

But . . . the verb may also be merely mental (e.g., Prov. 6:25), so that one wonders whether the actional interpretation does not arise out of misplaced legalism, i.e., the wish to define the prohibition in terms amenable to law enforcement. Since D expressly substitutes hitavvah (hit'awwah, "desire") for hamad in the second sentence, it clearly regarded the injunction as banning guilty desires.

D. Arrangement of the Decalogue

Gustave Oehler states:

The Old Testament does not expressly tell us how the commandments were divided between the two tables. If the third of the division given above is correct (Philo, Origen, the Reformed and the Greek church), it is most likely that five precepts are to be assigned to each table, as is assumed by Philo (l.c.) and Josephus (Ant. 3. 6) . . . Another view, which is that of Calvin (Inst. 2. 8. 12), followed by the Reformed Church, puts four precepts on the first table, and six, commencing with the command to honor parents, upon the second. The followers of the Augustinian division generally agree in beginning the second table with the last-mentioned precept, assigning three commandments to the first table and seven to the second. . . .

The division of the Decalogue, on the Philonic arrangement, which we accept, is the following: -- In the first table, the first commandment expresses the principle of monotheism, and forbids a plurality of gods. The second, in forbidding the use of any image in the worship of the Deity, abolishes the deification of nature in any sense. The third ("Thou shalt not take up, apply, the name of Jehovah thy God to vanity") demands reverence to God in life and walk as a whole, by forbidding the most obvious and frequent breach of this duty, the profanation of God's name by false swearing (cf. Lev. 19:12) or other misuse. The fourth commandment lays the basis of the ordinances of worship, by appointing the Sabbath. The fifth, the command to honor parents, lays the foundation of all social ordinances of life. The second table, which defines duties to neighbors, is obviously based on the common Old Testament trilogy of hand, mouth, heart (cf. e.g. Ps. 24:4). It first attacks sins in deed, -- injuries to the life, wedded state, or property of a neighbor; and then sins in word, -- injury to a neighbor's good name by false testimony or lies. Finally, since the last commandment forbids even to covet what belongs to another, it is made clear that the obedience demanded is that of the heart . . . (pp. 188-189)

Encyclopedia Judaica states:

Structure and Arrangement. A dual structure can be seen in the Decalogue: items one through four deal with man's relation to God; six through ten with man's relation to man; and the fifth, with relation to parents, forming a bridge between the two (Philo). . . .

While the biblical text gives no indication of how the "words" were distributed on the tablets, it is commonly assumed that they stood five over against five. An ingenious homily based on this assumption correlates the "words" opposite each other on the tablets thus: Murder is an injury to God whose image man is--apostasy