JOURNAL OF

THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute,

OR

Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE HONORARY SECRETARY,
CAPTAIN FRANCIS W. H. PETRIE, F.G.S., &c.

VOL. XXIII.

LONDON:
(Published by the Institute).
INDIA: W. THACKER & Co. UNITED STATES: G. T. PUTNAM'S SONS, *N.Y.*
AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND: G. ROBERTSON & Co., LIM.
CANADA: DAWSON BROS., *Montreal.*
S. AFRICA: JUTA & Co., *Cape Town.*
PARIS: GALIGNANI.
1890.

ORDINARY MEETING.*

D. HOWARD, ESQ., F.C.S., &c., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed, and the following Elections were announced :—

LIFE ASSOCIATE :—The Venerable Archdeacon G. Smith Winter, Canada.

ASSOCIATES :—J. Allan Osman, Esq., D.S., United States; Major Papillon, R.A., Reading.

The following is a report of an extempore address then delivered :—

ON "THE SCIENCES OF LANGUAGE AND OF ETHNOGRAPHY," WITH GENERAL REFERENCE TO THE LANGUAGE AND CUSTOMS OF THE PEOPLE OF HUNZA. By DR. LEITNER, PH.D., LL.D., D.O.L., etc.

THE time has long ago passed when grammar and its rules could be treated in the way to which we were accustomed when at school. Vitality has now to be breathed into the dry bones of conjugations and declensions, and no language can be taught, even for mere practical purposes, without connecting custom and history with so-called "rules." The influences of climate and of religion have to be considered, as also the character of the people, if we wish to obtain a real hold on the language we study. Do we desire to make language a specialty, the preparation of acquiring early in life two dissimilar languages, one analytic and the other synthetic, is absolutely necessary, because if that is not done we shall always be hampered by the difficulty of dissociating the substance from the word which designates it. The human mind is extremely limited, and amongst the limits imposed upon it are those of, in early life, connecting an idea, fact, or process, with certain words ; and unless two languages, at least, are learnt, and those two are as dissimilar as possible, one is always,

* January 21, 1889.

more or less, the slave of routine in the perception and in the application of new facts and of new ideas, and in the adaptation of any matter of either theoretical or practical importance. It is a great advantage, for linguistic purposes, which are far more practically important than may be generally believed, that the study of the classical languages still holds the foremost place in this country; because, however necessary scientific "observation" may be, it cannot take the place of a cultured imagination. The stimulus of illustration and comparison, which, in the historical sense of the terms, is an absolutely necessary primary condition to mental advance, is derived from classical and literary pursuits. The study of two very similar languages, however, is not the same discipline to a beginner in linguistics, *e.g.*, to learn French and Italian is not of the same value as French and German, for the more dissimilar the languages the better.

Again, if you desire to elicit a language of which you know nothing, from a savage who cannot explain it and who does not understand your language, there are certain processes with which some linguists, no doubt, are familiar, and others commend themselves in practical experience; for instance, in pointing to an object which you wish to have, say, a fruit which you want to eat, you may not only obtain the name for it, but the gesture to obtain it, if you are surrounded by several savages whose language you do not know, may also induce one of the men to order another to get it for you,—I suppose on the principle that it is easy for one to command and for others to obey; but, be that as it may, this course, to the attentive observer, first obtains the name for the required thing and next elicits the imperative; you hear something with a kind of inflection which, once heard, cannot be mistaken for anything else than the imperative. Further, the *reply* to the imperative would either elicit "yes," or "no," or the indicative present. This process of inquiry does not apply to all languages, but it applies to a great many; and the attitude which you have to assume towards every language that you know nothing about, in the midst of strangers who speak it, is that, of course, of an entirely sympathetic student. You have, indeed, to apply to language the dictum which Buddhist Lamas apply to religion—never to think, much less to say, that your own religion (in this case your own language) is the best, *i.e.*, the form of expression in which you are in the habit of conveying your thoughts, is one so perfectly conventional, though rational in your case, that the greatest freedom from prejudice is as essential a consideration as the wish to acquire the language

of others. In other words, in addition to the mere elementary acquisition of knowledge, you have to cultivate a sympathetic attitude; and here, again, is one of the proofs of a truth which my experience has taught me, that, however great knowledge may be, sympathy is greater, for sympathy enables us to fit the key which is given by knowledge. Gestures also elicit a response in dealing, for instance, with numerals, where we are facilitated by the fingers of the hand. Of course, one is occasionally stopped by a savage who cannot go, or is supposed not to be able to go, beyond two, or beyond five.

