

tic rather than Yahwistic, cf. $\text{D}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$ and $\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$ in vs.11 with 18.21, especially vs.11 with 18.12.

89³ 4. Both reports which we have even attempted to separate in large passages, are now greatly revised by the Jehovist. I will next show that for the legal section in Ex. 19-23. Some places of the Decalogue are colored in a Deuteronomic fashion, thus $\text{T}^{\prime}\text{T}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$ in vs.10, $\text{D}^{\prime}\text{T}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$ in vs.2, and vs.6 entirely (especially noticeable is $\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$). There has therefore probably been ^a backflow of Deut.5 into Ex.20: the Jehovist (?) has inserted Deuteronomic statements. The motivation of the Sabbath command in vs.11 only comes from the last redactor of the Pentateuch, who has bound Q and JE together. Because, it is borrowed from Q, i.e. from the source from which Ex.20 in any case does not stem; it has certainly not been viewed beforehand by the author of Deut., since the latter probably inserted something into the text of the ten commandments, but did not allow an ellipsis (I permit myself to think that the apriori and consequent precedence of the Exodus text is incomprehensible. The H^{\prime} before $\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$ in vs.4 is false, since $\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$ connects to $\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$, and this word, a genitive for the previous construct, means nothing, which would have to be coordinated with $\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$. In vs.15 $\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$ is mere explanation of $\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$, also $\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}\text{H}^{\prime}$ in vs.7 occurs in this sense.). In the Covenant Code the ordinances, which extend from 21.11 to 22.16 and are easily distinguished materially and formally as conditional sentences, seem to be contained entirely intact. The same is not true of the words (24.3). The presentation is very peculiar that while everywhere else the singular Thou is used in the address, in the section 22.17-30 ~~the~~ single You^(plural) emerges and even in a very abrupt