

flag to conduct the funeral services. From the head officer down, so the letter runs, the men congregated about and with the utmost respect listened to or participated in the ritual as it was read by one of the Catholic soldiers. Just before the body was consigned to the waves all the Catholic boys knelt on deck and recited the Rosary for the repose of the soul that had been summoned before the judgment seat of God. That afternoon \$100 was collected among the men, which was later handed to a Liverpool priest to say Masses for the boy who had not been permitted to enter the trenches.

Among other items the letter tells of the solemnity which enhances the scene as every night the Rosary is recited by the soldiers. Immediately after the evening meal they gather on deck to pray to the Lord of battles for the grace and courage to conduct themselves as gallant Catholic defenders of this nation. In our own minds we are contrasting this picture with that other scene of where a Catholic boy in the army of a so-called Catholic nation was laughed out of quarters when he attempted to recite his night prayers before retiring. Names mean little nowadays and the self-styled Catholic countries may learn much in religious fidelity from lands that do not flaunt faith pretentiously.—F. in The Guardian.

MARRIAGE AND A NOVEL

Mr. Hughes, in his novel, "We Can't Have Everything," having completed his entirely erroneous historical discussion of marriage, essays to show, through the medium of his lawyer, that divorce is permissible on purely Scriptural grounds. He says:

"According to St. Matthew, Christ allowed divorce on the ground of adultery. According to Mark and Luke he made no such allowance. New York State follows St. Matthew. The Catholic Church follows Luke and John. Old Martin Luther said that marriage was none of the Church's business. And that is what I think."

There is no need of discussing the futility of the statement that New York State follows St. Matthew. It does nothing of the kind and makes no pretense to do so. Whatever may have been the reasons which led jurists and legislators to legalize divorce in New York State on the ground of adultery, they were not guided by St. Matthew nor did they base their action on his teaching.

Why the name of St. John is brought into the controversy is hard to see, for he is not usually quoted on the subject of matrimony, nor is there any text of his which throws light on the doctrine of divorce. It would be a distinct contribution to the subject if Mr. Hughes would indicate the passage in St. John on which the Church relies, for it has hitherto escaped the attention of the controversialists on both sides. The truth of the matter is, that St. John has not left in writing anything which settles the question one way or the other.

What "Old Martin Luther" thought on any subject is not of interest to Catholics. Luther himself was not very clear as to what he did think on marriage. A variety of reasons, some of which are rather obvious, led him in the end to say equivalently what Mr. Hughes credits him with thinking; but he did not make his pronouncement secularizing marriage, until after he had written, and this subsequently to his break with Rome, that "Marriage is a Sacrament, an external sign of the most high, holy, noble thing that ever was or ever will be, the union of the Divine and human nature in Christ." It is to be noted in passing that the sign is like the thing signified, and that therefore the union of man and woman in marriage should be like the union of Christ's Divinity and humanity, that is, inseparable. Later, stress of deplorable circumstances caused Luther to say: "It is not forbidden that a man should have more than one wife. I could not forbid it today." (Erlangen Ed., Vol. xxxiii, p. 324). For the sake of public decency Mr. Hughes should popularize the Reformer's former opinion; he will hardly agree with the latter. In all events he should be cautious about following Luther's theology. Even Protestants make large reservations in doing so.

Mr. Hughes is very dogmatic in his statement about the teaching of the synoptics. As it happens, he is correct in saying that according to St. Mark and St. Luke, Christ made no allowance for divorce on the ground of adultery. He might have added St. Paul's name to theirs, for the Apostle is no less silent than they. But he is in error in stating that "According to St. Matthew, Christ allowed divorce on the ground of adultery." Divorce in the sense intended by the novelist was not permitted by St. Matthew for any reason whatever. St. Matthew deals with the subject in two passages, chapter v: 31 sq. and chapter xix: 3 sq.; and in each passage Christ is recorded as forbidding divorce, the very opposite to what Mr. Hughes says St. Matthew represents Him as teaching.

The passages from St. Matthew are as follows: "And it has been said: Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce. But I say to you that whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting for the case of fornication, maketh her to commit adultery: and he that shall marry

her that is put away, committeth adultery. (v: 31, 32.)

"Moses by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery." (xix: 7, 8.)

If those passages were obscure, which they are not, they should be interpreted according to the recognized principle of exegesis by parallel passages which are clear. Now St. Mark, St. Luke and St. Paul writing on the same subject do not admit divorce for any reason whatsoever. St. Mark says:

"And he said to them: Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if the wife shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery." (x: 12.)

St. Luke says: "Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery." (xvi: 18.)

St. Paul says: "For the woman that hath a husband, whilst her husband liveth is bound to the law. But if her husband be dead, she is loosed from the law. Therefore, whilst her husband liveth she shall be called an adulteress, if she be with another man; but if her husband be dead, she is delivered from the law of her husband; so that she is not an adulteress, if she be with another man. (Rom. vii: 2, 3.)

