

than the departure from Sinai (l. see above pp 93f, 96. Clem. Recogn. I,36,Aphhr.318f should also be added to the Patristic citations (quotations) on p.98).

331⁷ If Kuenen was correct, the redactor would have disconnected vs.28 from vss 1 and 4 and placed it behind vs.27, giving the impression on his side that the commandments of 34.14ff were the commandments written on the two tables. Since he didn't count naturally on the understanding to be gained through purposeful separation of the sources, ^{this} makes such (a suggestion) much more impossible, as far as it lies from him, and requires that one accepts the coherence which is constructed by him, in this case vs.28 should be connected with vs. 27. Instead of harmonization, therefore, the redactor has here himself corrected the worst contradiction that appears in the Old Testament.

331⁹ Kuenen is further forced to the conclusion that the same narrative by the same author twice in row records Moses' 40 days and 40 nights with Jahweh (24.18+31.18 ~~parallel~~ 34.28). However, this second 40 days' stay of Moses with Jahweh on Sinai is just as offensive in the same source as Kuenen's second discovered preparation for it (ch.19 parallel ch.34 init.). Only as the welding together of two parallel reports do these dublettes become comprehensible; they are highly improbable as the repeated passage of an original narrative and in any case, they are completely unpleasant on the basis of such an enormous division as Kuenen makes to separate vs.28 from vs.27. ^{l. - see next page.}

332³ My thoughts are not yet exhausted. In Kuenen vs.27 stands in the air, and the command 257D has no completion. The subject change of 257D in vs.28 is very difficult, and above all, very imprudent; if anywhere, the explanation is forbidden here, and the reader isn't left with the error that Moses, as previously, is not the subject of 257D. (2. One compares in 31.18, 32.16 how expressly God is said to have written the tablets with his finger.)