

with His Spouse, the Church. Let men therefore remember to honor Christ in their wives; and let women honor Him in their husbands. St. Chrysostom also insists on the injustice of legislation which in his time as in ours, supposes the superiority of man. Why, he asks, do not men remember what suffering suspicion of their wives' infidelity would cause them, before giving their wives grounds to suspect themselves? While, teaching this fundamental equality of nature and of dignity, the Fathers remind the early Christians that as man differs from woman in strength and bravery, so also he has special rights that connote special obligations on her part towards him. The union between man and wife is like the union between Christ and the Church; but as Christ is Head of the Church, so the husband is head of the family; and as Christ commands the reverence of the Church, the husband has a right to a corresponding submission on the part of his wife. As Christ loves, protects, and sanctifies His Church, so the husband ought to love, protect, and sanctify the wife. If, however, it is necessary for the good order and welfare of the family that there be one head in it, it does not follow that the husband is justified in asserting over much his right to rule lest the wife should feel that her position is one of inferiority. The husband must bind the wife to him in bonds of love, not in bonds of fear as if he were dealing with a slave or a servant. If he love her and is loved in return he will be gentle and kind and his wife will be happy and submissive. Where love reigns evil and trouble will not come; from love is born prudence, through love dissension becomes impossible, and every annoyance disappears (Chrysostom's *Homilies*). Over and over again Chrysostom preaches the lesson of love as the remedy of the domestic and social evils. He recommends husbands and wives to cherish a tender, constant, protecting love for each other. The word love is always on his lips, and he pleads with the warmth and the tenderness of one who is consumed with the fire of Christian love himself. We feel from his words that he was striving to light the divine flame of charity in breasts that were still frozen in pagan hardness. The pagan ideal of marriage died hard and Chrysostom knew that as long as it lived there could not be true Christian home-life. Home-life models society on itself: as the home is so the State will be: pagan homes make pagan States, and Christian homes make Christian States. Realising that a true conception of Christian love, and a true notion of the dignity of womanhood must reform the homes of his time our Saint returns to his task again and again, preaching the selfsame doctrine in varying tones and illustrating his discourses with all the richness of his genius. To-day the world is in sore need of Chrysostoms. Pagan legislation has paganised homes, and from pagan homes young pagans are issuing forth year after year to build up pagan States. Good women are everywhere needed to safeguard the homes. The women of France have saved France from utter ruin because they remained faithful to their Christian traditions; but the women of other countries are not as true as the women of France, and because of their defection ruin and decadence are flowing up over the earth like a destroying tide. As good women make men respect them, so bad women make men despise them and treat them at their own valuation; hence bad women, or even women who have a low ideal of their dignity as partakers of that human nature which Christ elevated, are a menace to any State in which they are found. And underneath all we come to the conclusion that unless girls are trained on Christian lines when they are young there will not be good homes, and there will not be good society. Once more we are led back to the real root of the evil: the godless schools designed by politicians like ours for the corruption of the people.

The charity of the monk is more than royal; a king, if he is good, can supply the bodily needs of the poor; but the monk, by his prayers, can deliver us from the tyranny of the devil.—St. Chrysostom.

Frivolity and Fair Play

There is an atmosphere round the coming diplomatic conference which is at once hard to analyse and essential to alter (says the *New Witness* for August 12). We do not refer to the elements which are palpably and positively one-sided, whether honest or dishonest. A man like Mond naturally hates Poland much more than he loves England. To do such men justice, they are merely indifferent to our English interests; while they would damage Polish interests with passion and delight. Nor do we refer to the strange but sincere fanaticism of papers like the *Nation*; and the people who merely pick out, in any foreign quarrel, the side against which they have some sectarian prejudice or other, and label its particular demands as "Imperialistic." Thus they talk about Greek Imperialism; the Turks being notoriously superior to all imperialistic temptations. And so they talk of the Imperialism of the Poles in Silesia; as if the presence of any Prussians at all in Silesia were not a monument of the success of the most insolent and infamous imperialism. Least of all do we include those who see in a certain division merely the literal and logical fulfilment of a treaty, who cannot see their way to accept the Polish argument for the counting of communes instead of individuals. We differ from the theory of these people; for we think nothing more valuable than the principle of the equality of groups as distinct from that of individuals. It is, for instance, the very principle of small nationalities that they should count like great ones; and we hope Mr. Harvey will remember that it is the principle not only of the separate nations of Europe but of the United States of America. The other principle always tends to the triumph of the abnormal fashion over the normal fact. But we can heartily respect those who really feel themselves bound to this form of the fulfilment of the treaty; and we agree that if that is really the contract, the contract should be fulfilled. But the thing of which we are now speaking is something much larger and looser and more prevalent than the views of these logical or fanatical minorities. It cannot be denied that a change of tone has taken place in considerable sections of public opinion in this country; and that many of the English, in a fashion incomprehensible to the French or to the Poles, are willing to be reconciled to the Germans.

To a Frenchman this attitude seems merely frivolous. And there is a real and sometimes even a respectful sense in which the English are frivolous. Only a people that was frivolous could have been so lightly and easily persuaded that it was sober and solid. The muscular Christianity of the upper and middle classes is a sort of schoolboy pose; and among the poorer classes this levity is akin to laughter and kindness, and all that is best in the nation. But when it comes to judging for other nations, this geniality becomes the very narrowest sort of nationalism. It becomes the imposition of our own insular triviality as an imperial tyranny. It means a parade of forgiving other people's injuries; and swaggering as good sportsmen because things are sport to us which are death to them.

A good case of this international complication can be found in the use of the word "Hun." Many in England to-day would take a half-humorous, half-remorseful view of the use of it. They would actually defend the use as an abuse; as people accused of slander do sometimes really defend it as vulgar abuse. Many would say that all is fair in love and war, or in hate and war, and that while the war lasted we might call the enemy a Hun as we might call him a Hobgoblin. And all the time the term "Hun" was not in the least vulgar abuse, or even vague abuse. It was a historical comparison that was accurate to the point of subtlety. It was a great deal too accurate to be understood in the least by the people who used it most. The Jingo journalist was a historian without knowing it, and probably without desiring it. As to the origin of the term, of course, nobody can deny that its use was just and logical in an almost pedantic degree. It cannot be a slander to describe the German soldiers by a parallel which their own leader offered them as a model. And when the Kaiser told his soldiers to destroy like Huns, he was only saying the sort of thing that all the Prussian leaders said systematically and steadily, up to the moment when the Prussian guard broke on the Marne. Prussia never pretended to be just, or dreamed of pretending to be just,

Tui Street Garage, Taihape

V. Nicholls

Proprietor

District Agent for BUICK CARS. All makes of Tyres and Motor and Bicycle Sundries fully stocked. REPAIRS executed at shortest notice by competent mechanics. Telephone—Garage 143; Residence 142.