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"There is no such disparity in marriage as unsuitability of mind and purpose"

Charles Dickens—"David Copperfield"
When we discuss inter-marriage, or as the Church is often pleased to call it, "mixed marriage", we are concerned to know whether or not two individuals of different faiths may enter a matrimonial alliance, while remaining, respectively in their different faiths.
1. An Introduction.

This paper is a discussion of what marriage between a Jewish man and a Roman Catholic woman or a Jewish woman and a Roman Catholic man, means to the individuals immediately concerned, to their respective families, to the respective churches that each belongs to, and to the community wherein they reside.

It is difficult to picture the problems of such marriages as seen by the persons involved. All one can hope to do is to marshal the facts regarding such marriage as viewed from the outside and to present these facts in as unbiased a fashion as it is humanly possible to do.

To dogmatically say that marriage between a Jew and a Roman Catholic must eventually end in failure is to presuppose a condition of family life which has little to verify it as sound. Human nature is too prone to conclude from isolated instances or cases that either such marriage is likely to end in success, this latter however, being the exception rather than the customary expression regarding such a marriage.

There is lacking at present anything like adequate and sound statistics regarding whether such a marriage has a better chance to result in success or whether it has a better chance to end in failure. Since the few statistics on this subject are either too inadequate or too old to be of pertinent value here, it has therefore seemed
most advisable to disregard them except possible for incidental reference, and to be here concerned only with an attempt to look at marriage between a Jew and a Roman Catholic largely through the case study method.

A distressed father writes: "My son thinks of marrying a non-Jewish girl. What ought I to say to him to dissuade him from his purpose?"

We would say to him: "Son, there are reasons of history, of sentiment, of religious obligations why a Jew should not marry outside of his faith; but, finally and above all, there is a reason that has to do with his own happiness."

"There are ancient prejudices that are submerged in the hot flame of courtship, but which themselves begin to burn again in the sober afterthought of marriage. Rapt young Jews say, 'This lovely young woman cannot harbor in her tender heart such a prejudice. In her sweet nature the inherited prejudice has died!"

"But, son, the sad fact is that even in the sweetest nature this prejudice often has been discovered later. Unbidden it has arisen in a moment of thoughtless anger such as is not uncommon in married life; it has come with burning reproach....'Jew!'"

"this is invariably a tragic conclusion of romance, for it sets up the timeless wall to stand between the pair. Only the most enlightened spirit may it be said, "It is incapable of prejudice."
"And beyond his personal happiness there are certain obligations that compel a Jew to marry within his own house. Is not this faith of yours worth perpetuating? Multitudes have loved it as a good way of life and have died, refusing to barter it for other and safer faiths. To marry out of the faith is generally to pass out of it; for it is seldom perpetuated in the children of such a union.

"So in many instances intermarriage is seen as a betrayal of all who perished to save the faith."

Thus we should speak to the young man; but, alas too often youth follows the light of his own flame.

A disturbed Catholic mother writes:

"My daughter thinks of marrying a non-Catholic boy. What ought I to say to her to dissuade her from her purpose?"

We should say unto her: "Daughter, mixed unions are always precarious. You can never forget that Pope Leo the Thirteenth advised that "care also must be taken that they (that includes you, my daughter) do not easily enter into Marriage with those who are not Catholics; for when minds to not agree as to the observances of religion, it is scarcely possible to hope for agreement in other things. Other reasons also proving that persons should turn with dread from such are these chiefly: that they give occasion to forbidden association and communion in religious matters; endanger the faith of the Catholic partner; are a
hindrance to the proper education of the children; and often lead to a mixing up of truth and falsehood, and to the belief that all religions are equally good." (1)

"As a good Catholic daughter can you ever forget the precepts of your Pope and adopt those of your Jewish husband?

"Can you sincerely embrace Judaism as an effort to remove the barrier and thereby solve the problem?

"Will your husband see to it that you are taken into the heart of his family? Will they receive you with open arms and accept you as one of their own?

"But, daughter, even if love could move mountains and erase barriers, the sad fact is that even in the most tolerant and hospitable of Jewish families there will arise, unbidden in a moment of thoughtless anger such as is not uncommon in Jewish family relationships, and with burning reproach... 'Goy'--'Shiksi'.

"Imagine your embarrassment and his too, when he marries you and introduces you to his parents. Can you even understand the many intimate and warm episodes and colors of his childhood, and can he ever hope to understand, in turn, your own origin?

"Can you imagine the invariably tragic conclusion of your romance, for the two souls, knit by transient threads of passion, will always remain wanderers in the separate deserts of your own external affiliations.

(1) "Arcanum Divinarum"-encyclical of Pope Leo XIII
"And who could tell when, on the part of the Jewish husband, there might crop up the secret and vivid realization that you, his wife, were after all a Roman Catholic, one who had indelibly inscribed upon him the stigma of "Christ-killer!" Who could tell when he himself might not even after the close comradeship of years of matrimony, feel a strangeness in this wife of his, you—my daughter, an external recurrence of the feeling this wife of his, you, were not one of his own people.

"Yes, it is unreasonable to let such nonsensical traditional suspicions enter into his love and consideration, but how could he ever forget his origin and yours, and the relationship that had existed between them?

"Which force do you think, my daughter, will ultimately triumph, his love for you or family compulsion?

"Can he ever forget, in love and in friendship, that you, the mother of his children, are the one of a race which has persecuted his race for centuries? He would be disinheriting himself, and what is more, he would be disinheriting his children by marrying you.

"Catholic zealots feel that a child whose misfortune it is to live under the influence of a non-Catholic father must be watched, guarded, and somehow kept within the fold.

"It isn't an easy life for either of you to take a husband or a wife who adheres to a religion belonging to a bygone age. That one loves one's children above all else, that one places their felicity and development above one's own, makes it all the harder to bear that there is no way they can
escape paying the price of their parent's ignorance. Even if there were no other evil consequence, the children would suffer from their parents' lack of harmony.

"So in many instances intermarriage is seen as a betrayal of all who believe in the voice of God, the Pope, who advises against it.

Thus we would speak to the young lady; but, alas, too often youth follows the light of his own flame.

................................

There is little doubt that in such Judeo-Christian marriages there are potential dangers that should not be disregarded. How are differences in social customs, family system, and home standards to be harmonized? How is the mixed social heredity imparted to the offspring to be dealt with so that they will not be disturbed by separate social ideals and social influences and brought into a common focus? How is religious friction to be avoided? Such are the potential dangers that confront the two persons of separate faiths who are planning to enter upon marriage.

From both primary and secondary sources of information the writer finds that most intermarriages are between Jewish men and Gentile women. It was seldom that the writer found that a Jewish girl married a Gentile man. The term Gentile is here used in the sense that it means a Roman Catholic. Occasionally such a marriage took place, but the majority were overwhelmingly the other way. Observation shows that in most instances that Roman Catholic wives are satisfied to embrace the Jewish faith, at least outwardly, and that the children are usually
brought up in the Jewish fold. The mere fact that the children of a Catholic mother and a non-Catholic father are usually brought up in the Jewish fold is sufficient cause for the Catholic Church to be opposed to such an inter-marriage. The Catholic Church requires of Non-Catholics that they bring up their children in the orthodox faith. The result of the two statements would be a conflict of the two religious demands concerning the upbringing of their children, which would tend probably toward family disharmony.

William Hurt makes the interesting observation that "Marriage of Gentile women with Jews is much more frequent than that of Gentile men with Jewesses. Perhaps the greater subjection of the Jewish girl to parental authority partly accounts for this fact. The Jewish young man feels himself less under family restraint. Numerical discrepancy doubtless is another factor. Census figures indicate there are in the United States 250,000 more males than female Jews. This disparity may largely be attributed to sex disproportion among immigrants. Prudential considerations also may influence the Jewish maid in her choice of a mate from among her own people; with a Jewish husband she feels a greater sense of economic security.

"On the other hand, the average Gentile girl doubtless appreciates the desirability of a Jewish mate. She has observed the Jew's excellent treatment of his family. He is the most uxorious of men. He is well qualified for maintaining a home. Patriarchal tradition influences him to be a good husband and father."
She has confidence that his financial capacity will safeguard her material welfare. Moreover, the Jew is a most masterful wooer. These last are interesting observations, but other than being merely interesting observations they have no reliability.

It would seem highly advisable to preface the general discussion of inter-marriage in this paper by an analysis of what marriage itself means to each party concerned, i.e., what does marriage itself stand for in the eyes of a Jew. The natural corollary to this would be "What it means to be Married to a Jew", and "What it means to marry a Catholic."

To avoid becoming complicated and confused in references to the word "Gentile", it shall here be designated to represent one who belongs to the Roman Catholic Church. To attempt to treat what is commonly connotated as "Gentile" would lead the discussion of inter-marriage far beyond the intended scope of this paper. For our purposes then the term "Gentile", I repeat, shall be embodied here as meaning one who is affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church in the capacity of possibly a "Believer", or better, "a church-goer".

(2) Walter Hurt—"Truth About the Jews"
The Question of Intermarriage

(An Example "for" such marriages)

Editors, B'nai B'rith Magazine:

In your June issue, you speak of intermarriage. How about the thousands of Jewish marriages that go on the rocks? I have been married for more than fifteen years to a Gentile who studied for the priesthood, did not like the teachings, and who left Italy. We have three sons and a daughter; the boys are all circumcized and all are learning to read and write Hebrew. Our oldest son was bar mitzvah (Being confirmed at the age of thirteen) this summer, of his own choice, and our Jewish community did everything to get the boy ready. The father, instead of objecting, goes with the children and does any work around the synagogue to try to pay for the children's education. We both attend services at times, as absolute faith in God is most important after all, no matter whether in church or home. I have many sisters and brothers, and so far my children are the only ones to be able to read and write in Hebrew.

I do not consider my case exceptional, since wherever there is intelligence there will be no religious or other wrangles. Of course, not all cases are alike, but it is not religion but the individual that counts.

S.S.B.

(From "Our Readers have their Say"-B'nai B'rith Magazine)

October, 1932--p.31
An Answer
"Against" such marriages.

Editors, B'нал B'rith Magazine:

In your October issue there was a letter, signed "S.S.B.", referring to anti-Semitism and inter-marriage.

Because her marriage to a Gentile (evidently an atheist) proved successful, is no reason why others should emulate her. Had her husband been a religious Catholic instead of an indifferent one, she would certainly never have been permitted to bring up her children in the Jewish faith! For a congenial intermarriage both parties to the union must be rationally inclined otherwise it is bound to end up on the rocks. Eighty-five percent of such marriages are failures. Oil and Water do not mix.

Her remark that thousands of Jewish marriages go on the rocks is an exaggerated statement; according to statistics they hardly exceed ten per cent. But even at that, there is a consolation-neither of the dissatisfied parties will call the other "Damn rotten Jew", a cry I once heard from an open window during a quarrel between two dissenting spouses.

Los Angeles, Cal. R.S. Green
II. What Marriage Should Mean To A Catholic and What Marriage Should Mean to a Jew.

If we condense in a short formula what has been said of the nature of marriage, the result will probably be only the following definition: Marriage is the union of one man and one woman in a community of life, hallowed by conjugal love, formed by the united consent of both parties to last until death part them, ordained by nature for the continuance and increase of the human race and the complement of both sexes. (3)

Blackstone says that "Our law considers marriage in no other light than as a civil contract." It, however, possesses a unique position in the field of contracts by the fact that it cannot be rescinded by either party or both at pleasure, though that effect is brought about in either way by certain kinds of misconduct.

How, then, does the Christian conception of marriage differ from the legal aspect of marriage? Pope Pius XI in his encyclical on Christian marriage, a document of some 16,000 words sets forth that "Chaste Wedlock is the principle and foundation of domestic society and, therefore, of all human intercourse", and that "the family is more sacred than the State, and men are begotten not for the earth but for heaven and eternity. "From this it follows that marriage constitutes "a perpetual and indissoluble bond which can not be dissolved by civil law."

Marriage is viewed by the Roman Catholic Church in the double light of a contract and of a sacrament. A marriage between Christians cannot be a contract without at the same time being a sacrament. Either marriage consists of both or it consists

(4)Rev. René I. Holaind, S.J.
of neither. This stand is taken and adopted on no other grounds than the definite statements of Christ himself, who taught,

"He Who made man from the beginning, made them male and female. And He said: For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife and they shall be two in one flesh. Therefore they are not now two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. . . . . . . . . . . . .

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."

The Roman Catholic Church bases its stand upon the sacredness of marriage from these words of Christ. From that source marriage assumes the character of a sacred rite. "When marriage is not a sacrament it is apt to become a mere temporary association, from which all sacredness has departed, and which is not secure enough to be the foundation of civil society." (4)

Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical Letter "Arcanum Divinae" enlarges upon these words of Christ to say, "for certain it is that in Christian marriage the contract is inseparable from the sacrament; and that, for this reason, the contract cannot be true and legitimate without being a Sacrament as well. For Christ our Lord added to Marriage the dignity of a Sacrament; but marriage is the contract itself, whenever that contract is lawfully concluded. Marriage is a sacrament, moreover, because it a holy sign which gives grace, showing forth an image of the mystical nuptials of Christ with the Church."

Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical Letter "Casti Connubii" states that "By matrimony, therefore, the souls of the contracting

(4) Rev. René I. Holaind, S.J.-"Natural Law and Legal Practice."
parties are joined and knit together more directly and more inti-
mately than are their bodies, and that not by any passing affec-
tion of sense of spirit, but by a deliberate and firm act of the will, and from this union of souls by God's decree, a sacred and inviolable bond arises." Therefore the sacred partnership of true marriage is constituted both by the will of God and the will of man; from God comes the very institution of marriage, the ends for which it was instituted, laws that govern it, the blessings that flow from it, while, through generous surrender of his own person one to another for the whole span of life, man, becomes, with the help and cooperation of God, the author of each particular marriage, with the duties and blessings annexed thereto from divine institution. (5)

Mrs. Charles Mattingly enlarges upon the sacrament of the marriage contract by saying that, "In raising the marriage contract to the dignity of a sacrament, a part of the Divine plan was that creation should not end here but that two creatures made in God's own image should have the sacred privilege of participation in the work of creation; that the gift of life should be passed on through that mysterious realm which precedes life and which is in the high counsel of God himself. This is indeed our sacred trust." (6)

Through this sacrament the Roman Catholic Church contends that the marriages of Christians have become far the noblest of all matrimonial unions. What are the purposes of such marriage unions? First, the Church looks not only to the propagation of the human race, but to the bringing forth of children for the Church. Secondly,

(5) Pope Pius XI-"Encyclical Letter:"Cast Connubii"
the Church defines the relationships and mutual duties of husband and wife. The husband is the chief of the family, and the head of the wife. The woman, because she is the flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, must be subject to her husband and obey him; not, indeed, as a servant, but as a companion, so that her obedience shall be wanting in neither honor nor dignity. For "the husband is the head of the wife; as Christ is the head of the Church... Therefore, as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let wives be to their husbands in all things (Eph. V. 23, 24)." Thirdly, children are to be brought up in the "discipline and correction of the Lord."

Perhaps the most significant factor in Christian marriage is the following statement expressed by Pope Leo XIII, "Christ therefore, having renewed marriage to such and so great excellence, commended and entrusted all the discipline bearing upon these matters to His Church." This makes the Roman Catholic Church dominant in the field of Catholic marriages.

Looking to no civil or ecclesiastical authority for grace or salvation in the married state, the Catholic must depend entirely upon supernatural grace and natural wisdom to sustain him in those sometimes terribly heavy obligations and difficulties which he encounters in the vow—"for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, until death do us part." To him marriage is a spiritual as well as a physical union. What therefore, God hath joined together let no man put asunder.

Marriage, its purpose and meaning, as outlined by the Catholic Church means a solemn and irrevocable step which is not to be undertaken lightly. The Church does its best to make sure of at least three weeks interval for reflection by requiring a triple publication of the bans. Furthermore only death can terminate the marriage contract. Marriage for Catholics is a sacrament,
an outward sign of inward grace, instituted by Christ.

Reverand Fulgence Meyer, O.F.M. sums up the "Grandeur of Christian Marriage" as follows—"The union between Christ and the Church is the sublimest, strongest, and tenderest; it is the most loyal, sacred and lasting union conceivable: no union could be more intimate, none more concentrated, and none more enduring. And this union is the symbol and model of the union between husband and wife in marriage. This thought alone must fill every young person contemplating marriage with a certain awe and holy dread, first, because of the sacred intimacy of marriage: it postulates the closest possible relations between the partners of it; second, because of the concentration and exclusiveness it requires: once married, you my love none other but the partner you have chosen, and you must love him or her with all your heart and soul; and third, because of the endurance of it, which extends until the death of one of the parties, for 'What God hath joint together, let no man put asunder'. "When you enter into and consummate the holy contract of marriage, it binds as long as the parties to it live and, no matter how disagreeable and impossible you may find your chosen mate to be, you are bound to him or her in the closest and most familiar manner, and you may turn to no other partner until death separates you." (7)

Marriage according to the Jewish law maintains a position somewhere between the position expressed by Blackstone as a civil contract and that of the Roman Catholic Church in its conception of marriage as a sacrament, and, as such, indissoluble. The Jewish law of marriage also considers the marriage concluded as a contract. It is more than a mere civil contract since it concerns "a relation which is based on morality and implies the most sacred duties. In such a contract, the mutual duties and

(7) Rev. Meyer-Youth's Pathfinder-p.212
rights emanate from the optional agreements of the contracting parties, while those who enter upon the state of married life must submit to the reciprocal duties which have been imposed by religion and morality. As soon as the marriage is concluded it is withdrawn from the arbitrary will of both husband and wife, and removed to the higher sphere of duty and conscience. It is called "Kiddushin"—consecration,—from the Hebrew word "Kaddesh"—to consecrate, to set apart as holy and inviolable. "the act of contracting marriage is termed "Kiddushin", since by this act the wife is set apart for her husband, and rendered inviolable and inapproachable in respect to any other man". (9)

Marriage was regarded as a divine ordinance. George Foot Moore quotes such expressions in regard to this factor as these: (10)

"He created it not a waste; to be inhabited He formed it." (Gen. 1,26, alleging Isa. 45, 18)

'It is not good that a man should be alone; I will make him a helper corresponding to him."(Gen, 2,18)

'One who has no wife remains without good, and without a helper, and without joy, and without a blessing, and without atonement", and adduces scripture for all these deficiencies".

'He is not a man, as it is said, Male and Female He created them, and called their name 'man'.

(9) Rev. M. Mielziner—"The Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce"—p. 27
(10) George Foot Moore—"Judaism"—p. 119
In the traditional marriage ceremony the bride was passive. The ring was the symbol of her acquisition by the groom. The old juridical view, according to which the woman was a chattel that the man acquired, has disappeared entirely from us, said Geiger. "We do not wish to retain any form whatsoever which was symbolical of this view in earlier days. This is the significance of the resolution that two rings be used in the ceremony, in order that it may become known thereby that the man and the woman marry one another, as responsible moral personalities, or if only one ring be used, Judaism protests decidedly against the imputation that an old oriental view still holds in its midst whereby the worth and dignity of woman are discriminated against legally in any way, even though this was not the case in life." (11)

It is interesting to notice that under the Hebrew theocracy, marriage was practically without religious ceremony. In fact, there is no evidence in the Mosaic law of a civil or religious form of marriage. It seems that it was not until after the exile that confession and forgiveness of sins on the part of the bridal pair became a part of the ceremony, but at the hands of the rabbi; nor was the rabbi called in until the fourteenth century of the Christian era, and then not as a priest, but as a learned man, to put important religious questions to the man and woman about to marry.

