

ORDINARY, PRINTED.

Public DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 9.1.91.
No. 17

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature. 12/1

Despatched in print. 15/1

[Despatch Abstract.]

Archaeology

Passing orders re the
lines on which conserva-
tion of ancient monum-
ents in Madras Presidency
is to proceed.

20/1/91
20.7.034
12-5-19
3/12/04
7-12-22
24/2/85

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER, GOV. OF GOVERNMENT—A.

PAPERS KEPT OUT OF FILE FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL
(not pagged).

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED. { Order complete.
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.

60 — 20-1-91-

This note has been put in
type at the C.S.'s desire, as
it is unavoidably of some
length.

Since it was drafted, a
letter written by Dr. Burgess
in 1886 (G.O. No. 533, March
13th, 1886) has been traced
in which he practically con-
ceded what has been urged in the
note—§ 31 & elsewhere. In
his later communication, printed
in G.O. No. 529 W. Feb. 16th, 1888, he
said nothing about the pro-
visional character of the
list (B) as the necessity for
eliminating all but a limited
number of items.

M.

Public dep

C. Nos. in bundle lettered A.
List lettered B.

FOR ORDERS.

The general question as to the line
which the Madras Government is to adopt
in regard to the "conservation and main-
tenance of ancient monuments and build-
ings of historical or archæological in-
terest" (section 11 of Resolution in the
Revenue and Agricultural Department
under date 5th May 1890, No. 2—5-60,
Arch., recorded in G.O., No. 395, dated
2nd June 1890) has to be answered.

2. The duty of preserving and repair-
ing such buildings has been, and is to
continue to be, imposed on the Public
Works Department. In other respects,
absolute discretion is given to the local
Government in regard to this branch (for
it may be considered as being such) of the
Archæological Department.

3. Until now, the decisions of Govern-
ment have followed rulings and enuncia-
tions of general principles by the Govern-
ment of India, couched in contradictory
terms as one or the other of the two op-
posite schools was in the ascendant.

4. These schools may be distinguished
in this note by the names of the "anti-
quaries" and the "restorers." Some
antiquaries have been more or less restorers,
and some restorers have been antiquaries;
but, on the whole, the schools have been
in marked antagonism. Honorable Mem-
bers will, no doubt, have seen from time
to time diatribes by the adherents of the
two parties: one lately written to the
"Overland Mail" will be found in the file.

5. Some years ago, the "restorers" had
much influence at head-quarters, and
obtained "representation" so to call it. A
department was created, and Captain Cole
was appointed Conservator for the whole
of India. Dr. Burgess and he were bitter
opponents, and the opinion held of the
one by the other must be taken with large
reservations; judging, however, from
Captain Cole's reports, his tastes and
talents were of an architectural, rather
than an archæological, order; he travelled
over all provinces, and visited the chief
buildings of interest; he prepared lists of
them; he suggested means of preserving
them, and, at times, of restoring them—
his suggestions in the latter respect were
too frequent. Dr. Burgess considered that
Captain Cole encroached on the ground of

* of June 13/90

* Later on was
"Major" Cole,
& both ranks
are given in
this note.

his department, and complained loudly whenever Captain Cole's recommendations had reference to ancient remains, such as those at Amaravati and Hampi.

6. Captain Cole's tenure of appointment was limited to three years, and when it expired, no successor was gazetted, and it was left to the party of antiquaries to deal with the question of the conservation of all remains. Some show of attention to the proposals of the restorers had, however, to be made, and the Government of India resolved to use Captain Cole's lists as a basis of operations. Each local Government was directed to take up those lists, 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 (then) present condition and historical or archaeological value, ought to be maintained in permanent good repair.
- II. Those monuments which it (was) now only possible or desirable to save from further decay by such minor measures as the eradication of vegetation, the exclusion of water from the walls, and the like.
- 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; and
- (b) those in the possession or charge of private bodies or individuals.

7. 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 carrying out 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 (it was said) had no wish 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 Governor-General in Council (it was added) held that the cost of these measures was a legitimate charge upon the Public Works allotment of each province, but would be prepared to consider in very special cases whether any further assistance should be granted from Imperial funds.

8. 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 (the Government of India added) 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.

