

634TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, JUNE 20TH, 1921,

AT 4.30 P.M.

ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the Election of the Rev. Anwyll Emrys C. Morgan, M.A., as an Associate.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon the Very Reverend the Dean of Canterbury to give the Annual Address on "The Old Testament and the present State of Criticism."

*THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE PRESENT STATE
OF CRITICISM.* By the VERY REV. H. WACE, D.D.,
Dean of Canterbury.

AMONG the objects of this Society, there is none more important than the investigation of the bearings of scientific discoveries on the Holy Scriptures. Those Scriptures are the shrine and source of the Christian Revelation, and the authority of that Revelation must stand or fall with their truth and authority. I thought, therefore, it would not be inappropriate to devote this Annual Address to a review, such as I offered the Society eight years ago, of the present position of the scientific criticism of the Old Testament, and especially of the Pentateuch. Notwithstanding the distractions of the war, that criticism has maintained its activity during the last few years. The veteran and indefatigable Dr. König, Professor of the Semitic languages in Bonn University, has published two very important volumes: one on the history of the religion of the Old Testament, the other an elaborate commentary on Genesis, besides other valuable controversial tracts. The late Dr. Orr's great Standard International Cyclopædia has placed within the reach of English readers a comprehensive review of all questions relating to the Scriptures, with a fulness and impartiality which no other Bible Cyclopædia has attained. Mr. Wiener, in that Cyclopædia and in the invaluable pages of the American *Bibliotheca Sacra*, has carried forward his searching cross-examination of the position of the German and English critics. Their representatives in England, both in universities and in popular handbooks, have been busy in maintaining that such views as those of the late

Dr. Driver are the "assured results" of scientific criticism, and in treating as insignificant obscurantists all English scholars who oppose them. At the same time a new and influential opposition to them has been gaining strength among historical scholars in Switzerland and France, under the influence of the eminent Archæologist and Egyptian scholar, Professor Naville of Geneva. Meanwhile "the Law and the Prophets" continue to tell their own plain tale, and the Jewish religion, which rests absolutely on the truth of that plain tale, continues its historic witness to it; and the New Testament, alike in the Gospels and the Epistles, assumes its historical veracity. The position of the "Word of God," as Jews and Christians regard it, amidst all this controversy, recalls the Psalmist's description of the Divine throne: "Clouds and darkness are round about it:" "truth and judgment are the habitation of its seat."

A vivid light has, however, been thrown on the present situation by a literary duel which has been in progress during the last two years in Germany, between Dr. König and a brilliant representative of the extreme critical school, Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch, who initiated the notorious Babel-Bibel controversy some twenty years ago. That controversy, as Dr. Delitzsch says, is over, and the Bible has not succumbed to Babel. But the recent revival of the Jewish question in Germany induced him to publish, last year, a tract which was ready for publication at Easter, 1914, but which he withheld during the war. It is defiantly entitled *Die Grosse Täuschung*, or *The Great Deception*; and it may be briefly described as a vehement and passionate attempt to show that the Jewish and Christian Faith is proved by modern criticism to be based on a gross deception embodied in the Hebrew Scriptures. His account, in a brief preface, of the origination of his argument is peculiarly interesting and instructive. "Every man," he says, "has his special experiences in life. As a young student I attended the lectures of a celebrated liberal theologian on *Old Testament Introduction*, and there I learned one day that the so-called Fifth Book of Moses, Deuteronomy, was not composed by Moses at all, notwithstanding that it asserts of itself that it was not only spoken by Moses, but actually written down by him; but that, in fact, it was first composed some seven hundred years later for a certain specific purpose. I came of an orthodox Lutheran family, and was deeply moved by this statement, especially as it convinced me; and

