

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை -6-
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 8.5.90
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 10/2

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

(13)

P.W.D. துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	186	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	20-1-1891	198/.

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

3. sheets

ஆவண. கா-1-18,006-15-6-87.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

ORDER—dated 9th January 1891, No. 17, Public.

In the Resolution of the Government of India, dated 5th May 1890, No. 2—5-60, in the Revenue and Agricultural Department, it was observed that the duty of conserving and maintaining ancient monuments and buildings of historical interest would rest with the Provincial Department of Public Works, and the hope that it would receive careful attention was expressed.

2. The Government will now state the lines on which conservation in the Madras Presidency should proceed, but before doing so must refer to the past history of this branch of the Archaeological Department since 1883.

3. In the year just mentioned general instructions for the guidance of this and other Governments were circulated by the Government of India.

Each Local Government was directed to use Major Cole's lists as a basis of operations, and in communication with General Cunningham or Dr. Burgess, as the case might be, to prepare classified lists and a detailed report showing—

I. Those monuments which, from their existing condition and historical or archaeological value, ought to be maintained in permanent good repair;

II. Those monuments which it was only possible or desirable to save from further decay by such minor measures as the eradication of vegetation or the exclusion of water from the walls;

III. Those monuments which from their advanced stage of decay or comparative unimportance, it was impossible or unnecessary to preserve.

A further sub-division of the monuments falling under classes I and II was to be made to distinguish—

- (a) those in the possession or charge of Government, or in respect of which Government must undertake the cost of all measures of conservation;
- (b) those in the possession or charge of private bodies or individuals.

In regard to monuments classed under I and II and also under (a), the detailed report was to indicate what arrangements were proposed by the Local Government for the due execution of the necessary measures of conservation. Definite provision was to be made for the proper custody and upkeep of each monument. The Government of India had no wish, it was remarked, to interfere in the details of the arrangements, but desired to be satisfied that every Local Government had at disposal the means for the intelligent and judicious treatment of any questions which might arise in connection with the preservation of buildings of such importance. The cost of these measures was a legitimate charge upon the Public Works allotment of each province, but in very special cases the Government of India would be prepared to consider whether any further assistance should be granted from Imperial funds.

In regard to monuments classed under I and II, and also under (b), it was to be reported what funds were available for their conservation; and whether the

custodians could be induced to allow the inspection, direction and control of Government officers in such matters. It might be advisable in some instances to offer small subsidies in view to securing the necessary amount of supervision, but this should only be proposed where the monument was one of primary importance and its due conservation could not be otherwise secured. In general, it was hoped that the local officers and the Local Government would be able to induce those interested to take proper steps for maintaining the buildings in their charge.

4. On receipt of these instructions, the Government called on Dr. Burgess for a report. He replied at some length, stating the principles which in his opinion should be observed in dealing with the question.

It might, he said, be laid down as a first principle that as the funds available for the proper conservation of buildings would necessarily be limited, they should be economised in such a way as to preserve so far as practicable as many of the more important ancient works as possible. To this end preservation should in all cases alone be aimed at, and in none, except perhaps where special funds were otherwise provided, should money be spent on restoration. One of the most essential conditions of preservation was that the buildings should be saved from appropriation as cattle-sheds, &c., and from the growth of vegetation on the roof and walls.

Muhammadian buildings were mostly built by the rulers of the time at the public expense, and were in the true sense of the term national monuments inherited by the British Government. Moreover, buildings of this class were endowed with villages for the express purpose of keeping them in repair, and a little pressure brought to bear on the holders of the inam lands might be sufficient to induce the owners either to dispose of their interest in the disused mosques to Government or to pay for the necessary repairs.

As regards temples and mosques and other buildings that had been deserted, Dr. Burgess considered it very desirable that Government should assume the right to appropriate them as national property falling to it by inheritance. It would then become possible to select the most characteristic examples for preservation by the State, and in each locality one or more of these might be utilised as local museums in which old sculptures, inscriptions and the like could be stored.

The existence of even a very small collection of sculptures, and similar remains in large outlying villages, would have its educational influence, and probably lead to the preservation of many monuments which would otherwise be broken up or burnt into lime. There were however not many good examples of Musulman architecture in Madras.

The large Hindu shrines which so distinguished the Presidency were in the hands of committees who *inter alia* looked after the repairs.

