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Continuity between the Gaps
The Pentateuch and the Kirta Epic

Joel S. Baden

In discussions of certain older, and recently rehabilitated, theories of the Pentateuch’s literary history, one often encounters the same criticisms, whether one reads older anticritical tracts or contemporary alternative presentations. Many of these criticisms fall into the category that might be called perfectionist. That is to say, it is frequently suggested that in order for a documentary theory to hold water it must be flawless; one hole, one gap, in any of the purported sources or in the explanation for their existence and compilation, any place where the present text is difficult to explain, and the entire theory will drain away.¹

The logical impetus behind such criticisms is easy enough to see. As one graduate student in a European doctoral program said to me recently, “I’d just prefer a theory that can explain every single word over one that doesn’t.” This is, naturally, hard to argue with. Nevertheless, it might be cautiously suggested that a theory that can indeed explain every single word of the present text is probably a bit overly optimistic about our scholarly ability to reconstruct the complete process of composition. Which is not to say that we can rest content with the mere recognition of areas in the text that are difficult, if not in fact impossible, to explain; it is, rather, that a few of them, here and there, do not necessarily shake the foundations of any given hypothesis. They are reminders that we are dealing with what must have been a historically messy literary project and that perfection of explanation, like perfection of transmission, is probably too much to ask.

¹ From the older critics, see especially W. H. Green, The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1902), 84: “The great body of the Elohim passages are given to the second Elohist [E], and nothing reserved for the first [P] but occasional disconnected scraps, which never could have formed a separate and independent record.” See also his broader comments on 106–9. More recently, Rolf Rendtorff made the same arguments, that the discontinuous state of the Priestly narrative is grounds for declaring untenable the theory that it was an independent document, beginning with this a priori definition of how P must function in a sustainable documentary framework: “It is important that the document being discussed is a coherent P narrative with but few gaps” (R. Rendtorff, The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch [JSOTSup 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1977], 137). His discussion continues, in great detail, exclusively along the lines of discontinuity within the P narrative, for the next twenty pages.
One of the places where that sort of perfectionism comes into play is in the assessment of the reconstructed sources. Unquestionably with regard to E, but also to a degree with regard to J – and, it must be admitted, in a few places with P as well, though the implications of this are rarely considered anymore – when the reconstructed sources of the Documentary Hypothesis are set forth, they have gaps, often significant ones. And these gaps are taken, and have been taken for generations now, as evidence against the existence of the source in question. What is E without a beginning? How can J lack any account of Moses’s birth or origin? Lack of narrative continuity – gaps – becomes the defining feature of nontexts. If something expected or required is missing, then we have not a text unto itself but a fragment, or a layer, or an insertion, or anything, really, other than a self-standing composition.

Although we are thankfully past this in the present discussion, one could point, as an example, to Frank Cross’s famous opinion regarding P’s redactional, rather than independent, nature: since P has no covenant at Sinai, and Cross could simply not imagine a narrative without such a covenant, P must have a hole in its narrative and therefore must be redactional. It is now recognized that it is actually quite acceptable for P not to have a covenant at Sinai, even as an independent text, and that Cross was reading the canonical text back into his reconstructed source, which is methodologically problematic. (Those who long for a formal introduction for Moses in J, it might be suggested, are potentially falling into a similar trap.)

Part of the issue, then, is the question of what constitutes a real gap. It cannot be merely the lack of something that I, as a reader, expect to find – whether on the basis of some other similar story, or on the basis of the canonical text, or on the basis of my own aesthetic judgment. I might desperately want to know where Moses comes from in J – who his parents are, what his birth story is, etc. – but I cannot fault the author of J for not providing that information for me. At least, I cannot fault him to the point of denying his existence because I happen not to care for his literary choices.

