

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—My attention has been called to a letter in your issue of Friday, the 5th inst., signed by Mr. Malone, and bringing my name somewhat prominently forward.

The document in question is replete with inaccuracies. It asserts, for instance, that Captain Burton in "endeavouring to support M. Du Chaillu," further added that he could confirm that traveller as to another instrument described in his book, consisting of pieces of wood placed over gourds, &c.

I said nothing of the kind. Mr. Malone, like most Englishmen, has probably read Dr. Livingstone, and has made over the South African explorer's description of such an instrument to me.

The inaccuracies put forth by Mr. Malone with respect to M. du Chaillu are far graver than the little specimen above alluded to. Mr. Malone began by interrupting the proceedings with ironical cheering, a practice not rare, I believe, in the House of Commons, but hardly admissible into an ethnological society. He then rose, and, after a preamble touching the fierceness of his disposition, adopted a tone and style of address which would have caused the coolest temper to boil over. My wonder is that M. du Chaillu restrained himself so long.

M. du Chaillu is a foreigner—one reason for courtesy; he was our guest—another reason; he has been subjected for the last two months to unusual annoyances—a third reason. I venture to hope that the person excluded from the future meetings of the Ethnological Society will be, not M. du Chaillu but the gentleman who, after taking undue advantage of our protection, insulted a foreigner and a guest, and received (and quietly pocketed) his punishment.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

RICHARD F. BURTON, M. Ethno. Soc.

14, St. James's-square, July 6.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—An account of the late meeting of the Ethnological Society appears in your impression of to-day from Mr. T. A. Malone, whose statement of the evening's occurrences is only partially correct. Soon after the chairman had left the meeting, I observed M. du Chaillu making his way in an excited manner to that part of the room in which Mr. Malone had been sitting. I followed him, but did not reach the spot until Mr. Malone called out "Is there no one here to protect me!" I at once requested M. Du Chaillu to come with me to the refreshment room, which he did, and I then returned to Mr. Malone and expressed the regret which the officers of the society felt at the insult he had received, and invited him to take some refreshment. He asked me if I would guarantee him from further insult, which I undertook to do, and so far Mr. Malone is right in correcting the accounts which you quoted. But while I concur thus far in Mr. Malone's account, I feel bound in justice to M. Du Chaillu to inform you that the rest of the letter is a very *ex parte* statement, and one which is little calculated to give your readers a fair impression of the insulting speeches which had been made by Mr. Malone. Indeed, up to the moment of the assault, there was a strong feeling in the meeting respecting the injudicious remarks of Mr. Malone, which were rendered still more unpalatable by his great professions of "painful feeling," &c. From the whole tenour of Mr. Malone's remarks one would rather have imagined that M. du Chaillu had been a culprit on his trial for some grave offence than a distinguished foreigner who had attended the meeting to hear a paper by the celebrated African traveller, Captain Richard Burton. I am at a loss to know by what right Mr. Malone made himself inquisitor-general, and, because a question of his was not answered to his satisfaction, why he should rise and lecture travellers in general, and M. Du Chaillu in particular? What a scene of confusion would have ensued if every author present had been thus cross-examined and bullied.

I must also correct one other statement which Mr. Malone has made in his letter, with as little justice, I fear, as the remarks contained in his speeches. Mr. Malone says, "A Syrian Christian was put forward." Now, I deny that any such gentleman was "put forward." It is true that a Mr. Ameuney, a native of Syria, gained permission to say a few words on the cannibalism of the Jews; but it is false to insinuate that he was put forward by the society.

Mr. Malone asks that M. Du Chaillu be excluded from all future meetings of the society; this request was made, however, before M. Du Chaillu tendered his apology to the Ethnological Society and the public. The subject will be duly brought under the notice of the Council of the Society who will decide whether M. Du Chaillu be again invited to attend the meetings of the Ethnological Society. I do not presume to divine what their decision may be, but I feel it due to M. Du Chaillu to state, that he enjoys the full confidence of the Ethnologists of this country.

In conclusion, I have only to state that I am not aware of any law existing in the Ethnological Society by which a gentleman can be excluded from attending its meetings. At present every member is allowed to introduce his friends (for whom he must be answerable) and, if I introduce Mr. Malone, I expect the chairman to prevent him from asking insulting questions of any author who happens to be present.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES HUNT.

Ore-house, near Hastings, July 5.