

*Home* (1919) Department.  
(Constitution)

*Ordinary* SERIES.

G.O. No. 206

DATED 15-2-19

INDEXED

---

[Despatch Abstract.]

Superintendent, Archaeological Survey--

Directing the----- to carry out in his future annual reports the suggestions contained in the Director General's note reviewing the annual report of the Southern circle for 1917-18.

# BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

# FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

9,882-2-17.

G.F.-29.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Received



Registered

Subject.

Director General of Archaeology's note reviewing the Annual Report of the Southern Circle for 1917-18.

ENCLOSURES

No. Nil

State copies Nil

No. 39

Station Madras, Dated the 15th January 1919

From (Name) A. H. Longhurst, Esq.,  
(Designation) Superintendent, Archaeological Survey  
Southern Circle.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,  
HOME (EDUCATION) Department.  
MADRAS.

Sir,

With reference to Government Order No.7, Home (Education) Department, dated the 3rd January 1919 forwarding a copy of a note dated the 31st October 1918 recorded by the Director General of Archaeology, reviewing my Annual Report for 1917-18, I have the honour to submit herewith explanatory remarks on the same with the request that a copy of my note may be transmitted to the Government of India, Department of Education, for information.

2. The tabular statement of Treasure Trove cases given in paragraph 5 (page 2 of my Annual Report for 1917-18), is similar in all respects to those which have appeared in my previous reports and which have been approved by Government and presumably by the Director General of Archaeology, since the latter has not complained about the manner in which this information has been given before

this year. During the Muhammadan invasion of Southern India, hundreds of Hindu images were buried for safety and every year some of these are accidentally discovered by people working on the land. So far there have been no interesting details concerning either the finder, the findspot or the manner in which the discovery was made worth recording in my Annual Report. When such interesting particulars do occur they will be recorded in my report.

3. The statement of tours given in paragraph 6 (page 2) is framed on exactly the same lines as in my previous reports and has been approved by Government and also by the Director General of Archaeology until this year. When I have occasion to call attention to any place of particular importance inspected during my tours, I do so in Part II of my report where I have the space to do full justice to the subject. As I submit a monthly diary to Government showing the time spent on tour and the places visited each month, I fail to see what useful purpose would be served in again publishing this same information in my Annual Report.

4. With regard to the conservation of ancient monuments in Southern India, I venture to think that as the senior and most experienced Architect in the department, I may safely be permitted to use my own judgment as to what I consider worth publishing in my Annual Report. The Director General of Archaeology's advice regarding repairs to ancient monuments in this Circle would be of more value if he would first make himself personally familiar with the monuments concerning which he offers criticism regarding my proposed repairs. During the seven years that I have been in charge of this Circle, the Director General of Archaeology has spent only two days inspecting ancient monuments in my charge. These two days were spent at Hampi Ruins in the Bellary District, when he expressed himself as being thoroughly satisfied with my conservation work at that place, so much so, that he said it was unnecessary for him to inspect any of the other numerous works in progress at other places in this Presidency, if I was carrying out the same policy elsewhere. Since then, he has been asked on more than one occasion to visit this

3  
Presidency to advise the Local Government and to assist me with his advice concerning certain proposed conservation works but so far, he has been unable to comply with these requests.

h-5 of  
Geo. art. 10  
h-21 of  
Geo. art. 10  
5. The Director General of Archaeology is mistaken when he states that I have made a "strange and unfortunate mistake" regarding my reference to the Gupta family in my illustrated monograph on the Srisaillam Temple appearing in Part II of my last Annual Report. The reference in question as pointed out in my report, is a quotation from Mr. Krishna Sastri's Annual Report for 1915.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A. H. Longhurst.

Superintendent.

