

decidedly closer occasion, is the practical consequence drawn. After that, the correctness of the present placement of the first sentence of 2.23 is to be contested (cf. LXX 4.19), since quite possibly the Jehovist has allowed the inversion for J's sake. The hand of the Jehovist is in any case evident by the placement of the last sentence of 4.20, which does not belong to J, but to E, and similarly perhaps in some expressions of speech in vss. 22f- whatever concerns 4.27-31, the pragmatic connection of this section in its present position can not be denied. Plainly vs. 29-30 stem from J, on account of the retrospective to 3.16 and on account of vs. 30: he did the signs before the people. On the other hand, vs. 27 is not connected to J in vss. 18, 20, 24-26, because in these verses, Moses should already meet Aaron again on the mountain of God. What should one do? Should one assign vs. 27 to E? As to that, vss. 27-31 are too smooth and complete. I believe that Aaron is inserted by the Jehovist, just as in JE in chs. 7-10- even if it is based on E- and has similarly attested an earlier presence for Moses on Horeb. In J Moses has spoken to the people and has done signs- that demands 4.1-9 (I. better perhaps 4.1-12, because vs. 10-12 is strongly separated from vs. 13ff, so that vss. 10-12 should better be considered belonging to the foregoing (to J)). The Yahwist knows nothing of Moses lack of speaking ability, and he even allows him to discharge this duty - before Pharaoh in chs. 7-11. Also in 5.1ff, the plural subject is not originally Moses and Aaron, but according to 3.18 cf. with 5.3, it is necessarily Moses and the elders.

72² 5.1-6 is probably is entirely taken from J, cf. vs. 3 with 3.18, 8.23, 7.16, 9.1, 19, 10.3) and the $\Delta^7 \psi \lambda \gamma$ (as opposed to 1.11). In vs. 8 $\sigma \tau \lambda \sigma \sigma \tau \lambda \sigma$ as opposed to $\gamma \sigma \sigma \tau \lambda$ (v. 18) catches our attention, and here and there an abundance of speech, e.g. vss. 4, 5.