

Copy of letter from W. Hughes Esq. Executive Engineer
Madura D. to the Supt. Engr. Circle
No 394 SE dated 17 September 1890.

I have the honor to bring
to your notice that there is no temple
at all at Vitakiramangalam (Serial
No 25) referred to in the list of monu-
-ments selected for conservation com-
-municated with your Endorsement
No $\frac{219278}{2-3-88}$ on P.O No $\frac{5296}{16-2-88}$ but the
one at Kovilputty (Serial No 21)
is sometimes denominated as that
of Vitakiramangalam and some-
-times that of Kovilputty, the latter
being a sub. village of Vitakiran-
-galam. I therefore request you
will be good enough to permit Serial
No 25 (Temple at Vitakiramangalam)
being struck off the list.

SE Office Engr. Trichinopoly
No 598 MD d/ 25 September 1890,
Submitted to the Chief Engineer

P.W.D with a request that permis-
-sion be granted to strike off serial
No 25 in page 76 of the list of
monuments selected for conser-
-vation in the Presidency, circulated
with G.O No 529 W of the 16 February/00.

Albion H COLPPE
Supt. Engineer W.C. de.

at

P. W. Cus: 9/68
6/3/88 A.L. 2.17 2nd Pub

L. Pub Co 745
6-1190
From
The Supt Engineer
11 mile

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 598 md
dated 25th 3 September 1890,
Sept. 27
Recd 29th

Requesting permission
to strike off from the list
of monuments selected
for conservation, Serial
No. 25, Temple at Vikra-
mangalam.

L. Pub Co No 3072/90.

2P
No 3939.C.d/1st October/90
Transferred to the
Public Department for
orders.

(By order)
McBrideley Major R.E.
under Secy. to Govt: M.D.

9/15 October 1890
Referred to the Arch.
eological Surveyor
for report.

Rednuchnee
Chief Secretary

30th
13/10/90.

Bangalore 17th October 1890.

No. 515.

From A. Rea Esquire, M. R. A. S.,
Archaeological Surveyor,
to Government of Madras.
FIRST ASSISTANT,

To
The Chief Secretary
to the Government of
Madras.

SIR,
Adverting to reference in the Public Depart-
ment No. 2855 of the 15th instant, I have the honour
to report as follows:-

2:- In Sewell's Lists of Antiquities Vol. I.
page 296, the following entry occurs under the
heading of "Tirumangalam Taluk":-
"Vikkiramangalam; - 12 miles north by
west of Tirumangalam. An old Siva temple
with many inscriptions."

3:- On page 289 of the same volume, under
the heading of "Meliur Taluk," is:- "Kovilpatti;-
15 miles north-north-west of Meliur (Kovilpatti).
A very old Siva temple with inscriptions. x x x x
x x."

4:- In Vol. II of the same work, page 273, in
the errata and addenda of Vol. I, is "Page 296,
x x x Kovilpatti, near Vikkiramangalam.
(see below). Dr. Burgess states, that the temple
at this place is architecturally one of the best
he has seen."

Id. Vikkiramangalam or Vikramangalam.-
Dr. Burgess has in print a volume of notes and
inscriptions in this district, and has therein
mentioned two inscriptions at this place. x x x x."

5:- In the List of Monuments selected for conservation in the Presidency of Madras in 1884, at page 74, mention is made of a temple - architecturally valuable - at Kovilpatti in the Erumangalam Taluk. Again at page 76, entry is made of the inscriptions at the temple of Vikramangalam in the Erumangalam Taluk.

6:- All these entries would seem to show that there were two temples - one at Kovilpatti and another at Vikramangalam. But in the errata and addenda of Vol. I of Sewell's work (see my para 4) the entry of the temple at Kovilpatti, is described as being on page 296 of Vol. I, whereas in fact, there is no mention of it there, it being inserted on page 289, under the Melur Taluk. But the temple of Vikramangalam is described on page 296.

7:- Again, in the quotation given in my above para 4, referring to Dr. Burgess' volume, the two places are mentioned. Turning to this work (Vol. IV, of the Archaeological Survey of Southern India, page 10) the description of the temple and inscriptions is headed "Vikramangalam"; and no mention of Kovilpatti is made. But, that it is the temple noted by Mr. Sewell in the quotation in my para 4 as being at Kovilpatti, is shown by the remark of Dr. Burgess - which Mr. Sewell quotes - that "Architecturally this is one of the most interesting temples visited in this neighbourhood."

8:- There would thus seem to be no doubt about the various descriptions referring to the one temple. The mistake may have arisen through the error of describing Kovilpatti as being in the Melur Taluk; and through the practice referred to by Mr. Hughes, of interchanging the two names. As the temple really stands in the village of Kovilpatti, the name of Vikramangalam should be struck off the list.

I have the honour to be
Sir

4
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Archaeological Surveyor
to Government of
Madras.

C No 3072.

From

A Rea Esq., M.R.A.S.
Archæological Surveyor
to Govt of Madras.
No. 515.

Dated 17th }
Recd 19th } Act/90.

Encls. C No 2855, etc.

Reporting on Serial
No 25 referred to in the list of
Monuments selected for conservation.
re Temple at Vikkiramangalam.

W.D.

Currents 2855 & 3072

Order 6th Nov. 90. No. 745.
3/11/90

In the circumstances
brought to notice same.
tion is accorded to item
No. 25. - at page 76 - being
struck out of the list
of monuments in the
Madura District select-
ed for conservation.

27/11/90

J.D.B.
24.11.90.