on the same day I sought an interview with my teacher, in the course of which the word escaped me: 'Then is the Fifth Book of Moses what is commonly called a forgery?' The answer was: 'For God's sake (*Um Gottes willen*). That is no doubt about the truth; but one must not quite say so (*Das wird wohl wahr sein, aber so etwas darf man nicht sagen*).' This saying, and especially his 'For God's sake,' rings in my ears to the present day, and is therefore, though with a deeper meaning, prefixed as a motto to this treatise. For I have never comprehended why, in such serious matters, what is true should not be spoken out." Accordingly he has spoken out, in this vigorous treatise, what he was taught by his old teacher—an eminent liberal theologian—was the practical result of German criticism of the Pentateuch, and that result is that the traditional account of Jewish history is "a great deception." The treatise was published in 1920, and in the course of that year ten thousand copies of it had been printed. Its full title is "Critical Considerations on the Old Testament Accounts of Israel's Invasion of Canaan, the Divine Revelation of Sinai and the Work of the Prophets." It will be seen that it is the work of a man who wishes to look facts in the face. He accepts the conclusions of German criticism respecting the Pentateuch, and he feels that the practical result of them is that the narratives in the Pentateuch are fictitious—in fact forgeries; that they attribute to Moses what Moses neither said nor did, and that consequently the whole story of the entry of Israel into Canaan is untrustworthy; and he proceeds to expose, without scruple, what he regards as its impossibilities and fictions. Starting from his point of view, it is a very powerful indictment, and must be felt, I think, to be a not unnatural result of the criticism he accepts. Conservative critics in England, who have said that this is the practical issue of such criticism, have been treated as unintelligent and brutal. But we now have an eminent German critic proclaiming loudly that this is the real outcome of it all, and denouncing the accepted traditions of Jewish history, "for God's sake," as a great delusion.

But this "outspoken" declaration has had one good result. It has, of course, compelled an acceptance of the challenge by one of the representatives of criticism, and happily this representative has been found in Dr. König of Bonn. This eminent scholar's answer is already in its third edition, and it amounts,

on the whole, to a plea that criticism must now admit the substantial historical truth of the narratives of the Pentateuch. The first question raised, he says, is that of the trustworthiness of the narratives of the ancient history of Israel. He begins by quoting a striking statement by Professor Edward Meyer, "the leading representative of ancient history at Berlin." This authority, who has no religious prejudice in favour of the Scriptures, says, in his *History of Antiquity* (vol. i, 1, § 131 : ed. 1913): "True historical literature exists in full independence only among the Israelites and the Greeks. Among the Israelites, who in this respect occupy a peculiar position among the civilized races of the East, such literature arose at an astonishingly early date, and commences with compositions of the highest importance, namely, the purely historical narratives in the books of Judges and Samuel." The narratives respecting David are regarded by him as indisputably due to contemporaries, "who must have been well informed respecting the characters and motives of the actors, and they cannot have been written later than the reign of Solomon." Looking backwards, he reckons as "genuinely historical" the narratives respecting Gideon and Abimelech. We are thus on the sure ground of contemporary history in the time of the Judges, and we may proceed with König to enquire whether we can go back farther without losing trustworthy historical evidence.

But if, as is generally admitted, even by such rationalistic writers as Nöldeke, Wellhausen, and Edward Meyer, the song of Deborah is to be regarded as "a direct echo of an historical event," it would be strange if the immediately antecedent narratives were not similarly historical. We can hardly be passing straight from myth or fiction to vivid history. König lays great stress on the broad fact that, notwithstanding the supremacy of the figure of Moses in the history of Israel, the vivid recognition of the period before Moses remained in the national consciousness and literature. That alone, as he urges, affords striking evidence of the historical sense of the Jewish people. Delitzsch, of course, in attacking the trustworthiness of the accounts of that early period, rests on the assumption, which König allows, of the four constituent elements of the Pentateuch, the Jehovistic, the Elohist, the Deuteronomic, and the Priest Code. But König urges that this "current derivation" of the oldest of these elements from the ninth or

