

JOHNSON'S
UNIVERSAL CYCLOPÆDIA

A NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A CORPS OF THIRTY-SIX EDITORS, ASSISTED BY
EMINENT EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN SPECIALISTS

UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D.
PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

ILLUSTRATED WITH MAPS, PLANS, AND ENGRAVINGS

COMPLETE IN EIGHT VOLUMES

VOL. IV

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

NEW YORK
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY

A. J. JOHNSON COMPANY

1896

AES
225
1896
2.4

COPYRIGHT, 1875,
BY A. J. JOHNSON.

COPYRIGHT, 1886, 1889,
BY A. J. JOHNSON AND COMPANY.

COPYRIGHT, 1894,
BY A. J. JOHNSON COMPANY.

NOTE.—The publishers beg to direct attention to the following changes in the constitution of the editorial staff: Prof. J. Mark Baldwin, Ph. D., Stuart, Professor of Experimental Psychology in the College of New Jersey, has been associated with Dr. Harris in the department of Philosophy, Psychology, Ethics, etc.; and Prof. Francis M. Burdick, Dwight Professor of Law in Columbia College, New York, has taken the place of President Henry Wade Rogers, whose other duties compelled him to relinquish his connection with the cyclopædia. By the death of Dr. Philip Schaff, as already noted, full charge of the department of General Church History and Biblical Literature now devolves on Dr. Samuel Macauley Jackson.

had sovereign authority over this subject, but by Art. 1, § 8, sub. 4, the power to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy was granted to the Federal Congress. This power has been sparingly exercised (see *BANKRUPT*), and most of the legislation in the U. S. upon insolvency has been on the part of the States. Even the enactment of a federal bankruptcy law does not annul a State statute on the same subject, nor does it prevent a State from passing such a statute; it only suspends the operation of the latter so far as that is in conflict with the federal law. Upon the repeal of the act of Congress the State statute is in full force. (*Tua vs. Carrievie*, 117 U. S. 201.) Art. 1, § 10, sub. 1, of the Federal Constitution forbids a State from passing a law impairing the obligation of contracts. Therefore a State statute can discharge persons from such debts only as are contracted after its passage. But a State law releasing one from liability to imprisonment for debts previously incurred is valid as it affects the remedy merely and not the obligation.

State Insolvency Laws.—No attempt will be made to give the provisions of the various State statutes on this subject. A brief outline of the general principles applicable to such legislation must suffice. The debtor may institute the proceedings when the insolvency is called voluntary, or they may be begun by his creditors and are then styled involuntary. From the time he is adjudicated an insolvent, and under some statutes from the date of instituting the proceedings, his control of his property, save such as the statute exempts, ceases, and his debtors can not discharge themselves by payments to him. An assignee, generally chosen by the creditors, takes the property, pays the expenses of the proceedings, and distributes the balance among the creditors. As insolvency legislation has no extra-territorial force, the assignee may not be able to obtain the property of the insolvent which is in another State. If it is land, the title will not pass to the assignee by virtue of the assignment; and even if the property is personal the assignee acquires title thereto only by the comity of nations, and when such title does not conflict with the laws or the public policy of the State where the property is situated, or with the claims of its citizens, or of creditors irrespective of domicile pursuing their rights against such property in accordance with its laws. Moreover, such assignee is not a purchaser for value of the insolvent's property, and therefore takes title subject to all equities against the insolvent. He is generally empowered, however, in the interest of creditors, to bring suits to set aside fraudulent conveyances by the insolvent, although such may be binding on the latter. As a State law has no force beyond the State boundaries, it can not discharge a debtor from obligations to citizens of other States, unless they voluntarily become parties to proceedings under such law. See 6 *Harvard Law Review*, 349, for criticism of this doctrine.

Composition with Creditors.—Insolvent debtors often obtain a discharge from their creditors by a composition, or voluntary arrangement under which the creditors release their claims in consideration of their mutual promises and of the payment of a part of his indebtedness by the insolvent or by a third person. The present bankruptcy law of England provides for and encourages such an arrangement between the bankrupt and his creditors, as did the U. S. law of 1867. Under the English statute a majority in number, representing three-fourths in value of all the creditors who have proved, may enter into a composition with the bankrupt, which will bind all the creditors within the jurisdiction if approved by the court, and thus discharge the debtor even against the will of the minority. A common-law composition binds only those creditors who choose to become parties to it. It need not be by deed, and even where a deed is employed no particular form is necessary. The utmost good faith is required on the part of the debtor. He must make a truthful statement of his financial condition; he must not secretly stipulate to give preferences to any of his creditors, and he must perform his part of the arrangement strictly.

Assignments for the Benefit of Creditors.—These are often resorted to by debtors for the purpose of securing a distribution of their property among their creditors, but they do not operate as a discharge from debts. The debtor, whether insolvent or not, may select his assignee and transfer to him a part or all of his property, with directions as to the manner in which it is to be divided among his creditors. It was early held by the English courts that such assignments were valid, even though giving preferences to favored creditors, and made to prevent others from reaping

the fruits of their diligence in instituting legal proceedings. The same doctrine prevails in the U. S. In Great Britain these assignments are acts of bankruptcy, and therefore rarely employed. In the U. S. they are frequent. Many of the States have statutes upon this subject which regulate the mode of making the assignment, define the duties of the assignee, declare whether preferences may be given, and subject all the proceedings pertaining to such transfers to the summary control of the courts. See *Williams's Law of Bankruptcy* (London, 1891); *Murdoch's Law of Bankruptcy in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1886); *Kisbey's Irish Bankruptcy Practice* (Dublin, 1884); *Bishop on Insolvent Debtors* (New York, 1884); *Burrill on Assignments* (New York, 1894).

FRANCIS M. BURDICK.