# NOTES.

## Previous papers

- Exo. 7 (Edw) 23.1.19
- " 1757 (Public) 28.12.15
- " 1260 Public 25.8.15
- " 1250 " 21.8.15
- " 1403 " 16.11.12

Have (Edw) Rept.  
le-111B- From the Superintendent, Archaeo-  
logical Survey, No 39 of 15.1.19

Subject: Annual Report of the  
Superintendent, Archaeologi-  
cal Survey, Southern Circle  
for 1917-18

(ix)

In G.O. No 7, Have (Edw) of 3.1.19  
the Govt. Communicated to the Superintend-  
ent, Archaeological Survey, Southern  
Circle, a copy of the note recorded by  
the D. G. of Archaeology reviewing  
the annual report of the Archaeolo-  
gical Dept., Southern Circle for 1917-18

Mr. Longhurst has submitted a note,  
explaining in detail the portions of  
the report which the D. G. has criti-  
cised and requests that a copy of the  
note may be forwarded to the Govt.  
of India. The D. G.'s remarks  
and Mr. Longhurst's explanations are  
dealt with below:—

p. 2 of the report  
at (K)

p. 2 of G.O. no  
7 Edw of 3.1.19

(ix)

Para 5 of the Report

(a) This deals with cases of treasure trove.  
The D. G.'s remarks on this portion of the  
report are contained in para 1 of his  
note. Mr. Longhurst states that  
hitherto

para 2 of  
his letter pp. 1-2 of

p. 2 of the Report  
at (K)

para 2 of the D.G.'s  
note p. 2 of B.O. at  
(ix)

para 3 of the Report  
letter p. 2 of

Circle should also conform  
to the rule. The D.G. considers  
the info necessary & there is  
no harm in furnishing it. Had  
the point been raised  
in previous years is not  
valid objection. The A.A.S.  
is not to be held responsible  
for the info. The Report at  
monthly of the Report at

(K)

para 3 of his note  
at p. 3 of B.O. at  
(ix)

hitherto there have been no interesting  
details regarding the find of the trea-  
sure and that if in future there are  
any such details worth recording he  
will record them in the report. Sub-  
mitted that no further action is

necessary. In any case there seems to be no  
objection in adopting the D.G.'s proposal to give a col. for the purpose  
of that would be a waste. But the matter is not overlooked.  
(b) Para 6 of the Report. - Statement of Tour

The D.G. suggests that a  
brief tabular statement showing the  
time spent at each place may be  
included in future reports, as it  
serves to show where the Superintend-  
ent has laid emphasis and as it  
is a recognised part of other reports.  
The Superintendent, Archaeological  
Survey, P. C. considers that no  
useful purpose will be served  
by such a statement, as he  
submits a monthly diary to the  
showing the time spent on tour and  
the places visited each month.

Submitted that the D.G.'s proposal  
seems reasonable and  
that he approved. The fact that other  
reports give this info makes it necessary that the report of this  
(c) Para 10 of the Report - Conservation of  
ancient monuments

The D.G. considers the portion deal-  
ing with this subject the least  
satisfactory portion of the Report.

the

para 3 of this  
note at p. 3 of

G.O. no 7 (22nd) (K)  
3.1.19

ibid

(8)

para 3 of the D.G.  
note at p. 3 of G.O.  
no 7 (22nd) 3.1.19

(K)

The D.G. complains that copies of inspection and conservation notes were sent to him only after the final copies were submitted and not in sufficient time to enable him to scrutinise the proposals contained in the notes. He requests that the Superintendent may be instructed to follow the usual procedure in future. Attention is invited to para 2 (i) of the letter from the Govt of India printed at p. 2 of G.O. no 1403 (Public) of 16.11.12 in which it is laid down that Provincial Archaeological officers should invariably consult the D.G. before approving proposals for conservation and also submit a memorandum of such proposals to the D.G. Mr. Longhurst makes no attempt to explain his omission to follow this procedure, but simply states that the D.G.'s advice regarding repairs to monuments is of little value as he is not acquainted with these monuments. The D.G. also complains of the meagre accounts given in the Report of repairs to monuments and states that the description of the monuments is not such as to enable him to judge of the propriety of the measures taken.

para 3 of the  
D.G.'s notes p. 4  
of B.G. no 7 & on  
3.1.19  
(K)

para 3 of the note  
of B.G. at (K)  
p. 4-5

para 4 of his letter  
p. 2 cf.

para 4 of his  
note p. 5 of  
B.G. at (ix)

para 5 of his  
letter p. 3 cf.

