Educational (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 443.

Dated 27th May 1895.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

REMUNERATION FOR A TEXT-BOOK.

Negativing the claim of C.Vencatasubbaramayya for -- (Telugu Grammar).

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

To

His Excellency the Governor in Council
Fort Saint George
Madras

The humble Petition of C.
Vencatasubbaramiah

Most Respectfully sheweth,

1 That your memorialist's father C. Cuppuswami Sastri was entrusted in G. O. (Edl) dated 22d November 1875 No. 389 with the preparation of three Telugu grammars for an honorarium of Rs 1500/. (Vide Enclosure A).

2. That on 16th September 1885 your memorialist's father Submitted the first or Highest Grammar on receipt of a reminder from the Director of Public Instruction dated 3d August 1885 No. $\frac{BB}{650}$, enquiring what progress was made in the preparation of those grammars referred to in the above para and when they would likely be placed in the hands of the printers. (Vide Enclosure B).

3. That the grammar submitted by the memorialist's father having been lost in the Director's Office, your Petitioner was asked by the Director in $\frac{BB}{241}$ dated 17th March 1887 to forward a Copy of the grammar Submitted by his father. (Vide Enclosure C)

4. That your Petitioner on 21st march 1887 submitted to the Director the draft Copy of the grammar in his possession pointing out that it was not a true Copy of the original submitted by his father as a true Copy was not kept by him.

5. That nine months after the submission of the Copy mentioned in the previous para, the Petitioner wrote to the Director of Public Instruction on 2d January 1888, 29th may 1888 and 22d august 1888 requesting him to grant the Petitioner a reasonable remuneration for the grammar Compiled by the Petitioner's father

6. That in reply the Petitioner was informed by the Director of ~~the~~ Public Instruction in $\frac{BB}{625}$ dated 8th september 1888 that the question of payment of remuneration for the advanced Telugu grammar Could only be determined after the book which was under revision was printed. (Vide Enclosure D)

7. That your Petitioner again on 5th april 1889 applied to the Director of Public Instruction for remuneration in the belief that revision of his father's grammar would have been Completed by that time.

8. That in reply the Petitioner was asked in $\frac{BB}{432}$ dated 2d may 1889 whether he would accept Rs 250/ as Compensation for the original Compilation of his father. (Vide Enclosure E)

9. That your Petitioner on 6th may 1889 replied that the remuneration offered was very low and requested the Director of Public Instruction that it might be increased

10. That the Director in his Proceedings No. $\frac{BB}{567}$ dated 14th June 1889 raised the remuneration to Rs 300/. (Vide Enclosure F)

11. That your Petitioner on his writing again on 20th June 1889 that the remuneration was yet low, was informed in $\frac{BB}{652}$ dated 15th July 1889 that if he did not agree to reasonable terms, the Grammar might be rejected and was also asked at the same time whether he would undertake to revise his father's grammar. (Vide Enclosure G)

12. That your Petitioner without disputing the amount of Rs 300/ offered for his father's Compilation undertook to revise his father's grammar

13. That thereupon your Petitioner was entrusted with the revision of the Grammar in $\frac{BB}{721}$ dated 7th August 1889. (Vide Enclosure H)

14. That on 3d July 1891 your Petitioner Completed the revision and submitted the grammar to the Director of Public Instruction

15. That the said Grammar as revised by your Petitioner was referred to Mr S. Rangiah Chettiar for his Criticism and those Criticisms were in $\frac{BB}{76}$ dated 21st January 1892 forwarded to the Petitioner for his remarks.

16. That on 29th September 1892 the Petitioner submitted his Comments on Mr Rangiah Chettiar's Criticism pointing out that most of his Criticisms Could not be maintained for reasons fully given in the Petitioner's letter of 29th Sept 1892 and requested that the matter be referred to a Committee for decision.

17. That your Petitioner's letter referred to in the preceding para was simply 'Recorded' in $\frac{BB}{24}$ dated 18th January 1894. (Vide Enclosure I)

18. That thereupon your Petitioner applied to the Director on 10th may 1894 for remuneration for his trouble in revising his father's grammar.

