

with the oft-repeated statement "Nevertheless, the high places were not taken away, the people sacrificed and burnt incense still in the high places," in what are the legitimate inferences to be derived from this statement? Is it that the Kings were too half-hearted, or too busy, or too feeble to stem the current of popular custom and the popular worship which they connived at or condoned? Or is it, as the modern critics affirm, because there was as yet in existence no definite law prohibiting this kind of worship, and requiring sacrifices in one place only? We are confidently assured by them that this is the true and only explanation. We are asked to believe that on this assumption everything becomes clear. It is said this is plain from Ex. xx. 24. For it is assumed that Ex. xx. 24 gave the virtual permission to worship in the high places, saying: "In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee and bless thee." But this is not only an assumption in itself, the words of the text do not warrant it. It is not written in the original "In all the places." But "in all the place," and it will easily appear that "all the place" is not logically identical with "every place" (see Gen. xviii. 26).

Another passage on which much stress is laid is Jeremiah vii. 22. "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt from serving burnt offerings and sacrifices." Hence it is assumed that we have the authority of Jeremiah for the assertion that the Levitical ordinances of burnt offerings and sacrifices were not coeval with the Exodus, nor indeed so old as time of the Prophet himself, but that they were, as the critics infer, a later invention of Ezra and the priests of the exile. But to make a quotation here, "Even if we allow the earlier assumption, namely, that they were not coeval with the Exodus, the later inference by no means follows, namely, that they were the invention of the priests of the exile. Were they not given at Sinai after the Exodus. Are we to suppose there was no ritual in the first temple, that there was no ordained sacrifices and no prescribed ordinances upon which the sacrifices were conducted, but that the whole ritual of sacrifice was the invention of the priests in Babylon? The supposition certainly makes up in boldness for whatever it lacks in probability or substantitive proof. Again it is alleged that Ezra ix. 11, cites a law of the Pentateuch as an ordinance of the prophets, and consequently it could not have been an ordinance of Moses. But was not Moses