Studying the life of Sven Hedin (1865-1952) in detail proves a fascinating entry-point not only into the European invention of the “Silk Road,” but also more generally into the intellectual history of a substantial period of time, ranging from the late 19th century to the end of the Second World War. An energetic explorer with curiosity for a vast array of subjects and who cultivated an impressive list of professional and social connections, he published countless books and articles and left behind a huge archive of notes and letters. There is now an extensive literature which helps to reconstruct the context of a European culture of exploration in Central Asia (Gorshenina 2014) in which to situate Sven Hedin’s life, follow his pathway within the geographical and archaeological traditions at the turn of the century (Wahlquist 2008), understand the scientific controversies he had been involved in (Forêt 2004) and sketch the evasive personality of an explorer whose worldview bore the contradictions of a seemingly endless appetite for discovery and celebration of Asian otherness and European power.

Yet the complexities of this figure of modern exploration are still far from exhausted. Initially unable to grasp an enormous quantity of documents published in many languages, biographers of Hedin, both non-academic writers and academics have only gradually abandoned the temptation of a hagiographical perspective (exemplified by Wennerholm 1978, A. Hedin 1925 and Essén 1959) and the official story told by his books (for which, see Kish 1984; Brennecke 1986) to delve into his lesser known writings and archives, so as better to understand his adventures in relation to his personality (Odelberg 2008) and critically engage his political career and notorious endorsement of National-Socialism (Danielsson 2012).

Hedin’s sympathies with the German Reich in World War I and then his support for the Nazi dictatorship cost him many admirers and have considerably complicated any effort to assess his career objectively. His own justification for his support of the Nazis was based on the strong Germanophilia on which he projected his own identity. In the concluding paragraphs of his Fünfzig Jahre Deutschland (1938), a book on the famous Germans he had met over half a century, Hedin highlighted the supposedly consubstantial proximity and subsequent shared Germanic identity of the Swedes and the Germans: “geographically our neighbours, racially our kindreds, in the imperial times our brothers in arms” (Hedin 1938, p. 251; my translation). He asserted that with other threats looming, the Hitler regime was the best option available for Germany and a neutral but friendly Sweden, “even though some aspects of the National Socialist worldview provoke our disapproval” and concluded: “The liberation from the yoke of slavery without the personal sacrifice of the individual is impossible” (Ibid.).

It is clear that his full support of Hitler, concerning whose actions he was well informed, was not a simple matter of political blindness.

Rather than engage in further analysis of Hedin’s links with Hitler and National Socialist ideology, my focus on Hedin’s early life concerns his admiration for Germany in general and more specifically for the German scholars who had influenced, taught or supported him during his youth. Specifically, I argue that too little attention has been given to Hedin’s special relationship with Ferdinand von Richthofen, the man he most explicitly and constantly admired from his youth into his later years. The focus on Richthofen and Hedin’s German training and influences helps us to understand Hedin’s early work and the trajectory of his career. Richthofen’s importance in Germany’s brief colonial past has rarely been studied, but can help to understand this phase as well as to reconstruct the intellectual environment in which Hedin built his worldview. While making use of the aforementioned secondary literature, I am relying most heavily on books published by Hedin, on the as yet too rare transcriptions of parts of his immense correspondence, and on archival documents. My aim is to collect and connect new elements that could help to explain how
the early “Silk Road studies” of Richthofen and Hedin were mutually constitutive and, eventually, to show the significance of their contributions to the geographical and historical imagination of Central Asia.

**Sven Hedin’s academic role model: Ferdinand von Richthofen**

In a letter sent in 1899 to his publisher Albert Brockhaus, Sven Hedin wrote about his professor, to whom he wanted to dedicate his last book (Brockhaus 1942, p. 18; my translation):

> He became my teacher and brought to my attention the questions that are dealt with in books, and besides that, still nowadays, he knows Asia better than anyone and he is without comparison the most famous geographer alive. I don’t know yet if he would accept such a dedication but I hope so. I will wait until I receive your reply anyway before I write to him about this. It would be really important to me.

Sven Hedin not only expressed his respect for Richthofen privately, but also devoted many pages to the German geographer, notably in an English-language article (Hedin 1933), a book on the German figures who inspired him (Hedin 1938), and more specifically, in *Meister und Schüler*, the book edited by Ernst Tiessen (alt. sp. Thiessen) in which Hedin reproduced and commented the letters he had received from Richthofen (Tiessen 1933).5

Born in 1833 in Carlsruhe, in Prussian Silesia (now Pokój in Poland), Ferdinand von Richthofen [Fig. 1], to whom Hedin referred as his *Meister*, is most often remembered as the creator of the phrase “Seidenstrasse” (Silk Road), a term which Sven Hedin more than anyone else popularized during the first part of the 20th century.6 Richthofen studied geology and geography in Berlin, notably under Gustav Rose and Carl Ritter, and graduated in 1856 with a Latin-language dissertation on melaphyr (Bibliographie 2010). He then embarked on more than a decade of long journeys that would take him from Austria to South East Asia, California and China.7 Because of the Taipei rebellion he could not visit China at all during the travels from 1859 and 1862 that led him to Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, Sulawesi, Java, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Maulmain and India. When he returned to Asia in 1871 after a few years in California, the unrest had ceased in most of China, and he was able to travel extensively in the eastern half of the country, but not in the western regions, including Turkestan where the Muslim revolt prevented him from visiting this region that interested him so much.8

In a letter sent in 1872 to the American geologist Josiah Whitney,9 with whom he had worked in California, Richthofen lamented:

> I am here at the very gates of Central Asia, and if those confused Mahomedans had not got it into their heads, ten years ago, to revolt against the Chinese rule and to make themselves to a great extent independent of it, I would now hire a wagon and some ponies, and travel with them clean to the Russian frontier on the Ili, with side-excursions to the Kunlun and Tian Shan mountains. I find to my astonishment that this journey could be made fortnightly with great ease and with no serious discomfort whatsoever. It is only eighty days (2200 miles) from here to Ghulja. (…….) As matters stand now, the enterprise of such a trip would be an absurdity. I must even give up the exploration of Kansu. This would not be a daring undertaking, but, the country being in a state of rebellion and warfare, it would require much time and be troublesome in the extreme. [Richthofen to Whitney 8 January 1872, SB, Kasten 4.]

Interestingly, he continued, before a long explanation on the importance of loess in Central Asia, with a judgment of the prospects of geography in China:

> I will therefore quite modestly turn my steps to-

---

*Fig. 1. Ferdinand Freiherr von Richthofen*
wards Sichuan, the great province of the west, and as yet unexplored. I will not find anything new or startling. China is not the country for brilliant discoveries.

Yet later in his life, Richthofen’s view had changed diametrically (RGS 2011, p. 259):

We agreed that China is... the least known of countries and also in the highest degree is worth an investigation... here was a task of gigantic proportions.

