

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

VOL. XXXVIII.

APRIL, 1927.

No. 3.

A SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF REV. HENRY ELIAS
DOSKER, D. D., LL. D., L. H. D.

*(Professor of Church History, Louisville Presbyterian
Theological Seminary, 1903-1926).*

BY REV. JOHN M. VANDER MEULEN, D. D., LL. D.,
President of Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary.

For those not well acquainted with Dr. Dosker, it may be well, before my expression of appreciation of him, to give, in a few words, the data of his life.

He was born in the Netherlands in February, 1855, at Bunschoten. His father was the Rev. Nicholas Herman Dosker, pastor of the Christian Reformed Church at Bunschoten, and his mother was Wilhelmina De Rondon. Henry Elias, for that was the name given him, was educated in the Dutch Gymnasium, a school of secondary education that corresponds roughly to our academy or high school. The family came to this country in 1870, the Rev. Nicholas Dosker having accepted a call to take the ministry of the Second (Dutch) Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan. Henry E. was sent to Hope College, Holland, Michigan, from which he graduated and of which he was one of the most distinguished alumni. He then entered McCormick Seminary without, of course, leaving the membership of the Dutch Reformed Church in America. His first church was a country pastorate in Ebenezer, near the city of Holland, Michigan. His second church was the First Reformed Church of Grand Haven, Michigan,

HARNACK'S REVOLUTION.

BY REV. PARKE P. FLOURNOY, D. D.,
Washington, D. C.

(In the present article Dr. Flournoy deals with only a few points bearing on the trustworthiness of the New Testament. For further discussion and proof of this important subject the reader is referred to Dr. Flournoy's book, "New Light on the New Testament", a book highly commended by the late Professor Warfield, of Princeton Seminary.)

Many are saying or implying that the New Testament is not trustworthy, and many would feel freer and relieved of anxiety if both Testaments were proven false. In the nineteenth century German criticism (which soon became world criticism to a large extent) asserted that the four Gospels were not written until the second century, and therefore could not have been written by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. But discoveries made especially in the last quarter of the last century show quite plainly that this is not true, and that of all literature of New Testament times the Gospels and other writings following them in this book show the highest proof of genuineness.

Of the apostolic origin of the Gospel of John no discussion is needed, as the Sinaitic Palimpsest and the Diatessaron of Tatian have thoroughly settled that. The last is made up of 50 per cent of Mark, 66 of Luke, 76.5 of Matthew, and 96 per cent of John. (See *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. IX, p. 39.)

Even the use (or rather abuse) of it by the Gnostics shows this.

As to the dates of the Synoptic Gospels we now have the testimony of Professor Adolf Harnack, probably the most prominent of all German higher critics. He was the successor of Ferdinand Christian Baur, the founder of the Tubingen school. The position of Baur and this school was that of utter denial of the traditional dates of the four Gospels. Baur and his followers held that not one of the Gospels was written in the first century; that Matthew, Mark and Luke were written about

150-160 A. D., and John between 160 and 170 A. D., thus showing that it was impossible for them to have been written by those whose names they bear in the New Testament; as all of these men were dead before these second century dates.

But discoveries of manuscripts soon proved the utter folly of these theories. The first of these discoveries was made by Professor Rendel Harris, who found The Apology of Aristides in the Monastery of Saint Catharine, at the foot of Mt. Sinai in 1889. Others speedily followed, all together fully convinced Harnack that there had been a great mistake.

Let us hear his own account of his gradual change of view.

There were other remarkable discoveries which brought about this thorough change in Harnack's views; but these can be only mentioned. Though earlier than the publication of the Diatessaron, they were of great value in establishing the apostolic origin of the New Testament, and its early use in the Church of Christ. In the "*Preussischer Jahrbucher*" of May, 1898, having shown the value of the Diatessaron and Apology of Aristides, he goes on to say: "But of still greater value was the find which we owe to a learned Scotch lady, Mrs. Lewis." (He refers to her discovery in the Saint Catharine Convent at Mount Sinai of the four Gospels in Syriac, the earliest of all Syriac versions.) "As the text is almost completely preserved, the *Syrus Sinaiticus* is one of the most important witnesses, nay, it is extremely probable that it is the most important witness for our Gospels."

