

The beautiful verses, 23.4,5, break up the material coherence of vss. 1-3 and vss.6-9 and are probably inserted. Finally, I would like to doubt whether it suits the original arrangement that a part of the words precedes the ordinances and a part follows them- by nature the ius (civil law) as well as the fas (divine law) together, 20.24-26 with 22.17ff. One may<sup>t</sup> maintain that if one doesn't want to make any great demands for the redaction of an eastern law book, which is certainly not confused in this case. The solemn conclusion of the entirety in 23.20-33 certainly doesn't belong to the codex itself, and however, is in any case not the activity of the Jehovist, but stems from J and makes the book of the law only adaptable for <sup>5772 730</sup>. Only two larger insertions has the Jehovist allowed himself. First, in vss. 31b,32,33. These verses are a correction of vss. 28-30 and stand in a similar contradiction to them, as Judges 3.1,2 to 2.2,3. It is especially worthy of note that in antithesis to vss. 31b-33 Yahweh is the subject of <sup>77</sup> in vss. 28-30: this stands only in his power and not in that of the Israelites, and can therefore neither be required of them as a duty nor be reckoned in oversight (default) as guilt. The second insertion is vss. 22b-25a. Because there is no place for the command in this promise, and by the insertion of the same it is completely forgotten that the sentences in vss. 26ff do not have purpose here as categorical, but only as conditional expressions, as apodoses to 22a. As to the contents of vss. 23-25 nothing is lost; the usual usages of the Jehovist are there.

<sup>91<sup>5</sup></sup> More important for the completion of the critical analysis but also more difficult is to ascertain the reviser in the historical sections.