It seems certain that Ferdinand von Richthofen changed his views after the end of the revolt in Western China and when he prepared his own historical work conducted from 1872 to the publication of the largely historical first volume of China in 1877. He was surely also influenced by modern travel writings on China, notably those of Hungarian explorer count Béla Széchenyi, who was accompanied by Lajos Lóczy (a.k.a. Ludwig von Loczy), a Hungarian geologist and geographer with whom Richthofen extensively corresponded and whose work on the geology of China he rated very highly (Lóczy to Richthofen, SB, Kasten 6, Folder 18).

Richthofen’s interest in Central Asia is noticeable in the first volume of China, and is a recurring topic of his correspondence throughout his life, from his early exchanges with Whitney to his long discussions with Lóczy and, last but not least, with Hedin. However, it is worth noting that, even though he would later have other occasions to fulfill his ambition to travel to Central Asia himself from the Russian empire, he could or would never seize them. Perhaps he felt that he had become too old to travel so far from Germany, and preferred to travel there through the accounts of others.

“Life is too short.”

It is not difficult to imagine the interest that Richthofen could have had for a talented young student not only interested in Central Asia, but also with outstanding linguistic abilities, energy, as well as Unternehmungsgeist (“spirit of enterprise”) and Idealismus, as Richthofen confessed to Hedin in one of the last letter he sent him, on 3 April 1904. Those last two characteristics help explain why Hedin went off to Central Asia earlier than Richthofen would have wished him to go. The German geographer, who had been thoroughly trained in geology in Berlin and on the field in Austria, asked his Swedish student to undergo the same rigorous program of study. However, Hedin, who by then had already lived in Azerbaijan, travelled to Persia and Mesopotamia and published a book about this experience (Hedin 1887), chose to follow the footsteps of his adventurous role-models Adolf Erik Nordenskiöld and Ármin Vámbéry rather than the scientifically ambitious academic path traced by his Meister.

Whatever the nature and extent of Richthofen’s disapproval towards Hedin’s impatience might have been, it does not seem like it created a real rift between them. In a letter sent in 1890, Richthofen already seemed, reluctantly, to accept Hedin’s decision:

I regret that, before doing everything that you are doing now, you should have come back to the study of Alpine geology... Now you will have to go ahead and experience what we call mountain studies (Gebirgsstudien) with good preparatory studies for sure, but still as a sort of autodidact. However, your good, clear view will help you to do this, since in this field what matters most is the natural ability to understand things. [Richthofen to Hedin, 2 September 1890; Tiessen 1933, pp. 74-75.]

In 1933, Hedin expressed polite regrets about having ignored his esteemed professor’s advice, but this was probably just rhetoric, not any indication he had second thoughts about setting off to the centre of Asia at such an early age:

How I regretted too, that I never had the opportunity to study the geology of the Alps under the instruction of the best German, Austrian and specialists, as Richthofen wished. I have missed such a training later during all my travels in Asia, particularly in Tibet. Life is too short. [Tiessen 1933, p. 76.]

Ferdinand von Richthofen, then president of Germany’s main geographical society, was an extremely influential man in European geography, and he helped Sven Hedin gain the audience and the scientific recognition he had sought ever since his childhood inspiration from reading about the achievements and witnessing the extraordinary popular success of Nordenskiöld. By opening to Hedin the pages of the Verhandlungen der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin (here abbreviated VGE) and the Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin (abbreviated ZGEB), Richthofen gave him a formidable platform to spread his writings to Europe’s geographers and convince future publishers and backers of the exceptional character of his endeavours and personality. He also introduced him to many of his colleagues and friends with high positions in German scholarly or political institutions, often let him be the centre of attention of the society’s conferences and honours (see, e.g., VGE 24 [1899], p. 459) and wrote him letters of recommendation, notably to Albert Brockhaus, who would remain Hedin’s German publisher for the next five decades (Brockhaus 1942, p. 8). As Hedin recognized, thanks to Richthofen he was “particularly treasured by the geographic circles of Berlin” (Tiessen 1902, p. 159).
The “lost letters” and the Berlin Geographical Society archive

Albert Brockhaus was probably Hedin’s main correspondent, at least until 1920, followed by a distance-by Richthofen. While the two-decades-long exchange between Hedin and Brockhaus had been carefully recorded in the two men’s archives and published by Susse Brockhaus in 1942, the exchange between Hedin and Richthofen, as published by Ernst Tiessen with a long introduction and extensive comments by Hedin in 1933 under the title Meister und Schüler, is lacunary (Tiessen 1933). Hedin stated more than once that he treasured the letters he had received from illustrious contemporaries (Brockhaus 1942, p. 292), but he also made it clear that the most important pieces of his collection were the letters he had received from Richthofen (Hedin 1938, p. 43). In characteristic fashion, reasserting his respect for Richthofen was also an occasion to lament the loss of other items of great value: his own letters to Richthofen, whose content he remembered particularly well decades later when he referred to them in Meister und Schüler.

Yet, contrary to Hedin’s own assertion, it turns out that almost all of those letters, published and unpublished, can be retrieved now. A handful of them had been published as dispatches from his early expeditions in the 1890s. Since Richthofen was heading the Berlin Geographical Society, it was not difficult for him to have Georg Kolm, editor of the society’s publications, include in them materials he believed to be of interest for geographical research. Hedin’s letters were published primarily in the VEGEB, the proceedings of the society, but later on some of them were published in the ZGEB, the main journal of the society. Publishing letters as travel-narratives was something Hedin was already used to in the middle of the 1890s. In June 1890, he had published 26 letters as a diary of his travels in Persia in Scandinavian newspapers, something he mentioned to Richthofen in his 19 July 1890 letter from Tehran. In Sweden, his diary was published by Aftonbladet and in Norway by Aftonposten (Odelberg 2008, p. 78). Granted, Meister und Schüler and the Stockholm archives show that Richthofen sent many letters to his student, whereas the letters from Hedin published by the Berlin Geographical Society were few. Hedin might have decided that to republish his own letters which had already appeared made no sense, and thus there was no point in even mentioning them.

Quite early into Hedin’s career, he and his sister Alma began to keep a very detailed record of both correspondence and publications. It is therefore surprising to read Hedin’s assertion about the loss of the letters. Ernst Tiessen, the editor of Meister und Schüler, was certainly familiar with the society’s publication and with Richthofen’s life and work, but quite possibly neither he nor Hedin knew where to look for the letters. Alternatively, might it be that Hedin’s lament at the loss was a pose? If so, to what purpose? To deny the scientific or personal importance of those documents, that shed light on the early development of his reputation and career, or simply because he wished to honour Richthofen by publishing only his letters? This question remains open.

