

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum United States & Europe—\$2.00

Published and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, B.A. Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.

Associate Editors: Rev. D. A. Casey H. F. MacIntosh

Approved and recommended by Archbishop Palumbo and Boretti, late Apostolic Delegate to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and copies for the Catholic Record: General agents: Messrs. P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Hearty, and Miss Sara Hanley, Kingston, Ont.; Messrs. J. Murray, Montreal; George B. Brewster, Regina; Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss B. Saunders, Sydney; Miss L. Heinger, Winnipeg; Miss Johnson, Ottawa and Miss Rose McKeaney, 149 D'Aiguillon street, Quebec.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 20 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order. Ordinary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 10 cents. Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.

In St. John, N. F. Single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main Street, John J. Dwyer and The O'Neill Co. Pharmacy, 109 Brussels Street.

In Montreal, single copies may be purchased from Mr. E. O'Grady, 865 Boulevard St. Viateur street, west, and J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine street, west.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1915

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND DIVORCE

Not only to Catholics but to the world, Protestant and pagan, it is well known that the Catholic Church countenances divorce, where there is a valid marriage, under no circumstances whatsoever. Recently we had occasion to refer to the ludicrous misconception of Catholic practice evidenced by our Methodist contemporary the Christian Guardian.

Here is the Guardian's reply: "Our friend the CATHOLIC RECORD does not like our reference to Roman Catholic priests marrying divorced men, and it argues that Protestant marriages are not really marriages, and refers us to 1 Cor. 1:12-15, where Paul says that if a man has a wife who is an unbeliever and she leaves him he is to let her go."

Well, in a sense, we liked it; and we are sure that our laughing readers enjoyed it. Moreover, we did the Guardian the justice of quoting its own words.

Now the Guardian tells its readers that we argued "that Protestant marriages are not real marriages."

What we said in the very words in which we said it, and in which the Guardian read it, was this:

Baptized Protestants contract sacramental marriage, a fact that was specifically noted in the much-abused *Ne Temere* decree. So that conversion to the Church would give them no advantage whatever so far as divorce is concerned.

Just how the Guardian construes this into arguing that Protestant marriages are not really marriages passes our power to understand.

The Guardian continues: "Now if this passage proves anything it proves too much for the RECORD. If these marriages were real marriages, then Paul sanctions divorce; while if they were not real marriages, Paul is evidently sanctioning concubinage."

This peculiar passage throws some light on the darkness in which the Guardian writer is egotistically groping.

Erastianism is apparently so much a matter of course with him that he does not even suspect that there may be any difference between Christian marriage and what is recognized as legal marriage by the civil power in any given case.

To Catholics the distinction is clear. Marriage is a natural contract with civil consequences. Therefore the civil power rightly takes cognizance of the marriage contract. It limits and restricts the natural contract. It imposes conditions which if not observed leaves the natural marriage contract without any legal status whatever.

It designates certain persons who must be the official witnesses of such contract under pain of regarding it, in the eyes of the law, as null and void. Here and elsewhere every Christian minister, Catholic or Protestant, is constituted by the State as a legal and official witness to the marriage contract.

Justices of the Peace and others are also so recognized. No Catholic questions the legal status of any legal marriage.

But marriage is also a sacrament of the new dispensation. And in so far as it is a sacrament the Church of God alone has the right and duty to legislate therein. We do not expect our Methodist friends to concede the claims of the Catholic Church; but we do think that they should understand them before asserting that the Catholic Church is inconsistent.

Legal marriage is all right so far as it goes; but Catholics do not concede to the State any control whatsoever over sacramental marriage.

In Turkey a Catholic would have no more right to keep a harem than in Canada; though the legal enactments with regard to marriage might permit him such a privilege.

Need we go on? Paul does not sanction concubinage, neither does he sanction concubinage. Infidels are not living in concubinage when they live in the natural contract of marriage; but neither are they living in the sacramental contract of Christian marriage. The only trouble with the Guardian's dilemma is that it has no horns.