19. That in $\frac{BB}{448}$ dated 26th June 1894 Your Petitioner was informed that the ag Director was not prepared to sanction any remuneration for the work as it was condemned by so competent an authority as the Telugu Translator to Government. (Vide Enclosure J)

20. That Your Petitioner on 27th November 1894 requested the Director to reconsider the order passed in $\frac{BB}{448}$ dated 26th June 1894 and to direct the payment of Rs 300/ previously offered for his father's Compilation and of a reasonable remuneration for his revision

21. That your Petitioner received the following reply in $\frac{BB}{1027}$ dated 5th December 1894:– "The Director regrets "that he cannot comply with the request. Mr. K. R. C. Veneata-"Subbaramiah should publish the book on his own account. "If it meets a want it will be sure to sell and thus "to recoup him for his labor in revising it." (Vide Enclosure K)

22. That your Petitioner finding that the reply abovementioned was still silent about the payment of Rs 300/, wrote to the Director on 16th December 1894 requesting the payment of Rs 300/ offered to the Petitioner in $\frac{BB}{567}$ dated 14th June 1889.

23. That in reply the Director of Public Instruction in $\frac{BB}{86}$ dated 9th February 1895 declined to reconsider the order in $\frac{BB}{1027}$ of 5th December 1894 and to pay any remuneration Either for the original Compilation by the Petitioner's father or for the Petitioner's revision (Vide Enclosure L)

24. That thereupon your Petitioner with a view to petition to your Excellency applied to the Director on 20th February 1895 for copies of the correspondence in respect of the Grammar which the Director in his Proceedings $\frac{BB}{207}$ dated 19th March 1895 declined to furnish remarking that the request was "a most unusual one". (Vide Enclosure M)

25. That your Excellency will see from the facts mentioned above that the Petitioner's Grammar has been Condemned on the strength of the single adverse Criticism of Mr. Rangiah Chettiar. Your Petitioner most respectfully begs to submit that Mr Rangiah Chettiar's Criticisms are vague, indefinite and untenable (as will be seen from the Petitioner's remarks submitted to the Director on 29th September 1892) and that a work of such vast importance and originality as the Petitioner's father's Grammar which occupied several years' labor and which is the outcome of extensive research, ought not to have been Summarily Condemned on the sole testimony of Mr. Rangiah Chettiar

The Petitioner further begs to submit that even granting that the Petitioner's revision of his father's Grammar was not a success, the Director was not justified in refusing to the Petitioner the Compensation of Rs 300/ for the original Compilation of his father which was offered to him in 1889

26. Your Petitioner therefore humbly prays

that your Excellency will kindly take the matter into your Excellency's kind Consideration, that Your Excellency will kindly send for all the Correspondence, Mr. Rangiah Chettiar's Criticisms and your Petitioner's remarks thereon from the Director's office, that your Excellency will after perusal of the same render your Petitioner justice and direct that Rs 300 which was offered to your Petitioner in $\frac{BB}{567}$ dated 14th June 1889 as Compensation for the original Compilation of his father be paid to him, that his remarks on Mr Rangiah Chettiar's Criticisms as well as those

Criticisms be referred to a Committee and that Your Excellency will also be pleased to direct that a reasonable remuneration be granted to your Petitioner for his revision of his father's grammar at the request of the Director of Public Instruction.

For which act of kindness Your Petitioner Shall Ever pray.

75. Annapillai Street
Black Town
1st April 1895

C Vmala Dabaramuali

Petitioner

List of Enclosures submitted herewith

A.	Proceedings of the Government (Edl dept)	dated	22. 11. 75	No. 389
B	Proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction	dated	3-8.85	No. $\frac{BS}{65}$
C.	do do	do	17.3.87	No. $\frac{BS}{241}$
D.	do do	do	8.9.88	No. $\frac{BS}{625}$
E	do do	do	2.5.89	No. $\frac{BS}{432}$
F	do do	do	14.6.89	No. $\frac{BS}{567}$
G.	do do	do	15.7.89	No. $\frac{BS}{652}$
H.	do do	do	7.8.89	No. $\frac{BS}{721}$
I.	do do	do	18.1.94	No. $\frac{BS}{24}$
J	do do	do	26-6-94	No. $\frac{BS}{448}$
K.	do do	do	5.12.94	No. $\frac{BS}{1027}$
L.	do do	do	9.2.95	No. $\frac{BS}{86}$
M.	do do	do	19.3.95	No. $\frac{BS}{207}$.