Inspiration [M. Eng. *inspiracioun*, from O. Fr. *inspiration* < Lat. *inspiratio* (deriv. of *inspira're*, breathe into; *in-*, into + *spira're*, breathe), trans. of Gr. *ἐμπνεῦσις*, a breathing into, inspiration, deriv. of *ἐμπεῖν*; *ἐμ-*, into + *πνέειν*, breathe]: The words *inspiration* and *inspire* are employed in technical theological usage to translate the terms *inspiratio* (inbreathing) and *inspirare* (to breathe into) in theological Latin, which rests, through the medium of the Patristic Latin, on the Latin Bible. Their meanings in technical theological usage, therefore, are grounded upon such passages in the Latin Bible as Job xxxii. 8, where *inspiratio* stands for the Hebrew *n'shāmāh*, and above all 2 Tim. iii. 16, where the Greek word *δεδεικνυμένος* is translated *divinitus inspirata*. This Greek word first appears in literature in this passage, and may have been coined by Paul, as expressing the fact that the inbreathing with which he had to do was from God more explicitly than the current terms, such as *ἐμπνεῦστος* (*ἐμπνέω*), which he might have adapted to his purpose. Its application to the Hebrew Scriptures apparently describes those Scriptures as having been breathed into by God in the process of their origination, in such a manner that they have been clothed with divine qualities and breathe out God to every reader. It is in this sense that the word inspiration has been applied to the Bible.

DEFINITION OF INSPIRATION.—In its theological usage, the word inspiration was at first employed to express the entire divine agency operative in producing the Scriptures. In the process of theological analysis, however, the various modes in which the divine has entered into the production of the Scriptures have been more clearly distinguished. Throughout the whole preparation of the material to be written and of the men to write it; throughout the whole process of gathering, and classification, and use of the material by the writers; throughout the whole process of the actual writing: divine influences of the most varied kinds have been at work, extending all the way from simply providential superintendence and spiritual illumination to direct revelation and inspiration; and entering into and becoming incorporated with the human activities producing Scripture in very various ways—natural, supernatural, gracious, and miraculous. In distinguishing thus between the various modes in which the divine enters into the production of Scripture, the several terms formerly used synonymously to designate the entire process have acquired each a distinct sense, connoting one element in the process. The general question of the "divine origin of the Scriptures" is now distinguished from the special questions of revelation and inspiration. "Revelation" and "inspiration" are sharply distinguished from each other; the former being used to denote the divine activity in supernaturally communicating to certain chosen instruments the truths which God would make known to the world; while the term "inspiration" is reserved to denote the continued work of God by which—his providential, gracious, and supernatural contributions being presupposed—he wrought within the sacred writers in their entire work of writing, with the design and effect of rendering the written product the divinely trustworthy Word of God.

Exact writers no longer use the term inspiration either in so broad a sense as to make it inclusive of all the divine activities operative in the production of the Scriptures, or in a sense synonymous with or inclusive of revelation; but confine it to the definite and fixed sense of the particular divine activity exerted in securing a trustworthy record. Discussion of the subject is, however, very greatly confused by the persistence of the older and more inexact usage of the word in many, even recent, works; together with the recent introduction of a newer usage by a special school of thinkers, who would make inspiration merely the correlate of revela-

tion, expressing the divine preparation of the mind of the prophet for the reception of the revelation destined for him, or in some way the subjective factor corresponding to the objective revelation in the case of the recipient of a revelation.

The following are some recent definitions: "Inspiration was an influence of the Holy Spirit on the minds of certain select men, which rendered them the organs of God for the infallible communication of his mind and will." (C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, i., 154.) "By the inspiration of the Scriptures we mean that special divine influence upon the minds of the Scripture writers, in virtue of which their productions, apart from errors of transcription, and when rightly interpreted, together constitute an infallible and sufficient rule of faith and practice." (A. C. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 95.) "Defining inspiration positively, it may be described as the influence of the Holy Spirit upon a human person, whereby he is infallibly moved and guided in all his statements while under this influence." (W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, i., 88.) "Revelation is that direct divine influence which imparts truth to the mind. Inspiration is that divine influence that secures the accurate transference of truth into human language by a speaker or writer, so as to be communicated to other men." (B. Manly, *The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration*, 37.) "The specific question with reference to the inspiration of the Bible presupposes a revelation as given, and asks whether the record of that revelation be inspired. . . . It has special reference to the Sacred Scriptures, and it thus embraces much of history, fact, and detail which is not a matter of direct revelation, but which came to the writers from other sources, from personal experience or testimony. . . . It is a special divine influence for a special purpose. Its object is the communication of truth in an infallible manner, so that when rightly interpreted no error is conveyed." Henry B. Smith, *The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*, pp. 8, 9.

THE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.—The formation of a doctrine of inspiration in the Christian Church was conditioned by the circumstance that a specific doctrine on this subject was commended to it by the fact that it was held by the writers of the New Testament and by Jesus as reported in the Gospels. The Jews at the time of the rise of Christianity looked upon their Scriptures as in such a sense the utterances of God that every word of them was divinely guaranteed to be true, and was clothed with plenary divine authority. With characteristic exaggeration, this idea was given most startling expression by some of the rabbis, and extreme inferences were drawn from it. The writers of the New Testament and Jesus, as reported by them, without committing themselves to these extremer inferences, yet obviously shared the fundamental conception from which they were drawn; and looked upon the Old Testament as divinely safeguarded in even its verbal expression, and as divinely trustworthy in all its parts, in all its elements, and in all its statements of whatever kind. That this is the state of the case with reference to the New Testament writers is generally recognized by competent scholars of all schools of thought, not only by those who accept the authority of the New Testament in delivering this doctrine to us, but also by those who, whether of evangelical or of unevangelical convictions, reject this particular doctrine. This will be shown by such references as the following: Tholuck (*Old Testament in the New in the Bibliotheca Sacra*, xi., 612), Rothe (*Zur Dogmatik*, 177), Farrar (*Life of Paul*, i., 49), Sanday (*Inspiration*, 407), Stuart (*Principles of Christianity*, 346), Pfleiderer (*Paulinism*, i., 88), Schultz (*Grundriss der evangelischen Dogmatik*, 7), Riehm (*Der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes*, i., 173, 177), Reuss (*History of Christian Theology in the Apostolical Age*, i., 352), Kuenen (*Prophets*, 449).

