

also appears to make the covenant in the name of the people, although that is not completely clear anymore. As concerns the narratives' appropriate theocratic basic laws, Exod.20 and Exod.34 stand in glaring contradiction to one another; in the former the commandments are almost only moral, but in the latter exclusively ritual. The Covenant Code, whose laws are characteristic of itself, joins elements of each type in its words. Regarding the cult, it stands at the same stage as Exod. 34, however, the ethic is more concrete and more casuistic than in Exod.20, and of a striking human, and a nobly natural attitude.

96?

Finally, a word about the probable progress of the narrative of Q. Besides the great legal sections, which we separated at the beginning, there also appear to be some smaller sections which belong to this source, which do not fall under the coherence of JE. By all means 19.1,2a, but however is not an addendum belonging to the original elements, not being an entirely complete statement of the exact reference to time in the sense of Q; cf. similarly, I Samuel 13.1, II Samuel 2.10. Perhaps the intended day is actually the 50th after the 15. Nisan, therefore about the 7th of the third month, which the Rabbinic tradition accepts. What follows the athnah in 19.2 belongs to JE, since Q doesn't say ויהי שרצו? - Nöldeke surmises further a fragment of Q in 24.14-18; so much I view with correctness. However, the beginning of vs. 15 ויעל ס' אל ההר is excluded, and the end of vs. 18 from ויעל אל ההר on. Finally, I believe 34.29-35 may be ascribed to this writing, if vss. 33-35 at the same time is probably an apocryphal appendage. cf. והיה וכל בני ישראל and

the last of the two of the covenant were solemnly...
 and as...
 of the... of Yerah...