

clearly see that he does not understand the nature of sin, the malice of which he measures by its opposition to our natural sympathies. It is true that in some sins there is such an opposition; but other sins actually proceed from natural sympathies not sufficiently controlled. The true malice of sin is in the offence against God: that is its essence. Again, the author does not seem to know that the most fervent and devoted members of the Catholic body are those who frequent this Sacrament, while those who neglect it soon lose their piety, and often become a disgrace to the Church. Above all he displays a complete misconception of the nature of Probabilism.

Rev. Orby Shipley.—“Tracts for the Day, No. 6.”

But certainly the most important of the recent Anglican essays on Casuistry is that edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley, which forms number six of the *Tracts for the Day*. It may be considered as a Ritualist manifesto on the subject. It formally proposes the establishment of a “purified school of Casuists” (1). It closes by declaring that “if the men of the same school which is ‘improving’ Anglican worship and Dogmatic Theology should be able to carry out this design and inform the conscience, and make men more saintly in their intercourse with one another they will have achieved a work which will cover them with glory.” His work will help, like other publications of the Ritualists, to dissipate many Protestant errors, and so prepare the way for Catholic faith. Moreover this writer is singular among those Anglicans whom we have as yet met with in understanding something of the nature and object of Casuistry. This evidently comes from his belief in the Sacrament of Penance. He sets forth the meaning and value of Casuistry in a very interesting manner, and his tract is certainly worth reading, as well on account of its general interest as for the insight which it gives us into the dispositions and tendencies of the Ritualist party. No Catholic writer would be listened to at the present time by those who will read and appreciate this essay, and it will thus do a work which we could not do, and tend to expose another Protestant misrepresentation, and bring some Anglicans a step nearer to the Church.

A measure of fairness.

For these reasons we cannot refuse our sympathy to what has been well done by this writer, and we can afford not to be surprised or offended if he seems to be still in many points under the influence of “the Protestant View.” The same spirit of fairness which has already enabled him to overcome many prejudices will in time enable him to shake off those under which he still labours, and to correct many theological errors. But, having said so much, the spirit of justice obliges us to add that where the essay treats directly of Catholic writers, it abounds in faults. Most of all ought its author to regret that he should have stained the pages of his essay with the most atrocious and

(1) That is, purified from the “vicious casuistry” of the Jesuits, against whom he repeats the calumnies of Mosheim and the Jansenists.