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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

completely at home. Now the idea of δίκαιος is prominent throughout the Songs of the Servant. That is one of his most characteristic epithets. And its intimate bearing on the passage before us is discernible in Is 53, 'My Servant the righteous, righteousness wins He for many, and their guilt He takes for his load' (so G. A. Smith, *Isaiah*, vol. ii. p. 345).

The outcome of this act of self-dedication for Jesus was of incomparable significance. It embraced a clear assurance of His Sonship and a fresh equipment with the Spirit. Let us attempt to realize what that implied. While these experiences, from the psychological standpoint, might be regarded as two aspects of the one spiritual fact, and while, in any case, they were necessarily inseparable from each other, it is legitimate to isolate them, in seeking to analyse their meaning. The assurance of the Sonship is the seal of God set upon that maturing experience of Jesus which culminated in His step of self-consecration to His mission. Here He reaches certainty as to the infallibility of His discernment in finding Himself in the crowning personification of the earlier revelation. He *is* the righteous Servant: He is God's chosen in whom He delights. Jehovah has called Him, and will hold His hand (Is 42^6). But in union with this marvellous consciousness, which, in its ripest form, is the climax of His spiritual growth, comes the sense of a new and unparalleled endowment with the Divine Spirit. From the result of this endowment, as recorded in the Gospels, which describe Jesus as being led or driven into the wilderness by the Spirit, we may gather that its main effect was to urge Him forward to His vocation, strong in the might of God. Here, too, He would find a corroboration of His earlier discovery. For one of the most typical features of the Servant is that God has put His Spirit upon Him (42^2; cf. 61^1).

The renewed consciousness of His equipment is the signal for decisive activity. And immediately the reaction supervenes. The intensity of His eagerness to be up and doing creates a crisis in His inner life. As He confronts the stupendous task of establishing the kingdom of God, doubts press in upon His soul. 'If thou be the Son of God'—the point of gravity lies there. How shall He assure Himself that His conviction is true? Is it safe to set out on this enterprise with no further guarantee? His temptation is to test the situation by employing the superhuman powers, of which He is conscious, for material ends ends which, at the same time, will procure His acknowledgment as Messiah. But the *nature* of His Messiahship is itself involved in such tests. If He yields, He is committing Himself to earthly and political ideals. To be greeted as Messiah on these conditions has nothing spiritual about it. It is simply to adopt the rôle expected by the national party. Jesus thrusts the suggestion away from Him in horror. In each instance He repels the temptation by casting Himself directly upon God. Of remarkable significance is Mt 4^4, 'Not by bread only shall man live, but by every word proceeding through the mouth of God.' This reminds us of His dependence on the earlier revelation. And there can be little doubt that when He had to choose between competing Messianic ideals, there stood clearly before His mind the figure of the Suffering Servant with which He had already identified Himself. For that was what His decision in the wilderness meant: the casting aside of the attractions of political authority and exaltation, and the deliberate choice of attainment through service, a service which essentially involved suffering.

Modern Positive Theology.

By the Rev. John Dickie, M.A., Minister of the Church of Scotland, Tarland, Aberdeenshire.

German theologians are at present much interested in the rise of a new Theological School, which claims to be at once modern and positive—the legitimate heir of the orthodox dogmatic tradition. The leaders of this movement are Superintendent Theodor Kaftan, of Kiel, and Professor Reinhold Seeberg, of Berlin. They are agreed, however, not so much in matters of detail as in principle and intention, and neither can be regarded as in any way responsible for the other. The younger men,

on the other hand, seem to be for the most part pupils of Seeberg, and stand to him in a relation of conscious and acknowledged discipleship, with more or less independence according to their individuality. Of these may be mentioned Karl Girgensohn, of Dorpat; R. H. Grützmacher, of Rostock; and Karl Beth, of the Protestant Faculty at Vienna, whose book, *The Moderns and the Principles of Theology*, published a little over a year ago, is admirable both as an historical account of the movement and as an exposition of its aims, and is, perhaps, the most distinctive contribution which it has yet made to theology.

So far, Modern Positive Theology is an aspiration rather than a system. We have programmes and statements of needs and principles, but no detailed application to the whole circle of Christian truth, like Julius Kaftan's, Haering's, and Wendt's, from the Ritschlian standpoint. But, of course, the earliest of the Ritschlian dogmatic systems belongs to a much later stage in the history of the school than the Modern Positive Theology has yet reached. The fullest exhibition of the Modern Positive doctrinal standpoint is Professor Seeberg's *Fundamental Truths of the Christian Religion*, a course of sixteen lectures delivered before students of all faculties in the University of Berlin during the winter session, 1901–1902 (4th edition, 1906). Of this, Messrs. Williams & Norgate announce an English translation. These lectures are fresh, vigorous, clear, and earnest. They are interesting and stimulating where they are least convincing. In my opinion there are few more admirable statements of what the Church is than we find in the fourteenth lecture. Of a like origin and somewhat similar character is Girgensohn's 'Attempt to proclaim the Old Truth to Modern Men'—*Twelve Addresses on the Christian Religion* (Munich, 1906). Work of this nature is perhaps more required in our day than treatises addressed to the professional theologian, and all the German schools in one way or another are endeavouring to meet the need. I think we ought to give them all credit for being actuated not by mere party motives, but by a real interest in religious truth as they understand it. As the interpreter of the 'Old Truth' to 'the modern man,' Modern Positive Theology naturally takes this part of its mission with special seriousness. But important as the work of popular statement is, such a treatment of the great problems of theology inevitably glosses over many leading questions, and leaves others altogether unanswered.

