

are differentiated only by the quality of their *s* sound; for example, the East Turkish *kasmak* = »der Grund, Boden des Kessels oder der in demselben angebrannte Teil der Speise», and *kazmak* = »graben, herumirren, herumstreifen». But in this present work I was not able to carry out this requisite distinction, because Dr. Hedin when originally noting down his observations on the spot did not discriminate between the two sounds. In some cases I could indeed, with the help of the dictionaries, have corrected his orthography by writing, for example *muz* = *ice*, in place of his *mus*, and *kizil* = *red*, in place of *kisil*. But too often the dictionaries would have proved of no assistance; for this reason therefore I had to abandon the idea of discriminating between the two sounds.

Now similar questions might arise in other languages, so that it is impossible to decide, off-hand and once for all, how far the process of simplification ought to be carried in the transcription of the geographical nomenclature.

II. THE TRANSCRIPTION OUGHT TO BE SO CLEAR THAT IT CANNOT POSSIBLY BE MISUNDERSTOOD.

If I write the East Turkish word for »stone» in the French way as *tach*, then the Englishman would pronounce it as *tatsch* and the German as *tach*, with the guttural sound, whereas the final sound of the word is in reality the same as the English *sh* in *sheep*. Consequently the spelling *tach* may easily be misunderstood by the non-philological reader, and therefore is not a convenient form to adopt.

If, again, I write the East Turkish word for »great», which begins with the same sound as *ch* in the English *child*, in the English way as *chong*, then the Frenchman will pronounce it as *schong* and the German with the guttural. Consequently the spelling *chong* may easily be misunderstood, and is therefore not a convenient form to adopt.

The first sound in the last mentioned word is compounded of two others, a *t* sound and a *sch* sound. If now I represent the *sch* sound by *sh*, and consequently write *tash*; then, to be consistent, I ought to write the latter word *tshong*. But this word may easily enough be interpreted as *ts* + *hong*, that is to say as an »aspirated» *ts* + *ong*. Aspirated *ts* sounds of this kind do occur in the Indian languages, in Tibetan, in Chinese, and so forth, and must not, either in the scientific or in the broader transcription, be confounded with the ordinary *ts*. But even though in the broader transcription one were to embrace *ts* and *tsh* under one common sign *ts*, or for the aspirated *ts* were to choose some other sign, as for example *ts'*, the sign *tsh* in the sense of *tsch* (the English *ch*) would nevertheless be strange and unfamiliar even to the ear of an Englishman, and one would always be tempted to pronounce *tsh* as an aspirated *ts*, and not as *tsch*. Consequently the use of *tsh* may easily be misunderstood and therefore is not a convenient form to adopt.

We have already seen that the form *ch* is not suitable to express the *sch* sound, and the consequence is that we cannot use *tch* either to indicate the *tsch* sound, which is a compound of *t* + *sch*.

The Swedish way of spelling the words would be *tasj* and *tjong*; but here the *sj* and *tj* might readily enough be taken for palatalized *s* and *t*. A Hun-