

completely incomprehensible; because it cannot be thought that vs.29 could be the postscript of vs.25. One must therefore explain the entire section of vss. 21-29 as an insertion (addendum). Internal reasons don't actually exist for that, because if "the narrative of the golden calf has no other meaning than that of decisively condemning the official cult of the kingdom of Ephraim," then one needs to take offense in this prefiguration of later relationships probably also in the Levites as zealots for the ancient, simple service of God, although to be sure the antithesis of Aaron and Levi is strange to some extent. Still other judgments, <sup>could</sup> excite suspicion towards vss. 21-29. Viz. the verses 30-35 know nothing of the apostasy being punished in such horrible way (vs.28), and likewise vs.20 allows itself to expect another continuation than that in vss. 21ff; one would wish to know how the drink was received by the people. However, such an assertion is not contained in vss. 30-34, and only vs.35, which in its present place stands completely lost in any case, the consequence of vs.20 is not improper. By this one is finally driven to also maintaining that vss. 30-34 is a supplement, although more ancient than that in vss. 7-14 and vss. 21-29. The internal nature of the contents of this verse doesn't argue against this conclusion, but only raises the thought that then much too little remains for the original report of the source (32.1-6, 15-21,35).

92<sup>r</sup> Ch.33 continues the previous account and in the following way.

The golden calf is the reason why God can no longer tolerate the Israelites in his immediate vicinity. Sinai is thought of here as the actual dwelling <sup>of</sup> God (cf. 19.4 <sup>75x</sup> אֲנִי אֶשְׁכֶּנֶת בְּאֶרְצְךָ), and the stay of the people itself is not presented here as previously as a period of time of short duration, but as a durative. It is a punishment that