It is this fact which accounts both for the immediateness of the adoption of this doctrine by the Christian Church, and for the tenacity of its hold upon it. From the very beginning, and unbrokenly since, this has been distinctly the vital belief of the Christian people as well as the formal doctrine of the organized Christian Church, as to the divine character of their Scriptures. It is this doctrine that was held and taught by the Church throughout the whole patristic age (see John Delitzsch, *De Inspiratione*, etc., and the catena of passages in Appendix B of Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*) and throughout the whole mediæval age; and that was given expression by the Church of Rome in the Tridentine deliverance that God is the author of the Scriptures and that they were written *Spiritu sancto dictante*. The same doctrine was held and

taught by all the Reformers, and underlies all the creeds of the Protestant Churches, finding its fullest expression in the later creeds of the Reformed Churches, such as the *Westminster Confession* and the *Formula Consensus Helvetica*. (See on the doctrine of the Reformed Creeds, A. A. Hodge, *Presbyterian Review*, 1884, p. 282, and on the Westminster Confession, B. B. Warfield, *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, Oct., 1893, p. 582, and *Presbyterian Quarterly*, Jan., 1894, p. 19.) Despite great divergences of opinion among recent theological writers, it is this same Church doctrine that remains not only the confessional doctrine of the Church at large, but the fundamental conviction of the body of Christian people.

That this doctrine, as confessed by the Church of all ages, pertains as much to the New Testament as to the Old, is not due merely to a natural extension to the New Testament writings of the inspiration which the New Testament writers themselves accorded to the Old. This extension itself is rooted in the authority of the apostles. And that, not alone in the sense that it was simply on the authority of the apostles, embodied in their writings, that the Church received the doctrine of the inspiration of the Old Testament, so that the inspiration of the former underlay that of the latter; but also in the sense that the New Testament writers claim for themselves the same inspiration which they attribute to the Old Testament. They did not for a moment allow that they, as ministers of a New Covenant, were less sufficient than the ministers of the Old; they asserted that the Holy Spirit was the author of their teaching, both in matter and in form; they demanded entire credit and claimed divine authority for all their deliverances; they placed one another's writings in the category of that Scripture, the whole of which they asserted to be inspired of God. It is thus simply on the authority of the apostles that the Church doctrine attributes this complete inspiration to the entire Bible.

In the whole history of the Church there have been only two lines of influence making for a lower doctrine of inspiration which are of sufficient importance to require notice in a general review:

(1) With forerunners among the Humanists (e. g. Erasmus), the Socinians introduced a method of thought which sought to distinguish between inspired and uninspired elements in the Scriptures. This was taken up by the Arminians (e. g. Grotius, Episcopius) and culminated in Le Clerc (*Sentiments de quelques théologiens*, etc., 1685, and *Défense des sentiments*, 1686). Le Clerc's views were introduced into England by the publication in 1690 of *Five Letters Concerning the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, Translated out of the French*; and called forth a number of replies, in which a lower view of inspiration was conceded in the effort to defend matters of even greater importance (e. g. in Lowth's *A Vindication of the Divine Authority and Inspiration of the Old Testament*, 1692). In Germany, George Calixtus (d. 1656) had enunciated opinions essentially identical with the lower view which was thus propagating itself in England, but with little effect until they were reannounced by Baumgarten (1725). Since the beginning of the nineteenth century great vogue has been obtained for such opinions; chiefly in the two forms which affirm, the one that only the *mysteries of the faith*—i. e. things undiscoversable by the unaided reason—are inspired, and the other that the Bible is inspired only in *matters pertaining to faith and practice*. But though appearing in a great number of writers, and affecting the thought of large and perhaps increasing numbers of Christians, this view has failed to supplant the common Church doctrine either in the creeds of the Church or in the hearts of the people.

(2) Thinkers of a mystical type have in all ages tended to erect the "inner light" which they seemed to themselves to enjoy from the direct work of the Holy Ghost in their hearts, to a position co-ordinate with or superior to the external light afforded by the divine revelation in the Scriptures. Hitherto thinkers of this type have stood somewhat outside the ordinary currents of Christian doctrine, and when advocating extreme views have tended to form separate sects. But in the nineteenth century, through the genius of Schleiermacher, a strong stream of essentially mystical thought entered into and affected more or less profoundly the whole body of Protestant theology. From this point of view man is conceived of as having, either as man or as Christian man taught by the Holy Ghost, a divine source and criterion of truth in himself, to the test of which every "external revelation" is to be subjected. Accordingly, the whole contents of the Bible, religious and ethical as

well as historical and scientific, the "mysteries" of faith as well as "rational" facts, such as are attainable by the unaided action of the human understanding, are subordinated to the judgment of human reason under such names as "the spiritual instinct," "the Christian consciousness," "the witness of the Holy Spirit in the heart," and the like. Adherents of this type of thinking define inspiration not as an activity of God rendering the Scriptural writings as such infallible and authoritative, but as the correlate of revelation in the process of the attainment of truth by the prophet himself—the subjective factor in the conception of divine truth by this chosen instrument of God. This tendency of thought has naturally assumed many forms and exists in various stages of development; sometimes it appears as only an undefined tendency, sometimes in a form distinguishable from vulgar rationalism only in the terms employed. It has become very widespread and influential in recent theological literature; but it has neither affected creed expression nor supplanted the ordinary Church doctrine in the convictions of the Christian people.

The effect of both of these attempted modifications of the Church doctrine of inspiration is to reduce the authority of Scripture. The former confines its authority to certain specified subjects—the undiscoverable mysteries of faith, or specific matters of faith and practice. The latter, in principle, sets aside its authority altogether in the general subordination of all "external authority" to "internal authority." The Church doctrine looks upon the Bible as throughout a divine book, and as such authoritative in and of itself, in all its declarations of whatever kind.