A 'Modern Positive Theology' is exposed to attack from two opposite directions. Many 'Moderns' will find it not sufficiently 'Modern'; while the other camp will think that the citadel has been betrayed to the enemy. For years the Ritschlian theology has been popularly known as 'the modern.' The Germans never apply the term to the counterpart of our pantheistic 'New Theology.' Besides articles by Herrmann and Traub, which I have not seen, dealing with Theodor Kaftan's *Modern Theology of the Old Faith*, the movement, as a whole, has been subjected to at least two detailed and searching criticisms from the Ritschlian side. From the standpoint of the Ritschlian Left—the so-called *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*—Bousset in the *Theologische Rundschau* (August 1906 to January 1907) finds that Kaftan's 'Old Faith' is a mixture of old and new which have not yet assimilated one another, while his 'Modern Theology' has the same fault of placing discordant elements side by side without welding them together into one consistent whole. Seeberg's is throughout a theology of compromise, dominated by the endeavour to carry over as much as possible of the old dogma into the modern world. 'He loves to paint in indistinct colours, the definite lines varnish, and in this magical enchanted twilight the forms of the old dogmas are lost, and cease to offend the eye.' Others more at home in such matters are welcome to determine how far such ideas are 'positive,' but this mediating theology of Seeberg's certainly marks no real advance, and promises no fresh light. Grützmacher is little more than an echo—a less liberal and more polemical Seeberg. 'By his own admission his work is patchwork, and, in the situation in which we are placed, patchwork is of no use.'

Bousset, like Beth, deals separately with Theodor Kaftan, Seeberg, and Grützmacher. Schian follows a different method. His articles, just reprinted in a small volume of 121 pages, bear the titles, 'The Principles of the Modern Positive Theology,' 'The Christology of the Modern Positive Theology,' 'How does the Modern Positive Theology reach its Christological Affirmations?' 'Reinbold Seeberg's *Fundamental Truths* and the Ecclesiastical Situation.'

These articles of Schian's seem to me quite as able as Bousset's, and more instructive. They are,

besides, much more friendly in tone, but I do not know that in judgment there is any substantial difference. So far as I can infer Schian's general standpoint, he represents the older Ritschlianism.

The criticisms directed against 'Modern Positive Theology' from the 'Positive' side I know only at second hand. The strict orthodoxy of Greifswald finds Seeberg grievously in error in reference to his doctrine of Scripture, his Christology, and his view of the Atonement. But for some points of minor importance, according to Hermann Cremer, he would pass for a pupil of (Julius) Kaftan's. 'His views are not Lutheran, or Reformed, or Pietistic. They represent a modern sentimentalism, and furnish not a counterpart to Harnack's *Essence of Christianity*, but a companion piece.' One notable and learned representative of this school, however, the late Professor Zöckler, in his posthumous history of Apologetics, lets Seeberg down gently, finding that, at any rate, the heterodox is less in evidence than what is sound and Scriptural.

Such, then, has been the reception accorded to 'Modern Positive Theology' in the land of its birth. I think it must be admitted that Seeberg is neither a Schleiermacher nor a Ritschl. But he is a theologian of vast learning and great literary power, thoroughly in earnest in his desire to be both modern and true in the fullest measure to the faith received from the men of old. He is, moreover, the direct theological heir of Thomasius and Frank, and as such his views are likely to find admittance where the great constructive spirits of modern theology would knock in vain. In view of its origin as the work of a 'positive' theologian, compelled by stress of circumstances to become, in some measure at least, 'modern,' and of its theological significance as a movement towards Modernism from within the citadels of tradition, I think that some profit may accrue to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES from an examination of 'Modern Positive Theology.' So with the editor's indulgence I hope to deal in a short series of articles with Modern Positive Theology in its attitude to Scripture and ecclesiastical dogma, in its Christology, and in its relation to the general theological movement and the practical needs of our day.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. LUKE.

LUKE XXIII. 43.

'And he said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.'—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

'And he said unto him.'—This is our Lord's second word from the Cross, and it is recorded only by St. Luke.

'Verily I say unto thee.'—As usual, this introduces something of special importance, or beyond expectation, cf. Lk 4^{24} 12^{37} $18^{17.\ 29}$ 21^{32}.—PLUMMER.

'To-day.'—Without an intermediate (1) state of unconsciousness, or (2) Purgatory.—ADENEY.

AN unexpected boon,—for the crucified often lingered in agony for more than two days.—FARRAR.

'Shalt thou be with me.'—Not merely in My company (σὺν ἐμοί), but sharing with Me (μετ' ἐμοῦ). The promise implies the continuance of consciousness after death. If the dead are unconscious, the assurance to the robber that he will be with Christ after death would be empty of consolation.—PLUMMER.

'In Paradise.'—The word, said to be of Persian origin, is used in various senses in Scripture: (1) a park or pleasure-ground (Neh 2^{8}, Cant 4^{13}, Ec 2^{5}); (2) the garden of Eden (Gn $2^{8\text{-}10.\ 15.\ 16}$ $3^{1\text{-}3.\ 8\text{-}10}$ etc.); (3) Abraham's bosom, *i.e.* the resting-place of the souls of the just until the resurrection (the meaning here); (4) a region in heaven, perhaps identical with 'the third heaven' (2 Co 12^{4}). It is doubtful whether 'the paradise of God' (Rev 2^{7}) is the same as (3) or (4) or is yet a fifth use. By His use of the word, Jesus neither confirms nor corrects Jewish beliefs on the subject. He assures the penitent that He will do far more than remember him at some unknown time in the future: this very day He will have him in His company in a place of security and bliss.—PLUMMER.

THE SERMON.

Jesus and the Individual.

By the Rev. W. M. Clow, B.D.

It is true that Jesus loved the whole world and died for it; it is true that He came to found His kingdom and build His Church, but His supreme