of our penitents lie under ecclesiastical censure? There is no better form of absolution for us to use than the form in the *Visitation of the Sick*. But why say that an indicative sentence is necessary (p. 19), when for 1,200 years absolution was commonly conveyed by forms of prayer? Or, again, see the teaching of perfect and imperfect contrition on p. 28. Dr. Pusey spoke of the imperfection of the contrition of the best of us; and in the Tractarian devotional manuals it was usual to warn against such *attrition* as found sorrow, not for sin, but only for its impending punishment, and to speak of such attrition as not repentance at all, but only remorse.

But let us turn from points of adverse criticism, and seek to find a larger perspective. Mr. Williams has given us a textbook on the work of a priest in penance, a subject on which there is in the English Church a great lack of textbooks. It is well written, clearly arranged, and gives much material in small space. It treats of many points of not very easy distinction on which a young priest may be glad to learn, or a busy priest to refresh his memory. It may serve to lead some to larger study of a neglected subject.

OSCAR D. WATKINS.

THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH, AN ANGLICAN ESSAY. By Hakluyt Egerton. The Faith Press, 1921. 3s. 6d.

Everything which comes from the pen of Hakluyt Egerton is suggestive, and this essay is no exception. On one point, however, it appears to me to be at best misleading. The author claims that the Anglican Liturgy provides for a popular offering of the one Sacrifice, not for a sacerdotal offering, and that Anglican ordination does not confer authority to offer the One Sacrifice. Protestant controversialists will, nevertheless, get little benefit; for this is combined with very strong insistence on the real presence, and turns simply on a particular and, so far as I can see, an inadequate use of language. Hakluyt Egerton's argument holds if the sacrifice is identified with a verbal oblation or with some sacerdotal act of oblation other than and after consecration. It does not deal with those various conceptions of the sacrifice which find the *esse* of the sacrifice in consecration or in consecration and communion.

There is no field in which Anglo-Catholic theology is so weak as in its treatment of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; and against an insistence on the "pleading of the sacrifice," which has primarily in view some specific oblation after consecration, Hakluyt Egerton's criticisms are a valuable and a necessary protest. I would venture to urge, however, that he should explore other conceptions of the sacrifice and that he should restate his view in light of these. I know no one who is so well qualified to face a question in which almost the chief problem is presented by difficulty of definition, and by the need of charity in this respect.

In the rest of the essay there is much which challenges question, and which is put in an unusual way or from an unusual angle. There is very little indeed which has not real value.

WILL SPENS.