So far as the case in point is concerned, while we do not know the facts, we are certain that if the divorced Guggenheim was married by a Catholic priest, the case must come under the Pauline Privilege where one at least of the parties was unbaptized. So far as the legal contract is concerned it was, according to the Guardian, legally dissolved.

Whether or not this cursory reference to an outstanding Catholic practice will be sufficient to enlighten our Methodist friend we do not know; he should study the question.

The Guardian concludes: "And again, Paul does not allow the believer to terminate the bond, as he declares distinctly that no such man must leave his unbelieving wife, whereas Roman Catholic priests have even ordered husbands to leave their wives under pain of refusing the sacraments to them. The RECORD will find it better not to quote Scripture too freely."

Though he gets pretty far from the Guggenheim case our Evangelical friend shows that he is so radically and unconsciously Erastian that we can understand and pity his confusion.

Precisely the same right that the civil power has to recognize and legislate for marriage in so far as it is a civil contract the Church enjoys in so far as marriage is a sacrament.

Neither here nor in Turkey can she give up a jot or tittle of the responsibility with which Christ charged her. Wherefore, though a marriage may be legal, if it is contracted in defiance of the laws of the Church, Roman Catholic priests will continue to warn Catholics, that they must validate such marriage or leave the (legal) husband or wife under pain of refusal of the sacraments.

Does our Erastian friend go so far as to concede to the civil power the right to say when the sacraments should be granted or refused?

It should not be necessary to point out that just as the civil courts declare invalid a civil contract when some essential condition is lacking, so the ecclesiastical courts must necessarily declare a contract of marriage invalid if it contravenes the legislation of the Church with regard to any essential condition.

DEATH OF A PROMINENT CATHOLIC LAYMAN

With deep regret we read the announcement of the death of a noted writer for the American Catholic press, Mr. Andrew J. Shipman. He died recently in New York, where he practised law very successfully for many years. He was a native of Springvale, Fairfax county, Virginia; having been born there on the 15th of October, 1857.

We have frequently quoted the writings of the late Mr. Shipman. He was one of the contributors to the Catholic Encyclopedia; and his writings on all points of Catholic doctrine and in controversy showed a deep study of his subject. His articles in the *Columbiad*—published from time to time—were very favorably commented upon; and his special subject in that publication on the "Catholic Layman" was a masterpiece.

The late Mr. Shipman was a member of one of the leading law firms in New York, and held the degree of LL. D. In conversation recently with a resident of London, who knew him for over twenty years, he said it was truly marvellous how Mr. Shipman had been able to devote so much of his time to writing and working for his religion, as he was one of the very busiest men in Wall Street, where his offices were located.

The following reference to him was recently published in the *Washington Times*:

New York, Nov. 13.—Georgetown College, Washington, D. C., "as a mark of remembrance of my Alma Mater," is to receive \$500 for each \$10,000 left by Andrew J. Shipman, a lawyer whose will has been filed in the surrogate court. Mr. Shipman was a member of the law firm of Blandy, Mooney & Shipman.

Here is an example for the Catholic who nearly always forgets his Alma Mater, and frequently omits the name of his Church in his will.

Mr. Shipman leaves a widow—who was Miss Adair Mooney of New York. To her the RECORD tenders its sincere sympathy.

A solemn Mass of Requiem for the repose of his soul was offered on the 19th inst. at the Church of St. Catherine, Washington Heights, N. Y.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH EXTENSION SOCIETY

We have received from His Lordship, Bishop Power, the letter which follows. In his arduous task of reconstituting the Catholic Church Extension Society of Canada we bespeak for him the sympathy and good will of all the readers of the CATHOLIC RECORD.

With regard to the formation of local branches, direction may be expected from local bishops.

Pending the appointment of a president and at the invitation of the Executive Committee I have consented to assume temporary direction of the Society's affairs.

The home mission needs of Canada and Newfoundland are very urgent at present. Earnest appeals from Bishops and institutions in sparsely settled parts have come recently to the Extension Society. No large contributions are expected during the war, and the only way open is to extend the membership of the Society by forming branches everywhere, so that the burden may be light and that local financial requirements may not be impeded.

