

Public (1897) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 1129-1130

DATED 30-8-97

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Addressing the Govt of India on
the system of numbering in
the Imperial & Provincial
Series of the reports of the
Archaeological Survey of
India.*

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

File and

Public (1897) Department.

CURRENT No.



Transferred to the Public Dept. from the office of the

*Ans
m/s
19.8.97*

From

*The Superintendent,
Archaeological Survey,
(Madras)*

No. 117.

Order

Dated *22nd July 1897*

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

*Requests orders as to the
numbering of the first five
South Indian provincial
volumes of the Imperial
series of Archaeological
Survey publications.*

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Archaeological Survey, (Madras.)

Bangalore.

22nd July 1897.

No. 117.

From

A. REA, ESQUIRE,

SUPERINTENDENT, ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY,

(MADRAS,)

To

The Chief Secretary
to the Government of Madras.

SIR,

With reference to my volume on monu-
- mental Remains of the Dutch East India
Company, at present in the press, I have
the honour to request the orders of Government,
as to the numbering of the first five South
Indian Provincial volumes to be included
in the list of Imperial volumes therein
inserted.

2. G. O., No. 339 Financial, dated 28th
April 1894, gives the Imperial and South
Indian Provincial numbers as follows—

Imperial No.		Provincial No.
VI	Corresponds to	I
VII	"	II
VIII	"	III
IX	"	IV

2.

But the last published Imperial volume XXIII just now received, gives the list thus—

VI		V
VII		I
VIII		II
IX		III
X		IV

3. It would prevent confusion in numbering, if not only the Imperial but the provincial numbers were communicated to all those engaged in the work of preparing volumes for the series. Thus the Imperial numbers XXIII and XXIV were notified to me, but not their corresponding provincial numbers for Western India. These latter however, now appear in the newly published Imperial volume XXIII. But for this, I would have been unable to include them in the list to be published with my present volume.

I have the honour to be
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A.
Superintendent.

under
NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

Public

I undertook from notice on a recent paper that Public will take these in future. I have transferred the current accordingly but please say if there is any objection.

Done
19 2 98

[Handwritten signature/initials]

But the last two
volumes

[9.75]
2,000 - 25-11-54

Lat. C. to 2250.

G.O. No 715. Fail
27. 7. 93.

Imperial No VII is Prov. No I
" " VIII " " II
" " IX " " III
" " X " " IV

Printed with G.O. No
203 Fail of 9. 3. 94

" " Ditto

NOTE FOR THE CA

In July '93 the G.O. issued instructions as regards the publication of future Archaeological Survey reports & forwarded a list showing the volumes which were to constitute the new Imperial series. Only four (South India) Provincial nos appear in that list.

Imperial No. 11, though relating to this Presy. was not assigned a Provincial No. The

~~Imperial No. 11~~
omission was pointed out to the G.O. of Madras in para 2 of this Govt's letter No 55 Fail of

23. 1. 94.

In its reply the G.O. said the 'Provincial numbering' was 'left to the Govt. to decide' & asked to be informed of the decision arrived at.

The Govt. Epigraphist
 & the Supt. Archaeological
 Survey were consulted &
 the Provincial Nos. were
 revised. Imperial No. VI
 referred to above was
 numbered. Procl. No. I.
 The Govt. of India was
 furnished with a copy
 of these proceedings.

* Impt. No. VI — Procl. No. I

"	VII	"	II
"	VIII	"	III
"	IX	"	IV
"	X	"	V

++ learned last year

Mr. Rea is his last
 volume. "Chalukyan Archi-
 tecture" has recorded the
 old provincial nos. now
 those originally assigned
 by the Govt. of India and in the
 last Imperial Series
 volumes ~~recorded~~ by the
 Archaeological Survey of
 Western India, the old
 Provincial Nos. are given
 to the vols. relating to
 this Presy. and Prov. ~~No. V~~
 is given to Imperial
 No. VI, as stated by Mr. Rea.

If the matter is set
 right in the volume now
 in the Press, a new Presidential
 with copy our list & then

with no further confusion
 as far as our Provincial
 nos. are concerned.

As regards Mr. Rea's
 request to be furnished
 with Provincial Nos. —
 All such numbers relating
 to this Presy. are intimated
 to him. There is, it is
 submitted, no necessity
 to ask other Provinces
 to inform us of the Pro-
 vincial Nos. they intend
 giving their reports. The
 Supt. Arch. Survey receive
 a copy of every report
 & the Procl. No. ^{of a new volume} could be
 inserted in his next
 report. It is not necessary
 that the Provincial Nos.
 of other Provinces should
 be up to date in the our
 list of Imperial Volumes.
~~Imperial Nos. are~~
~~by the Supt. Arch. Survey~~
 The Supt. Arch. Survey
 is informed whenever an
 Imperial No. has been as-
 signed to a volume by

I don't see why the
 should be in the
 list of Imperial
 volumes.

Phase 2a draft ~~not~~
~~not~~ put up G.

