

Names (PCGN) [London] and the Board of Geographical Names (BGN) [Washington].

I believe that I am not mistaken when I say that the Slavonic linguists use a single symbol with a diacritical accent, namely "š", for this phoneme and that the same symbol and accent mark are used in Croatia for the transliteration of Serb names.

I further note that the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) [Geneva], which has representatives in some fifty countries, proposes the same system for the transliteration of Cyrillic names.

Also, in its report to the Conference, the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, speaking on behalf of the official German body—the *Ständiger Ausschuss für geographische Namen*—said that it had adopted the ISO system of transliteration, and it recommended the adoption of that system by the Conference.

The ICOS Sub-Committee (see annex I for its membership) has, moreover, taken a similar position (see the resolution in annex II).

We are faced here with a difficult and perhaps delicate problem, which must, however, as I see it, be dealt with objectively by the Conference—and perhaps kept in reserve until further information becomes available. The Conference will certainly provide an opportunity for direct contact with the representatives of ISO so that the different points of view can be compared and a satisfactory international solution can ultimately be arrived at.

The stand taken at the Conference by the representatives of the Soviet Union and other Slav countries in a question which primarily comes within their jurisdiction does, of course, have an important bearing on the solution of the problem. If the Conference should be unable to arrive at a solution, a regional conference of the Slav countries should, I believe, be organized by the United Nations in the near future. I should like, in this connexion, to draw attention to the conferences regularly held by the International Board on Slavic Onomastics, whose competence in this matter is, it seems to me, beyond question.²

The regular contact maintained by the secretariat of ICOS with the representatives of ICOS in the Slav countries might, if the Conference wished, be used to facilitate further contacts.

² The third session of this organization was held from 14 to 17 September 1960 at Liblice in Bohemia under the chairmanship of Professor Witold Taszycki, of the University of Kraków, who is a member of ICOS.

Annex I

INTERNATIONAL STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

In implementation of the resolution proposed by J. B. Rudnyckyj (Winnipeg) and E. B. Atwood (Austin) at the Congress of Salamanca, we have been able to set up two sub-committees.

The first, which will have to deal with the international transcription of geographical names in Africa south of the Sahara, is composed as follows: N. A. Tucker (School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London), chairman; P. J. M. Geelan (Permanent Committee on Geographical Names, London), secretary; J. Berry (School of Oriental and African Studies, London), L. Houis (Institut français de l'Afrique noire, Dakar), G. P. Lestrade (University of Cape Town), and A. E. Meeussen (University of Louvain), members.

The other sub-committee will study the problem of the international transliteration of geographical names of the Cyrillic alphabet area and is composed as follows: M. Vasmer (Freie Universität, Berlin), chairman; R. Olesch (University of Cologne), secretary; E. Dickemann (University of Bern), E. Meynen (Bundesamt für Landeskunde, Remagen), J. B. Rudnyckyj (Winnipeg) and W. Taszycki (Kraków).

The two sub-committees will work in close contact with the Board on Geographic Names, Washington (Meredith Burrill and J. Mutziger), and the Permanent Committee on Geographical Names, London (P. J. M. Geelan).

The members of the first sub-committee have been able to meet several times and will submit final conclusions at the Congress of Munich, where a special section will be devoted to this question.

The conclusions of the Cyrillic sub-committee will be discussed at the next Congress and then referred to our Slavist colleagues, who will gather at Moscow at the beginning of September 1968 on the occasion of the fourth International Congress of Slavists.

We hope that an international agreement may soon be reached with regard to this difficult question. It cannot be denied that, for the solution of a problem of this nature, the guidance of linguists, and particularly of onomatologists, will prove to be quite indispensable.

Annex II

Resolution der X. Sektion (Kyrillische Subkommission) [VIe Congrès—Munich, 1958]

Die Subkommission hält eine Vereinheitlichung der Wiedergabe der Eigennamen, insbesondere der geographischen Namen für notwendig.

Die Subkommission tritt für eine Transliteration (nicht Transkription) kyrillischer Schreibungen ein. Hierbei sollte die einheitliche, sprachwissenschaftliche Transliteration zugrunde gelegt werden.