* 9. On receipt of these instructions, a report was called for from Dr. Burgess. He replied at some length, laying down certain principles.

* Madras G.O.
No. 2366 Public.
14th Decr., 1883.

10. It will be convenient, as in the case of the Resolution of the Government of India, to make large extracts from this reply.

† Madras G.O.
No. 884 Public.
3rd May, 1884.

He began with the truism that the proper conservation of buildings of architectural and historical interest must depend largely on the funds available and the judgment with which they were administered.

It might be laid down as a first principle that, as the funds would necessarily be limited, they should be economised in such a way as to preserve as 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 for such purposes as cattle-sheds, sugar factories, and

dens of squalor and dirt within, and from the growth of vegetation on the roof and walls without.

Muhammādan buildings were mostly built by the Government of the time at the public expense, and were in the true sense of the term national monuments inherited by the Government of the day. 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.

For temples and mosques and other buildings that had been deserted, it seemed (to Dr. Burgess) 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 Government, 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, &c., in large outlying villages, would have its educational influence, and probably lead to the preservation of many sculptures, &c., that would otherwise be broken up or burnt into lime.

There were not many good examples of Musulman architecture in Madras. The large Hindu shrines which so distinguished that presidency were in the hands of Committees who looked after the repairs as well as the revenues and ceremonies.

The monuments which Government would be fully justified in interfering 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 Godāvāri 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 existed for any other districts in India. They had,

however, been chiefly 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 it would be necessary, before deciding which buildings should be kept in repair, that each should be seen and reported on by some officer capable of forming a tolerably accurate estimate of its historical and artistic interest.

How this could be accomplished in any very limited period of time, Dr. Burgess was at a loss to point out. It would be waste of labor to call for fresh returns from district officers if these were to be compiled by the ordinary class of subordinates. Were 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 for a basis for the proposed lists, 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 temple; Tirumal Nayyak's palace at Madura; the rathas and caves at Mahabalipuram; the caves at Salavankuppam; the Chandragiri palace; Ginji, Dindigul and other old forts; and the Amaravati and Jaggayyapet 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, there was as yet too little information to enable Dr. Burgess to indicate what amount of conservation they might call for.

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 committees 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 whitewash, and more in scraping off the accumulated coatings of those materials.

Local custody and inspection was a matter of quite as much importance as repairs, and for this there should be some machinery. For small places and single isolated buildings it would be necessary to appoint either separate custodians or members of the district police, who would prevent mischief being done either by visitors or by natives, and report all attempts of the kind to their superiors, and, through them, when necessary, to the District Engineers. The District Engineer would visit each place in his district once a year and report on damage done and repairs required to the Curator or his deputy. For places like Hampi, a somewhat superior 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 local duties of conservation was the District Engineer, who could at least once every year visit all the works to be preserved in his district—and many of them much oftener—while his subordinates could bring to him all information available, and he would 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 whitewashing. What should be guarded against was any material modification in the way of mutilation or addition to adapt them to official requirements.

11. Some of the remarks quoted above will be referred to presently.

12. On receiving this report, Government entrusted to Mr. Robert Sewell the task 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.

13. It happened that Dr. Burgess left India about the time of the issue of this order, and the duty of selection devolved entirely on Mr. Sewell. The latter drew up lists, and these were not interfered with, to use Dr. Burgess's words, to any

appreciable extent except to insert a few remarks and additions chiefly relating to the Vijayanagar remains. The *lists (continued Dr. Burgess) were probably as complete as it would be possible, at the time, to make them, although it was fully to be expected that some important omissions would, in course of time, be discovered.

*Introduction
to list - Sec
line from
page 5*

14. The lists prepared by Mr. Sewell, and accepted by Dr. Burgess, will be found in the file. The pamphlet containing them is lettered B. It was circulated, on the suggestion of Dr. Burgess, to Superintending Engineers, and Government ruled that it should be regarded as a standard of reference. At the same time, it was ordered that the preservation of the monuments should be carried out in accordance with the instructions (then) communicated.

