

*HOREB: OR, THE PLACE OF THE HEBREW
DECALOGUE IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.*

So many of those who have "touched" this mountain in modern times have in an ecclesiastical sense either been "stoned," or "thrust through with a dart," that it is not without a certain degree of trepidation the present venture is made. After many sad experiences the Church is not unnaturally jealous of any rash speculation in, or reckless meddling with, its fundamental principles. If the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do? The first tablets were broken in a moment of passion by the great Hebrew lawgiver himself; and ever since their restoration the priceless relics have been laid up in the ark, and guarded with ceaseless vigilance by the archons of the Sanctuary. That the Decalogue should be critically examined at all has been thought by some not a little presumptuous: why should Divine finger-work be subjected to human scrutiny? That any place but the first and chiefest should be assigned to it has been regarded by others as indisputable: has it not been accepted by the entire Christian world as the Divine basis of all spiritual instruction? And does not our Lord Himself refer to it as a heaven-erected finger-post to those who sought in his day to enter into life?¹ Besides, is it not the fact that many of those who have essayed impartial investigation of this subject have been led to reject its claim to paramount and permanent obligation? to deny, as "The Brethren" do, *e.g.*,² that the Gentile Churches have ever been in subjection to it? or, finally, have been influenced by the desire to accommodate its place and character to their sabbatic or anti-sabbatic theories and customs? For these and other reasons the Church has ever insisted that

¹ Mark x. 19.

² "C. H. M. on Deuteronomy."

the ark and its contents should, if touched at all, be handled with reverence, and that the hands of its priesthood should be clean when the vessels of the Lord are brought forth. At the same time, if it may not unreasonably be questioned whether the custodians of the ark and its tablets are themselves in agreement as to its present place in the Church; whether the daily reading and teaching of the Commandments is not now becoming almost obsolete in our congregations; whether the feeling that the greater light of the Gospel has supplanted the dim twilight of the Mosaic dispensation is not Scripturally justifiable; whether the sayings of "the men of old time" have not been modified, extended, and elevated by the "But I say unto you" of Christ; in short, whether the Hebrew compendium of the moral law, as it used to be regarded, has not been swept away with the ancient economy: if these questions are neither unreasonable nor unpractical, then our inquiry as to the place of the Hebrew Decalogue in the Christian Church is not without its Scriptural warrant and justification: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."¹

It will greatly assist us in coming to a right conclusion as to the place of the Hebrew Decalogue in the Christian Church, if we carefully keep in mind from the outset the nature, character, and objects of the moral law itself. As written with Divine finger upon the fleshly tables of the hearts of our progenitors in a state of innocence, it was designed to be a Divine rule of *outward conduct* for every branch of the human family and for all lands and ages. It was meant to establish and regulate certain dutiful forms, customs,² habits mental and physical—*mores*—in conformity with Divine truth otherwise revealed. In the immediate presence of the Supernatural and Divine there is little need of written legislation as to the mode of our conduct and

¹ Thessalonians v. 21.

² "Shall change *the customs*, τὰ ἔθνη, which Moses commanded." Acts vi. 14.

worship. Instinctively the head is bent, the shoes are taken off, the entire frame assumes an attitude of attention, submission, reverence, and godly fear. When the interview ceases, there is but one thought, or impulse, in the mind; and that is to hurry off and obey the Divine command. When, however, this sense of the Divine Presence has been lost, it becomes necessary to insist upon those forms¹ and acts of worship at first spontaneously produced, because God is present although no longer visible, and his commission to us must be executed although his voice is no longer audible. When God presented Eve to her husband in Paradise, Adam required no written code of manners to teach him how to receive and treat her; she was God's gift to him, his helpmeet, and he felt constrained to love her as himself. But when the Divine hand which "gave her away" was no longer visible to fallen eyes, and the Divine love in the gift was forgotten by a fallen race, it became necessary to put into words and enforce what had otherwise been the spontaneous response of the creature to the will of the Creator. Again, when God rested from his works, and sought brief but delightful intercourse with his newly created human children, it was a natural impulse which led them to give up their work to meet and walk with Him. But with the rise and development of worldliness and selfishness in the heart, the day of sacred privilege had to be fenced round with the command: "Thou shalt do no manner of work therein." It will thus be seen by what process the originally plastic forms of worship, service, and obedience, became fixed and stereotyped, even to restraint and bondage, under the altered conditions of humanity. Like a hermit's prayer-cell in the rock, suggesting to all who enter it the duty, and constraining them to assume the posture, for the time being, of the kneeling suppliant,