eighth century before Christ requires justification. He himself regards the Elohist element as the oldest, and assigns it to the later part of the time of the Judges. But a more important point is that, in his opinion, both the Elohist and Jehovist portions are shown, alike by indirect and direct quotations, to rest upon still older materials. Even if those materials were handed down by memory only, they would still, in view of what the well-known capacity of memory was in ancient times, be of great historical value. But since the discovery of Hammurabi's Code of Laws, the supposition which was once maintained, and which even Delitzsch still mentions, that the Israelites at the time of Moses were an illiterate people, "has lost the last gleam of probability." Abraham himself came from a land in which writing was in general use, and was so generally understood, that marriage laws in the Code presumed the use of written marriage contracts. Consequently it is both possible and probable that, even in the period before Moses, records were made of important experiences; at least brief notices of genealogies or acquisitions, such as of the Cave of Macpelah. It is evident, from such points as the mention of the former names of places, that the people had a keen sense for ancient reminiscences; they quote old records like "the book of the Wars of the Lord" (Num. xxi, 14), or "the book of Jasher." The trustworthiness of the records is still further shown by statements which correspond in a remarkable and independent manner to facts which have only lately become known. Thus in the table of the nations, in Gen. x, 8-12, two races are distinguished in Babylon, and recent discoveries have shown that this corresponds to the facts. It is another curious point that the Chaldæans are not mentioned. "It did not escape the observant eye of the Israelites that it was only later that the Chaldæans played an important part in Babylonia." It is thus, says König, a false "dogma of many modern writers, as of Delitzsch himself, that the Hebrew historical books are of no value except when they are confirmed by other sources. Every other tradition is to be treated as having authority; but not the Hebrew. What gross injustice!" It will thus be seen that, while adhering to the current hypothesis of the four strata of the Pentateuch, König urges confidently the antiquity and historic value of the materials which are embodied in them. He repudiates, for instance, Delitzsch's assumption that the account

of the Tabernacle is "a pure fiction," and asks "what are the grounds for this customary contention of the Wellhausenians?" There are, he says, no reliable evidences against the existence of the Tabernacle as described in Exodus xxv to xxvii. Delitzsch's attack has thus served to bring out the fact that the most learned German criticism, as represented in a veteran scholar like Dr. König, has been forced to retreat very far indeed behind what may be described as the Wellhausen and Driver lines.

It is inexcusable in these circumstances that handbooks should be published, and encouraged by high authorities in our Church, which teach the pupils in our schools and colleges that the positions occupied by the critics of a generation ago are still strongholds of critical truth, and that the early narratives of the Bible are pious fictions, without historical value. On the contrary, one of the most learned—perhaps the most learned—of German scholars maintains with conviction the substantial historical truth of those early narratives; and even the hypothesis of the composite character of the Pentateuch is no longer incompatible with a belief in the reality of the revelations made to Abraham, and of the divine education of the Patriarchs, as narrated in the Book of Genesis. It is an immense gain in this long and obstinate controversy that these points should have been recovered. It cannot be too widely known, or too strongly asserted, that although the actual composition of the Pentateuch is still the subject of acute differences of opinion, there is no longer any critical agreement, even in Germany, that its narratives are unhistorical. Assertions that this is one of the "assured results of criticism" must be charitably stigmatised as due to ignorance of the state of critical investigation.

But the question is being carried to important further stages by two eminent scholars. Dr. Kyle, in America, has not only adduced indisputable evidence of the correspondence of the Pentateuchal history with archæological discoveries, but has proposed a new, and very interesting, explanation of those varying characteristics of the several sections of the Pentateuch on which the critics rely for its composite character. His book has so lately been published that it is premature to estimate the extent of his success. But his theory appears to be that the peculiar features of language and treatment, on which the critics

rely for distinguishing the sources, are simply due to the peculiar character of the various subjects which are being treated. In the investigation of these varying features of style, on independent grounds, he was surprised to find that he had unconsciously distinguished very nearly the precise sections which the critics assign to their several "Sources," and that the characteristics of these sections are thus accounted for without any supposition of distinct authorship. Dr. König, in a recent review of Dr. Kyle's former book, in the chief German critical journal, though differing from him, treated his work with much respect, and it will be of great interest to follow the discussion which must ensue on this hypothesis.

Meanwhile an entirely new element has been brought into the problem by the original and vigorous investigations of Professor Naville of Geneva. M. Naville is famous for his admirable work as an Egyptian archæologist, and his discoveries in Egypt had already thrown much light on the narratives of the Scriptures. He has been engaged in this work for at least forty years, and has of course become exceptionally familiar with the circumstances of ancient life in Egypt and in the Eastern countries connected with it. We owe to him, among other things, the discovery of the Store City of Pithom, and the singularly interesting illustration of the discovery of the Law, or of Deuteronomy, under King Josiah, in the deposition in an Egyptian temple of the law of that temple. But since about the year 1913 he has addressed himself especially to the problem of Genesis and the Text of the Old Testament, and on the latter subject he delivered the Schweich Lectures in 1915.