15. As the Government Proceedings (No. 529 W., February 16th, 1888) contained no instructions save those in regard to the standard character of the pamphlet, it must be supposed that the intention was to adopt whatever suggestions were made in the lists and, once for all, to declare that expenditure of public funds was justifiable and also desirable in order to preserve, repair, or possibly, within certain limits, to restore, any building or remains classed under I (a) and II (a); while with respect to those classed under I (b) and II (b), the private persons in charge of them were to be induced (and that not once for all but by repeated endeavours) to take proper steps for maintaining the buildings: in other words, to do for them what the State was doing for those under its care.

16. These orders are still in force, and under them the responsibility of the officers of the Public Works Department is considerable.

17. Now, with regard to the lists in the pamphlet, an endeavour will be made to show that they commit Government to measures far in excess of what even Dr. Burgess contemplated, and that the question of conservation has been dealt with on mistaken principles.

18. The following statement abstracts the lists:—

(a)

BUILDINGS or Remains in the possession of Government or in respect of which the work of conservation is to be undertaken by the State.

Districts.	I.		II.
	Number to be kept in permanent good repair.		Number as to which minor measures of repair will suffice.
Ganjam ..	..	..	1
Vizagapatam ..	..	2	2
Godavari ..	..	3	3
Kistna ..	..	27	29
Kurnool ..	..	3	7
Bellary ..	..	16	4
Anantapur ..	..	..	7
Cuddapah ..	..	1	7
Nellore ..	..	1	5
North Arcot ..	..	5	9
Chingleput ..	..	3	..
Salem ..	..	..	6
South Arcot ..	..	1	2
Coimbatore ..	..	1	..
Nilgiris ..	..	..	..
South Canara ..	..	..	..
Malabar ..	..	..	..
British Cochin ..	..	1	..
Travancore ..	..	1	1
Trichinopoly ..	..	4	1
Tanjore ..	..	..	..
Madura ..	..	5	3
Tinnevely ..	..	2	6
Total ..	..	76	93

(b)

BUILDINGS or Remains in the possession of private persons or committees.

Districts.	I.		II.
	Number to be kept in permanent good repair.		Number as to which minor measures of repair will suffice.
Ganjam ..	..	2	3
Vizagapatam ..	..	12	1
Godavari ..	..	21	..
Kistna ..	..	15	45
Kurnool ..	..	40	1
Bellary ..	..	9	7
Anantapur ..	..	5	3
Cuddapah ..	..	11	6
Nellore ..	..	2	10
North Arcot ..	..	7	4
Chingleput ..	..	20	16
Salem ..	..	2	5
South Arcot ..	..	7	1
Coimbatore ..	..	4	4
Nilgiris ..	..	..	3
South Canara ..	..	5	3
Malabar ..	..	..	3
British Cochin ..	..	..	..
Travancore ..	..	2	..
Trichinopoly ..	..	9	2
Tanjore ..	..	9	..
Madura ..	..	25	4
Tinnevely ..	..	12	5
Total ..	..	219	126

19. It will thus be seen that the conservation of more than five hundred monuments is recommended, of which the State is to assume direct responsibility for some one hundred and seventy, and indirect responsibility for the remainder.

20. The tale is not yet complete. Additions, in the case of a single district (Kistna) numbering above three hundred, have been made to the lists since they were first published, and under some of the ^{items} many remains are grouped together.

However, an idea of the standard will be given by the foregoing figures.

21. If the remarks of Dr. Burgess on pages 4 and 5 of this note are referred to, it will be seen that the lists from which these lists were prepared were largely based on untrustworthy information (it could not be otherwise and there is no intention of depreciating Mr. Sewell's work) supplied by native subordinates. Again, Dr. Burgess very properly laid stress on the impossibility of determining which monuments were worthy of special conservation until each in turn had been visited and reported on by a competent Archæologist. Government, however, ignored these just remarks, and ordered a list to be prepared on the basis—not of personal examination by either Dr. Burgess or Mr. Sewell but—of catalogues useful in their way but still acknowledgedly defective, unsafe and conjectural in the last degree: catalogues drawn up to serve as working lists for the Survey.

22. No latitude as to time was given to Mr. Sewell, on whom the preparation of the list devolved; he * was again and again pressed to complete it, and in the end Government merely obtained an

abstract of the catalogues arranged according to the classification desired by the Government of India. Mr. Sewell had frequently nothing to proceed upon excepting the hearsay evidence jotted down in his catalogues.

