

Home (1918) Department.

~~General~~
(Education)

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 1428

DATED 8-11-18

INDEXED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Amravati stupa

Communicating to the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey, copy of letters from the Director-General of Archaeology in India on the conservation of the ----- in the Guntur district and asking the former to revise his conservation notes on the stupa.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Home (253) C. N. 1225 B

12.5.18



FROM
SIR JOHN MARSHALL, Kt., C. I. E., Litt. D., F. S. A.,
Director General of Archaeology in India,

To
The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Home (Education) Department,
Madras.
Further, he proposes to re-erect eight of the granite
pillars belonging to the outer rail and to define the
position of the rest of this rail by a modern brick wall,
which will also serve as a compound wall to protect
this portion of the site. These measures would not only
involve a very considerable expenditure, which, in my
opinion, is unjustifiable, but they would have the effect
of giving a modern aspect and appearance to the site,
which is manifestly open to objection. To demarcate the
position of the processional path and thus render the site
more intelligible to visitors is an eminently desirable
object, but it is not necessary to do this by the costly
and elaborate methods contemplated by Mr. Longhurst. All
that is needed when the site is adequately drained, is to
relay the existing pavement slabs (where necessary) on a light foundation of broken coars or brick
and thus to demarcate the rest of the processional
path by a line of rough on the inner and outer sides
with the broken pieces of the old pavement. The
part of the pathway within the railing may either be paved
with the same material as the rest or left as it is, which is sufficient for
the purpose of turning over. The old pavement slabs can
be laid in situ and grass allowed to grow between the
interstices. This plan has been followed with success
fully at Sanchi, and is more economical and effective and
in every way preferable to the use of concrete and lime.

Sir,
I have the honour to address you regarding the con-
servaion of the site of Amaravati Stupa in the Guntur
District of the Madras Presidency, an inspection note on
which dated April 15th, 1918, has recently been forwarded
to me for information by the Archaeological Superintendent,
Southern Circle.

In the note referred to Mr. Longhurst draws atten-
tion to the irreparable damage done by amateur explorers
in the past, and to the present unsatisfactory condition
of the site and he rightly urges that steps should be
taken to preserve the few antiquities that now remain.
But to this end he advocates certain measures which appear
to me neither necessary nor desirable. I refer in parti-
cular to the recommendations made in paragraphs 5 and 9
of his note. The first relates to the treatment of the
pradakshina patha or processional path which once sur-
rounded the main stupa. The stupa itself has entirely
vanished and so, too, has the limestone railing which
bounded the processional path on its inner side. Of
the actual processional path all that now remains intact
is a small section between the south and west gateways,
and the use of concrete and lime.

pp 64 7 1918

Ear

11/15/18

12/15/18

2

3

and of the granite railing which is said to have encompassed it on its outer side, nothing is left but some detached pieces, the original positions of which are no longer traceable. The manner in which Mr. Longhurst proposes to treat these surviving remains is this. He proposes to reconstruct the whole of the processional path either of modern concrete or of old stone slabs laid on a bed of concrete, the concrete being supported on the inner and outer sides by retaining walls of brick. Further, he proposes to re-erect eight of the granite pillars belonging to the outer rail and to define the position of the rest of this rail by a modern brick wall, which will also serve as a compound wall to protect this portion of the site. These measures would not only involve a very considerable expenditure, which, in my opinion, is unjustifiable, but they would have the effect of giving a modern 'spick-and-span' appearance to the site, which is manifestly open to objection. To demarcate the position of the processional path and thus render the site more intelligible to visitors, is an eminently desirable object; but it is not necessary to do this by the costly and elaborate methods contemplated by Mr. Longhurst. All that is needed, when the site ^{has been} adequately drained, is to relay the existing pavement slabs (where relaying is necessary) on a light foundation of broken stone or brick and mud and to demarcate the rest of the processional path by edging it round on the inner and outer sides with the broken pieces of the old pavement. The central part of the pathway within the edging may either be paved with the same broken slabs (if there are sufficient for the purpose) or turfed over. The old pavement slabs can be laid in mud and grass allowed to grow between the interstices. This plan has been followed most successfully at Sanchi, and is more economical and effective and is in every way preferable to the use of concrete or lime,

which was never employed in the original structures.