¹ The use of the word "form" need not be a stumbling block to those who recall the import of such terms as "Uniformity" and "Nonconformity."

the moral law became a schoolmaster to bring fallen and degenerate man, by means of sacred forms, suggestive rites, and outward observances, with the aid, of course, of that Spirit who quickens the dead, back to God in Christ, a reconciled God and Father. Some writers of fiction¹ have pictured the seeker after hidden treasures as having been directed to place themselves in a chair-formed rock in a mountain crag, whence, and whence only, the place of the treasure could be descried; and, after a fashion analogous to this, the written law directs its votaries to comply with certain injunctions, to assume certain positions, to perform certain rites and ceremonies, that in the act of their compliance they may catch a glimpse of Him in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Those who climbed in the spirit of faithful Abraham, for instance, the hill of Moriah, where stood the temple, and offered with him the sacrifice which represented their nearest and dearest, saw, with the patriarch, Christ's day afar off, and were gladdened by the prospect. In the act of obedience, God reveals his purpose: "In the mount of Jehovah it shall be seen."² Those who allowed themselves to be sprinkled with blood at the altar, to be washed with clean water at the laver, and thereafter drew near the spot whence the Shechinah glory was seen shimmering through the vail, were being prepared for the hour when they could "draw nigh to God in the full assurance of faith, having their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and their bodies laved with pure water." The law maintained the channels and river-beds of outward temple-service in their integrity until they were filled at Pentecost with that vital torrent, "the streams whereof make glad the city of God."

A distinction has often been drawn, not always with clearness, between the moral and ceremonial laws of Scrip-

¹ Edgar Poe, *e.g.*

² Gen. xxii. 14.

ture. Wherein lies the difference? The entire Mosaic law is theocratic in its origin, character, and design. The laws relating to the elaborate ceremonial of the temple, or the tabernacle, were as purely ethical in their scope—*i.e.*, professed the same consciousness of obligation, or duty, towards God, and through Him, to man—as those which dealt with person, life, and property. Nor was it the case, as we shall have occasion to shew immediately, that the one was common to all nations, whilst the other was confined to the Hebrews. No doubt some parts of the law were meant to be transitory; others, transitional; and the rest, permanent. The Mosaic economy may be compared to a garden on which the summer sun had yet to rise. Here were spring flowers, fair and fragrant while they lasted, but temporary; such were the types and emblematic observances of the tabernacle. There stood some hardier plants and annuals safe to hold their ground at all events till the autumn; such were the sacraments of circumcision and the passover. While yonder against the walls of the sanctuary grew the fruit trees from Paradise, proof against the storms of ages; on whose stems have been engrafted better branches than their own, whose blossom was for fragrance, whose fruit was for nourishment, and whose leaves were for the healing of the nations; such were its moral precepts, its Sabbath-keeping, and its everlasting priesthood of Righteousness. But even the sanatory, civil, and political enactments of the law formed part of the morality of Judaism; for they also derived their authority from, and were uttered in the name of, Jehovah.

Another feature in the history of these moral precepts may fitly be considered here. The Tôrâh was gradually unfolded. Although the Mosaic code of morals was delivered on Mount Sinai to Israel in its mature and completed form, its several enactments were much older than the Exodus, and some of them as old as humanity itself.

At sundry times and in divers manners they had been spoken by the Divine voice of Inspiration to the fathers in order to check the corruption and meet the exigencies of the hour. As the articles of a Church's Confession are each a settlement, or authoritative decision of its supreme council, or assembly, upon some great controversy of the age, although compiled, condensed, and classified for modern convenience, and those who sign them at ordination are supposed to declare in effect that, had they lived in those days and taken part in the struggle, they would in all the circumstances of the case have voted with the majority; so the various requirements of which the Mosaic law consists had their origin in successive attempts to stem the current of iniquity in the past, to meet by Divine intervention and rebuke the evils and heresies of the age as they arose, although Divinely summarized at Horeb for the guidance and instruction of Israel, who subscribed them in a formula for ever memorable: "All that Jehovah hath spoken, we will do." This gradual unfolding of the moral law to the covenant seed of Adam and Noah, will, in some degree, explain the otherwise startling fact, now indisputably established, that all ancient nations possessed it in whole or in part, independently of the Hebrews, and indeed before Israel as a nation existed. There seems little reason to doubt that the ritual and worship of such men as Job, Melchizedek, Jethro, and others, was the primeval stock out of which all the religions and moralities (including the Hebrew forms) grew.

