

England. So far as the reviewer is able to observe, it adds nothing to our knowledge of Cardinal Pole, and indeed contains very little that is new in any way, save a number of rather startling characterizations of the great figures of the time.

If Mr. Haile finds it necessary to tell us that Martin Luther died "drinking and joking to the end," he ought not in all decency to leave his readers with the impression that this was the sum total of Luther's life; nor do such epithets as "adventurer," "the artful and astute author of Queen Katherine's divorce," etc., etc., give us a fair idea of Thomas Cranmer. And one cannot help smiling when Francis I, of all men, is described as "filled with horror" at "such atrocity and sacrilege" as the trial and burning of the bones of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Furthermore, the author takes unwarrantable liberties with the documents that he assumes to quote. His treatment of Cromwell's letter to Michael Throgmorton (pp. 224-5) is a case in point. Whole clauses and sentences are left out without the slightest indication of their omission, and the general effect of the letter (which, though malevolent and abusive to a degree, is a masterpiece of sixteenth-century style) is thus utterly lost. "Apeynement" should be "apeyrement." There are a number of minor errors and misprints which it would be useless to notice here. And it is extremely confusing to find "Pole's book" indiscriminately referred to as "Pro Unitatis Ecclesiasticae," "De Unitate," "De Unitate Ecclesiastica," and "Pro Ecclesiasticae Unitatis Defensione."

It is perhaps unfair to judge such a book as this from the standpoint of serious history, and the reviewer would have gladly refrained from doing so, had not the author virtually demanded such consideration in his preface. The fact is that another life of the Cardinal was scarcely needed when this book was begun. "Each century since that which saw the birth and death of Pole has seen his life and character brought before the judgment of the world," as the author rightly confesses. His biography has been written by Beccatelli, Phillips, and Zimmermann, not to mention F. G. Lee and Dr. Gairdner in the Dictionary of National Biography; and his letters have been published by Cardinal Quirini. Mr. Haile justifies the appearance of his "twentieth-century biography" chiefly on the ground that Quirini and Zimmermann are untranslated, and Phillips tedious and irrelevant. Doubtless the English-speaking world will be rendered more familiar with an already familiar figure than if this book had not seen the light, and we thoroughly concur in the author's estimate of his hero, whose learning, simple-mindedness, and piety will always be praised by all fair-minded persons, whether

Protestant or Catholic. But the reader should be warned that Mr. Haile's estimates of most of Pole's contemporaries, their aims and their policies, and of the general movements of the period as a whole are far less trustworthy, and that though he writes attractively, he is too partisan in his standpoint and too unscientific in his methods to deserve the same measure of respect that is accorded to the unprejudiced historian.

The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate. By Benjamin Wisner Bacon, D.D., LL.D. New York: Moffat, Yard & Co. \$4.

This volume is perhaps the most important American contribution to the study of the Fourth Gospel since the days of Ezra Abbot. Wide learning, historical imagination, ingenuity in framing hypotheses from few and perplexing data, are everywhere manifest. Though the temper is often controversial, the purpose is constructive. The writer does not claim to have discovered any new documentary evidence, but is confident, after having examined diligently all accessible data, that the author of the Fourth Gospel is not the Son of Zebedee, but some Hellenistic Jew living and writing in Asia at the end of the first century and the opening decades of the second century.

The early literary history of this anonymous gospel is difficult to trace. Dr. Bacon, however, is convinced that the gospel, as we now have it, shows signs not of structural unity, but of growth and revision. The chief reviser, it is contended, was a Roman, a contemporary of Papias and Justin, whose aim was to adjust the gospel "to rival forms of the evangelic tradition" and to procure for it "the apostolic authority of the John of Revelation, without detriment to the dominant authority of Peter, by a cautiously suggested identification of 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' with the Son of Zebedee" (p. 224). This reviser, in adding Ch. xxi to the gospel about 150 A. D., shares, it should seem, the view of authorship later expressed by Irenæus, but "instead of plain statement, shelters himself behind purposed ambiguity." But why do we have from the reviser even this cautious suggestion that the author of the Fourth Gospel is the Son of Zebedee? In passing it is to be remembered that the Gospel in its original form is, like the Epistles ascribed to John, anonymous; that Papias corroborates the suggestion of Mark x:39 in stating that John, like his brother James, was murdered by the Jews; and that evidently the Son of Zebedee had never been in Ephesus. Why, then, does it occur to the reviser to connect the Gospel with the Son of Zebedee? The answer is to be sought, not in the fact that there is other and excellent tradition