That this was the case is evident from the most cursory glance over the pamphlet B.

* Page 8 of pamphlet.
† " 8 of "
‡ " 16 of "
§ " 32 of "
¶ " 32 of "
|| " 42 of "
.. " 46 of "

Look, for instance, at items 11 * and 12 † Vizagapatam, 10 ‡ Kistna, 48 § and 49 ¶ Kurnool, 4 || Anantapur, 15 ** Cuddapah.

An old temple which "may be architecturally important" is for all time classified as one which the owners are to be moved to keep permanently in good order and Government officers are to keep urging them to do so.

Certain temples and inscriptions which "ought to be architecturally and historically valuable" are to be guarded for ever by the State, and some chronicles which "may be important" are (whether they are important or not) to be "carefully preserved." Two caves "probably of archaeological interest" are to be placed in charge of the village officers.

These are only a fraction of the monuments about which literally nothing is known save on hearsay and on tahsildars' reports.

In one case there is some local legend

Page 48.

that a bell-metal chariot is buried in the sand; the antiquarian value of this is estimated before it is found (at least fifty rupees are to be spent in digging on the chance of finding it), and it is placed in the highest class, and committed to the care of Government.

Not one quarter of the remains described as "architecturally valuable"—"historically important"—and the like—and, on the ground of their being such, thrown into some class or other, have been inspected by any archaeologist. "The information" (writes Mr. Sewell) "in Volume I of the Archaeological Survey is" (large in) "amount, but it 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."

23. Now, it is submitted that it is not right to have a "standard" list, the greater part of which is admittedly worthless for its purpose. Not a little labor is being imposed on the district officers in connection with remains, as may be gathered from the original reports belonging to G.O., No. 1373 W., dated 16th May 1890 (Current No. 1617). It is also evident that repairs are constantly being executed at the public expense on this or that building merely because it happens to

be mentioned in the pamphlet. Whenever the information in that is wrong, and the monument is not architecturally or historically interesting, the money spent must be thrown away, and even where some interest does attach to it, the expenditure may not always be justifiable.

24. In India just as much as in other countries—and indeed it may safely be said to a still greater extent—there are monuments not devoid of interest to the antiquary, but which nevertheless it is not the province of the State to spend the money of the tax-payer in preserving.

In the eyes of the student, every old temple may justly appear to possess some value, but so long as the Government maintains a paid staff 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 archæological world, and in respect to those buildings or remains of extraordinary age, interest, or beauty, adopts measures for their preservation, its duty seems to be fulfilled, and it may

* Items 18 and 20 on page 74. allow one or another of the many temples * of a Pandyan

era to crumble away—may permit local committees to add as many coatings of whitewash as they please to those which

† Item 3 on page 64, or 7 on page 66. already hide inscriptions of a Chola† or Vijayanagar† dynasty—may be careless as to how rank

‡ Item 7 on page 62. the vegetation § is growing within the circuit of a hill fort, and round ¶ a deserted shrine of Siva, or how the bats || are

§ Item 2 on page 14, 15 on page 16, 62 on page 22, and many more similar entries. ¶ Item 9 (a) on page 12. || Item 3 on page 48. gathering on the roof of a possibly historic cave.

These things are to be regretted, but they are inevitable; and it is not the province of the English Government in India to interfere in the vain hope of preventing them, any more than it is that of Parliament to stand in the way of the "restorations" by which the history of many a fine building is scraped off its walls, or to pass a Bill to stay the Railway Companies from driving their lines through Roman embankments.

25. In India, as in England, some interference is, no doubt, called for, but it should surely be moderate in extent. In England

the ancient remains, such as the Uleybury tump and Stonehenge, which are preserved by Act of Parliament, are very few: to those interested in antiquarian subjects they seem far too few, but probably a wise discretion was exercised in restricting their number below what antiquaries would desire.

26. So, it is submitted, should it be in this Presidency, and the standard may well be rather on the lines of Captain Cole's lists than on those of Mr. Sewell and Dr. Burgess. The jealousy between the rival schools, already alluded to, was, it may be suspected, in some measure the cause of what has taken place. In this connection Mr. Sewell's remarks in paras. 4 and 5 of a letter written

Madras Public No. 1202, in 1884 are worthy of note.