Here we find absolute unanimity on the subject, an unrestricted prohibition of divorce. St. Matthew is recording the same doctrine as they. There can be no opposition between them, his meaning cannot contradict theirs. Therefore according to the laws of exegesis the words of St. Matthew, were they doubtful, should be understood in the sense made clear by the other inspired writers, if indeed the words are susceptible of such a sense. That they are susceptible of such a meaning is clear from the reading of them.

Moreover that sense is their natural, obvious sense. The only reason for questioning whether or not that is their natural sense is the presence of the exceptive phrase in chapter five, and the exceptive clause in chapter nineteen. To what does the exception concerning fornication refer? In both cases the exception gives a man the right to put away his wife, should she be guilty of violation of her marriage vows, but in neither case is there any permission given for the divorce for which Mr. Hughes argues.

That the bond of matrimony still persists in spite of the separation appears from the context in both passages. Christ says that if a man who has put away his wife marries again, or if the woman who has been put away marries again, or if any other man marries the woman who has been put away; they all alike commit adultery. He could not say this except on the supposition that the relation of husband and wife remains. The meaning, therefore, of Christ's words, as recorded by St. Matthew, is as follows: A man may separate from his wife if she is unfaithful. If he separates from her for any other reason, he exposes her to temptation and is partially responsible for sins she may commit. If he separates from her on account of her unfaithfulness, the responsibility rests wholly with her. He may not, however, marry again, nor can the woman who has been put away marry again. If either of them attempts to do so, they will be guilty of adultery.

A difficulty has been raised concerning the passage in chapter nineteen, some claiming that the exceptive clause refers both to the words which immediately precede it and to the words "and marry another" which follow it. But the laws of logic forbid such a supposition. An example will make this clear. In the sentence: "He who eats meat on Friday, without a dispensation, and becomes intoxicated, commits sin," there is an exceptive clause similar to the one in St. Matthew; but obviously it can refer only to what precedes it. The same is true of the clause, "except it be for fornication."

Another reason for holding that St. Matthew does not mean to say that Christ allowed divorce is the fact that His disciples found His doctrine extremely hard. "The disciples say unto Him, if the case of a man with his wife be so, it is not expedient to marry." (xiv: 10.) Evidently Christ was promulgating a new doctrine; but the doctrine which Mr. Hughes says St. Matthew attributes to Christ was not a new doctrine, for it was the current teaching of the school of Schammai in Jerusalem at the very time Christ was preaching.

Besides the Pharisees used the doctrine of Christ in order to "tempt him," to set him in opposition to the law. But the doctrine according to which divorce was permissible on the ground of adultery was not in opposition to the law. Christ has explicitly said in the Sermon on the Mount that the doctrine of the Jews on the question of putting away wives must be different from that of the Pharisees; and the context in chapter nineteen shows that Christ was doing away with concessions and restoring to the ancient custom, which he formulated in the law: "What God has joined together, let no man put asunder."

Sensible men do not write on subjects of which they have no knowledge. This is a counsel of ordinary prudence, which is absolutely imperative where the matter treated is one of proverbial difficulty. Popular novelists, it would appear, have not learned this lesson. Without special training in exegesis, which is an admittedly difficult subject and requires very special training, they essay to determine the meaning of certain texts of Sacred Scripture, the most difficult of all subjects of exegesis; and not content to hazard an amateur's judgment on matters which are properly restricted to specialists, they propound an opinion which runs counter to the views of men who have given their lives to the study. They do this without so much as hinting that there are literally thousands of pages written at various times, in many centuries, in many languages and in many lands, with exhaustive commentaries, which demonstrate the very contrary of what they assert.—J. Harding Fisher, S. J., in America.

THE EASY WAY

Judas Iscariot didn't intend To sell out his friend; 'Twas an easier role to betray Than defend. When the scoffers were scoffing he hadn't the pluck To stand by his Master or he would have stuck. He sneered when the scornful derisively sneered, And jeered when with them that unitedly jeered. He was flabby at heart and afraid to deny, When he stood alone what he knew was a lie. He tried to be all things to all men and failed, And so on the cross was mankind's Saviour nailed.

Judas Iscariot didn't intend To sell out his friend; 'Twas an easier role to betray Than defend. It wasn't the silver that led him astray So much as the fear of what many would say. He coveted praise and he trembled at sneers And he sold out his friend for the multitude's cheers, And no doubt he feared that he, too, might be hurt, So safety and ease tempted him to desert. The cause seemed a losing one back in his day, And Judas selected the easiest way. Judas Iscariot didn't intend To sell out his friend; 'Twas an easier role to betray Than defend. And down through the ages the custom has grown, And some men build never a thought of their own. They're awayed by the many, they tremble at jeers, And sell out the truth for a few paltry cheers. They haven't the courage to stand up and fight, They'd rather be praised by the mob than be right. Themselves and their friends and their cause they betray Because at the time it's the easiest way.

EDGAR A. GUEST.

A BEACON OF HOPE

We never know just how far each little candle throws its beams. Some times the feeblest glow is magnified by circumstances into a lighthouse gleam of hope and guidance. Often the smallest flame has the largest saving grace. Not until one has traveled in a lonely and unfamiliar land on a dark night, groping with the eyes for some sign to guide and finally catching a faint glow in a distant habitation—a hut, perhaps—is the full significance of the matter brought before the mind. It may be only a candle, fighting the darkness in a rude room yet to the traveler it is a beacon of hope.