But of all discoveries, perhaps none more thoroughly awakened Harnack to the fact that his former position was a lamentable mistake than the discoveries of Sir William M. Ramsay, and especially that of the monument at Antioch in Pisidia, which shows that there was no historical error in Luke's assertion that Christ was born "when Cyrenius was governor of Syria" at the time of the first enrolment for taxing which was ordered by Augustus Caesar. That discovery showed that Luke was perfectly accurate. For a fuller account the reader must be referred to Sir William's great work on "The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testa-

ment", p. 224-237. The book contains the James Sprunt Lectures at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., 1913-1914.

Date of the Acts, The Synoptic Gospels: A. Harnack. 1911 A. D.

Ch. I.

"The identity of the author of the 'we' sections of the Acts of the Apostles with the author of the whole work."

P. 1. "One of the strongest arguments in favor of this identity is the argument from *language and style* . . . and it is hoped have proved conclusively that the hypothesis of a difference of authors is untenable". Many proofs of this given.

P. 34. "He (Luke) did not, at all events, invent the central fact (Council at Jerusalem, Acts XV) that the leaders on both sides came to an agreement that was temporarily satisfactory, and that the mission to the Gentiles was thus recognized."

P. 93. "I have now come to believe that there is a high degree of probability in favor of an early date for the Lukan writings. I am therefore compelled to attack the problem afresh and to come to a definite decision. If the solution which I propose must have the effect of revolution within the sphere of criticism, the revolution is only one of chronology.

Moreover, in reality it ought not to be called a revolution, for the views which I am about to set forth are the result of a slow evolution of more than fifteen years . . . and the stages of the evolution have not remained unknown to those who are interested in such subjects."

"I. The conclusion of the Acts (28:30, 31) must always form the starting point for an attempt to ascertain the date of the work; it runs as follows: (See the passage.) 'Paul remained two whole years in his own hired house, receiving all that came unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, &c.'

P. 94. "It has never been questioned, so far as I know, that these words proceed from the author of the complete work,

even though they have the appearance of a postscript—the real conclusion of the book is XXVIII 25-28. Moreover, in content and form they agree so closely with the Lukan style that from this point of view strong arguments can be produced in favor of their genuineness.”

P. 97. “The more clearly we see that the trials of St. Paul, and, above all, his appeal to Caesar, is the chief subject of the last quarter of the Acts, the more hopeless does it appear that we can explain why the narrative breaks off as it does, otherwise than by assuming that the trial had actually not yet reached its close.”

“If St. Luke in the year 80, 90, 100, wrote thus he was not simply a blundering, but absolutely incomprehensible historian!

Moreover, we note that nowhere in the Acts is either St. Peter or St. Paul so treated as if his death was presupposed; we indeed rather receive the contrary impression. Neither is the slightest reference made to the martyrdom of St. Paul! (here he records other prophecies), but not one word is said concerning the final destiny of St. Paul (and of St. Peter)! Is this natural?”

P. 98. “Have those who assign the book to the end of the century realized these difficulties?”

P. 99. We are, accordingly, left with the result *that the concluding verses of the Acts of the Apostles, taken in conjunction with the absence of any reference in the book to the result of the trial of St. Paul and to his martyrdom make it in the highest degree probable that the work was written at a time when St. Paul's trial in Rome had not yet come to an end.*” (Italics Harnack's.)

II. P. 99. Harnack goes on to show that the Acts must have been written before 70 A. D. because it contains no mention “of the destruction of the Jerusalem and the Temple, of Nero's persecution of the Christians, and of other important events that occurred in the seventh decade of the first century. . . .

(Quotes Isaiah's proclamation of Judgment of the Jews, yet)

"There is not one hint of the fact that the destruction of Jerusalem has come as a punishment of the nation." (Italics Harnack's.) "No use is made of the Pauline epistles."

P. 116. "This means that the Acts of the Apostles taken by itself requires of us that we set its composition before the destruction of Jerusalem and the death of St. Paul. We thus arrive at a *TERMINUS AD QUEM* for the dating of the synoptic Gospels, at least for St. Mark and St. Luke.* (Italics Harnack's.)

P. 125. "There is no doubt that St. Mark's Gospel belongs to the sources of the Gospel of St. Luke." . . .

"If two years after the arrival of St. Paul in Rome the Acts was already written, then the date of the Lukan Gospel must be earlier and that of the Gospel of St. Mark earlier still."