A formal legal instrument was signed (Kethutah) in which it was set forth that the bridegroom undertook to work for her, to honor, keep and care for her, to give her a sum of money and to increase her own dowry by one-half, at least. This Kethutah mirrors a fairly long span of the Jewish past. It is a legal document embodying the essential points agreed upon by the parties and

(11) David Philipson—"The Reform Movement in Judaism—p. 310
sanctioned by the law as the manner of their living together as husband and wife." It "means a written instrument". Today, practically its only function is to perpetuate an ancient tradition. Every Kethutah is exactly like every other Kethutah, while in former days, its effectiveness as a document of rights and guarantees was real. Its embodiment of the expression,-

"Be thou my wife according to the law of Moses and Israel" was merely a record of the marriage. The Jewish marriage, then, which was negotiated for many marriages by means of marriage deeds, still exists today, but its importance in marriage is lessened by the influence of statutory marriage of modern law.

"The marriage conveyed to the Jews", says Edersheim, a commentator, much higher thoughts than merely those of festivity and merriment. The pious fasted before the marriage, confessing their sins. It was regarded almost as a Sacrament. Entrance into the marriage state was thought to carry the forgiveness of sins, and the bridal pair on the marriage day, symbolized the union of God with Israel. In the Jewish community the germ of the idea of the sacrament was present and the marriage ceremony was planned to bear the impress of sanctity." (12)

Perhaps no one writer has equalled Reverand M. Mielziner in giving a clear cut analysis of what the Bible and the Talmud have to say upon the marriage relation, these being the main sources of the Jewish Marriage Law. --Mielziner says,

1. Marriage is a divine institution for man's happiness and welfare.

(12)Edersheim's "Life and Times of Christ"-page 352-Vol.1
2. Woman is a part of man's own being; hence, not, as according to the degrading views of almost all nations of antiquity, his inferior and slave, but equal to him in dignity, and destined to be a help at his side.

3. Through mutual, sincere affection, which is even more intensive than that which exists naturally between children and their parents, husband and wife shall become one flesh, that is, they shall coalesce in one being, one person.

4. Marriage was ordained and blessed by God, not only for the purpose of securing the material and moral welfare of the individual, but also to preserve and continue the human race.

The consequence of these principles are:

(a) As a divine institution, marriage must be sacred and inviolable.

(b) Perfect union and harmony shall exist between husband and wife; in mutual love and affection they shall assist each other, contribute to each other's perfection and happiness, and share a common destiny as to the good or evil which shall happen to them.

(c) The principle that "man shall cleave to his wife, and they shall become one being", excludes Polygamy as well as Divorce, as contravening the will of God and the design of marriage.

(d) The double purpose of marriage to secure the welfare of the individual and preserve and propagate the human race, implies the duty of man toward himself and to human society to leave the state of singleness and enter the state of married life, as soon as he is able to found and support a family. (13)

Celibacy was, in fact, not common, and was disapproved by the rabbis, who taught that a man should marry at eighteen, and that if

(13) "Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce--"Rev. M. Mielziner--p.16
he passed the age of twenty without taking a wife he transgressed a divine command and incurred God's displeasure. The Jewish institution of marriage, like that of the Roman Catholic Church, had for its main object, children, and this was the motive expressed in the Law. Although not expressly stated that the child was to be brought up according to the religious teachings, it might be naturally implied that such was to be the condition.

Our emphasis has been laid upon the orthodox views of both the Christian and the Jewish Churches. Although various Reform movements have brought about certain changes in the marriage, yet essentially they remain the same throughout the centuries.

Let us turn next to a discussion of how the Roman Catholic and Jewish Churches look upon the subject of intermarriage.
The Catholic Church and The Jewish Church
Look at Inter-Marriage

Both the Catholic Church and the Jewish Church have played such an important part in influencing the course of marriage that it seems wholly advisable at this point to make an analysis of the stand of both Churches on the subject of inter-marriage to see just how they differ and just where they agree.

The strict prohibition of Ezra and Nehemiah (about 400 B.C.) was supplemented on the Christian side by the various edicts of the Church beginning with that enacted by the Eastern Church at the Council of Chalcedon in 388 A.D. and followed by those of the Councils of Orleans (A.D. 538), Toledo (A.D. 689) and Rome (A.D. 743) enjoining Christians from marrying Jews.

Ecclesiastical canons prohibiting friendly intercourse and intermarriage between Christians and Jews may be briefly enumerated historically as follows:

Concilium Calchedonense
(Leo., Valentinus et Macicinun Imperatores
(14) 451 Anno Christi.

Concilium Veneticum
(Hilarus P., Severus Imperator
(12) circa 465 Anno Christi

Canon Apostolicum
(63) circa 500 Anno Christi

Concilium Aurelianense II
(Joannes P.11, Justinianus Imperatores
Childebertus Rex Francorum
533 Anno Christi
Concilium Aurelianense III
(Silverius P., Justinianus Imperator
Childebertus Rex Francorum
538 Anno Christi

Concilium Avernense
(Agapetus P.I., Justinianus Imperator
Childebertus Rex Francorum
535 Anno Christi

Concilium Teletanum III
(Pelagius P. II., Maurisius Imperator
Reccaredei Rex Hisp.,

589 Anno Christi

Concilium Teletanum IV
(Honorius P.I., Heraclius Imperator
Sisenclus Rex Hisp.,

633 Anno Christi

Concilium Constantinopolitanus
(Agathes P., Constantinus Pogonateis Imperator

680 Anno Christi

Concilium Romanum I
(Zacharias P., Constantinus Copronynus Imperator
743 Anno Christi

Concilium Mentense
(Stephanus P.V., Arnulphus Rex Germanae,
Odo Rex Francorum

888 Anno Christi

Concilium Vienneses
(Clenseus P.IV., Richadus

Canon 17,18,19)Imp erator, 1287 Anno Christi

Prof. Ephraim Feldman-Yearbook of C.C.of Am. Hebrews ('09)
Intermarriages Historically Considered)
Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical letter "Arcanum Divinae," continues to maintain a position very like that of his predecessors of hundreds of years past by stating in these explicit terms that,

"Care also must be taken that they do not easily enter into marriage with those who are not Catholics; FOR when minds do not agree as to the observances of religion, it is scarcely possible to hope for agreement in other things. Other reasons also proving that persons should turn with dread from such marriages are chiefly these: that they give occasion to forbidden association and communion in religious matters; endanger the faith of the Catholic partner; are a hindrance to the proper education of the children; and often lead to a mixing up of truth and falsehood, and to the belief that all religions are equally good." (14)

The latest expression concerning the perils of mixed marriage as viewed by the chief representative of the Catholic Church, the Pope, was expressed by Pope Pius XI on December 31, 1930, in his encyclical letter on Marriage "Casti Connubii", wherein is stated this significant stand on the subject of inter-marriage or as Pope Pius XI terms it "mixed marriage"-

"They, therefore, who rashly and heedlessly contract mixed marriages, from which the maternal love and providence of the Church dissuades her children for very sound reasons, fail conspicuously in this respect, sometimes with danger to their eternal salvation. This attitude of the Church to mixed marriages appears in many of her documents, all of which are summed up in

(14) Pope Leo XIII--Encyclical Letter "Arcanum Divinae"
the code of Canon Law in the canon, "Everywhere and with the
greatest strictness the Church forbids marriages between bap-
tized persons one of whom is a Catholic and the other a member
of a schismatical or heretical sect, and if there is added to
this the danger of the falling away of the Catholic party and
the perversion of the children, such a marriage is forbidden
also by the divine law. If the Church occasionally on account
of circumstances does not refuse to grant a dispensation from
these strict laws p rovided that the divine law remains intact
and the dangers above mentioned are provided against by suitable
safeguards, it is unlikely that the Catholic party will not
suffer some detriment from such a marriage." (15)

What are the considerations then that influenced the Roman
Catholic Church to take the stand that she did take on inter-
marrriage? To the question as to why marriage between Christians
and Jews were prohibited by the Christians—by Constantine and
the later emperors and by various councils, Mr. Jacobs informs
us that "the folk-lore of Europe regarded the Jews as something
infrahuman, and it would require an impossible amount of large
toleration for a Christian maiden of the Middle Ages to regard
union with a Jew as anything other than unnatural." (16) Mr.
Westermarck adds this important factor that "owing to the in-
tense Jewish hatred for the sacred name of Christ, the early
Church was more opposed to wedlock with Jews than pagans."(17)
Mr. Westermarck's method of expressing himself here gives the

(15) Pope Pius XI—Encyclical on Marriage—"Casti-Connubii"
(16) Mr. Jacobs—page 58—Short History of Marriage—Westermarck
(17) " " " " " " 
reader a splendid opportunity for what may well be termed "possible misinterpretation". "The Church", says Taunton, "has always abhorred these marriages both on account of the danger of perversion and the difficulty of educating the offspring as well as on account of the "communicative in sacris". (18)

Even when the Church grants the dispensation for such a mixed marriage, she does so reluctantly. "Thus the Church acts when she is forced, so to speak, to grant a dispensation for a mixed marriage. Whilst she allows it, she seems to fear lest her permission might be an occasion for the Catholic party to go far away from home, namely from the Church and from God. (19) The Roman Catholic Church always fears, with much justification, that with such a mixed marriage she may lose many of her otherwise close adherents. Therefore, it is only natural that she should unwillingly consent to such a marriage. Experience seems to have shown her that she has been justified in her suspicions in this respect.

As a result, the Roman Catholic Church before allowing such a marriage to take place requires prenuptial pledges in writing duly signed by the non-Catholic party in the presence of the Catholic priest, who is to witness the wedding ceremony, perhaps best illustrated by this form:

Form A 80-

Archdiocese of New York

Seal

Mixed Marriage

(Mixta Religio Vel Disparitas Cultus)

(18) Taunton-Westermarck-"A Short History of Marriage"-p.59
(19) Reverend Fulgence Meyer-"Youth's Pathfinder"-p.243
Reverend dear Sir:

Name

Child of and maiden name of mother

Address

A Catholic of this parish, wishing to marry

Name

Child of and maiden name of mother

Address

A non-Catholic (baptized in Sect

(never baptized)

humbly petitions his Eminence, the Archbishop as delegate of the Holy See, to grant a dispensation from the impediment of

the reasons are (give some canonical reason, see instructions of Sacred Congregation.)

The necessary promises in writing are attached herewith; and there appears to be no unusual danger of perversion.

Yours respectfully,

Church of

Enclosed please find check ($.......) for Alms.

Please make check payable to Chancery office
Archdiocese of New York

Form of promises for Non-Catholic

I, the undersigned non-Catholic, desiring to contract marriage with the Catholic party named in this application before a Catholic priest, duly authorized by a special dispensation from the Archbishop of New York, hereby promise in the presence of the undersigned witnesses:

(1) That all children of either sex born of this marriage shall be baptized and educated in the Catholic religion.

(2) That I will neither hinder nor obstruct in any manner whatsoever the Catholic party in the exercise of the Catholic religion.

(3) That in the solemnization of my marriage there shall be only the Catholic ceremony.

Signature of non-Catholic

Form of Promises for Catholic

I, the undersigned Catholic party, hereby promise in the presence of the undersigned witnesses:

(1) That all children of either sex born of this marriage shall be baptized and educated in the Catholic religion.

(2) That in the solemnization of my marriage there shall be only the Catholic ceremony.

Signature of Catholic

We, the undersigned hereby declare that we witnessed the signatures of the above contracting parties in their presence and in the presence of each other, on this...day of the month......193-

Signature of priest
Signature of witness
The Roman Catholic Church through the use of some such form as the one illustrated above attempts to safeguard her position in the family circles of such a mixed marriage by placing such requirements as obstacles that must be confronted and accepted before she will grant dispensation for such a marriage.

The question naturally arises as to whether the Roman Catholic Church forces requirements on the party to a mixed marriage who belongs to another faith. It seems that the Church does not "force" requirements on a non-Catholic party, since the marriage is of his or her making. Rather, it is a case where the non-Catholic, not the Roman Catholic Church, must bear the responsibility for any violation of conscience.

Since the Church has the power to impose whatever requirements she pleases on the marriages she sanctions, it would seem that she has also a right to demand that the children of such unions be brought up according to the practice of the Catholic faith. It is a severe requirement to exact under any circumstances, but the Roman Catholic Church feels justified in exacting it for she holds that loss of the Catholic faith by the children of such unions to be an irremediable calamity. The point has well been taken that no matter how literally the promises are kept, the non-Catholic parent cannot help imparting what religion he has to his children in considerable degree.

The Federal Council Committee's advice, representing the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, to a non-Catholic considering marriage to a Catholic is explicitly expressed in this one word,—"Don't". "Religion is a basic interest in human life, and the differences in religion, if these are
fundamental, may strain a marriage to the point of breaking, especially where they are aggravated by ecclesiastical interference."

"No religious body which confesses itself Christian can tolerate the imposition upon one of its own members of the requirements of another religious body by which the religious scruples of that member are aroused, or action repugnant to reason and conscience is forced upon him by an authority which he does not acknowledge.

"For example, if one of the partners to a mixed marriage submits to the dictation of such an authority and promises that his children will be brought up in a faith which he does not share, reason and conscience are offended, the seeds of future discord are sowed at the very outset of married life, and the prospect of true marriage, with conjunction of mind and soul, becomes remote.

"Or if either partner enters upon the union as a propagandist, determined through the intimacies of marriage to subvert the religious faith of the other, disaster is imminent."

Perhaps this criticism may be applied to this position, that the Church, or for that matter any church, that requires that the children of mixed marriages should be pledged to that Church is imposing an intolerable condition upon the two persons immediately concerned. Much commendation must be attached to the single word "Don't", which is the advice given to a non-Catholic considering marriage to a Catholic. "The Commonweal" magazine in an editorial (17), referring to the above stand taken by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in American states that "if the Council knows of cases in which its adherents sign away their consciences in signing the marriage promises, it would be better to address
its admonition to them. The promises are there, and all men know it: with scrupulous care, with patient iteration, does the Church insure that all men shall know it, for the Church wants marriages that will last and religious teaching that will take, and she must depend for them upon the responsibility and good faith of the parties to the promise. Let these Non-Catholics whose principles these undertakings violate, refuse to make them. We do not wish to sound blithe in urging this recommendation. To renounce marriage with the beloved one is a heavy price to have to pay for principle, admittedly. But it is the price the Church, compassionate mother though she is, stands ready to exact of her own children; and we cannot see how the churches of the Council, if they are to take their stand on principle, can fall short of the logic of adopting the discipline that must go with it. The report speaks further of "advising" people, on occasion, not to enter mixed marriages. That is a step in the right direction.

The attitude of the Catholic Church toward such mixed marriages is one of apprehension as to the possible unfortunate consequences such a marriage may have for the Catholic party involved. Writers representing or acting as mouthpieces for the Roman Catholic Church are of one mind in saying that such marriages in the largest degree are doomed to failure and unpleasant marital relations. Some of these same writers go so far as to say that experience seems to indicate that nine out of ten mixed marriages are directly or indirectly disastrous for the Catholic party and the offspring of the marriage. However, the important corollary must be added that the disaster takes the form of a serious weakening or complete loss of the holy faith. It seems, therefore, that the Roman Catholic Church's interest here bears strongly on the selfish and personal side of the matter, more so than as to the welfare of the individuals
immediately concerned.

The representatives of the Church feel that the marriages of this sort that do develop fortunately for the Catholic party are rare. The Church feels that even in the one marriage that is relatively successful in contrast to the other nine failures the Catholic party "can not but keenly regret the disharmony that exists on the point of religion between it, and the other partner. "One, a Reverend Fulgence Meyer feels that even this one favorable mixed marriage is unfortunate, since it gives others who are rather hesitant about intermarrying the needed initiative to go ahead and marry, feeling that their marriage will be successful.

Reverend Fulgence Meyer perhaps strikes the right note when he says that the only objection to mixed marriage is based "on the reference to the true religion, which she considers as the main and most important condition for the real and lasting success and happiness of marriage."(21) "The true faith is the most precious gift of God, and whatever marriage seriously jeopardizes its retention and proper transmission, the Church can not but frown on the dis­countenance to the limit of her power."(22)

According to these spokesmen for the Church, the opposition of the Church toward such mixed marriages is mainly for the purpose of promoting the real happiness of the couple immediately concerned. Reverend Fulgence Meyer expresses the thought of marriage beautifully when he says that two persons "who are minded to be so closely al­igned as to become two in one flesh, should have no serious ob­struction in becoming two in one mind, one heart and one soul; for the couples happiness, if it will have any, will

21 Reverend Fulgence Meyer-"Youth's Pathfinder-p,255
22 Reverend " " " " p.251
consist more in the union of their souls than of their bodies. But complete and satisfying soul-union is impossible between two persons who are estranged on the elementary article of religion."(23)

The Roman Catholic Church realizes that married life requires reciprocal concessions on the part of the two persons immediately concerned, but feels that on the element of religion there can be no concession or compromises. It would perhaps be for this very factor that one could criticize the Church as being too dogmatic in its stand and hardly tolerant. However, the place for such criticism is hardly here. The Church feels that too often is the signed statement of a non-Catholic party to a mixed marriage, that he will permit his Catholic wife to exercise her religion freely, and the children to be brought up in the Catholic faith, regarded as merely a proverbial scrap of paper.

Summing up the stand of the Roman Catholic Church on mixed marriage or as we have seen fit to call it in this paper "intermarriage" the highly emphatic word "Don't" stands forth as the advice to a non-Catholic as well as to the Catholic considering such a marriage. Repeating that highly significant sentence previously expressed in this paper we find that: "Religion is a basic interest in human life, and differences in religion, if these are fundamental, may strain a marriage to the point of breaking, especially where they are aggravated by ecclesiastical interference." For-

"No religious body which confesses itself Christian can tolerate the imposition upon one of its own members of the requirements of another religious body by which the religious scruples of that member are aroused, or action repugnant to reason and conscience is forced upon him by an authority which he does not acknowledge."(24)


(24) Federal Council of Churches in America-April, 1932
While the Roman Catholic Church has maintained a rather consistent opposition to any form of inter-marriage or "mixed marriage" as the Church has seen fit to use the term inter-marriage through its official organ of the Catholic Press, the Jewish Church may be characterized as having shown or maintained two positions, in its history, toward inter-marriage.

Historically, the attitude of the Jewish Church in regard to the problem of inter-marriage has been characterized by two attitudes:

1. From the beginnings of Jewish history down to the publication of the Deuteronomical Code in 621 B.C., or perhaps, to be more exact, to the time of Ezra, there was a great laxity and freedom in allowing marriage with the outsider.

2. From the time of Ezra down to the twentieth century, there was uncompromising severity in opposition to such inter-marriage.

Professor Ephraim Feldman in giving this division of the attitude of the Church towards inter-marriage, for the Church expressed the attitude in Jewish history as perhaps no other institution expressed it, makes a statement to this effect, namely, that the first period may be characterized as being as greatly lax in its stand or position on intermarriage as the second period is by an uncompromising severity in opposition to intermarriage. (25)

Perhaps the two periods, for convenience, may be characterized by what we may call "before and after the maturing of a clear religious consciousness". (26) That is to say, that where religious

(25) Professor Ephraim Feldman-"Intermarriage Historically Considered"-Yr. Bk. of C.C. of Am. Hebrews 1909

(26) Same
consciousness is inchoate, half-formed and vague, it is only natural that there should be little objection to intermarriage with the stranger, "and what little there is, is of that feeble, unresisting sentimental variety that gives up before the first gust of real passion and the determined claims of natural impulse." (27)

It seems appropriate here to find out just what kind of a power and personality this one known as Ezra was, and just why we divide the subject of inter-marriage or mixed marriage as it is characterized by the history of the Jewish Church with the age or period of Nehemiah and Ezra.

A history of Israel seems to indicate that Ezra came to Jerusalem in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes II, 397 B.C. Ezra came to Jerusalem as a religious reformer, his work having as its primary object the establishment of the Law as formulated by the priestly schools among the Babylonian Jews. Records concerning the details of his work are far more scanty than those of the work of Nehemiah. Perhaps the purpose underlying his coming to Jerusalem was to set before the people of the essence of the Law as understood by the strict orthodoxy of Babylonian Judaism. There is a question as to which of the two men, Nehemiah or Ezra came first. Evidence, however, seems to indicate that Nehemiah preceded Ezra, arriving as he did in Palestine in 444 B.C., while it seems that Ezra followed Nehemiah a half century later.