The war, of course, distracted notice from such subjects, but M. Naville's work is now receiving considerable attention in France. In the April number, for instance, of the well-known periodical *Foi et Vie*, an article appears from the pen of the eminent French historian M. Camille Jullian, of the Institute, the author of the famous *History of Gaul*, headed "The historical method, *à propos* of *Moses and Genesis* and the labours of M. Edouard Naville"; and a few quotations from this Review will afford a vivid and independent account of the nature of M. Naville's treatment of the subject. He commences by explaining that he is in no way concerned with any religious controversy. He is dealing with the subject as a pure question of science, and addresses himself solely to the learned world. The questions involved apply to

other subjects, such as the Homeric poems, the French *Chansons de Geste*, the Salic Law, the interpretation of Livy, or the story of Lancelot du Lac. M. Naville, he says, "in asserting his views, in constructing his theories, has not only been doing the work of a biblical exegete, according to his right and his duty, but he has also, with a skilful and bold movement, replaced the study of the Old Testament in the true path of the historical method." The criticism of the last century, he observes, consisted in taking ancient documents very much by themselves, in a sort of isolation, without investigating their relation to the contemporary conditions in which they were written; it dwelt on the contradictions in these documents, their improbabilities, their anachronisms, their historical or geographical inaccuracies, "and thereupon they were condemned; that is, they were declared not to belong to the date to which tradition assigned them, they were denied to the author whose name they bore, and attributed to some later author, or to various writers who had conspired to fabricate them." This method was applied to the Homeric poems, to the Song of Roland, the early works of Livy, and the Salic law. "From one end of history to the other, from the Genesis of Moses to the romances of ancient France, contemporary documents entered on a process of decomposition." But, he says, a new method commenced about 1880, under the impulse of the eminent historian Fustel de Coulanges, who urged historians not to criticise ancient texts according to their apparent literary structure, "but subject to an examination of the events and the places to which they were related." The consequence, he says, has been that the *Odyssey* has been shown by M. Victor Bérard to exhibit a marvellous accuracy in its description of the scenes of the voyage of Ulysses, and to be in conformity with the political condition of the Mediterranean nine or ten centuries before the Christian era. A like result has followed this historical treatment of the Song of Roland. "After the unique author of the *Odyssey*, behold the unique author of our national poem," and so on.

"This, then," says M. Jullian, "is what M. Naville has done for Moses and Genesis. I state again that this is no matter of orthodoxy, or revelation, or faith; it is simply a work of pure and noble science, before which we must bow our heads." M. Naville, he says, has in the first place had regard to the memorials of antiquity which are contemporary with Moses, in

accordance with the true archæological method. It is found that these memorials exhibit tablets, or small plates of baked clay, covered with cuneiform writing, in the Babylonian language. These are the tablets of Tel-el-Amarna, in Egypt, which are letters written to Pharaoh by Governors of Palestine, later than Abraham but previous to Moses, documents from Boghaz Keni in Asia Minor, relating to Egypt, Rameses II, and the Hittites, contemporaries of Moses; and contracts of the seventh century B.C. "What is the result? It is that the Babylonian Cuneiform was the official, learned, literary language, the written language of Western Asia, and that Moses was able to compose the book of Genesis in this manner, tablet by tablet. This is the explanation of the duplicate statements and repetitions of the book. That which brought a chapter to a close was not the natural termination of a narrative, but the end of the tablet; and at the commencement of the next tablet it was necessary to recur to the preceding text, to resume and recommence." M. Jullian then gives various illustrations of the correspondence of M. Naville's work with the archæological, geographical, sociological, and historical methods of modern science, and concludes by repeating that in all this there is no question of religion or dogma or tradition or belief. "There is no question of anything but of recovering the truth, and of doing so for love of the truth itself. M. Edouard Naville has succeeded. His work marks a new era in the criticism of the books of the Bible; it is that of a master workman, devoted to science, formed on the best methods, which are also French methods."