Finally, we must keep in view the special and peculiar circumstances which called for and occasioned what may be termed, I trust, without irreverence, the inspired *Hebrew Edition* of the moral law. The leading principles and maxims of morality, not to say of the worship of JAHVE,¹ had already been acknowledged, and were more or less in

¹ "Arkite Worship," p. 91.

general practice among other nations when the Hebrew tribes received their written code of ethics at Horeb. In several important respects many Gentile countries were far in advance of Israel in morality as well as culture. Even their oppressors, the Egyptians, were monogamists,¹ as were likewise the entire Japhetic race, while the sons of Jacob, including such men as David and Solomon, were steeped in the vice of polygamy and concubinage. When, therefore, after four hundred years of demoralizing bondage and oppression, they escaped by miraculous intervention rather than patriotic effort, from Egypt into the fastnesses and solitudes of the Sinaitic desert, they presented a spectacle of moral degradation and ignorance hardly to be distinguished from that of the grossest idolaters.² It was clearly necessary that there should be a *tabula rasa* of heart and life, where every old and evil custom should be written off in order that new and better habits might take their place.³ "Thou shalt not" was a preliminary step in their moral education towards "Thou shalt." A code of moral precepts, chiefly of a negative and prohibitive character in the first instance, divinely clear and simple, appealing directly to the conscience, or natural sense of truth and justice, carefully adapted to the almost infant condition of the tribes, and issued and enforced by the direct authority of Jehovah Himself,—this was what the state of the case imperatively demanded if Israel was ever to become "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession."⁴

We are now, I think, in a position to consider the place of THE TEN WORDS, or the Hebrew Decalogue, in the Christian Church. The Mosaic Tablets occupied a significant and symbolical position in the innermost court of the

¹ Herodotus.

² Exod. xxxii.

³ "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation" (chap. iv.).

⁴ 1 Pet. ii. 9 (Revised Version).

tabernacle. They were laid up, with Aaron's budding rod, which betokened the resurrection, and the golden pot which had the manna, the emblem of life, in the ark of the testimony, which formed the footstool of the Mercy-seat. Morality lies at the root and constitutes the basis of all practical religion. Where there is no consciousness of duty to God, and through Him to our brother man, no sense of right and wrong, truth or falsehood, there is nothing within the soul to which any Gospel appeal can be made, nor anything to which the claims of Religion, or the truth of Christianity, can be attached.

One object, therefore, of a written decalogue laid up in the ark was plainly to localize or concentrate all sacred forms and customs into one supreme attitude of submission and obedience at Jehovah's footstool. All forms of morality lead to the Mercy-seat. To that central point they all converge. Hitherto they come, and no further. Where the law ends, the gospel begins. To the waiting penitent at the tribunal the Father reveals Himself in his Son, as a just God and Saviour. Horeb was the scene of a mystic tabernacle, "the pattern" shewn to Moses of the Church in the wilderness. It will thus be seen that the Church is more comprehensive than many of its high dignitaries and narrow sectaries seem to imagine. It throws its shadow over all forms that bend before the Mercy-seat. It hallows the duty of every human relationship. The ethics of the hearth and home, of the factory and warehouse, of the palace and the cottage, of politics, literature, science, and art, have a place within its pale. "The kings of the earth bring their glory and honour into it."¹ Its Lord compares it to the gigantic mustard-tree, in whose spreading branches the birds of the air find shelter and rest.

Another object of a written decalogue laid up in the ark

¹ Rev. xxi. 24.

at the foot of the Mercy-seat was obviously to reduce the otherwise vaguely conceived principles of moral duty to visible shape and practical utility, so as to make it a *basis of judgment* against flagrant offenders. It formed a book of reference for the tribunal of the conscience. "By the law was the knowledge of sin."¹ Consistency occupies a place in ethical science analogous to that which it holds in logic or metaphysics. If the "law of non-contradiction" be an unsatisfactory test of positive truth, it is at all events a true safeguard against error. And that Israel might have a simple and yet effective means of testing this consistency of conduct on the part of those who had professed to accept Jehovah as their covenant God and theocratic King, a sharp-cutting weapon for self-conviction and public judgment always at hand, a strict and severe "schoolmaster" to educate the public conscience in discriminating between truth and falsehood, moral good and evil, against the day when "God's Truth and the Devil's Lie"² would be presented for choice, these "Ten Words" were written by the Judge of all the earth, and significantly laid up at the footstool of his throne.

