

After Yahweh has spoken the appropriate commandments, it reads in the immediate conclusion to that in vss 27f: "And Yahweh spoke to Moses: write down these commandments...and he was with Yahweh 40 days and 40 nights and he wrote the ten commandments upon the tablets." Therefore, Moses receives the command, i.e. to write down the previously communicated commandments, and he completes the same when he writes the ten commandments on the tablets. One must understand it this way, if he reads vss 27 and 28 after one another. Kuenen, however, takes vss 1,4, and 28 out of Exod. 34 and sees the conclusion of the Decalogue narrative of Exod. 19-33 (E), by which vs. 28 doesn't connect with vs. 27 but rather with vs.1. "Yahweh spoke to Moses: make two tablets of stone like the first, and I will write on the tablets those which stood on the first tablets which you broke (vs.1). And he hew two tablets of stone like the first, and Moses got up early in the morning and climbed the mountain of Sinai, as Yahweh had commanded him, and he took the two tablets of stone with him (vs.4). And he was there with Yahweh 40 days and 40 nights, didn't eat nor drink water, and he wrote the ten commandments on the tablets (vs.28). Therefore, Kuenen reaches (the conclusion) that the ten commandments of vs.28, which were written on the tablets, were not the commandments of vs.27, i.e. the commandments of vss 14-26, and that the subject of "he wrote" in vs.28 can necessarily be seen as "Yahweh."

331^f

If Kuenen is very sure of his idea, his criticism appears impossible to me. I don't yet comprehend how 34.1,4,28 should form the end to chs.32 and 33 (E). It is surely not necessary that the restoration of the broken tablets should be narrated in E. However, if it did happen, it would have to occur at the introduction of the tabernacle between 33.6 and 33.7. At the conclusion of ch.33 nothing else follows other