"Major Cole's list" (he writes) "consists of twenty items occupying two pages of his report, whereas the antiquities reported by me in Volume I of the Archaeological Survey Series of Southern India number many thousands, and the list is by no means complete, nor will it be complete for many years to come. * * * I consider it very undesirable to confine ourselves to Major Cole's list. It has been drawn up almost entirely from Mr. Ferguson's "Indian and Eastern Architecture," and from Major Cole's own inspection. Now Mr. Ferguson had very little opportunity of seeing things for himself, and I submit that he would be the first person to deprecate his few notes on Dravidian architecture being considered a final guide and as conclusive that *nothing else exists worth preserving* in the whole of the Presidency. It is a fact that the list in question does not include a very large number of monuments all of which ought to be most carefully preserved."

27. Major Cole was regarded by the antiquaries as a person who knew nothing about archæology, but whether or not the monuments which he selected for conservation were the best, the number of them was at least reasonable.

28. It is now submitted that this not unimportant question requires re-consideration; that the number of items in the standard list under the four classes [(a). I and II and (b) I and II] should be very limited — under (a) classes because it is not advisable, for reasons already stated, that the Government should include in the

x see p. XLVII & XLVIII of volume.

scheme of conservation more than perhaps twenty or thirty monuments or remains of all kinds:—under (b) classes because it is not desirable that pressure should be applied by the Governor in Council to the private persons or temple committees to whom the buildings belong; such pressure too often leads in this country to misapprehensions and indefinite expectations of reward at times, and at times to petty oppression.

Cf. remarks in column 10 on page 13 of pamphlet and in the same column on pages 61 and 69. The ~~press~~ ^{pressure} into which the State has ~~put~~ ^{been} with regard to the Seven Pagodas should not be forgotten; there steps for acquiring land were taken, but the doctrine of Archaeologists that any interference is right and proper to save the destruction of a monument underlies all these proposals; it is a dangerous doctrine.

29. The talk about the right and necessity of the State to interfere and compel private persons to keep ruins in repair is idle.

So long as the influence of the Archaeological Surveyor, and of antiquaries like Mr. Sewell, or indeed of any district officer who takes an intelligent interest in such matters, can be exerted to prevent wanton destruction or in prevailing on a land owner to preserve an old temple — a cromlech — inscriptions—all is well.

Such influence should, however, be used personally. There should be no hints of appeals to Government to compel what is desired; and no representation whatever should be made unless the person from whom it comes is sure of his ground and is not merely proceeding on hearsay evidence about some monument he has never seen, much less inspected, and of which the age and value are alike unknown to him.

30. If the views stated in this note are considered to be generally sound and such as should be acted on, it is proposed to call on Mr. Rea for revised lists, to be substituted for the "standard" of 1884, including only such monuments as are exceptionally beautiful (as specimens of their style of architecture), unique, or ancient.

31. Perhaps a total of 100 in all classes might be allowed.

32. It should be distinctly understood that no entries resting on mere report should be made.

33. Meanwhile, the officers of the Public Works Department should, it is thought, be relieved of the duty of constantly inspecting and submitting reports.

34. Dr. Burgess was of opinion that every District Engineer should visit every monument in his division at least once in the year. Colonel Pennycuik would probably think that the staff under him could be more usefully employed.

35. Proposals for expenditure should be initiated by Mr. Rea after personal inspection, and until the revised lists are ready, any repairs may with advantage be deferred.

36. The disposal of the several current numbers will to some extent depend on the orders passed on this note.

37. In C. Nos. 734 and 1039, proposals to spend Rs. 350 in carrying out certain work in connection with "a Siva" temple of old architecture built in the days of Pandya Raja of Madura," are contained.

This is, to say the least, indefinite, as the Pandis ruled with some interruptions from 300 B.C. or earlier until the middle of the 13th century, and again from 1365 until 1520.