As to the brick wall which Mr. Longhurst proposes to erect outside the processional path, it is difficult to imagine how a modern brick wall capped with cement could materially assist the sight-seer in visualising the ancient granite balustrade, for which it is intended to be a substitute. Nor do I understand Mr. Longhurst when he says that this granite ^{rail} originally enclosed the site and therefore a new "compound wall" may as well follow this as well as any other line. The granite railing referred to was designed to enclose only the main stupa and its processional path, but the site must have embraced many other monuments besides the main stupa, and it would, therefore, lead to a wholly erroneous impression, if a modern compound wall were erected around the latter, and the ground whereon the stupa once stood thus effectually separated from the rest of the site. Wherever the ancient limits of the site ^{may} have been, they were certainly at a considerable distance from the stupa, and this fact must be borne in mind in determining the alignment of any new wall. In view of the fact that Mr. Longhurst suggests the possibility of further excavation on the site, it may be advisable to defer erecting anything more than a temporary fence until the excavation is completed.

4 In paragraph 9 of his note Mr. Longhurst recommends the erection of modern brick walls to enclose the area of the old south gateway and of brick piers "in the new wall", to indicate the positions of the remaining three gateways. It is not clear why Mr. Longhurst wishes to differentiate between the treatment of the southern and other three gateways or what idea he wishes to convey to visitors by his proposed pairs or piers built into the new compound wall. Certainly the visitor who took note of these indications would be likely to infer from

them

p. 7

A

which was never employed in the original structures.
As to the brick wall which Mr. Longhurst proposes
to erect outside the processional path, it is difficult
to imagine how a modern brick wall could be so
could materially assist the night-see in illuminating the
ancient granite buildings, for which it is intended to
be substituted. Nor do I understand Mr. Longhurst when
he says that this granite wall "may as well follow this
therefore a new compound wall" may as well follow this
as well as any other line. The granite railing referred
to was designed to enclose only the main stupa and its
processional path, but the site must have embraced many
other monuments besides the main stupa, and it would
therefore lead to a wholly erroneous impression, if a
modern compound wall were erected around the latter
and the ground whereon the stupa once stood the effectual
ly separated from the rest of the site. However the
ancient limits of the site have been, they were certainly
at a considerable distance from the stupa, and this fact
must be borne in mind in determining the alignment of any
new wall. In view of the fact that Mr. Longhurst suggests
the possibility of further excavation on the site, it may
be advisable to be or erecting anything more than a ten-
penny fence until the excavation is completed.
In paragraph 9 of his note Mr. Longhurst recommends
the erection of modern brick walls to enclose the area
of the old south gateway and of brick piers "in the new
wall", to indicate the positions of the remaining three
gateways. It is not clear why Mr. Longhurst wishes to
differentiate between the treatment of the southern and
other three gateways or what idea he wishes to convey
to visitors by his proposed pairs or pairs built into
the new compound wall. Certainly the visitor who took
note of these indications would be likely to infer from
them

4
5
them that the south entrance differed from the other
three, and that the piers indicate toranas of the type
well-known at Sanchi and Bharhut but of which there was,
I believe, no trace at Amaravati. Apart from the wrong
inference which might be drawn from them, it appears to
me that these modern brick walls and piers would be sadly
incongruous on this ancient site and I strongly deprecate
their erection.

5 In the opening paragraph of his note Mr. Longhurst
refers to the small stupa excavated some years ago by Mr.
Rea but he does not indicate in what manner he proposes
to preserve this valuable relic which is now, I gather,
the most important object on the site. I shall be grate-
ful if enquiries can be made from Mr. Longhurst on this
subject.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

John Marshall
Director General.

INSPECTION NOTES ON THE AMARAVATI STŪPA, GUNTŪR DISTRICT.

