

one of those objections and has made them subsidiary arguments in supporting its position, but they are among its weakest arguments, though they have perhaps received more publicity than arguments that are much stronger. Green went into them and discussed them quite satisfactorily. Other books have discussed them more fully and good answers to most of them were available as early as 1730. There is now a little added archaeological information about two or three of them.

A brief mention about one, the chapter about the kings of Edom which says, "these were the kings of Edom before there was any king of Israel." Some say this could not have been written until there was a king of Israel. This is not a necessary conclusion, but if you want to think that somebody in the days of Saul or David made up a correct list of the Kings of Edom and inserted it into the Pentateuch at the place where it tells about Esau, it would not affect the main question. The Lord might have led an inspired writer to insert it there. It would not affect the basic question. (See Green's excellent discussion.)

It may be that this list of the kings of Edom in chapter 36 is an insertion at a later time, but I do not believe it is necessarily the case. We are told about Moses sending a message to the king of Edom, so there must have been kings then, and there might already have been as many kings as are listed here. I see no difficulty in that. Before there was a king of Israel it had already been prophesied that there would be kings of Israel so I do not think it is important, but I do think it is vital that you know the answers to these objections, simply because these particular arguments are often given more publicity than they deserve. Yet they are not really important. They might all be non-Mosaic and the higher criticism still not be true. Various early writers are mentioned and discussed in Green. I am not anxious that you know a great deal about these particular writers, but I want you to know the content of the verses and something of the problems involved. Section A dealt with men who were attacking the Bible, B deals with men who were trying to solve an interesting problem. A deals with something which has been and is easily answered and is of little importance, but B deals with something which is the foundation of the whole higher critical movement, though the men originally involved in it had no thought of any such thing. If no one had gone on beyond the early