

tion from the commandments, which God gives immediately or allows through means (mediator). The further continuation would then be 24.3-8, the necessary conclusion of the Covenant Code in chs.21-23. This section is ordinarily assigned to #1 and after that, therefore, 19.10-19, chs. 20-23, and 24.3-8 are seen as one coherence. However, two thoughts raise themselves against this. The section 24.3-8 cannot on the one hand be set in connection with the Decalogue, but on the other hand, it is closely connected with chs.21-23. To this (Decalogue), the people do not pledge themselves, but only to that which Moses has made known to them and has written down in vss. 3 and 4. Although the words of Yahweh are distinguished from the laws (ordinances), still the <sup>דברים 7:10</sup> cannot be understood following ch.20 where the Decalogue has already been publicized in such an impressive way- on the other hand, it is unnatural if not impossible that if this (Decalogue) were present, it would not have been sworn to. Since it is also expressly presented in vss. 3f and 7 that all the previous given words and ordinances of Yahweh have been shared with the Israelites and have <sup>been</sup> recognized solemnly by them, so the single conclusion remains that 24.3-8 does not recognize the Decalogue. Secondly, the thought raises itself against the origin of the same writing with that of the ten commandments and the Covenant Code that the narrative of the golden calf (and its preparation in 24.12-15), which is certainly not the continuation of 24.3-8 (1. Much more is 24.1,2,9-11, which has nothing to do with vss. 3-8 and the Covenant Code, set in connection with 24.12ff, therefore also with ch.32. Cf. pp. 88f remarks) and which has nothing to do with the Covenant Code, seems to be Elohist in regard to its basis and to presuppose similarly the Elohist