

Subcommittee & Administration
of the Wine.

April, 12th 1917.

at the first meeting of The Committee the Archbp.
presided. After opening & prayer:-

the Rev^d Langford Smith as mover of the
Resolution appointing the Committee read
his original resolution & then the Amendment
wh had been carried

The Archbp. ruled that the object of the
Committee was to find out what law is
the law of the C.E with regard to the
administration of the wine not what it
ought to be. This at first seemed to
create some little doubt in the minds of
some as to procedure & a short discussion
ensued. Eventually it was agreed to
accept the chairmans ruling & to
endeavour to find out what the Law is.
Rev^d Langford Smith led off pointing out in
a general way that the Law did not
stipulate a cone cups or single cups &
also that commonly two cups were used
& in some places as the Cathedral par
& even six that as a matter of fact
there was no limit to the number.

He also pointed out that the Chalice &
the cups were distinct vessels & that
according to the rubric the wine could be
consecrated in more than one vessel.

He then speaking of the use of more than
one cup at celebration said that in view
of our Lords saying - Where two or three are
gathered together &c he considered that
when the cups were administered to more
than two or three communicants it

2

Subcommittee re Administration
of the Wine.

became in effect a Common Cup.

The question of Custom arose. Mr Smith (lawyer) said that Judges had ruled that where a "custom" had ~~obtained~~ obtained for forty years it became de facto ~~equivalent~~ equivalent to the law. & therefore would have the same force. The question was then raised as to the definition of "Custom".

The Subcommittee adjourned. I felt that there was a good deal of "haziness" upon the question & that was not going to be an easy task to decide upon.

May ~~April~~ 10 1917.

Second Meeting

The Archbp. presided. The meeting opened with prayer.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read.

It was decided that Mr Langford Smith, the Convenor of the Committee should act as Secretary. The Archbp. again asked Mr Langford Smith to open the proceedings.

He again pointed out that the cups & the Chalice were two distinct vessels. Also further he showed that in the volume to the Communion Office of 1548 several cups were provided for. He also showed that the cups were of different kinds of material.

Business then proceeded as to the best method to be adopted in

3

Subcommittee re Administration of the Wine.

Arriving at a decision as to what the law is.

Mr Mann (Barrister) said he thought we could best arrive at a decision by the study of a series of propositions. after a short discussion the Committee decided to adopt that method.

The Archbp. then read a short paper in wh he contended that ~~the cups~~ from the present rubric, those of 1548 & 1662 the cups named in 1548 were not individual cups. reasons: -

- 1 the size of the cups - it was to be filled with wine.
- 2 When emptied there was to be a further consecration of wine.
- 3 In the rubric of 1549 the singular is used.
- 4 The Manual Acts indicate one cup.
- 5 In 1549 instructions for the administration of the wine. In 1552 no provision for the Manual Acts but the administration speaks of the cups.
- 6 In 1662 Manual Acts restored. In Administration direction is given for delivering the cups to any one.

Mr Dingen (Barrister) quoting from Lord Halebury "Rites & Ceremonies" said that though there was nothing prohibiting the use of the separate cups still

Subcommittee on

Administration of the Wine.

it did not follow that its use would be legal.

Mr Langford Smith in reply to the Archbp's paper said that he did not for a moment wish to infer that the cups mentioned in rubric of 1548 were individual cups but what he did mean ^{was} that more than one cup was permitted.

Acting on the Committee's decision the following proposition was ~~announced~~ ^{made} "The Law of the Ch. of Eng. does not permit the withholding of the cup from the laity" this was carried unanimously.

Next came on the question of "intinction" as suggested the Bishops' report.

The question arose as to whether the essence of communion was in the cup or in its contents.

The question was also raised by Canon Beck whether intinction could not be permitted in the administration of Communion in certain cases of sickness at this point it was decided to adjourn the discussion. It was also decided that for our next meeting these decisions of having proposition considered should send them in to the Secretary in time to go on the notice paper of the next meeting.

5

Subcommittee & Administration of
the Wine.

June 14th 1917.

The Archbp. presided. Meeting opened
w prayer.

The minutes of last meeting were read &
confirmed.

According to the business paper. Several
propositions had been sent in for
consideration. Mr Langford Smith had
also prepared & sent out to each Mbr.
several points for consideration.

The resolution by Rev Langford Smith was
then proceeded with viz that according to the
law of the Church, the bread & wine must be
consecrated separately & administered separately
(Rubrics in Common Service).

