

sponsor before an audience in Wanganui, that throughout Catholic Christendom 'even as late as Phillip II., of Spain,

Dirt

was considered essential to orthodoxy.' Of course not a scrap of evidence was offered in substantiation of this outrageous statement. Now (a) we can claim to know a good deal more about the 'essentials of orthodoxy' than this ill-informed critic who, by his own showing, is ignorant even of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. And among those 'essentials' dirt finds no place or name, either in reality or in the estimation of any person who is competent to offer an opinion on the subject. If Mr. Joynt says it does, well and good. *Carte in tavola!* Let him advance proofs for his statement and give chapter and verse for what he says. We want hard fact, not rapid declamation. But his assertion is not merely untrue; it is absurd; and once more we have to charge him with ignorance of the meaning of the words that he employs. (b) At every step in his fatuous lecture Mr. Joynt is giving us shocks of surprise at his ludicrous unacquaintance with the period about which he presumes to enlighten the public of Wanganui. His wild statement as to the supposed relations between orthodoxy and dirt is, in reality, a charge levelled against the Church. To which we might reply that, considered merely in themselves, cleanliness, is no more a virtue than its opposite is a crime; that the Church christianised and civilised the barbarian and semi-barbarian tribes of Europe and taught them the arts of peace; that it is no part of her functions to act likewise as a grandmotherly stocking-darner, *baignouse*, or washerwoman-in-ordinary to the hordes to whom she preaches the Gospel; and that if the Saviour meant His Church to supply the world at large with Pears' soap and bath-towels and tooth-picks and nail-files, He would probably have said so. But He did not. Now the European Catholic nations of the middle ages were mainly composed of the descendants of the Roman and Germanic races. And every tyro in Roman history and every reader of Tacitus know that these were wonderfully addicted to the custom of daily baths. We have no evidence that they changed their habit after their conversion, and there is certainly not a trace of Church legislation against it. In his *Domestic Manners and Customs in England*, Wright speaks of the frequency of warm baths 'in all classes of society' among the Catholic Anglo-Saxons. St. Bede (A.D. 734), Henry of Huntingdon (A.D. 1146), and Alexander Nickham all speak of the great concourses of people that bathed in the waters of Bath. A similar use was made of the great number of the Lady wells and holy wells throughout the country. If any class of the population could be considered 'orthodox' it would certainly be the members of the great Orders of monks. And the rules of St. Benedict, St. Isidore, St. Augustine, St. Dominic, and various other religious Orders of both sexes prescribed periodical warm baths. Public, private, and monastic baths were, indeed, a feature of middle age life. Some of the public baths—such as those erected for the poor by Queen St. Radegund and by Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle—were on a magnificent scale.

Public Baths

for the poor were also erected in many monasteries, one of the most noted of these being at St. Savine in the Pyrenees. A writer of the tenth or eleventh century records how the Catholic Bretons of his day bathed and changed their clothes every Sunday morning in honor of Christ's Resurrection from the dead. The great guilds—or combined trades unions, benefit societies, and religious confraternities of the middle ages—provided in many countries for periodical baths for the workers. In his *German Society at the Close of the Middle Ages*, Belfort Bax, a Protestant writer, speaking of Germany, says (p. 213): 'In some cases the workmen had weekly gratuities under the name of "bathing money"; and in this connection it may be noticed that a holiday for the purpose of bathing once a fortnight, once a week, or even oftener, as the case might be, was stipulated for by the guilds, and generally recognised as a legitimate demand. The common notion of the uncleanness of the medieval man requires to be considerably modified when one closely investigates the condition of town life, and finds everywhere facilities for bathing in winter and summer alike.' There were, of course, many—even saints and hermits—who neglected their hair, feet, clothes, or finger-nails—a state of things which is, perhaps, quite as prevalent to-day among sinners as well as saints, and among Protestants as well as Catholics within easy distance of Mr. Joynt's door, despite the prevalent worship of the morning tub among a small section of the community. The time of Philip II., to which Mr. Joynt refers, extended to within less than three years of the seventeenth century. But M. Viollet le Duc, who is one of the greatest authorities on medieval subjects, says that private and public baths were very common and commodious during the middle ages; that the use of them was very extensive; but that 'during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries [*i.e.*, during and after the Reformation] it was much less common than it had been before that period, and was confined almost exclusively to the higher classes. Clearly Mr. Joynt did not know what he was speaking about when he 'worked off' on his Wanganui audience the absurd fable that in the middle ages 'dirt was considered essential to orthodoxy.'

