

Home (1919) Department.

Education

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No.

7

DATED

3-1-19

INDEXED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Annual report of the Superintendent, Archaeological survey.

Forwarding to the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey a copy of the note recorded by Sir John Marshall, Director-General of Archaeology in India reviewing the -----

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 (S.D.) 2645 B.

18.12.18

No. 163

Government of India,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.
(A. and E.)

Delhi, the 13th December 1918

From

The Hon'ble Mr. H. Sharp, C.S.I., C.I.E.,
Offg. Secretary to the Government of India,

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Home Department.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of the
Annual Report of the Archaeological Department,
Southern Circle for the year 1917-18, forwarded with
your letter dated the 8th October 1918.

2. I am to enclose a copy of a note dated the 31st
October 1918, recorded by Sir John Marshall, Director
General of Archaeology in India, reviewing the
report, and to request that, with the permission of the
Governor in Council, it may be forwarded to the
Superintendent, Archaeological Survey, Southern
Circle for information and necessary action.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

H. Sharp

Offg. Secretary to the Government of India.

15x28
Recorded
written by Sir John Marshall, Kt. C.I.E.,
Director General of Archaeology in India, dated 31st Oct. 1918
receiving the Annual Report of the Archaeological Dept. Southern
India for the year 1917-18.

The tabular statement of Treasure Trove given in paragraph 5 of this report is useful, but in cases where the acquisition of Treasure has been advised by the Superintendent, it would be still more useful if a permanent record of the circumstances attending the find could be included. This could be done in the same tabular form, if the three entries of District, Taluk and Village were put seriatim as a, b. and c of each item in the column of Findspot which would leave room for the extra column giving details of the discovery. This new column need not be filled in where the Treasure has been found too unimportant to be acquired.

In paragraph 6 Mr. Longhurst states that since he has supplied the Local Government with monthly tour statements throughout the year, no detailed statement is called for in this Report. This is unfortunate, as a brief tabular statement of the time spent on tours, showing the number of days spent at each place, is of distinct use in judging of the year's work, as it enables Government to see where the Superintendent has laid emphasis. For example, in the present case we should like to know how much time was devoted to the exploration of the great temple complex at Srisailem which is described at such length and with such interesting detail in Part II of the Report under review; but the absence of the usual Appendix showing time spent on tour makes it impossible to do this. As the publication of such an Appendix on Tours is a recognized part of other Reports, it is suggested that the Superinten

Superintendent is Madras might be asked to include one in future,

The least satisfactory portion of the Report is the section (para. 100) dealing with Conservation. Here Mr. Longhurst has been something more than terse, so much so that it is impossible to form a just estimate of the year's work. He begins by saying that copies of conservation and inspection notes on all important repairs proposed during the year have been supplied to Government and to the Director General. As a matter of fact, no such notes were received by this office until after the final copies were struck off, which means to say that they were supplied for information, and not to enable the Director General to scrutinize the proposals in advance and modify them ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ where necessary. Mr. Longhurst's ostensible reason for this course is that his notes were either of too unimportant a nature, or too urgent, to call for the regular procedure laid down by Government. But this reason has not held good in all cases. For example, a note submitted by Mr. Longhurst on the monuments of Amaravati was neither unimportant nor yet urgent, and it was one to which I had to take considerable exception. A copy of this note with the correspondence in connection with it, is appended to this review, and it is suggested that the Government of India might perhaps address the Madras Government as to the desirability of their instructing the Superintendent to follow the usual procedure in future. Otherwise, it is impossible for the Director General to assist the Local Government as fully as he might otherwise do with his advice.

Now here in this Report is any detailed account of any piece of conservation work given. Appendix C gives in tabular form a statement of expenditure on all classes of work, and column 5 gives a concise description of these works. In few cases, however, is this description such as to enable the general reader to form any judgment as to the nature or propriety of the measures taken. As examples, I may mention item 3, "Repairs to Buddhist remains"; item 11, "Special repairs" (to Buddhist chaityas); item 14, "Repairs, (to the four-storeyed rock-cut Hindu temple), etc., etc., To be sure, most if not all of these particular items were petty, according to the sum expended, but even in the case of item 114, where the expenditure amounts to Rs. 3,252/- the only information given is "Repairs to the following ..." with a bare list of the monuments repaired. In paragraph 10 of the Report Mr. Longhurst states that a brief account of all special repairs carried out during the year has been specially supplied to the Director General for incorporation in his Annual Report, but unfortunately even this special statement consisted only of a bare list of 14 items selected from the 115 given in Appendix C to his Report, with a mere statement of the amount expended on each. I had asked specially for a brief statement of the special works themselves, to enable me to do justice in my own Report to Mr. Longhurst's work for the year. But neither in the special statement, nor yet in his provincial report, does Mr. Longhurst give any detailed account of what he has done in this the most important branch of his work. This is the more regrettable as Mr. Longhurst is himself a trained architect, and a readable account of his activities in this his special branch of work would be of interest and help to his colleagues in the Survey. I beg to suggest therefore that Mr. Longhurst

N-19
1/2

N-12-19
253

for
any

5 6
be requested to report in somewhat more detail on his conservation work in future.

4 In contrast to the inadequacy of his notes on Conservation is the fullness and elaboration of his notes on the Srisaillam Temple and the Kapotesvara Temple at Chezarla, given in Part II of his Report. These are most interesting and important accounts of these monuments, for which we ^{are} much indebted to Mr. Longhurst. His detailed description of the buildings and particularly of the bas-reliefs at Srisaillam are specially valuable, and in his painstaking account of them the Superintendent has rendered a distinctly useful service. On page 21 Mr. Longhurst has made a strange and very unfortunate mistake in connection with the history of the Srisaillam Temple. He confuses Chandragupta of the Imperial Gupta dynasty with Chandragupta Maurya, and pushes back the foundation of the temple six or seven centuries earlier than is justified by the sthalamahatmya.

5 On the whole, however, the Superintendent in the Southern Circle has done a good and useful year's work. But it is a pity that in regard to the most important branch of his activity, he should have contented himself with so very measure a statement. An improvement in this matter is desirable, if only in Mr. Longhurst's own interests.

To
The S.

1918

Annual Report of the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey.

Forwarding to the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey a copy of the
note by Sir John Marshall, Director General of Archaeology in India reviewing
the

READ AGAIN G.O. No., dated 191

” ” ” ” ” 191 .

READ ALSO:—

Q. No. 2643-B From the Govt of India, Dept of Ed. No. 163, dated 13-12-18.

" " " " " "

” ” ” ” ” ” 18

ORDER.

No. 7, dated 3. 1. 1997

his

A copy of the note ²³¹⁻¹⁰⁻¹⁸ recorded
by Sir John Marshall, Director
General of Archaeology includes
reviewing the Annual Report of
the Archaeological Department,
Southern Circle, ^{for the year 1917-18} ~~forwarded~~ is
to the Superintendent, Archaeo-
cal Survey, Southern Circle, for
information and necessary
action.

208
3.1.19

£
20.12.18.

22/12/18

20.12.18

LED

231208

7.

The S.A.s with a copy of the note H.E. the Governor
at H 2-5 cf.

2- JAN 1918

When given for copying

When copied

When examined

When signed

191

REAR AGAIN G.O. No.
191

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

..

..

..

A

A

A

A

A

A

A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH LITTO.

PAYERS 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.