I have quoted this account of M. Naville's work, instead of describing it myself, that it may be recognized that the German treatment of the Old Testament is now challenged, not by mere criticism in detail, but by a general and comprehensive movement of thought, supported by the principles of a great school of history in France. It is no longer a matter for Hebrew scholars only. M. Jullian says: "I shall no doubt be reproached as not being a Hebrew scholar, and as a neophyte or unskilled in Biblical studies. I am the first to acknowledge it. But I think I know the civilizations of the Bronze Age, and of the middle of the second thousand years before the Christian era, the civilizations in the midst of which Moses lived and in which the books of the Pentateuch would have been formed, and I observe that all that we know of these ancient civilizations

illustrates exactly the first pages of the Old Testament." This, in fact, constitutes the main characteristic of M. Naville's argument. He insists that a book like Genesis should be considered first of all in relation to its main purport, its occasion, the persons for whom it was intended, and the influence it was calculated to have upon them. In this point of view, consider the broad effect of the Book of Genesis. It commences by a revelation of the God whose actions it proposes to relate, and describes Him as the one supreme and sole Creator of heaven and earth. It proceeds to give a brief sketch of the history of mankind up to the time of Abraham, and then devotes itself entirely to an account of how Abraham was called by that one God to a special relationship with Himself. He called on Abraham to walk before Him and to be perfect, and promised that He would multiply him exceedingly, that all nations of the earth should be blessed in him, and that the land of Canaan should be given to him and his seed. The narrative then confines itself to the history of Abraham's descendants, down to their settlement in Egypt, until the moment comes when Moses is called upon to lead them out of Egypt and to conduct them to the Promised Land. Now this was the very moment when the information in the Book of Genesis was of supreme value for them. It proved to be a task of extreme difficulty to induce them to follow their leader, on this expedition through a wilderness, to a land as yet unknown to them. It was imperative to assure them of the nature of the authority under which Moses was acting, and to bring home to them the truth that they were invited to a special place and function by that Divine authority. It was of the first importance to revive in them at that moment a recognition of their inheritance from their great ancestor, and of the destiny which had been promised to them as his descendants. In that covenant between God and their fathers lay the whole future of the nation, and, by solemnly recording it, Moses laid the indispensable foundation of their whole history. Their office was to maintain in the world a witness to the one God of heaven and earth, and to the laws which He had revealed to their fathers, and proclaimed in thunder and lightnings through Moses. The Book of Genesis, from this point of view, is the Magna Charta of the Jewish nation, and the time when that nation commenced an independent life under Moses was the unique moment for its composition.

At what other period of Jewish history would the preparation of such a record have been opportune? As M. Naville puts the matter in a lecture he lately delivered in Paris: "Listen for a moment to what the critics tell us of the author who has transmitted these words to us. He is a writer of the Kingdom of Judah, who lived in the ninth century before Christ. The Jewish Kingdom was then divided: ten tribes were separated; and a worship was established among them which was not that of Jehovah. Both kingdoms were hard pressed to defend their independence against powerful neighbours. Moreover, it is not from this writer himself that we learn these words. It is from another, who incorporated them in a book of pieces and patchwork, the so-called 'redactor' of Genesis, who is supposed to have lived in the fourth century, at a time when Canaan was in the hands of the successors of Alexander, and the Maccabees were making vain efforts to save the independence of their country. It must be asked, was that the moment to announce to the Israelites such words as these: 'Arise! walk through the land in the length of it and the breadth of it; for unto thee will I give it'? or would not the promises of Jehovah to Abraham have seemed to the people like a mockery?" But the whole argument of M. Naville has been summarized by M. Doumergue, the Dean of the Free Faculty of Protestant Theology at Montauban, in a tract of which M. Naville has read the proofs, published at the office of *Foi et Vie*, and this tract contains a most instructive account of the present position of the controversy.*

From this review of current criticism I would urge again one broad conclusion which cannot be too urgently pressed upon the thoughtful public. The critics and their echoes in the press are continually speaking in the style of *Roma locuta est; causa finita est*. German criticism has pronounced that Genesis and the Pentateuch are a late compilation; let the world and the Church accommodate themselves to the fact. What needs to be loudly asserted is that this claim of finality is palpably untrue. To take only the recent article of Professor König in the *Expositor* for February last, German critics are

* The title of the tract is *Moïse et La Genèse, D'après les Travaux de M. Le Professeur Édouard Naville, par E. Doumergue, Doyen Honoraire de la Faculté Libre de Théologie Protestante de Montauban*. Paris. Editions de *Foi et Vie*, 1920.