The fee of membership is only 10 cents per month for adults and 5 cents a month for children under fifteen. As every diocese has its own poor missions the intention is to refund to each Bishop for local needs 20 per cent. of the amount collected in his diocese. The balance will be distributed by the Board of Directors to meet the home mission needs in Canada and Newfoundland. This form of co-operation, it is hoped, will not only have good financial results, but will also develop a sense of unity in the Catholic body.

The Catholic Church Extension Society of Canada and Newfoundland is the apostolate of our Home Missions. Its objects are:

1. To serve as a medium of distribution whereby those Catholics who are in a position to help others may extend church facilities to places in need of aid.

2. To train priests for the missionary parishes of Canada and Newfoundland.

3. To provide means of worship in sparsely settled districts.

4. To aid the Bishop of the Ruthenians in his missionary work.

5. To foster a missionary spirit among Catholics.

M. F. POWER, Acting President.

THE CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY

One of the departments of our Provincial Government, that especially commends itself to charitable disposed people, is that in charge of neglected or dependent children. Its scope is gradually widening and the exigencies of the present military situation will no doubt increase the number of its wards. It is a society that appeals to all classes in the community. It is non-sectarian and its constitution provides for the religious liberty of the children under its care. It is strictly forbidden to place Catholic children with Protestant foster-parents, or vice versa. There is no reason why it should not deserve the sympathy of all classes. Yet in many places it is not looked upon with favor.

What is the cause of this? The reason lies not in the nature of the work itself, nor in the actions of local boards of management, nor in any lack of efficiency on the part of the matrons in charge of the various shelters. It would seem that the agents or inspectors, sent out or appointed by the department, are largely responsible for this condition of things. As to the lady inspectors, who are few in number, it goes without saying that they should be persons who have shown themselves capable of managing their own domestic affairs before being appointed to look after the children of other people. No doubt the majority of them could qualify under this head; but there are some exceptions.

As regards the men, it is a strange coincidence that so many of them are either ministers or local preachers. Of course this does not disqualify them for the position, but it does give a semblance of sectarianism to the society. Moreover, their former calling has fostered in them a goody-goody, preachy style of address that does not appeal to business men, who look rather for exact knowledge of his duties and executive ability in the government's agent.

Among the requirements of an inspector, as laid down in the last annual report of the department, we find this clause: "He (the inspector)

should be a leader with executive ability and a large amount of common sense." We have no reason to doubt that the majority of the society's agents are prudent and capable men. Some, however, have not in their composition that last ingredient, viz., common sense. They are drawing a fat salary from the government and, of course, feel that they should manifest some activity. This leads them often to meddle in cases where they have no right to interfere. We often wonder if it would not be better to have fewer inspectors, and to transfer some of the duties performed by them to the local township and town councils, who are on the spot and who are the best judges in local cases of destitution or neglect. Our Catholic orphanages have no salaried inspectors. The local parish priest is the judge in such cases, and the plan works admirably. Fewer pious platitudes from well paid good Samaritans, fewer time light illustrations of horrible examples for the edification of maiden ladies and a little more quiet, earnest, unobtrusive work would be more in accord with the advice of the Apostle of Charity: "My little children let us not love in word and in tongue, but in deed and in truth."

There may, perchance, be other reasons for this undue interference on the part of inspectors, and this is the point that prompted this article. Perhaps they have put a socialistic interpretation upon the following clause in the list of the requirements of an inspector, above referred to: "He shall constantly keep in mind that the children of his jurisdiction have a claim upon the State, and that he is the appointed state father of all children, who may need his advice, care, help or protection."

Color is given to this suspicion by a statement made by an inspector sent from the head office to establish a local branch. At a public meeting he used these words in the writer's presence: "Parents must be made to understand that their children belong to the State, and that they are only the guardians of them, and if they do not fulfil their duties properly, the State can step in and take their children from them."

This is Socialism with a vengeance, and right here in this staid, Conservative province of Ontario.