CURRENT No. 417

Educational Dept.

22-11-75 / 34-35
Text Book Comm's Report 1874. (from Library)
File re Text books

From MRRy C. Vencatasubbaramayya

Dated 1st April 1895
Recd & Regd - do
Enclos - One file of Correspondence

TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY.

Subject

Praying for remuneration of Rs 300 offered originally by the D. P. I. for the Telugu Grammar compiled by the petitioner's late father MRRy C. Kuppuswami Sastri and for a reasonable compensation for the petitioner's own labours in revising the same at the D. P. I's request.

D. P. I. for paper

[G. / 24]
500—26-6-94.

Ed DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G. O., dated 189 , No.

Again G. O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. of 189 , dated from

Current No. of 189 , dated from

copd / exd } 5/4

Cuo 417 of 95

ORD~~ER~~. Edn No 776 / 6.4.95

Referred to the Director of Public Instruction for report, ~~which should be accompanied by the correspondence referred to in para 8 of the petition~~.

D / 4.4.95

To

The D.P.I. with Cur. & Enclo } Cot 6/4 despd 6/4/95

Note -

Submitted to us for approval.

W / 4/4/95

Current No 567

Office of the Director of
Public Instruction,
Madras, 6th May 1895.

No. $\frac{B.B}{360}$

From

The Honorable Mr. D. DUNCAN, M.A., D.Sc.,
Director of Public Instruction,
Madras,

To

The Honorable The CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Fort St. George.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit, as required in memorandum dated 6th April 1895, No. 776, a report on the petition of M. R. Ry. C. Venkata Subbaramayya dated 1st idem praying for the payment of honoraria (1) for the compilation of a Telugu grammar by his father and (2) for its revision by himself, both the compilation & the revision having been done at the request of the Department

2. In July 1875 M.R.Ry. C. Kuppuswami Sastri, the Petitioner's father, then in the Service of the Department was entrusted with the preparation of three graduated treatises on Telugu Grammar for a honorarium of Rs 1500 which was sanctioned by Government, Vide G.O. No. 389 Educational dated 22nd November 1875 (Enclosure A.). ~~For~~ a period of ten years subsequent to this date no progress seems to have been reported until in September 1885, in response to a reminder from this Department a compilation, termed an advanced Treatise on the Subject, was received from the Petitioner's father with an explanation for delay and a promise to bring

Why such a long delay? What was the D. doing all this time?

out the remaining works of the Series on the acceptance of the first. The manuscript copy was forwarded for remarks by turn to M.R.Ry. V. Krishnamachariyar, M.R.Ry. M. Seshagiri Sastriyar M.A., M.R.Ry. S. Rangayya Chetti Garu B.A., and M.R.Ry. V. Vasudeva Sastri B.A.; but, unfortunately, it was lost in September 1886 when returned by the last mentioned gentleman from Rajahmundry.

It was no fault of the petitioner

3. The opinion of these experts in the Telugu language was not favourable and they reported that the treatise could not be published without careful revision. The Compiler meanwhile died, and for a time nothing was done. In March 1887, however, it transpired that the deceased author had left a copy of the manuscript with his son, who readily furnished it, at the request of the Department

This copy, which was admitted not to be in all respects identical with the manuscript that was lost, was put into the hands of certain Telugu Scholars towards the end of the year 1888. In March 1889, it was again reported that the work had not been written in accordance with the instructions of the Text Book Revision Committee, and that the manuscript required thorough re-casting and revision — a work for which a honorarium of Rs 750 was asked.

The loss of the original manuscript was not his fault.

Who?

What instructions?