for the Ephesian residence of the Son of Zebedee, but that Papias and Justin accepted Revelation as originating from John. This endorsement of John, however, does not of necessity involve the assumption that the Son of Zebedee had ever been in Ephesus, unless Papias had in mind a temporary sojourn in Patmos; nor does it prove that John is the author of Revelation. For this book is at its core a Palestinian product which later on was revised in Ephesus, at which time the name of John was introduced into the Ephesian envelope (Ch. i-iii, xxii: 8-21) in order that the churches of Asia might accept Revelation as of apostolic authority. The apostolic name of John thus introduced, it was natural to ascribe the Gospel and the Epistles to the same author. The reviser who inserted the appendix into the Gospel accepts this tradition of authorship, though, as we have seen, somewhat hesitatingly. Is it conceivable, we might ask, that the Roman reviser wondered why such an important document as the Fourth Gospel, revealing as it does a man with a strong religious personality, should be ascribed to an apostle who had never been in Asia, who had, in fact, gone to the martyr's grave years ago? Is it possible that the reviser, though a Roman, had his doubts that Rev. Ch. i-iii is really an Ephesian intrusion into the Apocalypse? Dr. Bacon's reading of the evidence cannot countenance such inquiries. On the contrary, the true starting-point of the legend that connects the Son of Zebedee with the so-called Johannine Writings is precisely the "literary fiction by which the Ephesian editor of the Palestinian book of 'prophecy' sought to give it currency and canonicity among the churches of Asia" (p. 183). What this Ephesian editor of Revelation began, the Roman reviser of the Fourth Gospel continued, and Irenæus ended.

To the reader familiar with Ezra Abbot, Lightfoot, Drummond, and Sanday, it is evident that this reading of the early literary history of the Johannine writings involves a thorough discrediting of the testimony of Irenæus, a rigorous insistence upon the silence of Ignatius and Polycarp, and a definite theory as to the origin of the Apocalypse in its present form. This necessary task Dr. Bacon performs with a thoroughness and brilliancy impossible to picture in a brief review. The hypothesis which connects the Son of Zebedee with the Fourth Gospel, even if that connection be no closer than that of Matthew with the First Gospel, accounts rather better for the tradition voiced by Irenæus than the hypothesis of a literary fiction. But apart from the rightness or wrongness of the conclusion, it must be emphasized that Dr. Bacon's treatise is indispensable to students of early Christian literature. It is not easy reading, and the

better the reader is acquainted with contemporary discussion, the more important will the book become.

What's Wrong With the World? By G. K. Chesterton. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. \$1.50.

It will probably be conceded that when Mr. Chesterton sat down to compose this book he was undertaking a rather large order. Indeed, he himself admits that it a little tasked his ability thoroughly to illumine and ventilate the present malady of the world. When he came to consider the matter more narrowly, he seems to have stumbled upon the discovery that society is afflicted with no one isolable affection, but with an intricate and unruly complication of diseases. It is evidence of this paradoxer's triumphant virtue, his powerful common sense, that his diagnosis of the world's ailments is entirely lacking in the simplicity, unity, and rigid coherence to which we have been accustomed by the trenchant treatises of our sociologists.

To distrust the plausible simplicity of words, and smash resolutely through them to the variegated and disorderly facts which they conceal, is at least a beginning in fruitful social criticism. And Mr. Chesterton, as he goes about his passionate vocation of turning words upside down and inside out, dislodges, besides an abundance of excellent jokes, much matter of serious import. That the Feminist is "one who dislikes the chief feminine characteristics" may perhaps be regarded in either light. The parable of the umbrella stand is undeniably serious. We condense the argument as follows:

A Socialist means a man who thinks a walking-stick is like an umbrella, because they both go into an umbrella stand. Yet they are as different as a battle-axe and a bootjack. . . . The whole Collectivist error consists in saying that because two men can share an umbrella, therefore two men can share a walking-stick. Umbrellas might possibly be replaced by some kind of common awnings covering certain streets from particular showers. But there is nothing but nonsense in the notion of swinging a communal stick; it is as if one spoke of twirling a communal moustache. It will be said that . . . no sociologists suggest such follies. . . . At least sixty Socialists out of a hundred, when they have spoken of common laundries, will go on at once to speak of common kitchens. . . . Kitchens and washhouses are both large rooms, full of heat, and damp, and steam. But the soul and function of the two things are utterly opposite. There is only one way of washing a shirt; that is, there is only one right way. There is no taste and fancy in tattered shirts. Nobody says, "Tomkins likes five holes in his shirt, but I must say, give me the good old four holes." Nobody says, "This washerwoman rips up the left leg of my pajamas; now, if there is one thing I insist on, it is the *right* leg ripped up." The ideal washing is simply to send

a thing back washed. But it is by no means true that the ideal cooking is simply to send a thing back cooked.