The monuments which Government would be fully justified in interfering with were such buildings as the old palace at Chandragiri, the large group of remains at Hampi, the monolithic remains at the Seven Pagodas, some ancient caves in the Kistna and Godáviri districts, and ancient buildings in various places which had been desecrated or deserted.

What was the number of the latter, and how many of them might really be deserving of preservation, could not be stated.

The lists prepared by Mr. Robert Sewell were far more full than those for other provinces. They had however chiefly been furnished by native subordinates, and but rarely supplied any information that could be depended on with respect to the architectural style or age of the different monuments.

To prepare a full and accurate list on the basis of the classification laid down by the Government of India would entail much labor and time, since before deciding which buildings should be kept in repair, it would be necessary that each should be

and reported on by some officer capable of forming a tolerably accurate estimate historical and artistic interest.

How this could be accomplished in any very limited period of time, Dr. Burgess was a loss to point out. It would be waste of labor to call for fresh returns from officers if these were to be compiled by the ordinary class of subordinates. Government, however, to invite information from Collectors, Assistant Collectors and European Engineers regarding only such buildings as they had personally seen and to obtain suggestions as to the proper classification, much fairly accurate information might be collected which would not only serve as a basis for the proposals, but also afford much that would be useful for the guidance of the Archaeological Survey.

Dr. Burgess then recounted the buildings in the hands of the Madras Government, namely, the ancient temples and other structures at Hampi; the Vellore; Tirumal Nayyak's palace at Madura; the rathas and caves at Mahabalipuram; the caves at Salavankuppam; the Chandragiri palace; Gingee, Dindigul and old forts; and the Amaravati and Jaggayapet topes.

In regard to some of these, he suggested the adoption of certain measures.

As to such other remains as Government ought properly to assume the conservation of, he professed himself unable to judge from the scanty information before him amount of conservation they might require.

With respect to temples still in use as recognised places of worship, much must depend on the tact of the Curator and on the intelligence of the leaders of the community whether much or anything could be done to control repairs. Whenever possible, such committees should be urged to expend less on putting on plaster and wash, and more in scraping off the accumulated coatings of those materials.

Local custody and inspection was a matter of quite as much importance as the repair, and for this there should be some machinery. For small places and single buildings it would be necessary to appoint either separate custodians or officers of the district police, who would prevent mischief being done either by Europeans or by natives, and report all attempts of the kind to their superiors, and, when necessary, to the District Engineers. The District Engineer should visit each place in his district once a year and report to the Curator or his officers on damage done and repairs required. For places like Hampi, a somewhat permanent custodian or inspector would be of great value in checking misappropriations. Generally, the agency which on the whole seemed most suitable and economical for the duties of conservation was the District Engineer, who could at least once a year visit all the works to be preserved in his district—and many of them much more so—while his subordinates could bring to him all information available, and he could act in accord with the Curator. The police might also have their attention directed to the pilfering of materials from old buildings.

As to the utilisation of buildings, Dr. Burgess saw little serious objection to it so long as the monument was not altered or defaced in any way, or modernised by washing. What should be guarded against was any material modification in the form of mutilation or addition to adapt them to official requirements.

On receiving this report, Government entrusted to Mr. Robert Sewell the duty of selecting, in communication with Dr. Burgess, from the lists he had drawn up such monuments as fulfilled the conditions stated by the Government of India.

In consequence of the departure of Dr. Burgess to England, the duty of selection devolved entirely on Mr. Sewell. The latter drew up lists, and these were ultimately accepted by Dr. Burgess. On the suggestion of Dr. Burgess, the

pamphlet containing them was circulated to Superintending Engineers, and the Government ruled that it should be

used as a standard of reference, and directed that the preservation of the monuments should be carried out in accordance with the instructions communicated.

6. On reconsideration of the question, His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that the existing orders commit the Government to measures far in excess of what even Dr. Burgess contemplated.

The pamphlet of Mr. Sewell contained recommendations for the conservation of more than five hundred monuments, of which the State was to assume direct responsibility for about one hundred and seventy, and indirect responsibility for the remainder.

Additions numbering more than above three hundred have been made to the

G.O., No. 462, Public, May 29th, 1889.

on which the pamphlet was based were founded on admittedly untrustworthy information supplied by native subordinates. "The information," wrote Mr. Sewell, "in volume I of the Archaeological Survey, is all crude. Not a hundredth part of the monuments reported have yet been examined, nor indeed even *seen*, by any one whose opinion as to their value is worth having. And it would be entirely misleading, in my opinion, to attempt to classify lists when the classifier has inadequate means of knowing what is valuable and what is not."

