

- RS1 29/7 "legal system grew"
- RS5 27/4-5 appears continuous from single source, but "evidence" of several documents assumed
- RS5 46/2-3 continuous narrative from time of Abram on
- 6-2 U 226/4
U² 230/8 . . . often difficult to reconstruct the E narrative as a continuous account
- 6-1 U 166/6
U² 172/4 the Yahwist material stands out sharply enough from the surrounding material for us to read it as a continuous narrative
- 6-1 K 70/9 J forms a continuous, connected series of stories
- OE 180/1 if the individual parts reveal continuity and progress, they thereby reveal themselves to be parts of narrative works
- K 55/10 attempts made in past to trace narrative as continuous thread through Joshua down to end of 2 Kings have been gradually abandoned in recent times
- JB 85/10ff
86/1 As in the case of the Yahwist it is doubtful whether the Elohists' strand continued beyond Numbers. Scholars are currently much divided in this matter. One thing is certain: the editing of the Books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel is of a different nature than that of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers. Much that was formerly assigned to the Elohist can perhaps be attributed to the Deuteronomist.
- U²
U 180/5
K/70/9 *J is continuous epic*
6-1 The whole (Yahwist account) - from creation to the final settlement east of Jordan - forms a continuous, connected series of stories. Because the individual stories do not fit together well from a literary point of view, attempts have been made to divide J up into various subsidiary sources.
- K/71/10 After listing conflicting views by scholars on the unity of J, Kuhl concludes "Nevertheless we still consider it more probable that one author, using a single thread, strung the stories together as fixed component parts."
- K 71/4 For a time it was customary to regard the title "Yahwist" as a collective name for a group which was said to have edited the work. But the basic idea is so consistent throughout the document that a single author seems a more probable assumption than a group of editors.
- 6-2 AW 138/2 ". . . but taken as a whole, the reasons for a division into continuous sources are insufficient. (See context. Said with ref. to Von Rad's attempt to dissect the Priestly writing into sources)
- OE 181 On the other hand, the P section of Gen. 6.5-9.19 . . . reveals itself quite clearly as the continuation of the first creation narrative Gen. 1.1-2.4a, as may be seen by the reference back (7.11; 9.1-7) both to the driving back of the primeval waters there described (1.6-10) and also to the food commands there set forth (1.29-30).

P skips from Gen. 17.27 to 19.29 --- a striking instance of lack of continuous document.