Preceding Nehemiah and Ezra there was existent what some writers are pleased to call and "inchoate, half-formed and vague religious consciousness," a condition under which it was only natural to expect that there should be little objection to inter-marriage with the "stranger", and even where was objection to such...

(27) same as (26)
marriages it was of that variety that gives up before the first
gust of real passion and the determined claims of natural impulse.
"In fact, in the book of "Malachi", who preceded both Nehemiah and
Ezra we find a statement to the effect that he would not have ob-
jected to mixed marriages. Oesterly and Robinson seem to feel rather
that there is every reason to believe that such a practice was quite
common and prevalent. (28) "What Malachi says in reference to the
Gentiles is, indeed, a further argument that he belonged to a time
before, though but shortly before, 444 B.C., for the breadth of
view he manifests in this respect became a thing of the past dur-
ing the regime of Nehemiah and Ezra. One other thing which points
to a pre-Nehemiah-Ezra period is that the references to the law
in the book of "Malachi" suggest the Deuteronomistic rather than the
Priestly Code". (29).

Nehemiah and Ezra, especially the latter, felt very strongly
against marriage with the "stranger". It seemed that the priests
were not very zealous for what these two considered racial purity.
The priests were not anxious to drive away the "strangers", for
during the whole of the "exilic period" the priests in Palestine
had been officiating in the Temple, in spite of its bad condition,
and that they had as a result all along been in contact with the
people of the land of Judah, as well as with those farther north
who came to Jerusalem to worship.

Even Nehemiah's primary objection to intermarriage between Jews
and non-Jews seemed to be the fear, which is still maintained by
the orthodox believers today, that the children of such unions
were forgetting their native tongue. Nehemiah was on firm ground
(28) and (29) "A History of Israel "Vol.II-Oesterly and
Robinson-Page 108."
in enforcing an oath that marriage between Jews and non-Jews should not be contracted in the future for fear largely that the children of such marriages forgot their native tongue. This leads us more directly to the all-important polemic against mixed marriages which is contained in Ezra ix, x. The underlying principle may be expressed by this Deuteronomistic passage (vii.1-3) which runs: "When Yahveh thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and shall cast out many nations before thee... then shalt thou utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them; neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, not his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son."

Ezra and Nehemiah extended the Mosaic prohibition of intermarriage which says of the marriage with certain Canaanitish nations, "Thou shalt not make marriages with them, thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, and his daughter shalt thou not take unto thy son", for the reason that "they will turn away thy son from following me, to serve other gods. "They extended this prohibition so as to include all the pagan nations of the country. Such marriage between Jew and non-Jew had primarily been contracted among the higher grades of society and among the priesthood. The Jews had not only had general intercourse with the peoples of the lands, but the Jews returning from exile had intermarried with the women of these lands—especially the Samaritans. Ezra went even further than did Nehemiah by succeeding fully in inducing every one who had married a foreign woman to put her away (x.16-19), while Nehemiah did not more than exact a promise that in the future the Jews would not permit their children to intermarry with foreigners (Neh.xiii.25).
Ezra would naturally regard intermarriage between those Jews who had come to Palestine from Babylonia with those of the 'Mixed races' of their new environment as pollution. Was Ezra himself not a child of Babylonian Jewry? Ezra was merely seeking to follow in the footsteps of Nehemiah, by enforcing in Palestine what every Babylonian Jew who had remained faithful to his religion had been taught to regard as essential, i.e. separateness from those of different race and religion, or, as in this case, those who were held to be different in race and religion. It seems clear that the effort to prohibit intermarriage with non-Jews, or with Jews and Jewesses who were of mixed blood, was prompted by nothing more nor less than the desire to make the Jews of Palestine conform to the Babylonian form.

In the period "before the rise of religious consciousness" we find such illustrative cases of the freedom of intermarriage as these.

Samson refuses to listen to the pleas of his parents that there are daughters of Israel for him to choose from, and has for his wife the daughter of the Timnite Philistine. His parents attend the wedding feast and behave as if nothing was amiss.

Esau married two daughters of an "alien" race much against the wishes of his parents, Isaac and Rebecca. They may deplore such a union but to no avail for their son marries these daughters of a race alien to his own.

"Samson or an Esau, or a Judah, marrying the daughter of a Canaanite, or a Joseph, a David, a Solomon, and Ahat, or a score of such worthies scattered through some centuries, or even that of Moses, the son of Amran marrying an Aishite woman,
are not at all conclusive." (30)

"And the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanite, the Hittite and the Amorite, and the Perizzite and the Hivvite, and the Jebusite, and they took their daughters to be their wives and gave their own daughters to their sons, and served their gods."

"Judges."

Professor Ephraim Feldman makes this rather startling conclusion that the records indicate, unquestionably, that fully one-third of the population of Israel are of mixed descent.

This period when marriages between Jews and non-Jews were so freely entered into was followed by a period, beginning roughly with Nehemiah, or better, Ezra, about 400 B.C., which we shall indicate as the period characterized by the rise of, and the maturing of a clear religious consciousness.

It came upon these sons of Israel while they were forced to submit to what has been characterized as the "Babylonian Captivity", and when, there by the rivers of the Babylon, they took account of themselves, there was born the exalting consciousness of their uniqueness and their determination to live in accordance with it. "Israel will henceforth live for God and for God's law. Israel will live and, if necessary, die for this ideal."

There and by the rivers of the Babylon they swore a mighty oath:

"If I forget thee, O'Jerusalem, may my right hand forget its cunning; may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, If I shall not remember thee."

Those who would join her must now identify themselves

(30) same as 25 and 26.
entirely with the life of God and his ideals, otherwise they are to stay away. Israel had carried on, although—

"You divided your own house; your two nations had even a tooth upon each other's sinew,
Then the Philistines hewed your borders, the Syrian made you his estate;
Assyria shook Israel from Samaria,
Babylon whipped Judah down the hills

You returned from milky Euphrates,
from the bosomy banks, from the banks of sunlight, to spurring Jordan the wound among the hills, to Jerusalem the ash-heap—

Then lava from Italy,
the Roman army flowed and effaced you.
Your remnant was seeded over the earth
In Babylon, in Egypt, in Cyrene; on the oases and on the caravan tracks; in Scythia, in Spain and in the two Romes You set your dwelling

Among the nations you knew
the weathers of inhospitality,
marsh heat of contumely
suspicion fringing you like frost, mockery's wind lifting the skirts, Pogrom's lightnings."  (31)

(31) "The History of The Jews"-Isidor Schneider-Poetry
"Israel will henceforth live for God and for God alone. Israel will live, and if necessary, die for this ideal."

What about the ease of contracting a marriage between Jews and non-Jews?

The Deuteronomic Law is seriously enforced for the first time, even more severely than the letter of the law warranted. The mature religious consciousness of their uniqueness has made of Israel now a race determined to live its own pure religious life, even at the risk of seeming hostile to its neighbors. To the Israelite individuality and loyalty to the law of his God are all-important.

Its treatment at the hands of both the Romans and Greeks, especially the former, was such that Israel, under the strained relations existing, passed a decree so that the "heathen" could not intermarry with Israel so that should such a union take place, it was regarded as null and void.

Even if the Jews had wished to revise their restriction against intermarriage with non-Jews, the Church itself was erecting barriers against inter-marriage on its own side of the fence, especially is this last demonstrated by the Church Councils between the fifth and thirteenth centuries.

Passing over the centuries rapidly to the question of intermarriage in modern times as viewed by the Jewish Church we come to:

The French Synhedrin convened in August 1806 by Napoleon and looked upon intermarriage as follows:
"May a Jewess marry a Christian, and a Jew a Christian woman, or does the law allow only the Jews to marry only among themselves?"

They decided that the law does not say that a Jewess cannot marry a Christian, or a Jew a Christian woman, nor does it hold true that the Jews can intermarry only among themselves.

"The great Sanhedrin declares that marriage between Israelites and Christians, contracted according to the laws of the 'Code Civil', are, from a civil standpoint, binding and valid, and, although such marriages can not be invested with the religious forms, they shall not entail any disciplinary punishment (anathema)" (32)

This was followed by the radical Rabbinical Conference held at Braunschweig, Germany, in the year 1844, and it hastily ratified the answer given by the orthodox French Synhedrin, without as much as taking the trouble to have before them the original document, and resolving "that-

The intermarriage of Jews and Christians, and, in general, the intermarriage of Jews with adherents of any of the monotheistic religions, is not forbidden, provided that the parents are permitted by the law of the State to bring up the offspring of such marriage in the Jewish faith." (33)

It is evident from a slight comparison of the two expressions that the second goes a much greater distance than the first, although (32) and (33) same as (13) p.47 and 48.
the original intent of the document had been merely to reaffirm that which had been laid down by the French Synhedrin in 1806. It is interesting to note that one, Ludwig Philipson, one of the moving spirits behind this movement and an eminent scholar in his own right, after voting for it upon sounder study and deeper deliberation, changed his mind. Dr. Philipson then says:

"Religion must pronounce against mixed marriages. It has been said that such marriages will contribute toward the promotion of tolerance and toward bringing the different religions nearer to each other. But, on the other hand, it must be conceded that they contribute as well toward the weakening of true religiousness and sincerity in matters of faith. It is certainly our duty to widen the sway of tolerance so that it may rule over all classes and individuals, however they may differ in regard to creed and religious ground in order to gain a little more space for the dominion of tolerance.

"Therefore, little as any true friend of religion and humanity could wish that religion should stand between those who sincerely love and cling to each other, deeply as it must pain him to grieve such persons, still, from the standpoint of religion and of sincere religious life, he can not but disapprove of mixed marriages."[34]

Dr. Aub and Dr. Geiger, appointed to the committee of the First Jewish Synod at Leipzig in 1869 characterize intermarriage as detrimental to the Jewish faith and fireside. Mielziner refers to these two as "two celebrated banner-bearers of modern Judaism". (34) same as 13-page 48 and 49.
Dr. Geiger states that the divergence of spiritual life resulting from the difference of creed is apt to disturb the harmony of married life and mar the "sincere union of hearts". Dr. Aub states that "the education of the children that may be born of such wedlock is likewise a strong consideration against mixed marriages."

David Einhorn, leader of thought in this country at one time, most emphatically maintained that intermarriage is prohibited from the standpoint of Reform Judaism. To those, to whom the preservation and the perpetuation of Judaism must be as near and dear as their very lives, to them intermarriage could not but appear objectionable in the highest degree. "To lend a hand to the sanctification of mixed marriage is, according to my firm conviction, to furnish a nail to the coffin of the small Jewish race, with its sublime mission." (35).

Reverend I.M. Wise, in a public lecture on "Intermarriage", adds to the discussion of intermarriage this very pertinent "side" that few others have cared to differentiate from the general classification of those who enter such mixed marriages:—

"But then it might be urged that there are thousands and tens of thousands of individuals in this country who profess no religion at all; hence they are free of those prejudices. Why should any rabbi refuse to solemnize in behalf of Judaism the marriage of such irreligious parties, whose parents happened to be Jewish on the one side and Christian on the other, if no existing law restrains him? And we have seen that no such law rightfully exists. To this might be replied: Because the parties are irreligious; or because

(35) same as 13 p.52
such solemnization would be a mere mockery to persons
who profess no religion; and no rabbi will abuse the
authority invested in him to perform the task of a
lower magistrate; no rabbit has the right to act the
part of an ordinary stage actor—to go through a per­
formance and pronounce formulas and benedictions to par­
ties who believe in neither, and cannot consider them­
selves benefitted by either, as the next justice of
peace can declare them man and wife without any per­
formance or benediction.

"If the rabbi believes, as he ought to, that ma­
trimony is a sacred institution, sanctified by the law
of the covenant, by the expressed will of the Maker of
man, in whose name and by the authority of whose law
(revealed law) he unites the couple before him in the
holy covenant of matrimony, and invokes upon them God’s
blessing; he will not make a comedian of himself to do
and say all that for persons who do not believe a word
about it. If any one does not believe in the Living God
of Israel and the Sinaic revelation he has no reason what­
ever to believe in the sanctity of the marriage compact
as being instituted by the law of God, and consequently has
no cause to be married by a rabbi, who acts by that higher
authority only. This is certainly higher ground, which
it might be difficult to controvert."

(36)—same as (13) page 53 and 54.
Is intermarriage or mixed marriage advisable or desirable from the viewpoint of the Church? A study of the attitude of the Jewish Church toward intermarriage, amplified as it is by wide experience, would answer most emphatically, "No!" There is a feeling on the part of the Jewish Church that it is an impossibility to find in marriages where the couple immediately concerned are reared perhaps so differently, educated to different ideals and "trained in separate atmosphere and breathing a distinct air and living distinct lives," any real probable success.

The Jewish Church feels that the ideal marriage must have as one of its conditions harmony and unanimity of religion, that is, a community of respect and reverence for the same religion. An ideal marriage requires a complete unity not only physically and morally, but it means also a spiritual union where anything that touches the deepest and holiest questions of life are confronted by a united mind and heart of the man and woman immediately concerned. How could there be that complete union of souls and that perfect harmony and unity of household between two people who hold with serious conviction different views of religion?

Therefore, the Jewish Church feels that she must refuse to consecrate mixed marriages because they do not fulfill the conditions which the religions teacher in Judaism should recognize as indispensable for the ideal union. Then, there is the all-important factor that the education of the children that may be born out of such wedlock is likewise a strong consideration against mixed marriages. Mixed marriage is also vigorously opposed and prohibited from the point of view of the integrity of Judaism as a religion. The fear is here from the point of view of the interests of the
synagogue, for Judaism being the religion of a minority, as a matter of self preservation, opposes mixed marriages, which, if prevalent, would weaken its influence and endanger its very existence. Therefore, from the point of view of everything that is characteristic of the Jewish Church, we may conclude that intermarriage, as regarded by the Jewish Church, is inadvisable, undesirable and not permissible.

The story of Rabbi Moses is recalled in this instance and seems appropriate here at the close of this discussion on the attitude of both Churches -

"I am reminded of a story which is told of a good, pious woman who listened for a long time to the disquisition of a preacher on the existence of a God, and after the service was over she went out and said, "In spite of all that the preacher said I still believe in God."

In spite of all that might be said concerning the "pros and cons" of intermarriage, both from the historical and the religious point of view, Rabbi Moses felt that the rabbis after hearing the two sides of the question of intermarriage discussed, would go out and say, "I still believe that mixed marriage is undesirable."
Part II
The writer has been successful in deriving certain salient information as to the effect and result of intermarriage between Jew and Roman Catholic. He has drawn his material from the data of ten such intermarriages that have come to his attention from both primary and secondary contacts. This information he considers reliable since even his secondary contacts have been such as to be considered unbiased and sound, although the information so gained usually suffers through the new interpretation that might well be given to it through this medium.

These cases all have resulted into some form of domestic discord. The writer appreciates that in every complex situation such as these cases of domestic discord there are factors of a fortuitous or conjectural nature which must be taken into account whenever an explanation of the crisis situation in the marriage between a Jew and a Roman Catholic is attempted. He, however, feels that the domestic discord that he is about to deal with in these cases "has a genesis just as does a full-grown tree or a fully developed organism. This theory is closely related, logically, to the resistance theory in medicine. If the organism is functioning properly, that is, if it is in good health and has considerable reserve energy, it will be able to throw off the poisons which produce sickness. To understand the incident of the disease, then, it is necessary to understand how the resistance of the organism was lowered to such an extent as
to be unable to throw off these poisons. The appearance of a "germ" is fortuitous, but it may be the efficient cause of the cataclysm, i.e., the onset of the malady. In the same way, domestic discord is a matter of growth, a process of summation, which has its beginnings considerably removed from the crisis situation in which it became conscious and defined."(37)

A similar situation existed with the cases that the writer has become acquainted with. He has tried to get as close to the "genetic origin" of the discord as it was possible for an outsider to get and was, therefore, of necessity, forced to be satisfied with what information that seemed to have the "earmarks" of being genetic as he was able to gather. Only the information that is deemed pertinent to our discussion here will be included in the analyses of the material presented by the case studies. Family names will be referred to by the first letter of the last name. There has been no reason to believe, however, that there are not cases of intermarriage of a Jew and a Catholic that have resulted in successful adjustment, but such cases have not been presented to this writer and therefore he has been forced to draw for information upon these ten cases of intermarriage which ended in domestic discord.

Rabbi X informed me of a most interesting case that he himself was a party to. His depiction of this case was rather vividly drawn. The young man who was contemplating marriage to a Roman Catholic girl was undergoing the greatest trial that a couple contemplating intermarriage are forced to submit to when they inform their parents of their intentions of intermarrying.

(37) Ernest W. Mowrer-"Domestic Discord"-p.30-31
The parents of this young man realizing that they alone might not be successful in deterring their son from his proposed marriage to this girl who "didn't belong" had called upon this rabbi to assist them in making their son see the situation in its true light. The rabbi related the meeting of the four in some such fashion as this which probably was somewhat over-portrayed, yet the essential factors that we are concerned with are included in it.

The boy's mother had tried to impress her son with the sacrilege of the proposed act by saying in a choking voice, while tears coursed down her cheeks, "But my son, we are Jews! She is not of our faith!"

He answered with a defiant note in his voice, "I know that, Ma, but it can't be helped. I love her."

"Oh, my son! My son!" his mother moaned, becoming somewhat hysterical. "Think-think!-of this terrible thing you talk of doing. You cannot marry the girl! You must not! Think of what it will mean to you, to us all!"

His father, too, supported his wife's plea in these words: "You are my son and I love you—but I swear by the God of Israel that if you marry out of your faith, I will mourn you as though you were dead!"

Then the young man turned to the rabbi, the one who informed me of this case, with the hope of an understanding that his parents did not seem to offer. He hoped that the Rabbi might offer a way out which might result in some satisfactory compromise to all parties concerned. "Although I sympathized with him", said the Rabbi, "I could not approve his request which is disapproved
by both the Jewish and the Roman Catholic Churches. So I informed
him in some such fatherly fashion as I was capable of in some such
speech as I shall try to recite to you:

"When one is in love, thoughts cease to be either coherent
or logical. I am not preaching human conduct, either. I am only
showing you the moral consequences of such an act as you are now
considering. What will your married life be? Orthodox, or Christian?
What church will you attend? What will your children be? Don't
you see that you will be ostracized from all congregations, that
you will lose your identity? Nor must you forget the humiliation,
the disgrace, to your family. I am only showing you your duty as a
son and a Jew. Such a purpose as yours is like trying to mix oil
and water. They will never blend. I am considering, too, that the
oaths, the promises a man makes to a woman during the crises of
love may be forgotten after a while without any great injury to
the moral value of the lover who swore them."

The Rabbi informed me that the marriage had been entered into
against the objection of both the parents and himself. Alas, too
often youth follows the light of his own flame and the inevitable
happened. About a year later they were living apart because of
marital incompatibility. The real reason for their split was that
there was too much outside interference from relatives and friends
which made life together unbearable. Then again, social pressure
which resulted in the final marital "rift" was such that they
decided it was best that they live apart. Both sides, his and
her side, were exceedingly angry when these two had entered into
a marriage contract and had done everything in their power to
make for unpleasantries. It seemed that wherever they went the
disapproval of their relatives and friends was forcibly brought home to them. The Rabbi informed me that he understood the real crisis situation between the two had resulted in the failure of the two to agree upon church affiliations. Neither would join the other's Church. He would not go to the church at all and she would go alone on Sunday to her own church where she was made to feel how much of an outcast she had become as a result of her marriage to a Jew. He, too, had been forced to feel that he was no outcaste because of her marriage to a Roman Catholic from his business associates who were themselves largely Jews.