I take it that in the majority of cases of that kind, a good deal of our misconception with regard to the difficulty of the inquiry lies in ourselves—that ideas of multitude connected with the peculiar customs of the race that have yet to be ascertained, are at the bottom of the inability of that race to follow our numeration. For instance, we go up to ten, and in order to elicit a name for eleven, we say "one, ten"; if the man laughs, change the order, and say "ten, one"; the chances are that the savage will instinctively rejoin "ten *and* one," and we then get the conjunction. Putting the fingers of both hands together may mean "multitude," "alliance," or "enmity," according as the customs of the race are interpreted by that gesture.

I am reminded of this particular instance in my experience, because I referred to it in a discussion on an admirable paper on the Kafirs of the Hindukush by the eminent Dr. Bellew, who, I hoped, would have been present this evening. If you do not take custom along with a "rule," and do not try to explain the so-called rule by either historical events or some custom of the race, you make language a matter entirely of memory, and as memory is one of the faculties that suffers most from advancing age, or from modes of living and various other circumstances, the moment that memory is impaired your linguistic knowledge must suffer,—you, therefore, should make language a matter of judgment and of associations. If you do not do that, however great your linguistic knowledge or scholarship, you must eventually fail in doing justice to the subject or to those with whom you are dealing.

The same principle applies as much to a highly civilised language like Arabic, one of the most important languages in the way of expressing the multifarious processes of human thought and action, as to the remnant of the pre-historic Hunza language with which I am going to deal to-night, and which throws unexpected light on the science of language.

Let us first take Arabic and the misconceptions of

it by Arabic scholars. In 1859 I pointed out before the College of Preceptors, how it was necessary not only to discriminate between the Chapters in the Koran delivered at Mecca, and those given at Medina, but also to arrange the verses out of various Chapters in their real sequence. I believe we are now advancing towards a better understanding of this most remarkable book. But we still find in its translation such passages, for instance, as, "when in war women are captured, *take* those that are not married." The meaning is nothing so arbitrary. The expression for "take" that we have there is *ankohu*—marry, *i.e.*, take in marriage or *nikáh*, as no alliance can be formed with even a willing captive taken in war, except through the process of *nikáh*, which is the religious marriage contract. Again we have the passage, "Kill the infidels wherever you find them." There again is shown the want of sympathetic knowledge which is distinct from the knowledge of our translators who render "qátilu" with "kill" when it merely means "fight" and refers to an impending engagement with enemies who were then attacking Muhammad's camp. Apart from accuracy of translation, a sympathetic attitude is also of practical importance, *e.g.*, had we gone into Oriental questions with more sympathy and, in consequence, more real knowledge, many of our frontier wars would have been avoided, and there is not the least doubt that in dealing with Oriental humanity, whether we had taken a firm or a conciliatory course, we should have been upon a track more likely to lead to success than by taking action based on insufficient knowledge or on preconceptions. For instance, in this morning's *Times* there was a telegram from Suakim about the Mahdi, to the effect that El Senousi was opposing him successfully. I do not know who El Senousi is, but very many years ago I pointed out the great importance of the Senousi *sect* in Africa, and, unless the deceased founder of that name has now arisen, whether it is a man of that name or the now well-known sect that is mentioned, one cannot say from the telegram. The sender of the message states that as sure as the El Senousi rises to importance there will be a danger to Egypt and to Islam. But I am not sure that the writer accurately knows what Islam is; though there can be no doubt that the rise of fanatical sects, like the Senousi, which is largely due to the feeling of resistance created by the encroachments of so-called European civilisation, is opposed to orthodox Muhammedanism. Be that as it may, I also turned to-day to "the further correspondence on the affairs of Egypt" which a friend gave me, and really I now know rather