The letters which Hedin said were lost can be found in the Archive of the Berlin Geographical Society. The Society still exists, but its archive is not as extensive as might be expected given the Society’s standing as one of the oldest academic geographical institutions in Europe. Now stored in the Handschriftenabteilung (Manuscripts Department) of the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin under the Signatur “Nachlass 339,” the archive consists of an informal catalogue made of two thin folders, containing only rough lists of documents, and a few boxes with correspondence, notes and documents of various interest, which do not correspond exactly to the aforementioned lists. Among those are documents of great value for the history of geography such as pieces of correspondence between Alexander von Humbold and Aymé Bonpland, as well as attendance lists and proceedings from the early days of the Berlin Geographical Society, many of them in Carl Ritter’s own hand. Part of Ferdinand von Richthofen’s correspondence is here too, but not including the archive of his work on China, which had been kept by his publisher Dietrich Reimer and disappeared when the company’s building was destroyed by airstrikes during the Second World War (Zögner 2003, pp. 37-38).

Hedin’s letters are not separated from the other documents of the “Kasten 4,” but they are all signed by Hedin on their last page and signalled on their first page by the name “Hedin” written with a red pencil. They were sent from various locations in Persia, the Russian Empire, India and China as well as Stockholm and Berlin between 1890 and 1905 and constitute the most sizeable exchange of letters found in Richthofen’s correspondence archived in Berlin -- 14 letters accounting for a total of about 140 pages. The originals of the letters published as Brieifliche Mitteilungen (epistolary communications) in the VEGEB and the ZGEB following their reception by Richthofen, as well as the letter sent in 1890 by Hedin from Constantinople at the beginning of his journey to Iran, cannot be found here.

I have reconstructed an overview of the exchange from 1889 to 1905 using all the materials in my possession. More letters are probably missing as well as telegrams and short messages exchanged between the
two men when both were in Berlin, but I have chosen to mention only messages whose existence is proven. I also chose to include the Reiseberichte (travel dispatches) published in the VGBE and the ZGBE even though it was not always clearly indicated that they were originally letters or part of letters sent to Richthofen, as was explicitly mentioned in the case of the aforementioned Briefliche Mitteilungen. Even though the VGBE published news of Hedin received from the Swedish explorer Adolf Erik Nordenskiöld, I have not include correspondence involving Nordenskiöld, who used the letters he received from Hedin to inform Richthofen and the Berlin Society of Hedin’s progress during his long journeys.15

When juxtaposed to the letters sent to Hedin by Richthofen and published in Meister und Schüler, the letters found in the Society’s archive complement the few letters previously published in the VGBE and the ZGBE and thus help us get a better understanding of this long epistolary exchange. The correspondence helps demonstrate how the interaction between Richthofen and Hedin had a deep influence on the modern history of European exploration in Central Asia.

Overview of the reconstructed exchange

The letters are arranged by date in ascending chronological order, with the place of writing and the publication and/or archival location where they are to be found (abbreviations listed below in bibliography). R to H = Richthofen to Hedin; H to R = Hedin to Richthofen. The newly discovered letters in the Berlin archive have been highlighted in bold face.

R to H, Berlin, 27 November 1889. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 21 December 1889. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 17 April 1890. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Constantinople, [?.] 1890. Missing

H to R, Tehran, 19 July 1890. SB

R to H, Niederdorf, 02/09/90 R to H. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Samarkand, 4 November 1890. SB

H to R, Stockholm, 16 May 1891. SB

R to H, Berlin, 02 August 1891. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 10 April 1892. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 01 July 1892. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Berlin, 8 July 1892. SB

R to H, Berlin, 03 January 1893. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 10 May 1893. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Stockholm, 12 August 1893. SB

R to H, Berlin, 17 December 1893. Tiessen 1933; RA


R to H, Berlin, 21 July 1894. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Kashgar, 26 October 1894. VGBE. 21 (1894): 584-85

H to R, Kashgar, [.] November 1894. ZGBE 30 (1895): 94-134

H to R, Buksem am Khotan-darya, 17 May 1895 (+Kashgar, 29 June 1895). VGBE 22 (1895): 539-57

H to R, Kashgar, 30 November 1895. ZGBE 31 (1896): 346-61


R to H, Berlin, 01 January 1897. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 14 May 1897. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Stockholm, 31 May 1897. SB

R to H, Berlin, 05 June 1897. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 13 October 1897. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Stockholm, 24 July 1898 H to R. SB

R to H, Berlin, 12 December 1898. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 07 April 1899. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 14 May 1899. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Jangi-köll, 25 February 1900. VGBE 28 (1901): 77-81

H to R, Termilik, 28 October 1900. VGBE 28 (1901): 81-86

H to R, Tjarkhlih, 28 April 1901. SB

H to R, Leh, 28 March 1902. SB

R to H, Berlin, 26 April 1902. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 23 October 1902. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Stockholm, 26 October 1902. SB

R to H, Berlin, 18 January 1903. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 24 January 1903. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 30 January 1903. Tiessen 1933; RA

R to H, Berlin, 07 February 1903. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Stockholm, 17 September 1903. SB

R to H, Berlin, 03 April 1904. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Stockholm, 06 April 1904. SB

R to H, Berlin, 07 August 1904. Tiessen 1933; RA

H to R, Stockholm, 20 May 1905. SB

Annotated summary of the “Berlin letters”

For each letter, I indicate the location and date written by Hedin on the first page. I use Hedin’s own German spelling. Sometimes, when he was in Central Asia, he could actually send his letters only weeks after he had finished writing them. All the letters are in Staatsbibliothek, Handschriftenabteilung, Archiv der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin, Nachl. 339, Kasten 4.

Tehran, 19 July 1890

This letter contains a detailed account of Hedin’s travels in Persia with the court of the Shah, as well
as Hedin’s ascent of Mt. Damavand, plans of a trip to Russian Turkestan and an account of his adventurous theft of skulls in a Zoroastrian cemetery with Dr. Hybennet. Most of the content of the letter itself is therefore nothing new to people familiar with Hedin’s work and commentary on his travels in Iran (Wahlquist 2007). It describes events narrated in several publications, including an 1892 article in VGE, his dissertation on Damavand, his book on the Swedish mission to Persia (Hedin 1891) as well as two chapters of My Life as an Explorer (1925, pp. 64-76). In my opinion, it is mainly (if not only) interesting for its context and for the evolution of the relationship between Hedin and Richthofen. It also contains Hedin’s claims to have “brought back heaps of notices and drawings” and mentions his plan to publish a “genuine description of the whole trip” in Sweden when he returns. In two successive sentences, he asks Richthofen to help him publicise his exploit (“I would be truly grateful if a provisional news on the ascent could be published somewhere.”) and gives a rather unconvincing explanation for his decision not to undertake geological studies in Persia (“We were completely stuck in the camp.”) which sheds light on Richthofen’s subsequent regrets at his student’s lack of interest in geological training.

This letter seems to have had an important effect on Richthofen, who realised that Hedin would never get a proper training in geology but also that he was going to be able actually to undertake important travels in Central Asia. At this time Richthofen wanted to finish his masterpiece China, on which he was working since the early 1870’s. He was then writing the 3rd volume of China, the only one that would eventually never be completed by himself but by Ernst Tiessen. Richthofen’s work in the 1890’s was dealing more generally with geography as a science, in the wake of his Aufgaben und Methoden der heutigen Geographie (1883) and Führer für Forschungsreisende (1886) and departed from his original specialty on the geography of Asia with which he had earned his reputation. He probably felt that he had found in Tiessen a talented but somehow unimaginative follower who would have the rigour to continue his scientific work without surpassing it. In Hedin he recognized a spirited explorer and travel writer who could succeed where he had failed. Richthofen believed that even though Hedin did not want to take the time to acquire rigorous academic skills, he could counterbalance his impatience with his already obvious abilities as an explorer and thus bring to fruition Richthofen’s original intent of undertaking geographical and historical exploration of Asia.

