

2. Statements from any critical books that a particular document is not preserved in its entirety.

Exodus file. Wright, G.E., "Exodus" IDB We do not know E as a complete source but mainly as a supplementation of J, and Frank M. Cross, Jr. has argued persuasively that P can no longer be proved to be anything more than an editing and supplementing of JE.

Kuhl, 73/2 A further point to note is that in general it [E] is preserved only in the form of short supplements and additions to the text of the Yahwist, and where it does contain whole narratives it presents them not (like J and P) in a continuous sequence but as independent, single stories.

Kuhl, 75/6 This summary of the contents shows how scant is the flow of the sources where the Elohist is concerned. Not much in the Pentateuch is ascribed to it, and the little that has been handed down to us is but an accumulation of unrelated fragments. Because of its sparse and fragmentary nature, some have felt inclined to deny the writer the character of a narrator at all. And one must admit that in the condition in which it has been transmitted E can never have existed as an independent source. That, however, does not mean that what is available to us is the whole Elohist as it was written. On the contrary, we should rather consider that it was originally one large and complete record as is indicated by the fairly long and coherent sections in the Joseph story.

Kuhl, 76 Because the Elohist material transmitted to us is so limited and incomplete, it is necessary to be very cautious in making generalisations: . . .

U2 230/8 Since the Pentateuch is based primarily on the Yahwist's epic, it is often difficult to reconstruct the E narrative as a continuous account. . . Nevertheless, what is left of this tradition . . . stands out sharply enough for us to get some idea of its distinctive character.

WH, 37 P's continuation of the story is not preserved, but apparently it followed the lines of the older narratives, . . .

Kuhl, 71 The fact that there are still gaps and slight discrepancies within the individual stories is due to the transmission of the completed work: more than once we find evidence of later extensions and amplifications to the text.

Bewer 3rd, 85-6 As in the case of the Yahwist it is doubtful whether the Elohist's strand continued beyond Numbers. Scholars are currently much divided in this matter . . . Much that was formerly assigned to the Elohist can perhaps be attributed to the Deuteronomist.

XI-22 Guthrie, 159 Scholars are not agreed on the question of how far J continued his narrative." See N. H. Snaith in The O.T. and Mod. Study (ed. Rowley) pp.84-105

XI-37 IDB, "Pent." 714 While scholarly agreement on the scope of J and E has never been reached, and end points for both have been fixed all the way from the end of Numbers on into Samuel and Kings, it is likely that the end point is determined roughly by the date of the writer.

Fohrer, IOT, 182/4 ((P's continuity interrupted  
183/3 P not to be understood as a literary unity, but as a literary composite.