THEORIES OF INSPIRATION.—It will be impossible to enumerate here all of the divergent theories of inspiration which have been enunciated, especially in the nineteenth century, even by writers of name and influence. The attempt to frame a conspectus of even the more important of them is greatly complicated by the differences that exist even among modern writers in their definition of terms. Some sort of order may be introduced into the enumeration by separating the theories into three classes, according to the attitude they take concerning the relation of "inspiration" to the production of the actual books which constitute our Bible. Those points of view which deny that there is any specifically divine element in the religion of the Bible may, of course, be left out of account; they deny all "inspiration," and can not take a place among theories of "inspiration." Among those, however, who allow that the religion of the Bible is in some sense from God some confine the divine agency, which they call "inspiration," to the origin and growth of the biblical religion itself, and deny that it was active in the actual production of the writings (our biblical books) in which that religion has come to literary expression and record; others allow that God was in some way and to some extent concerned in the production of the writings themselves which compose our Bible, but deny that he was so concerned in their production as to become the responsible author of all their contents; while still others maintain that the biblical books themselves have been in such a sense written under the inspiration of God as to be constituted in themselves the Word of God written, to every word of which divine truth and authority attach. Most of the theories of inspiration will be found to take their places naturally in one or another of these classes.

I. Theories which confine inspiration to the divine agency in the production of true religion, denying that it directly enters into the production of the biblical books as such. In this class is included a great variety of theories very different from one another in everything except the one common tenet, that although they attribute a divine origin to the biblical religion, they look upon the biblical books, as such, as the product of unaided human powers. Writers of this class therefore deny inspiration altogether in the more exact and proper sense of that word; and for the most part define it as the correlate of revelation—as in one way or another a part of the process of revelation, the subjective factor in revelation, the preparation of the mind of the "prophet" to receive or assimilate the revelation, and the like. Thus Morell makes it merely the elevation of the religious consciousness, involving an increased power of spiritual vision by which religious truth is apprehended: "Revelation and inspiration indicate one united process, the result of which upon the human mind is to produce a state of spiritual intuition." And thus Rooke makes it "the inward spiritual preparation of a man to know and to feel what God chooses to communicate of his divine

thought and will"; inspiration and revelation being "correlative terms, twin factors of knowledge in some human consciousness, inspiration being the subjective factor and revelation being the objective factor."

Theories of this class differ from one another therefore according to their conceptions of the nature and processes of revelation; and these are largely determined by the philosophical preconceptions which underlie them. They range all the way from theories which differ from pure pantheism in little more than words, to theories which form the transition between the present and the higher classes afterward to be enumerated. They are all characterized by speaking of inspiration as "personal" and "non-biblical"—i. e. as belonging to the prophet and not to the book. And in even their highest form the nearest they can approach to speaking of "inspired Scriptures" is to say that an inspired man will of course write (as he does everything else) as an inspired man—i. e. any books he may write will bear the impress of his character and attainments. The following are some of the leading forms which this general conception has taken:

1. The lowest form reduces the divine influence exerted in inspiration to something which is essentially common to all men, and has received the names, appropriate to its several modes of expression, of the *natural*, the *intuitive*, or the *providential* theory. According to this point of view, the inspired man is simply the religious *genius*, and differs from his fellow men only in the degree in which his religious insight or susceptibilities have been excited under influences common to all, or only providentially different from those enjoyed by his fellow men. Sometimes this is so expressed as to be indistinguishable from pantheism. All life and thought are said to be divine—"the unfolding of the Life and Thought of God within the world." All human thought of God is therefore divinely inspired. "God is everywhere immanent and everywhere expressive; and expression, as soon as recognized, becomes revelation." (Whiton, *Gloria Patri*, 138.) At other times it takes forms of expression which are not only theistic, but make inspiration dependent on providential contact with Christ, and therefore tend to confine it to Christ's immediate followers. In one of its lower forms it is taught by F. W. Newman and Theodore Parker, and it grades upward to such teachers as Morell and Scherer (in one of his stages of development).

2. It is a higher form of the same general position which identifies inspiration with those influences of the Holy Ghost which are common to all Christians, and which has received the names, therefore, of the *gracious* or the *illumination* theory. According to this point of view, the inspired man is simply the Christian man of special spiritual attainments, and inspiration is nothing other in kind than *spiritual discernment*. This is the view of the more evangelical wing of the followers of Schleiermacher and of the followers of Coleridge. "To us, as to the holy men of old," says F. W. Farrar, "the Spirit still utters the living oracles of God." This is the view of such writers as Tholuck and Neander, as Arnold, Hafe, F. W. Robertson, Maurice.

3. It is still but a higher form of the same general position, when the peculiarity of the prophetic office is recognized, so that revelation and its correlate, inspiration, are confined to a special body of chosen men; but a sharp distinction is drawn between the revelation given by the inspiration of God and the record of that revelation which has been left to unaided human powers. One form in which this point of view is presented is represented by Mr. T. George Rooke, who calls it the "theory of sufficient knowledge." He teaches that God by revelation communicates sufficient knowledge to every biblical writer to enable him to produce the portion of Scripture committed to him, in which case "these writers could be trusted to express themselves in appropriate words, and there was no need for the Holy Spirit to supply the form as well as the matter of their utterance in every case, or even to superintend and check that utterance in its spoken or written form." (*Inspiration*, 158.) It is more common for writers of this class, however, simply to say that after God had communicated his will to the prophet, the prophet was left "to express in human language the divine conception, with which he was inspired, as well as he could." (So, De Witt, *What is Inspiration?* p. 82.) It is a somewhat higher point of view when Leonard Stählin (*Neue kirch. Zeitschrift*, 1892, No. 71) represents the Holy Spirit as not only by his inspiration communicating to the recipients of revelation the matter to be expressed, but as by the same act "fitting" them "to

express that which they say, exactly in those particular words which appear in their writings." Thus God's preparation of the sacred writers for writing was specific, but it only provided a basis for their writing; the writing itself was "free," and was not accompanied by any superintending or directing activity of God.