P. 126. Date of St. Mark. "The Gospel itself gives absolutely no direct indication as to its date; one thing only is clear from Ch. XIII—as Wellhausen also recognizes—that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem; how many years before there is absolutely no evidence to show.

Internal indications therefore place no impediment in the way of assigning St. Mark, at the latest, to the sixth decade of the first century, as is required by the date we have assigned to St. Luke." . . . Tradition . . . does not contradict.

P. 133. "The view gained by our investigation of the Lukan writings is that St. Mark must have written his gospel during the sixth decade of the first century at latest."

This revolution in the views of Professor Harnack, who was the most prominent opposer of the traditional date of the

*Note.—"The Aramaic Gospel of Matthew which Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis (who conversed with Presbyters of the Apostolic age) mentions, was earlier still. Even the Gospel of Matthew in Greek, which we have, seems to have been more widely known, and at an earlier time than Mark and Luke. Papias is said to have been 'The hearer of John and the companion of Polycarp'. See Casper Rene Gregory's *Canon and Text of the New Testament*."

For a full discussion of the date of the Gospel of Matthew, see Harnack's *Date of The Acts and The Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 133-135.

gospels, is the most remarkable occurrence in the history of the New Testament criticism. An uncompromising leader of the Tubingen school founded by Baur; an antagonist of Zahn of Erlangen, the great leader of those who held to the genuineness of New Testament writings, he has become convinced of his mistake, especially by the discovery of the Sinaitic Palimpsest found by Mrs. Lewis in the St. Catherine convent on Mt. Sinai, and of the Diatessaron of Tatian, and also by the discoveries made by Sir W. M. Ramsay in Asia Minor confirming the traditional dates of Acts and the Synoptic Gospels.

Since this "two whole years in his own hired house" indicates the completion of Acts in 62, and there is not the slightest hint of Paul's condemnation, or of Nero's persecution of Christians, Harnack's conclusion as to the date of the Acts, and of course the earlier date of Luke's Gospel, which he is sure must be later than Mark's, is certainly true.

He also points out that Luke, who had written the account in Acts VII of the martyrdom of Stephen, with such sympathetic vividness, could not have failed to portray the condemnation and execution of Paul, his own companion and dearest friend, in a similar way, if these had been accomplished before he wrote. When we read in 2 Tim. 4:6-8 Paul's triumphant salutatory, we cannot imagine Luke's omission of *his* glorious exodus, if he had written after it.

The article of Dr. Vedder in the January number of this *Review* shows that what Harnack himself says is true, *i. e.*, that his conviction of the absolute collapse of the Tubingen theory is only with regard to *chronology*. Strangely, he still holds on to this theory in other respects. We are sorry for Harnack himself, but rejoice that he has made so clear the genuineness of the gospels with their portraiture of Christ our Saviour for this world of sinners.

But, above all other evidences, the supreme proof of the Divine origin of the Scriptures is *Christ*. That marvelous portrait of Him, "The Light of the World", shining from their pages, is for each of us "with unveiled face", the power of full redemption. Paul said of the unbelieving Jew that when

Moses was read, "a veil was upon their heart". Many of us, too, alas, have a veil, "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life", upon our hearts. O that this veil may be taken away! that "with unveiled face" each of us "beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord", may be "changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord".

But to the individual believer there is an evidence of a different kind from that which observation of these general effects affords—an evidence which he does not see *around* him, but which he feels *within* him. To the mere observer, this internal evidence is unappreciable; but to one who believes in Christ—the central subject of the Bible from end to end—it is unspeakable. In its full force it enables him to say, "I know Him whom I have believed and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him (literally 'my deposit') against that day". It is a matter, not of observation, but of experience, and he who, by faith, has gained this experience, has found a pearl of great price for which he would not accept the whole world in exchange.

SOWERS OF THE WIND,
or
MODERNISM IN HOLLAND (II).

BY REV. HENRY K. PASMA, M. A.,
Pastor First Presbyterian Church, Charleston, Miss.

This second article concludes Mr. Pasma's discussion of "Modernism in Holland". The first article appeared in the January number of the REVIEW.

"We may confidently expect that the backbone of Fundamentalism is broken." In this sentence a writer in one of the religious weeklies summed up the diagnosis he had made of the decisions reached by the annual conferences and assemblies of various church bodies in our country regarding the doctrinal controversies which have disturbed Protestant Christendom in