Patience, according to the old proverb, is 'a plaister for all sores.' We Catholics must possess our souls in patience when the small wits of our time hurl their whooping anathemas at the middle ages, which of all other periods in history, they do not, or will not, understand. For

The Hobgoblins

with which they people that that period are disappearing fast before the light of research, and the Church and the middle ages are the gainers thereby. You cannot dismiss with a curl of the lip and a cheap sneer the era which produced Alfred, Anselm, Lanfranc, Langton, St. Bede, Peter Lombard, Alcuin, Scotus, Charlemagne, Godfrey de Bouillon, St. Bonaventure, Bernard, Dominic, Francis, and Thomas Aquinas; the era which, in the face of enormous difficulties and

trials, converted one vast continent and discovered another; which slowly and toilfully built up the grandest civilisation that this grey old world has ever seen; which was noted for its simple faith and what Lecky terms its 'enthusiasm of charity'; which emancipated the slave, created the Christian home, raised woman on a pedestal, originated the university and the free school, preserved the ancient literature and laid the foundation of the modern, and originated the jury-system, parliamentary institutions, the franchise, the eight hours' day, and most of what we call our modern liberties. Sane people do not rib-roast a 10 year old boy just because he has not reached the development of brain and limb and experience that befits five-and-forty. Neither do they commit the too common folly of expecting to find in the transitional and pioneering period of the seventh or tenth centuries, the developments in gas-stoves and brass tacks and steam-hammers that it took long centuries of more settled conditions to evolve. And in these countries at least it ought to be deemed bad taste to sneer at our pioneers just because their huts were not palaces ceiled with embossed zinc and bestrewn with Persian rugs, and their tree-felling not done by electric light nor their damper eaten to the strains of a Hungarian band. The middle ages had the thousand-and-one drawbacks that are inseparable from the hard and stern pioneering which gradually turns barbarism into the highest form of civilisation yet attained. But, *ma foi*,

Such Splendid Pioneering!

Even in the matter of civil rights, the Positivist Historian, Augustin Thierry declares that the middle ages formed 'the true epoch of freedom.' And Montalambert—who probably understood this malign period better than any other, with (according to Dr. Parsons) the sole exception of the great Italian historian Cantù, said: 'The middle ages were the era of really representative government, of institutions more sincerely and efficaciously representative than any which have been imagined since that time. Yes,' he continues, 'representative government was born in the middle ages and belongs to them. It was born of a natural combination of the elements which then constituted society: it came from the common action of the Church, Catholic royalty, the owners of the land, and the emancipated municipalities.'

IN THE WAKE OF THE RISING SUN.

(By 'VIATOR.')

THE CAVE OF ADULLAM.

On the hillside towards the east is the historic Cave of Adullam, a natural labyrinthine grotto, hollowed out of the solid rock by the ebb and flow of many waters. It is worthy of mention as being the cave where David sought refuge from the violence of Saul. The grotto abounds in passages and chambers through its long depth of 200 yards, and that it was for centuries used for interment of the dead is proved by the many niches carved in the rock, and the fragments of urns and sarcophagi strewn in profusion on the rocky floor.

THE VINE.

Running along the slopes of the hills, along these very hills, made sacred by the night journey of the Holy Family when St. Joseph, warned by an angel of Herod's fell design, 'arose and took the Child and His Mother and departed into Egypt,' along these hills may be seen, more than elsewhere in Palestine, the struggling vineyards, marked by their watch-towers and crumbling walls, still cultivated as in the olden times where the residents are Christians. Conscientious Moslems traffic not in the vine. Round about Bethlehem especially is the industry pursued. Indeed the vine is the earliest and the latest symbol of Judea. In reference and symbol and figure the vine is freely mentioned in the Old Testament and in the New—'He washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of the grapes.' 'I am the vine, you are the branches.' From this valley—the torrent of the cluster—Nehelacool, the spies cut down and carried back the giant cluster of grapes. A vineyard on a hill of olives with the fence and the stones gathered out, and the tower in the midst of it, is the natural figure, which both in the prophetic and evangelical records, represents the Kingdom of Judah. The vine was the emblem of the nation on the coins of the Machabees, and in the colossal cluster of golden grapes which overhung the porch of the sacred temple; and the grapes of Judah still mark the tombstones of the Hebrew race in the oldest of their European cemeteries. Hence the vineyards and the green strip of vegetation which break the gray surface of the hills are so many threads to guide us to the chief centres of the Israelite. Hebron was the primeval seat of the vine, the earliest centre, too, of civilisation, not only of Judah but of Palestine. It was the first home of Abraham and the Patriarchs; their one permanent resting place when they were gradually passing from the pastoral or nomadic to the agricultural life. Here Caleb chose his portion when at the head of his valiant tribe he drove out the old inhabitants; here under David and later under Abolam the tribe of Judah always rallied when it asserted its independent existence against the rest of the Israelite nation.

HEBRON AND BETHLEHEM

are closely allied in the history of the Kings of Judah, and this green oasis between the hills, still marked by the Pools of Solomon, is eloquent of the peace and magnificence inseparable from the reign of the wisest King of all. Amid the rocky knolls of Judea, in this valley called Urtas, Solomon 'planted him vineyards, and made him gardens and a paradise, and planted him trees in them of all kinds of fruit, and made him reservoirs of water'—they are there now—to water therewith the wood that bringeth forth trees.' From these gardens, no doubt, came the striking imagery of the