However, it may be guessed that the date of construction will not be far distant from that in the case of the inscriptions at Vikramangalam in the neighbourhood, and they relate, it is said, to occurrences in the beginning of the 13th century. The temple is classed under II and (a), and is therefore not one of the buildings "which from their present condition and historical or archaeological value should be maintained in permanent good repair," even under the present "standard." It is said to be half ruined, and the *inam* confiscated because worship has not been kept up in it. The Collector in or before 1884 proposed to re-assign part of the lands on condition of the temple being kept in repair. Mr. Sewell, on the other hand, was for placing it in charge of the Public Works Department and spending Rs. 100 a year on it. The present estimate, as will be seen from the details of it, provides for a good deal of "restoring" — always of doubtful expediency, and particularly so in a case like this.

Dr. Burgess, indeed, stated that the temple was "architecturally one of the best" he had seen, but this remark is discounted by his practice of speaking in the superlative on almost all occasions.

If the building is so very fine, it should have been entered under I (a) — not II (a).

Mr. Rea himself does not advocate the proposals so far as they relate to restoration.

P.T.O.

It is submitted that if the building finds a place in the revised list, the estimate may, subject to Mr. Rea's remarks, receive consideration, but not otherwise.

38. In C. No. 1617, a proposal in regard to the first item in the pamphlet B has been remitted for consideration in this department.

There is a temple at Kontiagodo, in the Paluru taluk, returned as in class I and therefore as a building to be kept in permanent repair. Mr. Sewell entered neither (a) nor (b) against it, but stated that it was in the possession of the Zemindar of Palur, and endowed with landed property worth Rs. 750.

There are neighbouring sand dunes, and it was estimated that to remove these would cost Rs. 1,500. Mr. Sewell wished the Zemindar to plant casuarinas and thus to prevent the drift.

This suggestion has been forced on the Zemindar; the Collector has "repeatedly" requested him to guard the temple by a plantation.

The Zemindar, however, has not seen his way to this; it cannot be sheer obstinacy, because in 1884, he took some trouble, no doubt at Mr. Sewell's instance, and probably went to some expense, in removing the sand—he may have good reasons for not wishing to have the proposed plantation.

Failing to move him, the Collector, writing in February 1889, suggested that Government should ask the Zemindar to give up some land and should itself make the plantation.

It is this proposal that is now for consideration, and it is submitted that it should not be thought of, and that undue pressure has been employed on a land owner who may exercise his own discretion in such a matter. There are some undeciphered inscriptions. Why cannot a rubbing of these be taken by Mr. Rea if it is supposed they are valuable, and let the temple be sketched and described before it is completely buried? The Archaeological department exists for such purposes.

39. In C. No. 1553, there is a collection of reports from the revenue officers of some twelve districts. There are not a few suggestions of a remarkable kind: here whitewashing an inscription is proposed, there nailing an iron plate over another. An officer in the Civil Service

+ p. 16 of file A.
also pp. 6 & 7 of
same file.

pp. 17-20 of
file A.

of the item in the revised list
Not this proposal in para 26
577 of his letter 2/4/90
of 23rd May 1889
attached to and for revision
submitted. J. H. G.
Also para 7 J. H. G.

No. 1617

J. H. G.

recommends an expenditure of Rs. 200 at Maduturru, in Vizagapatam, on a temple classed as II (b)—possibly it should have been II (a) as Mr. Sewell speaks of placing an inscription in charge of the village headman—and Mr. Rea says very sensibly that it won't do to repair every Chola temple of the kind. Another temple, at Tirumangalam, it is proposed to put windows in "to promote ventilation," to floor, and generally to rebuild! A stone with an inscription is to be repaired at the cost of Rs. 10-4-0, and Mr. Rea again wisely remarks that he does not see how "repairs can be necessary for an inscribed stone." Another similar stone the "villagers once volunteered" to repair "at their own expense," and the Deputy Tahsildar "has now been called upon to explain why this has not been done." Here is a little indication of the pressure which is probably applied too often to villagers and such persons by ignorant native officials. Who will believe the story of the volunteering? And the object, the "repair" of a stone.

In paragraph 5 of his covering letter, Mr. Rea proposes cutting down the encroaching vegetation at Allagarkoil, near Madura. The cost of carrying out what he proposes may be much more considerable than he supposes, and the work will have to be repeated in a few years.

