID 1 and three other inscriptions dating to P1:2, i.e. ID 2 from 1014 CE, ID 3 from 1018 CE, and ID 8 from 1076 CE, are the best to provide data to piece together the early life and history of the Pampakshetra (Pampa tirtha). Based on these, we understand that as early as at least the seventh century CE, the site was a modest yet established local pilgrimage destination, even though there are no extant structures from before the ninth century. ID 2 and ID 3 were found off site and record religious donations by non-local rulers. The donors of inscriptions ID 1, ID 2, and ID 3 visited the Pampa tirtha while in proximity to the site; these rulers did not reside near the tirtha. Their investment in the deities and religious life appears to have been limited and based on convenience, particularly for ID 1 and 3 where it is clear that these patrons visited the site on a military campaign. All three inscriptions do mention the goddess Pampa. ID 2 records a religious donation made by Iriva-Nolambadhiraja “to the god Mahakaladeva of Pampa” (Wagoner 1996:145). ID 3 also records a religious donation by the Nolamba chief Udayaditadeva “to the tirtha at the village of Pampa” (Wagoner 1996:145). By P2:1, the primary religious figures that most likely influenced the types of rituals and nature of the site were Pampa and Mahakaladeva. Wagoner (1996) argues compellingly that the presence of these two deities
structured the spatial development of the site into two architectural and conceptual nodes dedicated to either deity, Pampa or Mahakaladeva. Prior to the introduction of Virupaksha in P2:1, M.11, as the oldest structure at the site, is believed to have housed Pampa, as previously argued.

H.38 is noted as distinct from other structures, because it was the subject of a continuous string of additions until the Imperial Phase, and would have received several additions by the time that Mahakaladeva was mentioned in 1014 (ID 2) and again in ID 4 from 1199 CE (ID 4). Since the Mahakaladeva god was integral to the function and nature of the site, even into the “Virupaksha phase” of the site (P2:1), H.38 is a natural contender amongst all of the other structures as the abode of the Mahakaladeva god, the other primary deity of the pilgrimage location.

As discussed above, this bipartite division fits the spatial data for the earliest phase of the site, P1:1, in which the isolated structures of H.38 and H.40 were built in the depression at the apex of the hill, in contrast to the nucleation of shrines on the west side of Manmatha Tank. By the time of ID 2 and ID 3, however, these spatial divisions intensified as exemplified by H.9 and H.12. These two structures (H.9 and H.12) were spatially and stylistically separate from both groups and are considered as their own terrace (see Section 3.4.3.2).

The non-Pampa tirtha location of both the epigraphs and the receptors of the donations for ID 1 and ID 3 suggests that the Pampa-tirtha was not a place in which political elite was heavily invested, but rather that their visits and donations stemmed from circumstantial convenience. ID 1 and ID 3 were not intended for the audience at the Pampa tirtha; rather, ID 1 was found in Togurshode, Kurnool District, Andhra Pradesh, recording a gift to a Vedic scholar there, and ID 3 recorded a gift to recipients in Bagali, in Bellary District, where it was erected. Like ID 1, ID 3 records a donation made by royalty, the Nolamba chief, Udayadityadeva. The donation from Udayadityadeva was meant for a Kalidevasvami (local deity) of Balguli, consisting of land that would supply food offerings, and dedicated during the chief’s visit to the “village of Pampa” while camping at the nearby site of Kampuli (present Kampili). The encampment at Kampuli was located far from Udayadityadeva’s home of Hemavati (Nolamba capital in Andhra Pradesh) though only approximately eighteen kilometers from the Hemakuta Hill area (Wagoner
Wagoner translates the “encampment” mentioned in ID 3 to refer to a military camp, much like Vinayaditya’s camp when he visited Pampa-\textit{tirtha}, thereby indicating that the site was a pilgrimage destination for the needs of military leaders on campaign. This is further corroborated by the nature of the deities present at the site, as discussed below.

The association with death at the Pampa-\textit{tirtha}, as indicated by Vinayaditya I and Udayadityadadeva’s visits to the site for death-related purposes for their fallen soldiers after campaigning, is also corroborated by several other contextual details. Pilgrimages to rivers in South Asia are integral to death rituals, as exemplified by Varanasi/Banaras where pilgrims travel to submerge the ashes of loved ones into the sacred Ganges River (also a river goddess), to use the riverside cremation grounds, or even to die in the city to automatically gain liberation (Eck 1982). The Ganges is the archetypical river of the subcontinent and other rivers are often deemed surrogates or manifestations of this great watercourse. Rivers and river crossings are also identified in textual sources, as critical pilgrimage nodes for mainly death-ritual purposes (Wagoner 1996:149), such as in the authoritative medieval Sanskrit text on pilgrimage and \textit{tirtha}, the \textit{Tristhalisetu} of Narayana Bhatta (Schopen 1994: 287; Wagoner 1996:169). Most significantly, the \textit{tirtha} was a place for the deposition of cremated mortuary remains.

What is clear from the records of the site before the adoption of Virupaksha is that it was identified first and foremost with Pampa, either as the river pilgrimage site or as a goddess: it was “Pampa-\textit{tirtha}” or “\textit{tirtha} at the village of Pampa”. She was understood to be the site, to be the \textit{tirtha} (Schopen 1994: 289), and thereby the source of sacrality for the area. Her close identification with the site, between the seventh to eleventh centuries CE (ID 1, ID 2, and ID 3), is especially evident through the content of inscription ID 2 that introduces the fact that a second deity was also present at Pampa-\textit{tirtha}: Mahakaladeva, translated as the “great lord of death”. Pampa’s pre-eminence is nonetheless evident in this deific relationship and is attested through the identification of Mahakaladeva in a subsidiary relation to the goddess as “Mahakaladeva of Pampa”. As discussed in Chapter 1, Bhairavas often have a guardian role to a goddess or to another god, and as seen in the central and western parts of the Deccan Plateau, they can also act as guardians to water-sources (Jain 1973: 97 and Tarabout 1986: 371 in Masilamani-Meyer 2004: 218). Moreover, they have a fierce aspect (bhairava translates as the “frightful ones” [Eck
1982: 60; Wagoner 1996: 149], and in that role the Siva Purana 3.8.47 states the following: “You are called Bhairava because you are of terrifying features and you are capable of supporting the universe. Since even Kala [time] is afraid of you, you are called Kalabhairava” (Cohen 1997: 28). In this form, the deity is connected to the origin-myth in which he commits Brahmanicide in addition to acquiring suzerainty over Kashi (Varanasi). (For further discussion of the myth and the connection to Varanasi see Eck 1982 and Hiltebeitel 1990.) His connection to the Kalamukha sect which was active at the Pampa tirtha is discussed further in Section 4.1.1.

Through this association and access to important features of the site, Pampa as represented in M.11 demonstrates her importance within the tirtha. M.11 influenced the spatial arrangement of shrines and temples in the Manmatha Tank area, in addition to maintaining visual and physical access to the Manmatha Tank water feature and to the path of movement connecting the south and north ends of the site. The path of movement, therefore, connects death, Bhairava/Mahakaladeva, and the south, to death, Pampa, the river, and the north. The path of movement connects the two deities who anchor and define the Hemakuta pilgrimage in space and in ritual function.

3.4.5 The Material Development of P2:1

*Phase 2, Period 1: 1100-1250 CE (P2:1)*

The second architectural phase of the Hemakuta Hill area dates from the early twelfth to the mid-fourteenth centuries, and was characterized by the development of structures associated with a newly imported deity, Virupaksha. The first period of the second phase (P2:1) witnessed the transformation of the site into a larger pilgrimage center focused primarily on Virupaksha, an avatar of Siva and part of the Sanskrit Hindu pantheon. The emplacement of Virupaksha into this pilgrimage area marks a deliberate Sanskritization of the sacred space, a change made possible through the ritual and mythological marriage of the god to the goddess Pampa, who personified the sacred power of the site. The marriage to Pampa is a process recorded in the *Pampamahatmyam* (sthala purana), written in Kannada and as a type of text that promotes the site’s mythic origin and traditions. The date that the *Pampamahatmyam* was originally written is uncertain, but it primarily recounts the marriage of Pampa to Virupaksha. The marriage became part of the seasonal festivals of the Virupaksha Temple complex during the Imperial Phase (Das
2006; Kotecha 1982; Verghese 1995 and 1994:420; Wagoner 1991 and 1996), if not earlier. To this day, annual festivals are held to celebrate the betrothal of Pampa and Virupaksha (Phalapuja), and their marriage festival (Kalyanotsava) (Kotecha 1982; Verghese 2004:420). Establishing a Sankritic deity at the pilgrimage site assured a ritual space for future religious expansion beyond local deities, and also established the growing importance and non-local reach of the center. The Sanskritization of a goddess or “territorial spirit” (Stein 2010: 119) through a sacred marriage or a myth tied to Siva was a common process used during the early medieval period by ambitious regional political players, such as warriors or local chieftains, in an attempt to benefit from such local progenitors of power. As such, this process not only elevated the site of a local goddess but also the status of a local ruler through his association and investment in such sites (Stein 2010: 119).

The identification of Pampa with Siva’s wife, Parvati, for the purposes of Sanskritizing the Pampa-tirtha, consequently reduced her status in this new relationship. The reduction of status can potentially be identified in the new structural activity at the site focused almost exclusively on Virupaksha structures, while M.11, which has been identified as Pampa’s temple (identified by Wagoner 1996), did not receive any additional additions or renovations after P1:2. M.11 also ceased to be the mediator between the structures at the site and the river. The majority of the building activity in the landscape was for the creation of new structures for Virupaksha, one on Hemakuta Hill and others that formed a new structural and activity node to the south of the Manmatha Tank group.

Inscriptions indicate that by the turn of the twelfth to the thirteenth century, the patronage of structures and religious activities at the site became of political interest to both local chieftains and non-local elite (see Chapter 3). Religious donations and patronage of temples and shrines, or of resources for their daily needs, began to be conspicuously documented hereafter through epigraphs on or near religious structures (ID 4, ID 5, ID 10). This is a long-standing South Asian tradition that provided those seeking status with public statements of wealth and piety, thus also playing a part in the transformation of a small local and death pilgrimage site to an increasingly politicized religious landscape.
3.4.5.1 P2:1 Structures in the Manmatha Tank Area

Structural development of the Manmatha Tank area continued to decrease with fewer small shrines and temples being built than in previous phases, and construction focused on structures associated with a large temple complex dedicated to Virupaksha (Figure 3.26). The larger temple form that gained favor in P1:2 (vimana with an open and nine-pillared mandapa) continued to be preferred and a new trend of conglomerating structures appeared. Conglomeration indicates that proximity and shared space were valued over visibility and visible independence of a structure. This contrasts with the trend of P1:1, characterized by a proliferation of independent though tightly spaced shrines, spaced contiguously and very near to touching. The Phamsana form was revived from P1:1 and like P1:2, P2:1 explored new ways of organizing structures within ritual space through the conglomerating of two new Phamsana shrines built in the Manmatha Tank area, M.13 and M.14 with the mandapa of M.11 and the addition of a colonnade to M.12 (Figures 3.26 and 3.27). The conglomeration of shrines occurred over the course of P2:1 though dating of individual structures is somewhat unclear, it is clear that stylistically the shrines were built in independent episodes. This group conglomerated itself with M.11, though only to the northern edge of the P1:2 addition of the M.11 mandapa, which will be further discussed below.

The Phamsana shrine M.13 was built at the beginning of P2:1. This is the second structure at the site to be built oriented to the north. Like other Phamsana shrines, it is ekanga in form with an attached antarala, the walls are plain and built of unarticulated masonry (AISC 147). However, there is more of a vertical axis to the vimana than the P1:1 Phamsana shrines with a superstructure rising four storeys (bhumis). Comparatively, the P2:2 excluding the royal memorial temples built using Phamsana, H.18 and H.21, has eight bhumis. The M.13 superstructure is capped with a griva (neck) and sikhara that is, unusually, dvi-anga in plan. The door frame of the garbha-grha and the antarala are similarly austere in ornamentation, outlined with three concentric and unsculpted bands. There are no lintel or jamb figures on the arbhargriha, but the antarala doorway is framed by pilasters and each door jamb has a kalasha vase carved in relief. The kalasha vase relief carved onto a door jamb is also found on the north
entrance to H.38, in the H.38c addition dated to P1:2, as well as the M.10 shrine dated to P1:1 or P1:2, so this is clearly a long lasting symbol.

Figure 3.26 Manmatha Tank and Virupaksha Temple development of P2:1.
The nature of the conglomeration of the Manmatha Tank shrines makes dating the individual units difficult, as mentioned in P1:2. Visible in Figure 3.20, view north-west, is the P2:1 expansion of a colonnade to M.12 and its conglomeration with the south end of the vimana of M.13. Wagoner notes in the AISC that the colonnade of M.12 is “crudely constructed”, possibly reflecting the poorer quality of construction used for M.14 (AISC 146). However, the mandapa is constructed with greater skill and likely the non-Virupaksha-associated workshops active during P1:2.

At the turn of the period, either at the end of P2:1 or the beginning of P2:2, M.14 was built. This structure consists of an ekanga garbha-grha that opens directly to a nine-bayed and enclosed mandapa, oriented east-south-east (107 degrees east of north). The mandapa was built irregular in shape to connect it to M.13’s antarala, thus creating a double-shrined structure (Figure 3.26). Unlike to the surrounding Manmatha Tank area temple mandapas, the central bay of M.14 is larger than the other bays of the mandapa and it extends to the south, attaching itself to M.13. The enclosing walls have engaged columns that are filled in with slabs, except for the eastern wall. The eastern wall, facing the Manmatha Tank, is built of column-and-slab hidden by an exterior course of horizontal blocks, into which is set a door frame that lacks any sculptural embellishments (Figure 3.27), but is a “rougher and simplified version” of the door to the garbha-grha (AISC 148). Despite being rough, the doorway of the garbha-grha does have some sculptural details. There are kalasha vase motifs on the door jambs, though the band around the

Figure 3.27. Google Street View, view facing west of M.13 and M.14. Image captured July 2015.
frame (kalasha) is plain. The lintel is also embellished with Gajalakshmi, similar to the lintel found in M.11.

The earth is terraced to the north and west of M.14, obscuring most of its exterior. The higher mouldings of its vimana, such as the entablature (prastara), is similar to M.13; however, the rest of the elevation is missing. To the structure’s south is the raised colonnade, on level with M.12, that links the conglomeration and transitions into the paved terrace covering M.11A to the south (Figures 3.26 and 3.19). Part of the colonnade transitions into a clerestory supported by columns extending above the antarala of M.13. A portion of the roof of the colonnade is higher than the surrounding structures, allowing for light to penetrate the area. The entire conglomerated space is bounded by irregular rubble walls to the north and west.

The sequence of construction is uncertain for the group of structures that are a part of this conglomeration at the north end of the Manmatha Tank group: M.12 (missing vimana, mandapa, and colonnade), M.13 (Phamsana shrine), and M.14 (forms a double shrine with M.13, likely Phamsana). The colonnade of M.12, as discussed in P1:2, was built after the construction of M.13, because it was built up and wrapped around the south end of M.13. In Wagoner's (1996) article that discusses the sequence of construction of these pre-Vijayanagara structures, he dates M.12 prior to M.13 based on style, though he only mentions an early date for M.12's mandapa and does not mention the colonnade. In the Architectural Inventory of the Sacred Center, however, he mentions that M.12 (the whole structure) must have been built after M.13 (AISC 147). The colonnade of M.12 also intercepts with the northern edge of M.11 (Figure 3.19). M.11 would be of an earlier date than the colonnade, and than the entirety of M.12. The conglomeration, through intentional physical contact with M.11, can thereby be thought of as a conceptual and structural extension of M.11, Pampa’s shrine, towards the river.

M.11 is no longer the mediator of space to the river by P2:1, just as Pampa no longer stood between the structures of the hill and those at the tank to the river as of P1:1. Rather, structures were being built, starting in P1:2 but especially in P2:1 and P2:2, along the path of movement on the north side of M.11, though still along the path of movement out to the river: M.12 in P1:2, and M.13 and M.14 in P2:1. It should be noted that from the northwest corner of the tank, the extent of the M.12, M.13, and M.14 conglomeration, the river is not visible.
Currently there is a line of trees between the tank area and the river, which most likely was even more considerable in the pre-Imperial Phases due to limited structural development that occurred only from P2:2 onwards. The tree line may have also concealed the Anjenaya Hill across the river from the tank area. The lack of visual alignment with any of the other major features of the meso-landscape for the new non-Virupaksha structures M.13 and M.14 suggests that visual and physical accessibility was concerned and organized in relation to the path of movement and to M.11.

3.4.5.2 P2:1 Structures in the Southern Hemakuta Hill Area

H.30, also known as Mula-Virupaksha (translated to “the original lord Virupaksha”), was added to the granitic face of Hemakuta Hill, outside of the depression on which H.38 and H.40 are situated (Figure 3.28). H.30 is still an active temple today (Figure 3.29). This is another Phamsana structure, but unusually, it was built as a temple and not as a shrine that received a later addition of amandapa. H.30 consists of an ekanga garbha-grha, a narrower antarala, and a mostly-open nine-bayed mandapa, built on the western side of a natural water feature. The water feature, visible in Figure 3.29, is a spring-fed cistern. The structure is oriented east-north-east (83 degrees east of north) and sits on an uneven granite surface which is sloping gently downwards to the north so that the south entrance to the mandapa is even with the granite, while the north exit has a flight of stairs leading down a four-course platform foundation, as does the east exit, though the east stairs lead into the adjacent pond (Figure 3.29). The walls of the vimana are plain with a very faint articulation visible defining the garbha-grha from the antarala space. The superstructure consists of three storeys (bhumis) and the crowning sikhara and finial are missing (AISC 187). Unlike other structures of Phases 1 and 2, the roof of the mandapa has two drain spouts extending from the parapet on the east side that would channel rain into a pond as visible in Figure 3.29. The mandapa is not fully open; unusually, the row of bays closest to the entrance of the vimana are enclosed while the other bays are open. In addition, the north and south walls of the mandapa have miniature shrine niches built into them, while the central bay is enhanced by the four surrounding pillars resting on a raised square slab (see Figure 3.30). The door frame into the antarala from the mandapa consists of five concentric bands with kalasha vase shapes on the door jambs and a Gajalakshmi (goddess Lakshmi with elephants) carved onto the central
lintel. The *garbha-grha* is comparatively more austere in that it is carved only with three concentric bands and *kalasha* vase shapes on the door jambs (AISC 188). The *antarala* holds a small Nandi icon that sits on a pedestal, situated somewhat off of center. The center of the *garbha-grha* holds a *linga* on a pedestal that pours out to the north.

![Diagram](image-url)

*Figure 3.28. Structural developments on the southern end of the Hemakuta Hill from P1:1 to P2:2.*
The placement of this structure, bordering the water feature that it faces, prevents the devotee from entering on the axis to which the structure is aligned. Rather, the devotee enters and exits through the south-north axis of the *mandapa*, mirroring the movement through the larger pilgrimage space, from the hill to the river. Figure 3.31 illustrates the south and main entrance of H.30 (whitewashed) and Figure 3.32 shows the view eastwards toward the water feature from the *mandapa*. This unique *mandapa* plan creates, or frames, directed lines of sight and affords a particular type of experience once in the sacred space of the temple. The only other structures at the top of the hill are H.38 (H.38d) and H.40, and as mentioned, they are not visible outside of their depression. Their squat Phamsana superstructures and location in a depression engender an introspective experience. As such, other built and natural features that comprise the *tirtha* space (other structures on the hill, the Manmatha Tank area, and the river) are not visible from within this space and features within the space are not visible from outside. In a similar fashion, the *mandapa* space and siting of H.30 encourages an intimate interaction space for ritual activity between the devotee and the deity, unseen from the surrounding landscape in the alcove-type space the *mandapa* form provides. The view from the entrance to the *vimana* along the primary east-west axis is dominated by the water feature and the granite of the hill (Figure 3.32). Through the exit or open part of the *mandapa* leading northwards, the view aligns with the later P2:2 structure, H.21. Manmatha Tank is located further north (slightly west of north at 253 degrees east of north). Therefore, the devotee could see the other Virupaksha-dedicated structures that were initially unobstructed by H.21.

The only other construction on the Hemakuta Hill in P2:1 was an expansion of an existing building rather than a new building, in parallel to the conglomeration building seen at the Manmatha Tank area. H.38 continued to receive structural additions in P2:1 (H.38d, see Figure 3.34), some of which are also visible in Figure 3.33, a view of the south wall of the temple. The initial construction and end-date for the renovations have been established, but independent stages of construction in between have not been identified (AISC 194-197). In my research, the renovation stages have been attributed to temporal phases based on the structural trends of that phase. By P2:1, we passed the construction stages that added the *mandapa* to the *vimana*.
Figure 3.29. Google Street View image of H.30 and water feature, view facing west. Image captured July 2015.
Figure 3.30. Google Street View image of H. 30, view to west from east entrance of mandapa towards the interior of the temple. Image captured July 2015.
Figure 3.31. Google Street View image of H.30, view north or north-west. Image captured July 2015.
Figure 3.32. Google Street View image. View east from the mandapa of H.30, overlooking the water feature. Image captured July 2015.
Figure 3.33. Google Street View image. View towards the west of H.38 south wall. Image captured July 2015.
and were proceeding into stage “d” and “e”, noted on the maps as H.38d/e. In the “d” stage there were two self-contained bays added to the mandapa: one to the south of the mandapa and the other south of the antarala. The bays are delineated by corner columns which work to hold up the flat roof beams of each bay unit (AISC 195). There is no wall separating the bays, and the exterior walls consist of horizontal infill slabs running between the columns, visible in Figure 3.33 as part of the south side of the current structure. The placement and form of these new bays affected the access to the structure by blocking the southern entrance to the mandapa completely. Based on the addition of the mandapa in P1:2 (H.38c), the northern entrance appears to have already served as the primary entrance, a conclusion supported by the sculptural embellishment and the addition of framing benches along the enclosing walls of the doorway. In P2:1, though, there was also a raised sill placed in the southern mandapa doorway, with a cyma recta moulding with lotus petal (padma) ornamentation on the northern, inner edge. Such ornamentation traditionally faces out from the entrance of a structure, thus indicating that this feature, not present on any other mandapa doorways, was put in place when the bays were added to mark the entrance into their newly created space (AISC 195).

The following structural addition to H.38 is H.38e (Figure 3.34), a natural progression from H.38d in that another bay chamber was added to the east side of the H.38d extension. Due to their similarity, they most likely were constructed close in time. This single bay chamber was oriented east and is rectangular in plan with the same type of horizontal infill slabs composing and continuing the southern wall as H.38d. Wagoner speculates that there may have been a wall on the north end of the bay that was later removed to be reused in the final renovation stage (AISC 196). There is a door frame on the east side of the bay, suggesting that an enclosing wall on the north side was erected in this stage, though the frame was only roughly constructed with a single surrounding and plain band. It is unclear if this addition of a shrine-like bay to H.38 is an echo of the construction of the double shrine linking M.14 and M.13 during this phase, and perhaps a fore-shadowing of the triple-shrines built in the following period (H.18 and H.21).
Figure 3.34 Plan of H.38. Additions H.38d and H.38e.
3.4.5.3 P2:1 Virupaksha Structures: Foundations for the Imperial Temple Complex

Until P2:1, there was no structural or epigraphical indication that Virupaksha was part of the Hemakuta Hill area. Pampa enjoyed a position of preeminence among the local deities represented in the shrines and temples. Through the inscriptive evidence that ID 2 provides, we know that a fierce form of Siva, Mahakaladeva, was also present. Together, they were able to provide a tirtha with the same corporeal and soteriological death-related services of Varanasi to the north, albeit less powerful, as is indicated in the content of epigraphs ID 1, ID 2, ID 3, and ID 8. My description here of the early structural development of the Virupaksha structures is made possible by Philip Wagoner’s excellent architectural research; his findings are clearly explicated and described in his 1996 article. To the south of the slightly earlier Gulaganji shrine (VS), four Virupaksha structural units developed in the area that came to define the west end of the complex as it was later developed during the Imperial Phase (Figure 3.35). The four structures are as follows: vA) an ambulatory, vB) a mandapa, and vC and vD) gateways. These structures are not listed in this way in the AISC, but the capital letter identifier has been assigned by Wagoner (1996), and I have added the small “v” to denote that the structure later belongs to the Virupaksha group of structures in the imperial temple complex. These structures were organized around the vimana proper of Virupaksha. Unfortunately, the VRP and subsequent researchers have not been permitted access to this structure, as it is only accessible to priests (Kotecha 1982: 38). We do know that it is a rather small garbha-grha containing a single linga (AISC 112).

vA is a roofed colonnaded ambulatory that wraps around the garbha-grha on its south, west, and north sides (Wagoner 1996: 153; AISC 121-122). This original structure has been identified through the style of columns and a sloping overhanging eave (chhadya eave) placed over the perimeter. The form of the ambulatory is two bays wide on the south side, one bay deep on the west side, and four bays deep on the north side with the northern-most two rows resting on a 1-meter high platform. At the midpoint of the garbha-grha on the north side, marked by the current drainspout (pranala), there is a set of stairs that provides access to the northern platform. Across from the stairs is a doorway flanked by the vA columns, the four directly framing the passage from the stairs to the current doorway that leads to additional structures of a later
imperial date. These doors are more ornate than the other vA columns. Presently, the doorway leads to a shrine dedicated to Pampa and to the sleeping chamber of the temple idols.
(sayyagriha). During P2:1 when vA was constructed, this platform would likely also have led to a ritual structure (Wagoner 1996:155); however, no such structure from P2:1 is currently present. This missing structure attached to the Virupaksha ambulatory may be an indication of further renovation at the site (see below).

vB has also been identified to P2:1 through column style and the sloping overhanging eave (chhadya eave). This small mandapa is situated in part of the irregular south-west end of the current temple enclosure, where the south-west end meets the slope of the Hemakuta Hill, and directly south of the Virupaksha vimana. Only a small portion of this structure remains in place, consisting only of several bays that would have run along its northern perimeter (Wagoner 1996:155).

vC and vD are two ceremonial gateways that are difficult to identify in the current and imperial form of the Virupaksha Temple complex. Like the other P2:1 structures, they have been overwhelmed by other buildings added over the life of the Virupaksha Temple complex. Both gateways no longer have their superstructures nor do they function any longer as the gateways to the temple complex. Nevertheless, they were not removed but incorporated into the imperial structure and renovations, although their utility/purpose was voided by infilling the passage.

vC was constructed on a definite north-northeast angle (18 degrees east of north), and was located south-east of the Virupaksha structures. It intercepted the devotee on the path of movement down the hill and filtered the ritualized body into a newly formed space dedicated to a newly added and Sanskritic deity, Virupaksha. The gateway was a free-standing structure, and there is no current evidence for any sort of wall or enclosure attached to it. From what is currently discernable, the core of the gateway consisted of two bays by four bays between which runs a stairway that would have led the devotee through its space, and towards the Virupaksha structures, down the stairs (AISC 121). The two bays on either side of the stairs are on raised platforms. A three-bay porch is situated on the south end and at the base of the stairs. The porch was added later, most likely towards the end of P2:1 (AISC 121). The continued functionality of the gateway structure to direct the devotee from the Hemakuta Hill area into the Virupaksha area during the Imperial Phase is attested by its incorporation into the temple enclosure wall (prakara). Further into the Imperial Phase, the gateway was decommissioned by filling in the
south side with stone slabs (AISC 121) (discussed further in Section 4.1.4). Interestingly, the physical framework of the gateway was kept, though it’s utility in linking important spaces was decommissioned.

The north-west gateway, vD is located to the west of the northern section of the vA ambulatory and directs the devotee from east to west. The core of the gateway consists of three bays, the centre of which is a full passageway that progresses into stairs outside the east side. The flanking bays of the passageway bay, on either side, are small and only half-bayed platforms (AISC 122). Unlike vC, vD was not a free-standing structure. Wagoner (Wagoner 1996:155) has identified that there would have been an attached colonnade one bay deep, running south to north from the gateway. Much like the staircase between M.9 and M.10, vD also directs devotees to an area west of the Manmatha Tank group / Virupaksha-vimana centered structures, which is currently the Vidaranyasvami Matha (NFv/2). However, with the importation of a Sanskritic deity, we know that there also came brahmans, and they would have been occupying this matha space in P2:1 (see ID 4).

3.4.6 The Material Development of P2:2

*Phase 2, Period 2: 1250-1325 CE (P2:2)*

Structures built during this period, from 1250-1325 CE, are diverse in architectural language, sizes, craftsmanship, and configuration, more so than in the previous periods (Figure 3.36). Overall, they are situated to dominate space through physical and visual presence throughout the length of the Hemakuta sacred space. The configuration of the Phase 2 Period 2 structures suggests that they were designed to mediate devotee physical and ritual experience in an attempt to appropriate sacred authority and primacy, and as such they were most likely connected to political ambitions. Using new planning techniques to impose particular sight-lines for devotees and to create introspective space for movement and worship, intense personal experiences were personally crafted through architecture – a trend that began with H.30. In addition, P2:2 structures also continued to incorporate larger landscape elements into their overall planning, as H.30 also commenced.
The aforementioned physical and visual alignments are a foundational component of the cognitive maps devotees create when moving in and observing sacred spaces such as the

Figure 3.36 P2:2 Site plan and paths of movement.

