

To the Editor of the JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

SIR,—Major H. Raverty having felt aggrieved by the passage in an article of mine in your Journal, quoted below¹ (and by another passage in my Marco Polo, Vol. I. p. 156), by mutual agreement the question was referred to the arbitration of Dr. A. Sprenger and Mr. Arthur Grote: “*Are or are not these passages incorrect and unjust as asserted by Major Raverty?*”

The arbiters have given their award,² which amounts to this:

“The passages are neither incorrect nor unjust; but they are calculated to leave an unfavourable impression on the reader’s mind. The frame work of both papers appears to have been drawn from the same source; but a comparison of the Vocabularies shows that their respective authors worked independently of each other. The arbiters are satisfied that Major Raverty *was quite unaware of the previous publication*, and that his position is therefore completely justified.”

H. YULE.

¹ “It may be worth while to call attention to the fact that, according to the notes of Rájah Khán of Kábul, translated by Major Leech in vol. xiv. of the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (pp. 815–817), Upper Káshkar is also called SHIGHNÁN. . . . I must leave the matter on this solitary authority. The same is indeed said in Major Raverty’s ‘*Account of Upper Káshkar*’ in the 33rd vol. of the same Journal, p. 131. But I cannot regard this as a corroboration, for a comparison of the two papers shows that *they have been derived from the same original notes*, though no indication of this is suggested in the latter paper.”—New Series, vol. vi. p. 113.

² Colonel Yule originally sent a letter containing nearly the whole award of the arbitrators, a document which the Council found greatly too long for insertion.—Ed.