In the case of Mr. and Mrs. B., Mrs. B., a Catholic, informed me that although she and her husband had been married now for ten years their marital relations were far from pleasant. She forgives his "cheating" and "running around" because she loves him too deeply. He certainly does not reciprocate. She informed me that the condition they were subjected to as a result of their inter-marriage was something like this: "We are between the 'devil and the deep blue sea'. I am not accepted by his family, neither is he accepted by my family. We are virtually outcastes in our respective families in this regard. They look upon me as one who does not belong. I am an outsider". Her affection, however, was too strong to allow her to enter into a divorce with her husband although I am quite certain her husband would be quite willing.

In the case of Mr. and Mrs. Harry M., Mrs. M., sued for separate maintainance, but was unsuccessful. It seemed to be a case of "too much mother-in-law". Her mother made life pretty miserable for them especially since she was a highly efficient "nagger." Whenever Harry failed to work a week and as a result failed to bring home his weekly pay envelope, her mother would mix in and
make life unbearable for both concerned by saying, "See, you married a Jew and what is the result. No money at the end of the week. He probably spent his week's wages on himself. Now, if you had married one of your own kind, this would never have happened." Such persistent nagging on the part of his mother-in-law who conveyed her own rationalizations to her daughter and made her think the worst of her husband resulted in separate divorce proceedings. The Judge saw the source of the trouble, but refused to grant them their pleas.

In the case of Mr. and Mrs. R. we found that their domestic discord was largely the result of how their children were to be trained. Mr. R., although indifferent as to his own break with the church, was trying to make the best of it. He was determined that his sons should be trained in the Jewish Hebrew School and therefore to become acquainted with their Jewish heritage. His own 'chayder' had contained for him something that he never would forget. It had given him a training which did not allow him to forget he was a Jew, although he had married outside of his own people. His sons must not be allowed to take the step he had taken, although he did love his wife. His wife was equally determined that their children should go to the Church Sunday School where they would receive a "Catholic education". The zeal of the church officers who work to draw every born child of a Catholic parent into the school had been successful. She might have been willing to compromise, but the pressure of those connected with the Church convinced her that she must send her children to the Church School. Although, in theory, the parents' decision is optional, such pressure is brought to bear that only a person oblivious to public opinion and
to personal influence can resist it. These Catholic zealots felt that children whose misfortune it is to live under the influence of a non-Catholic father must be watched, guarded, and somehow kept within the fold. She realized that departure from what her group considered right—such as parochial school education—brings the severest criticism and ostracism, which, to one reared in a Catholic environment is unbearable. Because both parents refused to yield there was no peace in the family.

In the case of Mr. and Mrs. G., domestic discord arose largely over the important factor that their children, although they themselves tried to hide the fact of their intermarriage from their children, were made acquainted with their unenviable position by the taunts of their neighbors' children. Although they had moved, it seemed that their children were being forced to suffer the stigma of their own social ostracism. For their children's sake they decided that it would be most advisable if they lived apart, which they did.

The marriage of both Mr. and Mrs. M. and that of Mr. and Mrs. C. resulted in domestic discord largely due to the out-cropping of the outward prejudices, religious or traditional beliefs which proved an obstacle too great to overcome for the parties concerned. It seemed to be to their good fortune that divorces were granted to both couples for one reason or another and they all married again, this time to members of their own respective groups. Their marriages are seemingly successful at present.

A friend of mine to whom I am indebted for information relative to my other three cases of intermarriage between Jews and
Roman Catholics informed me that all turned out to be unsuccessful ventures in marriage largely as a result of the respective Churches interfering in one way or another. The case which I had uncovered in regard to domestic discord arising out of the question as to what Church should have charge of the religious education of the children of such a marriage was the seeming source of one marital failure that my friend informed me of. Another crisis situation grew out of the objection of the Jewish side of the partnership to the outside Catholic friends which his wife continued in spite of his repeated objections to them. She persisted in maintaining them, since she felt that they were her only "standbys", for his friends refused to accept her as one of them. The third case was simply the result of the mutual understanding between the two persons immediately concerned that their differences in background were insurmountable and their decision after twelve month's of attempted adjustment of their differences, the decision on their part that they would be best apart and living their respective lives as their parents might have wished them to have done.

Yes, such an attempt as theirs was like trying to mix oil and water. They never will blend. We have found that these marriages failed largely because of the differences that existed between the two persons entering a marriage contract and whose differences themselves insurmountable were made to arise to a "crisis situation" as a result of some outside influence whether it be the pressure of these churches, the respective families and families or whatever it might be. It also seemed as if the "cards were stacked against" this couple before they even said "I do".
The writer has tried to apply certain "principles" he has learned from an analysis of his case studies and has incorporated into the following case study, wholly fictitious "as it may be, what might happen in an intermarriage between a Jew and a Roman Catholic.

He has selected his material with care so as to present a careful and salient discussion of a representative intermarriage. The writer has been fortunate in being able to gain material from the works of such writers as Mary Grace Ashton, Ludwig Lewishon, Elias Tobenkin, and others. He has chosen his material from these writers with a care to presenting as interesting and pertinent discussion as it was possible. The result has been the Case Study that follows:
A "Prelude" to an Intermarriage

Samuel's views, including his unexpressed ones, are familiar to me by this time, we both having been together enough to know just where each of us stands on the question of marriage, and for that matter, intermarriage.

He has confided in me that he has become closely attached to several Gentile girls, about whom he finds a blond reticent charm that he very much likes. Whether he was at Kathleen's home, or at Priscilla's or Margaret's, he escaped that hectic embarrassed confusion in which his evenings with Jewish girls had so often ended.

"Girls brought up in bourgeois Jewish families were full of a Byzantine luxuriousness of sensuality they would not have been able to recognize or persuaded to admit. One could tell it by their full-breasted bodies and by the equatorial way in which some of them danced. It was difficult to be among them very long before one half-willingly succumbed with respect to sexual matters. Samuel found that he was truly of their own race and kind. Take Dorothy Goldsmith, for example. He had never been in love with her, never. There was a kind of clever, intelligent gaiety about her conversation that brought him back to her again and again. She was not the least in love with him; that was plain to both of them. They liked to talk, and now and then go dancing together. But by some perverse persistence she insisted on accenting the obligato of sex. They would find themselves indulging in petting parties they never intended. And there were other instances."
"It had probably been for that reason that he fled to Gentile girls for a while. There was about them a blond reticent charm that he enormously liked. His memory was filled with a succession of them, Kathleen, Priscilla, Margaret, all lithe and slim and self-contained. Even they were sensual, they were so frankly and not by indirection. And they could be beautifully free, for long hours of conversation, from any furtive or sultry obsession of sex. How many times had he been off with them on long all-day hikes or spent evenings at their home, and escaped that hectic embarrassed confusion in which his evenings with Jewish girls had so often ended. It was far enough, Heaven knew, from being a fact that they left him sexually unmoved. Their coolness and tutored restraint stirred his imagination; their firm clean-cut bodies stirred his senses. They became all merged in his mind with images of Greek Goddesses, and as if they were Greek goddesses he almost feared to touch them. One of them, Priscilla, was so singularly cool about sex as to be disarming. Kathleen's clean easy candor made sexual advances seem easy and yet silly. They knew how to be companionable without being provocative, these Gentile girls. It was not that they made one think of Platonic love, or feel it. It was that one could be with them for a space, and not think of love at all. Or one could think of it limpidly and with an easy unembarrassed heat.

"It would be nice, Samuel had often thought, to be married to one of them. For besides their litheness and slimness and athletic firmness, he loved their simplicity. They were not brought up as were the Jewish girls he knew to need and demand luxury. He had been often at the homes of some of his young
Gentile friends. What a pleasant effortless life and menage they seemed to conduct, these young couples, often on extremely limited incomes. The Latimers, for example, both of whom worked for a living. They hardly lived in splendor, but there were few homes in which one could feel the need of it less, few places where one could pass so gracious an evening. And where there was a large income it did not advertise itself in expensive clothes or furnishings in a vulgar research toward expensive glory." (38)

"There was a devotion without display, there was affection without public sentiment, and Samuel was impressed with the status of love and understanding he found among them. Perhaps above all, he was charmed by their at least apparent casualness." (39)

To Samuel there was something about Kathleen that drew him to her more than to Priscilla and Margaret, and for that matter, than to any Jewish girl of his acquaintance. What did he see in Kathleen that drew him to her rather than to other Gentile girls, and for that matter, to any Jewish girl of his acquaintance? Well Kathleen had--just how could he express himself on that rather intangible thing that made him feel that Kathleen had for him, or held for him, something these other girls lacked, lacked, at least, from his standpoint. Perhaps he was measuring only from his own standpoint. Perhaps! Oh Well! Wasn't he the one that had this feeling?

Yes, Kathleen had for him, if only for him, an attractiveness, a charm and fascination which he could not adequately express and explain even to himself. He knew that the feeling was

(38)and(39) "Reuben Cohen looks at Marriage and Intermarriage"--Irwin Edman--Menorah Journal (Oct. 1928)
there, for didn't he feel it? What did he care if he couldn't address himself about it to his friends. He sometimes expressed the feeling that he had for Kathleen in such words as these, "he found in her that beautiful soul, clad in that perfect form, so palpably and flagrantly made from all eternity to be loved". You see, Samuel and I had taken several courses while at college in the field of Philosophy, and when Samuel was at loss to express himself to me regarding his feeling toward Kathleen, he somehow remembered this expression from James and used it to apply to Kathleen. He seemed genuine in this feeling toward Kathleen. She seemed to hold for him a halo of perfection and charm which so absorbed Samuel in the desirable features of his love object that he became oblivious to the undesirable ones. Perhaps in his eyes Kathleen was "Just Perfect".

Well, perhaps he was blinded by this thing called "love". Was Shakespeare right in saying that "Love is blind, and lovers cannot see the pretty follies they themselves commit?" Kathleen felt that Samuel was sincere in his esteem, love and desire of her. She, in return, exhibited a real and genuine affection for Samuel. Perhaps she was acquainted with, but had disregarded the advice of St. John who says, "If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine (the true faith), receive him not into the house nor say to him, God speed you". She felt that her love for Samuel was genuine, warm and deep, and aiming only at his best interest. She felt she loved him too much to be able to live without him. Perhaps her love was of the type that it was because she could never be capable of loving any other man. To her Samuel was her life's one and only love. He was a soul-mate destined by heaven to be her
husband. It was what some call "love at first sight", but she couldn't help herself.

"If Kathleen was to be his, was to become his wife, she must know him not only as he was, but as he had been....She must be made acquainted with what it meant to be a Jew. She must know that he was a Jew.....There must be an understanding between them. They must be able to share each other's thoughts and feelings....That was what he considered marriage to be—a sharing of inmost thoughts and feelings.....There must be no locked chambers in his mind.....Marriage would be no marriage if there were....

"It was on the third Sunday since he had told her of his love that Samuel said to Kathleen:

"You know that I am a Jew, don't you, Kathleen?"

"Mm", the girl nodded without taking her eyes from the beautiful sunset she was watching; after some moments the girl came out of her reveries and sought Samuel's hand. She was apparently thinking about his question, for bringing her face around to him, she said, with a smile:

"Yes, I half felt that I should have a foreign sweetheart........

"In many ways," she said reminiscently, "you resemble George (her best friend had married a foreigner, an Icelander, by the name of George). He, too, was moody."

"Am I moody?" Samuel asked, surprised. She laughed. Pushing his disordered hair back she was studying his sharp, high forehead.....

"I was wondering," Samuel muttered to himself, but Kathleen heard him.

"I was wondering—what?" she asked.
"I was thinking," Samuel replied with a wave of his hand toward the city, "how nice it would have been had we known each other long before, if I had been born here, like yourself."

"Yes", she said enthusiastically, "we would have been friends since way, way back. We would have gone to the same school, and you would have carried my school bag for me. In the winter we would have gone skating together."

"Do you skate?" she suddenly turned on him.

"No."

"I noticed", she said, "that you are not much on sports, ball playing, and the like."

"No", he said, "we miss all that in the ghetto."

"In the what?" she queried.

"In the ghetto", he repeated, the color mounting to his face. "It is the place where we Jews live in Russia."

"Oh", she said.

"I guess you must have had it pretty hard in the Old World," she resumed after a silence.

"Did you suffer much in the Old World? Did you have to go hungry sometimes?"

"No", said Samuel, "I did not go hungry. We were spared that. There was always enough to eat in my father's house. Always. But there were other troubles. Persecutions..."

"Persecutions?" she repeated quickly, "Were your people persecuted? Were you persecuted?"

"There were persecutions, yes."

"Why? Why were you persecuted?"
"Because we were Jews".

He was staring blankly ahead. Kathleen was silent. A pained look came into her face, and her eyes seemed to be straining, reaching out after dim, distant visions. She was trying to bring to her mind certain memories, certain things she had read about in her school books, in childhood. There had been stories of religious intolerance and persecution in her history book. There were the Huguenots and Quakers. They had come to America because of religious intolerance in their native lands. But that had all been so far back. She did not know such persecutions still continued. Now she would have to add the Jews to the list of those suffering for religion. Huguenots...Quakers...Jews...

"And I never knew it, "Kathleen finally brought out. "I thought all this wrangling over religion was a thing of the past". Thinking of her earlier statement, she added: "I guess it is pretty wretched to be born in Europe."

"Samuel wanted to tell her that the wretched part was not being born in Europe, but in being born a Jew. But he refrained. The day had been so rich in love for them. They had been so happy. It would have been a shame to mar it with the recital of his depressing Old World memories. He would not lift the veil just yet. There would be other, more opportune occasions to initiate her into these things of his past." (40)

Sitting alone with Kathleen one Sunday night in the parlor, the story came back to Samuel with peculiar poignancy.

(40) Adapted from pages 132-138-"God of Might-" Elias Tobenkin
"he had been describing to her his life prior to his coming to America, trying to convey to her the martyrdom of his race in Russia, in the old World—the tragedy of the Jews for nearly two thousand years.

"Kathleen had been listening to him eagerly, sympathetic but strangely puzzled...Like the little boy who could not grasp "the thing called sunshine" because he had been blind from birth. Kathleen was unable to plumb the horror of the ghetto memories. Her mind could not encompass the injustices, the persecutions he was telling of. It was if Samuel was speaking to her of another planet.

"What was race hatred, she asked, and why? Why this feud between Christian and Jew? What did it matter what people believed, how they worshipped? No one is hurt by what you believe; it is what you do or don't that matters.

"She shrank from the tales of pogroms, killings, blood. Such brutal passions, such ghastly vehemence between man and man were utterly foreign to her nature. They were at variance with her birth, her education, and surroundings. They were distressing. She wished to forget these things. Samuel must forget these things. These things were of the Old World—and they were over with. He was in America. Nearly everybody who came from the Old World had a story of oppression to tell, not so bad as his, Samuels, but still oppression.....

"Don't bring these subjects up again", she pleaded with Samuel. "They make me feel so wretched. I don't ever want, ever want to think about them. You mustn't think about them either."

"Samuel described his father and sister to
Kathleen. About his father Samuel told of his mode of living, his religious convictions... He was orthodox, an orthodox Hebrew. He was staying with his daughter who was married to a rabbi. Samuel and his brother-in-law were worlds apart in their views and ideas. His sister had been a mere child when she married and was now completely under the dominance of her husband. His father's views coincided with those of his son-in-law, the rabbi.

"A rabbi," Kathleen interrogated, "that's a minister?"

Samuel nodded.

"A rabbi", she repeated as if trying to fix the word in her memory.

Samuel was born into the Hebrew faith; his people in the old World were Hebrews. But she was a Christian. Could he appreciate her background? Her background was perhaps as foreign to him as his background was strange to her.

Could the matter be merely dismissed by saying "What does it matter what one's religion is, so long as one serves the Lord. It is the sort of Life one leads that counts, not the church one goes to?"

I should have said, being a close "confidante" of Samuel, that the problem of "Would you marry a Christian?" been presented to Samuel before he became closely attached to Kathleen, he might have well said, "You probably don't seem to understand me"--"They are Christian, while I, I am Jewish. I have been brought up in an Orthodox Jewish environment which had much the same attitudes as are said to have existed in the Old World." But, well his love for Kathleen now was such, that he had adjusted himself to a more unorthodox way of looking at such matters. He was deeply in

(41) pages 141,149 and 150—"God of Might"—Elias Tobenkin
love with Kathleen and even the difference in religion existing between Samuel and Kathleen could not stand in the way of their "true love". "What mattered it," Samuel pondered, "Whether she was a Roman Catholic or a Protestant, of a religious affiliation which was contrary to his way of religious thinking? Wasn't it the sort of life one leads that counts, and not necessarily what church one goes to?" Samuel wanted her, not with the regardless, self-interested, unthinking passion of passing desire merely, but rather with that deep enduring ecstasy that stirs the soul of self-effacement, that longs to bring contentment to the loved one, that is gentle and gracious and delicate for fear of giving offense." (42)

Samuel's father was very much determined to arrange for his son a suitable marriage into a well-to-do and respectable Jewish family. Generally speaking, his father was a believer in the 'marriage de convenance'. He would arrange a marriage with a friend who had a daughter who would be suitable for his son, Samuel. That would be an exceedingly successful and excellent thing. Perhaps his father was what some commonly refer to as "inclined to be old-fashioned". Given first, then, a man of his father's stamp, high-principled, hard-working, yes, high-principled, undoubtedly-tenacious and old-fashioned...Religion. Not so much as a matter of creed and belief. That's not religion to him. No, religion was something racial, in-bred. It isn't only the spiritual point of view that Samuel's father was concerned with, but he realized, and was afraid of the severing of nationality, of tradition, of caste. He wanted Samuel to marry a Jewish girl, especially the daughter of a dear friend of his, who he considered would make an ideal 'marriage de convenance'.

(42) and (43) p.107 and 9.78—"Race"—Mary Grace Ashton
Was it possible for Samuel to comply with both the wishes of his orthodox father who had planned a "marriage de convenance" for him and with his love for Kathleen? Could both be compromised in some way or another? In short, could he reconcile the wishes of his father for a 'marriage de convenance' with his own love for Kathleen who, could hardly fill the requirements that his father demanded of a son's wife? It didn't seem possible that the two could be reconciled.

Then again the "Old Testament" was his father's family history. And for that matter his history also. Generations of persecution have brought out natural pride in its most virulent form. Two thousand years of Christianity have made him hate it. (44)

His father could never think that the boy would ever be such a fool as to marry a Christian. His father was proud to be a Jew; well, for that matter, Samuel was himself proud of his Jewish descent, but why should such a thing as difference in religion be allowed to stand in the way of his happiness? His father wanted Samuel to carry on as he might have done himself had he been in the position that his son was in at present. In short, his son was to continue where he himself might have left off. His father felt it was all-important that the family name be perpetuated not as an "assimilated" Jew might carry it on, but rather in the manner that he had carried on the family name that his very father had had passed on to him from his own father. His lineage must be kept free of any possible impurities of mixture.

(44) pages 80 and 81-"Race"—Mary Grace Ashton.
But Samuel’s thoughts were preoccupied with thoughts of his Kathleen. For the time being, he must see if it wasn’t possible to reconcile his desire to marry Kathleen with his father’s orthodoxy. And Samuel thought, "If she cares at all, she will, she must care enough for anything." And it seemed certain that he could tell his father that Kathleen was not a Christian, that she wouldn’t mind marriage in a synagogue, that she was easy and accommodating, and of no definite ideas, if to do so would make their love any easier and a less troubled thing. And then she was so lovely and winning that his father, after the first anger of disappointment, could not be very obdurate and hard. If he knew anything at all he must realize that his son had a right to his own standard of beauty, his own ideas of love, and he would become, under Kathleen’s influence, speedily reconciled to her presence. And it would be all right. Kathleen, of course, should do exactly as she pleased, without the least question. Would he, her lover, have her otherwise than grave, and filled with those charming thoughts about God, and the Saints and all the rest of it?...But all reasons and reasoning give way before love, and Kathleen, if she did but care enough, could not cling to the mere obstacle of mere faith. And they would be unbelievably happy. (45) Kathleen, Samuel felt, was to have her identity as a Catholic concealed from his father, and instead he was to introduce her as a Jewish maiden who would allow herself to be married in a Jewish synagogue and according to the orthodox way of doing things. Samuel did not want to break with his father and neither did he wish to lose Kathleen, for whom he had a great love.

