

ish government to hold the conferences as proposed, at Jerusalem. But the project is as yet premature, and since Paris could not have a religious parliament, but only congresses on the history of religion, we need not be surprised that the government of the Sultan should have regarded Father Hyacinthe's plan as unfeasible. Father Hyacinthe and his wife were received at Court. Madame Loyson visited the Harem, and both she and her husband were treated with unusual hospitality and esteem.

It would seem, however, as if some definite influence had been thwarting their plans. Although the Mussulmans have full confidence that Father Hyacinthe would hold these meetings in the spirit of the Religious Parliament, and would not take advantage of the occasion to stir up dissent and ill-will, still confidence in the Christians generally has not as yet reached that plane where the Sublime Porte will allow such a step to be taken. In February, Father Hyacinthe and his wife were in Athens, where Père Hyacinthe spoke in the hall of Parnassus on "St. Paul on the Areopagus," on which occasion the Greek court, including Her Majesty the Queen, members of the University, ministers of state, and the aristocracy of Athens were present, while hundreds of people were turned away.

Father Hyacinthe and his wife were received in the Orient with open arms by the dignitaries of the Greek Church, in both Constantinople and Athens. They write full of sympathy for the Oriental Christians, and glory in the spirit of the Eastern Church on the classical soil of Greece, "where the gods are dead, but the Christ is risen."

The pilgrims propose to celebrate the Paschal Feast in Jerusalem, and our best wishes accompany them. No doubt they will be received with the same cordiality by the Mussulmans, Jews, and Christians of the Holy City, as was shown them at Constantinople and Athens.

THE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS IN THE ROMAN CHURCH.

To the Editor of The Open Court.

Permit me to call your attention to a misstatement published in your March number under the headline "Moslem and Catholic Conceptions of Animals." The author, Mr. Evelyn Martinengo Cesaresco, speaking about Dr. Corrigan's approbation of a catechism, in which humanity to animals is taught, makes this surprising remark: "I believe this is the *first time* a Roman Catholic prelate has inculcated any such teaching, etc."

I say it is surprising to me, as it discriminates the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Would you please consult *Erklärung des mittleren Deharbeschen Catechismus zunächst für die mittlere und höhere Klasse der Elementarschulen*, by Dr. Jacob Schmitt, of the Priesterseminar of St. Peter, Freiburg in Breisgau, and *sub pede pagine* 301, etc., Vol. II., you will find as thorough an exposition of the relations of a Catholic to dumb animals as any sensible man, Mr. Evelyn Martinengo Cesaresco included, will approve of. The work mentioned is both approved and recommended by the Archbishop of Freiburg. The copy bears the date of the year 1889, and being in its seventh edition is reasonably supposed to have been approved, too, by some one in its first edition. Referring to the first volume, I see that its first edition bears the approbation of Bishop Lottar Kuebel, dated Freiburg, July 6, 1870.

Is it, then, not an imposition upon the intelligent readers of your publication

to be confronted with such nonsensical elucubrations, coming as they do, from the pen of a man who presumes to pass on for a scholar? Do you not see the harm and the gross injustice thus done to us?

Let those gentlemen, who through some reason or another, find fault with the teachings of the Catholic Church, apply themselves to a thorough study of the works both theological and philosophical of her eminent champions, instead of relying upon hearsay or second-hand references, and I am certain that much misunderstanding on either side will thereby be done away with. Please publish this and oblige

EUGENE, Oregon.

L. PRZYBYLSKI,
Catholic Priest.

[The author of the note to which the Reverend Father Przybylski refers is neither a man nor a scholar, but the wife of a prominent Italian nobleman, Count Martinengo Cesaresco. She has lived all her married life in Italy, and has observed, not without pain, that the members of the Roman Catholic Church of her home are, as it seems to her, less considerate of the rights of dumb animals than Protestants. We have not the slightest doubt, however, that the ethics toward animals officially taught by the Catholic Church are the same as in Protestant Churches. But the Countess is most certainly right in her claim that if Roman Catholic authorities would emphasise more strongly the kind treatment of animals, it would have a great influence upon the population of the Roman Catholic countries.—*Ed.*]

“THE CRITICAL, REFLECTIVE PERIOD.”

To the Editor of The Open Court:

In that very interesting work called *L'avenir de la science* which Renan wrote when he was a young man, and which the Vicomte de Voguë pronounced “*le grand livre de l'Écrivain*,” he declared that “the theory of the *primitive state of the human intellect*, so indispensable to the knowledge of the human intellect itself, is our *great discovery*, and has introduced thoroughly new data into philosophical science.”

Guyau, a young Frenchman who died before reaching his thirty-fourth birthday, but not before writing a very remarkable book, *The Non-Religion of the Future*, only confirmed his great predecessor's doctrine by saying with great emphasis: “Do we really need *voluntarily* to go back to the *state of mind of primitive peoples?*”

Dr. Caird, the present Master of Balliol College, Oxford, in the first of his opening series of Gifford Lectures in Glasgow University, began by saying that “a great part of the scientific and philosophical work of the last century had been the application of the idea of evolution to the organic world and to the various departments of human life.” “There is one aspect of this development,” he continued, “which is worthy of attention. . . This is the growing importance of reflective thought; in other words, the conscious reaction of mind upon the results of its own unconscious or obscurely conscious movements in the sphere of religion. Early religion does not trouble itself about its own justification; it does not even seek to make itself intelligible.”

The point that I am aiming at, and which these quotations clearly indicate, is, that the thought of all religions, and surely Christianity among the rest, is primitive, simple, spontaneous, naïve. Renan again says: “Only *semi-critical* intel-