GENERAL REMARKS.—All that now remains of this famous Buddhist monument is the site, a small ruined stūpa and the basement of a little brick temple still stand just without the south gateway and a number of mutilated sculptures and carved stones which were not considered worth removing to the museum by those who formerly excavated the site may still be seen. The site consists of a large open flat circular grass space surrounded by a ruined stone paved processional path which was once enclosed on its outer side by a massive stone railing composed of big upright granite blocks connected together with stone rails of the usual Buddhist type. The site of the masonry stūpa that once stood in the centre and which was enclosed by the beautiful white limestone railing, the bas-reliefs of which are so familiar to the educated public, is no longer discernible. Broken portions of the railing and a few carved slabs alone remain on the site but all traces of their original positions have vanished. On the outer side of the processional path a ditch about 4 feet deep and 6 feet wide was foolishly dug all round by some former explorer of the site and left open, with the result that during the rains the ditch is full of water and the huge upright blocks of granite that once formed the posts of the railing that enclosed the site have fallen over into the ditch and are now buried in earth and debris. On the outer side of the ditch is an embankment about 12 feet in height which is continued all round the circular site. The flat central space is covered with dumps of broken stone and brick bats unearthed during the excavations and a margosa tree has been planted in the approximate centre of the site, presumably, so that visitors may know that the tree indicates the position of the stūpa that once stood on this spot. Margosa trees have also been planted at the four cardinal points, where the old gateways used to be, and also all round the greater length of the processional path. This was a mistake because the trees are now of considerable size with roots in proportion which offer serious obstruction to all future excavation around this area. On the north-eastern side of the site and on top of the embankment is an oblong open enclosure constructed by the Public Works Department for the custody of the few remaining sculptures and carved stones. Alongside of the enclosure is a shed for the watchman who is permanently retained to look after the site on behalf of the Government. The general appearance of the site is that of a disused stone quarry overgrown with rank vegetation and which has been converted into a public latrine by the local villagers and pigs who live in the huts which surround the site on the east and northern sides respectively. It is obvious that this unsatisfactory state of affairs cannot be allowed to continue and that the site of this famous monument at least must be clearly demarcated and steps taken to preserve the remaining antiquities and carved blocks of stone on the spot. As these notes are written mainly for the guidance of the Public Works Department officer who may be deputed to carry out the repairs, proposed below, I will describe each item separately:—

(1) *The ditch.*—Before any repairs can be carried out, the ditch which surrounds the outer side of the stone paved processional path should be filled in with brick bats and earth up to the level of the path. As mentioned above, there are a number of big granite blocks which once supported the stone railing lying at the bottom of the ditch. As most of these are broken and owing to their vast weight and the trouble and expense that would be involved in attempting to refix them in position, they may be allowed to remain where they are. But on the eastern side of the path there are eight of these blocks in fair condition and here too the ditch is not so deep as elsewhere. These eight blocks should be refixed in an upright position against the old brick foundations of the stone paved path. When in position, they should be supported all round with a well-rammed filling of broken stone and brick bats so as to prevent settlement. There is any quantity of material for this work stacked on the spot. The earth required for levelling up the ditch can be obtained from the mound which surrounds the outer side of the ditch.

(2) *Loose blocks of stone.*—When the ditch has been filled in, all the big blocks of stone lying on the path or outside the site which are of interest and worthy of preservation should be moved into the central area. The same remarks apply to the larger stones within the Public Works Department enclosure. When the repairs proposed in these notes have been completed, this enclosure will no longer be required, so the brick piers supporting the wooden fencing may be demolished and used as building material in carrying out the present work. The object of moving all the large and heavy stones of interest into the central space at this stage of the work is because subsequently the whole site will be enclosed by a brick wall 3' 6" in height with a gateway on the south side. Once the compound wall is built it will be a difficult matter to bring inside any of these huge blocks of stone. If the officer in charge of the work will kindly inform me when he is ready to have the stones in question moved within, I will visit the site and point out on the spot which particular stones are worthy of preservation, as there are quite a number of broken stones in the Public Works Department enclosure which are of no archaeological value whatever and which may as well be broken up and used as building material in carrying out the present repairs. Why some of these useless stones were laboriously dragged up the high embankment and carefully placed within a somewhat costly enclosure while the really valuable pieces of sculpture, many bearing inscriptions, were left lying unprotected on the open site below remains a mystery.