That Ontario the State is forever stretching out one of its many arms to grasp and appropriate to itself some inherent right of the family or the individual. By the introduction of a Prussianizing system in education it is sinking its fangs into the God-given right of the parent to educate his child according to the dictates of his conscience, and now another arm reaches out to draw our very children themselves into its greedy maw, if we are not careful to observe its moral and hygienic regulations. This is no exaggeration. There are facts to substantiate it. It behooves us to be upon our guard. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

THE GLEANER.

THE CENSORSHIP

At the outset let us say that, despite its heading, this has nothing to do with the war. About the uses and abuses of the war censorship we have nothing to say. We are concerned here with the censorship of the parent.

This censorship of which we speak is ordained by God. It is not for a brief period of time, but for life. And it includes within its purview all questions of faith and morals. And its duties cannot be discharged by proxy—the appointment is to certain specified persons, and they cannot sub delegate their responsibility.

When a child is born into the world the greatest responsibility that can be laid upon human shoulders is placed upon the parents of that child. An immortal soul is entrusted to their keeping. God has created that soul for Himself, and in His own good time He will look for its return at their hands. The babe comes away from the baptismal font robed in the white garment of sanctifying grace. As it grows in years the dread responsibility rests upon the parents to see that it also grows in holiness. Its spiritual development must keep pace with its physical development. And it is too indeed to the parent who neglects the responsibility, and who takes but little care of this treasure that is his.

Softness is the predominant note of the age. Over indulgence is the crying sin of the parents of to-day. Obedience is but little insisted upon, and all notions of discipline are discarded as out of date. Liberty is degraded into licence, and precocious

independence takes the place of reverence. Infants in swaddling clothes are accorded the rights and privileges of grown ups. One looks in vain for the old-fashioned virtues of childhood. It is hardly too much to say that there are no children now.

It is not difficult to estimate the results of such an up-bringing. Parental respect goes by the boards. The truths of faith are severely discounted. The rights and duties of citizenship sit lightly upon the shoulders never trained to bear the yoke. The products of such a system as we have outlined will be little credit to the State and still less to God.

Children should be trained to obey and to practice self-denial. It is quite possible to be kind without indulging their every whim. The mawkish sentimentality that passes for kindness at the present time is really cruelty of the severest kind. There are appetites that we cannot satisfy. There are appetites that we must not satisfy. A child who has never been taught to say "no" will yearn for the one and indulge the other. The result must be a life of unhappiness and disappointed hopes.

The parent who really loves his children will be jealous of his responsibility. He will endeavor to discharge his office of censor faithfully and well. He will study his children's characters, and watch their budding temperaments. He will not hesitate to correct and reprove. The result will bring happiness to himself and to those entrusted to his guidance. It will bring honor to the State and glory to God.

COLUMBA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE LARGE place which Greece is now occupying in the attention of the world, and the exceedingly tortuous policy which she is pursuing in relation to the Allies have made the personality of her ruler, King Constantine, a subject of international interest. Closely allied by marriage to the Kaiser as he is, his sympathies seem to lie in that direction rather than with the cause of liberty and civilization and the highest interests of his people. And if Teutonic pressure should in the event prove too great to save the latter now, the termination of his kingship, and the elimination of his house will probably prove to be the price which Constantine will have to pay for his unfortunate alliances.

IN APPRAISING the position of King Constantine in the present unture it should not be forgotten that his sympathies are German, not alone because of his immediate alliance with the reigning Kaiser, but because of his own Teutonic antecedents. When Greece threw off the Turkish yoke early in the last century, and set up once more as an independent kingdom, it was to Austria she was directed to look for a ruler, and it was largely by pressure brought to bear upon her by the northern monarchies rather than of her own volition, that the boy prince, Otto, became King of the Greeks. Surprise has sometimes been expressed by historians that in her national reconstitution Greece made no attempt to recall her ancient imperial line. The solution no doubt lies in the quality and persistence of Teutonic pressure.