less about Egypt than I did before. For instance, I find (and I am specially referring to the blue-book in my hand) that letters of the greatest importance from the Mahdi are treated in the following flippant manner: "This is nothing more or less than an unauthenticated copy of a letter sent by the deceased Mahdi to General Gordon!" Is this not enough to deserve attentive inquiry? General Gordon would, probably, not have agreed with the writer of this contemptuous remark, which is doubly out of place when we are also told that the Mahdi was sending Gordon certain verses and passages from the Koran, illustrative of his position, which are eliminated by the translator as unnecessary, of no importance, and of very little interest! Now, considering that this gentleman knows Arabic, I think I am right when I add that with a little more sympathy he would have known more, and had he known more he would have quoted those passages, for it is most necessary for us to know on what precise authority of the Koran or of tradition this so-called Mahdi bases his claim, and knowledge of this kind would give us the opportunity of dealing with the matter. Again, on the question of Her Majesty's title of "Kaisar-i-Hind," which, after great difficulty, I succeeded in carrying into general adoption in India, the previous translators of "Empress" had suggested some title which would either have been unintelligible or which would have given Her Majesty a disrespectful appellation, whilst none would have created that awe and respect which, I suppose, the translation of the Imperial title was intended to inspire. Even the subsequent official adopter of this title, Sir W. Muir, advocated it on grounds which would have rendered it inapplicable to India. With the National Anthem, similarly, we had a translation by a Persian into Hindustani which was supported by a number of Oriental scholars in this country, who either did not study it or who dealt with the matter entirely from a theoretical point of view, and what was the result? The result was—that for "God save the Queen" a passage was put which was either blasphemous, or which, in popular Muhammedan acceptance, might mean "God grant that Her Majesty may again marry!" whereas one of the glories of Her Majesty among her Hindu subjects is that she is a true "Satti" or Suttee, viz.: a righteous widow, who ever honours the memory of her terrestrial and spiritual husband—neither of these views being intended by the translator, nor by that very large and responsible body of men who supported him, and that still larger and emphatically loyal body that intended to give the translation of the National Anthem as a gift to India at a cost of several

thousand pounds, when for a hundred rupees a dozen accurate and respectful versions were elicited by me in India itself.

I, therefore, submit that in speaking of the sciences of language and ethnography, we have, or ought to have, passed, long ago, the standpoint of treating them separately; they must be treated together, and, as I said at the beginning, taking *e.g.* Arabic, with its thirty-six broken plurals (quite enough to break anybody's memory), you will never be able to learn it unless you thoroughly realise the life of the Arab, as he gets out of his tent in the morning, milches his female camel, &c., and unless you follow him through his daily ride or occupations. Then you will understand how it is, especially if you have travelled in Arabia, that camels that appear at a distance on the horizon affect the eye differently from camels when they come near, and are seen as they follow one another in a row, and those again different from the camels as they gather round the tent or encampment; and therefore it is that in the different perceptions to the eye, under the influence of natural phenomena, these multifarious plurals are of the greatest importance in examining the customs of the people. Then will the discovery of the right plural be a matter of enjoyment, leading one on to another discovery, and to work all the better; whereas, with the grammatical routine that we still pursue, I wonder, when we reach to middle or old age, after following the literary profession, that we are not more dull or confused than we are at present. When one abstract idea follows the other, as in our phraseology, it is not like one scene following another in a new country which is full of stimulus, but the course we adopt of abstract generalisations, without analysing them and bringing them back to their concrete constituents, is almost a process of stultification.