On the eastern side of the site, lying partly on the processional path, is a big block of grey limestone measuring $13' \times 6' \times 1'$. It is carefully cut and dressed and decorated with two little pilasters representing conventionalised Persepolitan pillars. As there is no longer anything to indicate the original position of this huge block of stone which originally stood in an upright position and perhaps formed part of one of the gateways, it may remain lying flat upon the ground but it should be moved 8 feet to the west and placed on a bed of well-rammed broken brick to prevent it from sinking into the ground and eventually getting buried and lost to view. To the north of the west gateway is also a huge block of white limestone lying on the path. It appears to have formed a part of that gateway. This too should be treated in the same manner and moved 8 feet to the east. Just outside the north gateway is a big slab of limestone measuring roughly $4' \times 3' \times 6'$ and decorated with portions of two human figures. Near this entrance are also two long slabs of stone, one measuring $9' \times 2' \times 9'$ and decorated at its base with a semi-circular lotus medallion and the other $6' \times 2' \times 8'$ is a plain slab that once formed part of the inner railing. These three slabs should be removed within the central space. I have mentioned these five particular blocks of stone in detail as they represent the only really large and heavy stones to be shifted and laid on specially prepared beds of brick filling, so that provision for this item may be made when framing an estimate of the cost of the repairs. The blocks of stone now in the Public Works Department enclosure can be removed when required by hand and no special provision for the work need be made as it is a simple matter that can be undertaken by ten coolies working daily for three days.

(3) *Trees*.—The margosa tree in the centre of the site, the one growing in the south gateway and those which are found to offer obstruction to the work of repairing the paved processional path should be removed and the roots destroyed.

(4) *Stone linga*.—On the eastern side of the processional path stands a large limestone linga $1' 9"$ in thickness and 4 feet in height above ground. It is octagonal on plan with fluted sides which terminate at the centre of the crown. It is carved out of a large limestone pillar, perhaps a portion of a Buddhist stambha that once stood near the east gateway. It is broken near the top on one side and was set up in its present position by Mr. Rea. It should be moved into the central space and left lying flat on the ground with its broken surface below. This linga has no real connexion with the site which was merely used subsequently by the Hindus as a quarry on the decline of Buddhism. Lingas and Hindu idols carved out of slabs and blocks of limestone taken from this site are quite a common feature of the district. Lying beside the big linga is a smaller one carved out of a double or engaged Buddhist pillar. It is broken and unfinished but interesting as it affords direct evidence as to the manner in which the Hindus utilized some of these Buddhist remains in the service of their own religion. This little linga should be placed alongside of the big one within the central area. There are also three Hindu-looking sculptures in the Public Works Department enclosure, these too might be placed alongside of the two lingas so as to group all these later antiquities together in one spot. With regard to the three Hindu-looking sculptures, it would appear that these were discovered by Mr. Rea while excavating a mound three miles to the west of Amaravati known as the Kuchi-Dibba. However, like the rest of the sculptures discovered at the Kuchi-Dibba, they were evidently carved out of slabs of limestone removed from the Amaravati stupa. I was unable to ascertain the locality from whence the Buddhists obtained this beautiful limestone the best of which resembles white marble in appearance and withstands the action of the sun and rain excellently. Some of the bas-reliefs adorning the existing small stupa near the south gateway which were executed over a thousand years ago are as clear and sharp to-day as they were then. One reason for their surprisingly good state of preservation is the fact that the more important bas-reliefs were highly polished. There is no limestone quarry in the neighbourhood but there may be one somewhere in the range of hills on the northern side of the Kistna in the Nizam's dominions. The enormous size of some of the blocks of stone seems to indicate that the latter was brought to Amaravati by means of the river and not across country and it was dressed and carved on the site. This we know from some of the unfinished sculptures where the design is merely indicated in rough outline with a sharp chisel.

(5) *Processional path*.—The existing path surrounds a flat open circular space measuring 165 feet in diameter and the path itself is 12 feet in width and consists of a layer of bricks and broken stone bedded in mud mortar and paved on top with cutstone slabs 3 inches in thickness. The sizes of the paving slabs vary, but some of them are 12 feet in length and about 2 feet in width. The outer side of the path was originally enclosed by the big granite railing mentioned in paragraph 1 above, and which now lies at the bottom of the ditch. On its inner side, the path was apparently bounded by an ornamental limestone railing similar in style to the broken pieces of railing that still exist on the site. However, all traces of the position and extent of this inner railing has gone, so no attempt need be made to try and reproduce it now. But if the site is to be of any interest to the educated public, it is essential that the path be restored and the position of the outer railing be represented by a brick wall. In any case, a compound wall is necessary to protect the valuable antiquities within the central area and the new wall may as well follow the same line as the old railing which originally enclosed the site as any other line and thus serve two useful purposes instead of one. In paragraph 1 above, I have proposed that eight of the granite blocks of the outer railing on the eastern side of the path should be refixed in their original positions. This will, to some extent, obstruct the uniform appearance of the new wall, but it is of no consequence; in fact it is an advantage, as the granite blocks can be built into the new wall and will thus indicate to