---

2 See the comments in the previous note, which are directed at P.
3 Already a sticking point for GREEN, Higher Criticism (see n. 1), 84.
4 A question leveled more than once against P, in fact; see RENDTÖRF, Problem (see n. 1), 157; E. BLUM, Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 231; J. L. SKA, Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 147.
7 This does happen, however, with dismaying frequency in scholarship: the aesthetic literary judgments of the scholar are used as evidence for or against the very possibility that anyone could ever have written such a thing in such a way. See, for example, the comments of Marc
A true gap, rather, is the absence of information that is absolutely necessary for the narrative to get from point A to point C. There are certainly such gaps in the reconstructed sources of the documentary theory. The J source is missing the beginning of the spies story; it jumps straight from the conclusion of the Kibroth-hatta’avah episode to Moses telling “them” to go up to the Negev. P is missing the account of the births of Jacob and Esau; it jumps straight from the notice that Isaac was forty when he married Rebekah to the notice that Isaac was sixty when “they” were born. These sorts of relatively minor gaps are not usually too much of a problem, even for critics of the documentary approach. Under almost any theory such missing pieces can be accounted for by recourse to minor redactional intervention. Still, they are gaps.

More substantial, of course, are the gaps in what we call E. The E source, for example, is missing the entire account of Moses’s encounter with Pharaoh; it jumps from God’s revelation to Moses and instructions regarding his mission straight to the release of the Israelites. E has no beginning to speak of: whether one thinks that E begins in Gen 20 or Gen 15, neither of these could be the true beginning of the story. These gaps are serious gaps. They are so serious, in fact, that it appears highly likely – indeed, there is almost no other way to explain it

Vervenne with regard to the Priestly narrative of Exod 14: “it is not thrilling literature”; “the vocabulary is very stereotypic”; “this strand is without the effects of surprise nor does it move towards a real dénouement” (M. VERVENNE, “The ‘P’ Tradition in the Pentateuch: Document and/or Redaction? The ‘Sea Narrative’ [Ex 13,17–14,31] as a Test Case,” in Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies [ed. C. Brekelmans and Johan Lust; BETL 94; Leuven: University Press, 1990], 67–90 [here 79]).

8 The J story in Num 11 comprises vv. 1–10, the phrase “Moses said to Yahweh” in v. 11, v. 13, the phrase “Yahweh said to Moses” in v. 16, vv. 18–24a, and vv. 31–34 (see Baden, Composition [see n. 6], 82–102). The final verse of the chapter, v. 35, is a redactional insertion linking the J story of Kibroth-hatta’avah in Num 11 with the E story of Hazeroth in Num 12. The J spies story, for its part, comprises Num 13:17b–20, 22–24, the words “they went to Moses” in v. 26a, 26b–31, 33; 14:1b, 11–25, 39–45. Note that the J spies story is not necessarily lacking mention of any movement from Kibroth-hatta’avah, as that could well be the staging area for the spies’ departure in J. What is lacking is the antecedent of “them” – which means that no more is necessarily missing than a single clause such as “Moses gathered a group of men” or some such.

9 In Gen 25, the verses attributable to P are vv. 7–11a, 12–17, 19–20, 26b.

10 To E belongs Exod 4:18 and then nothing more until 11:1–3. The fundamental scholarly work that restricted the plagues cycle to two sources, rather than the three so often posited in earlier scholarship, was M. GREENBERG, Understanding Exodus (New York: Behrman House, 1969), 183–92.

11 In classical documentary scholarship, the first passage from E was largely thought to be the opening verses of Gen 15, vv. 1–6, or some section thereof. In recent years, this position has essentially been abandoned in favor of two theories that share one significant common feature but are otherwise in opposition. It is almost universally agreed now that Gen 15 is not to be divided into sources but is the work of a single hand. Many scholars believe that hand to be very late; documentary scholars tend to ascribe the chapter in its entirety to E.
within the confines of the documentary theory – that the E source was already materially discontinuous before it was combined with the other pentateuchal sources. That is, the compiler of the Pentateuch included in his work an E text that already had substantial gaps when it came into his hands.

Though this may appear to be something of a bold claim, I would suggest that objecting to the existence of E on the basis of its discontinuous nature would be a case of putting the cart before the horse. It is no one’s a priori assumption that discontinuous texts were necessarily taken up into the Pentateuch at the time of its compilation, just as (though it is often forgotten) no one ever decided in advance that there would be four documents that appear to have been interwoven. It is only after analyzing the text, and coming to the conclusion (whether one accepts it) that the evidence leads to the existence of four sources, that we begin to be able to identify the various states of each of those sources. In other words, the question of how a text could have so many gaps is not an argument against the identification of various passages as belonging together so as to constitute that text in the first place. It is a reasonable question to ask of the text once it has been identified – why is this text so gap-filled? – but it is not the basis on which the source was first identified.