Coming now to one of the most primitive, and certainly one of the remnants of a pre-historic language, that of Hunza, which I had the opportunity of examining twenty-three years ago, while Gilgit was in a state of warfare, and where I had to learn the language, so to speak, with a pencil in one hand and a weapon in the other, and surrounded by people who were waiting for an opportunity to kill me, I found that on reverting to it three years ago the language had already undergone a process of assimilation to the surrounding dialects, owing to the advance of so-called civilisation, which in that case, and which in the case of most of these tribes, means the introduction of drunkenness and disease, in this instance, of cholera, for we know what has been the condition of those countries which lie in

the triangle between Cashmere, Kabul, and Badakhshan, and to which I first gave the name of Dardistan in 1866.

Now, what does this language show us? There the ordinary methods proved entirely at fault. If one pointed to an object, quite apart from the ordinary difficulties of misapprehension, the man appealed to, for instance, might say "your finger," if a finger were the thing of which he thought you wanted the name. If not satisfied with the name given in response, and you turned to somebody else, another name was obtained; and if you turned to a third person, you got a third name.

What was the reason for these differences? It was this, that the language had not emerged from the state in which it is impossible to have such a word as "head," as distinguished from "my head," or "thy head," or "his head"; for instance, *ak* is "my name," and *ik* is "his name." Take away the pronominal sign, and you are left with *k*, which means nothing. *Aus* is "my wife," and *gus* "thy wife." The *s* alone has no meaning, and, in some cases, it seemed impossible to arrive at putting anything down correctly; but so it is in the initial stage of a language; in the Hunza language under discussion, that stage is important to us as members of the Aryan group, as the dissociation of the pronoun, verb, adverb and conjunction from the act or substance only occurs when the language emerges beyond the stage, when the groping, as it were, of the human child between the *meum* and *tuum*, the first and second persons, approaches the clear perception of the outer world, the "*suum*," the third person. Now, during the twenty years referred to "his" (house), "his" (name), and "his" (head) are beginning to take the place of "house," "name," "head," generally, in not quite a decided manner, but still they are taking their place. When I subsequently talked to the Hunzas, and tried to find a reason for that "idiom," if one may use the term, it seemed very clear and convincing when they said, "How is it possible for 'a wife' to exist unless she is somebody's wife?" "You cannot say, for instance, if you dissociate the one from the other, 'her wife,' or 'his husband.' 'Head,' by itself, does not exist; it must be somebody's head." When, again, you dissociate the sound which stands for the action or substance from the pronoun, you come, in a certain group of words, to another range of thought connected with the primary family relation, and showing the existence of that particularly ancient form of endogamy, in which all the elder females are the mothers and all the elder men are the fathers of the tribe. For instance, take a word like "mother;" "m"

would mean the female principle, "o" would be the self, and the *ther* would mean "the tribe"; in other words, "mother" would mean: "the female that bore me and that belongs to my tribe." Now, fanciful as this may appear to us, it is the simple fact as regards the Hunza language, which, when put to the test of analysis, will throw an incredible light on the history of Aryan words. For instance, taking Sanskrit as a typical language, you will, I believe, find how the early relations grew, and you will get beyond the root into the parts of which the root is made up; each of which has a meaning, not in one or two instances, but in most. I am not going to read you this volume which I am preparing for the Indian Government, and which is only the first part of the analysis with regard to this language, and only a very small portion indeed of the material that I collected in 1866, 1872, and 1884 regarding that important part of the world, Dardistan, which is now being drawn within the range of practical Indian politics—a region situated between the Hindukush and Kaghan (lat. 37° N. and long. 73° E. to lat. 35° N. and long. 74·30 E.), and comprising monarchies and republics, including a small republic of eleven houses—a region which contains the solution of numerous linguistic and ethnographical problems, the cradle of the Aryan race, inhabited by the most varied tribes, from which region I brought the first Hunza and the first Káfir that ever visited England, and of which region one of its bigger Chiefs, owing to my sympathy with the people, invested me with a kind of titular governorship. In that comparatively small area the questions that are to be solved are great, and it is even now in some parts, perhaps, as hazardous a journey as, say, through the dark continent. Whether you get to the ancient Robber's Seat of Hunza, where the right of plundering is hereditary, or into the recesses of Kafiristan or the fastnesses of Pakhtu settlers; whether you proceed to the republics of Darel, Tangîr or Chilás, or proceed to the community, where women are sometimes at the head of affairs, and which is neither worse nor better than others, an amount of information, especially ethnographic, is within one's reach, which makes Dardistan a region that would reward a number of explorers. I may say, in my own instance, if my life is spared for ten years longer, all I could do would be to bring out the mere material in my possession in a rough form, leaving the theories thereon to be elaborated by others. My difficulties were great, but my reward has been in a mass of material, for the elaboration of which International, Oriental, and other Congresses and learned societies have petitioned Government since 1866. My official duties