7. In making these remarks, His Excellency the Governor in Council desires it to

* Para. 3 of G.O., No. 884, Public, May 3rd, 1884.

G.O., No. 1202, Public, June 6th, 1884.

G.O., No. 1482, Public, July 3rd, 1884.

be understood that no blame whatever attaches to Mr. Sewell or to Dr. Burgess; the former merely carried out positive and reiterated instructions from Government and the refusal * to give him any latitude as to time must have increased his diffi-

culties in the preparation of a standard return from catalogues drawn up as working lists for the survey.

8. It is however abundantly clear that whenever the information contained in the standard list is incorrect, and a monument is not architecturally or historically interesting, the money spent must be thrown away, or even where some interest may attach to it the expenditure may not always be justifiable. There are, of course, many monuments not devoid of interest to the antiquary, but which it is not the province of the State to spend the money of the tax-payer in preserving. The duties of the English Government are, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, adequately discharged if a paid staff is maintained for the purpose of visiting, describing and sketching monuments of antiquity, and placing on record facts regarding them which may be of service to the archaeological world, and if measures are adopted for the preservation of representative buildings of extraordinary age, interest, or beauty.

9. With regard also to those buildings or remains which are the property of private individuals or bodies, the Government, it is scarcely necessary to say, cannot accept the theory propounded by Dr. Burgess that when there is disuse for purposes of worship, or neglect to execute necessary repairs, the monuments escheat to the State. Care must also be taken that the natural desire of antiquaries to preserve any remains of interest does not tend to the exercise of undesirable pressure by Government officers on Zamindars and others, as such pressure too often leads in this country to misapprehensions and indefinite expectations of reward, and at times to petty oppression; the Governor in Council has noticed several instances in which it has been unwisely advocated or exercised. If the personal influence of any officer who takes an intelligent interest in such matters can, without misunderstanding, be exerted to prevent wanton destruction or in prevailing on a land-owner to preserve an ancient monument, there is no reasonable objection to its being used. No representation, however, should be made unless the person from whom it comes is sure of his ground and does not merely proceed on hearsay evidence regarding some monument he has never seen, much less inspected, and of which the age and value are alike unknown to him. So far as the Archaeological Surveyor is himself concerned, there is not the same room for misunderstanding as in the case of a district official, and as long as he does not invoke the aid of the revenue officers, he is free to use such pressure as he can in the interests of any monumental remains.

10. The Government now resolves to order the disuse of the so-called standard list and to call on Mr. Rea to prepare in its stead revised lists including only such monuments as are unique or very ancient, or possess exceptional merit as typical specimens of their style of architecture.

11. A maximum total of one hundred in all classes will be allowed, and no entries founded on mere hearsay should be made; each entry must rest on personal observation.

12. There is no objection to Mr. Rea drawing up a provisional list of monuments which have already been inspected, and a final standard can then be prepared by the process of elimination.

13. The Archaeological Surveyor will understand that the Government does not desire to fetter him in any respect in regard to the inspection of other monuments, but for the purpose of conservation it is essential that the list of buildings or remains in the charge of the Public Works Department, for which the State either assumes direct responsibility or is prepared, if there is need to do so, to offer a subsidy to secure supervision, should be limited in number. In the latter case the conditions laid down by the Government of India, namely, that the monument is of primary importance and that due conservation cannot otherwise be ensured, must not be forgotten.

14. Pending receipt of the revised list of buildings, the officers of the Public Works Department will be entirely relieved of the duties of inspection and reporting.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Archaeological Surveyor.

" Public Works Department.

" Revenue Department.

Copy to the Government Epigraphist.

Exd. P. L. Pereira.

1-2-11

Govt. of {1891} Madras.
PUBLIC.

No. 186 W & 20. 1. 91

Communicated
to officers of the P. W.
Dept for information
& guidance with
reference to the under
mentioned Pro. of Govt.

No. 1347 W & 29. May 1884.
" 529 W & 16. Feb. 1884

1891 J.

Issued

Encl.

Recd.

G.O., 9th January 1891, No. 17.

JANUARY.

Yes.
C. A. B. at

Archæology.

Passing orders regarding the lines on which
conservation of ancient monuments in Madras
Presidency should proceed.

(3)