SOME PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN RENDERING GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES FROM ONE WRITING SYSTEM INTO ANOTHER

Paper presented by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics¹

In recent years the problem of rendering geographical names from one language into another has become of greater interest to many countries. The convening of the present Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names is a proof of this.

The Soviet Union, too, at the present time, is giving much attention to this problem. There are several reasons for this. The Soviet Union is doing a great deal of mapping its vast territories with their multinational population.

¹ The original text of this paper, prepared by L. I. Rosova and V. I. Savina, Central Research Institute of Geodesy, Aerial Survey and Cartography, appeared as document E/CONF.53/L. 48.

There have appeared of late a great number of maps and atlases covering areas all over the world and varying as to theme and content. A number of cartographic works in foreign languages have been issued in the Soviet Union. Finally, new problems have arisen in connexion with rendering geographical names in the national scripts of Asian and some African countries into Russian.

Soviet cartography is faced with two immediate problems: to transpose foreign names into the Cyrillic alphabet, which has been adopted by most of the languages of the USSR territories; and to transpose foreign names into languages whose script differs from the Cyrillic, such as

Georgian, Armenian, and the languages of the Soviet Baltic Republics.

In this report we shall touch upon the problems of rendering foreign names into the Russian alphabet and partly into the Roman alphabet. In order to resolve new problems which may arise in the process of such work, it is necessary to have definite rules based on the phonetic peculiarities of the language concerned, its orthography and morphology. The most satisfactory method of rendering foreign names into Russian is that of practical transcription, when only Russian letters are used and the rules of Russian orthography are observed.

We should like to say a few words on some general problems which arise when names are rendered into Russian from any system of writing. As a rule, we transcribe names from the official language of the country concerned. Should we also consider the other important languages that the people of the country speak, such as the Dravidian languages or Bengali in India? Our specialists answer this question in the affirmative.

Again, should words be transcribed by rendering only the phoneme in question or by sometimes rendering its variants, depending upon the position of the phoneme in the word? For example, in Persian names the letter ک represents a fricative uvular consonant and is generally pronounced کف , but before vowels it carries the value of "k", that is, it becomes explosive. We consider that the rendering of phonemes is preferable because of their semantic value.

And finally, is it practical in transcribing to preserve, to some extent, the "graphical image" of a name, sometimes ignoring its pronunciation? Shall we write Рейлинген or Райлинген (Reilingen); Албешти or Албешть (Albești)? We believe that the "graphical image" should be taken into consideration.

Another quite complicated problem is that of dialects. Should some dialectal differences that are peculiar to the toponymy of certain regions of the country concerned be reflected when rendering names into other languages? Should we ignore them if they are not fixed in national spelling? For example, the Arabic character ج usually represents the sound dʒ (as in "jury"), but in the United Arab Republic and some regions of the Sudan it carries the value of "g" (as in "get"). We think it practical to reflect such phenomena although the national spelling does not distinguish between them.

The problem whether compound place names should be written separately or in one arises in all languages. Should we follow the spelling of the original or work out a set of rules of our own? If we follow the original, we are often unable to render similar word structures consistently. This happens because one and the same compound name may be written in different ways in the national scripts. For example, German names including the words "klein", "gross", "neu", "alt", "ober", "nieder" and others are written both separately and in one. Again, the name "Bearpaw" can also be written "Bear Paw".

It seems to us necessary to have strict rules for rendering similar names irrespective of their spelling in the original, because morphologically similar structures should be transposed in identical fashion.

The problem of transposing generic terms is just as complicated. Should they be transcribed or translated? As we know, in some languages generic terms precede proper names (e.g. "Lac de Grandlieu"; راس الملعى (Ras el

Milh) in Arabic); in other languages they come after proper names, e.g. "Baba burnu", "Ak Dag", in Turkish; and in still others both positions are possible, e.g. رودشور (Rud-i-Shur), سفيد کوه (Safid Kuh) in Persian, महानन्दा नदी (Mahananda Nadi), जिल डेबर (Jhil Debar) in Hindi. In addition, proper names and the generic terms related to them may be written both separately and in one. All this considerably complicates the solution of the problem whether generic terms should be translated or transcribed.

We consider it possible to resolve the problem in the manner described below.