THE FALL of Constantinople and the heroic resistance and death of Constantine Paleologus (or Paleologue), the 80th Roman Emperor since Constantine the Great, is one of the precious memories of Christendom. It meant the extinction of Christianity in the Eastern Empire, and the long period of Turkish domination not yet terminated, it is true, but by reason of the faith of the Paleologi and the martyrdom of its last representative in the person of Constantine, a priceless heritage was bequeathed to the Christian Church, and a tradition of restoration which bids fair even now to be realized. The story of the fall has been told by Gibbon and by ecclesiastical historians, and is therefore familiar to modern readers. But the fate of the ancient line is lost in the mists of western history, and had Greece made any attempt to reconstitute it, a new and most thrilling chapter must have been added to the literature of romance.

THOUGH SO well known, it may not be amiss here to sketch briefly the last hours of the Eastern Roman Empire. After the Council of Florence this venerable fabric was

seen to be on the eve of destruction, Constantine XII. had succeeded his brother John VIII, in 1448. This heroic prince, although without any hope of success was, as we have seen, faithful to his trust to the last. The Sultan, Mohammed II., had seized everything up to the very walls of Constantinople, and while Constantine had tried desperately to get help from the West, and in this attempt had the support and co-operation of Pope Nicholas V., no help was forthcoming, save from Genoa and the Holy See itself. The valiant Genoese sea-captain, John Giustiniani, with five ships and seven hundred men, sailed into Constantinople, and while not strong enough to turn the tide, shared in the glorious defence of the city and, as Fortesque expresses it, "left to the 'proud' Republic a memory of which it really had a right to be proud." Constantine knowing that resistance was hopeless tried to make terms with the enemy, but Mohammed, drunk with the prospect that lay before him, of making the "New Rome" the capital of Islamism, would not consent, and demanded immediate surrender. He even offered Constantine a palace and a pension if he would give up the city quietly. "So long as he lives," was the reply, "the Roman Emperor must defend the Roman world. So, since neither oaths, nor treaties, nor any offer can bring us peace, go on then with the war."

THE SIEGE lasted from April 6 to May 29; 258,000 Turks fighting against less than 5,000 Romans. When at length it became apparent that resistance could not be further prolonged, the Emperor went to the Cathedral of Saint Sophia, heard the Liturgy and received Holy Communion. It was the last Christian service, says Fortesque, in the great cathedral, and we shall remember, too, that he received the last Sacrament in communion with the Holy See and with the Catholic Church. Then he made that famous speech which Gibbon has called "the funeral oration of the Roman Empire," and rode out to die. He stood, surrounded by his guard, near the gate of St. Romanos, defending while he lived the city he could no longer save. Fighting valiantly with his back to the wall, he fell in the tumult of the assault, as the last heir of the Roman name should fall, fighting for Christ and Rome and adorning the Imperial purple with the glory of his heroic blood. With him the old Empire died. It may be seen, then, how, notwithstanding its consequences, the event remains one of the most precious memories of Christendom.

ROMANCE LINGERS round the last descendants of the Emperors, and it is not generally known that the very last of the line died in England. The story may be briefly told. Constantine had a brother, Tomasio, a soldier of such spirit that Mohammed, "the Conqueror," speaking of the Peloponnese, said he had found many slaves in the country, but only one man, Tomasio. Of this prince it is related that after defending the fortress of Salonica with undaunted constancy against the Moslems, until all hope of relief was abandoned, he fled into Italy, where Pope Pius II, bestowed honors upon him and a pension until his death. Tomasio had an only son called John, who, accompanying his father into Italy, married a noble lady of Pisa, and, after Tomasio's death, with her assumed some of the pomp and state of the ancient Imperial court. The offspring of this marriage was a son, Theodoros, who in due course married and became the father of Prospero, who in turn became the father of Camillo.