(45) Page 107-"Race"-Mary Grace Ashton.
"But she was silent, her eyes bent on the ground. "Kathleen!" Samuel's tones were almost indignant. "What is the matter?" She turned then, and her eyes and her voice were as if she must say goodbye. "I can't, Samuel, indeed I can't. You must see its impossible." Samuel stared, without a word, then: "Impossible," he echoed blankly, "Why?"...But Kathleen could only shake her head, looking at him hopelessly.

"I'm afraid I don't understand," he said. "Why is it impossible?"

Again Kathleen shook her head.
Already Samuel was impatient.
"Oh, good heavens," he began, "surely you..." and then seeing her bowed head and the weary disappointment in its drooping, his voice changed.

"My dear, dear, Kathleen. Do you mean that what I said now was impossible?"

"It's because you don't understand," she said.
"How do you mean, don't understand?"
She looked up suddenly, quickly.
"Because you don't understand," she repeated passionately. She stopped a moment, then went on, "You said about trying to please him (the father of Samuel) in little things. That means being married in a synagogue, means keeping what I am, a Catholic, as far as possible in the background, means hiding all the truth from him, and living a stupid, horrible existence, full of equivocations, means the run of everything. Do you call that little?"
"No, Samuel," Kathleen said, much more gently than before. "Don't you see that how we began in a thing like religion and marriage so should we go on. What we told your father at the beginning, is what he'd always have to know. It would never be any easier to tell him I was a Catholic and you meant to let me lead a Catholic life in a few years than at first. On the contrary it would be much more difficult.

"You see"—Samuel was looking at her eyes---
"you see the whole point is, Kathleen, that I can't possibly do without you. I want to marry you, then I shall feel I've got you for ever. Do you think you can marry me, Kathleen?"---------

She was in love.

"It would be splendid, Kathleen, you know. It's just love, you know, really. Nothing else counts for anything. We could live perfectly; Kathleen, it's the only life for me. Surely you feel the same. You are so absolutely beautiful, you're the very meaning of beauty, and every since the moment I first saw you, I've thought so, Kathleen. You seemed more like a dream, like the spirit of desire. But you were there, and infatuation sent me perfectly mad. I waited for you up the road and when you said you'd come out with me, I could have sung going along. And then I loved you more and more each day. It was divine just to know you.---- You must marry me if you love me at all. Do you love me at all, Kathleen?"

He stopped and waited. Kathleen looked up, and bowed her head.

"Go on", she said.

He eyed her for a moment.

"Well, that's all, isn't it, Kathleen? There's
nothing more to say. It's so beautiful...

"Why, yes," she said, "I love you. I can't tell you how much."

And Kathleen, listening, began to see...

For he said that first she must know that he loved her above and beyond everything, that there was nothing, oh, absolutely nothing he would not do for her, that he wanted more than anything else in the world to marry her, that, indeed, in the true sense of the term, he could not live without her. Then: But he knew he must explain everything to her straight away, that she might come to a proper understanding of how things stood, trying to break down resistance that Kathleen places in his way, Samuel, says:-

"But why need he ever know more?"

A half-smile crossed Kathleen's lips.

"Oh, Samuel, do think! All sorts of things would happen. To a certain extent he'd be sure to expect us to lead a Jewish sort of life. And then," she stopped, and looked at him, "your father wants all his descendants to go on being Jews. And that, of course, would be utterly impossible."

"Why?"

"Samuel! Children, of course. All Catholics may only marry any one not of their religion on the understanding that their children are brought up Catholics. You do know that."

Samuel was silent.

"Yes, that would be a difficulty," he admitted at last.

"Well, what would he say about that?"

"I don't know. We mightn't have any."
Samuel did not seem to be concerned with what might be the status of any children that might result from his union with Kathleen. He seemed only concerned with the immediate present and in gratifying his ambition to make Kathleen his wife. Did he realize what marrying and having children in the wrong family can mean? It did not seem as if he did, or, at least, if seemed that if he did realize it, he tried to rationalize about it. It certainly would make for a hopeless muddle. It seems that in such a family everyone generally is unhappy and cheated, and no one ever can get out. Did he realize that the children of such a marriage would be forced to undergo a social position which, at times, would be unbearable?

Always, as far back perhaps as the "awakening of consciousness, the children would know that they were the offspring of parents of different religious affiliations. They might well be forced to acknowledge to themselves at least, that socially they were considered even lower than any group that might be called "pure" or "straight" Catholic or Jew. Would the choice whether they were to be allowed to join the Catholic Church or the Jewish Church be left to the "toss of a coin" or would there be some compromise whereby both parties would be satisfied. Perhaps the family would be of such composition that the wife would gladly accede to the wishes of her husband allow the children to be brought up in the Jewish faith. Perhaps! Would such a situation as this last be possible where a Catholic mother, loyal except in cases where love was concerned, had intermarried with a Jew intended that the children of such a marriage should be brought up according to the Roman Catholic standards of education.

(This factor in the lives of both Catholic and Jew is of such importance that it will be more fully discussed after marriage itself has occurred)
A gleam of humor rose for a moment in Kathleen.

"Oh, no," she said, "that's not enough."
"You go a long way", said Samuel. "I hadn't thought of all this".

"I should have to", said Kathleen.

"I see". Samuel gazed away, then turned to her once more.

"Oh, well," he said, "it doesn't matter. We must arrange something. Look here", he said suddenly, "there's evidently more in this than I imagined, but I don't care. (There was certainly more in this question than he had ever imagined, and he did care. No other but Kathleen, with her caressing insight, could see what might eventually result if she consented to this plan suggested by Samuel).

"We'll simply tell him anything, be as convincing as possible, appear to conform to all regulations, and then afterwards it won't matter," said Samuel. "After all, though I know you don't think so, what is religion, when all's said and done? Jewish or Catholic, I shan't care." (This shows how much Samuel had allowed himself to become a part of the American environment where he then lived. He was no longer held down by the traditions of the "Old World"),

"Samuel", Kathleen said sorrowfully, "it is impossible."

For a long time they were both very quiet, then he said very slowly:

"You don't, I suppose, think you're a trifle
unreasonable, Kathleen? As far as I can make out, you want me to do everything, so that you can keep everything in peace and comfort. That's what I want you to do. But how can it be asking you to give up a thing, just to-well, pretend for a time?"

"But it will be for ever."

"Oh, but it won't. That's absurd. For one thing he won't live for ever, and for another his living won't have anything to do with us. He can think what he likes, to preserve peace, but you'll be able to do as you like. The synagogue business can, I've no doubt be waived. And you can't think I should want to start interfering with your ideas of God. You can have a Church in the house if you like, or a shrine to Buddha, and as for the future-or-generations, well, taking it that there are any, they can go to Church where you want them to. Father, who will be about eighty-five by then, will think quite happily that they are good Jews (good little Jews), and like that, everything will come out as it should with no fuss. The synagogue wedding-affair may be a bit hard to get round at first, but I'm simply going to take a firm stand and assert my rights. I should be surprised if he does anything desperate."

Kathleen was a very practical thinking daughter of a very practical minded pair of Roman Catholic parents and she naturally would have scruples about entering such a compact of marriage without any formulation of a planned and intensive analysis of conditions that such a marriage necessitates and how they are to be successfully overcome. She being practical minded said piteously:-

"It wouldn't happen", she exclaimed, nothing is like that in real life. And then, although I know you love me.."
"Oh, you do know that, then", interpolated Samuel.

Kathleen nodded.

"Although I know that, I know also that, you don't, you simply can't possibly enter into my views on practically any single thing that happens or matters, and it's no use thinking that wouldn't hurt; if marriages only lasted two years it mightn't but in a whole long life it breeds some sad misunderstandings. (46) Samuel still persisted in his attempt to convince Kathleen to look at the matter of marriage through his eyes. "Well", said Samuel, "there may be a lot in what you say, but personally I can't think of a single point upon which our views don't more or less correspond. We like and hate and laugh at the same things always. And though I may not be a Catholic, I haven't the least objections to entering fully into your sympathies in that direction. To me, Catholicism seems as excellent as most religions, the outlet for a certain temperament. But I don't mind believing it all if you really want me to. I can't see where we should disagree, particularly."...(To Samuel, there appeared to be "nothing that would mar their love for each other." 'Love would find a way', so Samuel rationalized.)

For Kathleen, well there was nothing that she could say, lucid enough to form a proper explanation. "The whole point, Samuel's complete lack of any realization of the importance of her Faith to her, his assured (unconscious) manner of settling her difficulties, his whole-hearted missing of the point, this that kept her, held her with the terrible understanding of its significance, was all she had to say. And this he simply could not see;
his outlook was different altogether from hers, and the incompatibility formed a barrier between them subtle but non the less strong. ... He would never know that she could love him deeply (dearly), and still not dare to marry him. (You see, Kathleen was the practical minded person "who looked before leaping into the unknown").

All Samuel had to offer was that both he and Kathleen should simply go off and get married, and then his father would get the shock of his life when he found out that his son Samuel, whom he expected would carry on the family name by maintaining it in an orthodox Jewish manner, was going to marry Kathleen, daughter of devoted Roman Catholic parents. How would his father ever be able to be reconciled? Then again, Samuel would inform him that he intended to give up all ideas of carrying on in the family. But Kathleen was obstinate in her refusal. "Samuel told her, reproaching himself as being the base cause of her tears. "I see, I really can see your point of view. It's simply one of those impossible things. I know you can't help it, don't cry". (Was Samuel really able to see Kathleen's point of view?)

Samuel went even so far as to promise Kathleen: "We needn't say anything about your being a Catholic, I'll get around the Church business; after all, that can't matter so very much." (49) Kathleen considered that the root of the trouble must lie in the complete difference in their standards and in their points

(46) "Race"—Mary Grace Ashton. p 116-120-(47)same p, 123
(48) Same-page 130 (49) same page 244
of view"...."That she, Kathleen, would be in the most hopeless bondage, a Christian, dependent on, and in close contact with, those who distrusted and hated her, and who held forces against her, puzzled amused him, as assured. That she could talk of religion and beliefs as an obstacle between them, was simply beyond him. A difference in outlook. The bone of contention in every quarrel in life.....

"Kathleen, I can't understand you! he had said at last. "That's just it", she had cried! If you only could, you'd see why it is so impossible". "But what's so impossible?" He had stopped and taken her by the shoulders and stared into her face. "Look here, I'm not asking one single thing of you. I've given you everything now. Even said we'd marry in your Church. You know you'll be free to follow your religion. You must know no one could possibly interfere with you. I want you, you--I do believe you want me, then what in God's name is the matter? What's my family, my father got to do with you?...

"so they had gone on. He arguing, she saying no, no, over and over again. All the heartrending stages of that other time..."Oh, well, "Samuel had finally said, "Kathleen, you evidently don't attach the importance to our marrying that I do. I have allowed you every point, you still talk of the impossibility and futility. Marriage for us, in the light you view it, would indeed turn out a failure. We shall never arrive at any satisfactory understanding. In the circumstances, I think, there can be no more to be said. I'd better go." And he had gone,.....Kathleen was in love and denied love only through some religious objection." (50)
No, Samuel felt that he was not under any compulsion, that is, he should be under no compulsion to abide by the demand of his father that he "shall not at any time under any circumstances whatsoever take away for his wife any woman not of that religion or sect". "He must see fit to remain a member of the religion or sect in which he was born". It was damnable that anyone nowadays could be so bound to a limit so narrow... Now, if he liked, he had his definite, untempered alternative; his father was saying, after the long politic prevarications, without any qualification, "do this, or go". Now he could say to say to those people:......

"Look here! I'm going to clear out. I mean to marry a girl most decidedly not of the religion or sect in which I was born or reared. You can have the whole-show to do as you like with..."

............... .........................

"Why, demanded Samuel, "why can't I do what I like?" Oh, to be able to have it all, to marry Kathleen,.....Suppose for one wild moment it could be done. If to all intents and purposes, Kathleen might be anything, if it need not be known that she was a Christian.

"After all, religion—and that was the gist of the whole matter—was a personal and private concern. No business of any one's and surely it could so easily be kept away from curious eyes. (Could it?) It did not matter. But that was just what Kathleen would never see. She thought it did. It mattered so much to her. Why should it be so, mattering like that? At the bottom of everything. Mattering so much to his father, that he had made his whole property, every aim of his life secure against it.....

(51) "Race"—Mary Grace Ashton—page 271
Yes, it mattered perhaps, but only derived its significance from the attention people paid to it." (52) (How very large a factor social approval of such a marriage is, has demonstrated itself too often to need detailed description. It is a factor that can not be avoided. Such marriages become the concern of the immediate neighborhood and to a degree of the community, depending largely upon the size of the community itself.

"Really, if he married Kathleen, his religion mattered no more, from the point of view of the religion than if he married a Buddhist, and worshipped Buddha. Life and making money could still go on the same. But this plain common sense was what people did not seem to understand. Not the people he had to think of anyway. His father, owning property, had had a perfect horror of his possessions passing into Christian control, when, really, the individual convictions of the succeeding owners could not surely concern a soul. Kathleen had an insuperable dread of marrying anyone who did not happen to have the same conception of life and after-life as she had, and he knew hosts of ordinary people, Jews and otherwise, who, for all they professed the broadest, most ambiguous views, for all they protested complete indifference to this, that or the other, laid down, nevertheless, endless obligations upon those who would manage their affairs when unfortunately those affairs would be their own no longer. No one, really, didn't care about anything, and it seemed that a good many cared about religion in some form or other more than anything. There was no such thing as no caring."......................But what a stupid

(52) "Race"-Mary Grace Ashton p.275
mockery it all is! and how good it might be!

How well he remembered the sudden outburst of anger that had issued forth when he had informed his father concerning his intended marriage to Kathleen. He had expected no opposition from Kathleen. How well he recalled the "discomfited feeling that had come over him when he had fixed his gaze upon his father, and said abruptly:

"Father, I've been thinking of marrying."

"He had meant his voice to be casual, firm, but he was conscious that it sounded boyish and frightened.... But it was all over with, and he was relieved. He waited for an answer.

His father gazed at him with a smile that was not finished... At last he had it, the cause of that enigmatic look in Samuel's face. But did he have it all? He had naturally expected that Samuel was simply carrying out of his own free will, perhaps the marrying of one who would be agreeable to his father. Perhaps even the one that he, Samuel's father, had intended for the "marriage de convenance".

"Marrying—yes, that's right," his father's words came very slowly. "You are old enough enough to marry... Plenty old enough...And business..."

"I isn't that, "Samuel interrupted him. He was impatient, wanted to have things over with quickly. "It's about the girl. She is Christian."

His father's frame swayed the least bit forward. The expression in his face, however, remained unchanged; yet underneath that blank expression of whiteness there was the "palleness of death". His son, the one person there was to carry on in the
manner his father had, was going to marry a Christian... A Roman Catholic! No he would never become reconciled to this idea of his son marrying outside of his own religion. It hardly made for his father's peace of mind, in fact, it made for quite the opposite.

Samuel spoke with his Uncle and his voice had a raucous sound when he said, "What I want to know is what you think of such a marriage. Do you approve of it, or must I go my way alone henceforward?"

A thought, too repellent for words, flashed across his mind, and the uncle forced himself to speak, and with averted eyes asked,

"Do you have to marry her?"

Samuel blushed to the roots of his hair.

"Have to?" he exclaimed, indignantly. "Good God, no!"

A grateful look came into his uncle's eyes.

Samuel's anger subsided. His words came with a rush. He was telling his uncle about the girl. She was pure and innocent. There was nothing between them, except love. He loved her...

He paused for a breath and then continued fervently.

The girl and he were such perfect companions. She was not a Christian in the sense that they had known the word in Russia. Moreover, she knew that he was a Jew. He was not renouncing his religion or race. Such a thing was not necessary to the marriage between Christian and Jew in America. With the Psalmist, they would leave the heavens to God and earth to man...

His uncle, after much pacing about, finally stopped in front of Samuel and said:
"It is a big problem, the biggest problem you and I have yet had to face in the new World... Intermarriage. Jews were ostracised, stoned for things like that in the past... I am glad you are approaching this issue from the noblest side, from the spirit rather than the flesh... I am glad you speak so highly of the young woman... There is nothing above a pure, good woman in this world."

He stopped. He was not sure that what he had said was what he should say... He was not speaking theoretically now. There was a concrete issue before him. He had to meet the issue...

"It is neither God nor religion", His uncle resumed, feeling his way cautiously among his thoughts, "that are the most vital things in this question. It is people... People are at the bottom of the entire problem. You will be happy—if people will let you. As for people, my attitude toward them fluctuates with events; it varies with moods... There are moments when I grow pessimistic. It is time there were more tolerance in the world, tolerance by both Jews and Christians... It seems to me it is time the human race were wiser, kinder. And then again I think the human race has perhaps not yet had a fair chance. It has been swathed so long in bigotry, superstition, hatred, that it takes generations for it to get over these things. Perhaps the human race is first getting this chance now, here, in America...."

His uncle had analyzed things for him clearly; in a way he had even indicated his feelings. It was not God his uncle was considering in the matter of marriage between Jew and Christian; it was people... Samuel wanted to hear no more...

Time passed slowly, and yet he could not reconcile Kathleen to his way of looking at the question of intermarriage. She kept objecting on the grounds that "as he did not understand
(54) "God of Might"—Elias Tobenkin—page 123 and 124
(55) Same

123
now, so he would not at any time, if she took him upon those meaningless, inadequate terms, that were all he could offer." (56)

But Kathleen was only human. She couldn't remain cold to his entreaties. The bond of love was too strong to be held off as she was trying to hold it off. So she finally said, "Yes, darling, I'll marry you."

Perhaps she also had rationalized to the same point that Samuel had,—

"What does it matter what one's religion is, so long as one serves the lord. It is the sort of life one leads that counts, not the church one goes to.

And so they planned their marriage.

(56) "Race"—Mary Grace Ashton--page 123
And So They Were Married

"But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female.

For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife;

And they twain shall be one flesh; so then they are no more twain, but one flesh.

What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."— (57)

Kathleen is in the church with the bridegroom. Her father had taken her down the aisle on his arm in her long white frock and snowy, drifting veil. She has drifted away from him and has taken her place beside the man who will, from now on, look after her. They will be married in a few minutes. A voice is telling them what that means, or is supposed to mean, to them.

"Dearly beloved, we are gathered together in the sight of God to join together this man and this woman in holy matrimony... an honorable estate, instituted by God...not to be enterprised nor taken in hand inadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly to satisfy man's carnal lusts and appetites, like brute beasts that have no understanding; but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God."

The church is quiet. The voice of the man ordained by the church and the state to pronounce them married is clearly audible.

(57) From the tenth chapter of Mark.
"First, it was ordained for the procreation of children."

The clergyman's voice is sedate, solemn, monotonous. No one is listening. "Secondly, it was ordained for a remedy against sin and to avoid fornication, that such persons as have not the gift of continence might marry and keep themselves undefiled.

"But he said just now--you heard him if you happened to be listening--that marriage was not to be undertaken to satisfy lust. There seems to be an inconsistency even here. There's the other discrepancy that's more obvious, I grant you. These people who are being married are either throwing a great big barbaric party or are taking part in a holy sacrament, and that in itself is sufficiently confusing; but the confusion of ideas seems to have crept into the sacrament itself.

"In fact there is a lot of barbarism about this Christian ceremony. It is more than half heathen. There's the ring for one thing. She is going to be proud of that badge of slavery.

But it used to mean ownership in the old days just as truly as if it were an ox or an ass he had bought in the market, and was leading home by a string passed through it. And although, being modern, neither he nor she will think about it that way, his feeling for her is certainly going to be colored by the old sense of possession.