If the generic term is an integral element of a name (and we always consider it integral when the specific part is expressed by an adjective or a numeral), it should be transcribed, for example, "Schwarz Bach" – р. Шварц-Бах, महानन्दा (Hindi) р. Махананда, سفيد کوه (Urdu) – г. Кохе-Сабз, Uçada (Turkish) – о-ва Учада, Μεγάλο Βουνο (Greek) Г. Мегало-Вуно.

If the specific element is expressed by a noun, a combination of two nouns or a combination of a noun and an adjective, the geographical term ceases to be an integral part and becomes a generic term. In such cases it should be translated, e.g. Кӯҳи Бобоиоб (Tadjik) – г. Бобоиоб; Victoria Desert – пуст. Виктория; विकटोरिया नदी (Hindi) – р. Сварнарекха; $\text{कैपूर की पहाड़ियाँ}$ (Hindi) – горы Каймур, پلٹ بڈھا (Urdu) – пруд Бардха; "Baie de St. Brieuc" (French) – бухта Сен-Бриё; "Baba burnu" (Turkish), – м. Баба.

The rendering of noun flexions in genitive constructions consisting of a combination of generic and specific parts. is especially difficult. There are several ways of resolving this problem:

The term is translated and the nominative of the proper name is used (e.g. "Burtnieku ezers" (Latvian) – оз. Буртниеки;

The term is translated and the genitive form of the proper name is retained (e.g. "Dagdas ezers" (Latvian) – оз. Дагдас;

The whole construction is transcribed and a Russian generic term is added (e.g. "Puzes ezers" (Latvian) – оз. Пузес-Эзерс.

Unfortunately opinions on the problem differ. In our practice all three methods are used.

All these general problems are very complicated, there are different points of view of how to deal with them and it seems to us that an exchange of opinions would be useful.

Further, we should like to touch upon some special problems which have to be resolved in rendering names into Russian from certain systems of writing. First, there is the alphabetical writing system in its two varieties: (a) all sounds, both vowels and consonants, are represented (Greek, Roman, Cyrillic, Georgian, Armenian alphabets and the Korean alphabet, *kummun*) and (b) only consonants are represented (Arabic, Hebrew alphabets). Secondly, there is the syllabic script system (Burmese, Thai, Laotian, Khmer, Devanagari and other kinds of Indian script; the Japanese official alphabet, *kana*). Thirdly, there is the idiographic script (Chinese and Japanese).

Some of these systems have long been used in cartography (the Roman and Cyrillic alphabets and to some extent the Arabic alphabet and idiographic script); others have been used occasionally (the Devanagari and various kinds of writing used in Indochina); and still others have not yet been used at all (the systems of writing based on the

Indian syllabic script and used in India side by side with the Devanagari, as well as the Amharic script).

The authentic forms of foreign names can be established only with the help of national maps. That is why the absence of national cartography in a number of countries, and especially the absence of national alphabets in some African languages, hinder the work.

The method of rendering the geographical names of Africa, with its wealth of complicated languages, through English, French or Italian transcription is inadequate. That is why the efforts of linguists in some countries of West Africa in creating national alphabets should be appreciated.

The rendering of names from any system of writing poses a series of problems. These exist even when the language into which terms are rendered and the language of the original have the same alphabet. For instance, to render Byelorussian and Ukrainian toponyms into Russian we find it convenient to use a special method, that of morpheme replacement, which is justified by the close affinity of these languages: Byelorussian and Ukrainian suffixes and flexions are replaced by the corresponding Russian ones (e.g. Барысаў (Byelorussian) – Борисов; Глухів (Ukrainian) – Глухов) and the replacement of the corresponding sounds in the roots takes place.

This method is partly used in rendering other Slavic toponyms, e.g. Polish and Czech adjectives ending in “-i”, “-a” and “-ý”, –á respectively sometimes appear in Russian in the form of Russian adjectives: Wyzyna Małopolska – Малопольская возвышенность; Bródnowski Kanał – Брудновский канал; Muránsky Kras – Муранский карст and so on.

