ether than that assigned to Q (which does not show an artistic entirety of unitary conception), JE stands opposite in unity, with similar expressions, representations, legal institution throughout. With this, we can be content beforehand.

JE. If the former has chiefly J at its base, the latter has E. For 10.29 and 11.8 expressly said Moses would not appear before Pharach again, but Pharach in 12.31 troubled himself along with his servants in contradiction to this by calling Moses and Aaron. To E also belong the expression, at least of vs.31, cf. vs.32 with 10.24,9; beyond that D771% and 710 in vs.37, finally, 10772 for which J simply says 2007 in vss.31,35,37. J is also used in vs.29f; in vs.30a the enset is begun for Pharach and his servant to allow Moses "to depart."

The direct connection of 12.29 to 11.8 shows that 12.21-27, if it generally belongs to JE, yet, in any case, it is a more recent addition to the narrative of the more ancient sources. The same conclusion is arrived at, whene here (as in Q) the exemption of Israel from the angel of destruction is considered with the feast celebration as the main factor. In J and E it would not be thought that the plague could have hit Israel (1. According to J, Israel didn't even live among the Egyptians, but for themselves in the land of Goshen. The concluding statement in 12.22 does not fit in with the former presuppositions, but rather with Num.33.37097 577700.), but it seemed self-evident and based upon no further condition, as a connected presupposition, that "Ged makes a distinction," and all the emphasis rests upon the deadly blow of the strong hand; this blow and not the exemption from it is Similarly, 13.3-16. Nevertheless, this last section does not celebrated. belong to the eldest permanency of JE, travels back, just like 12.21-27,