

with the exception of the break (gap) which the last redactor of the Pentateuch with regard to Q has broken in 33.6,7 in the coherence of JE, the Jehovist has also accomplished his own in obliterating the original intention of the continuation of ch.32. Less from the fact that he has worked in fragments from J (2. In so far as 33.1-11 continues ch.32 it stems from E where Horeb, as perhaps in the kingdom of Israel in especially I. Kings 19, serves as the mountain of God par excellence; cf. "772) in vss. 5,6. In J, the departure from Sinai comes immediately with the giving of the law in 23.20ff, and in no way serves as a punishment, since the land, where milk and honey flow, from the beginning is the purpose of the trip. Naturally, however, the command to depart has also been present in J, and I surmise that parts of it have been contained in the Jehovist revision in 33.1,2, vs.3 (to the Athnah); because when Yahweh says: lead the people into a land where milk and honey flow, that is not expressed in anger, and is not hard language. What may have stood in E here, one can derive somewhat from 32.34. As a continuation of J in 33.1,3a, one can view vss. 12, 14: vs. 12 rebounds (returns) to vs.1. Certainly J has also known the ~~tabernacle~~<sup>ark</sup> and reported its erection; whether also the tent is another question. - Joshua as a temple guard reminds one completely of Samuel, who slept in the house of God; the tent stood outside the ~~tabernacle~~<sup>ark</sup>, as the more ancient sanctuaries outside the cities. In Q inside, as the temple in Jerusalem.), than the fact he has inserted inserted the two part conversation of 33.12-23 between Ex.33.1-11 and the immediate<sup>ly</sup> attached section in Numbers 10.33ff, once the appendix of ch.34. Because this is essentially his composition, he also may have borrowed some motives from J for the first parts. With