have hitherto prevented my addressing myself to the congenial task of elaborating the material in conjunction with others. In 1886 I was, however, put for a few months on special duty in connexion with the Hunza language, at the very time that Colonel Lockhart was traversing a portion of Dardistan. But I think you will be more interested if, beyond personal observations, I tell you something about that little country of Hunza itself, which in many respects differs from those surrounding it, not only in regard to its peculiar language, which I have mentioned, but in other respects also. Unfortunately, it is also unlike the surrounding districts in being characterised by customs, the absence of some of which would be desirable. The Hunzas are nominal Muhammedans, and they used their mosques for drinking and dancing assemblies. Women were as free as air. There was little restriction in the relation of the sexes, and the management of the State, in theory, is attributed to fairies. No war is undertaken unless the fairy (whom, by the way, one is not allowed to see), gives the command by beating the sacred drum. The witches, who get into an ecstatic state, are the journalists, historians, and prophetesses of the tribe. They tell you what goes on in the surrounding valleys. They represent, as it were, the local *Times;* they tell you the past glories, such as they are, of raids and murders by their tribe; and when the *Tham* or ruler, who is supposed to be heaven-born (there being some mystery about the origin of his dynasty), does wrong, the only one who will dare to tell him the truth is the Dayal, or the witch who prophesies the future, and takes the opportunity of telling the Rajah that, unless he behaves in a manner worthy of his origin, he will come to grief! This is not a common form of popular representation to be met with, say, in India. Grimm's fairy-tales sometimes seem to be translated into practice in Hunza-land, which offers material for discussion alike to those who search for the Huns and to those who search for the very different Honas.

Then with regard to religion, as I said before, though nominally Muhammedan, they are really deniers of all the important precepts of true Muhammedanism, which is opposed to drunkenness, introduces a real brotherhood, and enjoins great cleanliness as absolutely necessary before the spiritual purification by prayer can take place. The people are mostly Muláis, but inferior in piety (?) to those of Zébak, Shignán, Wakhan, and other places. Now, what is that sect? It is represented by His Highness Prince Aga Khan, of Bombay, a person who is not half aware of his importance in those regions, where, till very recently, men

were murdered as soon as looked at. One who acknowledges him, or has brought some of the water with which he has washed his feet, would always be able to pass through those regions perfectly unharmed! I found my disguise as a Bokhara Mullah in 1866 to be quite useless, as a protection, at Gilgit, whence men were kidnapped to be exchanged for a good hunting dog, but in Hunza they used to fill prisoners with gunpowder, and blow them up for general amusement. His Highness, who is much given to horse-racing, confines his spiritual administration to the collection of taxes throughout Central Asia from his followers or believers, and the believers themselves represent what is still left of the doctrine of the Sheik-ul-Jabl or the Ancient of the Mountain, the head of the so-called Assassins, a connexion of the Mahdi, if he be the Mahdi, or the supposed Mahdi, in the Soudan. I consider he is not the Mahdi as foretold in Muhammedan tradition; but, be that as it may, the 7th Imám of the Shiahs has given rise to the sects both of the Druses in the Lebanon and to the Hunzas on the Pamir. They are the existing Ismailians, who, centuries ago, under the influence of *Hashish*, the Indian hemp, committed crimes throughout Christendom and were the terror of Knight-Templar, as "Hashîshîn," corrupted into "Assassins."