The aforementioned physical and visual alignments are a foundational component of the cognitive maps devotees create when moving in and observing sacred spaces such as the
Hemakuta Hill area. Landscape alignments were very much a concern of the early patrons as the placement and organization of shrines and temples within the landscape created order and values from the larger world around, as will be discussed in Section 4.3.1 of Chapter 4. In P2:2, however, we see two new ways that structures began to be placed to make use of experience and the landscape. Movement through the pilgrimage area from the south end of Hemakuta Hill was no longer a direct trajectory from the private Bhairava temple, H.38, and partner temple, H.40, north towards the Manmatha Tank (Figure 3.36). With the addition of a massive gateway (H.36), movement onto the hill and into the sacred was structurally marked and mediated. The devotee’s experience was immediately monopolized by having to pass through H.36 at the turn of the boulders that crowned the entrance to the apex and the start of the procession on Hemakuta Hill. The Phase 2 architecture associated with Virupaksha, including H.36 and H.30, are more sophisticated in organization and scope than previous architecture, utilizing exceptionally precise orientations, placement, and creative use of architectural forms to choreograph particular devotee corporeal experiences. Contiguously, however, there is the sharply contrasting H.38 and the conglomeration of M.12, M.13, and M.14—stark and continuous renovations that were poorly planned and constructed. The contrast suggests that two very different groups were worshipping and shaping the site in distinct material ways according to disparate political, social, and ritual desires and needs. Also, the path of movement became increasingly utilized as a tool for imposing or revealing particular experiences by those who constructed shrines, as discussed throughout Chapter 4. H.9 and H.12 (P1:2) were placed very near to the path of movement, creating a new node of structures in a very visible location that imposed on the devotee passing by to acknowledge their physical presence and their novel architectural language.

H.36 currently stands as a two-storyed gateway at the highest and most visible point on the Hemakuta Hill. Originally, it had three storeys and there is nothing to suggest that there was ever an enclosure wall built with it. This was a gateway that guided the devotee’s body through space on a very specific path and provided further means for physical transition into an area understood to be a contained sacred space. The gateway was built in connection to H.30 as it was aligned directly towards the temple’s mandapa/south entrance at 352 degrees east of north. Built on the granitic sheetrock outcropping, the overall plan is square with raised rectangular platforms on either side of a central and equally proportioned rectangular passageway. There are eight
columns on the flanking platforms: two rows of four columns running lengthwise along the passageway. These columns support the floor of the second storey. The second storey is a replication of the first storey. There is a doorway into the passageway, from the south side, that is fitted between the two columns that also frame this doorway. The exit through the north side of the gateway is along a monumental stairway that continues outwards, towards H.30. Altogether, there are twelve steps that lead down through two terraces to the ground level (AISC 192). Wagoner posits that there were enclosing walls along the perimeter, based on the location and traces of plastering as well as the style of some columns, all of which suggest that ornamental detail was focused on the portions of the gateway visible from inside the structure (2001). In addition, there are perforated holes along some eaves of the second storey which suggest fabric partitions were used (AISC 193).

In light of the structure acting as an “entrance pavilion” with closed-in passageway, having fabric partitions on the second storey, and a third storey that is no longer present in which a moveable Virupaksha icon would have been placed (Wagoner 2001: 178), then this structure was even more visible and dramatic than the current form indicates. In addition, the enhanced performance of the individual entering and exiting the structure would have been greatly downplayed. Moreover, with perimeter walls (discussed further in Section 4.4) the experience of moving through this space with only H.30 visible would have been very intense and personal. The narrow space for movement through the gateway attests that the devotee transitioned in a small group or individually, since at most two people could move side by side.

With this new structure, movement onto the hill and into the sacred Hemakuta Hill area was directed and focused through the gateway. The body and the gaze is channeled towards the new Mula Virupaksha temple, away from the depression with the Bhairava and H.40 temple, which is mostly blocked from view by the design of the gateway and may have been completely blocked if in-fill walls were in place. The height of the gateway, with and without the missing third storey, and its location on the highest point of the hill imposes the structure on the pilgrimage path from most vantage points, both on and off of the hill. In addition, entering this sacred space through a gateway qualitatively and intentionally changes movement into an introspective and personal process, through which the sacred space that is anchored by the Mula
Virupaksha temple is revealed to the devotee. In addition, as the devotee enters into sacred space, he or she was also participating in a performance. The devotee is seen and can be seen entering the pilgrimage space. In a sense, the devotee was also entering into darsan with the sacred space of the Pampa tirtha. In terms of the gateway itself, it was built to be seen. The transition into a “special” space is flavored with the grandeur and centrality of the new god to the site, Virupaksha. The direction of focus away from H.38 and H.40 in Phase 2 of the site also maintains and reaffirms the sense of privacy for the rituals occurring within the depression by organizing space to direct the body and gaze northwards.

3.4.6.1 P2:2 Structures in the Mamatha Tank Area

The first and only structure built on the north side of the Manmatha Tank is NFr/7 (Figure 3.37). It is a small Phamsana shrine, with an antarala giving access to the ekanga garbha-grha. The structure faces west, and along with the P1:1 shrines M.5, H.38 and H.40, these are the only Phamsana shrines to face west. The plain walls are reminiscent of H.18 and H.21, except for a decorative band that wraps around the structure midway up the wall, which is carved with a creeper relief. The superstructure consists of three receding bhumis (storeys), capped with a squat and flat tower (sikhara). The door frame of the garbha-grha has an ornamental band on the frame (shaka) that is recessed, as well as guardians on the door jambs with Siva emblems and an unadorned lintel. The antarala door frame has pot motifs on the door jamb, followed by a recessed ornamental bank (shaka), and a Gajalakshami carved onto the lintel (AISC 35). (The description of the door frame for the antarala in the AISC simply describes the pot motifs as “beneath” (AISC 35). Most pot or vase motifs are located on door jambs and I have interpreted this case as sharing the same placement.) The most notable feature of this structure is its location, alone, on the north side of the tank and not in proximity to any other structure. NFr/7 is the first and only lone Phamsana shrine of which we know.
3.4.6.2 P2:2 Structures in the Southern Hemakuta Hill Area

In P2:2, H.38 continued to be developed, culminating in a final addition (H.38f) of an ambulatory that wrapped around H.38e on the south, then completely around the east, north and west sides of the structure (see Figure 3.38). Along the east side of the *vimana*, a row of six columns was put in place and slabs were used to roughly fill in the walls and ceiling. Along the north side, two rows of columns running along the length of the *vimana* were erected, creating a covered two bay-deep space that was closed in by infill slabs. The remaining length along the *mandapa* on the north side is one bay deep and three columns long as an extension of the outer row of columns that run along the *vimana*. The bays that are open were strategically chosen so that the *mandapa* space containing benches was not closed in by walls.

The west side is a continuation of the outer row of columns, creating a one bay-deep porch that flares out slightly towards the north end of the row (AISC 196). Only part of this
length is closed in; the space between the last three columns has infill slabs between them to close off that space. A new primary entrance to the structure was established on the south side in the first bay from the west end flanked by columns. A winding access path into the structure was created through the addition of an ambulatory. Access was through the south end, and the devotee had to walk the length of the west side to access the primary entrance to the mandapa on the north side. Moving in a clockwise fashion along the ambulatory provided access to the addition on the south-east side of the structure. Passing directly through the mandapa from the north side to the south side was the only route for access to the addition on the south-west side. No sculptural relief additions were added in the final phase of construction, nor were the stones finely dressed. Stone slabs fit well-enough together and small openings were left in places to permit light to enter along enclosed sides. The east and south parts of the ambulatory had almost no light coming in, however, which most likely suited the ritual needs of the patrons. Compared to the exceptionally fine stone work of contemporaneous and even earlier Phamsana structures, the labourers who designed and constructed the additions were nowhere near as skilled as the artisans who built many of the other edifices at the site. Indeed, the additions were reminiscent of the P1:1 Phamsana shrines. As such, there were clearly different groups of individuals operating in the ritual landscape of Hemakuta Hill. Those associated with H.38 appear to have stronger connection with the earliest shrines at the site, save for M.11. The effort of building small Phamsana shrines during P1:1 may have been transferred or limited to the use of space that H.38 offered. Both the early Phamsana shrines and H.38 with its continued structural activity may represent a local group who were not engaged in the new Sanskritic theology. These stylistic disparities may point to the increased politicization of the site. Consequently, the isolated structure of H.38 could represent a point of contestation as a continuation of pre-Sanskritic and local ritual values and community. I will return to this point in Chapter 4.

Two completely novel and almost identical triple-shrine temples were also constructed on Hemakuta Hill in P2:2. H.18 and H.21 were built close to H.9 and H.10, extending this structural node on the slope of the hill southwards. H.18 is located approximately forty meters south-east of H.21. Most likely, H.18 was the first of two structures to be built, and then H.21 came soon after as a somewhat pale imitation of the first (Wagoner pers. comm.): H.21 is slightly smaller
with sculptural relief that is shallower and in a simplified form compared to H.18. Their general structural plans are the same: three *vimanas* branch off of a central nine-bayed, enclosed

**Figure 3.38 Plan of H.38. Addition H.38f.**
mandapa. The north and open end of the mandapa extends into a partially closed and pillared porch. The superstructures over the vimanas also have the shukanasas on all three sides over the antaralas. And, the front end of the temples sit on a jagati platform.

The patron of H.18 is known thanks to an epigraph on a mandapa column, though the exact date for construction is not identified. It reads that the patron, Kampila-raya, installed three lingas to memorialize his mother, father, and possibly his grandfather (ID 5). Kampila-raya was a local and minor ruler who did not live at the site but visited from his territory, Kummata or Hosamaledurga, from 1300-1327 (Patil 1991: 113). (This inscription and others are discussed further in Chapter 3 and in the last section of this chapter.)

These two temples were meant to dominate space, not through elaborate ritual practices of the devotees, but through their presence and thus their own performance in space. Built on platforms looking out over Hemakuta Hill, to the river, the structures were oriented to the north, but slightly east of north. H.18 looks directly across the midpoint of the Manmatha Tank and out to the river at an angle of 9 degrees from the west side of the path down the hill. H.21 is several degrees more easterly, at 14 degrees, and positioned slightly south and on the east side of the

Figure 3.39. Google Street View. View south of H.21 from the top of its platform. Image captured July 2015.
path. An orientation of 14 degrees provides this temple with an axis that does not look over the
tank but to the east of it, towards a cluster of boulders at the shoreline. The divergence in
orientation of both temples from a cardinal orientation (north) does not seem to intentionally
align with any landscape feature that is detectable, though, and the other structures oriented north
are not off-set from north as much as H.21, or even H.18. The nearby H.12 is oriented to 6
degrees east of north and M.13 is set to 4 degrees east of north. The reason for these orientations
is unclear, but may be based on an alignment connected to the sunrise or sun zenith of a day of
importance. In any case, both structures were built on either side of the natural path leading
down the hill to the north end of the site. By being built on platforms that are face out to the
landscape below, and not towards the path of movement, visual access to the interior is
completely restricted as one moves past the structures, unlike nearby shrine H.9 that is open to
the path.

Figure 3.40. Google Street View. View south of H.18 from the top of its platform. Image
captured July 2015.
The form of H.18 and H.21 is completely novel to the Hemakuta Hill area, although an interesting permutation on the memorial shrine form already established at the site. Figure 3.39 and 3.40 are views of the triple-shrine temples from the top of their respective platforms. Several elements of the temples, such as the level of architectural elaboration including decorative figures and motifs, have no precedence at the site. As discussed further below, this indicates that the structures were part of an architectural tradition that developed elsewhere, almost to perfection. The triple-shrine temples of H.18 and H.21 each consist of three Phamsana (superstructure) ekanga vimana units, with narrower antaralas, and each vimana is arranged around a central mandapa. Shrines branch off of the south, east, and west sides of the enclosed nine-bayed mandapa in both temples, while an open-pillared porch is located on the north and open end. The back or south ends of the temples rest directly on the granitic surface of the hill. The north ends rest on a large crucifix-shaped platform that is echoed by the shape of the front half of the structure (the temples were built on their own platforms). These were a jagati platforms that extended significantly beyond the temples to provide space for ritual activities (AISC 173). Both temples also rest on and project out from the granitic slope of the hill on a platform (jagati) that consists of two levels of courses (Figure 3.41 and 3.42). Both levels consist

![Image](Google Street View. View towards the south of the H.18 platform and temple. Image captured July 2015.)
of five courses for H.18, while for H.21, the first level consists of 4 courses and the second consists of 5.

The walls of the vimanas for both temples are plain with a horizontal band wrapping the whole structure midway up the wall. The band on H.21 is plain (Figure 3.39). However, the band of H.18 (Figure 3.40) on the east and west shrine, as well as on the adjoining sections of the mandapa on the south-west and south-east, has a continuous frieze of eight-petalled rosettes interspersed with colonnettes (AISC 173). The band on the south shrine of H.18, and expanding into part of the mandapa, has carved vegetal rinceau motifs that emerge from the mouth of a monster mask at the mid-point of a wall in the garbha-grha (Figure 3.43). The design also includes vegetal buds, small dwarves (gana), and a Lajja Gauri. (Lajja Gauri is a folk goddess associated with fertility and abundance, as emphasized through the display of her pubic region. In addition, her head is often depicted as a lotus blossom.) In the porch there is a seat-slab with a seat-back that projects out from the plinth course, and above the plinth course the wall is open. For both H.18 and H.21, each superstructure of the vimanas, while using the familiar Phamsana form, rises up in eight receding storeys, far more than in previous Phamsana structures (H.18

Figure 3.42. Google Street View. View towards the south of platform and temple H.21. Image captured July 2015.

The walls of the vimanas for both temples are plain with a horizontal band wrapping the whole structure midway up the wall. The band on H.21 is plain (Figure 3.39). However, the band of H.18 (Figure 3.40) on the east and west shrine, as well as on the adjoining sections of the mandapa on the south-west and south-east, has a continuous frieze of eight-petalled rosettes interspersed with colonnettes (AISC 173). The band on the south shrine of H.18, and expanding into part of the mandapa, has carved vegetal rinceau motifs that emerge from the mouth of a monster mask at the mid-point of a wall in the garbha-grha (Figure 3.43). The design also includes vegetal buds, small dwarves (gana), and a Lajja Gauri. (Lajja Gauri is a folk goddess associated with fertility and abundance, as emphasized through the display of her pubic region. In addition, her head is often depicted as a lotus blossom.) In the porch there is a seat-slab with a seat-back that projects out from the plinth course, and above the plinth course the wall is open. For both H.18 and H.21, each superstructure of the vimanas, while using the familiar Phamsana form, rises up in eight receding storeys, far more than in previous Phamsana structures (H.18
seen in Figure 3.40 and H.21 in Figure 3.39). Additionally, in the center of each bhumi are blocks that project and have sculptural reliefs of a range of deities, except for the lowest block that has an unusual pendant-tassel motif, framed by a kirttimukha, or monster mask (AISC 174). Each subsequent block is slightly smaller than the one below it in the superstructure. These blocks are present on all four sides except for the west shrine that only has the blocks on three sides. Above the bhumis, the sikhara is dvi-anga in plan with a double-flexed curved profile. A central band wraps around the sikhara, much as a central band wrapped around the walls of the vimana. The finial (stupi) is a two-tiered lotus (padma) pedestal. The roof of the antarala extends from the face of the vimana superstructure (shukanasa) and is designed here to replicate a compressed superstructure of a vimana, complete with a sikhara in the shape of a ridge-vault (shala). The face of the shala is carved with raised bands and a kirttimukha (monster) mask with the unknown tassel motif (AISC 174).

Figure 3.43. Google Street View. Detail of H.18 band, view towards the north-east. Band on the left shows the eight-petalled rosettes interspersed with colonnettes. The band on the right shows the complex south band of the temple. Image captured July 2015.
The doorframes of the *garbha-grha* in H.18 have five concentric bands. The first band is moulded with lotus petals, the second is plain and recessed, the third projects with lotus-petalled edges, and the fourth and fifth are plain. The door jambs and lintel blocks are plain, though there is a faint etching of a *kalasha* (guardian) onto the door jambs. The door frames of the *antarala* have four bands that are plain except for the third from the outside, which is carved as a pilaster that supports an overhanging eave (*chhadya*) attached to the lintel. The lintel has three shrine superstructures carved into the stone. On either side of the *antarala* doorways, the walls have projecting shrine models reaching up to the full height of the wall. Within each of the models are a recess that acted as a niche for additional images of the temple deity (AISC 175). In comparison, H.21’s *garbha-grha* door frames have four bands, instead of five, and all door frames lack carvings.

In both H.18 and H.21, the nine-bayed *mandapa* is not made up of equal-sized bays. Four central columns divide up the interior space unevenly so that the central bay is the largest. However, for H.18 the central bay is articulated by a raised square platform with a raised circular platform in the center. The circular platform is known as a *ranga-shila*, and provides a raised

---

Figure 3.44. Google Street View. Detail of H.18 superstructure. View towards the west of the southern shrine. Image captured July 2015.
area for the performance of dances in honour of the housed deity. H.21 lacks a *ranga-shila*.

Marking the transition from *mandapa* to the porch in both temples, are two more columns, which are in turn followed by the single bay of the porch that is defined by two columns. The half wall that acts as a bench for the interior of the porch is on the east and west sides of the porch, and the two columns rise up out of the bend. The bench-wall wraps around, flanking the entrance of the structure.

Overall, both H.18 and H.21 are well preserved. However, the eastern shrine of H.18 is missing its finial and is only partially present on the western *vimana*, and the entire *sikhara* of the southern shrine of H.18 is half gone.

---

**Figure 3.45.** Google Street View. *View north of the south and east shrines of H.21. View of the superstructures and plain wall band.* Image captured July 2015.

The extended *jagati* platforms in front of both the shrines (H.18 and H.21) present a structure that is equipped and built to accommodate more elaborate ritual needs than earlier structures. This is especially clear for H.18’s platform which is adorned with the *ranga-shila*. This elaborate ritual space is grounded on an austere architectural language. Clearly, the severe architectural language should not be conflated with it being a conservative choice to use in terms
of rituals and that it can be executed with a great level of detail and ornamentation, as seen in H.18. The choice to use the Phamsana language clearly served to communicate an ideological message unrelated to a patron’s wish to demonstrate access to resources and skilled labour. The planning of the structures indicates that the view of the river from inside the structures and the view of the structures themselves were valued in planning the organization of the shrines. Privacy of rituals, visibility of the structures and accordingly the patron(s) in the landscape are definitely achieved characteristics of H.18 and H.21.

3.4.6.3 Inscriptions Dating to P2:2

The spatial development of the site in P2:2 indicates that the new popularized Sanskritic character of the site was further promoted by the individuals investing in the handful of new Virupaksha structures that appear throughout Phase 2. It also appears that there were different groups of Virupaksha patrons, given the two distinct and impressive Virupaksha structural nodes that developed, first H.30 and then H.36 at the top of the Hemakuta Hill, and the later cluster of structures south of the Manmatha Tank. These structures were consistently situated to intercept ritual movement through the pilgrimage landscape.

Donative inscriptions have allowed for the identification of aspiring patrons of the site, such as Maiduna Chaudayya, a local Sinda chief who left an unprecedented and detailed donative inscription (ID 4) of the gifts he bequeathed to Pampa (discussed as if she was a form of Gauri), her consort Virupaksha (discussed as if he was a form of Siva), and Bhairava, who can be identified as the Mahakaladeva from earlier inscriptions (Wagoner 1996: 161), as well as a fourth deity, Immadi Rachamallesvara-devaru, who was a commemorative Siva-linga that Maiduna Chaudayya founded for his overlord. Chaudayya also lists major donations he made in the past to the three primary deities of the site (Pampa, Virupaksha, and Bhairava). ID 4 is the first inscription that records the presence of Virupaksha at the site, directly mentioning that he was a new god there, and presenting the newly Sanskritized identity of Pampa. In this inscription, Chaudayya mentions the temples associated with Pampa, Virupaksha, and Bhairava, and gifts each with a plot of land that could provide funding for the daily food offerings (naivedya). His list of past donations included a wealth of ritual objects and additional structures that allow us to identify Chaudayya’s personal influence in the development of the site. In
particular, he provided a grant so that the newly arrived Brahmin community (who must have come to the site with Virupaksha) could be fed in their feeding house (sattra-sale). In addition, the inscription mentions that the grant was made with seven hundred heads of households as witnesses. Wagoner (1996: 173) has identified the sattra-sale structure as vB (Figure 3.35), the small pillared mandapa and he suggests that the volume of local witnesses for the grant indicates that there was significant community living in the area. (Wagoner [1996: 173] notes that the epigraph mentions that the grant was made in the presence of seven-hundred heads of households; this does not refer to the actual number of households represented; rather, the use of the number “seven-hundred” references a village assembly.)

Chaudayya’s patronage also included construction of structures, including an ambulatory and pathways connecting Virupaksha’s temple to Pampa’s shrine and the residence of head of the brahman, as well as to Bhairava’s temple. This path connecting the major polarized conceptual and structural nodes of the site passes through vC, the gateway that leads the devotee on the path from Hemakuta Hill area into the nucleus of Virupaksha structures and on through to the Manmatha Tank area (Figure 3.36). Gateway vD, on the far west side of the Virupaksha structures, provided access to the residence of the head brahman. Wagoner (1996: 162) suspects there once was another gateway in place leading to Pampa’s shrine but became subsumed by the later addition of a massive gopuram in the north wall of the Virupaksha Temple complex. If the identification of vD as being the gateway to the brahman-occupied area is correct, then this area may have also been the site of a matha, in the area that the post-Vijayanagara matha occupied consequently indicating continuity in spatial organization at the Virupaksha Temple.

Additionally, the ambulatory donated by Chaudayya would most likely be vA, which wraps around the west side of the Virupaksha space (Figure 3.35). The gifts provided for the lesser known deity, Immadi Rachamallesvara-devaru, were far less grand in scope. This commemorative linga, beyond being physically established, only received a small associated land donation, part of a plot of a garden (Wagoner 1996: 162). The political significance of establishing this linga will be discussed further in Chapter 4, but comparatively, the deity embodied in the linga was far less significant than the other three main site deities.
In sum, there was definitely more than one individual who played a role in the Sanskritization of Pampa-tirtha by importing Virupaksha, as can be seen in H.30, H.36, and the vA, vB, vC, and vD structures. However, Chauddya possibly played the most significant role in altering the religious and physical landscape of the Hemakuta Hill area at this time, however, particularly considering that his vA, vB, vC, and vD structures were ultimately incorporated into the imperial Virupaksha Temple complex. Overall, his inscription, ID 4, demonstrates how one individual with political motivation and access to resources significantly altered a religious landscape.

Figure 3.46 Site plan overview of structural developments from Phase 1 through Phase 2.
4 Spatial-Material and Corporeal Analysis of the Hemakuta Hill Area: 600-1400 CE

4.1 Descriptive Structural-Spatial Trends (Pattern Analysis): Expansive/Static, Orientation, Architectural Language, and Location

This chapter presents an analysis of the structural and spatial data of the Hemakuta Hill area (600-1400 CE), identifying how devotional experience was structured through corporeal management and the connection to the ritual, social and political life of the Pampa tirtha from P1:1 through P2:2. Although this chapter is organized primarily according to period and phase, with the exception of the renovations of H.38, structures are not discussed separately, rather they are explored according to the terrace space in which they are situated. I will also extend this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase and Period</th>
<th>Abbreviated</th>
<th>Calendrical Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1, Period 1</td>
<td>P1:1</td>
<td>600-900 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1, Period 2</td>
<td>P1:2</td>
<td>1050-1100 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Period 1</td>
<td>P2:1</td>
<td>1100-1250 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2, Period 2</td>
<td>P2:2</td>
<td>1250-1325 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Imperial Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>1325-1400 CE (the empire was established in 1336 CE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Phase</td>
<td>From the Later Sangama Dynasty to the Tuluva Dynasty</td>
<td>1400-1565 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1 Table of chronology.
analysis into the Early Imperial Phase to explore the continued development of ritual and corporeal management trends established in Phase 1 and Phase 2. Lastly, the ideas of communitas and thirdspace as well as mythological spatial organizations will be discussed in terms of the Hemakuta Hill area material world.

Figure 4.2 Site plan of the Manmatha Tank area, structural development from Phase 1 through Phase 2.
In order to isolate patterns of similarities and points of divergence, I have examined spatial and material attributes of the temples and shrines in the Hemakuta Hill area. The categories used in this chapter are comparable to the structural and ritual activity types identified by Wagoner in his research on Telangana temples (1986). Wagoner employs the categories of orientation, housed deity, and architectural mode to establish a typology of temples that are subsequently interpreted in cultic terms. Similarly, in this research, general physical and architectural features are isolated based on my architectural database (see Appendix B) including structural details detectible from photographs, plans, and published descriptions (see Figure 4.2 for an overview of the Phases 1 and 2 development of the site). Appendix B also contains an abbreviated version of the attribute database distilled from the original version, comprising the attributes found to best describe and reveal points of commonality and divergence that lent themselves to comparison. From this database, I have identified four attributes as foundational elements in the form and context of the Hemakuta Hill area structures: architectural language; the longevity of the structure’s religious life through additions and expansions; the terrace (or structural group that it inhabits); and the orientation of the structure as identified by the placement of the primary doorway or the main entry of the mandapa. These attributes are analyzed as spatial and temporal indices, both individually and in combinations. In the end, the descriptive spatial analysis permits an interpretation of ritual activities and social affordances. The four spatial-structural attributes are also employed to investigate other related features of the Hemakuta Hill area structures and their use of space.

The relationship of a religious structure to space can provide evidence for the development of architecture or space in terms of engaging the corporeal and social experiences of the devotee or housed deity, as well as the characteristics of this engagement. These relationships are identifiable through immersive tools such as Google Street View and remote sensing imagery, supported with time-sensitive data generated in GIS. However, the immersive data does not have easily quantifiable qualities that lend themselves well to tabulation in a database. For this reason, an examination of structural-spatial relationships that engage corporeal experiences is integrated with categories of temple and cultic types.
As indicated above, the four spatial-structural attributes that capture the diversity and configuration of the Hemakuta Hill area temples and shrines reflect the descriptive categories employed by Wagoner in his 1986 doctoral thesis in which he created temple typologies of the medieval period Telangana (Andhra Pradesh) religious structures. Both the Telangana temples and the Hemakuta Hill area structures belong to a shared “southern” architectural zone. As such, both research areas can be considered as part of the South Indian architectural tradition or schools of vastu-sastra during the period under consideration. Therefore, the use of architectural languages and ritual traditions manifest in similar ways in these two areas, though exact architectural forms and permutations vary depending on local architects, needs, resources, and influences. Architects in both areas employed the same two architectural languages: the austere form of Phamsana and ornate modes were selected from the broader Dravidian architectural language. Telangana structures have Phamsana, Vesara, and Bhumija architectural modes while Hemakuta structures include Phamsana, Vesara, and Rastrakuta. The most visibly recognisable attribute distinguishing these architectural languages derives from the ornate form and planning of Vesara, Bhumija, and Rastrakuta. As mentioned, this style contrasts with the austere form that characterizes Phamsana. Categorization of the Hemakuta Hill area structures into austere Phamsana form or ornate Dravidian form (including Rastrakuta and Vesara modes) constitutes the first of our four fundamental spatial-structural attributes. Expansions and addition to structures is considered to denote dynamic (or static) places of worship, forming the second category of the spatial-structural attributes. The third category includes a structure’s location within the Hemakuta Hill area in relation to the terrace space. The last spatial-structural attribute considered is the orientation of a structure. Orientation is taken into account, particularly as many of the structures examined depart from the auspicious and favored easterly orientation, thus signalling a ritual compensation in some form.

While Wagoner (1986) uses key formal attributes to establish a typology, this dissertation utilizes the aforementioned four attributes to investigate the elementary structural and spatial patterns in the Hemakuta Hill area through Phase 1 and Phase 2 and into the Early Imperial Phase. By focusing on these physical and spatial features, this work analyzes the “building blocks” that underlay the religious rationale of the larger site. These fundamental characteristics functioned to reveal the ritual nature of any given religious structure to the devotees. The ritual
context or cultic information relayed by the spatial-structural features, in combination or independently, indicates that the sign-value of these structures limited their forms to particular contexts, as it was also seen in Telangana according to Wagoner’s research (1986: 135).