There also exist certain difficulties in rendering geographical names even from languages with alphabets based on the Cyrillic. These difficulties are mainly connected with the absence of special letters in the Russian alphabet for designating certain sounds that exist in other languages. It especially concerns such languages as the Caucasian, which have a complex system of sounds rendered only approximately into Russian. In addition, the matter is complicated by the fact that in the alphabets of the languages of the western and eastern Caucasus there are several ways of designating approximately similar sounds, e.g. the explosive guttural sibilant affricate is usually indicated by qI in all the Caucasian languages but by kI in Adygej. There are cases when one and the same letter represents different sounds in the same language, e.g. the letters з and ж may represent either the fricative sounds “z”, as in “freeze”, and ж, as in “pleasure”, or the affricates “dz”, as in “goods”, and “dз”, as in “just”. Double consonants in different Nakh-Daghestan languages may designate both non-aspirate sounds and two consonant sounds of the same value.

All this makes it necessary to work out special rules for practical transcription even from languages using the Cyrillic.

When rendering names from variants of Roman writing, it should be borne in mind that the Roman alphabet adapted to different languages has a limited number of letters. That is why various diacritical marks have been added to some letters in order to indicate the specific sounds of the language concerned. In addition, the self same letters may be assigned different sound values, or a combination of letters is used for a single sound. In connexion with this, it should be noted that a thorough knowl-

edge of any language, its phonetics and orthography, is required when rendering names.

The rendering of names from languages with traditional spelling, such as English or French, is particularly difficult. In this case special phonetic dictionaries which give the pronunciation of proper names are of great help; for example, *Everyman's English Pronouncing Dictionary* by Danial Jones for the United Kingdom; *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English* by John Samuel Kenyon and Thomas Albert Knott for the United States; *Dictionnaire phonétique de la langue française* by Barbeau-Rodhe for France.

In rendering names from maps in Arabic script the main difficulties are caused by the absence of marks for short vowels as well as the *tashdid*, *sukun* and *hamza*. Therefore it would be most useful if the specialists of the countries which issue maps in Arabic script included indexes of the names transcribed into Roman lettering. This would considerably facilitate the rendering of these names into other systems of writing. As an example, we may cite the ten-volume “Dictionary of place names of Iran” issued in Teheran in 1949-1952 (ایران . جلد ۱-۱۰ . تهران . ۱۳۳۱-۱۳۲۸). It contains the Roman transcription of almost all the names it includes.

The differences between the phonetic systems of the Arabic language and the languages whose writing systems are based on the Arabic alphabet have resulted in the introduction of additional letters into the alphabets of some languages, e.g. گ, ژ, چ, پ in Persian, and the addition to some Arabic letters of diacritical marks, e.g. م, د, ر, و, ع, ح (ح) in Pushtu, ب, پ, ط in Urdu etc. Moreover, one and the same sound in these languages may be represented by different characters, e.g. ز, ذ, ژ, ن for the sound “z” in Persian. All this should be taken into consideration when rendering names from the Arabic script.

For many years, the geographical names of India on our maps have been transposed from English. However, since Hindi in the Devanagari writing has been declared the State language of India and the first cartographic materials in Hindi have appeared, e.g. the national atlas of India, issued in 1957 (भारत राष्ट्रीय पटलपत्र, प्रारम्भिक प्रकाशना भारत सरकार शिक्षा और वैज्ञानिक अटलपत्र पत्रालय शिव प्रसाद वर्मा कलिकात देहरादून), it has become possible to begin rendering Indian place names direct from Hindi. At the same time, the other important and widely spoken languages of the country, such as Bengali, Gujarati, Marathi, Tamili etc. cannot be disregarded. Therefore, in addition to the existing rules of rendering names from Hindi, new rules are being prepared by our specialists which will make it possible to transcribe correctly the names of states whose populations do not speak Hindi. However, no consistent rules can be worked out until cartographic materials in local languages are available.

As we all know, the Indian syllabic system gave rise to other systems of writing widely used in South-East Asia, such as the Burmese, Thai, Laotian etc. As the majority of the languages employing these systems of writing are cognate, it is necessary, when preparing rules for rendering terms from them, to treat equally such problems as the inflexion of consonants, the choice between transcription or translation for rendering geographical terms, the writing of compound names etc.

In rendering names from Chinese ideographic writing the fact that one and the same character may be read in

several different ways presents quite a problem. Such cases occur even in the Pekinese pronunciation on which our transcription is based.