**Samarkand, 4 November 1890**

In this letter, Hedin briefly relates his travel from Tehran through the east of Persia, notably the Dasht-e Kavir salt desert, where he conducted experiments and observations. Most of the events he refers to are present in the published accounts of his 1890 travels (Hedin 1892). He mentions a fever that made him stay in Asterabad during 10 days, where he experienced a small earthquake, and a village where 120 people had died, 100 of them women who were in the baths. He also recalls that his bread stocks were stolen by jackals while he was camping in the mountains.

Hedin indicates that he was using “Napier’s map.” Captain George C. Napier from the Bengal Staff Corps, who in 1874 had travelled to the northeast of Persia, was an intelligence officer “on special duty” to survey the area bordering with the territories of the Turkmens, which the British staff feared would quickly be subdued by the Russian army. He wrote reports for the Foreign Office (Napier 1876a; Herslet 1877) and published an article in the Journal of the Royal Geographical Society (1876b). Both the volume of reports and the RGS article were accompanied by maps, the former being more detailed (Napier 1876c) and the latter a reduced and simplified version for printing in the journal. It was probably the one used by Hedin, who in Berlin had access to the journals of the RGS but is less likely to have had access to Napier’s Collection of journals and reports then (it is not in his library in Stockholm either). There is no reference to this map in the catalogue of Hedin’s collection made by Philippe Forêt (1999).

Hedin also mentions his travels on the Western section of the Transcaspian railway, and his meeting with the Russian explorer and military officer General Kuropatkin in Ashkhabad. Once in Samarkand, he wondered at the mosques and mederses but already had begun to set his eyes elsewhere. A key passage shows how Hedin started to envision the way he would claim Richthofen’s legacy of travels in China and researches around the Lop-Nor question and benefit from his direct influence while making a name of his own:

Now I have pushed the goal of my travels further East and I will next go to Kashgar. Through Tashkent, Khujand, Kokand, Margelen, I will take a troika to Osh and I will go from there via Ghulja and Irkeshtam through Terek Davan. General Kuropatkin does not consider those travels impossible: I will only probably already find a lot of snow, I have already seen snow, but in Tashkent I will get hold of furs, tents, weapons and provisions for 10 days. When I arrive in Kashgar, I do not know what I will do. But I will never take the same path twice. If it
is possible I will go to Lob-nor to find the Chinese lake. It will probably be difficult at this time of the year. Thank you very much for your kindness that you wish to include a report in the *Verhandlungen*; unfortunately I do not have enough time for it at the moment.  

The last three pages of the letter are devoted to personal considerations about his plans for Christmas, his wish to come back to Berlin soon, and his satisfaction with the 445 pages of notices he wrote and 150 sketches he drew on the way from Tehran to Samarkand.

***

Stockholm, 16 May 1891

This shorter letter shows a more and more confident Hedin depicting his various occupations to Richthofen: he had just finished working on his translation of Nikolai Przhevalskii’s travels, and was working on his book on the Swedish mission to Persia before preparing the account of his own travels. Hedin gives Richthofen a dense summary of his trip back from Kashgar, interesting details about his encounters with imperial figures of Central Asian exploration, diplomacy and espionage such as Bronislav Grombchevskii, Pavel Lessar, Francis Younghusband, Nikolai Petrovskii and Father Hendricks and reveals his hopes for the future, before concluding comments on the exploration of the polar regions by Nordenskiöld, Nansen and Drygalsky. Most important is Hedin’s appraisal of this first expedition as his apprenticeship in exploration: “With this journey, I have at least learned generally how to travel in Central Asia and what is necessary to get there. And this is why this journey is of prime importance for me personally.”  

***

Berlin, 8 July 1892

This short letter (2 pp.) is of more limited interest, even though it shows a less triumphant and more vulnerable side of Hedin’s personality. Apart from his grateful words to Richthofen for the recommendation written to introduce him to Albert Brockhaus, it consists mainly in a discussion of Hedin’s eye disease. At 27, he was already suffering from a crisis of iritis similar to the one that would stop him in the middle of his third attempt at climbing Mustagh Ata in August 1894.

***

Berlin, 15 August 1892

In this letter, Sven Hedin, recalls how, relieved from his eye problems, he travelled to Halle (13 July 1892) to submit his doctoral dissertation on Damavand (Hedin 1892). During a few weeks, while the dissertation was successively read by the professors, he prepared for the exam. On the 28th, he was invited to sit the exam, with which Hedin was satisfied: “Everything went very well, quite remarkably philosophy too.”

He was examined in philosophy by Rudolf Haym (1821-1901), a philosopher who had written about German unity, Hegel, Schopenhauer, the Romantic school and Herder. It had been planned that he would be examined on Schweger’s *Geschichte der Philosophie* (1848), but he also had to choose to study the work of one particular philosopher. Hedin chose to study “Cartesianus” (Descartes, who had finished his life in Sweden) and “worked day and night with his writings.” Last but not least, Haym also asked him about his interest in oriental philosophies:

When, the day before the exam, I had to give Prof. Haym the list of what I had read, it impressed him terribly that I had also read the religious philosophy of Zoroaster and the moral philosophy of the Persian poet Saadi. He stopped short and said laughing, while examining me with his eye (like Prof. Kirchhoff, he has only one eye): “I do not know that. So you are going to instruct me. We are also going to discuss Zoroaster during the exam.”

The geography and geology exams with professors von Fritsch and Kirchhoff were not a problem either, even though he confessed that

Prof. Fritsch gave me only a few questions about historical geology that I could not answer. He was satisfied with the exam. Professor Kirchhoff was naturally kindness personified. He not only helped me during the whole time I spent in Halle by word and deed but also led me around the neighborhoods of the city when he found that I was spending too much time preparing philosophy. The two weeks of exams in Halle have left genuinely pleasant and unforgettable memories.

***

Stockholm, 12 August 1893

Hedin explains that he has had to undergo an iridectomy on the 28 April 1893 but that four days later, he started to feel intense pain in the other (right) eye. He had to spend two months in dark rooms to ease the pain of the iritis; hence his publication plans as well as the preparation of his next trip had been delayed. However, by then he had obtained almost all of his instruments, as well as an extraordinary amount of financial support:

The economic question is happily solved. The King has given 5000 Kr., the Nobel brothers 8000; I have obtained the remainder in sums of 1000 and 2000 or less from various private people in Stockholm and
Göteborg, so that the overall total now amounts to 22700 Crowns or 25000 DM. I had counted on 30000 Kr. and the King has in fact said that he will procure what is lacking during the next year. In any case, I have much more than Potanin or Roborovskii and Kozlov.