The assumption that architectural form and topographic placement could act as a sign to devotees can indeed be verified. Variations in structural form (based on architectural language) in the Hemakuta Hill area are not accounted for by temporal changes, as varying ornate and austere forms were used concurrently and throughout the phases under examination. However, variations in the use of space (access and placement within the Hemakuta Hill area) subtly changed through time. These variations are connected with structural forms (discussed below: architectural language, orientation, and the designation of being a static or dynamic structure). Both the use of space and structural forms evoked nuanced corporeal experiences and established a range of religious spaces that accommodated and/or were built for new religious traditions and active groups at the site, such as brahmans and fledgling imperial rulers. Such differences in structural-spatial features would not have been a choice made solely by an architect based on pattern assessment, particularly as some patterns developed over the course of several hundred years, or the length of a structural phase, e.g. throughout P1:1. In addition, variations were not simply a product of different architects or the adoption of specific styles. This indeed does not mean that we cannot distinguish variations in skill levels of architects working contemporaneously at the site. However, skill is not restricted to type or possible significance of the structure. To illustrate, one can look at the unprecedented architectural skill employed in the triple-Phamsana shrines of H.18 (Figure 3.40) and H.21 (Figure 3.39) compared to the contemporary additions to the Bhairava/Mahakaladeva H.38 temple, H.38e and H.38f (Figure 3.23). These three structures were built with the Phamsana form and illustrate two differing ways through which we can identify value and investment in a structure. H.18 and H.21 were constructed in their final form; that is, they were not designed or intended to expand architecturally or in terms of ritual use. Their static nature is confirmed through their placement next to the path of movement and next to each other, limiting expansion east and west. In addition, the topography of the slope of the hill limits expansion north and south. There are also no examples of tripartite shrines receiving additions in the Hemakuta Hill area or in Telangana. Similar to other initially small shrines (such as M.7a), H.38 consisted originally of a vimana and
antarala, situated with room to expand in all four directions, and thus allowed for architectural additions. As such, throughout the entirety of Phases 1 and 2, H.38 was able to continuously expand to address the needs of the religious community. However, as can be seen in Figure 4.9, additions H.38d, H.38e and H.38f were unprecedented at the site in terms of their design (the closest counterpart being the conglomeration of M.12-M.13-M.14 shrines in the Manmatha Tank area). H.38 did not expand along an east-west or north-south horizon after H.38c, unlike H.30 and H.36 or as seen at the Virupaksha temple that initially expanded along a north-south axis then to an east-west axis during the Early Imperial Phase. H.38 also did not facilitate movement in and out of the structure along a cardinal direction axis (see Figure 4.9 that maps out paths of movement in and within H.38 through structural additions). Furthermore, additions display a lack of interest in proportions, right angles, and aesthetics, clearly demonstrated in a comparison of the slab walls of H.38d and H.38f and the angles of the partial ambulatory of H.38f, versus the highly skilled and artfully embellished walls and proportions of the tripartite shrines of H.21 (H.38 in Figure 3.23 versus H.18 in Figure 3.40). H.38 and H.18 and H.21 do not display the same level of technical skills and concern for aesthetics. As such, non-local architects might have been commissioned by the wealthier and non-local patrons of H.18 and H.21, which was most likely not the case for H.38. H.38 exhibits a skill level comparable to the small memorial shrines and the conglomeration of shrines M.12-M.14 in the Manmatha Tank area, which were also serving the local community. Form, architectural language, and orientation, did not signal the skill level of an architect. Likewise, architectural skill and aesthetics did not determine the value of structures. Structural features were selected for other reasons, mainly the sign-value and underlying meaning of structures, as Wagoner identifies in Telangana (1986). However, unlike Wagoner’s Telangana temple collection that display a clear correlation of architectural languages to enshrined deities and orientation of structures (particularly for the triple shrines [1986: 137-138]), structures in the Hemakuta Hill area mainly lack their original enshrined deities, and there is greater variation in structure orientation per architectural language compared to the Telangana temples. Nevertheless, the spatial ordering of the site in P1:1 appears to have been determined by cultic meaning and needs, a trend that would further develop in subsequent phases.

In order to identify structural-spatial patterns, I have assigned non-hierarchical identifiers to each variable of the aforementioned four features. The flow charts of Figures 4.3 through 4.6
map the available variables for each feature under consideration. The charts are also divided by structural phase, and next to the charts are tables that list the sequence of identifiers per structure. The undated structures have not been included in these tables. Based on these sequences, basic structural and spatial patterns can easily be visualized for this chapter.
P1:1
600 – 900 CE
Seventh to tenth century

Figure 4.3 Structural-Spatial Flow Chart for P1:1.
P1:2
1000 – 1100 CE
Eleventh to twelfth century

Figure 4.4 Structural-Spatial Flow Chart for P1:2.
P2:1
1100 – 1250 CE
Twelfth to mid-thirteenth century

Figure 4.5 Structural-Spatial Flow Chart for P2:1.
P2:2
1250 – 1325 CE
Mid-thirteenth to early fourteenth century

Figure 4.6 Structural-Spatial Flow Chart for P2:2.
4.1.1 Structural-Spatial and Corporeal Patterns of P1:1

Period 1, Phase 1 presents clear patterns in the use of space and structural forms in that all but one structure was built using Phamsana architectural language out of nine (potentially 13 structures if the undated structures of M.7A, M.11A, M.9, and M.10 are included). Moreover, in P1:1, there was a clear distinction in spatial polarization of structure siting between the South Terrace and the Manmatha Tank area. However, between the South Terrace and the Manmatha Tank area, there is a conceptual correlation through the shared Phamsana architectural language. The common architectural language connects the entire site as a conceptual unit, while other markers, such as orientation and siting in space, signal differences in particular ritual activities.

Expansion of religious structures beyond their construction phase, implying that several generations of devotees were active and invested in the structure, suggests a functional difference in ritual life and social function. Making such a binary distinction is reasonable, considering other categorical differences inherent in the shrines such as the stark juxtaposition of architectural forms at the site (ornate versus austere) from P1 through P2. This can also be supported by epigraphic evidence that some shrines were built as part of a memorial cult, and typically after a generation turned into a place of public worship with longer-term investment. In this dissertation, shrines and temples that were expanded for more than one phase are referred as “dynamic”. However, structures constructed and expanded only in one phase are considered to be “semi-dynamic” (as the expansion may be the patronage of a single generation), although, they are categorized in the structural-spatial flow charts as “dynamic” with the qualitative distinction discussed below regarding accessibility and plans for expansion (see 4.1.1.2). The data of P1:1 correlates a functional difference between the two types of expansions. The “semi-dynamic” structures in the Hemakuta Hill area are Phamsana memorial shrines, despite that Phamsana memorial shrines in other parts of South India were typically “static” (see Wagoner’s work on the Early Medieval temples in Telangana:[1986 151]). It can be surmised that they were maintained and expanded by one or two generations of family members. However, the “dynamic” structures of H.38 and M.11 were not associated with a deceased individual or built as memorial structures. Thus, they served to stage more elaborate and diverse ritual activity in comparison to memorial cults, which can be attested by the expansion of the originally limited
ritual space of a shrine. H.38 and M.11 differ in their architectural forms (Phamsana versus Dravida architectural languages) and their use of space (as discussed in Chapter 3). Moreover, M.11 was expanded once and used continuously throughout both periods, while H.38 was continuously expanded to serve devotee needs over the course of Phases 1 and 2. It was their sustained devotional activity and ritual life that distinguished them from other monuments in the landscape, particularly as they were both among the oldest structures at the site.

The South Terrace, located in the depression beyond the apex of the Hemakuta Hill is diametrically opposed to the only other area of construction to the west of what was most likely a natural spring (transformed into Manmatha Tank) at the foot and northern-most point of the Hemakuta Hill. The two types of spaces created the setting for two distinct types of ritual activities, highlighted not through the use of architectural form but through variation in orientation and qualities of terrace space. Both areas had a use-life that spanned the entirety of Phases 1 and 2 and was manifested in distinct architectural developments. Moreover, outliers of the general patterns, which may indicate significant changes, are identified and analyzed in this chapter.

The general architectural trends, as seen in Figure 4.3, show that the structures in the Manmatha Tank area are Phamsana, except for M.11 (Pampa shrine), face an easterly direction, and are static. The westerly orientation of M.5 signals it as a building distinct from the other local (Manmatha Tank area) structures. Considering the only other west-oriented shrines are located in a different terrace, this divergence needs to be examined. The singularity of the ornate architectural language employed in M.11 sets this structure and its Dravidian architectural language apart from the entire site, especially from the memorial Phamsana (austere architectural language) which are grouped between this structure and the northern foot of the Hemakuta Hill. In addition, based on the structure’s architectural style assessed by Wagoner (1991; 1996), M.11 is the oldest identified and extant shrine of the site. Fittingly, it housed the source of site sacrality, the goddess Pampa. Lastly, the M.4 structure is also an outlier to the Manmatha Tank Phamsana shrines for it is the only one built in P1:1 that was expanded.
4.1.1.1 Worship Spaces and the Kalamukha Sect: Porches and Antaralas

Of the seven Manmatha Tank Phamsana shrines, three have an enclosed ritual space of an antarala (vestibule) (M.3-4, M.8), and three (M.1-2, M.5) have porches where devotional activities would be performed. There is no literature that discusses how antaralas and porches were used, however, as they are important features of the simple temples and shrines of Phases 1 and 2 in the Hemakuta Hill area, they have been subjected to a spatial and stylistic investigation herein. Therefore, my conclusions are suppositions. There is no distinguishing feature linked to the choice of porch over antarala, or what would be conventionally considered enclosed versus open-air ritual activity space. With their thick walls, antaralas created a smaller square space (except for M.4) for ritual activities. The very presence of the antarala suggests that it was a functional space of worship, simply marking a transition in space from the exterior to the inner space of the sanctum. However, it is possible that they were not used for ritual activity by the devotees due to the limited space they could provide, particularly when worship could take place outside the structure. Thus, ritual activity space in the antarala would limit the number of worshippers compared to the shrines with a porch. It seems likely that as a result of the size and openness of the porches, roughly equal in size to the garbha-grha for shrines (M.1-2, M.5), ritual worship was likely performed therein and not outside of it.

Regardless of the type of transitional space used at the entrance of the shrines, antarala or porch, it was the devotee activity (restricted to the antarala/porch space or outside of the structure entirely in the allotted intermediary spaces between shrines) that maintained the division of the garbha-grha in which a ritual specialist would have overseen puja and attended the murti. (In Theistic traditions, priests were the individuals appointed to perform daily puja rituals. However, the earliest identifiable ritual specialists active at the Pampa tirtha were the Kalamukha priests, present from P1:2 onwards and were “ascetics or yogins rather than ordinary temple priests” [Lorenzen 1971: 98]). From a stylistic analysis of the ritual spaces of the P1:1 structures, it is does not appear as if the form of the shrines and temples were being designed to fulfill any ritual needs specific to the Kalamukhas, unlike the design changes observable in P1:2 (see Section 4.1.2). The porches of the Manmatha Tank Phamsana shrines and possible worship in the exterior spaces of antaralas provided flexibility for the number of devotees that could
worship in addition to the visible (and physical) accessibility of the devotees worshipping. In this vein, the porches acted as a type of open proto-\textit{mandapa} that defined ritual space but was exceptionally permeable and harkened the \textit{mandapa} trend of P1:2 (discussed in 4.1.2). Although the direct and simple layout of these structures implies accessibility and a lack of physical and visual restriction to the inner sanctum, we know from textual traditions that the \textit{garbha-grha} was highly restricted, reserved only for priests and/or ascetics. This contradiction between architectural accessibility and regulated social accessibility is thought provoking for scholars investigating architectural spaces and correlated social information through environmental behaviour research techniques with a focus on measurements of accessibility (such as space syntax methodologies, as discussed below).

As mentioned, the space within and around the shrines (as devotee ritual space) was limited in size and comparatively smaller in scale than structures of the later phases. Local priests and ascetics from a non-agamic religious order tended to P1:1 memorial shrines in a more limited capacity compared to shrines for public honouring a non-memorial deity with daily rituals (\textit{pujas}), services, and festivals (\textit{utsava}) (Garimella 2002: 44). The memorial deities were most likely \textit{lingas} that would have been consecrated to the lord (noted in epigraphs and named as \textit{isvsara}) of the deceased. This expectation is enforced by the \textit{lingas} still present in later memorial structures, e.g., M.7, VS, and H.20 as it is confirmed to be the case for H.18 in ID 5. During Phases 1 and 2, the Bellary District and its temples were largely controlled by non-brahman Saiva Kalamukha monastic priests who practiced severe asceticism (Garimella 2002: 7). In contrast, Saiva brahman belonging to agamic orders served larger imperial centers in the rest of northern Karnataka and at Tamil temples. (The agamic religious orders, such as Advaita, had brahmans who worshipped based on canonical texts, the Agama scriptures, that dictated, in part, the worship in temples.) The Kalamukha were a sect of Saivite ascetics, or yoganis (discussed in Chapter 1) are known to have been present throughout Karnataka and during the eleventh to thirteenth centuries expanded their sphere of influence into parts of Andhra Pradesh and Mysore. They eventually disappeared by the mid-fifteenth century, replaced or absorbed by the Virasaiva religion, and both were “openly hostile to caste consciousness” (Lorenzen 1972: 97, 149). Lorenzen emphasizes the hostility of the Kalamukha order to the markers of status and castes
(1971: 98-99), and as such they would be at odds with the brahman caste soon to be imported to the Hemakuta Hill area in P2:1 and their adoption of Virupaksha (discussed below).

The Kalamukhas were established at the site, possibly as early as P1:1, but clearly during P1:2. Their early presence at the site may be suggested through the relative uniformity of Phamsana shrines (memorial or not) reflecting their disregard of social markers. However, the ability for a family or an individual to construct a memorial Phamsana shrine, which is the case for the Manmatha Tank Phamsana shrines, suggests some amount of social stratification at the site was being displayed. These memorial shrines had political and kin-based connotations, albeit without auspicious presentations. However, it is most likely that the presence of post-cremation rites attracted the Kalamukhas to the Hemakuta Hill area and is not until P1:2 that their presence can be observed through architectural changes. What is known about the local groups and the Kalamukhas based at the site during P1:1 and P1:2 is extremely limited particularly in terms of details of their ritual practices, as their texts have not been found (Lorenzen 1972; 1983). What we know of the Kalamukhas comes from donative inscriptions recording gifts to their temples and monasteries (mathas) (Lorenzen 1972) and Tantric Saiva scriptures from Kashmir produced from 900 to 1300 CE (Sanderson 1995). The epigraphs are, thankfully, detailed and long. Lorenzen places the Kalamukha presence in the Bellary District at the end of the ninth century CE or earlier, as there are several early instances of the Later Chalukya rulers supporting the Kalamukha educational efforts. These epigraphs can also tie them to the worship of Virupaksha and fierce deities such as Kali and Mahadeva (Lorenzen 1972:143-144, 149). The Kalamukha worshipped a form of Siva that was foundational to the Hemakuta Hill area. This was the destructive form of Siva known as Mahakala (the destroyer), also known as Bhairava (Verghese 1995: 5). He is enshrined in H.38 and was a remarkable presence at the Hemakuta Hill area from P1:1 through P2:2. The epigraphs that Lorenzen (1972) surveyed in Karnataka indicate that the Kalamukha influence throughout the region was pervasive and substantial. Therefore, the particular conservative and seemingly regulated form of the memorial temples of P1:1 in the Manmatha Tank area express a stable ritual and social control over the site that began to waver in P1:2, likely through a shift towards a continuous presence and investment in the religious life of the site by the Kalamukhas.
The Kalamukha sect was also closely related to several other extinct Saivite Tantric sects, of which little is known. These Saivite sects followed the doctrine of Pasupati (possibly the earliest sect to worship Siva) (Lorenzen 1972: 173), and confusion arises as the Kalamukhas were often interchangeably known (or were possibly conflated with) as the Pasupati, particularly in Karnataka (Handiqui 1968: 198 in Cohen 1997: 28). Of the little that is known of the practices of the Pasupati sects, the Kapalikas, who most closely resemble the Kalamukhas, primarily worshipped Siva as Bhairava (Cohen 1997: 28; Lorenzen 1972: 4). However, even if the Kapalikas were not present, the Pampa tirtha is not unique in which the Kalamukhas worshipped Bhairava. Mulgund (Dharwad district, Karnataka) is the other known site potentially wherein the Kalamukhas worshipped Bhairava. Mulgund was the center of the Kalamukhas during mid-tenth century CE, and the form of the Bhairava worshipped was that of Virabhadra (Virabhadra and Bhairava are interchangeable in some Puranic texts [Cohen 1997: 29; Masilamani-Meyer 2004]), though little documentation is available on the murti and the temple in which it was housed (Cohen 1997: 28). The other main site that connects the Kalamukha sect to Bhairava is Hemavati, the Nolamba capital. This version of Bhairava was associated with guardian and protector qualities (as opposed to fierce qualities). Nevertheless, Cohen suggests that this protective and powerful deity would have been appropriated as the primary deity by at least one Nolamba king, and he further argues that the Kalamukhas/Pasupatas patronized by the Nolamba kings in Hemavati would have overseen the cult (1997: 28). The Sidhēsvara temple, currently dedicated to the worship of Siva, houses a range of portable statues, including the murti of a bhairava (dating to the Nolamba period according to Cohen [1997: 29]), known locally as Henjerappa. It is unclear if this temple was the original and intended house for Henjerappa. The only correlation between this shrine and H.38 is the anomalous alignment of their doorways to the west (Cousens 1996: 85), connecting them to death. A more in-depth interpretation of the structural and spatial similarities between temples and shrines housing Bhairava is a direction for future research.

4.1.1.2 Spatial Organization of the Site

Of particular interest in this section is the organization of the group of Phamsana shrines in the Manmatha Tank area, mainly due to the fact that these are the largest group of structures. The
Phamsana shrines allow us to examine various aspects of kinship, as Garimella points out (2002:95-97), as part of a public and political discourse by the nadu or kinship group, which was the most essential and smallest political and geographic segment of the state (Stein 1980: 101:104). They can also be examined in terms of internal hierarchies within the family unit and in terms of the needs of the dead whose essence was enshrined and worshipped by the living.

As can be seen in the Manmatha Tank layout plans, the positioning of the memorial shrines, as a terrace space within the larger Hemakuta Hill area, suggests that a group sensibility organized the configuration of the memorial shrines. This group sensibility is dictated partially by the nature of the flat topography of this terrace within the Hemakuta Hill tirtha and also by the spatial organization of structures. Lines-of-sight between the memorial shrines to landmarks such as M.11 (Pampa’s shrine) and to the river (obstructed by vegetation) were not a priority, nor did the alignment or visibility of landscape features outside of the Manmatha Tank area influence the organization of the shrines. M.1, M.2, M.3, and M.4 most likely had an obstructed line of sight to M.11 due to the placement of M.5, M.8, M.7A, and M.11A. The river is not visible to any of the structures from the Manmatha Tank area. Although other nearby landscape features were important organizing features of the later imperial city, such as Malyavanta Hill, Chakra Tirtha bathing spot at the bend in the river, the Anegondi settlement, or Anjanadri Hill, they did not determine the structural alignments in Phases 1 and 2. However, nearby hills, such as Matanga Hill, can be seen from the Manmatha Tank space, and no structures were aligned with them. Indeed, the P1:1 shrines are not oriented to landscape features, as suggested elsewhere to explain variations in orientation (as has been proposed for the “small” temple alignments in Vijayanagara [Fritz and Malville 2006 b: 375]). We can reject this possibility based on satellite images in GIS and in Google Earth. Visibility to the tank/water feature and/or to the path of movement appears to have been of greater importance as clearly indicated by Street View coupled with layout plans. The Street View has captured this area from the path of movement without travelling into the spaces around the shrines. Thus, the Street View paths reflect the path that a devotee with no memorial shrine connections would have taken through the Manmatha Tank area. The spatial organization of the memorial shrines could only be partially captured and interpreted in from an egocentric perspective through a Street View analysis due to modern
fencing put in place to protect the deteriorating shrines. Otherwise, line-of-sight and access was assessed through an allocentric investigation using satellite imagery and site plans.

In terms of devotee corporeal engagement with memorial shrines, visibility of memorial shrines were taken into account and played a significant role in the arrangement of structures within the Manmatha Tank P1:1 group organization. However, their organization is homogenous which reinforces the idea of a group identity. As such, no one memorial shrine was positioned to dominate the space and attention of devotees over others. In addition, physical access to the memorial shrine ritual spaces for devotees who were not associated with these shrines was most likely restricted based on the visual cues of the architectural language, indicating private memorial worship and space.

The visibility of the memorial shrines and any associated devotee ritual activity of M.1, M.4, M.9, M.10 and M.11 (and possibly M.7A) were not obstructed by later constructions as seen from the path of movement in Street View, as was also the case during P1:1. The view of the M.5 shrine is obstructed in Street View by later temples, but during P1:1, there would have been an unobstructed line of sight to the rear of the shrine. Therefore, ritual activity at M.5 would not have been visible from outside the group of memorial shrines and from the path of movement, as the shrine and porch are open to the west and imply a closed and private function at the site. This excluded those who were not associated with memorial shrines. Moreover, the westerly orientation signals different rituals were conducted at this shrine. View of M.8 is also obstructed from the path of movement in Street View due to later structures (M.7), although the structure and associated ritual activity would have been visible from the path during P1:1. M.2 and M.3 would not have been visible from the path of movement where it passes east of the memorial group of shrines during P1:1, nor are they visible from Street View. However, they would have been visible from the path of movement, as it approached the Manmatha Tank area from the slope of the Hemakuta Hill.

Varying degrees of visibility between devotee on the path and memorial shrines as well as M.11 can be assessed in Street View. The path of movement in the Manmatha Tank area, immediately west of the tank area, has been recorded by Google Street View. The structures visible from the path of movement would have been M.1, M.4, M.5, M.8, and M.7A (if erected
It is also clear that only the north slope of the hill and a view of devotees moving down from the Southern Terrace to the Manmatha Tank area are visible to the memorial shrines, as the hill presents a sloped surface that sits above the memorial shrines providing a greater area of visibility. Maintaining nucleation of the memorial group of shrines in the area between M.11 and the foot of the Hemakuta Hill while not extending further west than M.9 and M.10, appears to prescribe the extent of this terrace space. This space was further defined through the intimate/private proxemics relationships of the structures and was anchored by the presence and placement of M.11 (the earliest structure). M.11 most likely was built in relationship with the pre-Manmatha Tank water feature (necessary for ritual ablutions) and to mediate the space of the sacred Hemakuta Hill and the Tungbhadra River. The placement of the Phamsana memorial shrines was also purposeful. Without examining the spatial distribution of the shrines, it would be logical to assume that the choice of constructing a shrine with an antarala instead of a porch, denoted a forethought to future expansions to which a mandapa could be added. However, as seen with shrine M.3 and M.4, room for expansion was rendered impossible due to the ordering of space. It can be seen that proximity and their close physical relationship took precedence over establishing room for future additions. The only structures to have a significant spatial expansion with the addition of a mandapa are those shrines believed to be associated with non-memorial deities, H.38 and M.11. Outside of the later addition of the antarala to M.4 during P1:1, these non-memorial structures are, consequently, dynamic in nature, and their use-life continued throughout Phases 1 and 2. Moreover, the aggrandizing of these two non-memorial, public structures through the addition of a mandapa was a pattern of P1:2. Since it is unclear in what order the P1:1 structures were built, beyond the earliest construction of M.11, it appears that spatial proximity symbolizing group solidarity was given precedence over future planning for expansion and aggrandizement.

Group identity as an important element of architectural and site planning can also be seen in the uniformity of building footprints and architectural complexity of the structures with antaralas and porches. Spatial organization and structural form do not suggest any kind of a pattern or serious attempt to diverge from group identity by a reduction or enlargement of the scale and/or complexity (in any capacity) of the Phamsana memorial shrine type during this phase which may have been prescribed by the local and early Saivite ritual specialists present at
the site. The spacing of the shrines also suggests that the act of circumambulation was not part of
the ritual repertoire of the devotional activities conducted at these memorial shrines. The extreme
proximity of M.1, M.2, M.3, and M.4 demonstrates that circumambulation was not possible or at
least important around the individual shrines. This was not the case with the South Terrace
shrines of H.38 and H.40 which were spaced far enough from each other to comfortably permit
the expected circumambulatory activity at a public shrine/temple. However, it is unclear if both
H.38 and H.40 were public structures based only on spacing. The function of H.40 is unclear,
although, the proxemics distance between H.38 and H.40 (Figure 3.16), roughly 7.6 meters apart,
indicates that the area around the shrines and also within the terrace space could accommodate
large groups of individuals for ritual activities. This is clearly differed from use of space in the
Manmatha Tank area.

The proxemics values of spacing between the Manmatha Tank shrines, placed
consistently in the Intimate/Private to Personal ranges, indicate a uniform use of space. This
means that comparable number of people were worshipping at each structure, also reflecting the
uniformity of ritual needs. In addition, it shows rituals and uses of space differed between the
Phamsana shrines in the South Terrace and the memorial shrines near the Manmatha Tank. This
difference in ritual needs/intentions may also be seen in the choice of orientation of the shrines.
The uniformity of ritual space and inter-structure order, as well as architectural form of the
Manmatha Tank Phamsana shrines, work with the interpretation of being a part of the cult of
memorial temples that are “particularized and marked with a human patron’s identity”. As such,
they were active for the life of their founders. This translates materially as a structure constructed
in a single episode, served by the patron and family, and then fell into neglect when that family
passed or moved from the area (Wagoner 1986: 162-163). Thus, the structure received little to no
renovations in the form of additions and repairs, and remained static. M.4 is an outlier of the
Manmatha Tank Phamsana memorial shrines, as architecturally it was not completely a static
structure. It was built and expanded within a short period of time (within P1:1) and may have
thus been serviced and used by more than one generation of family members. The expansion
consisted of an additional antarala, which was similar in volume to the surrounding shrines. For
this reason, M.4 can be described as “semi-dynamic”.
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The static to semi-dynamic nature of the memorial shrines of P1:1 suggests several conditions for the group of memorial shrines that were used by patrons and the community. First, these shrines served a limited cultic group which was not supposed to grow to any significant degree, nor did they grow, as the space for ritual actions did not expand and placement of neighboring shrines did not permit or plan for growth to occur. The static nature of the shrines therefore accommodated a limited, or “closed” group of worshippers. The capacity of the worship space was limited, but it was not completely “closed” or restricted, in terms of visual and physical accessibility (discussed further below). Indeed, this characteristic, which can be considered as a materialized value, indicates that there was no intention on the part of the patrons and community to expand the shrines. This seems to be the case, especially when compared to structural trends of the proceeding phases, as shrines were erected and expanded through the addition of a mandapa. This can be seen in Figure 4.2 where the addition of the mandapa to M.11 took more square footage than the original garbha-grha/shrine. The local values appear to have shifted in the proceeding phase.

However, the spatial arrangements of the memorial structure, while they were actively used by their associated families, signaled social associations of the memorialized to the local living Phases 1 and 2 devotional community. Additionally, as the structures embodied the memorialized, the intimacy proxemics measurements between the memorial shrines suggests the deliberate construction of a social community for the dead. The knowledge of the identity of specific patrons and associated memorialized ancestors, as represented by specific structures, would have formed part of local knowledge. Therefore, it can be extrapolated that there was a socio-political value to connecting oneself to the memory of the deceased, as was amply demonstrated in the epigraphic record of later phases (P2:2, H.18, ID 5).

4.1.1.3 Orientation

For this research, I have conducted a statistical analysis on the orientation of the structures at the site in order to identify major structural trends. Moreover, I have used a cluster analysis on select attributes recorded in Appendix B to detect meaningful group identification, particularly for the wide range of orientations available that do not lie on true cardinal directions. Clustering is a process of dividing objects into groups, while classification is a process for placing objects into
these groups (Tan 2005: 487). Cluster analysis, consequently, organizes objects into groups of most similarity or dissimilarity to other groups based on data that describes each object (Tan 2005:490). In order to identify groups of religious features based on orientation, I chose an exclusive clustering method in which objects are assigned to one cluster only, as opposed to overlapping clusters. This method is more appropriate for orientation cluster analysis due to the limited number of objects in the dataset (Tan 2005:492). A k-means cluster analysis of Phases 1 and 2 religious structures has been executed on the 24 datable temples and shrines that make up the dataset. I have chosen K-means for its archaeological applications of datasets with the understanding that the reliability of any statistical analysis on such a limited sample size could potentially be troublesome. (Baxter [2015] discusses the history of the use of k-means cluster analysis in archaeology and suggests alternatives.) Ideally, for a cluster analysis, such as k-means, a sample size of more than 500 would be ideal. As this research progressed, a statistical analysis of all the Phases 1 and 2 structures proved to be too coarse to yield information from a time-sensitive data set. For this reason, the examination of slight variations from overall structural and spatial patterns, phase by phase, produced the most useful and fruitful approach to analyze the development of the site.

