

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

enduring the reproach and shame of the rest (p. 195); and it will be possibly indignant to hear him recognising the "greater works which the Church should do, because the Lord went to the Father," in the triumphs of science and in the achievements of political and social reform (p. 216). But no one can read these pages without arriving at the conclusion that, if this is not orthodoxy, orthodoxy is no longer a living or a tenable position; and we may reasonably hope that a man so spiritually in earnest, a man who has entered so deeply into the mind and the life of our Redeemer, and yet retains so much freshness and independence of thought as Dr. Stalker exhibits in this volume, may be one of God's appointed agents to enlarge the old orthodoxy, and to bring about the longed for reconciliation between the faith that was once delivered to the saints and the knowledge which has more recently been delivered to the thinkers.

R. F. HORTON.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE EXPOSITOR."

DEAR SIR,—The Dean of Peterborough (THE EXPOSITOR, October, p. 253) has inadvertently ascribed to me an interpretation of the noble passage, Genesis i. 2, which I certainly cannot be said to have "recently" adopted. Probably he inferred this from the reference to my article "Cosmogony" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* given by Delitzsch in his *New Commentary on Genesis*. The view there proposed (more than ten years ago) I should now modify; but it is, at any rate, not that which is stated by the Dean. Nor from Delitzsch's note could any reader guess what it was. Moreover, in references to this *Encyclopædia*, ought not the date of the volume always to be given?

Yours faithfully,

T. K. CHEYNE.

OXFORD, Oct. 16th, 1890.