The question of interest for this essay is how or whether we are able to describe as a self-standing text a group of passages that do not necessarily connect to each other perfectly. It is not, to be clear, whether we should be more tolerant of ostensible gaps in the narrative (although indeed we probably should), for instance, the manner in which the episodes in the wilderness seem at times to run into each other without any clear marker of the passage of time or space. There is comparative work to be done that would likely demonstrate that where we see a gap an ancient author or reader would not encounter any difficulty. Rather, if we start from the admission that these passages were not originally continuous, can we still speak of them as constituting an independent literary work?

We tend, as a rule, to be less tolerant of gaps in some circumstances than we are in others. Or, to put it another way, there are times when we think that gaps are perfectly acceptable, even perfectly understandable, and we have no difficulty whatsoever in speaking about a single, unified, self-standing composition

---

12 The comments of two scholars are worth repeating here. “The gapped connection of the elohistic texts is therefore not a serious argument against the existence of an E source, but merely a statement about its condition” (A. Graupner, Der Elohist: Gegenwart und Wirksamkeit des transzendenten Gottes in der Geschichte [WMANT 97; Neurkirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2002], 11; translation mine); “Fragmentary preservation of a work cannot be used as an argument about its original scope” (E. A. Speiser, Genesis [AB 1; New York: Doubleday, 1964], xxxiv).

13 It is worth pointing out here that, among the narrative problems that the documentary theory – or indeed any literary-historical theory – purports to solve, gaps are not one of them. Gaps are a feature of the canonical text that no amount of subdivision, be it into sources or layers, can ameliorate.
Continuity between the Gaps

that is, for all intents and purposes, continuous despite its patent discontinuities, despite its gaps.

The Ugaritic epic of Kirta is preserved in three tablets, none of which is complete. The first column of the first tablet is missing approximately six lines of text. In other words, we do not have the beginning of the Kirta story. What is more, we cannot be sure at all where Kirta started. Although it is widely assumed that those first six missing lines contained some basic exposition of who Kirta is, for all we know there was an entire tablet before this one.\textsuperscript{14} And, in fact, although the three tablets we now have seem to span a reasonable narrative arc from the loss of Kirta’s family to the attainment of a new one, there is nothing to mitigate against the possibility that we have here an episode of a larger original whole, the extension of which, on both ends, has been lost to us.

Between the end of the first column and the beginning of the second we are missing text: the majority of El’s speech to Kirta. As Kirta restates the content of El’s speech, in typical Ugaritic style, no one worries too much about what might have been in this gap.\textsuperscript{15} Still – it is a gap. In the middle of the fifth column of the first tablet, approximately twelve to fifteen lines are missing, about a third of the column. We know that the missing text must begin with King Pabil’s speech to his wife and that somewhere in there he stops talking to her and starts instructing the messengers he will send to Kirta. But beyond that nothing more can be said.

The transition from the first tablet to the second is deeply convoluted. The last thing we read on the first tablet is the return of the messengers to Pabil, beginning the repetition of Kirta’s reply. The first thing we read on the second tablet is apparently the departure of Pabil’s daughter Hurraya, Kirta’s new queen. This first column of the second tablet is missing around forty lines, or a full five-sixths of its content. Some of what was there can be reconstructed: the report of the messengers, for example, again following typical Ugaritic style. But there is much that remains unknown. In fact, some have conjectured that we could be missing an entire tablet or more here.\textsuperscript{16} Who knows what may have happened between the delivery of Kirta’s message and the final delivery of Hurraya to her new husband?

The transition from the first to the second column of the second tablet is also sticky. About twenty lines are missing, in which the scene seems to have

\textsuperscript{14} This was the claim made in the seminal analysis of Kirta by H.L. Ginsberg, who posited the existence of at least one tablet preceding what we now consider the beginning of Kirta. See H.L. Ginsberg, The Legend of King Keret: A Canaanite Epic of the Bronze Age (BASORSup 2–3; New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1946), 8.