The religious setting of the Hemakuta Hill area, related to funerary rites and ancestral worship, appears to have necessitated a range of ritual activity areas that are signalled through the non-verbal features associated with architecture. One can examine the shrines in the Southern Terrace and M.5 as the only west-facing structures of the site until P2:2 in order to determine whether or not a western orientation signals particular information of the ritual nature of a structure. The general uniformity of structures throughout the site in P1:1 (Phamsana memorial shrines) suggests that the Hemakuta Hill area served as a setting for a particular type of religious structure. Differences in structural spaces between the south and the north ends of the site and the use of orientation materialized different ritual needs. As mentioned, cardinal directions symbolized values and ideas. The south is associated with the god of the dead, Yama, and considered inauspicious as a direction for spatial organization. H.38, as a structure associated with death and its deity, Mahakaladeva/Bhairava, is located in depression of the hill, and as such, it is hidden from sight of the northern and life-associated Pampa and memorial shrines. H.38 and H.40 are both oriented toward the west with their idols facing away from the rising sun, which
hides them from sight of Pampa to the north. Therefore, it can be said that a western orientation in these most-southerly and death-associated shrines played a part in the physical message of the ritual and sacred nature of a structure.

The variety of exact orientations for the shrines at the Hemakuta Hill area have been discussed in Chapter 3. These orientations can be explained in part based on the techniques used for establishing cardinal directions, a first and critical part of a temple’s foundation ceremony. Techniques for establishing cardinal directions were advanced and continued to be refined into the early medieval period from the Vedic period when directionality was necessary for constructing sacrificial altars and for building houses (Yano 1986: 17). Yano (1986) describes the various methods of orientation known from textual sources (sulbasutras [Vedic manuals for building altars], silpa- or vastu-sastras, and agamas) based on astronomical knowledge (jyotihsastra), specifically from a Saiva Siddhanta manual (IsadnaSivagurudevapaddhati) written in the late eleventh to early twelfth century. These textual sources were most likely known and used by architects in the Hemakuta Hill area following P1:2. The method employed in this area for establishing temple/shrine orientation was the more modest and ubiquitous one used throughout South Asia since the Vedic period, known as the “Indian Circle” method. This method, as it first appears in the Katyayana sulbasvtras, is as follows:

“Driving the gnomon into the levelled (ground), and drawing a circle with the rope whose length is equal to the gnomon (length), one drives two pegs at (the intersections of) the two lines where the shadow of the tip of the gnomon fails. This is the east (-west) line.” (Translated by Yano 1986: 18).

The “Indian Circle” was refined substantially over time as astronomical knowledge advanced along with mathematical equations to provide precision for orientation, particularly with the introduction of Hellenistic/Greek astronomy. Notably, improvements to the “Indian Circle” became widespread in the twelfth century (Yano 1986: 18), but as a widespread method it provided ample opportunity for slight errors or deviation from true cardinality based on the architect’s access to textual sources and astronomical knowledge. Most importantly, the “Indian Circle” provides a method which gives form to temporal information, such as an orientation measurement from a specific day/point in time that the shadow from a gnomon created. With this
in mind, slight variations in cardinal directionality of the shrines in the Manmatha Tank area suggest that a single method for setting orientation was used across the site. This also helps us determine a range of dates that were used for shrine foundation, as deemed to be auspicious and/or relevant, possibly to the deceased or for the ritual purpose/life of the structure and the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shrine</th>
<th>Orientation in Degrees (from AISC)</th>
<th>Degrees of Divergence from Cardinality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.40</td>
<td>~270</td>
<td>unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.38</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>3 degrees from west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>24 degrees from east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15 degrees from east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>12 degrees from east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>16 degrees from east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.5</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>14 degrees from west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13 degrees from east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10 degrees from east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6 degrees from east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10 degrees from east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.7A</td>
<td>~100</td>
<td>unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.11A</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7 Table of Structure Orientation and Divergence from Cardinality.
community. There is a consistent deviation from cardinal orientation for all the shrines, regardless of terrace area, general orientation (east or west), or architectural language. It can be assumed that there was one group of architects and body of architectural knowledge guiding construction at the site during P1:1; deviations from a uniform or agreed upon cardinality were prevalent during this phase. In other words, based on the consistent deviation from cardinality, it is clear that builders and patrons placed more emphasis on the establishment of orientation based on the choice of auspicious days used for temple foundation. However, no structure deviates substantially from a cardinal direction. Although an east or west orientation is clear, the slight deviations between neighboring structures is also conspicuous. Yet, it is unclear whether such orientations intended to relay specific information to the devotees or to preserve intimate information intended for kin/family consumption. Shared orientations, as seen M.11, M.10, and M.7A may have preserved and/or communicated specific ritual or relational information, much in the same way that spatial organization communicated specific relationships between the deceased and their family in the Manmatha Tank area (discussed further below).

In their archaeoastronomical work on the orientation of structures in the Vijayanagara area, Malville and Fritz (2006 a and b) choose to record and examine the azimuths of Vijayanagara-period religious and royal structures in the urban core. An azimuth measures the horizontal angle of the viewed point (from the entrance of the structure) clockwise (as seen from above) from due north. However, Malville and Fritz recorded their azimuths with a precision of 2 decimal places by using differential GPS and theodolite-based sun sights (Malville 2015:1977). The orientation of structures provided in the AISC range from general descriptions such as “west” to degrees with no decimal places. The AISC likely took measurements using a magnetic compass and accuracy for these measurements has not been published. The difference, however, between an azimuth reading and an orientation measurement taken with a magnetic compass should be a minor discrepancy from magnetic variation of 1° 56.28’. However, since the archaeoastronomical work of Malville and Fritz did not extend to the structures dated to before the Imperial Phase, this discrepancy cannot be tested. Eighty four smaller temples and shrines examined in their work may be relevant or comparable to the Phases 1 and 2 structures. Within this group they identified four clusters of azimuth orientations. The largest cluster has an azimuth of 70° to 80° (north of east) with an average of 75.02°. The smaller clusters have azimuths
averaging 159° (east of south), 257° (south of west), and 341° (west of north) (Malville and Fritz 2006b:375). They also note that overall there is an average divergence from cardinality of 17° (Malville and Fritz 2006b:375). Figure 4.7 above indicates that smaller imperial temple/shrine clusters do not provide patterns visible in the P1:1 structures and the average divergence from cardinality is 12°. There are two clusters of orientations, namely those facing east, between 96-114°, and the other cluster composed of two shrines facing west. In comparison, the azimuth readings for forty-two larger temples from the Imperial Phase were all built along significantly more precise lines of orientation. Of these temples, six have a central axis aligned to one-quarter of a degree from cardinality and eighteen are within 5 degrees of cardinality. The remainder appear to have been offset from a cardinal orientation due to the influence of nearby roads with a few exceptions for precise orientation towards other significant landscape features (Malville and Fritz 2006a: 363). The precision of the larger temple orientations, compared to the consistent divergence from true cardinality of the smaller temples that Malville and Fritz examined (2006b), suggests that there are two different methods for measuring orientation at the foundation stage. The method for orienting smaller temples during the Imperial Phase may be a continuation of a tradition established in Phases 1 and 2, as suggested by the similar average divergence from cardinality. Further research into the structural-spatial similarities of the Phases 1 and 2 shrines and temples and the “small” temples identified by Malville and Fritz (2006 a & b) will be fruitful, as these may be indications of local and initially non-agamic groups present into the Imperial Phase, similar to what the P1:1 structures represent in this research.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, Malville and Fritz conducted other archaeoastronomical work that yields compelling results on the organization of the Vijayanagara city in connection with sacred topography. Particularly the roles of the surrounding hills in geometrical plan and placement of important religious and political structures during the life span of the empire are important conclusions of their research (1993; 1996; 2006 a). Such hills as Matanga and Malyavanta served as key alignments points for structuring the city; at unestablished points in time, the hills were imbued with religious significance with placements of important mythological scenes on their slopes.
4.1.1.4 H.38 and the South Terrace

4.1.1.4.1 Overview and Access Patterns of H.38 from P1:1 to P2:2

During the P1:1 phase, H.38 did not stand apart in form from other structures at the site, particularly as it was built with a companion shrine, H.40. Both of these Phamsana shrines face west and both are in the same microtopographic feature, the Southern Terrace depression. However, over time, H.38 began to look different from other structures at the site due to constant structural additions (see Figure 4.8 for a table on H.38 additions and associated Phase and Period). The companion shrine to H.40 had a “one-generation” use-life, which is considered to be a static structure. It was not renovated after its initial construction in P1:1 even though it appears to have fulfilled the same ritual function and role as H.38 during P1:1. Both structures have space to allow a larger range of rituals in their surrounding exterior space, such as circumambulation. This section examines the structural and access development of H.38 from P1:1 through to P2:2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.38 Addition</th>
<th>Associated Phase and Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.38a</td>
<td>P1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.38b and H.38c</td>
<td>P1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.38d</td>
<td>P2:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.38e and H.38f</td>
<td>P2:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.8 Table of H.38 additions and correlated Phase and Period.

The continued alterations of the structure H.38 indicates the longevity of the ritual role that it fulfilled and its continued relevance at the site. Clearly, it satisfied a specific set of ritual requirements, which can be attested by the continued and irregular renovations to the shrine from P1:1 through P2:2. This is different than other and later structures that received structural additions. The workshop that produced the structure was likely the same employed throughout the site during the P1:1 phase, as the only technique-based differences noted in the P1:1
Figure 4.9 Movement through H.38 additions.
structures by Wagoner and the VRP is between the Phamsana shrines, including H.38, and the Pampa shrine. The latter fashions a unique red sandstone and Rastrakuta idiom. However, the architectural craftsmanship and planning used to expand H.38 does differ from other dynamic structures from the renovation H.38c (end of P1:2) onwards, indicating that this shrine served a particular set of ritual needs and this was not replicated or similar to the function of any other shrines/temple at the site. The distinctness of H.38 was not architecturally obvious in P1:1 as another Phamsana shrine with an *antarala* (except through the western orientation of the central axis), but became identifiable in the style and construction of walls (horizontal and vertical unfinished stone slabs), general lack of free-standing columns, and the irregular form of the additions from the end of P1:2, P2:1 and P2:2.

With the addition of a closed *mandapa* to H.38c (end of P1:2), movement into and out of the structure was uncharacteristically guided through doorways in the east, south and north; the devotee was not directed into the temple along the main axis of the structure (see Figure 4.9). The addition of self-contained chambers on the south side of the structure, H.38d and H.38e, limited a southern access into the *mandapa* and also created new paths of movement that continued the trend away from movement along a straight axis (preserved in H.38a and H.38b). In addition, the ritual functions of the chambers remain unclear. Their physical association with the H.38 *vimana* was important, as was their connection to the south through their placement on the south side of one of the southernmost structures at the site. The chambers were not related to the primary ritual activities housed in the shrine for they were removed from the path to the deity of H.38. During H.38d and H.38e the devotees entered into H.38 via the north or the west entrance of the *mandapa* and could choose to enter the H.38d chambers, or access the H.38e chamber without entering the main part of the shrine via an eastern entrance. Another trend that continued through H.38d to H.38f was an obstruction of sightlines. Through the construction of circuitous additions culminating in the H.38f ambulatory, the overall layout of the H.38 plan increasingly restricted sightlines, and consequently restricted direct sunlight from entering into new spaces, but it also stopped the emanation of energy from the center of the shrine (and additional chambers that may have been used as secondary shrines) out into the site. As a consequence of this design, devotee sensory engagement became restricted to the sounds and sights inside of each contained space. For example, obstructed sightlines into the H.38d
chambers or through the H.38f enclosed ambulatory along the east side of the structure, leading to the H.38e chamber, cut off direct sunlight and sightlines into and out of the spaces, creating enclosed, restricted, introspective, and intense places of devotee experience, interpreted as a thirdspace (discussed in Section 4.5).

4.1.1.4.2 Hemakuta Hill: South Terrace

The P1:1 tirtha of the Hemakuta Hill area accommodated at least two types of rituals, including funerary rites and ancestor worship. Pilgrims/devotees had access to all external spaces (areas outside of shrines/temples), although their ritual needs indeed circumscribed that they acted and visited specific spaces. Each terrace has its own quality of setting made possible by the nature of the Hemakuta granitic hill, characterized by microtopographic features that range from depressions, elevations, flat granitic outcrops, to steep slopes bounded by a ledge.

H.38 and H.40 are restricted from sight from most structures outside of the depression and vice versa. Second, the depression creates a type of performative space in which the structures within can be seen clearly and are the visual focus as a devotee enters into the space. The South Terrace is the first organized and delineated space that the devotee would encounter entering into the sacred space of the tirtha, as they round the bend of large cluster of boulders on the east side of the hill. Once at the summit of the hill, the view of the South Terrace is revealed and the path of movement takes the devotee across the width of the hill into that space. The path is characterized by a gentle inclination towards the shrines; beyond these structures emerges distant horizon line that dominates the view beyond the western side of the hill. The general physical experience of moving directly into the space is accentuated by boulder strewn path leading up the side of the hill. Procession towards and around the back of the shrines along the path into the South Terrace, an unusual approach to a religious structure, would have permitted the darsan with ritual and the murti of the deities at H.38 and H.40. The interior space of the shrines is restricted from view when approaching the shrines, although the terrace area space is highly visible and any activity around and outside of the shrines can be seen.

The South Terrace and accompanying structures present an interesting combination of juxtaposing qualities amenable to analysis. Movement into the space and around the structures
would have been highly visible once a devotee enters into the Hemakuta sacred area, though the structures are restricted from the rest of the site. The closer a devotee is to the shrine and to the murti of the deities, on the west side of the structures, the more private and less visible the worship and interaction. At the summit of a major hill no particular feature dominates the devotee visual experience. Even the shrines of H.38 and H.40 are fairly unobtrusive on the hill with their austere architecture, almost blending with the natural granite stones of the rugged landscape. In terms of sensorial engagements in the South Terrace, the senses could remain focused on actions such as darsan, making this an ideal location for inconspicuous and impure ritual actions including funerary ritual rites and activities appropriate for Bhairava and other destructive deities.

4.1.1.4.3 H.38 and Landscape Alignments

The earliest identifiable associations in terms of structural alignments between a landscape feature and a religious structure may have been established in P1:1, between H.38 and Matanga Hill. However correlations are considerably clearer by P2:1 during which we have literary and epigraphic evidence that supports the importance of Matanga Hill to the site (inscription ID 4). Crowning the hill is a north-facing temple dedicated to the fierce form of Siva, Virabhadra (NMg/1). The temple itself is difficult to date, as it was built up through subsequent episodes. Moreover, Virabhadra cult came to largely replace that of Bhairava, also a fierce form of Siva, in the Sangama dynasty era (~1336 CE) as he was popularized by the Virasaivas (Verghese 1995: 23) who absorbed or replaced the earlier Kalamukhas. Leading up to the summit of the hill are three massive stone staircases (and one has largely disintegrated) constructed from local granite, and inside the hill are two caves. One of the caves, NMg/4 (AISC 102) opens to the east and has been embellished with a doorframe that depicts a Siva linga and a Nandi statue (Fritz and Malville 1996: 222-223). The other cave is located lower in the hill and faces the north (NMg/7). According to the local interpretation of the Ramayana, this is the cavern in which Matanga and Sugriva lived (Fritz and Malville 1993: 223). This hill, one among four sacred hills of the site including Hemakuta, Malyavanta, and Anjenadri, became the most significant landscape feature to order the space for city development, most likely due to its massive looming presence and associated symbolic and strategic significance. Climbing to the top of the hill, one can attest to
the extreme panoramic view in all directions the hilltop affords. Accordingly, an epigraph from P2:1 (inscription ID 4) records how the patron was related to a Sinda feudatory that guarded the Hemakuta Hill area from the summit of Matanga Hill. However, the ascribed symbolic importance of the hill, known from the Imperial Phase literature, comes from its association with figures and episodes from the Ramayana that can be found in the local sthala puranas (Hemakutakhanda and Pampamahatmya). The Ramayana, however, was not conclusively present at the site during Phases 1 and 2. As Verghese points out, there are no archaeological traces of structures at the Ramayana-related spots from Phases 1 and 2, and there are scant epigraphic indicators that the Ramayana was important in the conceptualization of the Phases 1 and 2 landscape (1995: 45). The available epigraphic evidence references the area north of the Tungabhadra as Kishkindha, although, epigraphs were not found in the Hemakuta Hill area. During P1:1 there seem to be an alignment association with Matanga Hill between the cavern on the north side of the hill and the Bhairava shrine, H.38, but this alignment of features is not visibly distinguishable from the site of H.38 in the South Terrace depression. As discussed in Chapter 3, H.38 is oriented towards the west, but the west-east axis of the structure, when extended out into the landscape, aligns with the north side of Matanga Hill and the cavern NMg/4 (Figure 4.10). This cavern is marked with a Bhairava on a boulder outside of its entrance. At present, the precise alignment between the two features remains unclear, but it seems that their spatial correlation is not incidental. Thus, what started as an unassuming Phamsana shrine during P1:1, dedicated to a deity known to be favored by the Kalamukha sect, began the long tradition of spatial association with the Matanga Hill that would be carried on extensively through Phases 1 and 2. However, this connection was especially emphasized in the Imperial Phase as a means to promote order and legitimacy through city planning.
Figure 4.10. Alignment between H.38 and North Face of Matanga Hill. Image from Google Earth Pro. Imagery capture July 2015.
4.1.1.5 Manmatha Tank Terrace Space of P1:1

Moving from the South Terrace to the Manmatha Tank terrace demonstrates the stark contrast between the South and the North Terraces. Leaving the South Terrace there is a slight ascension out of the depression followed by a path of movement. This path would lead the devotee through a range of microtopographies with a descent of the sacred hill into a very different type of terrace in terms of spatial organization, topography, architecture and ritual.

The spatial organization of Manmatha Tank memorial shrines during P1:1 was not designed for performance or the display of ritual activity, nor for privacy and concealment. However, private rites serve the structures which were active participants in the landscape (see figures in Chapter 3). Memorial shrines were individuals acting in their own community. Hardy (1995) and Kramrisch (1946:176) argue that shrines were not simply inert, passive buildings but were encountered as powerful social beings capable of interacting with other shrines and devotees. They demonstrate the temple as the manifestation of deity, as both home and body. Kramrisch writes: “the temple is the concrete shape (murti) of the Essence; as such it is the residence and vesture of God. The masonry is the sheath (kosa) and body. The temple is the monument of manifestation. The devotee who comes to the temple, to look at it, does so as a seer, not as a spectator” (1946:165). Considering that the shrines studied in this research present only limited spatial and structural differences, we cannot prove whether a shrine’s proximity to another particular shrine was desired and auspicious. However, it is very likely that the spatial arrangement indicates individual or familial relationships that were present in the living community and that the shrines, or the lingas therein, manifested the deceased. The specific individuals and families associated with the largest cluster of memorial shrines at the site, those built during P1:1 in the Manmatha Tank area, are unknown. Based on ethnographic research, it has been established that the manner in which the dead were memorialized can be determined by how they died, their gender, and their role in a family (Blackburn 1985). However, ascribed status would have been a factor to the local community that chose to memorialize their dead at Pampa’s shores, because memorial structures were created for specific individuals and not for all individuals. It can also be argued that the influence of the early Saivite group present at the site, possibly the Kalamukha ascetics, restricted the display of such social markers to a minimum, as
mentioned above. It can be postulated that the individuals represented were chosen for their ascribed status (to a greater and lesser degree) and for their role in the community and/or family. The memorial structures also represent the living family members of the deceased that could mobilize the resources for shrine construction in addition to representing piety. The memorial structures manifested the deceased through a memorial linga (Wagoner 1996: 166) and by extension, the shrine, but also represented the living family: the shrine functioned as a symbol, referencing the dead and the living patron to the community worshipping and mourning in the same space.

Remarkably, a physical proximity to M.11 does not appear to have been sought after in spatial organization, as discussed in Chapter 3. The nucleation of the structures is fairly orderly, which means that there are two to three rows of shrines running north south, and the number of rows depends on the presence of undated structures. Around each of the memorial shrines is an allotted and limited space ideal for intimate ritual interaction, most likely between a small number of kin and the shrine/murti. The exceptions to this are M.1 and M.11, based on their placement in arrangement to the other shrines and their openness to the tank/water feature area and the path of movement. The path of movement may have predetermined the amount of ritual space that could be used at both structures. However, the change in architecture from the group of memorial shrines, as one proceeds towards the river, to M.11 would have been remarkable and at least marked the Pampa’s shrine as a special type of ritual space. The use of different building materials may not have been a visible cue if M.11 was whitewashed. However, the form of the shrine would have been a visual cue to ritual actors, particularly those worshipping at the site without a memorial shrine to perform ancestor worship.

The use of visual cues with symbolic functions, as Rapaport discusses in his Nonverbal Communication approach to urban spaces (1990), provides information between the use of space and the social life. Although Rapaport’s work focused mainly on modern urban spaces, his insights have been applied to archeological datasets (Fisher 2009; Pailou 2014 to name only two). Information concerning power, status, identity, and so on, can be built into sensorial cues, or latent and socio-symbolic messages. This can take the form of shape, color, style of structures, or their placement in an area. As such, the distinctness of M.11 from the neighboring memorial
shrines, as discussed in Chapter 3, marks this as a special space in the Manmatha Tank area and within the site as a whole. Since there are no restrictions to it in terms of spatial siting, it can be assumed that this was an important public structure, not another memorial shrine.

Being at the foot of the hill, the terrain of the Manmatha Tank area is flat. Thus, if a devotee travelled through the Manmatha Tank space, the most notable/noticeable features were those placed closest to the path of movement which passes directly between the shrines and the tank area: M.1, M.5, M.11, and possibly M.7A. Guiding the devotee towards M.11 along the path of movement and on opposite side of the memorial shrines was the water feature that later became what we know as the Manmatha Tank. In addition, the other main feature of the Manmatha Tank area is the looming presence of the granitic slopes of the Hemakuta Hill to the south. Devotees could be seen moving down these slopes towards the tank area, propelled northwards, into the tank area. There are no defined and demarcated stopping points on the hill in P1:1, indicating that the hill was not used as a vantage point to view the Manmatha Tank area during this period. This also supports the spatial assessment that visibility of worship did not significantly influence the organization of the memorial shrines. The two main natural features of the area, hill and water, most likely framed physical movement as well as the main visual engagement of devotees.

The P1:1 memorial shrines and M.11 with their distinct terrace can be further examined with space syntax theories. I employed access analysis, a technique developed by Hillier and Hanson (1984: 143-155). The primary function of access analysis is to graph the built environment according to depth of space and access patterns, permitting interpretations of social areas identified through their configurational order (topological description) (Bafna 2003:19). Convex spaces include “all parts are visible to all other parts” (Fisher 2009: 71) and the graphing that these spaces takes, such as a room in a structure, is represented as a node connected with a segment (edge). The relationship between each convex space is graphed out, thus illustrating accessibility and permeability. The carrier, illustrated as a node with a cross, represents the space outside of the structure of interest, to which a “passerby” or intentional visitor to the graphed
space would have access. These accessibility graphs enables us to examine complex spaces on two scales: on the building scale (also referred to as gamma-analysis) or on the settlement scale (alpha-scale).

Figure 4.11 Undated structures of Manmatha Tank area.
However, the space of Manmatha Tank area is conceptually more similar to a whole structure than to a settlement. A descriptive access analysis (not a graph analysis) of the Manmatha Tank shrine space (terrace) is executed to discuss its quality of integration from the path as a space that all devotees could access. The terrace of the Manmatha Tank area is conceptualized and treated as one structural unit so that it can be analyzed on the building (gamma) scale. Although each structure is not restricted by features, such as walls and doors, it is formally structured by the convex space of the terrace area and bounded by the path to the east, bounded to the north by M.11, and bounded to the south by the foot of the Hemakuta Hill (demarcated by M.1 and M.2). Convex maps of the settlement scale focus on the spatial configuration of features such as street networks, which is not of interest for this research. (For discussions of mapping types that can be performed on convex maps on the settlement scale, see Bafna 2003.) The flow between the structures need not be graphed using nodes and edges, as the access of spaces can be seen clearly in Figure 4.11. The indices associated with the graphs can measure a global relation of each shrine/space within the overall configuration of the Manmatha Tank area. The global relations measure and depend on accessibility. In the Manmatha Tank area, this refers to the number of structures that must be passed (visually or physically) to reach the next. If the carrier space was established as the path which all devotees/pilgrims to the tirtha travelled, it becomes clear which shrines were the most accessible, both visually and physically: M.1, M.5, M.11, possibly M.7A. The path enabled the devotee to access the shrines from the east and also allowed them to move into the shrines along the auspicious east-west access. The path guided the devotee away from memorial shrine space along an inauspicious approach, such as moving directly from the south instead of from the east. The auspicious approach maintains the depth of the memorial shrine space organization. The second most accessible spaces are M.2, M.4, and M.8. The least accessible shrines are M.3 and, if present during P1:1, M.9 and M.10 or M.11A. As can be seen in Figure 4.11, M.11A was likely removed prior to the construction of M.9 and M.10. M.11A would have obstructed access to M.9-10. The dates for these three structures are unknown, but they are likely from the early P1:1 phase (see Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion). The convex spaces of the memorial shrines are not places through which all devotees would freely move, although these spaces were not restricted. However, the path directed the individual to access memorial shrines from the east or brought the devotee past the
memorial shrines to M.11 and onwards. The convex spaces between and belonging to shrines M.1-M.5 and M.8 were in no way served as routes for accessing public spaces, such as M.11 or the river (non-memorial shrine features). It is clear that these convex spaces were not for devotees with un-related ‘business’ at the memorial shrines. The visual cues of the memorial shrines would have signalled their ritual nature and their restricted access.

4.1.1.6 Concluding Remarks on P1:1

When aspects of spatial organization are considered together with structural attributes of shrines, such as orientation, and accessibility, one can infer the needs and values of the community represented by the Hemakuta Hill area during P1:1. In the Manmatha Tank area, attention was clearly paid to developing close spatial organization (nucleation) of memorial shrines that consequently put priority on visibility to and from the path of movement, but not to the other surrounding landscape features. Physical proximity between shrines suggests a reflection of living social relationships. Moreover, the visibility of shrines to devotees on the path of movement proposes that visual interaction through darsan between the devotee and religious structure as embodiment of a deity or ancestor also formed part of the spatial development of the Manmatha Tank area. The shrine visibility afforded interaction and engagement with devotees to the tirtha, regardless of their family ties to the ancestors they memorialized.

The organization of the Southern Terrace indicates that this space could accommodate a range of rituals and sizes of groups, but interaction in the interior space of the shrines was of a private nature and possibly involved transgressive rituals that were impure, as the nature of Bhairava (guilty of Brahmanacide and associated with death and destruction) would suggest. It is clear that H.38 was a structure of intense social memory, as it developed according to the needs of the Saivite community throughout period 1 and 2. Bhairava’s nature, as a Saivite folk deity, suggests that he was a deity that could accommodate a range of ritual needs, regardless of a devotee’s sect.

The path of movement in the Hemakuta Hill area played a central conceptual and corporeally mediating role for the Pampa tirtha. The movement directed by the path prescribed ritual meaning and constituted an act of worship, in a similar fashion to the later imperial and
modern circumambulation of the Hemakuta Hill area (Kotecha 1982). The circumambulation of
the hill functioned to define and integrate the space. However, the linear trajectory across the hill
most likely was not the only prescribed form of movement-worship occurring at the site in
Phases 1 and 2. It is a path that connected ideas of death (south) to life (north) which may have
also been entangled with ideas of social and personal transformations in the event of death. The
ritual space of the shrines, such as the porches or any open-air place of worship past the
antarala, were not restricted in terms of visual and physical access. However, the structures with
antaralas may be precluded if worship was limited to exclusively inside-antarala worship. It
means that activities were not purposefully limited or restricted from view. Although the nature
of the spatial layout (the spaces between shrines) limited the number of participants for any one
shrine, there was an integration of the surrounding space that linked activities and promoted a
high degree of accessibility. From the path of movement traversing the east side of the shrines, it
is clear that the shrines were arranged for accessibility as their dominant organizational
characteristic. They maintained a shallow east-west expansion, hemmed in by the “last stop”,
M.11, before the devotee could access the river. The path of movement through the Manmatha
Tank area significantly ordered the space by connecting the entire site. It tied together the terrace
spaces but also mediated the experiences and interactions of the devotees with the other features
of the site.

Although the Hemakuta Hill area was a site of death-related pilgrimage activity, a
cremation area, as a ritually constituted and recognized space associated within the tirtha, has not
been identified for Phases 1 and 2, or the Early and Imperial Phases. However, the structures that
are within the Hemakuta Hill area can be considered as a materialization and spatialization of the
eschatological theistic beliefs that shaped death-related rituals. These structures enabled and
housed rituals which were an attempt to bring order back in a time of disorder following a death
for the community and for the universe. They were also means to transform the deceased: “the
rituals associated with death try to place the whole event within a wider, all-encompassing reality
of the cosmic world, thereby validating the social world, which…is threatened by the event of
death” (Kaushik 1976: 266). As mentioned above, during Phase 1, and to a lesser degree during
Phase 2, the Kalamukha ascetics had an influence and privileged position over the ritual life of
the area. Although they were a sect with tantric practices, there is limited information available
concerning their funerary rituals. We know more about the Vedic cremation rituals (Davis 1988) from their texts and of Saiva Tantric traditions from medieval Kashmir (Sanderson 1995). As such, both the Vedic and Kashmirian Saiva Tantric rituals have been used to interpret Phase 1 and Phase 2 post-mortem and post-cremation rituals. However, it is important to keep in mind that the Kalamukhas and Siddhantas mostly likely practiced their own local version of such rituals.