visitors the nature of the original boundary of the site. When the upright granite blocks are fixed in position, the spaces between the blocks can be closed with a brick filling and cement coping of similar dimensions as the rest of the wall. The brick wall should be $1' 6"$ in thickness and $3' 6"$ in height from the level of the stone pavement to the top of the cement coping. The only spot where the old stone paving is intact is between the south and west gateways. This portion should be taken as a guide for the restoration of the rest of the pavement. For some absurd reason, the greater portion of the old pavement was broken up and stacked in a big heap in the central area. So far as possible, these broken slabs should be used in repaving the path. On the inner side of the path there should be below ground a dwarf brick wall 9 inches in thickness and the same height as the top of the paving slabs, so that the inner and outer walls will thus form retaining walls for the concrete foundations within and on which the paving slabs will be laid. When the inner and outer retaining walls are built, the 12-ft. space in between should be filled up with a layer of concrete so as to make the bed for the paving slabs of a uniform level all round. It will be necessary to remove and refix most of the existing old slabs during this work. The slabs should be bedded in mortar and the joints and spaces in between them pointed with good cement so as to make the pavement thoroughly watertight. As there are not sufficient slabs available for repaving the entire length of the path, the remainder may be terraced with good strong cement. I will supply the Public Works Department with a plan and section showing the construction of the new walls and paths so that an estimate may be framed accordingly.

(6) *Drainage*.—When the pavement is finished, the central space should be levelled and sloped for drainage so that all surface water flows from the centre, where the central margosa tree now stands, all round towards the paved pathway. In order that the water may not remain on the path, a number of drainage exits should be made at regular intervals through the outer wall all round the site. The central space, when finished, should appear as a flat circular well-kept grass plot 165 feet in diameter surrounded by a paved pathway 12 feet in width enclosed by a circular brick wall $3' 6"$ in height. The dwarf retaining wall on the inner side of the path mentioned above should be given a coating of cement on top which should be flush with the level of the pavement and the grass plot on its inner side, so that surface water may flow from the plot within straight across the path and cut through the drainage holes in the base of the outer brick wall.

(7) *Water and lime*.—The water required for the repairs may be obtained from the well in the compound of the travellers' rest-house which is situated within a hundred yards of the site. Some time back, a murder was committed at Amaravati and the murderer very inconsiderately threw the body of his victim into this well. Since then, it has been used only for watering the trees in the compound. It will thus do the well good to have its supply liberally drawn upon. In the past, it was the custom for any one at Amaravati who wanted lime for building purposes to visit the stupa and remove the beautifully carved limestone rails and slabs and convert them into building lime by burning them. There are still any number of useless broken blocks of limestone on the site that might be used in this manner if necessary as they are not required for any other purpose. But it may be cheaper and take less time to cart prepared lime to the spot from Guntur or elsewhere. This is a matter for the Public Works Department to decide.

(8) *Old brick work*.—Between the south and west gateways, where the old paving of the processional path still exists, there are the remains of a brick wall about 1 foot in height and 8 yards in length standing on the pavement and originally against the outer stone railing. It looks as though this wall was once carried round the whole site and that it was provided with little niches for the accommodation of Buddhist images and small votive stupas presented by pious pilgrims as memorials of their visit to this famous monument. This bit of old wall should be repaired and retained as far as possible intact when the new outer wall is being constructed. There is also a small portion of an old brick wall in the centre of the west gateway which marks the site of a little brick temple that once stood there. However, as the paving at this spot will have to be taken up and relaid, these brick remains will have to be removed and they need not be rebuilt; as there is nothing left to guide one as to the dimensions of the original shrine, so it is now impossible to reconstruct the plan of the building.

