§iv.] OBJECT AND CONTENTS. [axtropucrion,   
   
 been raised on the basis of a view represented by the foregoing ques-   
 tions. The former of them, that of Grotius, Ewald, Eichhorn, and   
 others, proceeds consistently enough in denying all prophecy, aud   
 explaining figuratively, with regard to then present expectations, right   
 or wrong, all the things contained in the book. ‘The latter, that of   
 Liicke, De Wette, Bleck, Diisterdieek, and others, while it professes   
 to recognize a certain kind of inspiration in the Writer, yet believes his   
 view to have been entirely bounded by his own subjectivity and cireum-   
 stances, denying that the book contains any thing specially revealed to   
 John and by him declared to us; and regarding its whole contents as   
 only instructive, in so far as they represent to us the aspirations of a   
 fervid and inspired man, full of the Spirit of God, and his insight into   
 forms of conflict and evil which are ever recurring in the history of the   
 world and the Church.   
 6. I own it seems to me that we cannot in consistency or in honesty   
 accept this compromise. For let us ask ourselves, how does it agree   
 with the phenomena? It conveniently saves the credit of the Writer,   
 and réscues the book from being an imposture, by conceding that he   
 saw all which he says he saw: but at the same time maintains, that all   
 which he saw was purely subjective, having no external objective   
 existence: and that those things which scem to be prophecies of the   
 distant future, are in fact no such prophecies, but have and exhaust   
 their significance within the horizon of the writer’s own experience and   
 hopes.   
 7. But then, if this be so, I do not sce, after all, how the credit of the   
 Writer zs so entirely saved. He distinctly lays claim to be speaking of   
 long periods of time. To say nothing of the time involved in the other   
 visions, he speaks of @ thousand years, and of things which must happen   
 at the end of that period. So that we must say, on the theory in ques-   
 tion, that all his declarations of this kind are pure mistakes: and, in   
 exegesis, our view must be entirely limited to the enquiry, not what is   
 for us and for all the meaning of this or that prophecy, but what was   
 the Writer's ineaning when he set it down. Whether subsequent events   
 justified his guess, or falsified it, is for us a pure matter of archeological   
 and psychological interest, and no more.   
 8. If this be so, I submit that the book at once becomes that which is   
 known as apocryphal, as distinguished from canonical: it is of no more   
 value to us than the Shepherd of Hermas, or the Ascension of Isaiah:   
 and is mere matter for criticism and independent judgment.   
 9. It will be no surprise to the readers of this work to be told, that   
 we are not prepared thus to deal with a book which we accept as canoni-   
 eal, and have all reason to believe to have been written by an Apostle.   
 While we are no believers in what has been (we cannot help thin!   
 foolishly) called verbal inspiration, we are not prepared to set aside the   
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