~~Conservation~~ Mr. Loughurst has not also  
furnished the D.G. with a brief state-  
ment of special repairs to monuments  
as requested by him. The D.G. requests  
that Mr. Loughurst may be instructed  
to report in somewhat more detail on  
his conservation work in future.

Mr. Loughurst's ~~only~~ answer to the  
D.G.'s criticism is that as he is  
the most experienced Architect in  
the Department, he may be left to  
use his own judgment as to what  
is worth publishing in his Report.

Submitted that Mr. Loughurst may  
be instructed to follow the procedure  
in regard to conservation proposals  
referred to in p. 3 supra and to  
report in greater detail on the con-  
servation works in future reports.

(d) The D.G.'s criticism ~~is repeated~~  
of Mr. Loughurst's note on the history  
of the Srisailem temple and Mr. Loughurst  
answers thereto do not call for  
any remarks

2. Submitted that Mr. Loughurst  
may be instructed to carry out the  
D.G.'s suggestions referred to in para  
1 (b) & (c) above and that a copy of  
his

his note may be forwarded to the Govt. together with a copy of the Govt. that may issue instructing the S.H.S. ~~to carry out the D.G.'s suggestions as proposed above.~~

Suggestions as proposed above.

29.1.19 31.2.19  
19.1.19

Points (a) & (b) The Director General's suggestions are sound and the Supb. may be asked to carry them out.  
2. Point (c) Conservation. I regret to notice that Mr. Longhurst simply indulges in personal remarks against the D.G. without meeting the D.G.'s criticisms. The Supb. may be asked to incorporate in his provincial report a detailed account of what he has done in the matter of conservation. Further copies of inspection & conservation notes should be sent to the D.G. as prescribed.

3. The mistake re Chandraghanta is Krishna Sastri's but has been reproduced in Mr. Longhurst's report.

10/2/19

142

P

11.2.19.

12/2/19

B.31.

C.702

19.1.19

Please see  
Kandhar  
12/2/19

Go. No 1260, Public

25.8.15 in which the  
report was received in part  
wh- slip (M) - Please see  
13.1.19 at 91 of the Govt.

~~Woodbury~~

A draft order is submitted for approval

13-2-19

14-2-19

My 15/2/19

15-2-19

Directing the          to carry out the suggestions  
contained in the Director-General's note reviewing the Annual  
Report of the Southern Circle for 1917-18

C. No. 1113, From the Superintendent, Ar., No. 39, dated 15-1-1919  
Chaeological Survey

" " ..... " " ..... " " ..... " " ..... 191

ORDER.

No. 206, dated 15-2-1919

Mrs

With reference to his letter read above, the Superintendent Archaeological Survey is requested to <sup>carry on</sup> ~~work~~ in his future reports the suggestions contained <sup>the first two paragraphs</sup> ~~in paragraph~~ of the Director-General's note, dated the 31st October, 1918, copy of which was forwarded to him with G.O. no 7, Home (Genl) 23.1.19

2- The Superintendent's attention is drawn to para 2 (1) of the letter from the Govt of Sind no 320/330, dated 26<sup>th</sup> September 1943

pp 2-3 of Geo. at (8)

1912, forwarded to him in the Encl. No.

5149-1, Public, of the 11<sup>th</sup> October

1912, and he is requested to submit in future copies of inspection and conservation notes to the Director-General of Archaeology in advance so as to enable him to scrutinise the proposals contained therein. A detailed account of the ~~superintendent's~~ <sup>done by the Superintendent</sup> conservation work should also be incorporated in his future annual reports.

13.2.19

13.2.19

13.2.19

13.2.19

14.2.19

19.2.19

To

The Supdt., Archaeological Survey, S. C. I.

When given for copying

When copied

When examined

When signed

191

REAP AGAIN G.O. No. 191

DATED

RENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH LITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A — Copy in full.

B — Not to be copied.

P — Copy abstract only.

Q — Copy heading only.