

The demand for orthographical uniformity in geographical literature stands on the same footing as the demand for a uniform system of measures, a uniform thermometrical scale, and so forth. The same national prejudices and the same difficulties which have hitherto prevented the introduction of the metric system and the Centigrade thermometric scale stand in the way of the introduction of a uniform orthographical system. It must be admitted, however, that even though the national scruples were overcome, there would still remain a number of difficulties in connection with this question of a uniform orthography, which it will be by no means easy to overcome. For not only can an orthographical system such as that which is desiderated not be established in a manner that is at once as mathematically clear, simple, and unassailable as a system of measures or a thermometrical scale, since different standards of clearness and accuracy in transcription are set up by different languages, and their requirements with regard to these desiderata are sometimes divergent; nor can these varying orthographical ideals be forced to submit to one rigid system without suffering material damage. Hence to seek to set up an *absolute* orthographical system is to aim at a chimæra.

The conclusions reached by the above considerations with regard to the representation of the *sch* sound may be developed into the following law: *The same sound ought in writing and in print always to be expressed in the same manner, by means of the same orthographical sign or group of signs.* In philological literature the following proposition is also generally observed: The same orthographical sign ought always to indicate the same sound. Accordingly the sign *š*, which is met with in a number of phonetic alphabets, ought to indicate one sound only, namely that which the Englishman represents by *sh* as in *sheep*, the German by *sch* as in *schön*, the Frenchman by *ch* as in *chanter*, and so on, that is to say, the »voiceless *sch* sound». At the same time the same sign ought not to be employed to indicate the »voiced *sch* sound», which the Englishman writes *si* as in *occasion* and the Frenchman *j* as in *jouer*; but for this a special sign ought to be employed, for instance *ž*. In a similar manner the sign *s* ought to be used solely for the »voiceless *s* sound», such as we hear it in the English *set*, the German *ist*, the French *salon*; whereas *z* is most commonly employed to distinguish the »voiced *s* sound» that we hear in the English *easy*, the German *gewesen*, the French *poser*. The phonetic alphabets therefore that distinguish between a very great number of different sounds exhibit a remarkable complexity of strange signs, so that a text accurately written according to strict phonetic rule is wholly unintelligible to anybody except the trained philologist.

Hence it is clear, that in laying down an orthographical system for use in geographical literature the proposition quoted above must not be inverted; but instead of that, several of the sounds which philologists distinguish must be included under the same sign, for instance all the varieties of the *a* sound under the sign *a* and of the *l* sound under the sign *l*. The only question is how far it is expedient or necessary to proceed in this method of simplification, or to speak in the language of philology, how broad the transcription may and ought to be. For my own part, I should, for example, welcome a distinction, in the writing of Turkish place-names, between the voiceless and the voiced *s*, that is to say between *s* and *z*, because the Turkish language does distinguish between these two sounds, so that some words