9/8/97

P.S. This current was delayed
owing references having
had to be made to the Dept.
Govt. Press G.

Erne

64 Word Form.

U G P-No. 433 T..7-2 37..2400900.

[illegible]

Cur. 3113 A.

Cur. 3113 A.
ORDER No. 1129 of 30 Aug 97

The Govt. of India will be addressed

2. It is observed that Mr. Rea in his volume on Chalukyan Architecture has overlooked the directions as to numbering contained in G.O.No.339, Financial, dated 23th April 1894, in which should, in future, be observed.

H.R. Mc Gowan
(Draft of letter to India)

And with go 5702: then

220 Principle & method

5 upl; psychol. survey. 30/8/97
 2. 219 23/9/97

LETTER N^o 1130 of 30 Aug 97

10

The Secy. to the Govt. of India

Revenue and Agri: Dept.
(Archaeology)

Sir,

I am directed to address ~~you~~ regard-
ing the numbering in the Imperial and
Provincial Series of the reports of the
Archaeological Survey of India.

With Mr. MacLagan's letter No. 40-89 dated 28th July 1893 was forwarded a list of the ~~works~~ books already issued, showing the Imperial and Provincial numbering of the volumes. It was pointed out in my letter No. 88, Financial, dated 23rd Jan'y. 1894 that volume VI in the Imperial series (The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta) which related to this Presidency had not been assigned a place in the Provincial Series of Southern India, the first volume in which was shown as Imperial No. VII. The Govt. of India thereupon ~~was~~ was pleased to leave the ~~arrangement~~ ^{arrangement} of the Provincial number-

Cur. 3113 A.

ORDER No. 1129 of 30 Aug 97

The Govt. of India will be addressed.
It is observed that Mr. Rea in his volume on Chalukyan Architecture has overlooked the directions as to numbering contained in G.O. No. 339, Financial, dated 23rd April 1894, in which should, in future, be observed.

H.R. MacGregor
(Draft of Letter to India)

Read with go to H.R. this 1
is a nice volume matter
no principle is involved

Suppl. Archaeol. Survey. 7th July 1893/94
30/8/97
6/9/97
2/9

LETTER No. 1130 of 30 Aug 97

To.
The Secy. to the Govt. of India
Revenue and Agri: Dept.
(Archaeology)

Sir,

I am directed to address you regarding the numbering in the Imperial and Provincial Series of the reports of the Archaeological Survey of India.

With Mr. MacLagan's letter No. 40-39 dated 26th July 1893 was forwarded a list of the ~~works~~ books already issued, showing the Imperial and Provincial numbering of the volumes. It was pointed out in my letter No. 339, Financial, dated 23rd Jan'y. 1894 that volume VI in the Imperial series (The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta) which related to this Presidency had not been assigned a place in the Provincial Series of Southern India, the first volume in which was shown as Imperial No. VII. The Govt. of India thereupon was pleased to leave the ~~arrangement~~ of the Provincial number-

Indi G.O. no 203 Fin
d. 9/3/94
page 2.

the
ing to Local Govt. and this Govt. accord-
ingly revised the list, assigning Pro-
vincial number I to ~~the~~ ^{VI} volume alluded
to above, and altering the numbering
of the following volumes. ~~The~~ ^{is} de-
cision was communicated to the Govt. of
India Rev. and Agri: Dept. with my
endorsement No. 540, Finl., dated 30th
April 1894.

E
3. The Superintendent of the Archaeo-
logical Survey, Madras, now brings to notice the
the fact that in the table printed in
Vol. VIII of the Imperial Series,
(Muhammadan Architecture of Bhāṣṇa,
Cambay, Dholka, Champanir and Mahmudabad
in Gujarat) the decision of this Govt.
regarding Provincial numbering has not
been observed. Vol. VI in the Imperial
Series ~~which it was assigned should be~~
^{is entered as Vol V in}

~~numbered~~ The Southern India Series has
^{notified as No I as arranged.}
~~become No. V.~~ This Govt. has received
no intimation that the numbering adopted
by it has not been accepted by the Govt.
of India and I am therefore to ~~report~~ ^{request}
that the matter may be set right
ⁱⁿ subsequent volumes. I am to add that
Mr. Rea in his volume on Chalukyan
Architecture has himself wrongly adopt-
ed the original numbering prescribed by
the Govt. of India: the mistake has
been pointed out and will be recti-
fied.

^{Rea}
Mr. ^{Rea} suggests that it would be an
advantage if not only the Imperial but
also the Provincial numbers assigned
to each ~~volume~~ ^{work} were communicated to each
of the officers engaged in the duty of
preparing these reports. In that way

only can the list published in each
^{kept}
volume be complete and up to date.
I am to say that ~~the Govt that~~ this
Govt. considers the suggestion a good
one.

AC.
27/8/97
28
30.8.97

When given for copying } 1/9 }
When copied }
When examined 2/9 } 1897
When signed }

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

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