It has been said that "The Ten Words" are a divinely prepared "Summary," briefly comprehending the entire moral law.³ And such in a certain sense they are. They imply or comprehend the entire system of ethics as the Notes of a commentator imply and include the meaning and spirit of the classic text he is editing; or as the Epistle to the Hebrews briefly comprehends the whole Levitical system of the Old Testament which it explains and applies. It has been further summarized in the words of Christ: "Thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself." More briefly still it has been

¹ Rom. iii. 20.

² "Sartor Resartus," chap. vii.

³ Confession of Faith.

expressed by St. Paul "*in one word: LOVE.*"¹ But the Hebrew Decalogue, carefully examined, is rather a *supplement* than a summary, although the former includes the latter. With the development of sin, the rise of idolatry and every form of selfishness and violence in the world, and their corresponding effect in blinding the conscience and blunting the moral faculties of our nature, the moral law of Eden required supplementing to meet the new necessities of the case. The Divine text required an equally Divine commentation, and that on every chapter. This distinction between the Hebrew Decalogue regarded as a comprehensive supplement and a summary is far from being unimportant. It is not the moral law as comprehended in the Decalogue which alone is binding upon us, but the moral law *and* the Decalogue. We can conceive it possible, *e.g.*, for the rich young ruler who came to Christ asking, "What good thing shall I do to inherit eternal life?"² to have been sincere in his conviction that he had "*kept all these commandments*" from his youth up; *i.e.*, he had literally observed all the requirements of the Decalogue, (indeed the Saviour seems to accept his answer,³ and "beholding him loved him,") and yet to have grossly failed in his duty—his moral duty—towards God and man. The Jews were quick enough to note this. The Law formally required them to love their neighbour; and they added that it was still permissible for them to hate an enemy. Their notorious case of "Corban" was another instance of evasion.⁴ Their practice of polygamy was somehow explained as not inconsistent with the seventh commandment. And the Pharisees were persistent violators of the spirit of the Sabbath, while they scrupulously observed its letter. These and other instances are sufficient to shew that the

¹ ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ Ἀγαπήσεις. Gal. v. 4.

² Luke xviii. 21.

³ Mark x. 21.

⁴ Mark vii. 11.

nature and object of the "Ten Words" were those of supplement and inference, rather than of summary or abridgement. This will appear more clearly in the following brief analysis :

I. "*I am Jehovah*:" To have any other gods "before me" is therefore to commit immorality, to debauch the conscience, to act in glaring inconsistency with your first profession of obedience. "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." This enactment appeals to the conscience and common sense of mankind. "Come and let us reason together." There cannot be two or more supreme Divinities, much less two opposite or contending Objects of worship.

II. "*I am Jehovah*:" Therefore to invent arbitrary and capricious representations of God, or to think of Him "as altogether such an one as ourselves," is to do violence to our natural sense of what is right and true and dutiful. Christ is the only image of the Invisible God, the only adequate and perfect representation of the Deity. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." Is it right, then, for a Church professedly Christian to have images of Christ? or to think of Him henceforth after the flesh? To make a god to suit ourselves is wilful self-deception and deliberate wickedness.

III. "*I am Jehovah*:" To profess reverence for God's name and yet refuse to submit to his authority is, therefore, another act of immorality and sin. Hypocritical worship is an offence in the eyes both of God and man.