(9) *Gateways*.—Originally, there appear to have been gateways at the four cardinal points giving access to the processional path within. The stone pavement of the south and west gateways still exists, but all trace of the north and east gateways has vanished and it is no longer possible to reproduce them on plan. As a gateway is necessary on the south side so as to connect the site with the main road, the plan of the south gateway should be restored and the area enclosed by brick walls. The positions of the other three gateways can be indicated by a pair of piers in the new wall at each spot. I will supply the necessary drawings for this work and also for the repairs to ruined brick temple and little masonry stupa just outside the south gateway. It will be necessary to cut away and remove the embankment which now encloses the south gateway and connect this entrance with the main road on the south. The rest of the embankment should be sloped and dressed so as to give a uniform appearance all round the site.

MADRAS,
15th April 1918.

A. H. LONGHURST,
Superintendent, Archaeological Survey, Southern Circle.

polacochara Chapu 2. var

$\frac{24}{24} \mid 6$

The Supdr., Arch.

Survey, S. Litchfield

Consent in Engl: to
be held: with reply)

Call order
2576

8

8

Home
(Ed. 3)

6-1225/B.

Search:

24.6.18.
Referred to

the Supdt., Archaeological
Survey, Southern circle,
for early remarks.

19.6.08

Feb
12/18

$$\frac{C_2}{2.68}$$

May 6th

ms. 1352/B

Handwritten notes in Tamil script.

Handwritten notes in Tamil script.

Handwritten notes in Tamil script.

Handwritten notes in Tamil script.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.



9445 B 9
Registered 8/7/1918

Subject.

Conservation of the Amaravati Stupa in the Guntur District.

ENCLOSURES
No. 1
NIL
State copies

No. 374.

Station Kotagiri, Dated the 2nd July 1918

From (Name) A. H. Longhurst, Esq.,

(Designation) Superintendent, Archaeological Survey

Southern Circle.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

HOME (EDUCATION) Department.

Cotacamund.

Sir,

p. 8 ante

Omit portion in red bracket

I have the honour to return herewith the enclosure from the Director General of Archaeology concerning the proposed repairs to the Amaravati Stupa forwarded with Government Endorsement No. 1225-B-1, dated the 24th June 1918 and to state that it is useless for me to offer any remarks on the Director-General's criticism of my proposals as it is obvious from his remarks that he is unfamiliar with the site or the local conditions which prevail. I agree with the Director-General that from a purely esthetic point of view a modern brick wall around the site of this famous old Buddhist monument sounds "truly horrible", but at the same time I venture to think that such a wall is less objectionable than that the site should

10
remain in use as a public latrine and a feeding ground for the local
swine. If the Director General will be so good as to visit the site
with me during the coming touring season I will endeavour to convince
him of the necessity for my proposals which can only be properly under-
stood by one thoroughly familiar with the site and its present appalling
conditions.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A. H. Loughurst

Superintendent.

6-1415/B

11 10

Home (Ed. 2)

2202
Letter No. 1415-1 B of 26.7.18
Refer.

To
The Director General of
Archaeology in India.

Sir,
With refer. to your letter
No. 11 (L. S.) of 21st May 1918, regarding
the conservation of the site of
Amravati Stupa in the District
of the Madras Presidency, I am
to enclose a copy of Mr.
Loughurst's letter on the subject
and to state that, if you have
any suggestions to offer on it,
H. E. the Government in Council
will be very glad to consider
them. I am also to add that
this Govt. are anxious to take
early steps to prevent further
damage being done to these
buildings.

pp 1-4, c. 4.

App 9-10, c. 4

note
omit from in
red brackets
25/7/18

Called
3.8.18

To be despatched with a copy
of # 94 10, c. 4 and something
portion enclosed within
brackets in red pencil

22.7.18

22.7.18

24.7.18

Memo.

(No.) 1415 B.

Mamma. No 1415-28 of 26.7.18

to the Secretary, Archaeological Survey, Madras.

has been forwarded enclosing

with his letter No. 374, of 26.7.18, of

dated 26.7.18, the Supdt.,

Archaeological Survey,

is requested not to

concur in the work connected

with the conservation of the

Amaravati Stupa as the

details of the

are finally settled.