The use of space of H.38 and H.40 is a testament to the nature of the rituals practiced in the Southern Terrace: these structures were hidden in a microtopographic depression, facing west, with room for circumambulation of participants around the shrines. The South Terrace could accommodate a larger congregation and more rituals outside and inside H.38 than the tightly spaced memorial shrines in the Manmatha Tank area, or in most other terraces located on the hill. However, it is recognized that some post-cremation rituals may have been performed near the river’s edge, as can be seen in modern sraddha rituals (discussed further below) in Nepal (Mornig 2016: 186).

Pampa and her soteriological powers axially connected the liminal space of the South Terrace, associated with impure and post-mortem rituals, to the Tunghabhadra River which may also have been a site for post-cremation ritual activities. Both polar ends of the axis were concerned with transformation: the South Terrace and Hemakuta Hill were associated with transformative, yogic, and the impure, while the north end of the axis, situated at the river, may have been the site for post-cremation and liminal rituals as well, though also associated with purification through riverine, sacred waters. This axis was also reinforced and ritually reconstituted continuously through devotees travelling along the path of movement across the site.

4.1.2 Spatial-Material and Corporeal Analysis of P1:2

There is a noteworthy gap of construction activity for a couple of generations after the end of P1:1 (900 CE) until the erection of the first P1:2 structures (1050, the estimated date of M.12). There was also a break from the cult of memorial shrines in this phase. However, P1:2 was still part of the pre-Virupaksha period, and there were minor ritual changes at the site, suggesting that
the primary religious order came under control of the Kalamukhas. This also means that the break from the memorial cult took place likely due to the particular needs and values of the Kalamukha sect and their community (see Figure 4.4 for P1:2 Structural-Spatial Flow Chart). P1:2 can be characterized by its break in simple Phamsana shrines, and possibly of local groups using the site for memorial cult purposes. However, death-related activities were still a part of the function of the tirtha as seen in H.38 and M.11. These central structures were significant throughout Phases 1 and 2 and were expanded in P1:2. Shrines and small temples in Dravida architectural language were built, but they did not seem to fulfill the same memorial function as the Phamsana shrines in P1:1 or later in P2:1. While few structures for this phase were constructed, there are still general trends identifiable that characterize the P1:2 phase.

Only three new structures were built in P1:2 Manmatha Tank terrace and all of them have the identifiable Dravida architectural language. However, M.12 does not have a garbha-grha standing, and it is therefore unclear if it was built using Dravida or Phamsana. P1:2 also differs from P1:1 in that multiple shrines were expanded in P1:2, including two built in P1:1 (M.11 and H.38). M.12 proves difficult to interpret for it is missing its garbha-grha, and was only expanded later and with irregular additions during P2:2. M.7 was built and expanded in P1:2, most likely with multiple patrons contributing to the overall structure. The orientation of all the new structures in the Manmatha Tank area face slightly off of east (M.7: 106 degrees; VS: 90 degrees; M.12: 99 degrees). Therefore, the tradition and/or technique of orienting a temple in a manner similar to the original structure of the site, M.11 Pampa’s shrine, continued into the P1:2 phase. The east-south-east alignments of the three P1:2 structures also created an observable and experiential tie between M.11, the first and only other Dravida shrine at the site.

4.1.2.1 Architectural Additions

No new structures were added to the South Terrace, although as mentioned, H.38 was expanded in two episodes. First, its antarala was closed off, and then an irregularly shaped and closed mandapa was added. Since the form and architectural details of these additions were limited on this shrine/temple, it is difficult to determine the date of construction. These two expansions have been roughly assigned to P1:2 based on the appearance of mandapas at other shrines such as M.11 and M.7. The craftsmanship of the additions to H.38 were qualitatively
different than other contemporary structures from P1:1 and P1:2. Expansion b (closing off the antarala) and c (construction of the enclosed transverse rectangle mandapa) used plain and square columns projecting from the walls (AISC 195) as part of a transverse rectangle mandapa. The walls are “a single shell of horizontal courses” (AISC 194). In terms of changing religious priorities, shifts in ritual practices affected the layout of the shrine/temple plans. For instance, the mandapas of the other P1:2 temples are nine-bayed with carved free-standing columns in a precise square formation. Garimella (2002) argues that the form of the large square mandapas seen throughout the Bellary District during Phase 1-2 was a reflection of Kalamukha ritual traditions which were congregational in nature, according to the known rituals of the Pasupatas and due to the fact that the Kalamukhas were one of four groups that follow the Pasupati doctrine (Lorenzen 1972: 97 and 187). In addition, the renovations can be interpreted as signaling an increased economic stability. This could mean that the added mandapas to M.7 and M.11 were intended to provide a more defined ritual space at these public religious structures for the Kalamukhas. In addition, even more space for ritual performances were added at H.38: enclosed and irregular in form and thus not an expansion built according to a traditional shrine expansion seen elsewhere at the site. The expansions were most likely directed by the community and built by less skilled craftsmen compared to the other dynamic structures of P1:2.

4.1.2.2 New Structures and Terrace Space 2

Construction activity was focused on the Manmatha Tank area and significantly in a new terrace space. The new terrace space was located on the north slope of the Hemakuta Hill. Although it has no visual connection to the South Terrace, it does afford the views of the Manmatha Tank area. The new terrace is herein referred to as Terrace 2 and demarcated by two new shrines, H.9 and H.12. These two shrines indicate change expressed by several structural choices and the use of new space (Terrace 2 with H.9 and H.12). This development can be interpreted in two ways. Either new individuals or groups invested in the site or local individuals began to use the Hemakuta Hill area in a novel manner for social and political reasons, possibly replacing a function of the memorial shrines. The basic form of H.9 and H.12 is the same as other shrines at the site (small square garbha-grhas), so they were likely not built to cater different or expanded ritual practices. Moreover, inscriptions from P1:2 do not shed light on the
function of H.9 and H.12. Inscriptions ID 2 and ID 3 demonstrate that the Nolambas visited the site for pilgrimage during P1:2, but they did not contribute materially to the site. The original placement of inscription ID 8 remains unknown. However, it proves that by P1:2 the Pampa tirtha was a flourishing religious and educational center, receiving support from the Later Chalukyas with a locally based minister. As mentioned in Chapter 1, we know little about the extent or the nature of the control that these local elites coopted by the imperial groups as a part of their administrative structure espoused. One can argue that H.9 and H.12 were the result of a “shifting political mosaic” (Sinopoli 2003: 66) precipitated by the Later Chalukya involvement at the site. The H.12 shrine was built with the Dravida architectural language, similar to Pampa’s shrine. Unlike the latter, however, H.12 has very little architectural embellishment, particularly in its tower (sikhara). In addition, the structure lacks an antarala or porch, rather it was built on a very modest raised platform marking its entrance. Overall, the shrine has an austere appearance, akin to Phamsana architecture seen in P1:1. Thus, H.9 provides the only example of the Dravida proto-Vesara architecture mode at the site with its simple structure and antarala. The architectural language and mode show that they were not built as memorial shrines, and the space surrounding each shrine is much like the spacing between H.38 and H.40 in the South Terrace. Both groups of shrines were spaced so that there was enough room for circumambulation of each individual structure. The proxemics between the two groups of shrines also indicates that they staged public as opposed to private or memorial rituals, as they were not grouped in an Intimate or Personal phase as seen in P1:1 Manmatha Tank area. Moreover, both H.9 and H.12 were static and although, they have not been identified as memorial shrines, they were not renovated or expanded, suggesting limited generational investment.

H.9 was constructed with an easterly orientation (99 degrees east of north) with 1 degree difference from Pampa’s orientation (100 degrees east of north). However, H.12 is the first structure at the site to be built with a north orientation (6 degrees east of north). The usual north orientation no doubt conveyed distinct religious meanings while created a pronounced line-of-site between the entrance and housed deity to the Manmatha Tank area. Moreover, these two structures were situated to intercept devotees as they passed through the site on their way to the Manmatha Tank area, becoming part of the devotees corporeal experience.
Unlike the use of space in the South Terrace, devotees did not have to leave the path of movement to travel into Terrace 2 in order to access H.9 and H.12. Nor were the shrines of Terrace 2 oriented to visually restrict access to the interior for darsan with the deity. Instead, the devotee walked past H.9 and H.12 along the path of movement which provided visual access to the interior of the shrines. Terrace 2 acted as a transitional space between the South Terrace and the Manmatha Tank area. This transition was accentuated through the microtopography of the slope, for the terrace created a break in slope with soil accumulation. Moreover, the South Terrace is not visible; instead, the looming granitic outcrops dominate the view to the south. Beyond Terrace 2 to the north is a final descent of the hill into the Manmatha Tank area. Overall, Terrace 2 has open and public qualities, despite its modest shrine architecture. The space has a direct visual connection to the Manmatha Tank area while maintaining a distinctness of being conceptually and spatially separate from the other terrace areas. Notably, this terrace is not characterized by a spatial and structural organization that would have promoted an intense or charged experience of darsan that the South Terrace offers. Rather, its public accessibility is similar to the Manmatha Tank memorial shrines of P1:1. Indeed, the choice of architectural language does not suggest private/restricted use.

Besides investigating the new uses of space during P1:2, an analysis of the structural additions also sheds light on the material life of the site for this phase. In P1:2 mandapas were added to the antarala. The mandapas specific to this site and phase are open nine-bayed and highly permeable (visually and physically). Access is available from three sides of the mandapa, making the newly defined ritual space visually and physically more accessible. As an addition to a shrine, the mandapa confirms that that it was part of an aggrandizing plan, attesting to several possible changes. The addition could simply have been a means to accommodate more worshippers. It could also be done to accommodate expanding ritual needs, or simply express the authority and piety of a patron.

4.1.2.3 Manmatha Tank Terrace

The use of space in the Manmatha Tank area largely continued the practices established in P1:1. The structures were placed in Intimate to Personal proxemic distances from each other. VS was built beside M.2 and was highly visible from the path of movement into the area. Similar
to M.2, VS was also a static structure. It was oriented to 99 degrees east of north, replicating the Pampa shrine’s orientation, and it was built like the semi-dynamic M.7 based on what we can identify from the interior of the structure, as it was later engulfed by the Virupaksha Temple complex. It is clear that M.7 was positioned to be visually conspicuous to devotees moving through the *tirtha* space towards M.11. However, the devotee moving through the Manmatha Tank terrace would only be able to see a portion of the M.7 *antarala*, beyond the neighboring M.5. The addition of the *mandapa* dominated the view north on the path of movement, blocking M.11 from view completely, but the structure was situated within Personal proxemic distance from M.5 and possibly M.7A. Moreover, M.7 was built in the Rastrakuta mode, as was mostly VS, which probably also set them apart from the other structures. The function of VS within the Manmatha Tank area during P1:1 was unclear, as the Intimate-to-Personal proxemic distance from M.2 indicates that circumambulation of the shrine was impossible. However, its architectural mode suggests that it was public in nature, which would have also made it suitable for incorporation into the Virupaksha shrine. As such, M7 presents a highly public and accessible ritual space, more so than M.12 tucked away behind (to the north) of M.11 and possibly M.11A. On the other hand, several details of M.12 indicate that restriction of access was the intention of its patrons, as the placement within the terrace and that the *mandapa* was closed with only point of ingress. Physical proximity to M.11 appears to be important, but so does restriction of accessibility, physically and visually.

P1:2 unquestionably witnessed a renewed interest in the Pampa *tirtha*; the structural and spatial use of the site indicates a break with several traditions established in P1:1, the biggest of which was the cult of memorial shrines.

4.1.3 Spatial-Material and Corporeal Analysis of P2:1 and P2:2

Major changes in the ritual dimensions and material composition of the site characterized P2:1 and P2:2 due in large part to the importation of a Sanskritic deity, Virupaksha and an accompanying group of brahmans (See Figure 4.5 and 4.6 for the P2:1 and P2:2 Structural-Spatial Flow Charts). As such, both phases will be discussed in this section. During the P2:1 phase, a local group, the Sinda chiefs, established political control over the Pampa *tirtha*. They were followed by the dynasty of Kampila-ray that appeared in the Ballakunde-nadu area
epigraphic records at the end of the thirteenth century (phase P2:2). In this period, Mummadi Singeya Nayaka (~1280-1300 CE) and his son, Kampila-raya (1300-1327 CE) gained control and secured the area against the incursions by the Yadavas and the Hoysalas (Wagoner 1996: 166). The god Virupaksha, worshipped as an ascetic in the Bellary District, was integrated into the site through *hieros gamos* to the previously reigning goddess of the site, Pampa (Garimella 2002:33). Through their marriage, the potential for orthodox worship as a householder made him more accessible to multiple sects other than the non-Saiddhantikas and ascetics who did not practice marriage vows to the local religious complex. As such, Virupaksha’s arrival was accompanied by the religious order of brahmans mentioned in ID 4 (1199 CE), an inscription which records the gifting of a refectory for brahmans. Moreover, structures associated with brahmans, confirming their presence and integration into the site, can also be found in ID 10 from 1236 CE when a Hoysala king donated money to feed the brahmans in the refectory (believed to be vB). Verghese proposes that the Virupaksha cult was nurtured and developed by the Virasaivas after the Virasaiva reform movement of the twelfth century based on literary work done by local Virasaiva poets, Harihara and his nephew, Raghavanka (2000:94-96). However, Garimella argues that this was unlikely the case (2002).

The marriage of Virupaksha to Pampa was unusual for the male god whose name translates as “misformed eye” and is not known to have been married at other sites in the Bellary District where he is worshipped (Garimella 2002: 33). He presents a figure that “disregard[s] normative definitions of beauty” and is chaste, as Siva, perhaps like the Kalamukhas (Garimella 2002: 34). (Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty [1973] discusses the complex nature of Siva asceticism and eroticism in her *Asceticism and Eroticism in the Mythology of Siva*.) However, the brahmans in the Hemakuta Hill area married Virupaksha and made him more of a “householder” in their image. There are no epigraphic records at the site that connect the Kalamukhas to Virupaksha, although their co-presence with the brahmans is confirmed in inscription ID 4. It is not clear how religious life in the Hemakuta landscape was negotiated between the Kalamuka ascetics and the Saiva brahmans. The continued use of H.38 shows that death-related ritual activities and investment in the Bhairava cult was still an important aspect of the site, in addition to the revival of the memorial cults (H.18 and H.21 and possibly NFr/7). All non-Virupaksha Temple complex structures built in P2:1 and P2:2 are Phamsana shrines and temples. Moreover, the non-
Virupaksha complex structures also continued to expand in the Manmatha Tank area (M.13 and M.14 from P2:1 and NFr/7 from P2:2) and as new terrace space on the face of the Hemakuta Hill (H.30 from P2:1 and H.18 and H.21 from P2:2).

In contrast to P2:1, the cult of memorial temples gained more momentum in P2:2. The Sindas moved their royal cult of memorial temples to Pampa-tirtha from Kurugodu in P2:1, as did the Kampilis in P2:2 by Kampili-ray (Wagoner 1996: 166-167). A more focused development, in terms of resources and skilled labour, was directed to building and expanding the Virupaksha structures while transforming the Pampa-based tirtha into a Virupaksha cult center. It is difficult to identify the architectural language defining the Phase 2 Virupaksha Temple complex structures, as the existing parts from P2:1 were heavily consolidated into later additions including the original the diagnostic portion of the structure. Wagoner proves that the architectural language was probably Dravida, the same language as the Pampa shrine. However, as a temple complex with a wide range of auxiliary structures connected for worship at the main shrine, including two gateways and an ambulatory, it would have constituted an architecturally distinct space. The distinctiveness that made the Virupaksha pre-complex area visually identifiable is evident in the topographic division of its southern boundary, starting at the hill (situated at the base of the slope), and from the tightly spaced Phamsana structures to the north. In addition, only three structures developed beyond a shrine with a mandapa. Competing with the Virupaksha node of structures were three other ambitious architectural programs: the conglomeration of shrines and temples at the north end of the Manmatha Tank area (M.12-14), the Mula-Virupaksha, or H.30 temple, with associated monumental gateway H.36, and H.38 (all discussed further below).

Garimella postulates that there was indeed friction and a division of labour in effect at the site, as demonstrated in ID 4 (2002:62). This donative inscription records the gifts to the shrines of the primary deities of the site: Pampa, Bhairava, and Virupaksha. All three received substantial donations for structural renovations and whitewashing, land and funding, ritual implements, housing of local brahmans and the construction of a rest house connected to the Virupaksha Temple (different than H.36). It is understood that the agamic Saivite brahmans were continuously provisioned by patrons interested in the Virupaksha Temple constructed at the base
of the Hemakuta Hill. ID 4 indicates that provisioning for the divine trio was done on a much larger scale than the donations made by Chaudayya to his own memorial shrine deity, H.21, Immadi Rachamallesvara. The differences in the size of donations may reference the importance and division of the two different groups of priests/ascetics working in the same landscape.

Chauddya’s inscription (ID 4) illustrates that Bhairava (H.38) remained an important element of the ritual landscape from P1 into P2. In P2:1, two enclosed and self-contained square bays were added onto the mandapa (AISC 195). Then in P2:2 an irregular ambulatory was added. All additions were finalized by the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries (Wagoner 1996: 145). The irregular planning of the structure suggests a strong association with local groups. Its placement and fierce deity, Bhairava, indicates that H.38 played a significant part in indigenous funerary cult, or at least formed central part of funerary ritual activities. While the central role of Pampa began to be overshadowed by Virupaksha-associated structures and religious activities, the Hemakuta Hill area continued to function as a death-related pilgrimage center.

4.1.3.1 Structure Conglomeration: M.12, M.13, and M.14

It is clear that the cluster of temples and shrines to the north of M.11 have not been given adequate scholarly attention. This is understandable, as the cluster is a jumble of shrines and temple pieces held together by colonnades and historically overshadowed by Pampa’s temple to which it abuts. Despite the lack of epigraphic evidence, it appears that the Sinda investment at the site coincided closely with the transposition of their cult of memorial temples to Pampa tirtha, as well. Inscription ID 4 indicates that a temple was already erected by the Sinda treasurer Heggade Rechayya (Wagoner 1996: 166) to receive donations and memorial linga from Chauddy (author of the inscription) for Rachamallesvara II, a Sinda chief and referred to or divinized as “Immadi Rachamalla II”. The temple is not decisively identified, but may be M.13, as suggested by C.S. Patil due to its close stylistic resemblance to late twelfth century temples from Kurugodu, where the royal cult of memorial temples for the Sindas were initially located (1992: 131, 236). The area north of M.11, including M.12-M.13-M.14, became a distinct unit of space throughout P2. However, it was first established as a northward expansion of the Manmatha Tank area in P1:2. M.12 is significant as the first structure built during P1:2 (1050 CE), according to the stylistic dating of Wagoner (pers. comm. and 1996: 145), after a gap in
building activity at the site. M.12 marks the revival of the site, and then in P2:1, this northern Manmatha Tank node was built up through discrete construction episodes.

The M.13 Phamsana and potentially Sinda royal memorial shrine was built at the end of the twelfth century followed by M.14 and then a colonnade. The time frame for this node of development indicates that this was an ambitious architectural program belonging to a group who were establishing themselves as an important part of the sacred landscape, attempting to associate themselves with the soteriological powers of Pampa, by appropriating a major portion of the Manmatha Tank area. In effect, this was the first group of structures at the site to disregard, or possibly transgress, the established tradition of proxemics for memorial shrines. P1:1’s memorial shrine placement was fastidious in maintaining spatial organization that left at least an Intimate proxemics distance between the structures. Instead, M.14 was built to absorb and control access to M.13 by creating a double shrine. This was followed by a colonnade addition that physically and conceptually tied together M.13 and M.14 to M.12 and, most importantly, to M.11.

Initially, M.13 was situated so that it did not block the entrance to the M.12 enclosed mandapa. However, it would have been memorable for the devotee moving through the P2:1 pilgrimage, as it was the last structure to be passed before the path of movement left the Manmatha Tank terrace. Moreover, it was placed so that its eastern walls delimited the western side of the path of movement. This structure faces north, to the river, the second structure to assume this orientation. Due to its northerly orientation and through its placement up to the path of movement, it had a much greater impact on a devotee in terms of sensorial engagement, although, the M.13 structure is modest in size (at least, initially) similar to the previous Phamsana shrines. The devotee was guided to walk the length of the structure that dominated the entire view west past M.11 (see Figure 3.20 and 3.27).

This construction along the northern path of movement continued and was expanded with the building of M.14 at the end of P2:1 or the beginning of P2:2 (Wagoner 1996: 157). M14 was built as an east-facing temple with an enclosed irregular mandapa and as mentioned, it was constructed to transform M.13 into a double shrine via the connection of its mandapa to the antarala of M.13. It is peculiar that the orientation of M.14 is not complementary to M.13, as
they did not form a right angle or align in terms of their orientation, as opposed to other multiple-shrine temples (M.21 and M.18). M.13 orients fairly accurately to the north, while M.14 is oriented to the east, but deviates 17 degrees to the cardinal east. Cardinality was not a concern for the patron of M.14. However, physical association and possibly control of access to the royal memorial shrine (M.13) were clearly important. Unlike the mandapas of P1:2 but similar to M.12, the mandapa of M.14 is not easily viewed or accessible, with only one small entrance on the east side. The interior space provides an area large enough to accommodate community rituals, but the nature of the space is unusual. Garimella discusses how the open square mandapa favored across the Deccan easily permitted future expansions of a structure and that the square mandapa architectural element can be used as an index for a growing economy (2002: 41). In the Manmatha Tank area, it is unlikely that construction of a mandapa was done for expansion, due to the logistics of limited space. There are detailed architectural conventions that can be followed for temple expansion, such as an expansion along the two axes that an open mandapa could provide. Mandapas were useful spaces for Kalamukha congregational worship, at times including dance performances dedicated to a deity (Lorenzen 1972: 183), as was most likely the case at the open and square mandapas of M.11 and M.7.

The M.12-M.13-M.14 conglomeration does not elicit the same openness of Kalamukha-influenced structures, particularly in light of the Kalamukhas’ aversion to social status and caste. The M.12-M.13-M.14 conglomeration translates architecturally into a restriction of access to the interior spaces of the shrines and thus, to the sacred. As such, the conglomeration demonstrates a clear interest in restriction of darsan with the temple deities/lingas of M.13 and M.14. It is interesting to compare the conglomeration to the high accessibility of P1:2 structures of H.9 and H.12 which were also situated along the path of movement. Kalamukha-influenced shrines were open to the landscape, to bodies traversing the site, and ritual activity was highly visible in the landscape as well (except for inside the mandapa of M.11). Further into P2:2, around the late thirteenth century, an irregularly raised colonnade was built to physically and conceptually link M.12, M.13, and M.14 and connected this structure with M.11. Part of this raised platform was constructed in front of the M.12 mandapa and restricts access to most of the north side of the M.11 mandapa. The visual effect of the additions creates an unbroken line of religious structures from M.11 northwards and an enclosed ritual space.
Very few structures in the Hemakuta Hill area renovated beyond a mandapa. The exception was H.38, the Virupaksha temples, and the north Manmatha Tank conglomerate. Interestingly, M.12, M.13, and M.14 conglomeration expanded in a similar fashion as H.38—in an irregular fashion, most likely to suit the contemporary needs and through the use of the same workshop. Similarly, as will be discussed below, the closed nature of this structure group suggests an emphasis on privacy or a restriction of access. The conglomeration was completed around the same time when the Sindas lost control over Ballakundenadu (the Bellary District), which may translate as a desire to demonstrate control of sacred resources and space may have been a design choice in the face of political and military instability.

4.1.3.2 Triple-shrine Memorial Shrines: H.18 and H.21

The Sindas lost control of Ballakundenadu in 1275 to 1300 CE and were replaced by the Kampila-raya dynasty. Kampila-raya himself, succeeding after his father, became a legendary figure that defended his kingdom from the incursions of the Delhi Sultanate while also successfully expanding his boundaries during the first quarter of the fourteenth century (Wagoner 1996: 166-167). Kampila-raya was the patron of H.18, a Phamsana memorial temple of unparalleled craftsmanship built as a triple-shrine form. H.18 is located in close proximity to

Figure 4.12 View South-East of H.21. Image from Google Street View. Captured July 2015.
H.21, another triple-shrine Phamsana memorial temple, though the latter was not quite as elaborate or as large. Both were constructed at the end of P2:2. Wagoner proposes that H.21 may have been built by Kampila-rayas father, Mummadi Singeya Nayaka (1996:167), yet there is no donative inscription for the structure. However, Kampila-rayas established an inscription in his temple (inscription ID 5) specifying that H.18 was in fact a royal memorial shrine. It is safe to assume that most likely H.21 was as well. The Hemakuta Hill area appears to have therefore remained a site for royal memorial cults during the Sindas and the Kampilis.

H.18 and H.21 are located in what is referred to as Terrace 6. The terrace is not a flat, but rather an area of sloping exposed granite sheetrock bisected by the path of movement so that devotees must travel past the shrines. Significantly, the placement of the structures and the form of the landscape prevents the devotees from having physical or visual access to the interior of the shrines, and subsequently the inscription within H.18 (ID 5) (Figure 4.12). Both structures were built on raised plinths that project out from the slope of the hill so that as the devotee passed the shrines he/she lost height and needed to look up and back at the shrines to see their anterior. Both shrines face north though with less precision than M.13, and as expected, there is limited accessibility to the interior through a porch that has inward-facing benches. In this way, light can illuminate inside the structure, but devotees walking past were further restricted inwards visibility. However, the scope of the individual structures is very clear in a way that the three shrines are clearly articulated with unparalleled (for the site) and intricate sikhara elevations. These temples were also a statement of control: they controlled the form of the hill to suit royal memorial needs, patrons controlled resources and craftsmen to produce a new form of temple in the landscape, and the architectural form controlled access to a structure that provided for the well-being of deceased kin. They managed to project all this in a much different material way than the Sindas or the patrons of the conglomeration of M.12, M.13, and M.14 that created a spatial and conceptual relationship with M.11.

Similar to all other Phamsana memorial structures in the Hemakuta Hill area, H.18 and H.21 were not conducive to a ritual circumambulation. The supporting terrace does not accommodate such processions, much like the small Phamsana memorial shrines in the Manmatha Tank area. Here the plinths do not wrap around the entire shrine, only around the
The nature of the triple-shrine temple and its placement on the hill indicate that these structures were never meant to be expanded and that they were built in their final form. This also appears to be a statement of control on the part of the patrons. The temples cannot be expanded or renovated, thus only the original patron could be accredited. This could elevate the patron in the hierarchy of a family and was a social indicator of family influence for the living. Overall, the form and command of space makes it very clear that these shrines were not conceptually or politically linked to the other structures on the face of Hemakuta Hill.

4.1.3.3 The Other Virupaksha Structures: H.30 and H.36

A second Virupaksha temple was constructed in P2:1. H.30 is located on the Hemakuta Hill, slightly north of the hill apex. As has been discussed in the Chapter 3, it was designed to engage the corporeal experience of the devotee in a highly nuanced and carefully planned manner that had not been previously seen at the site. Like the later temples, such as H.18 and H.21, this temple was positioned on the Hemakuta Hill so that future expansions of the structure itself would not be feasible. Moreover, in the case of H.30, the *mandapa* was built up to the lip of a spring-fed cistern (Figure 3.29) bounded on its east side by a high-rising granite sheetrock. However, like H.38, the orientation of the structure lent itself to engineering a highly introspective, possibly intense and personal interaction/*darsan* with the housed-deity. As a solitary structure in P2:1, the shrine was situated east of the path of movement, and like H.38 and H.40, the devotee needed to purposefully enter into the terrace space, leaving the north-south

![Figure 4.13 Google Street View, view through H.36 to H.30. Image capture July 2015.](image-url)
path of movement and walking around the exterior of the temple to gain visual and physical access to the shrine. Terrace 3, much like Terrace 6 of H.18 and H.21, is characterized by an expanse of exposed granite sheetrock, although, the design of the H.30 temple suggests that it was not built to dominate space and signal political ideas of control and power linked to the patron of the temple or to the memorialized ancestors. Rather, H.30 is conspicuous for

Figure 4.14 The site plan and dominant paths of movement for P2:2.
conforming to the gentle contours of the sheetrock and was clearly designed for the devotee ritual experience. The mostly-open mandapa suggests social and corporeal accessibility. In addition, the use of the Phamsana architectural language for a Virupaksha structure is worth noting; it may have been chosen to naturalize the structure into the Hemakuta Hill area landscape. The selection of this architectural design may have further complemented the harmonious integration of the base of the temple with the bedrock.