"She wanted to be married in church for a variety of reasons, not necessarily connected with the idea of God. There had been moments perhaps when she was so moved by her love that she did think of God as having something to do with it, and as she put it to herself and to him, she would feel more married if they were wedded in church, and she did want her marriage to be dignified
by ceremony." (58)

"She stood before the minister who was to marry them, very tall and straight. With lips slightly parted she looked at him steadfastly, not at the man beside her who was about to become her husband. In the hush that had fallen throughout the chapel, all the restless movement of the people who had gathered there in the expectation of those ancient words that would unite the two before the altar.

"There before the minister, who was fumbling mechanically at his prayer-book, a great space seemed to divide the man and the woman from all the others, their friends and relatives, who had come to witness the ceremony of their union. In the woman's consciousness an unexpected stillness settled, as if for these few moments she was poised between the past of her whole life and the mysterious future....the strange colorings of the mood and feeling, all the petty cares of the event itself, had suddenly vanished. She did not see him, the man she was to marry, only the rugged face of the old minister, the bit of fluttering vine, the expanse of blue sky. She stood before the veil of her life, which was about to be drawn aside.

"This hushed moment was broken by the resonant tones of the minister as he began the opening words of the sacrament that had been said over so many millions of human beings. Familiar as the phrases were, she did not realize them, could not summon back her attention from that depth within of awed expectancy. After a time she became aware of the subdued movements in the chapel, of people breaking into the remote circle of her mystery,-

(58) Pictorial Review-March, 1933 Pl6 "The Wedding Day"
Mary Borden.
even here they must needs have their part,—and of the man beside her looking intently at her, with flushed face. It was this man, this one here at her side, whom she had chosen of all that might have come into her life; and suddenly he seemed a stranger, standing there, ready to become her husband! And now, after certain meetings, after some surface intercourse, they had willed to come here to be made one........ (59)

The clergyman was speaking to him, asking him if he would take her. She had dreamed of this moment for so long that now she couldn't realize—

"Wilt thou take this woman to be thy wedded wife? Wilt thou love her, comfort her, honor and keep her, in sickness and in health; and forsaking all other, keep thyself only unto her, so long as ye both shall live?"

How shadowy the church was! How strange everything was! The man beside her, he seemed strange too suddenly. Wasn't he after all a stranger? What did she know about him? What was she doing there?

A voice was speaking to her.

"Wilt thou have this man to be thy wedded husband? Wilt thou obey and serve him?"

..., No, the words "obey" and "serve" didn't mean anything.

Did any of these words mean anything? Certainly they did. She and Samuel were promising to love each other always, and always be true to each other. The vows weren't necessary, but just because they knew that it wasn't necessary they were glad to make them." (60)

(59) "Together"—Robert Herrick pages 3 and 4
(60) "Her Wedding Day"—Mary Borden page 17
"And who gives this woman in marriage?" the minister asked solemnly, following the primitive formula which symbolizes that the woman is to be made over from one family to another as a perpetual possession. She gave herself of course! The words were but an outgrown form... There was the necessary pause while her father came forward, and taking his daughter's hand from which the glove had been carefully turned back, laid it gently in the minister's large palm. The father's lips twitched, and she knew he was feeling the solemnity of the act,—that he was relinquishing a part of himself to another. Their marriage,—her father's and mother's had been happy,—oh, very peaceful! and yet—hers must be different, must strike deeper, for the first time she raised her shining eyes to the man at her side....

"I, Samuel, take thee Kathleen for my wedded wife, to have and to hold... in sickness and in health... until death us do part... and hereto I plight thee my troth." "To have and to hold from this day forward, for better or for worse, for richer or for poorer... According to God's holy ordinance; and thereto I give thee my troth."

These old words, heard so many times, which heretofore had echoed without meaning to her,—she had vaguely thought them beautiful,—now came freighted with sudden meaning, while from out of the dreamlike space around sounded the firm tones of the man at her side repeating slowly, with grave pauses, word for word, the marriage oath. "I, Samuel, take thee Kathleen", that voice was saying, and she knew that the man who spoke these words in his calm, grave manner was the one she had chosen, to whom she had willed to give herself for all time,—presently she would say it also,—for always, always, "until death us do part." He was promising it with tranquil assurance,—fidelity, the eternal bond,
throughout the unknown years, out of the known present. "And hereby I plight thee my troth. "Without a tremor the man's assured voice registered the oath—before God and man.

"I, Kathleen", and the priest took up with her this primal oath of fidelity, body and soul. All at once the full personal import of the words pierced her, and her low voice swelled unconsciously with her affirmation. She was to be for always as she was now. They two had not been one before: the words did not make them so now. It was their desire. But the old divided selves, the old impulses, they were to die, here, and forever.

"She heard herself repeating the words after the minister. Her strong young voice in the stillness of the chapel sounded strangely not her own voice, but the voice of some unknown woman within her, who was taking the oath for her in this barbaric ceremony whereby man and woman are bound together. "And hereby I plight thee my troth,"—the voice sank to a whisper as of prayer. Her eyes came back to the man's face, searching for his eyes.

"There were little beads of perspiration on his broad brow, and the shaven lips were closely pressed together, moulding the face into lines of will,—the look of mastery. What was he, this man, now her husband for always, his hand about hers in sign of perpetual possession and protection? What beneath all was he who had taken her with, thus publicly, the mighty oath of fidelity, "until death do us part?" Each had said it; each believed it; each desired it wholly. Perversely, here in the moment of her deepest
feeling, intruded the consciousness of broken contracts, the waste of shattered purposes. Ah, but theirs was different! This absolute oath of fidelity one to the other, each with his own will and his desire,—this irredeemable contract of union between man and woman,—it was not always a binding sacrament. Often twisted and broken, men and women promising in the belief of the best within them what was beyond their (duty) power to perform. There were those in that very chapel who had said these words and broken them, furtively and legally...with them, of course, it would be different, would be the best; for she conceived their love to be of another kind,—the enduring kind. Nevertheless, just here, while the priest of society pronounced the final words of union, something spoke within the woman's soul that it was a strange oath to be taking, a strange manner of making two beings one!

"And I pronounce you man and wife", the words ran. Then the minister hastened on into his little homily upon the marriage state. But the woman's thought rested at those fateful words,—"man and wife",—the knot of the contract. There should fall a new light in her heart that would make her know they were really one, having now been joined as the book said" in holy wedlock". From this sacramental union of persons there should issue to both a new spirit.

"Her husband was standing firm and erect, listening with all the concentration of his mind to what the minister was saying—not tumultously distracted—as though he comprehended the exact gravity of this contract into which he was entering, as he might that of any other he could make, sure of his power to fulfil all, confidant before fate. She trembled strangely. Did she know him, this other self? In the swift apprehension of life's depths which came through her heightened mood she perceived the ultimate
division lying between all human beings, that impregnable fortress of the individual soul... It was all over... "With this ring I thee wed". He looked tenderly at her. Her lips trembled with a serious smile,—yes, they would understand now!

"...The thing was done; the priest's words of exhortation were largely superfluous. All else that concerned married life these two would have to find out for themselves. The thing was done, as ordained by the church, according to the rules of society. Now it was for Man and Wife to make of it what they would or could.

"The minister closed his book in dismissal. The groom offered his arm to the bride. Facing the chapelful she came out of that dim world of wonder whither she had strayed. Her veil thrown back, head proudly erect, eyes mistily ranging above the onlookers, she descended the altar steps, gazing down the straight aisles... beyond into the vista of life... She swept on deliberately... her hand just touching his,—going forward with him into life.

"It was over—the fine old barbaric ceremony, the passing of the irredeemable contract between man and woman, the public proclamation of eternal union. Henceforth they were man and wife before the law, before their kind—one and one, and yet not two. Thus together they would pass out of the church". (61)

To Samuel, as he stood beneath the "Chuppah" (canopy) with his bride "soon-to-be", it seemed as if he stood before the veil of his life, which was about to be removed. The voice of the

(61) "Together"—Robert Herrick—Pages 4-8
Rabbi, the man ordained by the Jewish Church and the state to pronounce them married, is clearly audible to all save Samuel. Samuel is able to visualize the ceremony only through a mist which seems to have separated from him all but his bride "soon-to-be". His trance was only broken by the resonant tones of the Rabbi as he began the opening words of the Jewish marriage. Familiar as the phrases were, he did not realize them, could not summon back his attention from that depth of awed expectancy.

It seemed as if the mist lifted from before him just for the briefest interval, so that he might follow the most significant elements of the Jewish marriage ceremony. At this brief interval he was aware of the subdued movements in the room where the "Chuppah" stood, of the people breaking into the remote circle of his mystery, even here they must needs have their part, and of the woman beside him looking intently at him, with that understanding and sympathetic look. It was this woman, this one here at his side, whom he had chosen of all that might come into his life; and suddenly she seemed a stranger, standing there, ready to become his wife!...And now, after certain meetings, they had willed to come here to be made one...

His father's lips twitched, and Samuel knew he was feeling the solemnity of the act, that he was relinquishing a part of himself to another. Their marriage, his father's and mother's—had been of the orthodox sort, oh, very peaceful! And yet his must be different, must strike deeper. Could it be anything but different from that of his parents?

All Samuel was aware of was merely—a few initial statements uttered by the Rabbi.

The ceremony had opened with these words: "Blessed
be he that cometh in the name of the Lord; we bless you out of the
house of the Lord." Then for the briefest of intervals he heard
the Rabbi utter, "He who is almighty, blessed and great above all
being, may He bless the bridegroom and the bride." This was fol-
lowed by two Benedictions; the first, spoken by the Rabbi while
holding a cup of wine in his hand, runs: "Blessed Art Thou, O
Lord our God, King of the Universe".

Mechanically he drank of the cup of wine placed in his
hand. He had tasted of the same cup with his bride "soon-to-be".
Did not this sipping of the wine together signify and symbolize
union? Following the wine-sipping, the Rabbi uttered the "Blessing
of the Betrothed" which ended with the words: "Blessed are Thou,
O Lord, Who Sanctifiest Thy People Israel by the rist of the
"chuppah" and the sacred covenant of wedlock".

As if from a place afar he heard the Rabbi say, "The
ring is placed on the forefinger of the right hand of the bride,
this being the most prominent finger, for the ring is the token
of marriage". -Repeat after me these words-

"Be thou my wife according to the law of Moses and
Israel. I faithfully promise that I will be a true husband unto
thee. I will honor and cherish thee, work for thee, protect and
support thee, and provide all that is necessary for they due
sustenance, even as it becometh a Jewish husband to do. I also
take upon myself all such further obligations for they maintain-
ance, during thy life-time, as are prescribed by our religious
statute."

These old words, heard so many times, which heretofore
had echoed without meaning to him, -now came freighted with
sudden meaning, while from out of the dreamlike space around sounde
the firm tones of the woman at his side repeating slowly, with grave pauses, word for word, her marriage oath to him. She had plighted her troth to him and he knew that the woman who spoke these words was the woman he had chosen, to whom he had willed to be joined to give himself in her service for all time,—she was to be the mother of his children. She had plighted "her troth unto him, in affection and in sincerity, and has thus taken upon herself the duties incumbent upon a Jewish wife.

"Behold, they are consecrated unto my by this ring, according to the law of Moses and Israel."

The thing was done; the Rabbi's words of exhortation were largely superfluous. All else that concerned married life these two would have to find out for themselves. The thing was done, as ordained by the synagogue, according to the rules of society. Now it was for Man and Wife to make of it what they would or—could.

Henceforth they were man and wife before the law, before their kind—one and one, and yet not two. Thus together they would pass from under the "chuppah".

.........................

And so they were married by a justice of peace across the border from the state wherein they resided. The witnesses,...well, they were two friends whom the justice of peace was able to get to act in that capacity on the promise of "something to celebrate it with".

They were to find that Love and Marriage "are two distinct and entirely independent states of being,—one is the creation of God, the other of Society."  

(62) "Together"—Robert Herrick—page 21
"Thus the stream of their little world was to flow on, repeating its high-pitched note of gratulation, of jocular welcome to the married state, as if to say, "Well, now you are one of us-you've been brought in-this is life". That was what those people with whom they came in contact would say and think, as they welcomed these neophytes on the large vale of human experience. "Started together on this marital path-what will you make of it?

Would they ignore the pitfall of mistakes, "the stones along the road, the miserable failures that lined the path? Wasn't their love of the enduring kind, so that obstacles such these would be eliminated without a break in their comrade-ship, togethership?

We shall see if the "union of Man and Woman is based on effort in common, together; not on emotion, not on sentiment, not on passion, not on individual gratification of sense and soul. Were these two "partners in living, and was the fruit of their bodies to be another proof of partnership?" (63)

(63) "Together"-Robert Herrick-page 515
Married Life.

"Several years ago Ruth McEnery Stuart wrote a negro story in which she described a "Corn-field darky" who had married a good-looking and—in the opinion of the neighbors—entirely worthless man who habitually sat under a tree and fanned himself while his wife hoed their patch of garden. The couple seemed devoted to each other, but their friends disapproved and urged Mandy to get rid of her lazy spouse, to which she replied: Wherefore? I married for love and I got it; Ephum married for love and labor and he got it. We is bof satisfied."

"Mandy was a philosopher. To most of the onlookers her marriage looked like a failure, but she was happy in it because she knew exactly what she hoped to get out of marriage and realized that to get what you want is, in a sense, success." (64)

Mandy may have been a philosopher who was happy in marriage because she knew exactly what she hoped to get out of marriage, and realized that to get what you want is, in a sense, success. But even at that, Mandy never tried what we call intermarrying with some one not of her religious faith or race. Mandy was content with being in a world which for her speld "happiness", and even Mandy had "outside interference" from neighbors who disapproved and urged her to get rid of her lazy spouse. Can you imagine what might have been the condition if Mandy had taken it upon herself to marry a person different fundamentally from her in religious and race. Would she have received social approval from her neighbors? Hardly! She disapproval expressed by her neighbors would have gone far beyond mere disapproval and might have become "potential dynamite". Then again, Mandy's existence was in general far simpler than the existence of those who intermarry.

(64) "Marriage in the Modern Manner"—Wile and Winn p.3
Mandy lived in a little world of her own which was far smaller than the world of our couple who had intermarried. Her circle of friends was more limited, while our couple were always in need of reconciling a large group of friends and acquaintances. When Mandy married her lazy spouse only her immediate friends were mildly concerned, but when Samuel married Kathleen, "gossip", the local town crier, aroused a community disapproval of this union.

So Samuel and Kathleen had married because they felt that they might be able to live merely for themselves and not to be concerned with what we may call "social approval". Samuel had so well expressed this thought when he had said, "...but my way of being in love is not to let any consideration whatever come into things. Just to love, you know". Marriage according to Samuel's way of looking at it was to be merely in love and "let the rest of the world go by." It "sounded good", but just how practical could any such idea be in civilization such as they tried to adjust themselves to. Samuel and Kathleen could be forced as time went by to see that they could hardly live "for themselves and by themselves". Our way of living simply does not permit such practice, although certain isolated cases seem to place "such" a way of living together as a possibility.

The first six months of their married life, Samuel and Kathleen described to me as "ideal". They were "ridiculously" happy. They were so concerned with their immediate selves and the love and admiration they bore for themselves that the "outside" world concerned them little. Samuel told me of their feeling for each other in such terms as these:
"I am really ridiculously happy", he said to me one evening as he walked home with me from his apartment. "I feel almost like apologizing for it. I seem to see the world from a fixed point of view... Marriage is, when it is successful, a sweet and amiable arrangement by which two friends may live together.

"But, best of all, marriage gives me, and Kathleen, too, I think, a curious old-fashioned sense of security. As far as I can make out, my friend; you don't seem to feel the need of knowing, when you turn the key in the lock in the evening, that there is somebody there to greet you. Really the ups and downs of a day come to seem comparatively trivial next to the quiet assurance of some one whose love is there like a constant grace and benediction—for you, apart from your successes or defeats.

I used to get a lot of sentimental stuff off about friendship in the old days. Well, what two friends can have more in common than husband and wife? Where can there be more completeness and intimacy of companionship?... Well, we have no child. For the moment we don't want any. There is a complete and beautiful 'entente' and self-sufficiency between us that we both have a notion a child for the present would spoil. Children, too, somehow, would put us in the class of the older generation. It would mean problems for which at present neither of us feels competent. We seem at present in a lovely niche of time; we are knocking on wood, crossing our hearts."

I'm certain that "knocking on wood, and crossing their hearts", would hardly be sufficient to keep their domestic bliss in existence for any great length of time. It may be worth our while to turn our thoughts back to the family of Samuel, which, on hearing of the marriage of Samuel to a Catholic daughter, had (65) "Richard Kane looks at Marriage"—Irwin Edman p.174
had a decided effect on the father, Samuel's remaining parent.  

Samuel's father when confronted with the news of his 
son's marriage "had stopped in his walk with a jerk. His face 
became scarlet; he trembled from head to foot. His eyes became 
preternaturally large. He shook his fists above his head. 

"So it has come to det? Den it stops now, today, in 
dis hour. Ent if not, den you can leave dis house...Uch! I'd 
rather see you under de eart'!" And so in the house of his father, 
who now lived with his daughter, Samuel's sister, there followed: 

Samuel's father and sister now made up what remained of 
the once larger group of four which had included Samuel's brother, 
Samuel himself, Samuel's father and his sister. Samuel's mother 
had died several years before. Samuel was now dead. The sur-
vivors duly sat mourning. They sat on low stools for seven days, 
and Samuel's father did not shave, and his father, too, slit his 
waistcoat; just as if they had taken Samuel off to the cemetary 
and put him in the wet ground and heaped sods on his coffin. 

It might have been otherwise(now that the damage was 
irretrievable and what was wed could not be unwed) if there had 
been any chance of really reconciling Samuel's father to the 
situation and of bringing Samuel's wife into the Jewish fold. 
How well the problem might have worked itself out had Samuel's 
father been of this frame of mind,-  

"Well, my Samuel-I mean after all, he has not embraced 
Christianity; and as for her, his Kathleen, well, if you can, 
you can figure that she is not a Christian. Och-och-och. Such 
times..if only Kathleen were a Jew. Such a nice girl. She 
probably has no use for religion in general; you understand me, 
or not? She loves him, doesn't she? He loves her, doesn't he?
They love each other, don't they? So what can you do? Sure, it certainly would have been nicer, if he had married a Jew in a traditional way in accordance with the demands of God, but I am saying—are we consulted? Have we any influence with them today? So be it—the thing is done and that's all. It had to happen. He is not the only one now, is he? It is now sort of an epidemic. May God preserve us! Thank God that he at least remained a Jew." That would have been the more ideal philosophy for Samuel's father to have developed when he learned of his son's marriage to Kathleen. Well, Samuel's father reacted in the opposite manner.

"How much!" Samuel would have said, in an academic manner, "would I give if I were only able to convince my father how ridiculous it is for him to oppose my marriage with Kathleen. Why should I be bound by a prohibition that has its origin and applicability hundreds of years ago?" But Samuel never expressed this feeling to his parent. Perhaps he was too immediately concerned with the last statement made by his father. "But you won't be happy and she won't be happy and when you have children you'll be more miserable than ever." It was more than a mere expression, it seemed almost like a prophecy. "Oh, well", Samuel said to himself, "we aren't going to be immediately concerned with children, we are going to live only for ourselves."

But in married life there are difficulties to be encountered, there are misunderstandings, trifling at times, but often cause to bring on a marital troubles and even to make those
who had placed trust in each other, in the intuition of love, and in the glorious knowledge that they were one, to become "strangers under the same roof"!

It is hard to be a Jew, as they say, but happily, it is harder still to forget that one is a Jew. It is hard to be a Catholic, as they say, but happily, it is harder still to forget that one is a Catholic. A man cuts the thread that binds him to the synagogue, but another thread follows him. A woman cuts the thread that binds her to the church, but another thread follows her. It may be the thread that unites him with his sainted parents and once a year leads him back to the synagogue where he says kaddish (mourner's prayer for the dead on the anniversary of the death of that person). It may be the thread that unites her to her spiritual experiences and visitations at prayer, at Holy Mass, and at the reception of the sacraments. Or it may be the thread of the historic sense by which he feels his kinship to martyrs and saints and prophets. Or it may be the thread of the historic sense by which she feels her kinship with the martyrs and saints and the Popes.