22.7.18

24.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

25.7.18

26.7.18, of

To The Supdt., Archaeological Survey (Mamma)

FROM

D. B. SPOONER, Esq., Ph.D., F.A.S.B.,

Offg. Director General of Archaeology in India,

To

The Secretary

to the Government of Madras, Madras.

Simla, the 14th October 1918.

SIR,

In reply to your letter No. 1415-B-1, dated the 26th July, I

have the honour to say that in the enclosure to your letter Mr.

Longhurst does not appear to have attempted to meet Sir John Marshall's objections to his various proposals regarding Amaravati.

It is not only that Sir John objects to the erection of a modern brick wall, he objects also to the position in which it is proposed to erect it, that is, in place of the rail around the stupa. He objects also to a number of other proposals in Mr. Longhurst's Note to which the latter now makes no reference, notably to the laying down of a concrete pradashina, and the erection of piers to mark the position of the old entrances, his reason in this case being that such piers would suggest that originally toranas stood in these positions analogous to those at Bharhut and Sanchi - a point for which no evidence exists. All that Mr. Longhurst now urges is that the site must be adequately protected. Sir John Marshall agrees. But surely this can be done without resorting to the many measures proposed by Mr. Longhurst, which would make its last state worse than its first. If a modern brick wall is unavoidable it ought to be kept outside and clear of the ancient monuments and constitute a mere compound wall. If erected where Mr. Longhurst proposes, namely along the outer edge of the processional path, the impression thereby conveyed will be altogether wrong as pointed out by Sir John in his letter of the 31st May, as this was certainly not the limit

of

14
12

of the ancient site. Sir John Marshall is of opinion that if the site is levelled and turfed and the other measures indicated in his former letter to you are carried out, a sufficient protection could be afforded to the site by a suitable hedge or fence, or possibly the two combined. This, however, is a question which can be determined by the Local Superintendent, as Sir John does not think that a special visit to the site is called for on his part. I could, however, invite renewed attention to the details given in his letter of the 31st May, and urge that due consideration be given to Sir John's proposals before the costly, and in some ways objectionable measures, advocated by Mr. Longhurst are carried out.

b6/b7C

*Section was
checked
pp 9-10
and
that this should
be typed
mcs
9/4*

I do not consider that Mr. Longhurst's letter No. 374 is in any sense an answer to the weighty objections which Sir John Marshall had raised.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

J.B. Spooner

Offg. Director General.

Home (Cde)

le. 1225/B, from the D. G. of Archaeology
1161, d/ 31.5.18.

Subject. Conservation notes on
the Amarnath Stupa.

Mr. Longhurst as
usual sent a copy of these notes to
Govt: and these were recorded in
Go. No. 636 Ed. 4, d/ 17th May 1918.
It is perhaps desirable to obtain
Mr. Longhurst's views on the Director
General's suggestions by means of
an official reply.

The draft and below is
for app.:

19.6.18.

21.6.18.

27.6.18

End: No. 1225/B-1, d/ 24.6.18

[No. 1415/B], from the Supdt., Arch.
Survey, No. 374, d/ 2nd July 1918

In the circumstances

reported by Mr. Longhurst, it seems
desirable to forward a copy of his letter
to the Director General, inviting him
to undertake a tour to the Presidency
If he replies that it will be possible
for him to do so, the fact may be
intimated to the Arch. Supdt., asking

not necessary
167

the latter not to commence any repairs to the monument until after the site has been inspected

2 A draft letter to the D.S. is subd.

13-7-18.
Lk
18-7-18.

Revised draft for approval. he may send a copy of this to Mr Longhurst ask him to postpone work until the question is finally settled

16-7-18
18-7-18

For approval

148.


I regret that I cannot approve the wording of this draft: it seems to me by its baldness to run considerable risk - no doubt unintentionally - of defeating its purpose. I suggest that it would be preferable to send to Sir John Marshall a copy of Mr Longhurst's letter; and say that if he has any suggestions to offer upon it, we shall be very glad to consider them; and also that we are anxious to take early steps to prevent further damage being done to these buildings.

20-7-18.

clean draft
please
19/7/18

clean draft submitted.
17-7-18
16/7/18

(omitting the sentences in red brackets - which is unnecessary)



With refer. to H. E.'s note on

the previous page, a revised draft is

Subd: A Definite answer to the Arch.