Hedin is also satisfied with the official passes and promises of help that he received from Russian and Chinese authorities and says he is now waiting for his health to improve: “During the sickness, my constitution has indeed been ruined by morphine, atropine, cocaine, salicylic acid, natron, etc.”

Last but not least, Hedin explains his position on the practice of travel in disguise, something attributed to him in *Petermanns Mitteilungen* (Heft VII):

[It] says, that I wanted to travel disguised as a Persian merchant. It is of course completely erroneous. In my statement in Stockholm I said that I wanted to try to enter Lhassa dressed as a Kashgarian. This would naturally be attempted only in very favorable circumstances and only if I could seize the opportunity to walk the last days of the journey with a caravan of merchants from Leh. It is indeed a minor consideration and I cannot take any risk with the record of my expedition.

Stockholm, 31 May 1897

Hedin expresses his gratefulness for Richthofen’s “great and friendly interest with which you have followed me before, during and after my journey.” He shares Richthofen’s view that his travels through the Pamir took more time than they should have and could have turned him away from his actual goal, Tibet, but he is happy with the results of his explorations and subsequent journey, which he describes over five pages, and already thinks about the next expedition, in which he wants to bring a “physicist” and a “naturalist.”

Richthofen was particularly interested in this letter, which he annotated with geographical coordinates and to which he replied from Berlin as soon as 5 June 1897, asking for detailed information and stating his belief that Hedin will have a good travelogue to publish:

You will have many details to give us, as you have already done with your letters full of information, and I rejoice at the idea of reading the account of your journey. You combine the interest for the people and for all the branches of geography with a good scientific understanding. Beyond that you possess the humour that is so important to make an exciting story.

Richthofen also advises Hedin not to wait to write his travelogue:

A travelogue must be written energetically immediately after the return journey. Then the impressions are still fresh and the view is not distorted by many books. The best is to write “from the guts” without being preoccupied with what others have already said or how others have interpreted this thing. [Tiessen 1933, pp. 113-14.]

Stockholm, 24 July 1898

This letter provides glimpses of Hedin’s greater and more explicit ambitions, both on a scientific and a personal level. He asks Richthofen for his support in his opposition to Kozlov on the topic of Lake Lop Nor. Richthofen had contradicted Nikolai Przhevalskii twenty years earlier when the Russian explorer claimed to have found the location of the lake. Hedin’s travel observations confirming Richthofen’s theory, which had eventually been accepted by Przhevalskii in 1885, were now being contradicted by Petr Kozlov. Hedin, who knew the work of Przhevalskii very well for having translated it into Swedish and had travelled to the same places as Kozlov, hoped for Richthofen’s support, but the latter was busy preparing his book on Shantung as well as the international geographical congress of 1899 and did not mention the topic in the letter he sent Hedin five months later. Was Richthofen too busy to reply? Was he reluctant to get involved in this controversy again? Did Hedin overestimate the importance of the controversy? Later events tell us that Hedin did not give up on the matter, as his discovery of Loulan in 1900, a city that Chinese records located on the banks of a big salty lake, definitely confirmed Richthofen’s explanation and helped Hedin formulate his “wandering lake” theory (Hedin 1940).

The rest of the letter consists mainly in Hedin’s observations about his economic success (“Now I get for the book [as a minimum and for the first edition only] about 80.000 RM.”), along with some recognition of the downside of exploration stardom: “It is not a pleasure to travel to America, but who knows when again I could have the opportunity to make 25000 dollars in five months!”

Despite its respectful tone, the letter comes across as a manifesto defending his way of life and refusal to follow the traditional academic path that Richthofen had wanted him to follow. To his master’s insistence that “unfortunately the earth is small: there is nothing left to be discovered” (Tiessen 1933, p. 119), Hedin was defiantly asserting that while he would not cope with the burden of academic life, he could have a successful career in exploration. With a wonderful
phrase that referred to the opera by Richard Wagner that spread the fame of the ‘Fliegende Holländer’ in Europe, as well as to Ármin Vámbéry, one of Hedin’s role models, who had travelled to Central Asia disguised as a dervish, Hedin summarised his rejection of academic life and his ambition to remain an independent explorer: “I was born a dervish and a Flying Dutchman and love absolute freedom” (Ich bin zu Derwisch und Fliegende Holländer geboren und liebe eine absolut Freiheit.) [p. (5)].

Tjarkhlih [Charklik], 28 April 1901

This letter is a rich account of Hedin’s travels in the Lop-Nor region with details of his view on the Lop-Nor enigma. Aware that he is not only continuing Richthofen’s theory but also starting to offer a new explanation of the puzzle about the lake’s location, he describes his “excursions” in the area and provides two sketch-maps showing the relationship between the old lake, the new lake and the Kara-Koschun [Fig. 3. Hedin’s sketches of a profile and map illustrating his observations about Lake Lop Nor.]. Hedin bases his theory not only on observations of the physical features but, more importantly, on his surveying of human settlement. He found the remains of four different villages on the shore of the old lake as well as manuscripts and inscriptions on wood tablets which were identified as Tibetan and Chinese. “A Chinese who looked at them here in Tjakhlikh says that they are all dated: name of the Emperor, year of the reign, month and day! He says that they are 800 years old (?) These manuscripts will surely reveal many valuable secrets.”20 As often with Hedin, archaeological and philological observations combine with physical geography to construct a cohesive scientific narrative, a stage on which to project his own character too. The intertwined relevance of physical geography and philology is something that he quickly appreciated and stressed in his accounts of this discovery, including a letter to Aurel Stein sent a few months later.21 The letter to Richthofen thus anticipates Hedin’s later work on the “wandering lake” and offers insights into his methods in the field. It concludes with personal remarks as well as a characteristically ambitious and optimistic presentation of his next projects of journeys to Tibet and India.

Leh, 28 March 1902

Hedin has arrived in India, “back to civilisation,” and can write to Richthofen again to express his satisfaction about his last expedition:

I have often thought about how much you would have liked to take part in my last travels. I believe that I have achieved great results and unveiled broad expanses of the mysterious regions of Central Asia. How it would please you to see my great map, 1076 sheets, almost 300 meters long, all painfully enough drawn. The big question is only how such a travel map can be published.22

He then narrates his route from Central Asia to India and the pleasure he had to meet Curzon, “a well travelled and capable man who knows Asia so incredibly well,” before laying out his plan for the return journey through the Russian Empire.