II. Theories which teach that God was directly concerned in the production of the biblical books, as such, so that it is true to say that the Bible contains the Word of God, and is therefore, as such, of divine origin; but which confine inspiration to certain portions or elements in the Bible, and thus deny that God is the responsible author of the whole book. Writers of this class are agreed that inspiration is the peculiar property of certain chosen instruments of the revelation of God's will, and that it attaches to their written product, the biblical books. But they usually define inspiration as synonymous with or the inseparable accompaniment of revelation, and are thus led to deny inspiration to all parts and elements of the Bible which are not direct "revelations." They differ from one another in the matters and elements which they severally determine to be inspired or uninspired in the Scriptures. Three well-marked sub-classes may be distinguished:

1. *The Theory of Partial Inspiration.*—This holds that some distinct and separable portions or parts of the Bible are inspired and others not. Sometimes the line is drawn broadly between the Old and the New Testament. Sometimes (as, e. g., by Coleridge, in some of his utterances) an inspiration is attributed to the Law and the Prophets which is denied to the rest of the Bible. At other times the larger portion of the whole book is thought of as inspired. Dr. G. T. Ladd thinks "a large proportion of its writings inspired" (*Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, i., 759), and with reference to the New Testament, that it is inspired "in nearly all its extent" (ii., 508). R. F. Horton has even undertaken to go through the Bible and point out generally what is inspired and what not (*Revelation and the Bible*); and W. Fr. Gess has carried out this process in such detail that he is prepared to separate the inspired and uninspired portions down to the very sentences and clauses (*Die Inspiration der Helden der Bibel und der Schriften der Bibel*). "In the blessing of Jacob," he says, for example, "only the prophecy concerning Judah is a real word of God" (p. 426).

2. *The Theory of Limited Inspiration.*—According to this point of view, the Bible is inspired indeed throughout, but only in certain of its elements; in other of its elements it is not from God. (a) Some limit inspiration to what they call the *mysteries*, i. e. to things not discoverable by unaided human powers, while what man could come to know by his natural faculties rests only on human authority. Walter R. Browne (*The Inspiration of the New Testament*) argues that the "supernatural element" in Scripture alone is inspired, since, on the principle of economy, God will give only such aid as is necessary. (b) Others limit inspiration to what they call *matters of faith and practice*, i. e. to religious doctrines to be believed and moral precepts to be obeyed, while in the whole sphere of philosophical, scientific, and historical fact the writers are said to have been left to their unaided powers, either absolutely or with the exception of such of these facts as are inseparably involved in "matters of faith and practice." This, as has already been pointed out, is a very common theory, especially among apologetic writers seeking to mark out the *minimum* to be defended. (c) Others limit inspiration to the *ideas, thoughts, concepts*, while the writers are held to have been left to their unaided powers in bringing these "concepts" into expression. It is obvious that this theory passes very readily into the one enumerated above under 1, 3; it is differentiated from it in that it posits the continued operation of the Spirit in the whole process by which the material to be written is thought out by the sacred writers, and leaves them to themselves only in the actual "wording." This seems to be the theory of Dean Alford; and many others hold it somewhat confusingly in conjunction with other conceptions.

3. *The Theory of Graded Inspiration.*—According to this point of view the Bible is indeed inspired in all its parts, but some portions of it are more inspired than others. This mode of statement originated in the Jewish schools and has had large popularity, especially among English writers of a generation or two ago, such as Daniel Wilson, Philip Doddridge, John Dick, Enoch Henderson. It is obvious that it is the result of the confusion—common to the writings of this whole class II.—between inspiration and the other processes by which a divine element has entered the Bible.

If we are to subsume all the divine influences, providential, gracious, and supernatural alike, revelation as well as inspiration in its stricter sense, under the one name of "inspiration," then it is undeniable that some portions of the Bible are more inspired than others. More of these processes have been operative in the production of some portions of the Bible than others. Writers of this type need not differ therefore from those of class III. otherwise than in definition. Most of them have, however, become confused in their distinctions, and have thus been the means of propagating a lower view of inspiration than that held by class III.

III. Theories which maintain that God was in such a sense concerned in the production of the biblical books, as such, that his providential, gracious, and supernatural activities attending the preparation of the matter to be written and the men to write it, were supplemented by his co-operation in the very writing of the books themselves; so that he is the responsible author of the Scriptures in all their parts, in all their elements, and in all their statements of whatever kind; and they are the Word of God written, and as such are infallibly true and divinely authoritative in all their declarations. It is evident at once that this theory is identical with the Church doctrine of inspiration. It has received the name of the doctrine of *plenary* inspiration, in contradistinction from the several theories of incomplete inspiration enumerated under II.; and in contradistinction from that form of the theory of limited inspiration, which confines inspiration to the thoughts, ideas, or concepts, and denies that it extends to the choice of the words in which these thoughts, ideas, and concepts are expressed (II., 2, c.), it has received the name of the doctrine of *verbal* inspiration. It exists in two forms, which differ in their conception of the mode in which the divine activity has worked in the production of Scripture. These are:

1. *The Theory of Dictation.*—According to this mode of conception the whole of Scripture has been dictated by God to the human writers, who thus are to be thought of not as authors but as amanuenses, penmen, or even, as some writers affirm, merely pens, blind instruments in the divine hand, acting mechanically in the production of the resultant writing. From this point of view God alone is the author of the Scriptures. Its characteristic contention is that the human writers have contributed no quality of their own to the product, save as a musical instrument may contribute a quality to the music played upon it. It "excludes the working of the natural faculties of man's mind altogether, . . . so that both the understanding and the will of man, as far as they were merely natural, had nothing to do in this holy work save only to understand and approve that which was dictated by God himself unto those that wrote it from his mouth, or the suggesting of his Spirit." (John White, *A Way to the Tree of Life*, p. 60.) The obvious marks of human authorship in the biblical books, as, for example, the differences in vocabulary, style, and the like, have led to modifications of the stringency of this contention; until, as Dr. Henry B. Smith says, "there is little room left for objection," and the dispute between this form of the doctrine and the next to be mentioned "becomes a verbal one." (*The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*, p. 24.) An instance of this moderate manner of stating the theory may be found in Rohnert, *Die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift*, etc., p. 46. While he is sure that "in the act of inspiration the self-moving activity of the holy men of God entirely receded," yet he is equally sure that "the dictation of the Spirit was not a mechanical repeating of words for mechanical record," but that the persons who wrote were used *as persons* and not as dead utensils, and acted as the willing instruments of the Spirit's activity, working "freely according to their individual peculiarities." In every age of the Church there have been representatives of the theory of dictation. Only in the Protestant theology of the seventeenth century, however, did it tend to become dominant. At that time it found more or less clear expression in many of the chief doctrinal treatises of the Lutheran and Reformed bodies alike, and in Britain as fully as on the Continent (e. g. Quenstedt, Calov, Hollaz, Heidegger, Buxtorf, Hooker, White, Lightfoot). In our own day this theory has been revived in the Lutheran Church, in reaction against the prevalent lower theories, chiefly through the example of a great theologian of the U. S., C. F. W. Walther; it is represented in Germany by such recent writers as Kölling and Rohnert.

2. *The Theory of Concursus.*—According to this mode of conception the whole of Scripture is the product of divine

activities, which enter it, however, not by superseding the activities of the human authors, but confluent with them; so that the Scriptures are the joint product of divine and human activities, both of which penetrate them at every point, working harmoniously together to the production of a writing which is not divine here and human there, but at once divine and human in every part, every word, and every particular. The philosophical basis of this theory is the Christian conception of God as immanent in his modes of working as well as transcendent. It is this theory, as has already been pointed out, that underlies the Church doctrine of inspiration and constitutes, indeed, the Church doctrine of the mode of inspiration. It was the conception of the greatest of the Fathers (e. g. Augustine) and of the Reformers, and it remains the conception of the great body of modern theologians. It is, for example, the theory of Gausson, Lee, Bannerman, Manly, Dieckhoff, of A. C. Strong, A. Cave, C. Hodge, A. A. Hodge, H. B. Smith, and Shedd.

THE RELATION OF THE DIVINE AND THE HUMAN IN INSPIRATION.—That the Scriptures are a human book, written by men and bearing the traces of their human origin on their very face, is obvious to every reader. That they are a divine book as well is the contention of every theory of inspiration. How are these two factors, the divine and the human, to be conceived as related to one another in the act of inspiration? And how are the two consequent elements in the product, the divine and human, to be conceived to be related to one another in the Scriptures? This is one of the fundamental problems in working out a conception of inspiration, and it has received very varied treatment.

1. Some writers have emphasized one factor or element in so exaggerated a way as to exclude the other altogether. At one time the divine element was commonly so emphasized. This produced the seventeenth century theory of dictation. This is not common to-day. The opposite fault of emphasizing the human factor or element so exaggeratedly as to exclude the divine, which is an inheritance from rationalism, is, however, very widespread. The effect remains the same, though the underlying philosophy be altered to one of a pantheizing type, which speaks, indeed, of the Scriptures as wholly divine, but adds that so also is all thought and all expression of thought. Nor is the effect altered when men allow a divine element of preparation for the book, but deny a divine factor in the immediate production of the book itself as such, and consequently deny any divine element in the book itself as such (e. g. Gladden, *Who Wrote the Bible?*, Horton, *Inspiration and the Bible*).

2. Others appear to conceive of the two factors in inspiration as striving against and seeking to exclude one another, and of the two elements in the product as lying over against one another, dividing the Bible between them. Crude and mechanical as it appears, such a conception seems extraordinarily common, and makes itself heard in the most unlikely places. It is this point of view which leads to the declaration concerning a given element in the Bible, that because it is human it is therefore not divine; and which underlies the quite common remark that in the prosecution of biblical science it is becoming ever more certain that the "human element" in the Bible is larger than we supposed—with the implication that the divine element is therefore smaller. (Sanday, *The Oracles of God*; Thayer, *The Change of Attitude toward the Bible*.) So Dr. Ladd speaks of the difficulty of determining "the exact place where the divine meets the human, and is limited by it." (*What is the Bible?* 437.) This conception naturally is held with different degrees of crudity, and sometimes results even in an attempt to separate the inseparable, and to point out in detail what elements or parts of the Bible are divine and what human (Gess, *Die Inspiration*, etc.; Horton, *Revelation and the Bible*).

3. Justice is not done to the two factors in inspiration or to the two elements in the Scriptures by any other theory than that of *concursus*. On this theory the whole Bible is recognized as human, the free product of human effort, in every part and in every word—with the exception of the comparatively small portion which came by direct revelation. And at the same time the whole Bible is recognized as divine, to the smallest detail. The human and divine factors in inspiration are conceived of as flowing confluent and harmoniously to the production of a common product. And the two elements are conceived of in the Scriptures as inseparable constituents of one simple and un-compounded product. On this theory, of every word of the Bible in turn, it is to be affirmed that it is divine and that it is human; and all the qualities of divinity and of humanity are to be

sought and may be found in every portion and element of the Scriptures. This is the Church doctrine on the subject, and it has underlain the thought of all the great Church teachers of all ages, and finds more or less full expression in their extant writings.