\textsuperscript{15} Indeed many scholars simply fill in the lines completely; see, e.g., N. Wyatt, Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilimilku and His Colleagues (BibSem 53; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 184.

shifted from Pabil’s kingdom back to Kirta’s, and invitations are going out for the wedding feast. Another fifteen-line gap exists between the second and third columns, between the announcement of the future birth of Kirta’s eldest son Yasib and the listing of his six future daughters; the gap presumably contained the list of Kirta’s six remaining future sons.

About twelve lines are missing between columns three and four. We leave off with Athirat beginning to castigate Kirta for breaking his vow and pick up again with Kirta calling to Hurraya. What precisely did the goddess say? Another fifteen lines are missing between columns four and five, which must, based on the context, contain Kirta’s dictation to Hurraya of her forthcoming speech to Kirta’s nobles, and another twenty-five lines between columns five and six in which she presumably delivers that speech.

We lack forty lines at the end of the second tablet, after the arrival of Kirta’s nobles and before the beginning of the third tablet, in which Kirta’s son Ilhu is (perhaps) being told what he should say upon entering his father’s presence. Is it possible that we are missing a tablet or more between the second and third tablets? It is possible, even if it might not be likely. What did the nobles say to Kirta? What else took place? Is this where Kirta falls ill? How much time passes here?

At the end of the first column of the third tablet, Ilhu is telling his sister Thitmanit that Kirta is not ill but is holding a banquet; after another fifteen-line gap or so, she is returning to Ilhu and challenging him with the fact of Kirta’s illness, which, in that gap, she must have witnessed for herself. Almost forty lines of missing text later, we are in what seems a completely different world. Someone is speaking to someone else – who either might be is entirely unclear – about a famine. The famine is not anticipated, nor is it ever mentioned again.

Thirty-five missing lines later, a divine herald is being summoned, perhaps by El, perhaps not. Another thirty-five-plus missing lines later, El is trying to find a deity of healing. It is fair to presume that in that gap the gods have been summoned, though it is quite possible that something more was also related there. The end of the fifth column is a shambles, with only a few words preserved.

---

17 For the suggestion, see E. L. GREENSTEIN, “Kirta,” in Ugaritic Narrative Poetry (ed. S. B. Parker; SBLWAW 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 9–48 (here 30). Wyatt suggests perhaps it is a deity who is providing Ilhu with the instructions (WYA TT, Religious Texts [see n. 15], 221).

18 The common assumption has been that expressed by B. MARGALIT, “The Legend of Keret,” in Handbook of Ugaritic Studies (ed. W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt; Handbuch der Orientalistik; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 203–33 (here 229): “The illness of the king induces a paralysis of Nature.” See similarly GREENSTEIN, “Kirta” (see n. 17), 35; WYA TT, Religious Texts (see n. 15), 232. But it is admitted also that “the text of this scene is very fragmentary, and its contents consequently are obscure” (MARGALIT, “Legend of Keret,” 228). In every case, however, the direct line between Kirta’s illness and the drought is simply stated as fact, with no explicit grounding in the text.
though it is clear from the context that El has created a clay goddess of healing, Shatiqat. The sixth column is, blessedly, preserved almost entirely and even concludes with a colophon from our friendly neighborhood scribe, Ilimilku. Nevertheless, many scholars have argued that the story must have continued on – perhaps in an earlier recension, shortened by Ilimilku, or perhaps somehow even beyond the colophon.19

To summarize, these are the phenomena we see in the Kirta epic: It has no beginning. It contains a number of small gaps that, by virtue of cross-reference or repetition, we can fill in almost entirely. It contains a larger number of substantial gaps where we can guess as to at least part of what must have been there but cannot reconstruct it with any certainty. It quite possibly contains one or more gaps of unknown length, potentially entire tablets. The scenes shift precipitously over space and time, with the shift identifiable only through contextual clues rather than any explicit markers of such. There is at least one passage that has absolutely no literary connection with any other part of the text. There are thematic elements that appear only in one of the tablets – notably, for instance, the idea of Kirta’s illness, which is absolutely central to the third tablet but which is unmentioned in the first two; conversely, the vow to and curse of Athirat, which is the major plot element in the first two columns, is entirely absent in the third, where Kirta’s survival is chalked up to the triumph of Shatiqat, El’s creation, over Mot – though one would think that Kirta’s death could be avoided only by appeal to Athirat’s leniency. Yet she is never mentioned.