4. In view of the serious defects & of the large sum which would have to be paid as honoraria, to those who might undertake the revision, the Petitioner was informed by the Director that he was not prepared to recommend more than Rs 250 for the compilation (Enclosure E). The Petitioner regarded the sum as inadequate stating in his letter dated 6th May 1889, that it was not a fair proportion of Rs 1500, the honorarium fixed by Government for the Series and requesting that the amount might be raised to Rs 500. The Director took the opinion of certain gentlemen as to what sum might be offered, and on their advice returned a portion of the manuscript, not essential to the treatise, and proposed to recommend to Government Rs 300 for the rest (Enclosure F). Petitioner was requested to say whether he would accept this. In reply the Petitioner stated that the remuneration of Rs 300 was in his opinion still very low and asked for the criticisms of the gentlemen who were consulted, in order to enable him to decide whether

Why not sent?

the proposed remuneration was sufficient. The Director found it accordingly necessary to inform the Petitioner that the manuscript had not yet been accepted and that it might be ultimately rejected. He asked the Petitioner at the same time whether he would revise the manuscript with the help of a competent Pandit on the lines recommended by the experts. This proposal, I construe to be an alternative to the offer to pay to the Petitioner Rs 300 – an offer which the Petitioner had declared himself unwilling to accept. If the Petitioner was willing to do this, he was to submit definite portions of the revised manuscript for approval before proceeding any further. This, the Petitioner undertook to do in his letter dated 24th July 1889, and added

But from Procs B.B. 652 / 15 July '89 it does not appear that this was an alternative proposal.

Does not seem so. Nor was the petitioner made distinctly to understand anything like that.

This is not apparent. The petitioner's letter is not here. It is with the D.P.I.

that he was a Telugu graduate, who had given some attention to his vernacular while at College and that he hoped to do justice to the work. He revised two chapters and sent them in October 1891 and, in January 1890, these were referred to Dr. Oppert and M.R.Ry M. Seshagiri Sastriyar, but were condemned as not meeting the conditions laid down for revision. The chapters were returned to the Petitioner along with the remarks of Dr. Oppert & M.R.Ry. M. Seshagiri Sastriyar in August 1890, and he was again requested to thoroughly revise the work, following the instructions communicated to him. The Petitioner seems to have paid little heed to the criticisms of Dr. Oppert and M.R.Ry. M. Seshagiri Sastriyar and of the gentlemen who had gone through the work in 1889. In July 1891, he submitted the whole manuscript revised. This was referred to M.R.Ry S. Rangayya Chetti Garu B.A., now the Telugu Translator to Government and again condemned.

5. It may be noted here that M.R.Ry S. Rangayya Chetti Garu had the opportunity of examining the manuscript both before revision and after revision. The criticisms of M.R.Ry S. Rangayya Chetti Garu on the work, were received in December 1891, and were replied to in September 1892 by the Petitioner. As was to be expected he called in question the correctness of some of the critic's remarks. The manuscripts were examined subsequently by the Special Assistant to the Director; but a change in the incumbency of that office was in the way of the manuscript being gone through to the end. The manuscript was eventually rejected in January 1894.

6. The Petitioner bases his claims to the remuneration on the ground of the work having been done at the Director's request. When a work is produced at the request of the Department it is always understood that a claim for remuneration will be dependent on the acceptance of the work by the Department— an acceptance which is made or not made after consulting officers duly qualified to advise the Director. The original manuscript not having been accepted, and the Petitioner not having taken advantage of the offers first of Rs 250 and then of Rs 300, made

To see whether the petitioner actually rejected the second offer of Rs 300, his letters should be called for from the D.P.I.

to him years ago, no claim can be admitted at this date. Since that offer was made, the original manuscript has been altered by the Petitioner and according to the best advice, the Director can obtain, the alterations are not for the better.

7. The Petitioners' claim to separate remuneration for revision has nothing to rest on. Not only was revision undertaken without any understanding as to remuneration and without any notice of claim for it, but, in defiance of instructions, this revision was completed without definite portions of the manuscript being submitted for approval before proceeding further. The Petitioner undertook revision at his own risk, miscalculating, perhaps, his powers to do the work.

