

SELECT COMMITTEE re ADMINISTRATION OF THE WINE.

RESOLUTIONS FOR MEETING ON THURSDAY JUNE 14th <sup>1917.</sup> at 4.15 p.m.

-----000-----

Proposed or suggested by Rev. S. E. Langford Smith.

1. Adjourned from last Meeting:-

*as expressed in the Rubrics (moved by the Canon)*

*Amended*

"That according to the law of the Church, the bread and wine must be consecrated separately and administered separately (Rubrics in Communion Service) *as expressed in the Rubrics*

2. That in consequence of the above the law does not permit administration of the wine by the methods known as Intinction Commixture or Instillation. *Conced*

*Not amended*

3. That the wine may be consecrated in a Cup Chalice or Flagon and a distinction is apparently made between a Cup and a Chalice but except as a convenient vehicle for administering the wine no special value or sacredness is attached to the Cup more than to the Chalice or Flagon in which the wine is consecrated (Rubrics of the Order of Communion 1548 and 1st Prayer Book 1549)

4. That the wine must be administered to each communicant by means of a cup but the law does not stipulate the size of the cup or the material of which it is made.

5. That the symbolism of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper does not consist in drinking from a common cup but in a partaking of the bread and wine which alone are the outward and visible sign of the Sacrament.

( The Church Catechism - What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper? Ans. Bread and Wine- which the Lord hath commanded to be received)

6. That to enforce the sharing of a common cup as necessary to a proper and valid partaking of the Sacrament is an unauthorised addition to the Symbolism of the Sacrament as defined in the authoritative teaching of the Church.

7. That although the use of individual cups is a departure from the custom of more than three centuries and apparently was not contemplated by the compilers of the Prayer Book yet such use does not necessarily involve a contravention of the law of the Church.

( Decision by the late Archbishop Temple and Late Archbishop Saumarez-Smith)

8. That no Bishop or company of Bishops is empowered by the law of the Church to authorise the administration of the wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper by any other means than as provided in the Book of Common Prayer.

Suggested propositions re use of Separate Cups by Mr. W. J. G. Mann

1. There is no objection in law to the administration of the wine in two or more cups at the same time and at one celebration (provided such cups are used indifferently as common cups.) *leaving open the question of their being used as common cups*

2. The symbolism of the one-ness of the Christian Community referred to by St. Paul (1 Cor. X 15-17) is expressly found by him in the "one bread" of which "all are partakers". It is submitted that similarly this symbolism is to be seen in the "one wine" of which "all are partakers" rather than in the vessel which pro hac vice contains it and from which it is accordingly administered. (See the wafer shaped bread case 11 Hals 678 Ridsdale v Clifton 2 P.D. 276)



3. There is no doctrinal significance in and no theological objection to the use of Separate Cups except

4. (a) The Bishops by resolution at the Lambeth Conference 1908 adopted the advice that

"in special cases where exceptional circumstances seem to require a departure from the usual manner of administration counsel and direction should be sought from the Bishop of the Diocese"

and this advice is also offered on behalf of the Bishops of Australia and Tasmania in the report presented to General Synod in 1916.

(b) The Archbishops at Lambeth Palace in the case of the Incense and Processional Lights on 31 July 1899 expressed the opinion following:-

"The ministration of the Ministers is contained in and prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer. It is there that we find what is the form to be observed in all the offices of Public Worship. Every Clergyman is required by the 36th Canon to use the form in the Book of Common Prayer prescribed and none other, and the only authority which can bind or authorise the Clergyman to make any variation whatever from what is contained in the Book is either an Act of Convocation legalised when necessary by Parliament or the order of the Crown issued with the advice and consent of the Metropolitan under the Act of 1559 or a direction of the ordinary under the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act 1872 (35 and 36 Vic. C.35) (See II Hals.676 t.)".

(c) The authority for variation referred to in (b) does not authorise a variation of the law with regard to the Communion Service (See II Hals.676 Martin v Mackonochie LR.2 P.C. 365 Sheppard v Bennett LR. 4 P.C. 350 at p 404) If the Prayer Book prescribed the Common Cup a Bishop therefore could not authorise any departure.

(d) The Bishops must by reason (a) (b) and (c) have held the view that a departure from the usual method namely the common cup to something other than the common cup could be made within the law otherwise the Bishops would appear to be advising what was calculated to lead to a violation of the law. It is submitted that the advice was adopted in order to ensure that within the law the wine should be administered either in the usual manner or in some other generally acceptable manner.

#### Rev. Canon Beck

1. That at the communion of the sick, and at open Communions the Rubrics historically considered, and in their actual wording, distinctly point to the use of the Common Cup as the law of the Church in the administration of the wine.

2. That, even if the Rubrics in question are susceptible of more than one meaning, the long continued usage of the Church establishes that on their true construction they prescribe the use of the Common Cup.

Hence we conclude that the use of the Common Cup in the administration of the wine is required by the existing law of the Church.