In P2:2, approximately 1250-1325 CE, H.30 was expanded in a novel way with the application of a new architectural form of ancillary ritual structure, the Kannada Kalla Upparige (Stone Palace) or multistoried entrance pavilion (Wagoner 2001). As mentioned, the placement of H.30 on the hill prohibited it from further architectural expansions along its east-west axis. However, a monumental gateway or pavilion H.36 was erected along the south end of the north-south axis of the temple, which also served to enhance the significance of the south to north path of movement and overall axis of the site (Figure 4.13 is the view directly through H.36 to H.30 and Figure 4.14 presents the major trajectories of movement across the Hemakuta Hill). H.36 marked and mediated devotee access of the Hemakuta sacred area. It was built to be the first guided experience of the Pampa tirtha, stressing the importance of H.30 above all else through corporeal management (visual and physical direction). Wagoner points out that H.36 also functioned to lead the devotee “to a ritually defined space” much as a gopura or gateway would lead the devotee into a walled temple precinct (2001: 173). Thus, this further supports the notion that the Hemakuta Hill area was a defined and contained ritual space that the pavilion and associated temple were built to subtly command – most likely as part of a brahman-led program of integrating and naturalizing Virupaksha into the once-Pampa dominated space that had been heavily influenced and overseen by the Kalamukha ascetics. A later imperial addition of a walled enclosure, attributed to the Sangama ruler, Devaraya II (1426-1443) (identified in the Sivattattvacintamani, discussed in Filliozat and Filliozat 1988: 7-9), marks an imperial appropriation and control of the hill’s sacred space.

There are only five known examples of multistoried entrance pavilion structures, kalla upparige (stone palace), all of which are located in the Deccan. The best preserved one is located in nearby Citradurga and is useful for interpreting the original form of H.36 (2001). Wagoner
argues that these buildings were three stories tall with their ground floor walled in unlike the open mandapa-like plan that one sees today (2001). As such, in this phase, H.36 was highly visible with its three storeys, enabling a performative aspect for the devotee entering and exiting the building. However, considering that H.36 was not an open structure, the movement in it was private. Additionally, Wagoner (2001) illustrates that the structure also housed a portable murti in the upper storey, thus providing a vantage point for darsan between the god image and the tirtha. An enclosed passageway leading through the ground floor is a fairly narrow space that limited individual interaction and encouraged a type of introspection that was echoed in the architectural and spatial planning of H.30. Additionally, the pavilion conceptually resembles the eight mystic entrances into the Pampakshtetra discussed in later sthala puranas that were sought out in the landscape by Das (2006). In his work, he describes these gateways as “places fit for engaging in spiritual practices that lead to devotion, thus qualifying one to enter the sacred area” (2006: 382). Similar to H.36, they functioned to “create the proper frame of mind to comprehend the dignity of Pampakshetra and…attain proximity to Siva” (2006: 382).

The structure of H.36 can therefore be interpreted as a means for spiritually preparing the devotee’s entrance into the Hemakuta Hill space, albeit with an agenda of creating an experience that was initiated and dominated by Virupaksha. Entering this sacred space through an enclosed pavilion forced a particular type of movement and group dynamic that is akin to a single file procession, channeling the body and the gaze towards H.30. Imposing movement along their shared axis, H.36 also functioned to draw the devotee away from the South Terrace with its H.38 and H.40 structures. In pre-P2:2 phases, the devotee entered into the sacred space of the hill and crossed the width of the hill into Terrace 2 immediately and then travelled north down the hill to H.30. With H.36 in place, the function of the South Terrace was made secondary to H.30. The direction of focus away from H.38 and H.40 in Phase 2 of the site also maintains and reaffirms how Terrace 2 was a distinct unit of space that was organized by the microtopogrpahic depression.

In addition to the effects of passing through the structure, the height of the gateway and its location on the highest point of the hill establishes the structure as a major landmark for the area and would have drastically changed the way devotees conceptualized and oriented
themselves in space. H.36 visually imposes itself on the path of movement, as it is visible along much of the path and the summit and outside of the Hemakuta Hill space.

4.1.3.4 Development of the Virupaksha Temple Complex

According to the local sthala purana, Pampamahatmya (the dating for which is unclear and is based on the older Sanskrit text Skanda Purana), Virupaksha self-manifested as a linga (autochthonous or svayambhu) on the Hemakuta Hill, and upon this manifestation he was wed to Pampa and became known as Lord of Hemakuta (Garimella 2002: 31). (The Virupaksha linga on Hemakuta Hill is one of sixty-eight self-manifesting lingas.) These svayambhu lingas are said to appear through great devotion of a community and consequently functioned to affirm the sacred nature of the area (Garimella 2002: 33). As mentioned above, although, it is difficult to date most of the Hampi area sthala puranas, in the twelfth century writings of the local Virasaiva poet, Harihara (Girijia Kalyanam), the mythical union between Pampa and Virupaksha was firmly established, as was his primacy at the site (Garimella 2002: 33; Verghese 1995: 18).

A spatial examination of the development of the Phase 2 structures shows that the Pampa tirtha was significantly recalibrated to accommodate the new Virupaksha cult. The heart of the Hemakuta Hill area, conceptually and spatially, was re-organized to rest on Virupaksha, “lord of Pampa-pura” (quote from Rakshakavacha in Verghese 1995: 18). Previously, the Hemakuta Hill area was organized symbolically on a north-south axis based on the opposition between between the destructiveness represented by Bhairava/Mahakaladeva at H.38 and the salvific, life-affirming properties of the river goddess, Pampa at M.11. Moreover, the early literature detailing the marriage of Pampa to Virupaksha also implies that their cults also merged. Regardless, the south-north axis of movement through the site was still maintained throughout Phases 1 and 2.

The temple complex that developed in P2:1 likely included a shrine, a roofed colonnade ambulatory that wrapped around the south, north, and west sides of the possible shrine with a mandapa, a free-standing ceremonial gateway at the southeast corner of the ambulatory and another one at the western extension of the ambulatory (most likely leading to the area of the brahmans, just as there is currently a matha in that area), a feeding house/pillared house, a defined path from Virupaksha’s shrine to Pampa’s shrine that may have also been marked with a
free-standing ceremonial gateway, although traces of such have not been found (Wagoner 1996: 162). The construction of the major ancillary structures, such as the path/gateway between Virupaksha to Pampa, the ambulatory, as well as provisions for the brahmans were funded by the considerable investment of Chauddy (see inscription ID 4), a politically ambitious Sinda subordinate who worked to develop religious merit and prestige for the site that would subsequently benefit the Sindas and their memorialized deceased (Wagoner 1996: 165).

The organization of the gateways and ambulatory maintained the south-north flow of movement through the site, from Terrace 2 to the river. In fact, the Virupaksha structures were situated to the west of the path of movement which passed along the east side of the Manmatha Tank similar to the earlier Manmatha Tank structures. The orientation of the entire Virupaksha Temple complex is recorded by Fritz and Malville (2006 B: 419) as having an azimuth of less than 5 degrees from true east, thus establishing a tradition carried on into the Imperial Phase of large temples adopting cardinal orientations (or very close to true cardinality). It is unclear if this orientation was mimicked from Phases 1 and 2 structures or if it was refined over time. Regardless, other Phase 2 structures have orientations that diverge from cardinality by more than 5 degrees, as did Phase 1 structures, but with one exception. The exception is M.13, recorded as 4 degrees from north.

As Virupaksha was adopted as the tutelary deity for the Sangamas (and subsequently by other dynasties), his temple also came to represent those rulers. In a similar fashion, M.13, potentially a royal memorial shrine, represented Sinda rulers. Notably, the connection between royalty and the M.13 shrine pre-dates the appearance of the Sangamas and their appropriation of the Virupaksha Temple. A true cardinal orientation, in as much as architectural and astronomical tools and skills made possible, generates and connects the deity and the ruler with cosmological order.

There is one outlier to the Manmatha Tank structures from the P2 phases: NFr/7. It is a simple Phamsana memorial shrine with an antarala. What distinguishes this structure from the others is that it was constructed alone on the north side of the Manmatha Tank and it is oriented west. It is a static structure and appears to have been constructed with memorial or death-related functions. It may be that this new north space was chosen for development, because the
Manmatha Tank area to the west of the tank and southwards through the Virupaksha construction was completely filled. As such, NFr/7 was situated off the path of movement to the east and was visually and physically accessible to the devotees moving towards the river, similar to the other memorial shrines from P1. This shrine, however, was the final free-standing single-shrine Phamsana memorial structure to be built during Phase 1 and 2.

As NFr/7 is the only structure to have been built in this new space, one can argue that the construction of memorial shrines was restricted and/or halted from P2:2 into the Early Imperial Phase north of the large Virupaksha temple. Garimella’s work on the imperial development of the Virupaksha Temple complex indicates that the new Sangama rulers who adopted Virupaksha as their patron and state deity (*kula-devata*, see *Epigraphia Carnatica*, Vol. VIII, Sb. 375 in Verghese 2000:97) were concerned with creating a ritual environment worthy of a god with such a role. Eventually, this lead to restricting the development on the Hemakuta Hill and the construction of other Virupaksha shrines in the city, and they did not adopt any of the previously used structural themes associated with memorial temples at their site (e.g. triple-shrine temples, Phamsana architectural language). Their eventual concern with the inauspiciousness of death at the site and in connection to the state deity may have consequently forced a restriction on the development of memorial shrines near the temple/Manmatha Tank. This seems to be the case since Virupaksha temple expansion would cut off the south-north axis at the site during the imperial period and the ties between Bhairava and Pampa in favor of focusing on an east-west axis that the imperial rulers developed for Virupaksha (discussed in Section 4.1.4).

### 4.1.4 Early Sangama Spatial Reorganization of the Hemakuta Hill and Virupaksha Space

Wagoner has identified three major expansion stages during the Sangama period which reorganized the sacred space of the Hemakuta Hill area and delineated the Virupaksha temple space (the temple at the foot of the Hemakuta Hill) as the abode of a deity as large as the expansionist ambitions of the Sangama rulers (2006: 14). The first reorganization was a true demarcation of the Virupaksha space as separate from the Hemakuta Hill through the construction of a colonnade cloister (*malika*). Devotees passed from the Hemakuta Hill space through gateway H.7, a *kalla upparige* (discussed further in Section 4.3.3.), with an associated
Figure 4.15. The addition of the cloister, H.7 and associated structures to the Hemakuta Hill and Virupaksha space. Structures from Post P2:2 have been assigned unique colors.
Figure 4.16. Detail of the Cloister, H.7, and associated structures. Structures from Post P2:2 have been assigned unique colors.
monolithic lamp pillar (H.5), into a demarcated Virupaksha temple space. The cloister (H.2) followed the northern-most contours and boundary of the hill that a series of structures aligned east to west previously delineated (Figure 4.15 and 4.16). It is not clear how far the colonnade originally extended or wrapped around the Virupaksha space, but what portions are remaining run the length of the south side of the current Virupaksha temple complex precinct walls (prakara) (180 meters), visible in Figure 4.18 (Wagoner 2006: 16). In the extant portions, the cloister is one bay deep with columns forming north and south-facing walls. However, the south-facing wall, visible to the Hemakuta Hill, is filled in with horizontal slabs set between the pillars (AISC 157). (A view of the cloister from the north is not attainable from Google imagery; however, plates 485 and 486 in the AISC have captured this view.) According to epigraphic evidence, H.7 and H.2 (colonnade cloister) were built between 1385 to 1400 CE (Wagoner 2001: 178). Both of the “stone palace” gateways on the Hemakuta Hill, H.7 and H.36, were positioned south of the temple and guided the south-to-north flow of movement through the site towards

Figure 4.17 Google Earth image of H.2, H.7, H.5, H.6, and H.9 that were used in the first phase of spatial reorganization of the Virupaksha and Hemakuta Hill space.
Virupaksha-associated structures. Simultaneously, however, H.2 (the cloister) established a new axis of movement to the site, the east-to-west movement into the Virupaksha temple space.

Nucleated around the H.7 gateway and stretching to the east along the crest of the hill are a series of small north-north-east facing shrines and temples: H.3, H.4, H.6, and H.8 (respectively 20, 24, 34, and 27 degrees east of north). Before the construction of H.2 and H.7, the H.3 and H.4, H.6 and H.8 structures formed the southern-most boundary on the Hemakuta Hill slope. Their accessibility was drastically altered from the path of movement through their incorporation into a new and non-permeable cloister boundary between the space of the hill and the space of Virupaksha (H.2). Access was restricted through east-west movement across the north side of the cloister, comparable to the movement into the Virupaksha space that would develop in the second spatial reorganization of Virupaksha space. The path of movement that originally followed the natural microtopographic features of the hill, past H.9 and down through gate vC (during P2:1), was channeled through H.7 (see Figure 4.17) and past the structures that were incorporated into H.2. The stairs leading from a northern terrace of H.7 guided the devotee towards the Virupaksha space but does not line up with vC, or suggest a natural flow of movement through one into the other, even though the northern-most stairs of H.7 are approximately six meters from the entrance of vC (see Figure 4.16). The choice to angle and place H.7 in a way that does not continue a natural flow of movement to vC suggests that H.7 was purposefully aligned with a landscape feature. Wagoner suggests the angle of H.7 was to create a visual alignment with Matanga Hill to the east (see Figure 4.19) (AISC 160), and the hill is strikingly framed between H.7 and H.9. Although H.7 does guide movement south-to-north, the east-west axis of the structure is roughly aligned with Matanga Hill at 112 degrees from east.

The second stage of Virupaksha spatial reorganization is the construction of a high prakara wall that surrounds the entire temple complex, visible in Figures 4.18 and serves as the outline for the temple complex, as illustrated in Figure 4.15 (Wagoner 2006: 15). The south side of the wall was built approximately three meters from the colonnade cloister (H.2) (AISC 160) and restricted physical access to the shrines H.6 and H.8 (entrances faced north-east: 34 and
Figure 4.18. Google Street View of H.2, H.7, and Virupaksha prakara walls. Image capture July 2015.

Figure 4.19. Google Street View of the visual alignment of H.7 to Matanga Hill. Image capture July 2015.
27 degrees east of north), visible in Figure 4.15. Consequently, visibility and physical access to H.8, H.6, H.3, and H.4 were also restricted. The prakara wall of the Virupaksha compound blocked off visibility from the hill to the Virupaksha structures and the Manmatha Tank area. The dominant path of movement into the Virupaksha space became east-to-west. However, south-north movement through the Hemakuta Hill area was not cut off. Rather, if a devotee was moving from south to north, they were immediately channeled from H.7 into the Virupaksha space through vC, which was incorporated into the prakara. The prakara signals that the older and original southnorth axis of movement through the Pampa tirtha, connecting Bhairava to Pampa, was being challenged: the devotee could move south to north or choose to move east to west through the Virupaksha temple and then exit the complex from the north to continue towards the river. Some features were built to maintain the north-south axis inside the temple complex: a north gopura V (gateway with towering superstructure) was built into the prakara, in

Figure 4.20 Google Street View of Gateway M.15 and NFr/6. Image captured July 2015.
line with vC and two other contemporaneous gateways, M.15 and NFr/6 (see Figure 4.21). M.15 marks the northernmost point of the Manmatha Tank area. NFr/6 is located north of M.15, but

Figure 4.21 Paths of movement and site plan from Phase 2 and 3. Spatial reorganization of Hemakuta Hill Area during the Early Imperial Phase.
the entryways do not lineup, and as such, there is no line of sight out to the river created between the two structures. The intentional obstruction of sightlines and slight reconfiguring of the path of movement echoes the arrangement of H.7 to vC. It seems likely that the offsets of closely placed gateways were a signal of entering and leaving distinct spaces, mediated directly by Virupaksha. Therefore, the intention of the architectural planners was not to simply maintain the south-north alignment through the site. The continued development and acknowledgment of the south-north axis was intentional into the second phase of spatial reorganization (an exact date for this phase is not clear), the passage through these structures maintains the original flow of movement of the site.

By the third phase of spatial reorganization in the mid-fifteenth century, the original organization and movement through the site became firmly dominated by the royal deity of the Sangamas, Virupaksha, and the imperial activities that occurred in his temple complex (see Garimella 2002 for an extended discussion of the development of Virupaksha temple complex architecture and rituals; Wagoner 2001:13-23). In this phase, the vC gateway was closed off, stopping the flow from the south into the Virupaksha complex (see Figure 4.21) effectively compartmentalizing the ritual practices occurring on the Hemakuta Hill and in the Manmatha Tank area. The devotee was made to move through and experience the large scale and bounded Virupaksha space (Wagoner 2001:16). Furthermore, perimeter walls bounding the ritual space of the Hemakuta Hill were constructed at this point or during the second phase (Brubaker 2004: 170), with additional gateways restricting access and flow through space (H.42 and H.1). The Hemakuta Hill perimeter wall and the prakara is roughly dated to the first half of the fifteenth century based on the Sivattattvacintamani document in which the Sangama ruler, Devaraya II, is noted to have funded both structures (discussed by Brubaker 2004: 170 and Filliozat and Filliozat 1988: 7-9). However, it is unclear if the prakara and the perimeter wall of the hill were constructed at the same time or formed two separate phases as proposed by Wagoner (the second and third phase) of spatial reorganization of the Hemakuta Hill area. Regardless, the ritual use of Hemakuta Hill continued during phase three, and there was sustained recognition of the space as ritually potent, observable in oral and mythic traditions that have continued to today but also in the appropriation of the Hemakuta Hill as the site for early Sangama memorial shrines. In several versions of the local mythic cycle, identified by Wagoner in modern oral traditions and some
variations of the *sthala purana, Pampamahatme* (1991: 147; 2001: 13), the Hemakuta Hill was recognized as a powerful space where Virupaksha conducted his ascetic practices. Likewise, from the 1330s into the early fifteenth century, the Sangamas constructed four multiple-shrine royal memorial temples: H.10, 15, 19, and 20 (Wagoner 2001: 19). These four shrines are situated around the first royal memorial shrine of the site, H.18, in Terrace 6 (discussed in Section 4.32), even though the Hemakuta Hill was also a site associated with Bhairava and impure rituals performed by non-Sairedhantika sects. The closing of the vC gateway ultimately shut down the physical and most likely, the ritual relationship between Bhairava and Pampa. By the mid-fifteenth century, Pampa was firmly and solely tied to Virupaksha, and through Virupaksha, she was tied to the Sangamas, as can be seen in the new path of movement that incorporated her original shrine, leading out to the river: the devotee can pass through the Hemakuta Hill space but then must cross through the Virupaksha space, east to west, through high prakara walls that restrict any line of sight beyond the complex, and then finish the path northwards through gateway V, M.15, and finally, through NFr/6 (Figure 4.21).

4.2 Ritual Theory: Funerary Rites and Associated Pilgrimage

The South Terrace of H.38 and H.40 was a space for introspection and impure rituals in which social role markers could be suspended in the face of loss of loved-ones. It was the ultimate liminal space for changes in status or resistance to take place, particularly due to its liminal physical nature within a pilgrimage space. Indeed, the pilgrimage space of Pampa *tirtha* can also be considered a liminal space. The theoretical concept of liminality was first introduced in 1909 by Arnold Van Gennep in his seminal work, *Les Rites de Passage*, in which he describes rites of passage, the process of shifting from one social status to another, such as coming-of-age rituals, marriage, and death, as having a three-part structure: separation, a liminal period, and then re-assimilation (1960). The initiate is first stripped of the social status that he or she possessed before the ritual, then inducted into a liminal period of transition, and finally given his or her new status. The achievement of the new status re-assimilates initiates into society at the end of this process.

It was not until the second half of the twentieth century, though, that the terms “liminal” and “liminality” gained popularity through the writings of Victor Turner (1967; 1969). Turner
focused primarily on this transitional phase which he described as a state that is “betwixt and between” in reference to pilgrimage. As “betwixt and between” suggests, liminality becomes a theory of a ritual stage during which participants are detached from their ordinary social routines and enter into a transition state in which emotionally, physically, and socially, they are between two sets of identities. Structure, as presented by “law, custom, convention, and ceremony” (1969: 95) is no longer applicable in the temporary liminal state and the term that describes this state of anti-structure is *communitas* in which individuals within a community feel a oneness (equality) together as social structures disappear. Pilgrimage is also considered to be a liminal phase, like an extended rite of passage, with the release from everyday structure that enables the removal of social differences to allow for healing and renewal through *communitas*. The liminal phase of pilgrimage is temporary, namely the individual(s) who enter into it emerge back into structure and society at the end. Eade and Sallnow (1991) and Coleman (2002), as well as many other scholars (such as Sallnow 1981, Morinis 1984, Van der Veer 1984), have demonstrated that Turner’s anti-structure rarely ever exists in a pilgrimage setting and have accused Turner of “theological idealism” (Coleman 2002:356). For this reason, “pilgrimage as an institution cannot actually be understood as a universal or homogeneous phenomenon but should instead be deconstructed into historically and culturally specific instances” (Coleman paraphrasing Eade and Sallnow 1991: 3).

An analysis of the material world combined with textual interpretation can advance our understanding the ritual and social uses of the site for the early phases of pilgrimage activity in the Hemakuta Hill area, including the configuration of the space and the types of structures built. However, identifying where, how often, and what specific rituals were executed can prove especially difficult. Prescriptive medieval texts outlining Vedic (Davis 1988) and Siddhanta doctrines and soteriology (Sanderson 1995), have been used to establish a general structure for Saiva funerary rituals by Mirnig (2016): the rite to separate the soul from the physical body, the rites to ritually cremate the corpse (which likely occurred off site as no evidence of cremation activities have been linked to the Hemakuta Hill area), rituals that include offerings of food and water for the deceased to generate a new body (*sraddha*-type rituals), and rites to transform the deceased and integrate him/her into the world of ancestors were practiced at the site (2016:189). Those rituals that took place post-cremation were present from P1:1 into the Early Imperial
Phase at the site and thus can be situated in the Hemakuta Hill area. Figure 4.22 presents a table of post-mortem and post-cremation Saiva rites, compiled from the work of Sanderson (1995) and Mornig (2016), most likely performed in the Hemakuta Hill area by Saiva Tantric initiates, including their suspected locations for performance based on ritual needs (such as water) and whether the kin of the deceased were considered to be in a period of impurity (post-cremation and prior to the liberation of the soul). One area that Wagoner (1996) and I have identified as an acceptable space for impure rituals, or rituals performed by the impure, is the South Terrace. Due to the cleansing properties of a sacred river, I also include the Tungabhadra River as another potential locale for impure rituals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-cremation Post-mortem Saiva Rituals</th>
<th>Known or Suspected Locations for Performance of Rituals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kin of the deceased bathe and pour libations for the deceased.</td>
<td>Tirtha: Tungabhadra River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purification rites for the kin of the deceased</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-mortem offerings for the deceased (sraddha-like rituals): Vavasraddha and Ekoddistasraddha</td>
<td>Tirtha: South Terrace, Tungabhadra River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rites for the integration of the deceased into the ancestral line of Siva manifestations: Sapindikarana or Saivasapindikaranam</td>
<td>Tirtha: South Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-mortem offerings for the ancestor line: Sraddha</td>
<td>Tirtha: Tungabhadra River or South Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rite to Rescue the Dead: mṛtoddharaḥ</td>
<td>Tirtha: South Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sakta Lamp sraddha: Sivadipasraddham, saktasraddham</td>
<td>Tirtha: South Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly offerings for the ancestor line: Sraddha</td>
<td>Tirtha: Tungabhadra River, memorial shrines, or South Terrace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.22 Table of post-mortem and post-cremation Saiva rites.
Specific to the medieval Saiva Tantric traditions, Sanderson’s (1995) work on rituals from Kashmir notes a range of post-mortem and post-cremation rituals that may also have been performed at the Pampa *tirtha*: the Rite to Rescue the Dead (*mrtoddharah*) through which individuals that died an impure death could be rescued from the hells so that they could receive proper funerary and post-funerary rites that were subsequently performed for them over several days, as well as the *sakta* Lamp *sraddha* (*Sivadipasraddham, saktasraddham*) wherein the deceased is named as the embodiment of Bhairava (1995: 32-35). In addition, there were *sraddha* rites that consisted of ancestor [*pitr*] offerings and worship, a common rite of both orthodox and heterodox traditions, wherein the living provided sustenance to the deceased soul in order to sustain and appease the ghost before it was liberated into the ancestor line.

Additionally, the souls of three generations of paternal ancestors were propitiated through yearly *sraddha* rites. Upon death, the eldest paternal ancestor, the great grandfather is released from the triad of ancestors for the father to become the grandfather, the grandfather to become the great grandfather, and the newly deceased to become the father for his living son to worship (Blackburn 1985: 264; Olivelle 2012: 66). Concern with multiple generations of paternal ancestors is best illustrated in P2:2 with the memorial shrine H.18, which was dedicated to the memorialization of the patron’s father and grandfather (and mother) (ID 5). This is not to suggest that only men were memorialized in P1:1, but that only those influential individuals had their shrines constructed for memorialization by individuals also with influence. It is very likely that the Saiva Tantric communities in the Hemakuta Hill area practiced similar, if not the same rites outlined by Sanderson (1995) for their dead. However, it is unclear how such rites as *sraddha* were practiced by the Kalamukha ascetics. For example, the Kalamukhas did not traditionally consume typical food offerings from *sraddha* rites, as they vowed a restriction of subsistence for bodily function in addition to celibacy, truthfulness, non-injury, and non-theft (Lorenzen 1972: 81). Nonetheless, it may be postulated that death-related rites considered impure, particularly during the period in which the family was within an impure post-cremation phase and before the dead was incorporated into the world of the ancestors (signaled by the *Saivasapindikaranam* rite), would have taken place in the southernmost terrace and H.38 or at the river. The rites that can be identified as taking place during the impure and transitional phase included feeding the dead. Those post-mortem rites were not considered impure, outside of the impure period after
death when the deceased transitioned out of ghosthood (from the point of cremation when the soul of the deceased is believed to have left the body and is a ghost [preta]), such as yearly sraddha rites to memorial shrines, for those families that were able to afford it (Mornig 2016: 190).

Several authors have pointed out the paradoxical nature of Saivite funerals and understanding of the state of the soul upon death in that according to medieval Saivite Tantrism, the soul is liberated at death (or before) to achieve godhood due to initiation rituals performed while alive (to become equal with or identify with Siva [Sanderson 1995; 25-26]) (Mirmig 2016 187-188; Olivelle 2012; Sanderson 1995). However, there was a parallel orthodox investiture in which the soul was also thought to be separated from its earthly body, entering into a state of ghosthood and thus necessitating the living family to work for its care and transformation into an ancestor, a tradition carried over from the Vedic period (ca. 1500-500 BCE) (Mirmig 2016: 188). Following or before the incineration, a second initiation rite for the liberation of the soul is performed. In this latter process, who and how individuals are released for liberation varies according to religious sect. (For a complete theological discussion of the Vedic versus the Saivite understanding of death and ritual actions, see Davis 1988. For a historical discussion of the Saivite Siddhantas, see Davis 2000.) However, the Siddhantas negotiated the paradox of the state of the soul and resolved that with the help of the rites of incorporation into his/her ancestral line, the ghost soul joined his/her ancestors that were degrees of manifestations of Siva.

This research is concerned with the rituals performed after the incineration of the corpse, as many of these activities would have been executed in the Hemakuta Hill area. We know that a group of kin associated with a deceased person travel to a “suitable tirtha” for libations and foods to be offered for the deceased. From the point of entering into an impure state with the cremation of the corpse, the kin of the deceased also entered into a liminal phase known as the period of death-impurity (Davis 1988: 46). This period of impurity (asauca), affecting those related to the deceased, necessitates social isolation and restriction from regular ritual and daily activities (Mirmig 2016: 198). Libations were a customary part of post-cremation rituals and consisted of a simple gesture in which the devotee/kin bathe and cup water in their hands and let it flow back out to the source (Lochtefeld 2010: 32), wishing the deceased join the divinities (Davis 1988: 47). Considering that libations were also a customary pilgrimage rite, we can say
that two ends of the Hemakuta Hill area, south and north, death and life, appear to have been connected through the needs of funerary rites and through the movement that this spatial ordering generates.

The few inscriptions available for the site (Appendix C) detail religious donations, most likely commemorating post-cremation and/or sraddha-type rites and offerings for ancestors of the patron (ID 1 through ID 8). It is unclear where specifically the various sraddha rites were practiced, though, they are mentioned in the *Pampamahatmayam* (parts of which are dated to the eleventh through mid-sixteenth century) in association with conceptual south-east and south-west gateways leading into the Pampa *tirtha* (Das 2006: 387-388, 394). These rituals do not appear to have been associated with memorial shrines. Rather, the shrines, as embodied ancestors, were situated in areas associated with life and with access to the purifying capabilities of the Manmatha Tank and Pampa. In other words, memorial shrines were kept spatially and visually separate from the activities of the South Terrace and opted for visual accessibility and/or proximity to the Pampa Shrine. The location of memorial shrines further confirms that ritual activities in the South Terrace were conceptually associated with funerary, and/or impure death related rituals, as opposed to the Manmatha Tank area. Rituals such as *sapindikarana*, or rite of initiation as the second rite of liberation according to the Tantric Saiva tradition, in which the soul of the deceased is transformed from the liminal state of a ghost into an ancestor and/or godhood, performed after a period of post-cremation that varies by tradition (Das 1976:256; Mornig 2016: 191; Sanderson 1995: 34). Such a rite would have been appropriately performed in the South Terrace, due to its liminal nature and association with the river. Additionally, it may have been performed with the cremation rites, as is suggested by Mornig (2016: 191) based on the eleventh century Saiddhantika ritual manual *Somashambhupaddhati* [or *Kriyakandakramavali*], by Somashambhu.