FATHER FRASER'S CHINESE MISSION

Taichowfu, China, Nov. 26, 1916. Dear Readers of CATHOLIC RECORD: That your charity towards my mission is approved by the highest ecclesiastical authorities of Canada let me quote from a letter from His Excellency, The Most Rev. Peregrine F. Stagni, O. S. M., D. D., Apostolic Delegate, Ottawa: "I have been watching with much interest the contributions to the Fund opened on behalf of your missions by the CATHOLIC RECORD. The success has been very gratifying and shows the deep interest which our Catholic people take in the work of the missionary in foreign lands. . . I bless you most cordially and all your labors, as a pledge my earnest wishes for your greatest success in all your undertakings." I entreat you to continue the support of my struggling mission, assuring you a remembrance in my prayers and Masses.

Yours faithfully in Jesus and Mary
J. M. FRASER

Previously acknowledged... \$11,984 56
E. Mathewson, Arnprior... 5 00
M. J. C. St. John's, Nfld... 1 00
A. T. Kinkora... 2 00
T. F. McNamara, Low Point... 1 00
A. Friend, Lawn... 1 00
W. R. Bell, Revelstoke... 1 00
C. M. K. Elmwood... 5 00
W. J. Ryan, Chesley... 5 00

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH EXTENSION SOCIETY OF CANADA

CATHOLICITY IN ACTION

Few are the Catholics who realize that they are members of a Church which is really Catholic. They believe it. They even know it to be so; but they do not realize it. They have no daily practice which is based on the Catholicity of the Church. They know and often realize that in government the Church is world-wide. The existence of the Pope brings this fact home to their minds. But that Catholicity involves wide co-operation or any form of activity looking beyond the boundaries of the parish and the diocese—this is what people do not realize, and the fact that Catholics do not realize it is a source of great weakness to the cause of Catholicism. Individualism and localism are obstacles in the way of any important general movement. We repeat the article of the Creed, "I believe in the communion of saints," without attaching much meaning to it. A society like that of Catholic Extension is one effective means of bringing the practical import of this article home to our minds.

Because we are Catholics we are bound to assist other Catholics, particularly those in the sparsely settled section of our great Canadian West, to live and die in the Faith. There are thousands upon thousands in Canada without adequate means of practicing their holy religion. To them the Catholic Church Extension Society gives, as far as it is able, FRIENDS, RELIGIOUS TEACHERS, CHAPELS, VESTMENTS—in a word the means of serving God.

IN OPPOSITION to the Catholic Church Extension Society we have, in addition to the indifference of many Catholics to the law of Catholic Charity, the mighty opposition of the PROTESTANT MISSION SOCIETIES. During the year passed, the METHODISTS OF CANADA GAVE \$692,574.95 to Mission work. THE PRESBYTERIANS GAVE FOR MISSIONS IN CANADA \$408,263.75. It is unnecessary to state that a large amount of this money was spent in an endeavour (and with some success) to EVANGELIZE Catholics. The Methodist and Presbyterian Mission Reports confirm the statement more than once.

The Protestant newspapers published in Ruthenian are circulated among our foreign Catholic brethren. Even "MARIA MONK" has been

translated into Ruthenian to aid in the work of EVANGELIZATION.

UNITED CATHOLIC ACTION is necessary to combat the enemies of the Church and to save our people in life and Eternity.

Send your contributions to the Extension Society and be assured you are making a first class investment for Eternity.

REV. T. O'DONNELL, President, Catholic Church Extension Society, 67 Bond St., Toronto.

A GREAT MISTAKE

The San Francisco Monitor observes: How often has it happened that parents have stood in the way

of their boys when these boys felt that God had called them to His service—when they were convinced that Christ had addressed to them the invitation "Come, follow Me."

One reason after another has been urged why their sons should not enter the priesthood or the religious life, and it is to be feared that in too many cases of this nature the objections and opposition of parents have been heeded and a vocation has been lost.

To serve one's country is a noble thing, but to serve God as the Apostle says, is to reign.

A gentleman seldom meets rude persons.

Canada's Victory Loan

The Bonds of the above issue run in denominations of \$50.00 and multiples thereof.

Yielding in excess of 5½% interest, they provide an absolutely safe and profitable investment and afford, at the same time, an opportunity for the exercise of Patriotism and Duty on the part of purchasers. This Bank is prepared to receive subscriptions for and to make advances, upon favorable terms, against these Bonds.

THE MERCHANTS BANK OF CANADA



HOW many Victory Bonds have you bought?

Have you put yourself to any real inconvenience to buy Victory Bonds?

Have you denied yourself some purely personal gratification, so that you could invest the money saved in Victory Bonds?

Have you realized the urgent need for personal self-sacrifice to make the Victory Loan a great success?

Until you have bought Victory Bonds to the very limit of your ability, you have not done your duty.

Campaign Closes Saturday Night
What Answer Will You Give?

Issued by Canada's Victory Loan Committee in co-operation with the Minister of Finance of the Dominion of Canada.