8. The Petitioner states that "

copies of the correspondence applied were not furnished to him. The Petitioner asked for copies of twelve documents. Of these, one is a letter of his father's, one was M. R. Ry. S. Rangayya's criticisms, one was a mere endorsement by the Director referring the criticisms to the Petitioner, and nine were letters written by the Petitioner. It will be observed from enclosure M. that what I considered a most unusual request was for a man to ask me to provide him with copies of his own letters — nine in number. I would have had no objection to supply him with copies of the three first documents alluded to above; but a public officer can hardly be expected to supply to correspondents copies of their own letters, apparently for no other reason than that they

Why were they not sent?

[illegible] the complainant may be expected to know copies of his letters. He might as well have asked the petitioner for the copies themselves have not been at the trouble to keep them. The Petitioner assigned no reason why he had not taken and kept copies of his letters

9. The Petitioner asks finally for a committee to examine into the criticisms and counter criticisms and explanations. If the Petitioner has reason to believe that he is in the right, he should have no hesitation in publishing his work as suggested by me (See enclosure H.). The best tribunal to which he can appeal is the Scholastic world. If the book commends itself to Students and teachers, the Petitioner will make far more than Rs 250 or Rs 300 by the sale of it. Judging by the confidence he expresses as to the value of the work, I am surprised that he is not prepared to put it to this simple test.

10. The whole matter may be stated thus. The Department arranged for a book to be written in accordance with certain instructions, which were communicated to the person who undertook to write the book. Neither the original manuscript nor any of its subsequent revisions conformed to those instructions. The Department therefore declines to take over or pay for it.

11. I may add that whether Government admits or rejects is Petitioner's claims to remuneration the manuscript is of no use to this Department.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient
Servant
D Duncan
Director of Public Instr

Educational Dept.

Current No. 567

From

The Director of Public Instruction
Madras

To

The Honourable the
Chief Secretary to Govt.
Fort St. George

No.

Dated 6th
Despd. 6
Received 7th } May 1895.

No. B.B/360

BOOK BRANCH
DESPATCHED
6 MAY 95

Edl. C. No. 417 & encl.
Enclosures 1. (~~two~~)

Submitting remarks on a petition of M.R.Ry C. Venkatasubbaramayya re-remuneration for certain literary work done for the Department.

Refce 776 – 6-4-95

Papers

The MSS is of no use, so if we pay R 300, we shall pay it for nothing. The offer of R 300 for the father's MSS, not having been accepted, petr was asked to revise the said MSS. He has failed in this work. This petition should be rejected

A.H.

JG 20/5

For orders.

It is submitted that inasmuch as Enclosure F G does not definitely withdraw the offer of Rs. 300/- while asking the petr. if he was willing to revise his father's work, the sum should be paid to him being slightly over half the sum originally offered for each grammar (assuming this to be Rs. 500 for each of the three). This should be considered as a payment for his father's work; for his own work he apparently deserves no payment

D
14-5-95

I submit that the petr. should be paid nothing and left to sue Govt. if so advised. He did not comply with instructions and the book has been absolutely condemned on this ground and apparently on scholastic ones too. It is absurd to contend that the Edl. Dept. must because it agreed that a certain person should write a book upon certain lines and of a certain character buy that individual or his heirs or assigns for rubbish which is not even in the form agreed upon and which is of no use to it.

18/5/95

C 20/5
R 21/5

[G./24.]
600—8-3-95.

Edl DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Current No. 417 of 1895, dated 1-4 from C. Venkatasubbaramayya
Current No. 567 of 1895, dated 6-5 from the D.P.I.

ORDER. dated 27th May 1895 No. 443

The Petr. will be informed that the Govt., having called for and perused a report regarding his claims from the D.P.I., sees no reason to grant his requests.

(True copy)
22-5-95
24/5/95

DESPATCHED
1 JUN 95
IN M.S

The Petr. ~~(thro' the D.P.I.)~~
The D.P.I. with enclosures returned } (G.O.)

Copied 29/5

[illegible]

a Text-book

Cs

([illegible])

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed
} 189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED 189 ,							
CURRENT No.							
ENCLOSURES TO G. No							
ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.							
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.							
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.							

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.