

be to indicate the taking and receiving of that which, before the reception, was external to the receiver. It should be observed also that the word of which "partaking" is a translation, is, in the Latin, "communicatio," the *Koinonia* of S. Paul (in 1 Cor. x., 16), answering exactly to our word "communication." It is rendered "contribution" in our English Testament Rom. xv., 26, and "distribution" 2 Cor. ix., 13. It is the word used of the "communion" of the Body and Blood of Christ 1 Cor. x., 16. In every instance it has the sense of "giving," or "imparting" something which the receiver has not before; and it never means "receiving." And this is of especial importance to observe in 1 Cor. x., 16, where St. Paul speaks of the "communion" (*Koinonia*) of the Body of Christ, i.e., of the "imparting" of it; not therefore of the *act of the receiver* as if he had said, "the bread and cup are the feeding on Christ." Thus again, looked at in this way also, we are taught that the blessing comes to us from without, in the Sacrament, and not from within us.

It has, moreover, been well observed that no Calvinist nor Zuinglian Confession has ever used the words "given and taken" of the benefit conferred in the Lord's Supper. It may be interesting to know what a pious and thoughtful layman considered the words to mean. Alexander Knox, the Private-Secretary of Lord Castlereagh, for several years prior to the union of Great Britain and Ireland, wrote a book on the "Use and import of the Eucharistic Symbols." The fact of this book being written at a time when the life of the Church seemed to be fast dying out, is a remarkable instance of the watchful care of our Lord for His Church. Mr. Knox was born about 1760 and died in 1831. Not a breath of Eucharistic controversy stirred the fast stagnating waters of the Church; and yet a layman was found to write deeply and beautifully of this blessed mystery of our religion. Writing on Art. xxviii., he says:—"In the 28th Article, which treats specially of the Lord's Supper, are the following words: "the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner;" this position was no doubt made in contradiction to the gross doctrine of a literal transubstantiation: but it rejects that error, not by a mere negation, but also by laying down the strict truth of the case. The Body of Christ is not said in a general way to be *received*, but to be *given, taken and eaten*; as if there was a solicitude, in correcting the abuses of the Sacrament, explicitly to maintain the union between the heavenly and spiritual blessing; and the outward and visible sign. *This is given* by the minister, and *taken* by the communicant. To use these precise expressions, therefore, respecting "the Body of Christ" is, by clearest implication, to *combine* that heavenly and spiritual blessing with the given and taken symbol."

Again, in speaking of Art. xxix., he goes on to say:—"It need