Now I have been fortunate enough, owing to my friendship with the head of their tribe, to obtain some portions of the Kelám-i-pîr volume, which takes the place, really, of the Korán, and of which I have got a portion here. I thought it might not be unworthy of your society to bring this to your knowledge, as a very interesting remnant which throws, *inter alia*, considerable light, not only on their doctrine, but also on the Crusades. By a similar favour, I have had the opportunity of hearing the Mitháq, or covenant of the Druses, and that covenant of the Druses is a kind of prayer they offer up to God, not only in connexion with the Old Man of the Mountain, the head of the Assassins who began about 1022, but also with those mysterious rites which also take place in what I may call the fairy-land of Hunza. I do not know whether you are already wearied, but, if not, I might, perhaps, read you out some portions. First, with regard to the covenants, or one of them, which the "U'quelá" or the "initiated" or "wise," as distinguished from the "Juhelá" or "ignorant" "laity," among the Druses, offer up every night.

This Druse covenant makes the mad Fatimite ruler of Egypt, Hakim, the "Lord of the Universe." As I said before, the present "Lord of the Universe" for the Hunzas is the lineal descendant of the 7th Imám, a resident of Bombay, one to whom the Muláis make pilgrimages, instead of going to

Mecca or to Kerbelá. You may imagine that, even as regards the Druses, there must be something higher than *their* "Lord of the Universe"; but, such as he is, it is with him that this covenant is made. Reverting to his living colleague, the Indian "Lord," it may be stated that there are men scattered throughout India of whose influence we have only the faintest conception. I pointed out in 1866 that if any one wanted to follow successfully my footsteps in Dardistan he would have to get recommendations from His Highness Aga Khan of Bombay, and I am glad to say that Col. Lockhart has taken advantage of that recommendation. The Druse "Lord of the Universe" is regarded as one with whom nothing can be compared. The Druses are to render him the most implicit obedience, and to carry out his behests at the loss of everything, good name, wealth, and life, with the view of obtaining the favour of one who may be taken to be God; but the sentence is so constructed as to make him, if not God, only second to God; in other words, only just a discrimination between God as the distant ruler of the Universe and, perhaps, some lineal descendant of Hakim, or rather, Hakim himself as an ever-living being, as the ruler of *this* world. This and some other prayers, with some songs, one amongst which breathes the greatest hatred to Muhammedanism, and speaks of the destruction of Mecca as something to look forward to, seem to be deserving of study. There are also references in them to rites connected with Abraham. A full translation of these documents, compared with invocations in portions of the Koran, would, indeed, reward the attention of the student.

I will now again revert from the Druses of the Lebanon to the Muláis in the Himalayas. I obtained the poem in my hand from the head of that sect, and the wording is so that it denies whilst affirming the immortality and transmigration of souls. It says, "It is no use telling the ignorant multitude what your faith is." "Tell them," continues the poem in effect, "if they want to know, in an answer of wisdom to a question of folly: 'if your life has been bad you will descend into the stone, the vegetable, or the animal; if your life has been good you will return as a better man. The chain of life is undivided. The animal that is sacrificed proceeds to a higher life.' You cannot discriminate and yet deny individual life, and apportion that air, stone, or plant to the animal and to man, but you ought to be punished for saying this to others!" And on this principle at any rate the Druses also act or acted, that that is no crime which is not found out; and a good many people, I am sorry to say, elsewhere think

much the same; whereas in Hunza they have gone beyond that stage, and care extremely little about their crimes being found out. The Mithâq and other religious utterances of the Druses and the Kelâm-i-Pîr of the Hunzas, if published together, with certain new information which we have regarding the Crusade of Richard Cœur-de-Lion, would, I think, were time given and the matter elaborated, indeed deserve the attention of the readers of your "Transactions." It also seems strange that where such customs exist there should be a prize for virtue, but there is one in Hunza for wives who have remained faithful to their husbands, something like the French prize for *rosières*.