themselves maintaining the historic truth of those narratives of the Patriarchs, which older critics, and their younger British echoes, denounced as mythical; and a distinguished school of French and Swiss historians are reasserting the substantial Mosaic authorship of Genesis and the traditional "Books of Moses." It is less than honest for persons in authority, Professors and Deans and even Bishops, to be treating the results of the German criticism of the Pentateuch, as presented, for instance, by the late Dr. Driver, as having been definitely established. On the contrary, scholars of the highest position, both at home, on the Continent, and in America, are not only maintaining a strenuous opposition to these complicated and artificial theories, but are urging, on broad historical grounds, the substantial truth of the traditional belief. It should also be borne in mind that the practical questions at issue depend on historical rather than on literary considerations. It is an unquestionable consequence of the views of the German school that the representation conveyed by tradition of the course of Jewish religious history is a radically erroneous one. Of this the fact that the Tabernacle, according to that school, is a later fiction, is a glaring illustration. At and after the Exile, according to the critical view, books and parts of books were written which presented a completely false conception of the development of the Jewish religion, and the authority of Moses was systematically invoked for ceremonies and for teaching which were not due to him. It has always seemed to me that this is incredible from an historical point of view; that the Scribes of the Exile could not have induced the Jews of their day to accept a complete misrepresentation of the history and religion of their ancestors; and that this proves that the critical system which involves such a consequence must be vitiated by some fatal mistake.

I must needs express one personal conviction in conclusion. In this Address I have treated the subject, like M. Jullian and like M. Naville himself, from a point of view which is independent of theological or religious considerations. But I must own I do not see how to repel Voltaire's question, "If a sacred book contains a falsehood, can that book be sacred?" In plain words, if the Pentateuch is of such a nature that the plain man cannot accept it at what we may call its "face value," if it states as realities, like the

Tabernacle, things which are elaborate fictions, if it describes the religion of the Jews at the time of Moses as being what it really became some centuries later, if, in a word, its history cannot be trusted, can it still be considered to possess the sacred and authoritative character to which our Lord and His Apostles appealed? Can it be accepted as that "Word of God" on which the whole life of the Christian Church has been founded? These are the momentous practical issues which are involved in modern critical contentions. I do not appeal to them to prejudice the decision; it is of the highest importance that that decision should be reached on the independent ground of true criticism and sound history. But it must be a matter of profound satisfaction to Christian men and women when a leading German critic like Dr. König, and great historical and archæological authorities like M. Naville and M. Jullian, give an independent support to the ancient traditions.

DISCUSSION.

A vote of thanks was then proposed to Dr. Wace by the CHAIRMAN.

The Rev. Prebendary Fox, M.A., in seconding the Chairman's proposal of a vote of thanks, said he desired to express the cordial appreciation of the meeting of the very able and convincing paper they had listened to that afternoon.

Prof. H. LANGHORNE ORCHARD, in supporting the vote of thanks, felt sure that he was voicing the unanimous sentiment of the audience.

They had been listening to a most valuable paper which, marked on every page by the well-known ability and scholarship of the learned author, set forth clearly and judiciously the present state of Old Testament controversy between sceptical downgrade critics and their opponents.

The position of downgrade critics was pitiable.

Their frequent boast of having on their side all scholars, or at least all eminent scholars, was not likely (in view of pp. 274-275 of the Paper) to be quite so noisy; nor would their "assured results" be much longer permitted to masquerade as facts. It had been shown that scholarship was on the side of "The Traditional View," and

that all known facts agreed with the statements of Scripture. In controversy of this character, there were needed two qualifications :— (1) Investigation, for ascertaining facts, that dreamy guesses be not substituted for them ; (2) Logical reasoning, that facts be rightly interpreted. Could sceptical downgrade critics point to any instance where archæology had established their conclusions. What archæologist was on their side ? Nor had these gentlemen been happy in their arguments. Their arguments, intended to prove that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, and that history which has not been confirmed by known contemporary facts is untrustworthy, were both of them examples of false major premise.

The HON. SECRETARY added that if any non-Members present desired to join the Institute, that afternoon would be a favourable time for doing so, as all new Members or Associates became entitled to receive the New Volume of *Transactions* containing the twelve papers of the past session (and the discussions thereon), including the valuable address by Dean Wace to which they had just listened.