THE EVIDENCE OF INSPIRATION.—It will not be possible to present even an outline of the evidence for the inspiration of the Christian Scriptures here. All that can be attempted is to indicate the sources from which it is drawn. It is necessary even for this purpose, however, to discriminate between the several definitions of inspiration. If we are to define it as the correlate of revelation, the evidence for it is the evidence for supernatural religion. If we are to define it as a wide term, including all the divine activities which have entered into the production of the Bible, the evidence for it is the evidence for the general divine origin of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. In these two bodies of evidence the whole ground of Christian apologetics is covered. If, on the other hand, we define inspiration, with exact writers, as the activity of God in producing a divinely safeguarded record of his will in written documents, all this mass of evidence for supernatural revelation and for the divine origin of the Scriptures is presupposed. Inspiration, in its more exact sense, can not come into discussion until theism, the reality of revelation, the authenticity and historical credibility of the Scriptures, the divine origin and character of the religion which they present, and the general trustworthiness of their presentation of it, have been already established. It is the crowning attribute of these sacred books, and is inconceivable and would not be affirmed if they were not previously believed to be the trustworthy records of a divinely given religion. When inspiration is said to be independent of the authenticity or historical credibility of the Scriptures, or of their trustworthiness in their presentation of the facts or even the doctrines of Christianity, or even independent of the truth of theism itself, it is because a different definition of inspiration is in mind from that which is used by exact writers, and in which it is affirmed by the Church doctrine.

It is obvious that the primary source of evidence for inspiration, in this its exact sense, is the declarations of Scripture itself. (1) This is not reasoning in a circle: the question of inspiration does not come into discussion until the general trustworthiness of the Scriptures as sources for Christian doctrine has already been established; and the establishment of this belongs to the general "evidences of Christianity," and not to the specific evidence for inspiration in its more exact sense. (2) Nor is it to be objected to on the ground that the nature of the inspiration of the Scriptures is to be inferred by induction from the phenomena of Scripture, and not learned from the teaching of Scripture. This could be true only on the supposition that the general trustworthiness of the Scriptures as sources of Christian doctrine had not already been established by the general "evidences of Christianity." Immediately on the establishment of this, any phenomena of Scripture which may seem to be inconsistent with its teaching as to its own origin and character, pass into the category of "difficulties" not yet explained; and can set aside or modify the doctrine derived from the teaching of Scripture only in case they raise an objection to it formidable enough to neutralize the whole body of evidence for the general trustworthiness of the Scriptures as sources of Christian doctrine. The actual phenomena of Scripture—phenomena, as is asserted, of "error" and "discrepancy"—which are pleaded in this reference, are, however, of a kind which are far from being able to raise so formidable an objection to the truth of scriptural teaching. These "discrepancies," as Prebendary Row says truly, "have been exaggerated to an extent that is absurd. A large number of them admit of an easy reconciliation under the guidance of common sense. Others arise from the fragmentary nature of the narrative, and our ignorance of the entire facts. Not a few of the remainder owe their origin to the fact that the events have been grouped in reference to the religious purpose of the author, rather than to the order of direct historical sequence. Of a few the reconciliation is difficult." None of them are such as would justify a rejection or modification of the teachings of the New Testament, coming to us authenticated as that teaching as a whole is. (3) Nor yet is it to be objected to this appeal to the Scriptures that equal testimony is not borne by all parts of the Scriptures to their inspiration, and specifically that it is only in the later and more "scholastic" portions of Scripture that a fully developed doctrine of Scripture can be discerned. This is just what would be expected

from the progressiveness of the delivery of doctrine, and from the manner in which Scripture is written (occasional writings); and it is much in favor of the doctrine as derived from Scripture that it is only developed gradually in the progress of revelation, and finds its clearest and fullest expression in the New Testament, from the mouths of Christ and his apostles—and, among them, from the mouths of those most didactic and logical in their expression of doctrine.

It has already been pointed out that the Church has always, acting on these principles, derived her doctrine of inspiration from the Scriptures, and primarily from the New Testament. As Dr. Sanday truly says (*Inspiration*, p. 393): "The one proof which in all ages has been the simplest and most effective as to the validity of that idea was the extent to which it was recognized in the sayings of Christ himself." It has also already been pointed out that it is really not a matter in dispute among untrammelled scholars that the doctrine of inspiration which underlies the whole New Testament's dealing with the Old, and which is expressed in all the New Testament declarations upon the subject, is one quite as high and strict as that which the Church has adopted. As Hermann Schultz (*loc. cit.*) expresses it: "For the men of the New Testament the Holy Scriptures of their people are already God's word, in which God himself speaks"; and the doctrine of a "verbal inspiration" both underlay all Christ's dealings with Scripture and is formally recognized by the "scholastic men of the apostolic circle" "in express words, as well as in the way in which they cite" the Old Testament books. It will not be possible to draw out here the details of evidence on which is based this general judgment of modern scientific exegesis as to the New Testament conception of Scripture. It must suffice to say that it rests on a wide induction from all the phenomena of the use made of the Old Testament by the New: inclusive not only of such direct assertions of divine infallibility and authority for Scripture as those of Christ in John x. 35, of Paul in 2 Tim. iii. 16, and of Peter in 2 Peter i. 21, but also of the obvious assumption of the divine inspiration, trustworthiness, and authority of the Scriptures in the whole dealing of the New Testament with them. This comes to expression, for example, in the titles given to Scripture, such as "Scripture," "the Scriptures," "the oracles of God": in the formulas of quotation, such as "it is written," "it is spoken"; in the mode of its adduction, by which "Scripture says" and "God says" are made equivalents (Rom. ix. 17, x. 19; Gal. iii. 8), and even the narrative portions of Scripture are quoted as utterances of God (Heb. iv. 4); in the ascription of Scripture to the Holy Ghost as its source, and the recognition of the human writers as only his media of expression (Mat. xxii. 43; Acts ii. 34); in the reverence and trust shown toward the very words of Scripture (Mat. xxii. 32, 43; John x. 34; Gal. iii. 16); and in the attitude of entire subjection to Scripture which characterizes every line of the New Testament books. That the New Testament books were in the estimate of their writers equally "Scripture" with the Old Testament is evinced by the claim to equal authority which is made for them (2 Cor. x. 7; Gal. i. 7; 1 Thess. iv. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 6-14); by the similar ascription of their inspiration to the Holy Ghost (1 Thess. i. 5, ii. 13, iv. 2; 1 Cor. ii. 16; vii. 40); and by the inclusion of New Testament books along with the Old Testament under the title "Scripture" (1 Tim. v. 18; 2 Peter iii. 16).