IV. "*I am Jehovah*:" As God had rested from his creative work that He might come and hold spiritual fellowship with his human children, it became a moral necessity for them to suspend their secular employment that they might solemnly assemble and keep the tryst with Him. Abstinence from labour or physical recreation was not in itself a moral or sacred act, but it was an indispensable

condition of undistracted worship. It was idle and false to profess to serve God with all the heart and soul and strength and mind at the time and place appointed, while mind and body were otherwise occupied with worldly thoughts and unspiritual vocations. No earthly king would be satisfied on a reception day with such divided homage. Both time and place of sacred worship had therefore to be fenced in, and fenced round, from distracting and disturbing influences. We must *be still* to know that He is God. And such protecting fence-work the Fourth Commandment is intended to supply. It neither institutes nor defines "the Sabbath," but simply marks off and hallows *the time* of its enjoyment: "Remember the Sabbath *day* to keep it holy." At stated times, at regular intervals, and Divinely-appointed places, Jehovah had promised to come down and meet with his people and rest with them in sacred fellowship and soul-communion; and these times and places were hallowed and set apart for the purposes of this worship: "The place which He had chosen to put his name there" had not yet been revealed, nor did the sanctuary exist when the law was delivered on Sinai: "Thou shalt reverence my sanctuary" would not then have been understood; but the sacred trysting-time had been known from the beginning, and the day for its observance was carefully to be remembered. But the day is not the Sabbath, only the time set apart for its enjoyment. What that spiritual rest is into which believers enter here, and enjoy eternally hereafter, cannot be learned from this Commandment. We are only warned as to what is inconsistent with its spiritual observance. Endless and useless controversies in the Church have been the result of ignoring this distinction. Multitudes have mistaken the means for the end. Even in our Lord's time the day itself, apart from its sacred uses, had come to be regarded with superstitious reverence, as if there was something intrinsically

sacred in the interval between its sunrise and sunset which man had been created to respect. But the day was made for man to enjoy his Creator's favour and friendship in, and not man for the day. And how many myriads of our intelligent fellow Christians awake on the Sabbath morning with a feeling of solemn awe inspired by the thought that "the day" has come, while oblivious of the arrival of the Sabbath's Lord! The spiritual rest in the enjoyment of the Divine presence and favour is the true Sabbath keeping—"the rest," *σαββατισμὸς*, "which remaineth for the people of God."¹ To these observations on the nature and scope of this Commandment it only remains to be added: That the argument from the Divine example, from Scripture, conscience, and common sense, for marking off, or hallowing, the day of public and private worship from the business days of the week, is just as valid and binding when applied to the first day of the week as to the seventh. As the law which hallowed the temple for Jehovah's worship is still in force as regards the Church, so the injunction forbidding any secular employment on the day when Jehovah visits his people under the Old Dispensation is still applicable to this day when Christ comes to meet his people under the New. What was essential to the enjoyment of the one is equally essential to the other. Now the Saviour's habit of meeting his disciples on the day which commemorated his resurrection, the continued token of his presence with them on that day after his ascension, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day,"² not to say the Divine guidance of the Holy Spirit given to the Apostles, having established that day as the trysting-time when Christ should meet his people assembled together in his name for all future ages, it must be fenced round by the same means and for the same reason as the seventh day to the Hebrews. The argument, therefore, for "wholly resting

¹ Hebrews iv. 9.

² Rev. i. 10.

all that day from worldly occupations" is neither Jewish, nor Scotch, nor Puritanical, but is the dictate of sound reason and conscience in every country, kindred, and tongue, as Divinely interpreted in the Fourth Commandment.

V.-X. Such is the First Table of the Decalogue. The Second exemplifies the same principles in defining and enforcing our duty to man. Parents are God's representatives in the family and must be honoured for his sake. Life is his gift and must be held sacred. Marriage is his ordinance, "and the bed must be undefiled." Property is his endowment, as well as our neighbour's character and position, and these must be respected as we shall answer to the great Judge at last.

What, then, is the place to be assigned to this Divinely inspired supplement and practical application of the principles of the moral law in Old Testament times in the teaching of the Christian Church? That something more than mere historic interest attaches to it is apparent from its reproduction in letter and spirit in the teaching of Christ and his Apostles. Neither yod nor little corner of its letters was to perish till all had been accomplished.¹ To say *Corban* in excuse for breaking the "Fifth Word" was hypocrisy.² To offend in one point, according to St. James, is to be guilty of all. "For he that said, Do not commit adultery; said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law."³ From these and similar references it is evident that the moral precepts of the Decalogue, having their basis in eternal truth, are still in force in the Gospel ages. But while they still occupy a place in the teaching of the Church, it is, to say the least, doubtful whether they occupy the same place as in the Tabernacle.

¹ Matt. v. 18.

² Mark vii. 6, 11.

³ James ii. 11.