Stockholm, 26 October 1902

Having travelled back to Europe and experienced the pleasure of recognition and fame, it is a triumphant Hedin who took up his pen to write to Richthofen in 1902. After devoting much of this long letter to describing his efforts to publish the several volumes of the scientific results of his expedition and his atlas — enlisting the help of scholars to analyze data and trying to obtain the financial support for the expensive
project — he then elaborates on how his renown had spread:

In winter, I’ll go on a “tournée,” à la Sarah Bernhardt. On 7 November I begin here, on the 10th here too, on the 14th in Petersburg, then a couple of cities in Sweden, then Copenhagen, then London, Edinburgh, Dundee, Aberdeen, Glasgow, Newcastle, before Christmas. For Christiania, the date is not sure yet. (...) At the end of January, the tournée in Germany begins with Berlin, Hamburg, Danzig, Leipzig, Dresden, Frankfurt, Munich, Stuttgart [added note: Many other German cities have invited me but time is lacking. Only today, I have received two new invitations that I cannot accept.] — and then Basel, Vienna and Budapest (through Lóczy). Probably Paris will come later but it’s not sure.

Clearly the respect he earned from royals inflated his ego:

I have explained the whole question of Lob Nor to the Tsar, at his own request. He is very friendly to me. For instance he telegraphed to the King: “Dr. Hedin is a fearless and important explorer. He has many friends in Russia. I will provide him with every possible help during future travels.” Nicholas.23

***

Stockholm, 17 September 1903

Contrasting with the previous letters, this one is almost obsequious. Hedin apologises for not writing earlier, congratulates Richthofen on his new honorific functions and marvels at his “energy and ability to work at the age of 70” which is “much harder than to cross Tibet.” The core of the letter is a description of upcoming publications, and a new implicit call to Richthofen to resume his work on the Lop-Nor question with Hedin.

***

Stockholm, 6 April 1904

In the first lines of this long and rich letter encompassing a vast array of personal and scholarly questions, Hedin appears again as a respectful and humble student expressing his gratitude to his professor for the letters he received from him. The first paragraphs also confirm that the key figures of his epistolary network in Berlin were his friends from the Richthofen seminar: Eduard Hahn, Otto Baschin, and Ernst Tiessen.

A long discussion of his last publication then leads to interesting remarks about some contemporary explorers of Central Asia and Tibet which begin with his first written mention of Count Otani Kozui: “Just before the outbreak of the war, a certain Count Otani from Tokyo wrote and asked me about my conditions for a Japanese edition.” Otani had already led an expedition to the Taklamakan desert two years before, but had had to leave the group himself. In 1904, he was busy with his duties in Japan but also tried to gather information about the researches of the likes of Sven Hedin before setting up another expedition that would reach Central Asia only in 1908. Otani was a genuine admirer of Hedin as well as Aurel Stein, with whom he corresponded from 1906.

In another paragraph, Hedin criticises the British and Russian policies in the area, notably Francis Younghusband, with whom he got along well and who would provide him with essential authorisations and contacts when he would travel to Tibet a few months later with the extraordinary caravan leader Mohamed Isa, who had previously travelled with Francis Younghusband and Jules-Léon Dutreuil de Rhins (Allen 1982, p. 235). Hedin writes:

The expedition of my old friend Younghusband does not have my sympathy. Undoubtedly it may become easier to penetrate Tibet, but since I have always lived with the Tibetans in friendship and hospitality, it is painful for me to see this injustice. It is unbelievable cowardice to fire with a repeating rifle at these harmless people who cannot defend themselves.

The methods used by the Russians do not have his sympathy either: “The advance of Kozlov was unwise too. In the long term, bloodshed and violence will not benefit those wild peoples.” Last but not least, he expressed his fears that this could only lead to reprisals, and that European travellers like Tafel, Futterer and Holderer could be the victims of such vengeance. But he probably thought about his own projects too, according to Hedin, Younghusband’s violence was not only a moral problem, but a practical obstacle to the later discoveries he was aiming at: “Now it is impossible to travel in Eastern Tibet without the shield of a strong escort. The Tanguts are little more than robbers, but if there is a question of blood revenge too, things can only get worse.”24

Hedin’s criticism can also be explained by his opposition to aspects of a culture of exploration that in many circumstances was still accepting extreme racism and violence towards local populations. Moreover, he believed that British civil servants and officers did not understand Asians, something he would often repeat, notably ten years later when, in a book in which his germanophilia and scientific disagreements with some British geographers had led him to a form of anglophobia (Forêt 2004, p. 194; Heffernan 2000), he criticised the use of Indian soldiers on the Western front: “It is an act of cruelty to them to force them over to the white man’s country — to die all to
no purpose” (Hedin 1915, p. 353). Given Hedin’s later support of nazism, as well as our current rejection of some “colonial” attitudes that he showed in his actions and writings, it would be wrong to conclude that he was an anti-racist, culturally sensitive traveller, but such statements by Hedin, as well as his permanent support of the use of local names instead of imperial toponyms (such as “Everest”) show that appraising his attitude towards native populations is a complex endeavour. It must take into account the context of his time and milieu, of his own political biases and ethnocentric Weltanschauung in which Europe, Christendom and Germano-Scandinavian nations benefited from an assumed scientific and moral superiority, but also of the genuine respect that he had for most of the people he met, for their welfare and their culture.

Indeed, Hedin would say how highly he rated Aurel Stein as a researcher and as a person, an opinion he had first acquired by reading Stein’s Preliminary Report (1901), in which he perceived the author’s human qualities and understanding of Asian cultures that many other explorers lacked (Hedin to Stein, 4 March 1902, LHAS, Stein 5/78-95). Hedin’s admiration for Stein as a scholar has been noted, but the personal level on which this admiration was expressed has not been stressed (Morin 2012, p. 4). However, the letters sent by Hedin to Stein and a partially published commentary Hedin submitted to the RGS in 1909 show that Hedin, despite his strong character and tendency to seek honours for himself, totally revered Stein, and made no mystery of it, both publicly and privately. In 1904, the two had not yet met, and Hedin was therefore exaggerating slightly when telling Richthofen of his — then only epistolary -- relations with Stein; “I know Dr M.A. Stein very well. He is a splendid man” (Dr M. A. Stein kenne ich sehr gut. Er ist ein prächtiger Mensch.) (pp. [5-6]).

Describing the work he had been undertaking in Stockholm in the year since his return, notably the preparation of his Scientific Results, Hedin detailed the list of his collaborators, notably “the good old Himly.” Karl George Friedrich Julius Himly (1836–1904), a German philologist who had translated Chinese materials for Richthofen during the preparation of China, had joined Hedin’s team a few months before to be in charge of the decipherment of Chinese manuscripts and the descriptions of Chinese maps (Cordier 1904, p. 624). Hedin noted: “He will be busy with that for one year and a half, but he complains very often about his health.” Himly never finished this project, because he died only a few weeks after this letter, but his work, resumed later by August Conrady (Conrady and Himly 1920), was also a strong element of continuity between the researches of Ferdinand von Richthofen and those of Sven Hedin. Here we see similarities to the way Aurel Stein assembled a team of experts (Sims-Williams 2009; Aurel Stein 2012): Hedin and Stein, the two leading explorers of Central Asia in the early 20th century, both developed tight networks of philologists and scientists around them and each envisaged his own position no longer as that of a poly-math covering very diverse scientific fields on his own but as that of a project manager with scientific initiative and a strong leadership building a framework to combine the expertise of others.