(Formerly Suttee was practised, but Suttee had rather the meaning of Sâthi or companion, as both husband and wife went to the funeral pyre.) Prizes are similarly given to wives who have not quarrelled for, say, a certain number of years with their husbands. The most curious custom which seems to permeate these countries is to foster relationship in nursing where a nurse and all her relations come not only within the prohibited degrees, which is against the spirit of Muhammedanism, but also create the only real bond of true attachment that I have seen in Dardistan, where other relatives seemed always engaged in murdering one another.

Nearly all the chiefs in Dardistan give their children to persons of low degree to nurse, and these and the children of the nurse become attached to them throughout life, and are their only friends. But this foster-relationship is also taken in order to get rid of the consequences, say, of crime; for instance, in the case of adultery, or supposed adultery, the suspected person who declares that he enters into the relationship of son to the woman with whom he is suspected, after a certain penalty, is really accepted in that position, and the trust is in no case betrayed. It is the only kind of forgiveness which is given in Dardistan generally to that sort of transgression; but further than that, drinking milk with some one, or appointing some one as foster-father, which is done by crossing two vases of milk, creates the same relationship, except amongst the noble caste of Shîns, who were expelled by the Brahmins from India or Kashmîr, and who hold the cow in abhorrence as one of their religious dogmas, whereas in other ways they are really Brahmins, among whom we find Hindooism peeping out through the thin crust of Muhammedanism.

Finally, there are differences amongst Muhammedans as great as there are between a good Christian who tries to follow the Sermon on the Mount, and a merely

nominal Christian. Science and religion, according to a Muhammedan saying, are twins, and if I understand the object of this Society, it is in order to make this twinship (if I may be allowed to use the expression) more real that your labours have been initiated, and that, under Providence, they have been carried to the successful results that have followed them both here and abroad.

The CHAIRMAN (David Howard, Esq., F.C.S.).—Dr. Leitner has given us a most interesting discourse, interesting not only in what he has placed before us, but also in his suggestions of what we should like to hear. I believe the principle that he has laid down of the importance of not merely studying a language, but of studying it in connexion with the modes of thought, habits, and life, and so forth, of the people, is of primary importance. You find people trying to understand Eastern literature in the light of Western thought, and importing generic terms and tenses into a language which has no tenses at all, and so on. I believe the principle of Dr. Leitner's subject is of vital importance, and the glimpses he has given us of strange people and languages throw an interesting light on a mysterious problem, upon which I trust we shall hear a good deal more, from the learned author, than we have yet heard. Dr. Leitner is obliged to hurry away, and I am sure, on your behalf, I may convey to him your hearty thanks for having come here at no little inconvenience to himself to give us this most interesting address.

The meeting was then adjourned.

REMARKS.

Dr. CHAPLIN writes as follows: "Dr. Leitner's remarks upon what he called 'sympathy' in investigating the speech of a little-known people seemed to me just and valuable. Doubtless, a consideration of the physical conditions, history, and habits of thought of a people is most important to the understanding and explaining idioms and forms of speech. When a Spanish Jewess, for instance, in reply to a polite inquiry after her well-being, says 'sus enemígos,'—'your enemies,' her meaning is not clear until we remember that she is accustomed to think and speak in an Oriental way, and unconsciously

to use Bible phraseology. In her mind to say 'sus enemígos' is a courteous way of intimating that she is suffering trouble; 'May your enemies be as I am'! (cf. 2 Samuel xviii. 32). When we are told (Genesis xxix. 1) that 'Jacob lifted up his feet and came into the land,' &c., we are to understand that he *hastened* on his way. The phrase is still in use, and indicates the raising of the feet in running or rapid walking, instead of the slouching gait common to people who wear unwieldy shoes or sandals when they are going leisurely. It is an every-day custom in Palestine for the country people to take off their shoes and carry them in their hands or their girdle in order that they may more readily 'lift up their feet' when in a hurry."