

This leads me to the question of orthography as regards aboriginal terms.

In the first place, I must plead guilty to the charge of not having constantly used the same graphic system. I will even confess that my present mode of spelling such words is not quite satisfactory to me. As a rule, I have tried to spare as many difficulties as possible to both compositor and proof-reader*, and thus insure a greater accuracy in the printing of my feeble contributions to anthropological science†. If Mr. Wardle will only read again his own article of two pages and a half, he will, no doubt, find the omissions and alterations due to the printer's negligence as well as the wrong spellings he is made to attribute to me (Etuane, Taxelh, etc.)‡ and come to the conclusion that I had some sort of an excuse for changing my graphic system when experience had taught me that it proved too trying to the type-setters.

Yet it stands to reason that a uniform system scrupulously followed from the beginning would have been much preferable.

But is it really "a cause of regret that" I have "not designated the equivalents in my system of phonetics for those of my colleagues' writings"?§

In a paper which Mr. Wardle was bound to notice since, in the volume in which it appeared, it immediately followed the article complained of, I had just remarked that "philologists could not too carefully precise the value of the letters used or, when extra signs or diacritical marks are found necessary, they could not too minutely explain the peculiar characteristics of their alphabets"||. It now seems that, through the irony of

* Such a consideration will probably lead me to abandon the spelling Tsi-khoh'tin and Tse'kehne, which are the only correct names of the tribe, more commonly called Chilcotin and Sekanais by ethnologists and others.

† It seems hardly necessary to remark that I have never had an opportunity of revising the proofs of anything I ever wrote in English.

‡ Since this is a reprint, I might adduce, in confirmation of my remarks, the 35 typographical errors which adorned (?) the first publication of the present non-technical article.

§ Notes, etc. p. 119.

|| Cf. The Use and Abuse of Philology, p. 86.