4.2.1 Communitas and Thirdspace

Kin-based post-mortem rites, both at the site of cremation and afterward at the *tirtha*, created a sense of *communitas*, signaling the liminal state of the living, in reconstituting their world in the face of death and as a period of transition for the dead during their passage to the ancestral line and liberation into godhood (for Saivites). The sense of *communitas* may have also
been further intensified among the mourners through rites specific to that group or caste (Kaushik 1976), the various sraddha-like rites in which the ghost of the deceased is nourished, and also through their shared impure status and state of antistucture. However, all mourners among the group of kin were not equal in that the individual designated to receive the deceased’s inheritance was the chief mourner (Olivelle 2012). Therefore, the Hemakuta Hill area, as the post-cremation tirtha, provided a platform for the negotiation of identity and social reorganization. Similar to Turner’s view of liminality as a rite of passage, these funerary rites were obligatory (necessary for the well-being of the deceased), and yet fostered a sense of unity through kin-relationships to the deceased, possibly creating a sense of group identity. Moreover, both the identities of the smaller group to one another and the larger community were reconfigured by the end of the rites. Individuals from the kin group emerged from the liminal phase (rite of passage) with new social roles, and reoriented themselves accordingly.

Overall, Turner’s model of social structure versus anti-structure in pilgrimage, specifically a pilgrimage associated with funerary rites and ancestor worship is not a simple dichotomy, regardless of the anti-caste teachings of the Kalamukha ascetics. Funerary rites and ancestor worship in the Hemakuta Hill area were inevitably based on lineage/kinship and social hierarchy, and sometimes materialized in memorial shrines. However, while general pilgrimage rites at a tirtha can generate a sense of communitas between worshippers as Van der Veer argues for the pilgrimage site of Aayodhya (1984), in the Hemakuta Hill area, the communitas was most likely generated between those of the same social (caste) group – such as between pilgrims performing funerary rites together or between those who had or did not have a memorial shrine to practice ancestor worship (sraddha). Differences between social and possibly ritual groups are materially manifested in terms of patronage of memorial shrines. Differences are also expressed through the performances of rites, along with the shrines, that would have been visible to other devotees travelling through the Hemakuta space. However, as discussed below, the performative aspect of the Hemakuta Hill area differs significantly from that of the Manmatha Tank area.

Identification of the South Terrace as a thirdspace allows us to examine its transformative capabilities, at once real and imagined, and deeply entrenched with symbolisms of purity and impurity that mediated ontological negotiations of life, death, salvation and damnation. The
primary structure of the South Terrace, H.38, was in a constant state of expansion, according to the ritual and social needs of the devotee community. The structure transformed over time, materializing the transformative powers of the terrace and of the Pampa tirtha. The South Terrace can also be considered a Lived space, according to Lefebvre trialectics of space, in that as a whole it is a liminal and transgressive space. In addition, H.38 developed over the course of Phase 1 and 2 to increasingly induce introspective and heightened embodied experiences best represented through the myriad of access patterns of the structure. The transformative capabilities of the Hemakuta Hill, as indexed by Siva’s yogic practices in the Pampamahatmyam, could be most strongly felt in the South Terrace and consequently were harnessed for transformative post-mortem rights for the dead and remaining kin. However, the transformative capabilities of the South Terrace, as harnessed by the post-mortem rights at H.38, were also founded on an interdependence and relationality between the living and the dead. Indeed, the space of the South Terrace “cemented intersubjective social dependencies” (Swenson 2012: 17). In order for the living to transition out of the liminal period of post-cremation impurity back into a reconfigured everyday (pure) social world and in order for the dead to move beyond ghosthood to that of ancestor or godhood, the living (kin of the deceased) and a priest must unite to perform the prescribed rituals and act without transgressions for the period of transformation. For the prescribed actions of the kin, during the prolonged liminal period, each actor/kin would consistently be faced with the decision for proper behavior to maintain efficacy of post-mortem rituals culminating in personal social and identity change. Transgression and resistance to social change within the liminal afforded additional opportunities for participant awareness of the social deconstruction and the forging of new identities. However, it is unclear to what extent the post-mortem rituals could be negotiated in terms of where they could be performed, which rituals needed to be performed, and how often for success.

Intimately tied to individual spiritual transformation is the conception of the Hemakuta Hill in the Pampamahatmyam. In this text, the hill is ascribed with potent transformative powers, where Siva performed his own meditations (yogah). Likewise, Saiva Tantric rituals include meditations, a tradition of yogic practices that were essential “strategies for transforming the body to achieve salvation” (Morley 2008: 155). Additionally, heteroprax ritual practices, those practiced by the non-Saiddhantikas such as the Kalamukhas and the Kapalikas, could include
consumption of impure substances (e.g. alcohol, flesh). Such rituals would only have been performable in the Southern Terrace space, and in the Bhairava temple (H.38). By exposing themselves to substances viewed as impure by the orthodox (and the Siddhantas), the non-Saiddhantikas believed that they opened themselves to the possibility of transcendence and expanded their consciousness: “the initiate empowers himself to experience sudden enlightenment (alamgrasah)…Transgression, then, is translated into transcendence” (Sanderson 1995: 85-86). Such individual practices suggest a level of personal autonomy in terms of achieving liberation. However, as the ordering of types of ritual space in the Hemakuta Hill area suggests, the transformation of the self was intimately tied to specific spaces, and upon death, it was also inescapably integrated with familial relationships and their identities.

4.3 Mythological Associations with Matanga Hill

The conceptual and spatial a relationship of the Matanga Hill to the Phase 1-2 monuments on the Hemakuta Hill has been tentatively established in this work as early as P1:1. However, the imperial gateway, H.42, concretely establishes intentional visual and physical alignment (discussed further below). Matanga plays a special role in the Ramayana as an ascetic with a hermitage where Rama stops before he visits the monkey kingdom to secure an alliance with Sugriva permitting him to locate Ravana. It is at Matanga’s hermitage that, upon instructions of Matanga, a mendicant woman named Sabari waits to gaze upon Rama at which point she is able to transcend this world and move onto heaven with the rest of the sages from the hermitage (Hiltebeitel 1980: 202). What stands out in this part of the epic is that Sabari offers herself to flames and through simply the sight of Rama and the “powers of Matanga”, she achieves liberation after death. These purifying and salvific properties of Rama and Matanga are powers similar to those associated with the Pampa-tirtha and Varanasi/Ganges pilgrimages. By appropriating Matanga, the primacy of Pampa’s role at the tirtha was once again diminished in favor of emplacing figures from the Ramayana into the Vijayanagara imperial space. Associations of the landscape with Rama (the ideal god king) and the Ramayana were part of a continuous program of elevating the status of the once-local tirtha to a space fit for imperial rulers who used it for legitimation of power.
It is unclear when the tallest hill of the broader landscape and horizon near the Hemakuta Hill area became associated with the Ramayana and Matanga (both the hill and the figure from the Ramayana). However, the Matanga Hill’s conceptual integration into the fabric of the site did occur with the development of the Virupaksha Temple complex in P2:1. It was most likely also at this point that he was incorporated into the mythological Sanskritization of the Pampa through her marriage to Virupaksha (circa twelfth century CE), which is part of local oral tradition even today. In the oral account recorded by Wagoner (1991: 147) and mentioned in the 1585 CE text, *Channabasava Purana*, Matanga is the father of Pampa and his hermitage is located on the apex of the Matanga Hill. The version in the *Channabasava Purana*, however, does not discuss the Matanga Hill and references Pampa and Virupaksha as Parvati and Siva and explains how they came to be married. She goes to the river every day and retrieves water for ritual use at the hermitage, right at the point in the river below the Hemakuta Hill. One day she spies Virupaksha, practicing his asceticism at the peak of the Hemakuta Hill and falls in love with him. With the help of the god of love, Manmatha, and by practicing severe austerities, he falls in love with her as well. The sighting of Virupaksha, at the apex of the Hemakuta Hill according to this version of the Pampa-Virupaksha myth/ *sthala purana*, may have been tied to the P2:2 construction of the monumental entrance pavilion, H.36, that housed the mobile idol of Virupaksha in the second storey for devotees and for the purposes of *darsan*. Placement of a structure at the apex and the most visible point of the Hemakuta Hill in order to elevate and show the idol (in addition to shaping devotee experience in space) works well with the oral tradition of Virupaksha practicing asceticism at the peak from whence Pampa, down by the river, could see him. It is clear that by the early fifteenth century CE at the latest, there was an established hermitage on the peak of Matanga (discussed in the text *Pampasthana Varnanam*, 1430 [Dallapiccola 2003: 24-25]). Moreover, *sthala puranas* written later, such as the 1509-1529 text, *Shri Krishnadevarayana Dinachari*, depicting the mythological siting of the city of Vijayanagara by the sage Vidyaranya mentions the association of the hill top with sage Matanga from the Ramayana (Dallapiccola 2003: 24). Matanga was most likely part of a package of new Ramayana sites that were emplaced from the twelfth century CE onwards: Matanga as Pampa’s father, and Virupaksha as the object of Pampa’s affections/marriage partner.
4.3.1 Landscape Alignments

Malville and Fritz’s (1993; 1996; 2006a) research points out that the Virupaksha Temple complex was constructed off of true cardinality by 5 degrees. It was also built at an intersection of two lines, one between the Hemakuta Hill and the Tungabhadra River and the other between the Matanga Hill and Malyavanta Hill (Malville and Fritz 2006a:364). The location for the temple complex permits the overall structure to fall along the two large and mythically imbued environments, ordering the landscape and naturalizing its power. However, the connection between the Virupaksha Temple and the Matanga Hill to the Malyavanta Hill axis appears to have been a conscious initiative during the imperial developments of the temple, particularly with a longitudinal expansion east-west axis. An east-west expansion during the Imperial Phase functioned well for the space of the temple, as it is restricted on the north by the Manmatha Tank area and on the south by the topography of the Hemakuta Hill. By expanding east-west during the imperial period (P3), the temple cut off and redirected the flow of south-north movement, which materialized the central role and importance of the Bhairava and Pampa for the death-related tirtha. An east-west expansion also allowed for the structure to intercept the axis of Matanga to Malyavanta: “As measured from the roof of Virabhada temple just above the shrine the gopuram of the Prasanna Malyavanta temple has an azimuth of 111° 35’. Exactly opposite lies Virupaksha temple” (Malville and Fritz 1996: 225). The portion of the Virupaksha Temple used for measuring this alignment is the top of the superstructure of the inner gateway to the temple compound (the inner gopura is recorded as E in the AISC [118]) (1996: 225). This feature was not in place during Phase 1-2, but constructed in 1510 according an edict recorded in an inscription on Krishnadevaraya’s coronation (No. 106 from Patil and Patil 1995: xx, xxiv). It is considerably east of the Virupaksha structures of P2:1 by approximately 70 meters. In effect, the importance and expansion of the sacred space of the Hemakuta Hill area to include the Malyavanta Hill, and thereby the alignment to the Matanga Hill were not structurally established until the mid-Sangama period, when the Raghunatha temple core was first established. This temple core was part of an extensive program of infusing the Vijayanagara landscape with imagery and events from the Ramayana that continued throughout the imperial period.

The Sangama period spanned from 1336-1485. Deva Raya II (r. 1424-1446) was the most successful of the Sangama rulers and he brought about an efflorescence in culture and the arts.
During his rule, the Raghunatha temple on the Malyavanta Hill may have been initially constructed. We know that in the early sixteenth century, this temple was considerably expanded, along with several other Vaishnava structures (Kotecha 1982: 108). It was constructed around a boulder believed to mark the site from the Ramayana where Rama waited during the rainy season before leaving on his campaign against Lanka (Verghese 1995: 44).

In terms of the historical interest and association of the Hemakuta Hill area landscape with events from the Ramayana, Phases 1 and 2 lack any association worthy of analysis. Verghese (1995:45) discusses the few epigraphs that mention an association with the Ramayana for the area: 1) a Kannada inscription from 1069 CE found in Anegondi which names the area as Kishkindha, 2) a Later Chalukyan inscription, found in a nearby village temple, mentions that Kishkindha and Rishyamuka as located in the Hemakuta Hill area, dated to 1088 CE. The limited connection is logical for the Cult of Rama did not appear in South Asia until the eleventh century. However, by the Imperial Phase, during the fifteenth century CE, other sites connected to the epic were identified in the Hemakuta Hill area through architecture and sculptures. In fact, imperial rulers (from the fifteenth century onwards) consistently sought tools to legitimize their rule and association to Rama, as the ideal dharmic king-god was an efficient means to do so. Prior to its association with the Ramayana, the Malyanvanta Hill was associated with Siva, and not with events from the Ramayana. This was at least the case until as late as 1410 when Ganesh was consecrated in a cave of the hill by a royal minister (Verghese 1995: 46). By 1410, the hill may have shared associations with Siva and Rama. However, once appropriation of other sites from the Ramayana and of the Rama cult began, the cult was popularized throughout South India by the Vijayanagara Empire (Verghese 1995:46) from the fifteenth century onwards. If the cult of Rama and other Ramayana site-associations were present in the Hemakuta Hill area before the fifteenth century, particularly during Phase 1 and 2, it is fairly safe to assume that they would have been exploited for political agendas as quickly as they came into fashion and would have been utilized by groups such as the Sindas or Kampili chiefs for socio-political purposes.

Overall, Malville and Fritz demonstrate the importance of the alignment connecting the Virupaksha Temple to the Matanga and Malyavanta Hill axis that clearly informed architectural decisions for the imperial Virupaksha Temple complex expansions (Figure 4.23). Or, the precision of the axis was not as refined as it later became, and the importance of the Malyanvanta...
Hill was much different than what it became with the implantation of Ramayana events. Hence, the Virupaksha Temple complex would have developed spatially to refine the precision of its alignment with the hills.

The Hemakuta Hill area was indeed a sacred landscape nested inside a much larger sacred space from 600-1325 CE. If there was a concern for the Virupaksha Temple to be in line with the Matanga to the Malyavanta hills, then this marks the point at which non-visible landscape alignments began to be used in organizing and conceptualizing space. The Malyanvanta Hill is not visible from the Virupaksha structures, especially with the Matanga Hill blocking the line of site. Imagery from Google Street View (Figure 4.24) along with the GoogleEarth Pro Ground-Level View (with extruded terrain) and elevation profile function (Figure 4.25) confirm that even from the top of the Matanga Hill, the highest point in the Vijayanagara area, the Malyavanta Hill, is not visible and that there is in intervening granitic ridge in between the sacred hills. (The intervening ridge served as the northern boundary of the Urban Core of the City of Vijayanagara, which was the residential area for the elite.) The elevation profile (meters above sea level) of the Malyavanta (471 m) – Matanga (463 m) – Virupaksha (427 m) alignment illustrates how the intervening ridge (461 m) is almost as tall as the Matanga Hill and that the visual connection among either three of the nodes of the alignment is limited to the visibility of Virupaksha temple complex and Matanga Hill.

Figure 4.26 illustrates the development of the spatial associations/alignments through structure placements during Phase 1-2 and into the Early and Imperial Phases. These are physical alignments, some of which were not visible and conveyed symbolic information that needed to be taught. The first identified alignment at the site is between H.38 and the north-face cave on the Matanga Hill. This alignment was not visible due to the microtopography of the Hemakuta Hill and it began a tradition of tiered information built into the landscape, between visible and invisible spatial knowledge. In addition, the association spatially established the conceptual importance of the Mantaga Hill for the local understanding of the sacred nature of the site. Subsequently, in P2:2 a visible alignment between the H.36 pavilion and the H.30 Virupaksha Temple was constructed with an additional line-of-sight between the north entrance of H.30’s mandapa and the Manmatha Tank area. Further visible associations with the Matanga Hill
Figure 4.23. Google Earth Pro view south-west of the Virupaksha-Matanga Hill-Malyavanta Hill alignment. Imagery date December 2016.
Figure 4.24. Google Street View facing north-west from Malyavanta Hill towards Matanga Hill. Image captured July 2015.
Figure 4.25. Google Earth Pro elevation profile of alignment of the Virupaksha Temple to Matanga Hill to Malyavanta Hill. Image captured December 2016.
from the Hemakuta Hill were constructed during the Imperial Phase, such as gateway H.42 that frames the Matanga Hill with its entrance. H.42 (and associated walls) not only expresses imperial control of the sacred Hemakuta Hill area, but as an imperial structure, it also creates the conceptual association between the rulers and the sacred Matanga Hill as well as the corresponding mythology. Google Street View supported with satellite imagery is used to differentiate between topographic alignments that were or were not visibly identifiable by travelers in order to examine the landscape for visual associations that may have impacted the understanding of the Hemakuta Hill area sacred space. Overall, unseen alignments that were based on exact spatial measurements and orientations are a characteristic of the Imperial Phase. As unseen knowledge, or spatial information that is not visible, the difference between visible and invisible alignments (such as the alignment between Virupaksha temple and the Matanga and the Malyavanta hills) provided a qualitatively different experiences for devotees with or

![Google Earth Pro imagery depicting the spatial alignments that developed over Phase 1, Phase 2, and the Early Imperial Phase from Hemakuta Hill. Imagery date May 2017.](image)

Figure 4.26 Google Earth Pro imagery depicting the spatial alignments that developed over Phase 1, Phase 2, and the Early Imperial Phase from Hemakuta Hill. Imagery date May 2017.

without access to the alignment information. This indicates that site planning was done to affect a range of audiences with access to varying information. The hierarchization of spatial symbolism appears to have been limited during Phases 1 and 2 to the alignment of H.38 to the Matanga Hill. However, the importance of visible information/associations at the site are actually
documented in epigraphy/graffiti at the Matanga Hill. Carved onto boulders, the summit of the Matanga Hill acted as an observatory point for powerful visual and religious experience and was most likely part of the Phases 1 and 2 tirtha experience. Some of these inscriptions have been recorded by Patil and Patil (1995): No. 250, 252, 253. Their format is a record of the visitor’s name with no date given, but they mention a variation on the fact the devotee came to the Matanga Hill to “look.” They mention that they “looked” at Virupaksha, or of god Matanga, and that through this “look” they attained satisfaction. The importance of darsan and the likelihood of an intentional alignment with H.38 to Matanga from P1:1 onward is further supported by such informal records.
Chapter 4

5 Summary and Conclusions

This dissertation is an examination and analysis of the Hemakuta Hill area, the site of the earliest stone structures at the imperial capital city of Vijayanagara in the Bellary District of Karnataka, during Phases 1 and 2 and the Early Imperial Phase (c. 600-1400 CE). In addition to providing novel and digital-based data, it sheds light on the distinct clusters of structures manifesting distinguishable patron and group values or agendas through a historical, phenomenological, corporeal, and architectural analysis of the Hemakuta Hill area, as a site for death-related pilgrimage with the later addition of the Sanskritic Virupaksha cult center. These distinct groups, such as local and non-local elite memorializing ancestors, high status and commoner communities, as well as non-local elite performing impure and/or post-cremation rituals, are identified through their contributions to the built environment and their material impact on the Hemakuta Hill area. The shrines and temples constructed and used by various groups from a range of Saivite traditions provide us with the opportunity to examine their ritual and social life, as well as spaces of intense embodied experience for transformation and the naturalization of new gods, materialized through structural-spatial planning. This research highlights the nuanced ritual and social information available as a result of the utilization of structural forms within a codified religious architectural tradition in conjunction with the use of space and associated devotee corporeal experience and movement in the built environment.

5.1 The Shifting Role of Pampa and Bhairava

The veneration of the salvific grace of Pampa led to the establishment of the earliest and continuously propitiated cults in the Hemakuta Hill area. As a riverine place of death, transformation and transition between worlds and associated with the salvific powers of powers of Kashi and the Ganges, the Pampa *tirtha*, established through a goddess relationship to Bhairava, became a powerful and magnetic force in the Hemakuta Hill area. Indeed, shrines and temples at the site identified with ancestor worship or post-cremation rites as well as with non-Saiddhantika to Siddhanta Saiva Tantric traditions, benefited from the power of the place.
engendered by Pampa. While the cult of ancestors was not consistent in its popularity and patronage throughout Phase 1 and Phase 2, it established the Hemakuta Hill area as a participant in a larger Deccan-wide cult of memorial shrines for ancestor worship, which eventually facilitated royal memorial shrines to be established at the site, including the shrines of the Sangama Dynasty.

Pampa and Bhairava’s primary roles in the Hemakuta Hill area can be demonstrated through their organizational powers of the sacred space, chiefly as generating the primary axis of movement and as forming the spatial anchors that oriented the site within the cosmos, which lasted until the Early Imperial Phase. Bhairava (H.38) is located as the southernmost point of the site, and both the cardinal south direction and the god are associated with impure, death-related rituals. The goddess Pampa, to whom Bhairava is subordinate (as is common in medieval Saiva Tantric tradition), is situated at the north end of the site. The north is an auspicious cardinal direction where the goddess is associated with life, salvation, and the purifying abilities of the nearby river. Bhairava’s southern field of influence in organizing the site is limited to the South Terrace wherein he (H.38) along with a companion shrine (H.40) are contained physically and visually by the microtopographic depression of the Southern Terrace. However, Pampa’s field of influence for spatial organization is far more expansive. The spatial organization of memorial temples and shrines indicate that they were not associated with impure (post-cremation) rituals, in that physical and visual sightlines with Bhairava were not created. There was, however, a clear concern with establishing a sensorial and physical relationship with Pampa, M.11. The memorial structures are clustered in the Manmatha Tank Terrace, to the south of Pampa’s shrine; those memorial shrines and temples, which are not located in her terrace (H.18, H.21, H.9, and H.12), are situated on the north-facing slope of the Hemakuta Hill. However, they have visual access to M.11 and were built along the path of movement directing ritual movement through the site towards Pampa’s shrine, M.11, and further to the north, Pampa as the Tungabhadra River.

The prescribed path of movement that the devotees followed across the site, following the natural microtopographic features down the north-facing slope of Hemakuta Hill, linked Bhairava to Pampa and to the river. The path of movement mediated devotee physical and ritual experience of the sacred space and as such, a trend developed in which shrines and temples
constructed on the Hemakuta Hill were positioned so that they visually and physically dominate particular points along the path of a passing devotee. This trend developed early, in P1:2 (H.9 and H.12) and continued on in P2:2 (H.18 and H.21). However, in P2:1, a more aggressive siting of structures co-opted and actively directed the path of movement. Initially in P2:1 and P2:2, these structures, particularly gateways associated with a newly imported Sanskritic deity (H.36.vC, vD), channeled movement through the site. This trend continued and expanded into the Early Imperial Phase as part of an architectural program to order space and elevate the status of Virupaksha. These renovations subsequently enhanced the reputation of the new imperial rulers who adopted Virupaksha as their patron and the deity of their state.

The Sangamas gradually reorganized the space of the Hemakuta Hill area to assert Virupaksha and their needs from a royal temple complex (identifiable through the increasingly hierarchical organization of space along a horizontal longitudinal axis), ordering the ritual space of the site. Initially, the trend of channeling a south-north path of movement through gateways (H.7, V, M.15, NFr/6) was continued, while simultaneously asserting Virupaksha’s ability to order the ritual space through structural developments that imposed an east-west path of movement into the site. The new east-west movement, along the base of the hill, into the developing Virupaksha complex was established and promoted through additional structures, such as a cloister running east-west, associated with H.7, that channeled devotee movement through space. The construction of H.7 and H.2 indicates that both the south-north and east-west paths of movement were coexisting and mediating the devotee experience at Hemakuta Hill area. Thus, Pampa maintained ritual relationships between Bhairava and Virupaksha, permitting her to meet non-Saiddhantika ritual needs and prior to the disappearance of the Kalamukhas by the mid-fifteenth century CE. The Sangama reorganization with its focus on Virupaksha eventually cut off the ritual connection between Pampa and Bhairava by blocking the south-north path of movement through the construction of a high prakara wall around the Virupaksha temple complex in conjunction with the closing off the only path permitting movement south-north, the vC gateway. With the shutdown of the south-north path of movement, the entirety of the Hemakuta Hill was subsequently treated as an impure space, needing to be contained by a perimeter wall and controlled through additional gateways for access. This control of space is an
intense reflection of the containment of space seen throughout Phases 1 and 2 of the South Terrace.

A digital historic reconstruction of the site has made it clear that the South Terrace was an exceptional space of creative potential and intense embodied experience as a liminal thirdspace. The increasingly non-\textit{sastric} design of additions to H.38 materialized creative interpretations of the prescribed temple building guidelines, which served particular ritual needs of a range religious of groups active in the Hemakuta Hill space. The South Terrace was a space filled with the potential for individual initiates and family members of the recently deceased to step outside of their everyday identities and work towards transformation through yogic practices and intense introspection, or through otherwise dangerous, esoteric and/or impure ritual activities.

The liminal and transformative nature of the devotee corporeal experience in the South Terrace and of H.38 became increasingly apparent throughout the period of my study, particularly into Phase 2, as the rest of the Hemakuta Hill area continued to develop. The structural development of the pilgrimage site highlights an intentional isolation of the South Terrace space while a tension in the organization of space developed, as Virupaksha, the dominant force of the site, was in the process of supplanting the Bhairava and Pampa relationship. Consequently, Virupaksha-related structures (such as H.30, H.36, vA-D, H.7) were designed to also create an intense introspective space for the devotee embodied experience, though these structures were built according to \textit{sastric} guidelines and intended intense \textit{darsan} with Virupaksha at H.30 or in the shrine located at the foot of Hemakuta Hill. The gateways and H.30 temple attest a highly nuanced planning in the use of microtopographic features and surrounding structures of the Hemakuta Hill to generate powerful, individual corporeal experiences for the devotee such that no other structures at the site, aside from H.38, could proximate.

While investigating how Pampa’s popularity and once-central role at the site changed over time, this research points out that her conceptual, salvific, and organizational importance continued into the Early Imperial Phase, in part due to her Sanskritization and marriage to Virupaksha, the soon-to-be the patron deity of the Vijayanagara rulers. Furthermore, epigraphic
evidence has been brought to the fore confirming her persistent role in the Hemakuta Hill area, despite her new role as wife of Virupaksha. Construction and spatial resources were heavily directed towards Virupaksha upon his introduction to the site and into the Imperial Phase away from the early Pampa-Bhairava duo that initially organized the spatial and conceptual form of the Hemakuta Hill area.

In addition to creating introspective devotee experiences and a temple complex that fulfilled the developing royal needs, structural developments associated with Virupaksha and with the Sangamas expanded on another trend that was also initiated with H.38, the alignment with sacred hills within the landscape. Through the association with sacred hills within the broader landscape, structures were made a part of a mythological dialogue involving the larger landscape in an attempt to further generate naturalization and legitimacy over the space of the Hemakuta Hill area. An alignment with a sacred cave (NMg/4) on the tallest hill of the area, Matanga Hill, which also became an important organizing force within the Vijayanagara city and within local mythology that includes events from the Ramayana. Association of the Ramayana with sites in the Vijayanagara city appeared conclusively in the fifteenth century CE. The alignment between H.38 and NMg/4 was not visually identifiable but indicates that even early in the history of the site, the Hemakuta Hill area was understood to have existed within a much broader sacred space. As such, several of the Virupaksha or Sangama-associated structures, built during Phase 2 and into the Early Imperial Phase, established a visual alignment connection with the Matanga Hill, although, they were not constructed in a physical alignment with the hill. This is also the case with gateways H.7 and H.42. Sangama authority and legitimacy was articulated through the planning of such structures. These gateways controlled access and mediated the devotee experience at the site. Through alignment with the largest sacred symbols in the landscape, the sacred Matanga Hill, ritual space and authority was appropriated and naturalized at moments of introspective and deeply felt corporeal experiences, such as entering into the sacred space of the Hemakuta Hill or of the royal Virupaksha temple complex area.

By appropriating the Matanga Hill, the primacy of Pampa’s role at the tirtha was once again diminished in favor of emplacing figures from the Ramayana into the Vijayanagara imperial space. Subsequently, Bhairava fell out of favor with the disappearance of the
Kalamukhas, much as H.38 ceased to expand. Bhairava’s impotence was further reduced when he was replaced by the Virabhadra cult. Indeed, it was a Virabhadra temple that was built to crown the Matanga Hill throughout the period of the Sangama rule.

