

RAWLINSON continues:

The fabrication of the Foreign Office MS. and of the Chinese Itinerary can be brought home to Klaproth, I think, positively and with almost mathematical precision, but the attribution to him of the German Baron's narrative does not rest quite on the same determinate evidence. On his handdrawn map in 6 sheets Klaproth has, however, sketched Kashmir under the same distorted features as Georg Ludwig von —. Therefore, Lord Strangford was of opinion »that this agreement in a false geography, not otherwise known to exist, proved one of two things, either that Klaproth must have copied his map from that of the German Baron, the asserted recent discovery of the latter document being thus shown to be untrue, or that he was himself the author of both the fabricated Journals.

But Rawlinson seems to have some doubt:

There does, however, seem to be an alternative explanation that both Klaproth and the inventor of the Baron's travels may have copied from a third spurious original, which is as yet undiscovered, and I am the rather inclined to attach some weight to this hypothesis that beyond the Indus, Klaproth's Map exhibits no similarity whatever to the Baron's Journal, either in nomenclature or in the general description of the country; and it certainly does seem extraordinary if Klaproth really invented the Baron's story and tracings that he should not have reproduced the fictions in constructing his own subsequent map.

If Rawlinson felt inclined to attach some weight to the hypothesis of the existence of a third spurious original, as yet undiscovered, it is surprising that he could be so positive in his charge against Klaproth. He quotes Lord STRANGFORD'S opinion that MACARTNEY'S map had served as a basis for Klaproth's forgeries, but he believes that also other sources had been consulted. He says:

The name of Bolor, indeed, which may be called the pivot of all this spurious geography of Central Asia, bears direct evidence to the historical sources from which it is derived, for this title, although in general use amongst writers from the 10th to the 17th century, has become obsolete in the country ever since, and was certainly quite unknown at the date of these pretended travels, whether applied to a river, or to a city, or to a range of mountains.¹ With regard to the remarkably correct description of Kaferistan,

who was an uncle of JOHN and died in 1823. The year before, or in 1822, Klaproth found his map, »détestable». He then goes on in the following, lovely way: Dans un article inséré dans le quarantième cahier du Journal Asiatique (page 249), j'ai dit que feu M. Arrowsmith avait été le plus ignare de tous ceux qui se sont occupés à fabriquer des cartes. Il paraît que ce jugement a paru trop sévère à quelques géographes du continent, dont toute la science consiste ordinairement, à copier et à réduire ce que l'atelier d'Arrowsmith leur fournissait. Ayant à coeur de prouver que je n'avais employé, pour désigner les travaux de ce graveur anglais, que des expressions convenables, je vais soumettre sa carte de l'Asie à quelques observations, et l'on se convaincra, je l'espère, que l'épithète d'ignare, que j'avais choisie pour le qualifier, était fort bien choisie. — Le patriotisme brutal de quelques journalistes anglais, qui paraissent ignorer que la science n'a pas de patrie exclusive, leur a fait envisager cette critique de leur fameux faiseur de cartes, comme une attaque dirigée contre l'honneur national de l'Angleterre. La tête d'un ignorant seule peut enfanter une idée aussi absurde. . . — J. Klaproth: *Observation sur la Carte de L'Asie, publiée en 1822*, par M. Arrowsmith. *Mémoires relatifs à l'Asie*. Tome III. Paris MDCCCXXVIII, p. 284 et seq.

¹ With regard to Bolor Sir HENRY YULE states the conclusion »that there is no real evidence for the existence of a state, town, or river called Bolor on the western side of Pamir». In his opinion »the name has now become so tainted, first by mistake and next by fiction, that it would be well