

again (but this we have not yet studied, since the Messianic prophecies have been postponed for a time) upon the return from Babylon. Time appears to be a slight concern to the prophet, events are the significant things. Finally we have found how utterly unnecessary the so-called spiritualizing exegesis is in all places where we have met it. Israel, so far at least, has been Israel; Jerusalem, Jerusalem; and Babylon, Babylon. We do not deny the possibility that these names in places may stand for the chosen people and the forces of evil respectively. But at least we have not found such places as yet, and from our study it would seem that such a use should be hinted at in the context in some way, or else exegesis would forever remain insecure.

In a word, we have tested in a limited and superficial way, but yet in a fair number of cases, the historico-grammatical exegesis of prophecy which takes the words in their plain sense--that meant by the author and recognized by the hearers--as far as patient study can discover that sense. We have tried to test this time-honored method of exegesis as applied to prophecy and we have not found it wanting.