hat long teaching inturies, he next ny false urch of

e of the comto the pinions

n, and vas for logical ersally , gives led to in our giving oming t was ts, or King loved , but d an IXth 7. H. wav this ibed

an rom only the tly, ger h is ing the ore,).

to

Brett, the eminent Nonjuror, who was consecrated to the episcopate by the Nonjuring Bishops (1716).

Dr. Brett says of the OBLATION : "That it is omitted in the Communion Office of the Church of England, is evident to all that are acquainted with that liturgy, and that it was not casually, but wilfully, left out there, is no less evident." But it is when Dr. Brett comes to the transposition of the prayers, and the reason which lies behind their sequence and setting, that the point he makes becomes illuminating to a degree. "The words, 'to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving'... as they are now placed in the post-communion, can by no means be applied to the material elements, for it is absurd to pretend that we may offer to God that which is not, or present to him that which we have eaten and consumed.... This omission and transposition could not be made otherwise than with design." (See On the Eucharist, London, 1736; Dean Goode's Rule of Faith, vol. II., p. 362.)

Dr. Blakeney, a representative Evangelical, says of the first thanksgiving, which follows the Lord's Prayer after Communion : "This is the only prayer which refers to sacrifice, but this cannot refer to the elements, and moreover, it need not be used at all, the minister having his choice of this or the next, which, in itself proves that it cannot refer to the sacrifice of the elements, for, in that case, it would be essential to the service." (Blakeney on Common Prayer, p. 422.)

It is clear, from Dr. Blakeney's statement, that to add this prayer as is proposed, to the Consecration Prayer, would not only alter the doctrinal standard of the Communion Service, but it would make a prayer which is now an alternative, and may never be said, a matter of obligation on the part of every clergyman of the Church. If the Church were to accept such a change, it would mean that she made a complete, right-about-face, from the Reformation position, in the direction of a Romeward movement, and a surrender of the principles for which she has stood since 1552. The Prayer Book was purged most effectively by our Reformers of false sacrificial teaching, and it must not be allowed to re-enter by a back door, or for that matter through any other door.

"Everything between consecration and reception was removed, most significantly, to some other place." (Hole's Manual of English Church History, p. 195.)

Canon Carter admits that "its removal from this place was intended probably to do away with the close