(1. from previous page- That the Deuteronomist recognizes a second 40 days' stay of Moses on Sinai, shows that he understands Exed. 34 to be in its present place. About the Decalogue in Exed. 34, good or bad, he must be silent.)

Besides, if Yahweh wrete the tablets with his finger, this means he doesn't need Moses to hew them out and to bring them along; and as opposed, if Moses made the tablets, he should also make the writing. And did Yahweh somehow chisel the ten commandments in stone over 40 days? while Moses must look on, and still in zeal forget to eat and to drink? Moreover, the necessity of letting 34.4 go with vs.l and taking it out of the coherence is no recommendation for Kuenen's criticism. Because this verse (4) is indispensible for vs.5 and doesn't allow itself to be ripped out.

After all of this, it appears to me completely abortive to attempt to take vss 1,4, and 28 from ch.34. It is apparent that if one allows these verses to stand, it is necessary to see that the redactor has erected the bridge which travels from chs 32 and 33 to ch.34 by the insertion of vs.lb and of Δ'JwL'D in vss. la and 4. conclusion so unacceptable and improbable that it, in any case, must be shunned? It is much more close (to the truth). If ch.34 is surely set in connection with the foregoing, the once-again-appearing ten must necessarily commandments on the tablets be independent on the earlier; because a double Decalogue, a double two-tablet law is impossible. The redactor, therefore, gives the two-tablet law of Exod. 34 as a replacement for the earlier ones which had been broken; according to an often used recipe (Joshua 5.2, I Samuel 11.14). If this shouldn't be valid, then the whole

criticism of the narrative books of the Old Testament isn't valid;

(3. Also the change from 7293) in vs.1 into 722 53) can be ascribed to

the redactor. In vs. 4, he has perhaps written the entire sentence on account of the loss of the article of the second 27,32,577