His feeling of kinship seems to have had to do with devout parents. Her feeling of kinship seems also to have had to do with devout parents who were good Roman Catholics. He thought of Judaism as a sacred institution because it was bound up with memories of his mother...She thought of Catholicism as a divine institution because it was bound up so closely to the worship of her parents.

Samuel began to feel that he must cease to be the Jew. He laughed inwardly—he must cease this everlasting analyzing, brooding, tormenting himself over little things, nothings...Life
was there to be lived and not to be put under a glass like a butterfly for study and observation...He must learn to take life as the people about him did—lightly, playfully...

"Yes, he must learn to live in the present and not be forever digging into the ruins of the past, or pulling down the veils from the castles of the future...He had been brooding, speculating out of all proportion in these last few days...That must end...The one unpardonable vice of his race was just this: it did not know how to play....

She, too, had been brooding, speculating out of all proportion in these few days.

"I've been so worried about you", she was muttering, "So worried".

"Sam, Kathleen asked, "is your father a rabbi?"

"No," he said, "why?"

--An expression half amused, half curious came into his face.

"It is your sister's husband then who is the rabbi?" she gently ignored his question.

"Yes," he said, "my brother-in-law. But why do you ask?" The glint of amusement had left his eyes.

A heavy silence hung between them for some moments. Kathleen finally broke it.

"It was foolish", she spoke haltingly, "but I have been worrying in the last few days about--your family...The thought of religion ever coming between us--"

..............................

"What has put this into your head?" He spoke brokenly yet quickly. "This about religion, I mean. Who talked to you?"
Kathleen was biting her lips in embarrassment.

"Who put this into your head?" Samuel repeated....

Who had put these things about religion into her head? He would know, he had to know.

"The matter which had set Kathleen ruminating about the difference in religion between herself and her husband had come to her though one of the maids...It was a song the maid had been singing...The particular song was the latest out and she was humming it from morning till night."

Samuel insisted that Kathleen outline to him the contents of the song. She did.

It was about a Jewish girl who had fallen in love outside her faith. The girl in the song reminded, pleaded with; She was a "rabbi's daughter" and "such she must remain". She must renounce her love for the "Christian boy". It was a love that would go unhallowed, it could not be sanctioned. She must pluck it from her breast; there was no alternative. The Jewish law was stern. And--

"If you a Christian marry,
Your father's heart 'twould break."

In the last couplet the girl was dying. She had renounced her love as her religion had dictated, but her life was going also.

"Is this all?" Samuel asked.

It was not all. Kathleen had talked with the maid about Milwaukee, about the Jews there. The maid had told her of an incident—a pathetic incident.

"What was the incident?" Samuel persisted, relentless to-
ward himself, toward Kathleen.

The incident was this.

'A Jewish boy-in Milwaukee-had fallen in love with a
Christian girl, married her secretly and then sent a friend to
break the news to his orthodox father. The father sent back
work to the son that he would disclaim him if he did not divorce
his Christian wife. The boy declined to let religion interfere
with his marriage and the father disowned him. More, the old
man declared his son to be dead and prayed and mourned for him
as for one departed...After a month of this, the father suddenly
passed away. He had grieved himself to death over his son's
marriage.'

"Is this all now?" Samuel asked again.

This was all.

"Pay no attention to these things", he said after a
silence, "it's all nonsense".

"You mean it isn't true?" she asked turning her face
to him.

"Oh, it may be true enough," he replied without meeting
her eyes, "but it is all nonsense none the less."

They were both looking out upon the
lake. The noises coming from the water, the grass, the trees,
served to intensify the stillness of the night.

"Lovely, isn't it?" Kathleen turned her eyes full of
rapture upon Samuel.

"Yes", he answered meditatively.

"More than her previous questions about religion, about
the Jew, this enraptured remark about the panorama outside their window intensified to Samuel the difference of race between Kathleen and himself, and his fascination for her because of the difference...How she loved nature—the things of nature...A field, a tree, a brook—and she was happy...A beautiful sunset, a gold rimmed horizon in the west thrilled and delighted Kathleen, as if it were a gift which nature had intended primarily for her.

"Nature...That was something in his race, his people, huddled for centuries in the ghettos of the Old World and denied the privileges of living on the soil, had no understanding for, had even come to look askance at, as if the laws of nature, like man's laws, too, were not functioning for all alike..." (66)

Samuel asked himself, "Am I still a Jew?" Can I say to myself with the firmness of conviction, "I am a Jew. I do not go often to the synagog, but I feel myself to be a link in a chain of a great history by which I am united to a majestic past and joined to all others who share with me this heritage. I am a Jew in proportion as I am conscious of my historic significance. As long as I possess this consciousness I march with the prophets and the martyrs of Israel. I can walk with a high head as the heir of spiritual kinds, the brother of all who partake with him of the proud inheritance. I am a Jew." He brooded, speculating out of all proportion these last few days...That must end...The one unpardonable vice of his race was just this: it did not know how to play......Nature to Kathleen was like a mother to come to when worried or distraught-------She was depressed now....

(66) "God of Might"-Elias Tobenkin-pages 194-198
She was troubled. He must dissipate her troubles. He must not let any misunderstanding take root between them. He must never allow it—not between them. Between them there should be harmony. He must speak to her, he would speak.

But Kathleen anticipated him.

"Sam", she said, her face permeated with tenderness, "your father—would he grieve as that man did in Milwaukee—if he knew you married a Christian girl?"

"Samuel felt as if a precious vase he was guarding had been knocked out of his hands and was lying on the floor in a thousand fragments... The fragments were his thoughts, his words, the wise convincing words he was preparing to utter to Kathleen to assure her, to comfort her.

He did not speak; he was in a daze.

"Would he?" Kathleen repeated gently, "would your father grieve like that?"

Samuel made a move as if to rise and go, but Kathleen put her hand upon his arm.

"Come", she pleaded, "don't be angry... it concerns me much, and I want to know."

"I suppose he would grieve... it could not make any difference to us here... And we cannot all be alike, think alike."

Kathleen came up and sat down beside him. She put her hand on his shoulder.

"Sam, dear", her voice faltered and the words stuck in her throat as if they had become dilated, spongy. "Sam—I—would just as soon join your church—if this would make things more agreeable to your family... I would just as soon join your church."
And now Kathleen....
Kathleen running from herself, running to his church for ease of mind—what did it mean?—where would it end?

A hysterical laugh was welling up from his chest, welling into his throat. He choked it down with an effort.

Controlled himself....

He fumbled for his watch, found it...

"Kathleen", he said weakly, "it is midnight. Don't let us start talking religion now. We'll never get a wink of sleep if we do—"

How well Samuel recalled the significant meeting he had with one of his aunts quite recently. She was very much opposed to his marriage with Kathleen. She showed her disapproval on every occasion. Samuel was paying a visit to her home one evening to pay his respects, and after exchanging the common greetings asked his aunt:

"So you are really angry at me?" Samuel asked, coming withing a few feet of her.

She looked up to him for an instant and then lost her gaze in the work basket once more.

"No, why should I be?" She replied with a sarcastic laugh, "no-o-o!"

"Why should one be angry with him?" she continued, as if she were addressing not Samuel but a third party. "What has he done? A mere trifle, a bagatelle! She has just gone—and become an apostate—that's all...."

"I have not become an apostate", Samuel's face flushed a deep red. "I have done nothing of the sort. I have not
renounced my religion, I have not denied my people... No one has asked me to renounce anything".

"No-o", his aunt's voice was cold and metallic. "He has not renounced anything..."

"I have not renounced anything", Samuel repeated firmly. His aunt looked at him, her eyes blazing.
"And what about children-aren't you going to have any?"
"We are", he answered.
"And will you raise them-as Jews-with a Christian mother?"
"I shall raise them as men-as men and women", Samuel measured his words.

"As men and women?" His aunt repeated after him with a harsh sneer.

"Yes, as men and women", Samuel was uttering his words slowly. He had rehearsed this little speech often in his thoughts and was not going to lose any of its effect in the process of delivering it... This is a free country. We all believe in one God, Jew and Christian alike, and there is no compulsion to join one denomination or another.

"That is more of your uncle's talk," his aunt indicated.
"Did you ever see men and women in this world-yet? I have lived close on to fifty years and I have not seen them. I have met Jews, Christians, Mohammedans-but I have not met just men and women... You are dreaming just as your uncle has been dreaming all his life-all his life--In his case I was there to see at least that no harm came from his dreaming, while in your case-

"God, Oh God", she took her head between her hands and
began to sway to and fro, her frame convulsed with sobbing...

"How could you?" She looked up at Samuel with streaming eyes, her words coming between gulps. "How could you do this to us all?...Your mother, your father... 'Twere different if they hadn't brought you up properly, if they had been nobodies, But you were raised so well... You were not a common, thoughtless boy. On the contrary you were educated, well educated in the Talmud, in the law... Your parents had taken such pains with you—had brought you up in piety... Your mother will find no rest in her grave."

Religion was a matter between one's self and one's conscience. The law did not interfere in such matters.

"Love, happiness," His aunt was wiping her tears with the end of her apron. "Of course I have understanding for such things—but not with a Christian...."

"I knew it would come to this," she was moaning dry-eyed a minute later. "I knew no good would come from letting you live alone with Christians for eight, for ten years... I warned your uncle repeatedly. But he wouldn't listen to me. He wanted you to be different, he said... Well you are different all right enough... You certainly are not a Jew and longer... I don't care what you have or have not renounced, but you are not a Jew, with a Christian wife, with children to grow up uncircumcised, Christian"

And when he had returned home to Kathleen from this "unpleasant" visit, Kathleen questioned him concerning the health of these relatives whom he had just visited.

Any reference to family, especially his family, she had noticed, was setting Samuel on edge of late.....

"I have been thinking", she said,"what a beautiful world it would be—if there were only us two in it, just you and I".
"I guess it will be just you and I, Kathleen", he said with an attempt at a laugh. "It looks as though it might be you and I-against the world...."

Kathleen sat upright.

"If it is to be you and I against the whole world", she said firmly, "Then that's all there is to it. We'll face the world."

Both came to realize, perhaps Samuel more than Kathleen since Kathleen was more acquainted with the responsibilities before marriage, that you couldn't merely "let the rest of the world go by." They were beginning to find out more and more that their very selves were matters of concern to the neighbors and neighborhood wherein they resided and for that matter to the community at large... They represented to the people a "freak" combination which the group as a whole looked down upon as unwholesome. They found themselves more and more forced to rely on their own individual selves, that is, a reciprocal relationship merely between these two immediately concerned, in the capacities of lovers, friends, companions, and so forth...

And then came that all important event in the life of this couple. Their first child. And after the birth of a son--For it was a son--had come that burning issue of the child's circumcision. Was Kathleen going to permit Samuel to have the baby circumcised... His fears concerning this fact were soon dispelled for Kathleen sensibly said:

"All modern doctors recommend it as a matter of health. I needn't tell you that. And his name is Jewish so I have nothing
against it...Even Samuel himself was astonished as his own satisfaction when the more or less religiously-minded Jewish surgeon of his acquaintance introduced his first son into the company of Israel. He rationalized, it was the result of a very rational consideration, that a boy with such a "very-much" Jewish name and uncircumcised might find himself from the start in a puzzling situation. But Kathleen had one of her flashes of insight:

"I didn't know you were so Jewish in your feelings."
"Do you mind?" he asked.
She smiled. "I have atavistic attacks myself when I hear the Gospel hymns."

He shook his head. Somehow it was different, different. Life was becoming more confusing for him from day to day. It had never been clear. There had never been in it a fundamental order. Now he often grasped his head. It seemed to spin. Aside from the strange alienation from his parents, for the friends of his youth, aside from the restlessness of his life with Kathleen, there was another factor which had become more acute and to which he could not but allow great weight...it was a subtle and difficult and delicate matter---one could not cope with it by either words or action.................

(68) Differences the existence of which he had scarcely been aware of were forcing themselves to the surface—were becoming marked. It seemed that this certain awkwardness had come into Samuel's, as well as for that matter Kathleen's life, with the birth of their first son.

(68) "Island Within"—Ludwig Lewishohn—p.258
"Prior to the arrival of the infant, Sunday afternoons had been a joy to them. He and Kathleen would spend them together. In the first months after their marriage, in the spring and summer, they would rise early and go riding into the country or about the lake. Later when the doctor cautioned Kathleen not to fatigue herself, they spent their Sunday afternoons at home, sleeping late and resting about the house.

But their little son made "no distinction between Sunday morning and any other morning. He woke and demanded attention at the usual hour. Seven O'clock would find Samuel out of bed. Kathleen would be up a trifle later. She was completely engrossed in the infant and had no time for anyone or anything else. Samuel found the entire Sunday forenoon on his hands—and the thing had become unfortunate, and even painful.

With the coming of the child Kathleen's aunt had come to live with them. Kathleen was relieved and grateful; her Aunt was running the house from the kitchen to the nursery. But Samuel, though he had been as insistent about Kathleen's Aunt's coming as Kathleen, was less at ease. Her Aunt had introduced a new atmosphere into the house—an atmosphere that had been foreign to it hitherto.

There was nothing definite Samuel could set out against this atmosphere. There was nothing deleterious about it. It was home, a family atmosphere, nothing more—Nevertheless Samuel could not escape a feeling of being at a disadvantage in it, of being worsted by this new atmosphere. There was something dominantly aggressive about it... Kathleen, he imagined, would feel the way he did if his mother had been alive and had come to have a say in the running of their household. There were times, particularly on
the forenoons of Sundays and holidays, when he had come to feel himself like a stranger, an outsider, in his own home...

On such mornings Kathleen's Aunt and, under her influence, Kathleen was living in a world in which he, Samuel, had never been initiated, and there seemed no possibility of his becoming a part of this world of theirs.... Their conversations ran differently on such occasions. They employed turns of speech which were new and unfamiliar to him. He had never heard them before... Or if he had, it was in that misty period of his early life, and in another language....

Between him and Kathleen's Aunt a peculiar relationship had arisen. They were on cordial terms during the week. On Sunday mornings, however, neither seemed quite able to disguise a certain feeling of aloofness from the other....

She was never openly censorious of Samuel. But on Sunday morning, her gaze and manner conveyed a certain silent and firm disapprobation such as is rewarded for those who grow thoughtless of canons of good taste.... Samuel got the distinct impression that he was somehow in the wrong place, doing the wrong thing; that no matter how exemplary his conduct as a man might be during the week, as a husband and the head of a family on Sunday morning, the Aunt considered him a complete disappointment--Months passed..

One Sunday morning she had found him in the parlor, engrossed in a stack of store correspondence, and could not keep back a taunt: Sunday was no time for a man to be about with a weekday mind... She smiled not unkindly, as if trying to send these words on their mission with as little sting as possible. To Samuel, however, they were like the flash of a knout..............
"She had laid bare his most vulnerable spot. In a flash she had disclosed the root of all his awkwardness on Sunday. He had himself been groping in that direction, been discerning it dimly. There could be no more groping now. It was clear—the issue between him and his household, between him and the rest of his neighborhood, was unmistakable... Whether she was aware of it or not, Kathleen's aunt had made it clear. She had torn the veil with one rent....

A weekday mind... That was at the base of the difference between them. A weekday mind—on Sundays.... Physically, in dress and appearance, he had approximated his townspeople, his Christian neighbors, he was one of them. Spiritually, however, he and they remained on different planes....

He had adopted the Christian Sunday as a matter of convenience, of external conformity, as he had adopted many other American, Christian, ways and customs... But he had no spiritual attachment, no exalted feeling, for Sunday, beyond the fact that it was a day of rest. Monday, Wednesday, any other day in the week would have suited him equally well as a day of rest, had the people about him chosen to make a holiday of that day.

It was not so with the other inhabitants of their neighborhood. It was not so with Kathleen's Aunt. It was not so with Kathleen—not even with Kathleen. To them the day had a spiritual significance. To them Sunday was Sabbath. It was a day allowed by time, by tradition, memory—It had been their Sabbath, the Sabbath of their parents, for centuries, for a thousand years, or longer... To them Sunday was a day bound up with sentiment, with beauty, with the loftiness of spirit....

Sunday had the same significance for Kathleen, for her
Aunt, for the people of the community wherein they resided that Saturday, his Sabbath, the Jewish Sabbath, which America had swept into oblivion—had had for him in his early childhood in the Old World....

The plain fact (matter of fact) was—and as the weeks and months went by the thought was coming to rest upon him with increasing melancholy and weight—that he had been swayed by visions rather than by facts. He had let his imagination, his dreams run away with him...He had entirely misapprehended the influence of the Church in the lives of the people about him...He had underestimated the force of centuries of habit and tradition in their lives. The influence of the Church was everywhere—even in his own home—yes, in his own home...It was a Christian home...everything about their life, his life, Kathleen's life, was regulated in accord with Christian canons, with Christian ethics...Kathleen was not conscious of this, it was in her blood.......

"He was mediating over these things one Sunday morning, while persons were already on their way to church. They were going in families and singly, on foot and in automobiles...Boys and girls were going. Children were carrying their Sunday School texts. Several people recognized him....They nodded.... (69)

The question of her husband's religion was becoming a susceptible spot with Kathleen...She never dreamed that Samuel's want of church affiliations could enter so vitally into their existence....Now and then Samuel thought of their child.

It seemed to him that there was something he should do in the matter. His child was growing up rapidly. He felt he (69)"God of Might"—Elias Tobenkin-pages 219-224
should take action—action to tie his son closer to himself. They
were not as near, his little son and himself, as he and his father
had been... He must take action... Yes,..

"But the more Samuel brooded over this, the more his
own shortcomings as a father—a father to an American son—came into
relief... In later years it might be different... Later he and
his grown son might find common ground to stand on... and then
Kathleen's Aunt suggested that Grant was now old enough to go
to Sunday school. Whatever church Grant might choose ultimately,
when he was a man, it could not be amiss if he started out by
being regular in such matters.

.....(70)

Samuel visualized what might be in order for his son.
The question of his child perplexed him most. He was not so much
concerned about himself as he was about his child. To his mind
the birth of a son conveyed to him the prospective glad tidings
of "Thank God! a 'kaddish' for our soul! Samuel had been given
to brooding over this very matter for days. His son, yes, he had
always had hopes before he had fallen in love with Kathleen that
he would have a son who would carry on after he, Samuel had him­
self passed on... It was most important that his son be able to
carry on for him, as his own father had expected Samuel would
carry on for him... It was not a matter for immediate concern,
but it was a frame of mind that the Jewish people are always
concerned with... You see Samuel like the rest of his race did
not know how to play...

Oh, well,... there were other problems that were immediate­
ly concerned his son's welfare. He wanted it to be easier for his
son to find his way back to Judaism than it was for Samuel him­
self... He wanted it to be easier for his son... It was to be
different with his son... He hoped he would grow up to be a good
(70) "god of might"—Elias Tobenkin page 237 and 239
You see Samuel was beginning to doubt whether his child would be able to grow up merely as a man...and not as a Jew or a Christian. How he has departed from his original stand, when he was provoked in an argument with his aunt relative to his children's upbringing....

His aunt had then looked at him, with eyes blazing.
"And what about children—aren't you going to have children?"

"We are," he had answered.
"And will you raise them—as Jews—with a Christian mother?"

"I shall raise them as men—as men and women", Samuel had measured his words.

"As men and women?" His aunt had repeated after him with a harsh sneer.

"Yes, as men and women", Samuel had uttered his words slowly. "This is a free country. We all believe in one God, Jew and Christian alike, and there is no compulsion to join one denomination or another.

"Did you ever see men and women in this world yet?—his aunt had answered. "I have lived close on to fifty years and I have not seen them. I have met Jews, Christians, Mohammedans—but I have not met just men and women."

