

Nachträge- Exod. 19-34

329¹⁰

With my presentation of the Decalogue narrative, i.e. of the historical connection, in which the ten commandments of Exod. 20 have stood originally (E), Kuenen (Theol. Tijdschrift 1881 p.164ff) is essentially agreed. The most important change which he introduces is that he takes Exod. 20.18-21 into account, and he transposes it in back of 19.15-19. This is a thoroughly intelligible improvement.

330²

Kuenen also agrees that the so-called Covenant Code has nothing to do with the Decalogue narrative. He goes a step further than I, however, and denies that the same really had a place here in the coherence of one of the narratives of JE. Indeed, the corpus explodes the historical boundaries, and only by artificiality does one succeed in binding it with Exod. 19.20-25 and 24.1,2,9-11.

330⁴

When the Covenant Code does ^{not} belong to J, at least not at this point of J, then Exod. 34 is allowed the place, which I had given to it.

330⁵

My investigation has confirmed a well-known observation of the young Goethe (1. The Young Goethe 2. 230ff (Hirzel, 1875). Cf. B.G. Niebuhr in Dora Hensler 1.493). We have in Exod. 34 another Decalogue on two tablets in a narrative, which begins and ends similarly to that in Exod. 20, with a forty day stay of Moses with Jahweh on Sinai after receiving the 10 commandments. Kuenen employs this conclusion in part, and in part he rejects it. He admits that an independent reports of the making of the covenant, a complete and unquestionable parallel to Exod. 19, is contained in Exod. 34, but he denies that the the parallel reaches to Exod. 20. At all events, he denies that the communicated commandments in Exod. 34 are actually the Decalogue on two tablets.

330⁷

One should think that is not unclear to read in vss 27 and 28.