

they are sent away, and as a heavy punishment it is also penitently

received by them. However, their sadness doesn't effect any change of the outcome, but only a substitution of his true presence does Yahweh share with them, which is the tabernacle in Ohel Moed (i.e. the tent of meeting). Undoubtedly, the erection of the ~~ark~~^{ark} and of the tent- which without it would have no other reason (meaning)- once was narrated between 33.6 and 33.7, since presently a very apparent gap exists between both these verses. One doesn't know what the jewelry in vs. 6 is related to, and when it is only shown in ch.35, one doesn't know from where the tent in vs. 7 suddenly appears. Since the description of the sanctuary is communicated in extensu from Q, thus the reason for the gap is clear. Therefore, if the erection of the ~~tabernacle~~^{ark} had actually stood here (1. Whether the ~~tabernacle~~^{ark} according to the intention of our narrator, contained new tables of the law, or whether the same broken ones remained, cannot be determined. It seem more probable to me that the latter is correct), thus this is transfered at this place and point in time, because the true symbol would be set in opposition to the false. By the idol that they made for themselves, the Israelites have given the proof that they are not ready for the immediate nearness of Divinity, and since they couldn't be managed without a purposeful representation of the same (i.e. the Divinity), Yahweh gave them the ~~tabernacle~~^{ark} instead of the calf. Also one sees from that, that to both the same material, the absconded jewelry, is related, so that such an antithesis of the self-chosen and the God-given sanctuary is intended.

937 The exact and internal connection in which the command for leaving and the erection of the true sanctuary stand to the narrative of the golden calf is usually not understood. And that is no surprise. Because