It seemed as if his very words were being reiterated to him, as an echo. He was beginning to agree with his aunt's way of looking at the matter. There could not be any men and women. There were either Jews or Christians...It was hard for him now to acknowledge, even to himself, that in the synagogue and in the old tribal family there were the two guarantees in the continuance of Judaism...Samuel was discovering that perhaps he had disi—
herited himself when he had married Kathleen... He had loved Kathleen and Kathleen had loved him... yet. It seemed as if there were too many outside influences to make it possible for them to live by themselves....

As for Kathleen she, too, was beginning to feel that perhaps the Roman Catholic Church had shown itself as a wise religious "mother" by forbidding the marriage of a Catholic with a non-Catholic. Perhaps, that she and Samuel had married under the emotional agitation loosely called love, she brooded over the matter. She was becoming confirmed to the fact that the attitude of mind required to accept religion entirely on authority must be built up from childhood or not at all; when a converted adult bumps up against problems where reason and authority clash, that person tends to take the side of reason. Kathleen felt that her own orthodox Catholic upbringing had been such that she could not break the tenets of Catholicism. She realized that formal although the ritual of Catholicism was, its tenets were not mere forms; applied to the personal life of the individual, they are concrete, right, and vital—and none more so than those dealing with marriage. She felt that she must comply with the demands of the Roman Catholic Church as a wife and mother, and also what is implied by the pledge it requires of Catholics to bring up their children in the orthodox faith. Yes, Samuel would naturally object to her sending their little son off to Sunday School, to Mass on Sundays and "holy days of obligation" and seeing that they abstained from meat on Fridays and fast days... she felt certain that the question of sending their son to school would provoke the greatest objection from her husband. If she was to abide by the
demands of the Catholic Church she would or rather "should" send their little son to a parochial school. The Roman Catholic Church believes "Catholic education" to be the "ultimate redemption of the world". She knew that sooner or later pressure would be brought to bear upon her from various outside influences, especially from the various groups connected with the Church, to draw her little son into the Church school. "Although in theory, the parents' decision is optional, such pressure is brought to bear that only a person oblivious to public opinion and to personal influence can resist it. Kathleen had the feeling sometimes that her parents would have wanted their grandson to be educated in a Catholic school. Wasn't it a blessing?

Somehow, even greater effort is put forth to draw children of mixed marriages into the church educational system. They felt, Catholic zealots, that a child whose misfortune it is to live under the influence of a non-Catholic father must be watched, guarded, and somehow kept within the fold. Departure from what the group considers right—such as parochial school education—brings the severest criticism and ostracism, which, to one reared in a Catholic environment is unbearable. There might even be a threat of a more severe punishment—refusal of absolution after confession, a method resorted to in many dioceses. That is the most terrific blow that can be dealt anyone who accepts the Pope as "Christ's Vicar on earth" and the priest as his representative". (71)

Samuel wondered what was to become of their son, he brooded over the boy, over himself. He "recalled his own child—(71) "What It means to Marry a Catholic -Forummag."
hood and boyhood and its difficulties and he wondered how this boy of his would adjust himself, by what inner means of adaptation or resistance he would adjust himself to a hostile and complicated world... But perhaps he would not need that sense of protection and refuge; perhaps, like his mother, he would be at home in the world... At home in the world... At home in the world... How did one achieve that? His father and mother had had it upon some terms that he could not quite make clear to himself. His generation had lost it—perhaps he and Kathleen had only persuaded themselves and feigned to themselves to have it by a specific kind of regular refuge in a small and unique society... Where would be the spiritual dwelling-place of his boy?

(72)

Samuel loved his wife, but he wanted his son to be brought up in a traditional Jewish atmosphere. "I want my child to be brought up as an observant Jew, same as I was, no matter what they believe. I don't believe much myself." He had nothing in his blood and tradition with which inwardly to consent to the Christian notion of marriage as a sacrament; hence he was never resigned."

"...Yet, he was not the only one who had ventured out on this new course... Other Jews had intermarried: elsewhere in America... He knew the names of three or four such Jews in his own state... They had children... Others of his race were united to their Christian surroundings, with the Christian people about them, by ties of love, by ties of blood...

Had they arranged their lives more successfully and with greater dignity than he had arranged his? Were there no "problems" in their case?............ Were they happy?..................

(72) "The Island Within"—Ludwig Lewisohn—pages 280 and 297
"It would perhaps clear things for him, give his whole life a new turn, if he were to have a talk with one of these Jews, a heart to heart talk. And so he had had this heart to heart talk with a Jewish business associate.

He took this business associate of his into his confidence as if they had been lifelong intimates. He described his past: The stern orthodoxy of his ghetto bringing up, the Old world humiliations, persecutions. Then came America: The vision of equality and justice, the vast tolerance. There were no heights to which his dreams would not ascend. He had been dreaming of a new millenium for his race, for humanity. America had appeared to him as a new Sinai yielding new tablets to guide the conscience of mankind--America had become his faith, his religion.

But the dreams had broken down somewhere. The process of furthering his growing together with his surroundings, of becoming one with the community, with the people of the community, had become impossible for him. This was reacting disastrously on his family, on Kathleen. It was tending to make a lonely person out of his wife, as lonely as his own self.

His Jewish business associate listened attentively, but without a shadow of surprise, as if what Samuel was telling him was not something unfamiliar. An ironic half-smile played about his mouth, a smile at no one and at nothing in particular.

"Why don't you join a church--your wife's church?" his associate said wearily when Samuel had finished.

"Join-a-church?" Samuel had scarcely looked for such a suggestion.

"Yes, why not make a clean job of it?", his friend
continued in the same vein, "You have married into the Christian
world and you might as well become one of it—a Christian."

"The business associate was not making sport of him.
His friend's face was too grimly earnest for that. Samuel did not
wish to hurt or offend the older man.

"But, you—you don't seem to have made a clean job of it
yourself," his voice was unsteady. "You haven't become a Christian."

"No", his associate said quietly, "and that is why I am
in a position to advise you. I speak from experience.—"

"...............he continued with equal vehemence:

"Nobody bothers about your belief or unbelief—it is
conformity that people demand...If I had known eighteen or even
fifteen years back, when my children were still small, what I know
today, I would have gone where nobody knew me and would have buried
my Jewish origin as deep as I could...then it was still time. Then
I could lose myself still to the Christian world. I would conform
Oh, I would conform...Or else, Else I would come out with my race
openly and aggressively...Stuck to it...I would have made my wife
and children Jews at any cost, at all cost...There is nothing more
humiliating than my position today...You will be in the exact
position fifteen years hence...Look...

"I am very fond of my family", his associate said,
putting the picture of his family back into his pocket, "and yet
you see me, at my age—traveling...Am I on the road because I
haven't the brains to build up a business of my own in Chicago?
Never! I am traveling because home means a thousand little pin
pricks to me, and equally as many little tragedies to my children,
my family. I am a devoted father and my children adore me......
But they can never forget my 'indiscretion'... I am a Jew—I have remained a Jew... My daughters can never forgive me that... There is no malice in it... But the Jew in their circle—and that circle includes the whole of Christendom—is not popular, and they feel that I had no right to cast a shadow over their status in the world... I should have merged my religion with theirs—if that was what the world called for... If their mother cared not, or would not exact this from me at the time of our marriage, I should, they feel, have done this after their birth, for their sake...."

He passed his hand over his face as if the little speech had cost him great effort, and went on:

"And from their point of view they are right. There are a thousand inconveniences. I am home in the evening. Their friends come in. Young men will have their justs. Someone springs a joke about a-aJew. we all laugh-heartily... Suddenly there is a self consciousness... Someone had bethought himself, had recalled something... The house he was in, was not well, not exactly, not exclusively Christian... There is a breath of apology in the air, a feeling of restraint, estrangement... the evening has been ruined."

Samuel was barely listening. He was studying his friend's face. It was grave now with the gravity which he, Samuel, had known in his father, in his uncle, in other Jews... The pain in it was not acute and passing. It was, on the contrary, a deep, lasting sorrow, such as death might leave; an irreparable loss, which wealth can't restore, nor success mitigate....

Samuel had completely regained his self-possession.

"I should think", he said, "in a city, in a city of considerable size, things would not come to such a clash, the difference wouldn't be noticed so."
"big or small", his friend replied, "it is the same thing. A person moves in a certain circle. You either conform to the customs and prejudices of that circle, or you don't. If you conform you are in it; if you don't, you are out of it."

"Have you tried to raise your children to be just people?" Samuel hesitated, as if knowing beforehand what the answer was going to be.

"You are trying—are you succeeding?" his friend smiled sadly. "I knew some Germans in Chicago once, who tried to raise their children as free thinkers....Failure...the whole thing was a failure....If you are a Christian you are a Christian, whether you profess your religion or not. And if you are a Jew, no palliatives, such as free thought, idealism or the doctrines of Spinoza (which was what my father taught me to profess) will help you—you are a Jew...your children will be either Christians or Jews—there is no half way...The world will have us only on its own terms and the terms, which a dominant race, or class, or religion imposes, are always the same—surrender....Christian and Jew will fuse and become the one one when the Jew will be willing to efface himself, to extinguish his identity, to kill the Jew in him, not otherwise....The millenium for Jew and Christian of which you spoke is not here and you and I, and a hundred or a thousand others in our position were either visionaries—or unthinking." (74)

And when Samuel questioned later concerning the why and the wherefore of his failure to make adjustments with Kathleen told me just what the situation was. He had told Kathleen (74) "God of Might"—Elias Tobenkin—p. 251-255
although he loved her as much as ever, he felt that she was not a
wife to him at all and they might just as well not be married.

In answer to my question as to just what was wrong, Samuel answered:

"Nothing! Nothing except that she's a Gentile and I am
a Jew. We're both fond of each other and we understand each other
intellectually, but at the emotional basis of life there is, no,
no opposition—there's a divergence. You've heard of parallel
lines that can never meet? It isn't very clear to me yet, the
whole thing; I haven't probed it. But I feel as if I've never
been married at all. Maybe I'm wrong and it's just because
Kathleen and I are, by instincts, old-fashioned. But I don't
think that explanation suffices..."

Perhaps, and very likely, it was the influence of out-
side influences which made it impossible for them to bring up
their child merely as a human being without any really definite
religious affiliation added to any number of internal and ex-
ternal influences.

God would take care of their little boy, he was to
be the one who would be guided perhaps by a hand above—and what-
ever "the cards held in store for him would be his fate."

As the curtain is lowered upon the scene of this attempt
to make an intermarriage a matter of concern only to the two who
had contracted such a matrimonial adventure, we have before us
the "picture" of Kathleen attending the "Confession", on the
very Sunday, the day upon which the Jewish "Day of Atonement"—
"Yom Kipper" fell. Samuel in the Jewish synagogue had his fer-
vent contrition only drowned by the self-reproaches of the pen-
itents whose perpetual state was the strictest matrimonial chastity

(75)"The Island Within"—Ludwig Lewisohn—page 272
A Sociological Interpretation

of

Inter-Marriage
Marriage is not easy—ever under the best circumstances. It depends upon the character and the mental attitude of the two persons whether they live in a state of grace or a state of disgrace. Mixed marriages merely introduces a set of complications to be met, special adjustments to be made:

A couple contemplating intermarriage must consider the seriousness of such a marriage for it seems that "mixed unions" are always precarious, and the chances of harmony, happiness, and success are far greater from the start when the husband and wife have like religious views. The writer realizes that each marriage and intermarriage is an individual case; he, however, has been able to draw certain sociological "principles" which must be considered for an understanding of what intermarriage means to the persons concerned.

a) Both the Jewish and the Roman Catholic Churches are opposed to intermarriage between members of their respective churches. Their stand may be stated by the advice of the Federal Council committee to a non-Catholic contemplating marriage with a Catholic; "Don't. Religion is a basic interest in human life, and differences in religion, if these are fundamental, may strain a marriage to the point of breaking, especially where they are aggravated by ecclesiastical interference". The respective Churches do everything in their power to prevent such marriages. The couples have a seemingly insurmountable obstacle to overcome in respect to their church affiliations. Church interference has played its share in causing or helping to cause a marital "rift" in the life of these two who are involved in an intermarriage.
b) The respective families of the two persons contemplating an intermarriage are vigorously opposed to such a union. Each becomes an outcaste in the eyes of their respective families. A son of an Orthodox Jewish family is usually mourned as dead should he enter such a marriage contract. The Roman Catholic also finds her parents exerting what power they possess over their daughter to prevent any such step. Even after the couple have disregarded the opposition of their respective families and have become "as one" the influence of the families plays an important part in encouraging marital "rifts".

c) Relatives and friends usually look upon such a marriage with disapproval. It usually happens that the relatives and friends of the one look upon the other as "an intruder", "one who just doesn't belong". He is not accepted in the circle of relatives and friends of his wife, while she is not accepted in the circle of friends and relatives of her husband. There is strong pressure from both friends and relatives which has a strong influence in making for domestic discord.

d) The factor of hereditary influences in the lives of both parties must be given due thought. Too often do such influences lend toward the outcropping of race hatred. Too often do such influences make for marital incompatibilities. Too often do such influences tend to result in making for "strangers under the same roof".

e) The interaction of such a family with the community especially where that family is a part of a small compact neighborhood tends to result unfavorably upon the parties of such a marriage. Social disapproval in one form or another keeps "cropping" up and shows itself forcibly to the parties "immersed" in such a marriage.
f) The question of how their children should be trained spiritually presents a real problem to parties of an intermarriage. Are their children to be trained in the one Church or in the other? Are their children to grow up as perhaps free-thinkers? This problem that confronts persons who have undergone a mixed union. Perhaps they have made a more or less satisfactory adjustment of their own problem, but the problem of their children’s training lends toward family disharmony.

g) Then again the question of whether the children of such a marriage are to be trained in the parochial school or in the public schools presents a problem of great complexity. The interaction here has made for domestic discord. Often neither parent refuses to agree to the wishes of the other parent in respect to the education of their children. Not only is there internal pressure, but there is always working the influence of the Church on the parties involved in such a mixed marriage. Primary and secondary means of gathering information have lead the writer to believe that the Roman Catholic Church plays the most influencing role in this matter of the children’s spiritual and other educational pursuits.

These factors must all be considered as tending toward making an adjustment between two parties who are contemplating or who have already contracted such a marriage highly difficult. Conflict usually results over the influence of one or more of these factors. This conflict may be open or overt, incipient or repressed. We may well conclude that "there is no such disparity in marriage
as unsuitability of mind and purpose". Charles Dickens has expressed it well. Intermarriage merely introduces a set of complications to be met, especial adjustments to be made. These adjustments have often, the writer has found, not been successfully made and the possibilities of the husband and wife adjusting their attitudes and behavior in accommodation with each other has failed to be realized. Marriage is not easy—even under the best circumstances; intermarriage is many-fold more difficult. "Don't", is the advice of most people to those contemplating such marriage, "Such marriages too often fail!"
SUMMARY

The writer of this study has tried to show in this paper, first, the theoretical background of the place of both marriage and intermarriage as they relate to the respective histories of both the Jew and the Gentile, represented here by a Roman Catholic. We have found that marriage is considered to be a contract as well as a sacrament in the "eyes" of the Roman Catholic Church. Marriage according to the Jewish law maintains a position somewhere between the position expressed by Blackstone as a civil contract and that of the Roman Catholic Church in its conception of marriage as a sacrament, and as such, indissoluble.

Secondly, we have traced the historical position of the Jewish Church and the Roman Catholic Church in its relation to what we call "inter-marriage" and find that the two Churches represent far better than any other "measuring stick" the attitudes of the two peoples toward intermarriage. We find, first of all, that the Roman Catholic Church has maintained a more or less vigorous opposition to "inter-marriage". The highly emphatic word "Don't" stands forth as the advice to a non-Catholic as well as to a Catholic considering such a marriage. "Religion is a basic interest in human life, and differences in religion, if these are fundamental, may strain a marriage to the breaking point, especially where they are aggravated by ecclesiastical interference. Thirdly, the Jewish Church in regard to the problem of intermarriage has, historically, been characterized by two attitudes:

a) From the beginnings of Jewish history down to the publication of the Deuteronomic Code in 621 B.C. it was characterized by a great laxity in regard to inter-marriage with the outsider, while-
b) From the time of the Deuteronomic Code down to the twentieth century there has been an uncompromising severity in opposition to such marriage with the outsider.

The Jewish attitude may therefore be as taking different forms "before and after the maturing of a religious consciousness."

Part II attempts to open the problems of intermarriage from actual case studies. A composite picture of intermarriage is then presented, the material of which resembles a "patch-work quilt" at times, yet certain salient problems that such a couple must confront are presented and applied to the couple who have undertaken such a marital adventure. One gathers the impression that this inter-marriage is a failure. It is! Does that go to show that all such inter-marriages are failures, is the natural question? With exceptions, such inter-marriages, whether the couple continues to live in name as man and wife "until death do us part", the facts remain, that the "cards are stacked before they are dealt" to the couple. It is not possible for such a couple to live by themselves and "let the rest of the world go by". Our civilization does not allow for such a possibility. Case after case has presented itself to the writer to confirm this conclusion. "The cards are stacked."

The writer does not even hope that he has covered all that might be said on this problem. All he has tried to do is present the "highlights" of intermarriage in as impartial a manner as it was possible for him to present them. The writer puts himself firmly against such marriages, if only for the sake of those yet unborn who are to enter the world as a result
of such a marriage. Such marriages have all the "earmarks" of making for "strangers under the same roof". Marriage is contracted largely because of love, but due to various influences we find couples unable to make proper adjustments either to themselves or to the world without and the result is that although they are legally together, yet they are in many other ways, religiously and racially, "strangers under the same roof."
A Bibliography

Ashton, Mary Grace

Borden, Mary

"By One Who Did"

Commonweal Magazine

Edersheim, Alfred

Edman, Irwin

"Face"

(A Novel of Marriage)
Frederick A. Stokes & Co.
New York - 1928

"Technique of Marriage"
Pictorial Review
January, February, March, April - 1933

"What It Means To Be Married To A Catholic"
Forum Magazine
April - 1926

"Mixed Marriage"
Commonweal Magazine
April 13, 1932

"Life and Times of Christ"
Longmans Green & Co.
New York - 1903

"Reuben Cohen Looks At Marriage and Intermarriage"
Menorah Journal
October - 1928
Feldman, Ephraim

Herrick, Robert

Hurt, Walter

Lewishohn, Ludwig

Mattingly, Charles (Mrs.)

Meyer, Fulgence (Reverend)

Mielziner, M. (Reverend)

"Interrunriage Historically considered"
Yearbook of Central Conference of American Rabbis-1909
"Together"
The MacMillan Company
New York-1908
"Truth About The Jews"
(Told by a Gentile)
Horton and Company
Chicago-1922
"The Island Within"
Harper and Brothers
New York and London
1928

"A Great Sacrament"
A National Catholic Welfare Publication

"Youth's Pathfinder"
St. Francis Book Shop
Cincinnati, Ohio-1927

"Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce"
Bloch Publishing Co.
New York and Cincinnati
1901
Mielziner, M. (Reverend)

Mowrer, Ernest W.

Oesterley, W. U. C. and Robinson, Theodore H.

Philipson, David

Schmiedler, Edgar

Schneider, Isidor

"Youth's Pathfinder"
St. Francis Book Shop
Cincinnati, Ohio-1927

"Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce"
Bobbs-Merrill Publishing Co.
New York and Cincinnati -1901

"Judaism"
Harvard University Press
1927

"Domestic Discord"
University of Chicago Press
1928

"History of Israel"
Volume II
The Macmillan Co.-1930
New York

"The Reform Movement in Judaism"
The Macmillan Co.-1907
New York

"Readings on the Family"
The Catholic Press-1932

"The History of the Jews"
Poetry-March 1930
Tobenkin, Elias

Westermarck, Edward Alexander

Wile, Ira S. and Winn, Mary Day

"The God of Might"
Minton, Balch & Co.
New York-1925

"A Short History of Marriage"
The Macmillan Company
New York-1926

"Marriage in the Modern Manner"
The Century Co.-1929
New York-London