Ebraica, lib. iii, ch. 24. *Vide* Levi's Ceremonies of the Jews, p. 146.

It is probable that the usages in the matter of divorce now existing among the Arabs are the same, or nearly so, as they were when Mohammed began his legislation. An Arab may divorce his wife on the slightest occasion. So easy and so common is the practice that Bruckhardt assures us that he has seen Arabs not more than forty-five years of age who were known to have had fifty wives, yet they rarely have more than one at a time.

By the Mohammedan law a man may divorce his wife orally and without any ceremony; he pays her a portion, generally one-third of her dowry. He may divorce her twice and take her again without her consent, but if he put her away on a triple divorce conveyed in the same sentence, he cannot receive her again until she has been married and divorced by another husband, who must have consummated his marriage with her. By the Jewish law it appears that a wife could not divorce her husband; but under the Mohammedan Code, for cruelty and some other causes, she may divorce him; and this is an instance where Mohammed appears to have been more considerate toward women than Moses. Among the Hindoos, and also among the Chinese, a husband may divorce his wife upon the slightest ground, or even without assigning any reason. She is under the absolute control of her husband — a perfect machinery of obedience. The law of France, before the revolution following the judgment of the Catholic church, held marriage to be indissoluble, but during the early revolutionary period divorce was permitted at the pleasure of the parties when incompatibility of temper was alleged. The Code Napoleon restricted this liberty, but still allowed either party to demand a divorce on the ground of adultery committed by the other, for outrageous conduct or ill usage, on account of condemnation to an infamous punishment, or to effect it by mutual consent expressed under certain conditions. By the same Code a woman could not contract a new marriage until the expiration of two months from the dissolution of the preceding. On the restoration of the Bourbons a law was promulgated, 8th May, 1816, declaring divorce to be abolished; that all suits then pending for divorce, for definite cause, should be for separation only, and that all steps then taken for divorce by mutual consent should be void; and such is now the law of France.

Divorce in Holland may be obtained for adultery and for malicious desertion. If other causes can, by an extended interpretation, be brought within the reason of the first two causes, they are held sufficient. Thus the commission of an unnatural crime, or perpetual imprisonment, are good grounds of divorce. Besides the divorce, which entirely dissolves the marriage, there is also a provisional separation introduced from the canon law, termed a separation of bed and board, cohabitation and goods. There must be lawful reason set forth in the application tending to show that the continuing to live together is dangerous, or at least insupportable. In this proceeding the intervention of the authority of the judge is requisite, who, after a summary inquiry, may confirm the agreement in this respect. President Von Bynkershoek observes: "It were to be wished that, from the too easy compliance of the magistrates, separations were not so frequent as they at present are." If such a separation includes a division of the goods, the community of goods induced by law on the marriage is suspended, and the marital power of the husband thereby ceases. Should the parties come together again, the former rights and consequences of marriage revive. When the marriage has been dissolved on account of adultery or malicious desertion, the innocent party may marry. And it is also permitted to the guilty party to marry again, while the other remains unmarried, except to the person with whom the adultery is committed.

This seemed to have a very salutary influence since divorces there were very rare, but the tide of contiguity seems to have brought with it many elements of demoralization and more dissatisfaction in relation to the marriage ties.

In Spain the same causes affect the validity of a marriage as in England, and the contract is indissoluble by the civil courts, matrimonial causes being exclusively of ecclesiastical cognizance. (Instit. Laws of Spain.) At the reformation the Protestants rejected the Papal tenet, that marriage was a sacrament and indissoluble. In some Protestant countries, however, the ecclesiastical courts clung to the