

of the fields and the scattered nature of the tenures. For even where only a small area of a particular kind of soil was to be found in the village, it had to be cut up into plots corresponding with the number of the villagers. These plots were often so small that they could not be shown on the field maps of the rice lands until the scale was altered from thirty-two inches to sixty-four inches to the mile. In order to carry out this rule, each ryot's holding and the area belonging to each koont were scattered all over the village, thus obliging cultivators in large villages to go from one to two or three miles to visit and till each plot of their holdings. Such a distribution of the fields could never have existed if each tenant were thought to have a right to the land he or his ancestors had cleared; in that case every holding would have been in a ring fence.

In conclusion, I think I may safely say that everywhere throughout the length and breadth of India it will be found that the Dravidian matriarchal cultivator, who has introduced his distinctive cerebral letters into Sanskrit and Pushto, and has left very distinct traces of his speech in all Prakrit and Pali dialects, has also left the mark of his inborn conservatism upon the agricultural tenures and customs. That everywhere the oldest village system was the communal tenure of the Dravidian sons of the tree, whose staple crop was rice; and that the rule of individual property in land, which distinguishes the Bhaiāchāra and Pattidari systems of tenure, and which has in many places all but obliterated the old communal rules in *ryotwāri* villages, is a later importation into India made by the barley-growing immigrants from Asia Minor.

J. F. HEWITT.

#### 4. DIMĀPŪR.

DEAR SIR,—I think it is a great pity that one at least of the photos of the Y-shaped stones described by Dr. Brown was not given in the last number, and hope the

Council will see their way to publishing one in the next issue. Since writing the remarks which appeared in the last quarterly, I have seen Major Godwin-Austen's description (with plates) in the Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society of 1874, but none of his drawings seem to me to give sufficient detail of what he calls the V-shaped stones. One certainly represents a V (not Y) springing directly from the earth, but from his description it is clear that there is a double row of Y-stones, and because the front row is taller than the rear row he thinks they were used to support beams for a roof. The evidence, however, is not conclusive. He says there are signs of a mortice on the tops of the V's, as if they had been connected by another piece, but that *no such pieces were found*. He gives a ground-plan of the stones, showing the relative position of round pillars and Y-stones, which ought also to be republished. I do not remember seeing any V-shaped stones in Dr. Brown's series, and they clearly could not be used for supporting a roof. It is unfortunate that Major Godwin-Austen does not give any drawing of a stone in support of his theory that they were used as supports of the roof of what he thinks was a "*market-place from its position just inside the gateway.*" To me this seems a very extraordinary conclusion to arrive at. If the structure were merely a market-place, why should the stone supports be so elaborately carved? Why, again, should there be in front of it two rows of huge round columns carved in a totally different way, without bird or beast of any kind being depicted on them? And what is the meaning of the large isolated column, 17 ft. high and 23 ft. in circumference, which stands opposite the centre of the rows of stones, but at a distance of 150 ft. from them?

The ruins and traditions of the Kacharis and Nāga tribes require careful investigation: even the name Dimā remains unexplained, and the date of the destruction of the city (by Nāga tribes?) unrecorded.—Yours truly,

R. F. ST. ANDREW ST. JOHN.