Great strides in the development of moral truth have been made since the day when Jehovah spake unto his people in Horeb. Christ, by his obedience, has "magnified the law," raised the standard of its morality, not abolished it. With his advent and the baptism of Pentecost "the original ethical outfit of man,"¹ not to speak of the inner spiritual life, has been remodelled, extended, and raised to a higher platform; new light has been thrown upon our relationship to God as our reconciled Father in Christ; a new definition of the term "neighbour" has been given, and the old "middle wall of partition" has been broken down between Jew and Greek; a new divine family, God's spiritual children, has been created by the Spirit; and mercy, now, rejoiceth against judgment. In these altered circumstances what was no doubt a perfect exposition and comprehensive supplement of moral truth from Moses to John the Baptist, requires in itself to be expounded and supplemented to meet the conditions of the case. The new edition of the Horeb Tablets was published to the Church in the *Sermon on the Mount*, and its new summary was "tabulated" in the upper room at Jerusalem on the eve of the crucifixion. When the venerable Archbishop Usher² submitted to be catechised by the devout and saintly Samuel Rutherford, as was the custom in those times at family prayers, and in reply to a question as to the number of the commandments said, there were *eleven*, it was deemed unnecessary in his case to proceed further with the "exercise." But when, on the following Sabbath, by which time his character and office had been discovered, in Rutherford's pulpit he preached from the text: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, as I have loved you,"³ it was felt that he was not only

¹ Dr. S. Cox.

² Dean Stanley's "Lectures on the Church of Scotland."

³ John xiii. 34.

exhibiting in his own person and conduct a beautiful illustration of the spirit of the Gospel, but also suggesting, by his answer on the preceding night, a profound thought on the connexion of the Old Testament morality with the New. To the Divine summary and practical enforcement of moral truth as delivered to Moses our Lord has added an equally authoritative summary and enforcement of the higher morality which He taught in the words of the "Eleventh Commandment."

The Hebrew Decalogue, then, and along with it the entire moral law, as explained, exemplified, and fulfilled in Christ, occupies a Divinely appointed place in the modern Church, although not in all respects the same place as that which it held under the older dispensation. It is no longer at the footstool of the Mercy-seat, hidden away in the ark of the testimony, but reflected by the Gospels in the life, character, and work of Him who occupies the throne. The law fulfilled is no longer our dread, but our boast and our joy. It is no longer written on tables of stone, but has been engraven by the Spirit's teaching on the fleshly tables of the heart. It is no longer obeyed from fear, or from motives of reward, but from gratitude and overflowing affection. And, above all, it is no longer to be taught as a mere system of ethics distinct from and preparatory to our spiritual life and work, but as merged into and blended with that all-comprehensive, perfect, and Divine legislation: "The truth as it is in Jesus." As the rain-filled streams and rills of highland ridges centre in the mountain lake that forms the reservoir from which the inhabitants of our great cities draw their daily supply, so all types, emblems, rites, codes of moral and spiritual enactments, all forms of truth in the Old Testament pointed and led up to Him who was the Living Truth, out of whose fulness we all receive grace upon grace. It is in, and through, the spirit of Christ's life and teaching

in the Gospels, that we who live in the Christian ages must study the Decalogue :

“Talk they of morals ? O thou bleeding Love !
Thou Maker of new morals to mankind !
The grand morality is love of Thee.”¹

In Christ all fulness dwells. He is our model in ethics as well as spiritualities. To Him all forms and customs are subordinated. Before Him every knee must bow. By Him all our domestic, civil, political, moral, and religious obligations are hallowed ; so that whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we must do all to his glory. Those who love Him will keep his commandments. Moses and Elijah were but his forerunners ; this is the beloved Son, let us hear Him.

R. BALGARNIE.

BRIEF NOTICES.

In *MICAH, with Notes and Introduction*, by Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M.A. (London : Cambridge Warehouse), the new volume of THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS, the author of our best commentary on Isaiah does not appear at his best. The picturesque element in the character and words of the Morasthite is not brought out, as surely it should have been in an exposition intended for the use of the young, who indeed would gain a far more vivid conception of the man and his work from Robertson Smith's *Prophets of Israel*, although that can hardly be reckoned a book for virgins and lads. Nor does Mr. Cheyne, in our judgment, meet, as he is very capable of doing, the wants of more advanced and experienced students of the Prophecy. As an instance of the former defect we may take his treatment of the opening verses of Chapter vi., where it

¹ Young.