Even though Hedin had thus learned to work with collaborators, he was still highly critical of the work of others and did not seem to tolerate approximation, particularly in cartographical works. He did not think highly of the work of Russian surveyors, felt the superficial explorations of Dutreuil de Rhins and Grenard were of no great interest, and told Richthofen that the cartographical work of Bower and Littledale was useless. “Where those gentlemen have travelled must still be considered terra incognita.”

Hedin’s own cartographical work was anticipating his major achievement in this field, as he wrote to Richthofen, in reference to the ambitious project of construction of a map of the world at the millionth scale spearheaded by the German geographer Albrecht Penck (Pearson and Heffernan 2015):

Now there is also a question which has occupied us in recent days. It was our intention to add to the Atlas a general map of my entire journey on the 1:2.000.000 scale. Now it has occurred to me: would it not be very desirable to show this map of my region at 1:1.000.000? -- in the sense of Penck. When it is convenient, I would be pleased to hear your experienced opinion.

This foreshadowed a project that would be formally prepared only decades later, begun in 1938 and resoundingly announced in Germany three years later as a Central Asia Atlas at this scale (Hedin 1941; Haack 1941). The ambitious project was then dubbed by French geographer Emmanuel de Margerie (1941, p. 196), “the most considerable non-official cartographic enterprise of this century.” Germany’s defeat in the war led to the abandonment of the project, which was taken up and published in preliminary form in 1950 by the American Army Map Service and actually completed and published in Sweden in its final form more than a decade after Hedin’s death (Hedin and Ambolt 1966).

On a trivial note, Hedin laughs off Richthofen’s request to see him travel to the South Pole, a very fashionable destination for ambitious explorers in those years, and says that he works so much he does not have the time to find a partner.
Stockholm, 20 May 1905

The final letter sent by Hedin to Richthofen is of limited interest beyond the particularly friendly tone that had become the norm between them. Hedin, who was about to set on a long journey to Asia, was not expecting the death of his master, who was supposedly not in bad health. However, the letter conveys quite strongly the idea that Hedin, while relishing the idea of being Richthofen’s successor in Asia, and letting his pride show, was no longer trying to please him by copying his style. Having told him about his work in Stockholm and his plans for what was to become his most famous and controversial expedition, Hedin indulged in lyricism to conclude his letter: “And then my destiny leads me out again to the last white spots in Asia” (und dann führt mich mein Schicksal wieder hinaus zu den letzten weissen Flecken in Asien) (p. [8]). Those were the last words he wrote to Richthofen.

Conclusion

Some of the letters found in the archive of the Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin offer interesting insight into the relationship between Sven Hedin and his “Meister” Ferdinand von Richthofen, from 1890 to 1905. They do not shed a new light on the nature of Sven Hedin’s travels, research and life, as most events mentioned had already been described in texts published in various languages and under various formats during Sven Hedin’s own life. Nor do they change the way we could look at the “filial” relationship between Richthofen and Hedin, something known through the letters published in the relatively unknown but fascinating Meister und Schüler and Hedin’s subsequent commentary in that volume as well as in his other autobiographical writings and in more recent biographical literature published in German, Swedish and English. However, the 14 letters found in Berlin help refine our view of Hedin as an ambitious young geographer, a rising explorer with an intense desire to earn the respect of a man who seemed to value scientific accuracy more than adventure. It seems that Hedin not only wanted to obtain Richthofen’s approval, but also did his best to gain the German geographer’s respect and to make him proud of him. Richthofen was not a man of many words, not one people could befriend easily. What is known of his personality through biographical accounts and his own publications and unpublished letters tends to indicate that very few men received more praise from him than did Hedin. The widespread view that Richthofen had been disappointed by Hedin can largely be counterbalanced by the fact that his initial disapproval did not last long and that his friendship with Hedin grew stronger when the young Swede made his own reputation as an explorer without forgetting his professor and his scientific ambitions and legacy.

Nothing testifies to that better than a review of Hedin’s Scientific results of a journey in Central Asia, published in the Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin in 1905. In this 5-page article that has never been translated or commented on, despite the fact that it was probably the last text written by Richthofen before his death in October 1905, one of the great geographers of the 19th century offers a scientific appraisal of his student’s scientific work with words that betray more than the esteem in which he held his work, and further consecrate Hedin as his heir. In this encomium, Richthofen, whom Hedin called “the man who, more than anyone else was my guide in the deserts of Asia” (Tiessen 1933, p. 145), wrote:

The time of the first filling in of the white spots, which for forty years occupied a great expanse on the maps of the interior of the continents, is now over. But what still matters is to continue the work of discovery, to build the knowledge in detail, and simultaneously to deepen it scientifically with the current means of research. There is no field more rewarding for such an activity in the next decade than the central region of Asia, where Przhevalskii had paved the way and where others followed him, but only after the first isolated efforts, the general outlines had been laid out. .... Sven Hedin, who seems to have been born with the desire for audacious and fresh travel, who, at an early age, practiced in the Middle East the art of fruitful journeys, and who has laboured through the requisite degree of scientific, technical, and linguistic education in order to undertake larger endeavours, has followed his powerful inner desire (Drang), setting himself the task of casting more light on Central Asia.28
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Notes  
1. A systematic bibliography that introduces the most important of his books and some of the studies about Hedin is Waugh 2001, which is now available in a slightly updated electronic version. An earlier comprehensive bibliography is Hess 1962.

2. See also Sven Hedin’s post-war account of his Nazi connections and unapologetic justifications of his support to Hitler (Hedin 1951); in addition to the aforementioned biographies and publications by Hedin himself, see Mehmel 2000.
3. On Imperial Germany’s colonial rise and Richthofen’s actions in particular, see Osterhammel 1987, Steinmetz 2007; also, Marchand 2009, pp. 153-56.

4. For recent publications from his correspondence, see Lessing 2000 and Unkriig 2003. On the archival sources, see, e.g., Weber 2012.

5. This book must be considered in the context of Richthofen’s 100th birthday in 1933 and the publication of tributes by former students and colleagues including Defant, Krebs, and Penck. See Richthofen 1933, Drygalski 1933, and an earlier appraisal of Richthofen as a teacher by Philippson 1920.

6. On the history of the term, see Waugh 2007; Chin 2013; Rezakhani 2010; and de Montety 2016.

7. For more on Richthofen’s life and legacy, with additional bibliographic references, see Kolb 1983; Stäblein 1983; Broggiato 2012; and Wardenga 2007.

8. On the Muslim revolt, see Kim 2004. Richthofen’s own account can be read in a letter sent on 12 January 1872 from Shansi province to Walter Pearson, Secretary of Committee of the General Chamber of Commerce in Shanghai (Richthofen 1903, pp. 103-08).

9. Richthofen met Josiah Dwight Whitney (1819–1896) in California and worked with him for several months. They developed a long, friendly relationship and exchanged dozens of letters. Richthofen addressed Whitney in his letters as his “dear professor.”