12.7.18) Supdr: is also subd: for appl:.

Td
22/7/18

24.7.18

11/25/7/18

Letter No. 1415/B-1, d/ 26.7.18.

Memo No. 1415/B-2, d/ 26.7.18.

~~Subd: A~~

orders as to ~~whether~~ a reminder

to the D. S. of Archaeology may ~~be~~

Letter No. 1415/B-1, d/ 26th July 1918.

19.9.18

3 26 So, the draft below is for appl:.

20/9/18

24.9.18

(Sir John Marshall is on leave until he returns 15.10.18.) Remd on 15 Oct

11/25/9/18

pp 13414, L. 2194/B, from the D. S. of Archaeology,

No. 2302, d/ 14th Oct. 1918.

Dr. Spooner, offg D. S.

offers certain suggestions for

re-modelling the measures of

conservation proposed by Mr.

Loughurst in connection with the

Amravanti Stupas. He and Sir

John Marshall are ~~in~~ agreed

conservation note
at pp 5 to 7, c.f.

p. 14, d p. 4, e. f.

The first letter
has already
been communicated

I do not think
to

in condemning the measures
proposed by Mr. Longhurst in his
conservation notes (pp 5 to 7, e. f.) as
being not only needlessly costly, but
also objectionable, in other ways, tend-
ing to spoil the whole architectural
effect. It does not now seem possible
to do anything further than
to communicate the two letters
from the D. S. to Mr. Longhurst
and ask the latter to completely
revert his proposals. The last
sentence in the second letter (p. 14
e. f.) may however be excised as it
might give offence to Mr. Longhurst.

Orders are solicited.

30.10.18.
30.10.18.

31.10.18

It is a pity that Sir John Marshall
can not visit the site. But it
seems clear from the present
letter that Mr. Longhurst's suggestions
are objectionable. Reasons which
are very sound are given.

We may communicate a
copy of this letter to the Supt
with a remark that he will

revise his conservation notes
in accordance with the remarks
therein

Draft my 11/11/18

A draft order is dated:

3 With refer: to the Secy's marginal
remark at 'K' overleaf, it is respectfully
submitted that
H-1-4, e. f. (H-1-4, e. f.)
Sgt John Marshall's letter was not
formally communicated to the Arch.

Supdt.: The original of that commu-
nication was sent but it was returned
to the Secy with the Supdt's reply. As it
is not clear whether a copy of that letter
has been taken for record in
the Arch. Supdt's office, it was
suggested that both the letters may
be communicated. It may be presumed
that the S. A. S. has taken copy of the letter


3.11.18
4.11.18

5.11.18

Draft amended.

May issue
my 6/11/18

7.11.18.



B:8
C:6
A:8

H.E.

Communicating to the Supdt., Arch. (Ed. 4)
Survey, copy of letter from the D. S. of Arch. in India
on the conservation of the in the Gandhara Dist. and
asking the former to send his conservation notes on the
Read again G.O. No. _____, dated _____ 1918

" " " " 636 Ed. 17. 5. 1918 (X)

Read also:-

C. No. 1225/2 From the D. S. of Arch., No. 1161, dated 31.5. 1918.

" " 1415/2 " " Supdt., Arch. Survey, 374, 2.7. 1918.

" " 2194/2 " " D. S. of Arch. " 2302 " 14.10. 1918.

ORDER.

No. 1428, dated 8-11- 1918.

Mos.

* Copy of the letter
from the D. S. of Archaeology
No 1161 dated 31 May 1918 and
in India, No. 2302, d/ 14th Oct.
1918 regarding the conserva-
tion of the Amuravati Stupa
in the Gandhara Dist. and com-
municated to the Supdt.,
Arch. Survey, Southern Circle,
in continuation of Memo. No.
1225/2-2, d/ 24th July 1918
and he is requested to
revise his conservation note
in the light of the remarks
therein.

To the Supdt., Arch.

Survey, S. Circle,

To be revised on 3.1.18

3.11.18.

5.11.18

Recd to the
with Encl
2.11.18

636 Ed. 17. 5. 18

(L. 11.18)

11.18