IN THE time of Pope Paul V., so runs the history, Camillo, untrue to the traditions of his house, espoused the Eastern schism and by this act of apostasy necessarily rendered himself obnoxious to the Papal authorities. He was forced to leave Rome with his son, and with their flight history passes into tradition. It was believed at the time that they both perished at sea and that with them the Imperial line was extinguished. There is reason to believe, however, that like so many later royal exiles they found their way to England, and in Cornwall the thread is picked up again. In the parish church at Lindulph there is a mural monument, ornamented with an escutcheon of brass, on which is engraved two towers, with the figure of an eagle with two heads, resting a claw on each turret. The singularity of this armorial bear-

ing is to those versed in heraldry very striking and the inscription beneath is even more remarkable. It is, in light of the foregoing, worth transcribing.

THIS QUIRKY and curious inscription reads as follows: "Here lieth the body of Theodoro Paleologus, of Pisanio, in Italy, descended from the Imperial line of the last Christian Emperors of Greece, being the sonne of Camillo, the sonne of Prospero, the sonne of Theodoro, the sonne of John, the sonne of Thomas (Tomasio), the second brother to Constantine Paleologus, the eighth of that name, and last of the line that reigned in Constantinople until subdued by the Turks, who married with Mary, the daughter of William Balls, of Hadlye, in Suffolke, Gent, and had issue five children: Theodoro, John, Ferdinando, Maria, and Dorothy, and departed this lyte at Clytton, the 21st of January, 1686."

NOR DOES the record end here. It has been ascertained that of the children mentioned in this inscription, Dorothy, the youngest was married at Lindulph, to William Arrundel in 1656, and died in 1681; Maria was unmarried, died, and was buried there in 1674. Of the sons, Ferdinand and John, no record is preserved, and the name of Theodoros has likewise perished. It appears, however, by the parish register of Hadleigh, in Suffolk, that the father, Theodoros, was married there on 27th May, 1617, and that this son was the first progeny of the union. The who's subject is curious, and in the light of current events it would well repay investigation on the part of competent historians.

THERE is a discrepancy between the above inscription and authentic history. It will be noted that the last Christian Emperor is there described as Constantine Eight. He was in reality the twelfth of the name. The writer of the inscription probably confused the enumeration with Constantine's father, John VIII. That Constantine had other collateral descendants is probable. When John Galt, traveller, novelist and historian, was in the Levant, he met with an old Greek prelate, the Primate of Moresa, whom he describes as "an extremely respectable-looking old gentleman," who claimed to be descended from the Paleologi. Galt concluded that his rank in the government lent coloring to the claim. The story throughout were it proved to its depths would doubtless add another and fascinating chapter to modern history.

ON THE BATTLE LINE

All eyes are centred on the Balkans where events are moving rapidly. Serbian resistance is over; the only hope is that the southern army may be saved. Pressure by the Allied powers has so far failed to force Greece to abandon her neutrality and may antagonize Greek sentiment. Rumania appears to be on the verge of entering the war. There is little real reason to hope that she will take the side of the Allies. Rigid as the censorship is, enough is allowed to transpire to show that the Balkan situation is about as bad as possible.

Events in the Balkans are hastening to a crisis. The people of Greece are largely on the side of the Allies, but they fear, as do the diplomats of London, Paris and Rome, that the King proposes to use the army to insure the success of the Germans and Bulgars. The Government at Athens, which holds power despite the fact that it has no mandate from Parliament, is reported to have ordered all Greek merchant ships in French and Italian ports to leave immediately. This indicates a belief that the Allies mean to apply pressure to make Greece fulfil her treaty obligation to aid Serbia, and an intention on the part of the King and his Ministers, who are for the time being supreme because Parliament has been dissolved, to refuse, and possibly openly to side with the Germanic powers.

The Germans are doing their best to foment trouble between the Allies and Greece. Despatches to Frankfurt and Zaiting from Constantinople, which have no doubt been sent to Greece, say that "the English already consider Saloniki as English territory. They have been heard to say that Greece must either draw the sword voluntarily or be forced to do it. The overthrow of the dynasty is hinted at. In Athens serious measures are being considered. The state of siege which now exists in New Greece is likely to be decreed at any moment throughout the entire kingdom. Although the consent of Parliament is necessary under the law, superior forces can oblige the Government to act without the consent of Parliament. The Anglo-French forces are making large requisitions in Saloniki without the