10. Richthofen to Hedin, 3 April 1904; Tiessen 1933, p. 138. Even though the letters Richthofen received from Richthofen which were published by Tiessen are now in RA (Stockholm), I have not examined the originals and quote from Tiessen’s edition here and subsequently. The translations of the letters (all in German) are mine.


12. I have not yet been able to look at the letters exchanged between Tiessen and Hedin in the Swedish archives (RA, Sven Hedins Arkiv, Korrespondens, Tyskland, Tiessen, 499), but they might shed some light on the roles they played respectively in the publication of Meister und Schüler.

13. Since the only letters with names annotated in red in those boxes are letters received by Richthofen and because parts of Hedin’s text that can be identified as important to Richthofen (notably sentences about the Lop-Nor question) have been underlined with the same pencil, it is possible that the annotations could be in Richthofen’s own hand.

14. Richthofen mentioned the last of these in a letter to Hedin a few months later (Richthofen to Hedin, 2 September 1890 (RA, Sven Hedins Arkiv, Korrespondens, Tyskland, Richthofen, 490).

15. See, e.g., a letter sent by Hedin from Schah-yar to Stockholm on 24 February 1896 that is quoted in VGEB 23 (1896).

16. The translations here and from the other letters are all mine. In the notes which follow, I transcribe all the unpublished letters from Hedin’s original text in German. While Hedin was completely proficient in this language, his letters, particularly those sent when he was away from Europe, contain some irregular grammatical forms and orthographies. While I have chosen to maintain the outdated but at the time correct orthographies as they are in the MSS, I have corrected the obvious errors and careless mistakes to make the text more readable. I have not modified the orthography of the Turkic, Iranian or Chinese place names mentioned by Hedin in the German text, which often differ from modern German transcriptions of those names. The English translation of those excerpts tries to use the transcriptions of those names most commonly used now and does not attempt to retrieve the orthography of Central Asian place names in use in geographical literature in the early 20th century.

The German original (pp. [7-8]):


17. The German original:

Durch diese Reise habe ich wenigstens gelernt wie man überhaupt in Centralasien reist und was dort für die Ausrüstung zu kriegen ist. Und deshalb ist die Reise für mich persönlich von grösster Bedeutung.

18. The German original (pp. [2-3]):


Die Geographie und die Geologie machte mir keine grossen Schwierigkeiten, nur Prof. von Frisch gab mir einige Fragen aus der geschichtlichen Geologie die ich nicht beantworten konnte. Er war doch mit dem Examen zufrieden. Professor Kirchhoff war natürlicher Weise die Liebenswürdigkeit des Professors.

150
er fand dass ich mich zu viel mit der Philosophie beschäftigte. Die beiden Examenwochen in Halle haben also lauter angehende und unvergessliche Erinnerungen geliefert.

19. The German original (pp. [6-7, 10-11]):
Die ekonomische Frage ist glücklich gelöst. Der König hat 5000 Kr. gegeben, die Brüder Nobel 8000, das übrige habe ich in Summen von 1000 und 2000 oder weniger von verschiedenen Privatleuten in Stockholm und Gothenburg bekommen, so dass die ganze Summe sich jetzt auf 22,700 Kronen oder 25,000 RM beläuft. Ich hatte 30,000 Kr. berechnet und der König hat in den That gesagt er will das Fehlende im nächsten Jahre verscharfen. Ich habe jeden-falls viel mehr als Potanin oder Roborovskij & Kosloff...


20. The German original (p. [6]):

21. Hedin to Stein, 2 January 1902; HAS Stein 5/78-95:
The ancient sites I reached now to the N. from Kara-Koshun belong to a quite different period than Karadung, and the MS are Chinese, but they give the key to the Lop-or question and are extremely interesting.

22. The German original (pp. [2-3]):

23. The original, with the quotation from the Tsar’s letter in French (pp. [13-15, 18-19]):
Im Winter habe ich “die Tournée” à la Sarah Bernhard. Es ist kein Vergnügen, aber ich muss doch, um meine alten Freunde wieder zu treffen. Am 7 Nov. beginne ich hier, am 10 auch hier, am 14 in Petersburg, dann ein Paar Städte in Schweden, danach Kopenhagen, London, Edinburgh, Dundee, Aberdeen, Glasgow, Newcastle bevor Wein-achten. Für Kristiania ist die Zeit nicht bestimmt ...


24. The German original (pp. [4-5]):
Die Expedition von meinem alten Freund Younghusband ist mir unsympathisch. Freilich ist es vielleicht jetzt leichter in Tibet einzudringen, aber da ich selbst immer mit den Tibetern in Freundschaft und Gastfreiheit gelebt habe, wirkt es auf mich peinlich diese Ungerechtigkeit zu sehen, es ist mir ungläubliche Feigheit auf diese harmlose Menschen, die sich nicht verteidigen können mit Repetiergewehren loszugehen...

Ebenso unklug war das Vordringen Kozloffs; mit Blutvergiessen und Gewalt geht es an der Länge nicht dies wilden Völker zu gewinnen ... [M]an jetzt im östlichen Tibet ohne starke Escorte überhaupt nicht reisen kann; die Tanguten sind ja sowieso Räuber, und kommt noch Blutsache hinzu, wird es noch schlimmer.

25. Hedin’s comments were included in a set of responses to a paper Stein had delivered to the RGS, a meeting at which Hedin could not be present (“Explorations” 1909, pp. 269–71). An unexpurged version of Hedin’s remarks, containing more praise for Stein as well as criticism of the lack of financial support given to Stein by British authorities, can be found in the Stein archive in Budapest (LHAS Stein 5/78-95).

26. “Die Karten von Bower und Littledale sind unter jeder Kritik; wo diese beide Herren gereist sind, ist das Land noch terra incognita” (p. [14]).


Die Zeit der ersten Entschleierung der weissen Flecke, welche noch vor vierzig Jahren auf der Landkarte grosse Gebiete im Inneren der Festländer einnahmen, ist vorüber. Aber noch gilt es das Entdeckungswerk fortzusetzen, die Kenntnis im einzelnen auszubauen, gleichzeitig aber auch mit den heutigen Mitteln der Forschung wissenschaftlich zu vertiefen.

Kein dankbareres Feld für solche Tätigkeit gab es noch vor einem Jahrzehnt, als die Zentralgebiete Asiens, wo Przewalski die Bahn gebrochen hatte und andere ihn gefolgt waren, aber doch erst nach einzelnen Richtungen
die allgemeinen Grundlinien festgelegt hatten. .... Sven Hedin, dem die Lust am frischen und kühnen Wandern angeboren zu sein scheint, der die Kunst nutzbringenden Reisens früh in Vorder-Asien geübt und sich dann das erforderliche Mass wissenschaftlicher, technischer und sprachlicher Ausbildung für grössere Unternehmungen zu ver-schaffen bemüht hatte, folgte mächtigem innerem Drang, indem er sich die Aufgabe stellte, über Zen-tral-Asien weiteres Licht zu verbreiten.