

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Burton on the Synoptic Problem *Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem*. By Ernest De Witt Burton. Printed from Volume V. of the Decennial Publications. The University of Chicago Press, 1904. 4to. Pp. 72. \ \$ 1 net.

T. Nicklin

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 02 / March 1906, pp 127 - 128

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993910, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993910

How to cite this article:

T. Nicklin (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 127-128 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993910

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

seems to be justified. A subject like *Δούλοι* has only 5 columns, but *Düngung* has over 20! *Duracinus* (usually a cling-stone fruit) has 4 columns, *Egge* (a harrow) over 3, *Ente* nearly 10, *Eiche* 63½, and *Epheu* 20. In the last two cases the mythological importance of the oak and the ivy partly excuses the length of the articles. But, generally speaking, exuberances of this kind, suitable doubtless to a separate book on ancient *Landwirthschaft*, should be carefully pruned away in an Encyclopaedia. An excrescence of another kind is a quotation from Livy—whose works are presumably accessible to most users of the Encyclopaedia—occupying three-quarters of col. 2529. We have on a previous occasion noted the insufficient numismatic equipment of some of the writers on topography. Here, under *Dora*, nothing numismatic later than de Saulcy is quoted; the British Museum Catalogues seem to be

unknown to those who write on places such as *Emesa* and *Elaeussa*; we are not told that *Eboda* issued coins; and under *Edones* their king Getas, who is known to us by a most remarkable coinage, studied by Babelon in Svoronos' *Journal*, is not so much as mentioned. Doubtless he will find his way in under *G*; but there should at any rate be a cross-reference. It might also have been worth while to include the personification of *Dynamis* on Alexandrian coins. Every specialist is liable to take an exaggerated view of his own subject, and consider it to be unduly neglected. But in the case of sciences like numismatics, which bear on most other studies in an often unexpected way, would it not be worth while to have a bibliography made by some specialist for the purposes of the Encyclopaedia?

G. F. HILL.

BURTON ON THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem. By ERNEST DE WITT BURTON. Printed from Volume V. of the Decennial Publications. The University of Chicago Press, 1904. 4to. Pp. 72. \$1 net.

THIS is a work that satisfies more, the more it is studied. The first glance at it may leave the reader repelled by what he will feel to be an insult to his powers of following an abstract or complicated argument. A careful perusal makes him forget his annoyance, and recognise that there is substantial value in the monograph.

The feature which is at first repellent is the introduction of diagrams or graphs to represent the various theories that have been or may be propounded for the reconciliation of the facts exhibited by the Synoptic Gospels. This is a method which doubtless has its uses for certain branches of mathematics and political economy; but when applied for the purposes of making a literary or philosophical argument not obnoxious to confusion of thought, it seems a concession to lazy thinkers such that its extended use would soon lower the average standard of power to reason.

Once the reader, however, has digested his scruples about this innovation, he will find the writer to be a sane and subtle judge of

his subject. He very properly sets forth upon his investigation with the timely remark that 'ever since the days of Augustine or Jerome, not to say earlier, the mutual resemblances of the first three Gospels have been observed, and the problem thus created for the biblical scholar has been discussed.' Then follows a statement of every conceivable hypothesis—with a diagram for each—and a brief discussion clears the ground for the view which Prof. Burton advocates. Here is, perhaps, the one weakness in the work. The arguments used for dismissing hypothesis M (as its diagram is numbered), *i.e.* the hypothesis of an oral tradition issuing in our three Gospels, are not as convincing as they ought to be for the author's purpose. He states that 'it fails to account for the large amount of close verbal agreement which exists between the Gospels'—this must be discounted by the fact that where oral repetition or teaching is greatly used, as in the East, it attains an accuracy inconceivable amongst us and comparable to Lord Macaulay's memory. 'It very unsatisfactorily accounts,' he continues, 'for the remarkable agreement between the Gospels, especially between Mark and Luke, in order of section': the same criticism is applicable. 'It furnishes no explanation of the relatively small amount of agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark in threefold matter'—a sound

argument, but null against a possible restatement of hypothesis M. That is this. In hypothesis Y, *i.e.* the hypothesis that St. Matthew's Gospel is one combination of St. Mark's gospel with an indeterminate non-extant source, and St. Luke's is another combination of them, we may suppose the indeterminate source to have been oral tradition.

Prof. Burton decides that hypothesis Y is the least inadequate, modifying it, however, by postulating two or more documents for the indeterminate source. It may fairly be urged that he would have very great difficulty in substantiating any claim to superiority in this modified hypothesis over the hypothesis that one or more of these sources were oral. On the other hand (except for certain questions—especially that of the value to be attached to the ancient attributions of the Gospels), the difference between a rigorously accurate tradition orally transmitted to catechumens and a document freely treated is very inconsiderable, if not immaterial.

The reader may like to see Prof. Burton's final list of sources. Of major sources he

distinguishes 1. 'the Gospel of Mark, substantially as we now possess it'; 2. 'the special Matthaean source, probably the Logia of Matthew, spoken of by Papias'; 3. 'the Peraean document, consisting of Luke 9⁸⁷–18¹⁴ and 19¹⁻²⁸, portions of it being contained also in the record of the Galilean ministry and passion week of Matthew'; 4. 'the Galilean document found in Luke 3⁷⁻¹⁵, etc.' These, he says, were beyond doubt written. Of minor sources, two only need be mentioned here, *viz.* 'the infancy story of Matthew,' and 'the infancy story of Luke.' This last, he thinks, had existed in writing before.

The monograph concludes with a useful table exhibiting the parallelism of the Synoptic Gospels, and assigning every verse in them to the source the author believes it to be derived from.

The work may be commended as a handy introduction and work of reference for anyone who wishes to begin the study of the synoptic problem for himself.

T. NICKLIN.

EARLE'S *MEDEA*—A STATEMENT.

As general editor of the series in which the late Professor Earle's *Medea* appeared I desire to assume the responsibility for the disposition of the conjectural readings that was made the subject of remark in the *Review* for October 1905 by the distinguished scholar whose recognition of the substantial merits of that edition would have been a satisfaction to its author, who passed away before the number in question reached America. It was, I have recently been told, Earle's wish at least to insert references to the Critical Appendix in most cases where the MS. reading had been set aside; but with characteristic scrupulousness he chose to reject even these references in his desire to mind the general injunction not to put critical matter into the Notes, which were intended primarily for younger American students, who are not easily induced to believe in the profitableness of textual discussion; whereas the riper scholar would, it was thought, naturally work with the Critical Appendix constantly in mind.

May I take this opportunity of saying something about the career of one who for thirteen years has been a constant con-

tributor to the *Classical Review*? No American student of the classics took a heartier interest in the *Review* than Professor Earle, by whose untimely death, at the age of forty, the United States loses one of its most gifted scholars, and his University one of its most effective and beloved teachers. With the exception of a single year, each volume of the *Review* from 1892 to 1905 has contained some evidence of his studies in Greek and Latin literature, syntax, epigraphy, and kindred subjects. The majority of his papers dealt with the textual emendation or critical interpretation of passages from most of the classical Greek writers, especially the tragedians; others dealt with Appian and Heliodorus; and with Cicero, Horace, Seneca, and Statius.

Professor Earle's youthful career gave ample promise of its later distinction. Graduating in 1886 from Columbia University with high honours, he won the fellowship in letters, one year of which he spent in Greece, where he had charge of the excavations at Sicyon which resulted in the discovery of a theatre and the statue of Dionysus now standing in the Museum at