Despite the gaps, shifts, discontinuities, and unexpected changes, we still speak of a Kirta epic. Indeed, no one suggests that what we have here may in fact be literally unrelated fragments – at most it has been suggested that the present Kirta epic is a combination of previously independent Kirta traditions, an ostensibly reasonable suggestion that has not found much favor.20 In fact, those who argue for a full-blown Kirta epic use these gaps almost as support for such a claim: by filling in the gaps, sometimes quite expansively, we can see how Kirta must have originally had a nice full form. Gaps are not a detriment – they are simply a part of the story.

The basic thrust of the comparison between the Kirta epic and the sources of the Pentateuch is surely clear enough. Of course one is not unconscious of the significant material differences between Kirta and any given pentateuchal source. Kirta is written on tablets, and exists – however one thinks of it – independently from any other texts. The pentateuchal sources exist only as the result

19 See, e.g., S. B. PARKER, The Prebiblical Narrative Tradition: Essays in the Ugaritic Poems Keret and Aqhat (SBL Resources for Biblical Study 24; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989), 145; Ginsberg, Legend of King Keret (see n. 14), 8–9.

of scholarly inquiry, are written on our minds and hearts, and were interwoven with other texts.

Yet the driving question here is not whether E is to be equated with Kirta in any ham-handed sort of way, but is rather what we consider evidence of, or evidence against, continuity. Given all of the discontinuities in Kirta, there remain ostensibly good reasons to talk about it as a composition. There are the superscriptions, to begin with: the first and third tablets open with the title *l-kirta*, which would seem to connect them. Then again, there are the seventy-three psalms that open with *l-David*, and we do not consider those all to be a single composition. There is the fact that Kirta is found on tablets in the first place, so that we are forced on material grounds to read it through, at least within each tablet. Then again, there is nothing to say that multiple originally independent compositions could not be collected onto a single tablet, just as, for example, KTU 1.114 has the narrative of El’s drunkenness and a related, though surely originally independent, recipe for a hangover. We are all perfectly familiar, in the biblical realm, with multiple compositions being collected onto a single scroll.

What convinces scholars of the continuity of Kirta is not necessarily its material features but rather the internal coherence of the narrative. Across the gaps we find the same characters at work: Kirta and Pabil, Hurraya and Yasib, El and Athirat. We find clear references to the same events, though we pick the story up after a large break: the embassies between Kirta and Pabil, or Kirta’s banquet, or the fear of Kirta’s imminent death. We recognize that there are common threads winding through these tablets and the bits and pieces written on them. Even when we know we are missing texts we can see how what we do have is internally coherent – or, sometimes, we create rationales to make what we have internally coherent.

We accept the continuity of Kirta, and the existence of a broad Kirta epic, despite the fact that we do not have a beginning for it; despite the fact that we cannot directly connect one piece to the next; despite the fact that, in some places, we can barely understand what certain passages are doing, indisputably, in the middle of the story, and despite the fact that the story as a whole is less than perfectly clear.

Scholars are uncertain what to make of the Kirta epic: Is it royal propaganda? Is it historical, somehow? Is it satire? The “truth” may not really matter here; what matters is that, again, despite its poorly preserved state, which perhaps makes it impossible to know what the text “means,” the “meaning” of Kirta is still debated. Interpretive worlds are built on the basic assumption that we have a text here that can be interpreted, that has enough existence of its own, enough integrity as a composition, to be treated as such.

---

21 For a survey of the varied history of interpretation, see Margalit, “Legend of Keret” (see n. 18), 204–18.
Now to be slightly ham-handed about it: I would posit that the reconstructed E document of Neo-Documentary source criticism is far, far less problematic than the Kirta epic. It too is lacking a beginning, and, again, is of unknown length. It too has gaps, many of which can be filled in, at least in general outlines, with little difficulty. It too has one or two substantial gaps, in which we can suggest some events that may have taken place, but perhaps not all. But, unlike Kirta, it also has lengthy stretches of ostensibly uninterrupted narrative; unlike Kirta, it contains no passages that seem to have absolutely zero relationship with anything else in the story; unlike Kirta, there are always close narrative, thematic, and linguistic links even across the gaps. If you gave an impartial observer the E narrative and the Kirta narrative and asked which one was more likely to be an originally continuous whole, despite its present tattered shape, I think there would be no question that the answer would be E.