When rendering Japanese place names in idiography from Japanese maps and atlases, one has to resort to special reference materials where these names are transposed into Japanese syllabic writing, *kana*, or into Roman script. This is necessary because the pronunciation of characters in Japanese geographical names often differs from their present generally accepted pronunciation.

Special rules are to be observed when rendering Armenian, Georgian and Greek names from materials in the national languages and Korean names from the national writing, *kunmun*. These are the main elements in the problem of rendering foreign names into Russian.

There is also the problem of transposing names from languages that have no alphabets of their own. In our opinion, they should be fixed in writing by means of the alphabet of the language most nearly akin and transcribed according to the existing rules.

As we mentioned earlier, at present we have to issue maps and atlases not only in Russian but also in languages with Roman and other systems of writing. This, in its turn, makes it urgent to create methods to deal with new problems. In working out such methods, we believe that whatever valuable information has been accumulated by all countries should be utilized.

When making maps in Roman script we consider that place names of countries using the Roman alphabet should be written as they are written in their own countries, including diacritical marks.

When rendering names from non-Roman writings into Roman script, we think it advisable to transliterate them in Latin characters in accordance with the system of transliteration in use in the country concerned.

Thus, the place names of the Soviet Union should be rendered in accordance with the system of transliteration of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR; the place names of Bulgaria in the system of transliteration of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences; the place names of China in the official Roman writing of the country etc. The Roman writing used in international editions, e.g. the RGS II² system for the place names of India, Iran, the Arab countries etc. might be used as well. Much remains to be done in respect to the rendering of names into other systems of writing, such as Arabic; what is important is to work out a special system of transposition.

Now that economic, scientific and cultural relations among various countries have been considerably expanded, the rendering of names from one system of writing into another has become of still greater importance. In order that this work may be more productive, it is necessary, in our opinion, first, that an exchange of information among various countries on rendering geographical names should take place, which would help to resolve the problems of both national and international standardization; secondly, that the national orthography in a number of countries should be standardized, particularly the orthography of proper names; thirdly, that cartography should be developed on the basis of the main local languages with their own national alphabets.

² Royal Geographical Society.

PRINCIPLES OF TRANSCRIPTION OF AFRICAN PLACE NAMES

Paper presented by France¹

INTRODUCTION

A system for the transcription of the African place names of the French-speaking States south of the Sahara was developed by the National Geographic Institute in 1963. This system was designed to meet the following two needs:

Standardization of place names through the use of a system of spelling unencumbered with useless letters and marks;

Reconstruction by a French-speaking reader of an acceptable pronunciation of these place names making possible their proper identification.

The realization of these aims demands, first, the adoption of guiding principles and, secondly, the choice of a set of detailed rules.

The guiding principles are, in brief, as follows:

Use of the Roman alphabet as the basic alphabet;

Pronunciation of all letters apart from a few exceptions for practical reasons as explained below;

One-to-one correspondence between the phoneme and its written form.

With regard to the set of detailed rules, an effort was made to avoid diacritical marks through the use of digraphs. While some of the digraphs retain the phonetic

value which they have in French, others, on the contrary, are conventionally represented² by sounds peculiar to the African languages concerned.

In both cases, the digraphs may be underlined if further differentiation is desired. In order to avoid an excessive number of conventional digraphs, the transcription system has been designed more along phonological than phonetic lines. Although the phonetic element is still given considerable weight, the accepted procedure has been to disregard many of the nuances if these do not have any appreciable effect on the meaning of the words.

This system can, of course, be adjusted to take any local peculiarity into account. The paramount consideration, however, is that the collection of the place names in the field and the recording of their pronunciation should be effected by means of a phonetic alphabet and should be firmly based on serious linguistic research into the languages concerned.

* * *

The recording of place names in unwritten languages on to cards is a very difficult task. In the African languages in particular, there are many consonants and vowels which, being alien to the European languages, cannot be properly represented by any letter of the Roman alphabet.

¹ The original text of this paper, prepared by the National Geographic Institute, appeared as document E/CONF.53/L.52.

² This does not mean "arbitrarily" represented because logical, historical or practical reasons necessarily influence the choice of the most satisfactory equivalents.