To the P.W. Dept. 14
Arch. Surveyor
Revenue Dept
A. Sewell Esq. C.S. 3

15/11/90

C. 28/10

6TH NOVEMBER 1890, No. 745, PUBLIC.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers :—

From W. HUGHES, Esq., Executive Engineer, Madura Division, to the Superin-
tending Engineer, VI Circle, dated 17th September 1890, No. 394 S.E.

I have the honor to bring to your notice that there is no temple at all at Vikkira-
mangalam (serial No. 25), referred to in the list of monuments selected for conserva-
tion communicated with your endorsement, dated 2nd March 1888, No. 2192 T.J., on
G.O., dated 16th February 1888, No. 529 W., but the one at Kovilputty (serial
No. 21) is sometimes denominated as that of Vikkiramangalam and sometimes that of
Kovilputty, the latter being a sub-village of Vikkiramangalam. I, therefore, request
you will be good enough to permit serial No. 25 (temple at Vikkiramangalam) being
struck off the list.

No. 598 M.D.

Submitted to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, with a request that
permission be granted to strike off serial No. 25 in page 76 of the list of monuments
selected for conservation in the Presidency, circulated with G.O., No. 529 W., of the
16th February 1888.

TRICHINOPOLY, (Signed) A. C. SMITH, Lieut.-Col., R.E.,
25th September 1890. Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.

No. 3939-C.

Transferred to the Public Department for orders.

(By order.)

1st October 1890. (Signed) W. L. C. BADDELEY, Major, R.E.,
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

From A. REA, Esq., M.R.A.S., Archæological Surveyor, to the Chief Secretary to
Government, dated Bangalore, 17th October 1890, No. 515.

Adverting to reference in the Public Department, No. 2855, of the 15th instant,
I have the honor to report as follows :—

2. In Sewell's *List of Antiquities*, Vol. I, page 296, the following entry occurs
under the heading of "Tirumangalam Taluk" :—

"Vikkiramangalam ; —12 miles north by west of Tirumangalam. An old Siva temple with
many inscriptions."

3. On page 289 of the same volume, under the heading of "Melur Taluk,"
is :—"Kovilpatti ; —15 miles north-north-west of Melur (Covilpatty). A very old
Siva temple with inscriptions. * * * * *

4. In Vol. II of the same work, page 273, in the errata and addenda of
Vol. I, is "Page 296, * * * Kovilpatti, near Vikkiramangalam—(see below). Dr.
Burgess states that the temple at this place is architecturally one of the best he has
seen."

Id. Vikkiramangalam or Vikramangalam.—Dr. Burgess has in print a volume of notes and inscriptions in this district, and has therein mentioned two inscriptions at this place. * * * *

5. In the *List of Monuments selected for conservation in the Presidency of Madras* in 1884, at page 74, mention is made of a temple—architecturally valuable—at Kovilpatti in the Tirumangalam taluk. Again, at page 76, entry is made of the inscriptions at the temple of Vikramangalam in the Tirumangalam taluk.

6. All these entries would seem to show that there were two temples—one at Kovilpatti and another at Vikramangalam. But in the errata and addenda of Vol. I of Sewell's work (see my paragraph 4), the entry of the temple at Kovilpatti is described as being on page 296 of Vol. I, whereas in fact there is no mention of it there, it being inserted on page 289, under the Melur taluk. But the temple of Vikramangalam is described on page 296.

7. Again, in the quotation given in my above paragraph 4, referring to Dr. Burgess' volume, the two places are mentioned. Turning to this work (Vol. IV of the *Archæological Survey of Southern India*, page 10), the description of the temple and inscriptions is headed "Vikramangalam;" and no mention of Kovilpatti is made. But, that it is the temple noted by Mr. Sewell in the quotation in my paragraph 4 as being at Kovilpatti is shown by the remark of Dr. Burgess—which Mr. Sewell quotes—that "architecturally this is one of the most interesting temples visited in this neighbourhood."

8. There would thus seem to be no doubt about the various descriptions referring to the one temple. The mistake may have arisen through the error of describing Kovilpatti as being in the Melur taluk; and through the practice referred to by Mr. Hughes, of interchanging the two names. As the temple really stands in the sub-village of Kovilpatti, the name of Vikramangalam should be struck off the list.

ORDER—dated 6th November 1890, No. 745, Public.

In the circumstances brought to notice, sanction is accorded to item No. 25 at page 76 being struck out of the list of monuments in the Madura district selected for conservation.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department.
„ the Archæological Surveyor.
„ the Revenue Department.
„ R. Sewell, Esq., C. S.

Exd. A. Raitt.

Govt. of {1890} Madras.
PUBLIC.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 6th November 1890, No. 745.

NOVEMBER.

Archæology.

According sanction to item No. 25, temple at Vikramangalam, being struck out of the list of monuments in the Madura district selected for conservation.

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
18, No.

Back Paper, No.

Further Paper, No.

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No. 2855 — a

3072 — a

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER, &c., OF GOVERNMENT—A.

PAGES KEPT OUT OF FILE FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL
(not-paged).

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED.

Order complete. 100
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

H.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.
R = Print, but not for monthly volume.

ORDINARY, PRINTED.

Public DEPARTMENT.

G.O., DATED *6. 11. 90*

No. *745.*

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature. *14/11*

Despatched in print. *15/11*

[Despatch Abstract.]

Archaeology

According sanction to the
item No. 25, temple at
Vikramangalam being
struck out of the list of
monuments in Madurai
district selected for con-
servation