To return to the objection that I already anticipated above, Kirta and E are not comparable texts, because we have Kirta, we can hold it in our hands, and E does not exist except in the minds of a handful of scholars. To this, I offer three responses.

First: we should not overstate the material unity of the Kirta epic. It exists on three separate tablets, only two of which are marked with the superscription l-krt. That the three belong together seems obvious now, but it remains to some extent a common scholarly decision rather than a “fact” apart. Indeed, in its initial publications, the tablets were presented in what we would now consider the wrong order, with what is now the second tablet coming at the end. The material unity of Kirta is predicated on the literary judgment that these three materially separate tablets belong together and always belonged together.

Second: if the existence of a text as nothing other than theoretical reconstruction means that we cannot talk about its potential original shape, its potential gaps and what may have occupied those spaces, or its themes and function despite our uncertainty about its beginning and ending, then scholars probably have to stop talking about P; frankly the entire enterprise, which consists of nothing other than reconstructing literary texts and holding them up for consideration, would be thrown into disarray. What documentary scholars say about E is different from what virtually everyone says about P only in degree, not in kind. Some scholars, such as the present author, may be willing to tolerate more imperfection than are most. But almost everyone tolerates a little of it. And every pentateuchal scholar talks about texts that exist only in our minds.

Third: this essay is not an attempt to convince anyone that E exists. It is after a methodological point: not that E exists but that the argument from gaps – the argument that if the reconstructed text is not perfectly continuous then we cannot talk about it as a self-standing composition – is a faulty one. Why must

---

22 Margalit, “Legend of Keret” (see n. 18), 203. There is similar scholarly disagreement, it may be noted, about the order of the tablets in the Baal Cycle.

---
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a reconstructed text of E be held to a higher standard than the actually existing
text of Kirta, again, not as to whether it exists but as to whether its literary shape
is worthy even of consideration as a text in its own right? If Kirta is assumed to
be a self-standing unified composition, despite its abundant flaws, then the flaws
undeniably present in E should not be a necessary impediment to its receiving
the same status.

The process of identifying E in the Pentateuch is not dependent on the
existence of gaps or the existence of continuity. As with the other sources, E
is identified by recognizing narrative contradictions between some texts and
narrative agreements between others. As the passages that belong exclusively
with each other and stand in opposition to the rest of the text are collected and a
profile begins to emerge, then the question can be asked as to why these passages
seem not to be perfectly continuous at points. It should be noted that the first
step, of identifying the passages that belong together, is often accomplished
along similar lines by both documentary and nondocumentary scholars. But
nondocumentary scholars then take these disparate passages and attribute them
to a redactional layer rather than considering the possibility that they could have
constituted a self-standing text unto themselves. Whether it is explicitly stated or
merely implicit, it seems likely that this is due to a suspicion that in the absence
of observable narrative continuity there can be no consideration given to the
possibility of narrative independence.

Continuity is a sliding scale. It depends on what sort of text we are dealing
with, what degree of preservation we expect, what the age of the text is, and,
most important, who is doing the judging and what sorts of results said judge
wants to find. There is no denying the subjectivity inherent in determining what
is continuous and what is not, what is literarily tolerable and what is not. I may
find my reconstructed J text far more readable than another scholar might. That
is perfectly acceptable. But within our own constructed systems of continuity,
we should at least try to be consistent from text to text. And I would again
contend that — everything else being equal — in terms of continuity, at least,
the pentateuchal sources of the documentary theory all, even E, are far more
continuous than a text like Kirta. The existence of the pentateuchal sources may
be denied if it must — but not on these grounds.

---

23 One may note how regularly groups of passages that documentary scholars assign to
E are isolated and linked together by scholars who do not work in a documentary frame-
work. See, e.g., A.H.J. Gunneweg, “Das Gesetz und die Propheten: Eine Auslegung von Ex
33,7–11; Num 11,4–12,8; Dtn 31,14f.; 34,10,” ZAW 102 (1990): 169–80; more strikingly, E.
Blum, “The Decalogue and the Composition History of the Pentateuch,” in The Pentateuch:
International Perspectives on Current Research (ed. T.B. Dozeman et al.; FAT 78; Tübingen:
Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 289–301.