There can be no question that what has been outlined above as the Church doctrine of inspiration is grounded in the conception of Scripture held by Christ and his apostles. It will necessarily be accepted as true by those to whom the authority of Christ and his apostles is supreme. It will be rejected by those who refuse the authority of Christ and his apostles in matters of doctrinal truth. And it may be avoided by those who, while accepting this authority in general, yet suppose that on a principle of "accommodation," or on a principle of "incomplete knowledge," as applied to Christ and his apostles, they may modify the application of that authority in detail. The first of these attitudes toward the authority of Christ and his apostles is the historical attitude of the Christian Church; and it is the only attitude from which the "plenary inspiration" of Scripture can even come into discussion. If Christ and his apostles are not of infallible authority, even in the matter of their doctrinal teaching, the question can not be raised whether they have been rendered by the Holy Ghost infallible, not only in the matter, but also in the very form of all their communications, of whatever kind.

LITERATURE.—The history of the doctrine: Delitzsch, *De*

Inspiratione Scripturæ Sacræ quid statuerint Patres Apostolici et Apologetæ Secundi Sæculi (Leipzig, 1872); Westcott, *Primitive Doctrine of Inspiration* (in his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, App. B.); Berger, *La Bible au Seizième Siècle* (Paris, 1879); Rabaud, *Histoire de la Doctrine de l'Inspiration des Saintes-Écritures* (Paris, 1883); Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture* (New York, 1883); Cramer, *De Roomsche-Katholieke en de Oud-Protestantsche Schriftbeschouwing* (Amsterdam, 1883); *De Schriftbeschouwing van Calvijn* (Amsterdam, 1884); *De Geschiedenis van Het Leerstuk der Inspiratie in de Laatste twee Eeuwen* (Utrecht, 1887); Rohnert, *Die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift und ihre Bestreiter* (Leipzig, 1889), together with separate pamphlets by the same author on the doctrine of Luther; Pieper, *Luther's Doctrine of Inspiration* (in *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, iv., 249); Moore, *Calvin's Doctrine of Holy Scripture* (in same *Review*, iv. 49).

The seventeenth century doctrine: Among the Lutherans, in such dogmatic treatises as those of Gerhard, Quenstedt, Calov, Hollaz; among the Reformed, in such as Chamier, Amyraldus, Turretine; in Great Britain, before Le Clerc, in Bishop Jewel, Whitaker, Usher's *Body of Divinity*, Ball's *Catechism*—after Le Clerc, in Owen's *The Reason of Faith*, Calamy's *The Inspiration of the Holy Writings*, among the more conservative, and Lowth's *A Vindication of the Divine Authority and Inspiration*, etc., and Williams's *Boyle Lectures*, among the more concessive.

Modern Treatises.—Expositions and defenses of the Church doctrine: Lee, *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*; Bannerman, *Inspiration of the Scriptures*; Gausson, *Theopneustie* (and English translation); Elliott, *A Treatise on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*; Cunningham, *Theological Lectures*; Manly, *The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration*; Watts, *Faith and Inspiration*; Patton, *Inspiration of the Scriptures*; Macgregor, *The Revelation and the Record*. Advocates of a modified doctrine: Row, *Inspiration, its Mode and Extent*; Warrington, *Inspiration*; Simon, *The Bible, Theocratic Literature*; Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture and What is the Bible?*; Sanday, *The Oracles of God and Inspiration*; Horton, *Inspiration and the Bible, Revelation and the Bible, and Verbum Dei*. BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

Installation [from Mediæv. Lat. *installatio*, deriv. of *installare*, put in a place or seat; *in*, in, into + *stal lum*, from O. H. Germ. *stal*, place (: Eng. stall) > Mod. Germ. *stelle*, place]: the ceremonial act by which an ordained minister is formally put in possession of his office and empowered to exercise its functions and receive its emoluments. In the English Church the ceremonial form differs according to the office conferred, and also the name, *enthronization* being the technical term in reference to a bishop, and *institution* and *induction*, the first being the committal of the "spiritualities," the second, the admission to the "temporalities," being the terms for the lower clergy, while *installation* properly refers to the office of a canon or prebendary in a cathedral church. The word is also applied to any formal induction into a rank, an order, or an official position, as, for example, the *installation* of a Knight of the Garter. Among the Congregational churches of the U. S. the term applies to all ministers, and is distinguished from *ordination* as being the conferring of the pastoral office over a particular church. Originally the Congregational minister was only regarded as ordained when, and as long as, installed over a local charge.

Revised by W. S. PERRY.

Insterburg, in'ster-boorch: town of East Prussia, Germany; at the confluence of the Angerap and the Inster (see map of German Empire, ref. 1-K). It is an important railway junction, has two evangelical churches, a Roman Catholic church, a Reformed church, a gymnasium, and a reformatory, and carries on a considerable industry in weaving, tanning, brewing, and distilling, and a brisk trade in corn and linseed. It owes a great deal of its prosperity to a number of Scottish families which settled here in the seventeenth century. Pop. (1890) 22,227.

Revised by B. B. HOLMES.

Instinct [from Lat. *instinctus*, instigation, impulse, deriv. of *instinguere*, instincum, goad on, incite, impel]: complex inherited reactions of an animal organism directed to an end, and stimulated from the environment. Instincts are distinguished from impulses (see IMPULSE), which originate within the organism. Two great characters seem to attach to instinct: first, they are considered a matter of the original endowment of an organism, and, further, they are thought to exhibit the most remarkable evidence in na-