Here again the test should be the appearance of these remains in the revised list. If they are of extraordinary interest, Honorable Members would probably not object to five times the expenditure proposed.

40. In a later communication, Mr. Rea alludes to unwise proposals for "repairs" to a "rock-cut cave" and a "painted rock," in North Arcot, at a cost of rupees 540; and deprecates any such expenditure.

The Collector of North Arcot writes strongly about the "Delhi gate" at Arcot, which building is now a "place of assignation."

He proposes that the Public Works Department should use it as a rest-house, and Mr. Rea agrees in this suggestion, which can be referred to the Public Works department for early consideration.

Some extravagant proposals involving an expenditure of Rs. 600 for fencing certain rock-cut caves near Conjeeveram and Arcot are deprecated by Mr. Rea.

*This might be
mentioned if it is
advised in the revised
list to be submitted.*

28

*These will probably
be omitted from
the revised list.*

*Yes
28*

page 21 of A.

do.

page 22.

P.T.O.

41. It is unnecessary to weary Hon'ble Members more with details; those already given will sufficiently illustrate the reckless way in which suggestions, probably originating with ignorant subordinates, are passed on to Government.

It cannot be expected that Collectors, any more than Executive Engineers, can give attentive consideration to these matters. All this points, it is submitted, to the necessity of a less ambitious programme of conservation.

42. Lastly, in connection with the general question, a re-consideration of G.O., No. 462, Public Department, dated 29th May 1889, is thought to be desirable. In these Proceedings, sanction has been accorded to a proposal to prohibit any digging, save by officers of the Archaeological Survey, in not less than 302 mounds. They are called "ancient mounds," but it is admitted that nothing is known of the contents of any but some half-dozen, and that there are any contents of interest rests wholly on hypothesis. The mounds are stated to serve, as a rule, as "convenient quarries for the neighbouring villages." No information as to ownership is given, and if, as seems probable, there are many which belong to private individuals, the prohibition to quarry is one that cannot be enforced.

*In the coll.
of printed
orders*

The inconvenience to the villagers of being prevented digging in mounds near to hand must be great, and it does not seem at all desirable that they should be so prevented in cases where nothing is known of their supposed contents. Even if there are Buddhist remains in two hundred out of the three hundred and two, it is going too far to keep these ruins inviolable; a few may serve for samples of the rest; Kistna district is not the only site of such remains and the multitudinous relics of early Buddhism cannot be for ever preserved to gratify archaeologists.

Probably the full force of the order (one drafted, it is ^{believed} observed, by an office clerk) was not felt at the time.

That the mounds should by degrees be examined and excavated by Mr. Rea is reasonable and to be desired; his time could probably be better occupied in doing so and there would be more solid gain to archaeology than in his giving cursory attention to hundreds and hundreds of fifth-rate buildings scattered over the

*It was
a mistake
to draft the
order.
The original
order was found
to be a mistake.*

*I don't agree - he must
know what the mounds
contain, there for them is
no need to dig in the village
by order of the Government.
I don't like the order.
I don't see how it can
be enforced. I don't see
how it can be enforced.
I don't see how it can
be enforced. I don't see
how it can be enforced.
15/7/90
JH*

*The word should
have been "would".
The substitution of a
c in the proof was
not noticed.*

Presidency, and supporting, or deprecating, proposals to clear grass and brushwood out of old forts which can well be left alone, or to "repair" stones.

Government will gain more credit by the labors of the excellent antiquary who is now the Archæological Surveyor if his work is concentrated.

10/8/80

W.P.
9/9/80

Conservation of
ancient monuments

How. Mr. J. C. S. S. S.
to be considered

17
9-1-91

1006
A

A

15th Dec 1890

9 TH DECEMBER 1890, No. 17, PUBLIC.

January 17/

Res
7/10

Note for the L.S.
These archaeological
papers were put aside for others, in the
rush of the budget, & allowed to remain in
disposal of the L.S. I took them up at the
end of last month, & drafted the order on
the 25th & 26th Jan. but since then
there has been delay in the
prep. The drafts (which
follow notes by Hall) will
be sent to the L.S. as
he dealt with them
originally. H.P.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT

ORDER—dated 9th Dec 1890, 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, laying down the principles which in his opinion should be observed in dealing with the question.