The trouble with the modern world, according to Mr. Chesterton, is that the modern reformers, the Socialists, the Feminists, the new educators, ignore what the people want. In their projects for a golden age in the future they assume a kind of man and woman that has never existed. What the people want, he believes, is what they have *always* wanted. The way to make them happy is to help them fulfil the ideals which they have cherished from the morning of time. Reform must be based not on human nature as presented in the romances of H. G. Wells and the scientific Utopians, but upon human nature as revealed in the history of the race. The history of the race reveals the fact, for example, that man has always wanted a hearth and home—not a share in a communal bed-chamber or kitchen. Begin, therefore, with man in a home and reconstruct society to conform to that ideal, instead of beginning with a communal kitchen and reconstructing man to conform to that ideal. Begin with anything you please, except the theory of a sociological quack. Begin with an order that the hair of all poor schoolgirls shall be cut off for the purpose of cleanliness:

With the red hair of one she-urchin in the gutter I will set fire to all modern civilization. Because a girl should have long hair, she should have clean hair; because she should have clean hair, she should not have an unclean home; because she should not have an unclean home, she should have a free and leisured mother; because she should have a free mother, she should not have an usurious landlord; because there should not be an usurious landlord, there should be a redistribution of property; because there should be a redistribution of property, there shall be a revolution.

The parable of the red hair sounds distinctly radical; Mr. Chesterton would doubtless assert that, on the contrary, it is distinctly conservative. It is designed to conserve the red hair; it is designed to conserve the world. Mr. Chesterton calls himself a Liberal; within a few years he will probably be publicly thanking God when men call him a reactionary. For at heart he is a kind of philosophical Tory—a twentieth century disciple of the school of Thomas Carlyle. "What's Wrong With the World?" is "Past and Present" modified by the time-spirit. The two prophets, so incongruously assorted in temper, are at one in their diatribes on game-preservers, in their distrust of systematizers, in their hostility to "philosophical radicalism," in their fundamental dogmatism, in their respect for a somewhat remote past, and in their sense of something fixed and eternal in the needs and nature of man. The irony of the comparison is in the differences. Carlyle

thought help should come from the House of Lords; Chesterton turns his back upon the lords and calls upon the Commons. Carlyle released his thunder upon democracy; Chesterton embraces democracy and trains his guns upon Socialism. Carlyle derided manhood suffrage; Chesterton swears by manhood suffrage and makes a laughing-stock of votes for women. What will be the conservatism of 1950?

Notes.

Admiral Alfred T. Mahan is publishing with Little, Brown, & Co. "The Interest of America in International Conditions."

Another volume of the "Descriptive Sociology" will soon be issued by the trustees of Herbert Spencer. It deals with the civilization of the Chinese, information concerning which has been collected and arranged by the British consul at Foochow, E. T. C. Werner.

A document newly discovered by Ernest Law in the Record Office forms the basis of a book by that well-known historian of Hampton Court, to be published by Bell. In it some statements usually made concerning Shakespeare's life are tested anew.

"An Account of the English Colony in New South Wales," by David Collins, sometime judge-advocate and secretary of the colony, and edited with Introduction and Notes by James Collier, is reprinted by Whitcombe & Tombs of Melbourne.

The eighth part of Dr. Edwin Abbott's "Diatessarica," entitled "The Son of Man; or Contributions to the Study of the Thoughts of Jesus," is promised by the Cambridge University Press for November 1.

"The Green Helmet, and other Poems" is the title of a new volume of verse by W. B. Yeats, which the Cuala Press of Dublin, will shortly have ready. Besides eighteen new lyrics, the volume will contain a poetical drama.

"Porphyry's Letter to His Wife Marcella," being the only English version of the letter, which after a number of centuries was rediscovered in 1816, is to be published, as a revised edition of Alice Zimmern's translation, by Mayle of the Priory Press, Hampstead. It will be in the form of a shilling booklet.

Alexander Murray of Aberdeen announces for immediate publication "The Teacher's Complete Text-Book of Physical Exercises," by Isabel Murray.

"Pleasant Pages," written by Arthur Guiterman and composed and manufactured under the direction of J. H. Nash, typographer, is in the press of Paul Elder & Co. It is a catalogue of the books and cards suitable especially for the Christmas holidays.

In the list of Brentano's autumn announcements are: "D'Orsay; or The Complete Dandy," by W. Teignmouth Shore; "Storm and Treasure," an historical romance of French life, by H. C. Bailey; "The Merry Past," by Ralph Nevill; "Popular