5.2 Identifying Religious, Social, and Political Actors

At the Phase 2 site of Vijayanagara, the landscape was manipulated and molded by multiple groups of participants, as the site fulfilled a range of ritual needs for devotees and patrons. Initially, locals and non-locals came to the site for the salvific properties that Pampa, the river and goddess, provided for their deceased ancestors. They also travelled for funerary needs executed at the Bhairava temple. The non-local influences on the Hemakuta Hill area were imported primarily with the orthodox god, Virupaksha, who also brought with him a new group of religious leaders, the brahmins (c. 1100 CE). As mentioned, prior to Virupaksha’s presence at the site, at least during P1:2, the Saiva Kalamukha ascetics oversaw religious needs. As such, this research has also shed light on the non-Saiddhantika and Saiddhanta religious influences perceptible through structural-spatial trends reflecting the core values that each group held. The non-Saiddhantikas ritual was not solely fixed on a murti (typically a lingam, transportable or fixed), but extended to interaction and communication (visually and audibly) with other initiates. Garimella observes that the Kalamukhas appeared to have practiced rituals that of the as Pasupata sect (also non-Saiddhantika). These Pasupata rituals are recognizable through the construction of square gathering spaces in the temple, a mandapa, permitting visual transaction between devotees and the deity (Garimella 2002: 42-43), which can be seen at M.7, M.11, and possibly M.12. In such congregational activities, six acts of worship (upahara), ranging from laughing, singing, dancing, and incantation, were offered to the deity and other initiates (Lorenzen 1972: 185). A space in which these visual and audible devotional transactions could be shared equally is reflected in the use of square, equilateral shape for a mandapa (Garimella 2002: 42-43; Lorenzen 1972: 187). However, the ritual intention of the Siddhantas was on the murti (linga) installed in a shrine/temple through “worship for a common good” (Sanderson 1995: 20). The memorial temples and shrines built with no intention of accommodating royal needs did not develop to accommodate the hierarchical requirements, as identified within the Virupaksha Temple complex. As such, the non-royal Siddhanta temples, such as H.30 and by
extension, the terrace of H.30 and H.36, organized sacred space so that the devotee moved through space, experiencing a transition from a periphery into an intimate center focused on Siva and the linga housed in the shrine. As Garimella notes, “at the center, Siva rules as the overlord of the entire macrocosm in his image in the microcosm of the temple. Here he inhabits the linga, his highest material form and absorbs everything that approaches him and emanates everything that issues forth” (Garimella 2002: 45).

Under the non-Saiddhantika, Kalamukha influence (c. 800-1100 CE), religious structures in the Hemakuta Hill area were visually and physically accessible; the exception to this was H.38. This structure was continuously and regularly expanded throughout Phases 1 and 2, which suggests that it was supported through a stable group of patrons, and that likely non-elite and elite invested across many generations. Indeed, the development of H.38, and subsequently its relationship to M.11, is the most consistent and constant architectural trend at the site that can be materially identified. The cult of ancestors at the site, however, was not consistently propitiated in that there were periods in which memorial shrines were not constructed, though the cult endured. The uniform, austere forms of the earliest shrines suggests that the cult was supported primarily through local chieftains. However, the P2:2 and Early Imperial Phase memorial shrines and cult of ancestors were appropriated by royalty, initially by the somewhat-non-local Kampili rulers and then by the local Sangamas.

The orthodox influence at the Hemakuta Hill area, appearing c. 1100 CE, present a religious architectural tradition that promoted intense darsan experiences while simultaneously naturalizing the newly imported Virupaksha god. Structural-spatial patterns established in Phases 1 and 2 were expanded for later city-wide planning by the imperial rulers, as they were set in place by two major groups, the primarily local devotees headed by the Kalamukha ascetics as well as the non-local and local devotees led by the orthodox brahmans. Space, corporeal experience, and movement became resources to be managed by these two groups; they were part of a socio-ritual and socio-political dialogues and motives.
5.3 Deities and Ancestors as Actors

Devotees and the ascetics/brahmans were central actors in the Hemakuta Hill area, but the agency of deities and ancestors commemorated by shrines deserve equal consideration. Manifesting in murtis and as the religious structures (discussed in Chapter 3), the deities, including ancestors (referred to collectively as deity/ancestor), were active participants in space. Such actors participated in darsan with the devotees, while also being cared for by priests, ascetics, devotees, and family members. Additionally, the social relationship between devotees and deities/ancestors can be investigated through approaches such as Proxemic analysis. The different scales of interpersonal space identified in areas such as the Manmatha Tank indicate a priori social relationships between structures and the memorialized, particularly those built within the Intimate/Private scale. The organization of structures (particularly memorial shrines M.1-5, m.8) within the Intimate/Private scale also reflects the types of ritual activities that were possible in such spaces; individual to small group worship at memorial shrines was possible though ritual actions, such as circumambulation and congregational worship, was not feasible.

It was not until P2:1 that temples were constructed in the Manmatha Tank area which demonstrate a desire for physical proximity to Pampa’s shrine, M.11. The exception to this trend was the modified structures of M.7A and M.11A. By applying the Proxemic and access analysis trends to Manmatha Tank structures, time periods for the construction and dismantling of both anomalous structures have been extrapolated. M.11A appears to have been built prior to M.11 and was possibly dismantled in connection to the construction of M.11. M.7A was likely dismantled with the appearance of the Virupaksha-associated brahman community in P2:1 as it blocks the path to the west through the Manmatha Tank area where the community would likely have been residing. Other shrines and temples in the same terrace maintained a distance greater than Public Proxemics threshold (>3.65 m) to M.11 until P2:1. Starting in P2:1 (possibly earlier, in P1:2) through P2:2, an agglomeration of shrines and temples (M.12, M.13, and 14 that became one large religious structure) was built to physically amplify and integrate M.11. The religious structure (agglomeration) of M.12, M.13, and M.14 was constructed between Pampa and the river not only to create a physical connection with Pampa, M.11, but also to dominate the space of the north end of the path of movement. This agglomeration is structurally similar to H.38, as
seen in walled additions and the style of addition planning (such as colonnaded areas and jointing of the *vimana* and the *mandapa*). These two structures, H.38 and the agglomeration of M.12, M.13, and M.14, may be representing a further materialization of the tensions and negotiations over the organization of the site and access to Pampa that existed between the more orthodox Saiva Siddhantas (as well as other orthodox groups represented by Virupaksha and associated brahmans) and local, non-Saiddhantikas traditions, such as the Kalamukhas whose oversight would have been over the H.38-M.11, the Bhairava-Pampa organization of the site.

### 5.4 Management of Corporeal Experience: Space and Spatial Relationships

Most structural-spatial innovations in the Hemakuta Hill area took place in reaction to and as an adaptation to site expansion. The extent to which the different cults, social groups, and values were able to coexist in the Hemakuta Hill area appears to be significant, although, traces of potential conflict were present, especially in the removal and paving over of spaces and structures. The use of space across the Hemakuta Hill areas progressed from a planning that was characterized by an open and accessible nature making use of topographic features to establish conceptually distinct ritual areas to an ever increasing appropriation, definition and bounding of space through a range of novel architectural mechanisms and elements. Related to the range of spatial management during each period by cult or group champions were corresponding corporeal experiences that were concurrently, and most likely, the desired effects of the spatial manipulations. Piety and claims to the right to power were bedfellows for political aspirations that infiltrated the Hemakuta Hill area most obviously by Phase 2 with the increasing Sanskritization of the *tirtha* (see Chapter 3 and 4).

By examining the development of the landscape and identifying when, where, and how the space was altered, this dissertation has examined the political and palimpsestual nature of the Hemakuta Hill area. However, the identity of specific individuals or groups is often due to the lack of textual information. Political aspirations were demonstrated by the mobilization of resources to imprint and then to shape and dominate the sacred landscape. These trends and trajectory of increasing spatial and corporeal management were expanded into the Early Imperial Phase, as demonstrated most clearly by the continuous expansion and enclosure of the
Virupaksha Temple complex and the concurrent treatment of the Hemakuta spaces as a restricted resource (walled with gateway access). Spatial referencing of landscape features increased over time through sight lines and then to landscape alignments that were not visible. The identification of these spatial references in this research presents a landscape of accumulated and tiered levels of spatial knowledge: that which is visible versus that which is invisible. In other words, there was knowledge that was accessible and observable to the public and then there was knowledge that was restricted and needed to be taught.

As the site became increasingly popular pilgrimage location, particularly after the adoption of Virupaksha and the Sanskritization of Pampa and then as the capital city of the Vijayanagara Empire, the devotee moving through the original sacred space of the Hemakuta Hill area was targeted by a complex network of claims to power that were built into space, coloring their experience, knowingly or not, and naturalized through the material world of the sacred space. Unseen knowledge may not have affected the devotee’s corporeal experience of space, however, it would have created a specific understandings of the landscape. Similarly, the range of structures and cults throughout the Hemakuta Hill area mostly likely ensured a wide range of devotee corporeal experiences, all of which were tied through the unifying path of movement along the south to north path across the sacred hill to the river. However, even this unifier was eventually disassembled by the cult based at the Virupaksha Temple complex, which dominated site and was used as a tool for political legitimacy by the imperial rulers. The power of the original folk deities and associated local groups were gradually eclipsed and then subsumed by Virupaksha, the Sanskritic tutelary deity of the Vijayanagara’s imperial rulers.
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Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

There are two appendices to the dissertation. Appendix A contains the glossary of specialist terms that have been used. These terms are categorized in three sections: South Asian Architectural Terms, Archaeoastronomical Terms, and South Asian Religious Terms. Appendix B contains an introduction to headings used in the architectural data tables that follow. The data tables are organized by period (P1:1, P1:2, P2:1, P2:2, Undated).

A.1 Indian Architectural Terms

Text in italics are taken verbatim from the AISC Glossary of Indian Architectural Terms, p.231-234. Text with a * in front of it indicates that it is taken verbatim from the handout “Temple Morphology: South India (Dravida Tradition)” provided by Tamara Sears, initially written by Philip Wagoner (Sears and Wagoner n.d.). All other definitions have their source cited.

A.1.1 Primary Architectural Terms:

**Dravida:** The ‘Southern’ language of temple architecture (Hardy 1995:388).

**Nagara:** The ‘Northern’ language of temple architecture (Hardy 1995:389).

**Phamsana:** “Shrine mode with pyramidal superstructure of tiered eaves-mouldings” (Hardy 1995:390). Can also be considered as an architectural language.

**Vesara:** A type of superstructure based on the [Karnata] dravida with its storeys of diminishing proportions, but with the wall section of each storey greatly abbreviated so as to produce a form with stronger vertical accents (AISC 234).

A.1.2 General Dravidian Architectural Terms

**jirnoddha:** “The indigenous architectural and religious practice of temple renovation and expansion” (Garimella 2002:3).

**kapota:** *A downcurved eave moulding.

**sikhara:** *Dome-shaped element crowing the vimana tower; the fifth of the six elevational levels.
stupi: *The finial and final of the six elevations of the vimana tower.

brahmacchanda: *A square plan vimana plan is said to be Brahmacchanda, or “having a Brahma rhythm.” The god Brahma is associated with square forms.

A.1.3 Temple Morphology: Dravidian Tradition (South India)

A.1.3.1 Components of the Temple Body

antarala: Part of temple body. Antechamber or space before the sanctum/garbha-grha door (Mills 2011; AISC231).
*An entry vestibule leading between an attached mandapa and the garbha-grha, often occupied by the priest who mediates between the deity in the sanctum and the worshipper in the mandapa.

garbha-grha: Part of the temple body. “The sanctuary, the chamber housing the divinity within a shrine or temple” (AISC 231).
*The garbha-grha is the essential component of any temple: an enclosed sanctum or shrine housing the deity’s consecrated icon. This chamber is generally square in plan; the single doorway defines the temple’s orientation.

pradakshinapatha: *An ambulatory passage. Temples with an internal passageway are called sandhara. Those without an internal pradakshinapatha are termed nirandhara.

prakara: “Enclosure wall surrounding a temple courtyard” (AISC233).
*The enclosure wall defining the sacred compound surrounding the temple.

vimana: *The term describing the temple proper, i.e. the main architectural unit consisting of the temple’s garbha-grha, antarala and pradakshinapatha, if present. The term is also used to refer to the superstructure that rises above the temple proper. “Shrine unit, consisting of garbha-grha sanctuary and attached ambulatory, and/or antarala antechamber if present” (AISC 234).

gopura: *A high, towering gateway marking entrance into the prakara. It is often capped by a sala (barrel-vaulted) element, and its walls are often lined with small, individual shrines or a continuous, colonnaded cloister.

tala A story.

A.1.3.2 Types of Mandapas

mandapa: “Columnned hall” (AISC 232) or porch.
A pillared hall or pavilion that functions as a place of shelter for the worshipper offering puja to the image in the sanctum. They may be either attached to or separate from the garbha-grha. In Chola period temples (c. 9th-13th centuries A.D.), a typical sequence is as follows:

1) ardda-mandapa = “half-hall,” articulated w/ the shrine proper
2) maha-mandapa = “great hall”
3) mukha-mandapa = “entry-hall”

Common detached types of mandapas include: (1) a Nandi-mandapa, found in Siva temples and containing an image of Siva’s bull Nandi, and (2) kalyana-mandapa, for performing the rituals in the annual festival of the god’s marriage.

rangamandapa: “Enclosed columned hall, usually with nine bays” (AISC 233).
vimana: “Shrine unit, consisting of garbha-grha sanctuary and attached ambulatory, and/or antarala antechamber if present” (AISC 234).

A.1.3.3 Projections and Recesses
Temple plans can be classified according to the number of parts (anga) that project outwards from the original square plan of the vimana. The square plan represents the grid of the vastuparusha mandala.

ekanga: *A temple whose plan is a perfect square is said to have one (eka) member or part (anga)“.

dvi-anga: *A temple which has a single projecting element at its center is said to have two (dvī) members (anga), and is thus called dvi-anga. The central projecting offset is called a bhadra. The two corners of the original square are then termed karna (‘corner’).

triyanga: *A three (tri) membered plan is one where an additional projecting element is interposed between the karna and bhadra. These additional projecting elements are termed pratibhadra. Sometimes there are recesses (salilantara) dividing one anga from the next.
A.1.3.4 Examples of Dravidian Plan Types

Figure A.1 Dravidian plan types. Reproduced from Sears and Wagoner (n.d.) handout.

A.1.4 Elevation Levels
There are six levels that make up the basic elevation of the temple proper. They are defined as follows.

*adhisthana:* *Basement or plinth.*

*pada:* *Wall level, often containing niches for sculptures of deities.*

*prastara:* *Entablature, usually consisting of three distinct members:
1) *uttara* = the beams supported on the tops of the walls
2) *kapota* = a downward curving eave, frequently punctuated by small lunettes called *gavaksa.*
3) *vyalamala* = a decorative frieze carved with mythical beasts of hybrid form, combining characteristics of the lion and crocodile.

*griva:* *Receding “neck” beneath the *sikhara.*

*sikhara:* *Dome-shaped element crowning the *vimana* tower; it can be in any of a variety of different shapes, including *Vismucchanda, Brahmacchanda,* and *Rudracchanda.*

*stupi:* *Finial atop the *sikhara*
A.1.5 Temple Morphology Terms: North India

Temple morphological terminology is adopted for the description of appropriate Phamsana elements.

*bhumis:* “Horizontal division or ‘storey’ in a Nagara superstructure” (Hardy 1995:388).

*sikhara:* *Curvilinear tower* as opposed to the South Indian sikhara that is dome-shaped that crowns the tower.

A.2 Archaeoastronomical Terms


*aligned:* “When human intentionality in a monument’s axial direction toward a target is argued…meaning three or more related structures placed in a line” (Pendergast 2015:391).

*altitude:* “The vertical angle between the viewed point and the horizontal plane through the observer…All points on a level with the observer have altitude 0º (the actual horizon may be above or below this); the zenith (the point in the sky directly above the observer) has altitude +90º, and the nadir (the point directly below the observer) has altitude 90º. The angle between the observed point and the zenith (90º minus the altitude) is also known as the ‘zenith distance’” (Ruggles b 2015: 460).

*azimuth:* “The horizontal angle of the viewed point measured clockwise (as seen from above) round from due north)… Azimuth varies from 0º to 360º: the azimuth of due north is 0º/360º, that of due east 90º, that of due south 180º, and that of due west 270º” (Ruggles b 2015: 460).

*elevation:* Height above sea level of a location – not to be confused with altitude (Ruggles b 2015:460).

*magnetic azimuth:* “Determined with respect to magnetic north rather than true north, which result when using a magnetic compass, must be converted to true azimuths before the astronomical possibilities can be assessed” (Ruggles b 2015: 460).
location: Latitude (Pendergast 2015:391).

profiles of the local horizon: “Azimuth and altitude” (Pendergast 2015:391).

orientation: “The measured direction of a structure’s façade or axis with respect to the local meridian (azimuth)” (Pendergast 2015:390-391).

A.3 Religious Terminology

bhairavas: Guardian deities (Das 2006:383).

bhakti: Devotion as well as a term used “to refer to a series of regional movements in medieval India that stressed intense personal devotion to god or goddess, the leadership of exemplary poet-saints, and the importance of a community of devotees. The earliest of these bhakti movements date from the seventh through ninth centuries” (Davis 1995:29).

brahmakunda: The term is made up of the name “Brahma” or “Brahman”, the god associated with creation of the universe, and “kund”, a reservoir or tank with steps and were most often associated with temples (Das 2006:382).

darsan: “In the Hindu ritual tradition it refers especially to religious seeing, or the visual perception of the sacred…The central act of Hindu worship, from the point of view of the lay person, is to stand in the presence of the deity and to behold the image with one’s own eyes, to see and be seen by the deity. Darsan is sometimes translated as the “auspicious sight” of the divine” (Eck 2007:3).

East: East, as a concept and cardinal direction, is interpreted in Sanskrit to also mean “forward” or “front” (Das 2006:383). As a rule of thumb, most temples face the east and the rising sun.

matha “Traditional educational institutions”, similar to a monastery (Stein 1960:165). Advaita “Monistic or non-dualistic school of philosophy…the followers of which are known as the Smartas. The two important Advaita mthas at Śṛṅgeri and Kanchipuram, besides a number of others, propagated the Smarta religious system under the Advaita philosophy in southern India” (Verghese 2000:4).

Pampamahatmyan In this work, the Pampamahatmyan (The Glory of Pampa) refers to the earliest sources of the written origin myth of Hampi discussed in the work by Das (2006). This version of the text was also edited and pieced together...
by him from three different manuscripts, two written in Devangari characters and one written in Telegu (Das 2006:381). Das believes that the work was composed in the sixteenth century (2006:385).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pradaksina</td>
<td>Circumabulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silpa-sastras</td>
<td>Instructional texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarta</td>
<td>Followers of the Advaita, monistic or non-dualistic school of philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sthala purana</td>
<td>A type of Puranic text that details the mythic origin and importance of a sacred place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vastu-sastras</td>
<td>An architectural treatise and type of <em>silpa-sastras</em> or instructional text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vira Saiva</td>
<td>A Saivite reform sect also known as Lingayats or Vira Saiva. A religious movement that began in the twelfth century CE as a rebellion against the power of the Brahmins and the caste system. Founder was Basava (Kulke and Rothermund 1998: 141).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B Architectural Data Tables

B.1 Architectural Data Table Headings

The following section provides background information on particular table headings for the architectural data tables of this appendix.

VRP Assignation:
Features mapped from the extensive field survey of the Vijayanagara Research Project (VRP) were given a unique locational identifiers designated according to the map series developed for the site or assigned with a location name and number. The map series is an artificial grid with a y-axis following magnetic north (Fritz 2006). The side of each square measuring just under 5km, with a total of 25 squares, and each square is denoted by a letter. The central square that the majority of this research examines, N, has a three letter code. The square N is first subdivided into squares of approximately 930m a side; each with their own letter that follows the N. These squares are further subdivided into squares of approximately 180m on side, with their own letter, written in small case, which follows the 930m square letter assignation. All features that have been recorded by the project are recorded with their map series number followed by their own number that has been sequentially assigned. For example, a feature within the N square will be listed as NAc/1 (AISC ix).

Many of the features that are of interest to this research are located in feature clusters that are named such as the monuments around the Manmatha Tank and on Hemakuta Hill. In these areas, each structure is identified by the name of the area, followed by a number, for example, Hemakuta 1. If the structure is within a temple complex, such as the Virupaksha complex, then the feature is identified by the complex name and a capital letter, for example Virupaksha A. For brevity, these names are recorded in the tables and in the text by the first letter of the area and the number or letter, for example Manmatha 1 is recorded as M.1; Virupaksha A is VA (AISC ix). However, if the feature has been changed over time, this research is noting the permutations by a minuscule letter, for example, the original form of Hemakuta 38 from Phase P1:1 will be noted as H.38a while the third expansion of Hemakuta 38 from P1:2 will be noted as H.38c. In some
cases, the structure is still active and may be referred to by its current name, for example Virupaksha S may also be referred to as the Gulaganji Madhava Shrine or noted as “VS”.

There is one caveat to this formulation: there are two structures that are no longer standing and only their basements are left. The VRP has identified them the name of the cluster area that they are in, numbered them based on the closest extant structure, followed by the capital letter “A”. These two “ghost” structures are Manmatha 11A and Manmatha 7A.

For the portions of the Virupaksha Temple Complex that have been identified as being separate structures pre-empire, the VRP assignations do not recognize them as separate elements and will therefore be labelled according to the letters assigned by Wagoner (1996).

It is important to remember that these assignations represent a palimpsest of features visible by surface survey during the VRP inventory work from 1980 through 2002.

Degrees:
The numbers listed express the orientation of the structure with 0 as magnetic north. Mapping of the entire Urban Core for the VRP 1:400 Map Series took place from 1984 to 1996 (Fritz 2006:49). It was in 1987 that Hemakuta Hill and the Virupaksha temple complex were mapped out (Fritz 2006:49).

The declination for magnetic north, which points to the North Pole, changes over the years and location on the globe with reference to the North Pole. However, according to the shastric tradition, South Asian architecture was oriented according to true north. The difference between magnetic and true north measurements changes over time and this difference is called magnetic variation. Magnetic variation for specific locations and years can be calculated online through websites such as the Natural Resources Canada. The difference between magnetic north in 1984 and true north is a magnetic declination of 1° 56.28’ West (http://geomag.nrcan.gc.ca/calc/mdcal-r-en.php?date=1987-02-19&latitude=15.335&latitude_direction=1&longitude=76.462&longitude_direction=1&grid=on). Understanding the purposeful divergence from true cardinal directions requires that the degree measurements recorded in the VRP have the magnetic declination added, producing an orientation calculation based on true north, also known as azimuth. Having the azimuth degrees
is also helpful in that much of the archaeoastronomical work done for the Vijayanagara period at the capital is recorded and discussed in terms of azimuth by Malville and Fritz (1996; 2006a; 2006b; Malville 2015). True north also changes over time.

For a discussion of Large and Small Vijayanagara Temple astronomical orientation, see Malville and Fritz 2006a and 2006b. Methods for building preparation and construction, such as establishing orientation and establishing true north (http://www.vedicplanet.com/vastu/vastu-faqs/vastu-faqs-3/) through the use of sanku (gnomon) and surtra (cord) (Mills xiv-xv; ) are recorded in various Shastra manuals. See Mills PhD Dissertation, General Introduction – Text contents, for more information on the design and construction of temples as found in early Saiva literature. For a discussion of the technical treatises that guided the southern subcontinental architectural traditions, the Mayamata (written between the 9th to 12th centuries and referred to as the “classical age” of Hindu architecture [Bharne and Krusche 2013]) refer to Ajitagama and the Rauravagama (Dagens 1984).

As Fritz and Malville note (1993:417), the exact orientation of the vast majority of temples in South Asia have not been examined and recorded. This leaves a substantial hole in the understanding of choices of orientation and purposeful divergences from exact orientations in South Asian architecture when the skills to do so were a well-established practice during the Common Era. While much is known of the recommended orientations for elite and religious architecture listed in the Shastric sacred texts, that they are to be in alignment with the cosmos and thereby the creation and maintenance of cosmic order, little work has been done to understand the purpose of orienting structures away from precise cardinal directions. Fritz and Malville have published several articles detailing the spatial organization patterns of alignments at Vijayanagara of the monuments from the Imperial Phase (1993; 2006a & b) although patterns established by Phases 1 and 2 were not the subject of their investigation.

Architectural Structure Type:
Architectural structure types are adopted from the Vijayanagara Research Project as discussed by Michell and Wagoner in the AISC (2001: xiv-xvii).
### B.1 Table. Architectural Structure Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Structure Type</th>
<th>Structural Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shrine</td>
<td>The rudimentary form of a shrine consists of a square or rectangular <em>garbha-grha</em>. They can have an <em>antarala</em>, a single-bayed porch that typically has two frontal columns (AISC xiv).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>The rudimentary form of a temple consists of a <em>garbha-grha</em> with an <em>antarala</em> linked to <em>mandapa</em>, square or rectangular (AISC xiv-xv).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory</td>
<td>Ambulatory passage that can be covered with colonnades; normally part of a larger structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>A architectural passageway that may or may not be associated with an enclosing wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mandapa</em></td>
<td>A pillared hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architectural Language:**

The architectural language of the structure is listed as identified by the VRP in addition to architectural mode where relevant. For an in depth discussion on the nuances and developments of architectural languages and modes see Hardy (1995).

**Number of Modifications:**

This column lists whether or not a feature has had architectural additions made to it, or not. If the architectural feature is an addition to an original structure, then the number of the addition is noted out of the overall number of additions the original structure received. If the feature has been incorporated into a larger structure, it is noted as “Incorporated” followed by the VRP assignation of the feature to have incorporated it. If no modifications have been noted, “no” is listed.
The following are architectural data tables. These tables are organized by period.

**Table B.2 Architectural data for structures built during P1:1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VRP Assignment</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Architectural Structure Type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Architectural Language</th>
<th>Number of Modifications</th>
<th>Plan shape</th>
<th>Porch or Antarala</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.40</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>porch</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>antarala</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>antarala</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>porch</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>porch</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.5</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>porch</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.38a</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>shrine to temple</td>
<td>likely granite</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>porch</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.4a</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.4b</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>extension of antarala</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.11a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>shrine to temple</td>
<td>non-local sandstone</td>
<td>Dravida in Rastrakuta idiom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dvi-anga</td>
<td>antarala</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC; Verghese 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B.2 Architectural data for structures built during P1:2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VRP Assignment</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Architectural Structure Type</th>
<th>Architectural Language</th>
<th>Number of Modifications</th>
<th>Plan shape</th>
<th>Porch or Antarala</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>Dravida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>dvi-anga</td>
<td>raised platform before entrance</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.9</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>Proto-Vesara</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>dvi-anga</td>
<td>antarala</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.12</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>Dravida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>only mandapa</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.7a/Naganandeshvara Temple</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>shrine to temple</td>
<td>Dravida in Rastrakuta idiom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dvi-anga</td>
<td>antarala</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS/Gulaganji Madhava</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>Dravida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>antarala</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.11b/Durgadevi Temple</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>shrine to temple</td>
<td>Dravida</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>dvi-anga</td>
<td>antarala to mandapa</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.38b</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>shrine to temple</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>enclosed antarala</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.38c</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>shrine to temple</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>enclosed antarala to mandapa</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.7b</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>shrine to temple</td>
<td>Dravida in Rastrakuta idiom</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>antarala to mandapa</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B.3 Architectural data for structures built during P2:1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VRP Assignment</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Architectural Structure Type</th>
<th>Architectural Language</th>
<th>Number of Modifications</th>
<th>Plan shape</th>
<th>Porch or Antarala</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.13, Immadi Rachamallesvara</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>minimum 2</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>antarala</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC; Patil 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.14</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>part of a double shrine, added to M.13</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>antarala to common mandapa with M.13</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC; Patil 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>Phamsana (W); Kalinga (Patil 1992)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>antarala to mandapa</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC; Patil 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Virupaksha Shrine</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>Dravida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ambulatory</td>
<td>Dravida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mandapa</td>
<td>Dravida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>gateway</td>
<td>Dravida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>gateway</td>
<td>Dravida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H38d</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>shrine to temple</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B.4 Architectural data for structures built during P2:2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VRP Assignment</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Architectural Structure Type</th>
<th>Architectural Language</th>
<th>Number of Modifications</th>
<th>Plan shape</th>
<th>Porch or Antarala</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>Phamsana (Wagoner), Kabamaba (Michell 1985: 274)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>triple-shrine</td>
<td>porch to mandapa</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC; Verghese 2001:60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>Phamsana (Wagoner), Kabamaba (Michell 1985: 274)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>triple-shrine</td>
<td>porch to mandapa</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFr/7 (AISC34)</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>antarala</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.36</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>gateway associated with H.30</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.38e</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.38f</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>Phamsana</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>ekanga</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wagoner 1996; AISC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.5 Architectural data for undated structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VRP Assignment</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Architectural Structure Type</th>
<th>Architectural Language</th>
<th>Number of Modifications</th>
<th>Porch or Antarala</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>Possibly Phamsana</td>
<td>1 - incorporated into wall with removal of superstructure</td>
<td>porch</td>
<td>AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>shrine</td>
<td>Possibly Phamsana</td>
<td>1 - incorporated into wall with removal of superstructure</td>
<td>porch</td>
<td>AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.7A</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>? - only basement remains</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>AISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.11A</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>? - only basement remains</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>AISC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C Epigraphic Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Year CE</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Location of Epigraph</th>
<th>Material of Inscription</th>
<th>Language of Inscription</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>P1:1/P1:2</td>
<td>Later Chalukya king, land grant to a local elite, appointed prime minister of an early Late Chalukyan king. In the Vijayanagara region, in nearby town of Anegondi on a tank dedicated to Pampa. Stone slab, Kannada, QJMS, VII, Ins. No. X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>