

point I would ask what section of the Pentateuch, of what we have previously looked at, would be most apt to bear a similarity to this section? Of course we glanced at the Book of the Covenant, the Ten Commandments and the Covenant ratified. Between those two would be the principles of the constitution. Chapter 24 would be the ratification of those principles. There are those who say that chapter 34 represents an earlier story of the Covenant between God and the people. You compare the two and see the differences and know how to develop from the simple to the complex and note the development in the document. Suppose you find that there the Covenant is in a simpler form than chapter 34 and that it is somewhat fuller in chapter 20. It is a natural arrangement: they give the Covenant; they set it down so the people will know what God's relation to them is and what He wants them to do. But then, after they had prayed to the golden calf, it is not necessary to repeat it all but to stress certain aspects of it as they renew it and to summarize it, and consequently you might say that in this one chapter you have reviewed all that you had from chapter 19 to 24. Here you have a renewal which does not need to be nearly as full but which can have many similarities to it. It was the great German poet who in studying the book of Exodus, advanced the suggestion that chapter 34 is the original and that chapter 20 had the original commandments in the simple primitive form which has such themes as "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk" and other terms like that which, he said, are the real original ten commandments. And also, that these have been somewhat enlarged and made more spiritual in the form which we have in Exodus 20 as a later development. Many critics hold this view, although many others deny it. It is not basic to the higher criticism, but it is typical of much of the higher criticism. It is important to know its contents, since the Pentateuch has such an important place in the Scripture. It is certainly wrong for Christians just to know the story and nothing else: i.e., just to know the incidents and not to know anything about the law or about its real structure and how it fits together to make one production with vital meaning at the beginning of the Bible.

It is vital for us to know something about its divisions. The divisions I am giving you are not inspired. You will find them given differently in other books, and you may like the arrangement given in some