G.O., No. 884, Public, dated May 3rd, 1884.

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 as 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 or sugar-factories, and from the growth of vegetation on the roof and walls without.

Muhammadan 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 looked after the repairs as well as the revenues and ceremonies.

The monuments which Government would be fully justified in interfering 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 Godavari 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

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

How this could be accomplished in any very limited period of time, Dr. Burgess was at a loss to point out. It would be waste of labor to call for fresh returns from district officers if these were to be compiled by the ordinary class of subordinates. Were 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 for a basis for the proposed lists, 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 temple; Tirumal Nayyak's palace at Madura; the rathas and caves at Mahabalipuram; the caves at Salavankuppam; the Chandragiri palace; Gingee, Dindigul and other 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 what 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 committees 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 whitewash, and more in scraping off the accumulated coatings of those materials.

Local custody and inspection was a matter of quite as much importance as repairs, and for this there should be some machinery. For small places and single isolated buildings it would be necessary to appoint either separate custodians or members of the district police, who would prevent mischief being done either by visitors or by natives, and report all attempts of the kind to their superiors, and, through them, when necessary, to the District Engineers. The District Engineer would visit each place in his district once a year and report on damage done and repairs required to the Curator or his deputy. For places like Hampi, a somewhat superior 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 local duties of conservation was the District Engineer, who could at least once every year visit all the works to be preserved in his district—and many of them much oftener—while his subordinates could bring to him all information available, and he would 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 whitewashing. What should be guarded against was any material modification in the way of mutilation or addition to adapt them to official requirements.

5. On receiving this report, Government entrusted to Mr. Robert Sewell the task 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

G.O., No. 529 W., February 16th, 1888.

to Superintending Engineers, and the Government ruled that it should be regarded 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, ^{H.S.} the Honorable 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. 162, 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 Archæological 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, ^{H.S.} the Honorable 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 archæological 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; 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. 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 about 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 Archæological 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 Archæological 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.)

from order

Chief Secretary.

To the Archæological Surveyor.

" Public Works Department. 14

" Revenue Department. 7

Copy to the Govt. Epigraphist.

Dec 2 1890

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 Archæological 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 archæological 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.
- G.O., No. 884, Public, dated May 3rd, 1884.

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.

Muhammadan 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

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

How this could be accomplished in any very limited period of time, Dr. Burgess was at a loss to point out. It would be waste of labor to call for fresh returns from district officers if these were to be compiled by the ordinary class of subordinates. Were 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 proposed lists, 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 temple; Tirumal Nayyak's palace at Madura; the rathas and caves at Mahabali-puram; the caves at Salavankuppam; the Chandragiri palace; Gingee, Dindigul and other old forts; and the Amarávati 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 what 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 committees 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 whitewash, and more in scraping off the accumulated coatings of those materials.

Local custody and inspection was a matter of quite as much importance as repairs, and for this there should be some machinery. For small places and single isolated buildings it would be necessary to appoint either separate custodians or members of the district police, who would prevent mischief being done either by visitors or by natives, and report all attempts of the kind to their superiors, and, through them, when necessary, to the District Engineers. The District Engineer would visit each place in his district once a year and report to the Curator or his deputy on damage done and repairs required. For places like Hampi, a somewhat superior 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 local duties of conservation was the District Engineer, who could at least once every year visit all the works to be preserved in his district—and many of them much oftener—while his subordinates could bring to him all information available, and he would 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 whitewashing. What should be guarded against was any material modification in the way of mutilation or addition to adapt them to official requirements.

5. On receiving this report, Government entrusted to Mr. Robert Sewell the task 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

G.O., No. 529 W., February 16th, 1888.

to Superintending Engineers, and the Government ruled that it should be regarded 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 lists since they were first published, and many remains are grouped together under single items in the pamphlet. The lists

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 Archæological 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 archæological 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 Archæological 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 Archæological 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 Archæological Surveyor.
" Public Works Department.
" Revenue Department.
Copy to the Government Epigraphist.

Exd. P. L. Pereira.

Govt. of {1891} Madras.

PUBLIC.

Issued

Encl.

Recd.

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

JANUARY.

Archæology.

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