Can. Beck again raised the question of adminis-
tration in cases of sickness wh. could not swallow
the bread & wine separately.

Mr Dingen pointed out that such cases were
provided for in the 3rd Rubric ~~for~~ after the
Communion of the Sick.

The beam moved as an amendment that the
word Church be inserted in the words as expressed
in the Rubrics & according to custom. This did
not obtain a second & the beam was ~~proposed~~ asked
to leave out the words "according to custom"
This he did somewhat reluctantly & the
resolution as amended was carried
unanimously.

Mr Langford Smith then moved the 2nd resolution
wh. was carried unanimously.

The question then arose as to what was to
be our next order of procedure. The
Archbp suggested that we might propitly

Subcommittee re Administration
of wine.

take the order as suggested in let.

Langford Smith's points for consideration
Can Beck thought that by doing this
we should be wasting time as the point
we wanted to arrive at was what is
the law at the present time & he did
not quite see how the consideration of
the historical would help.

The archbp said he thought it would
but he said he was in the position
of a learner & thought ~~should~~^{such} a
method would be decidedly instructive
& helpful in coming to a decision.
This seemed to be the feeling of most
members & it was decided to adopt
this method.

Question I The History of the Administration
was then considered.

Can Beck said that there was great
diversity of opinion as to whether at the
Institution by our Lord each disciple had
his own cup. He quoted several authors
who maintained that they ^{did}. On the
other hand there were those who did not.
Moreover there was a doubt by some that
the institution took place at the paschal
feast judging from the age given by St John
so that he did not ~~consider~~ see how the
consideration would help. He said he had
given a good deal of time & thought to
the question.

The archbp said he had also been very
interested in this question. & had

Subcommittee re Administration
of the Wm.

Written to Several rev. Gentlemen of
Learning & Standing asking their opinion
as to the description of the Institution
favoring the use of the individual
Cups.

First he quoted Plummer's Commentary
on St Luke as against the individual cup
but Langford Smith pointed out that
Plummer in another place had given
a different opinion.

The Committee having expressed a
desire to hear the opinion obtained
by the Centbs requested him to read
them.

Achdean Lewis (Morn College) said that
he had spoken with Principal Hosper
of St Andrews College (Presbyterian) who
was against the use of the individual
Cups. He argued from Mark 14²³ compared
with 1 Cor. x¹⁶ & 1²³⁻²⁸ that the Common
Cup was used at the Institution.

Rev. Mickleth (St James) quoted Matt^h
26²⁷ emphasizing "the" of Mark 14²³.
1 Cor 10¹⁷ & Wm. emphasizing drinking
out of one Cup.

Bp. Adelaide considers use of separate
Cups not warranted by N. T.

Rev. Garnsey (Warden St Paul's) refers
to Babour Gadsden also. Mark x 33-39.
x 10¹⁶ St Luke 22¹⁷⁻²⁰. 1 Cor. x 16.
Against individual cups.

8

Subcommittee re Administration
of the Wine.

Can Host (Sr James Col. East St Kilda)

Quoted Feb 75⁸ — Against individual
cups. Says that the use of the
Separate cups suggests that we
are to be on our guard against
one another. ^{he mentioned the fact of the}
omission of the article in the oldest
manuscript. in fact. I note.

Bp Grafton Says that the
Chairman of Host favors that
all anti of one cup.

— against individual cup —

Bp Goulbourne npt to above passage.

— against individual cup —

Mr Langford Smith Said that for
every one wh the Archbp had
brought forward he could bring
two on the other side. I quoted the
Personnel of the Presbyterian
Subcommittee of Glasgow. The
Archbp asked him if he were
quoting from the "Advertisements"
of the Individual Cups. He replied
that he was quoting from a
copy of the Report.

Mr Lingen said that what he
had heard from the Archbp he
felt more convinced than ever there
is was the wine & not the cups wh

Subcommittee re Administration
of the Wme.

9

was the important thing

→ She then said that he could not quite agree with the arguments adduced by the gentlemen just quoted. He thought that in some of the references that had been quoted especially in the Epistles ~~where~~ the language then used was largely metaphorical & not historical. Moreover he thought that they had quite lost sight of the ~~Hebrew~~ Effect of the Hebrew mind & Hebrew thought. Moreover he reminded the Committee of the Change of Expression which was liable to arise in translation & reminded them that our Lord spoke in Aramaic & not Greek.

Mr. Hammond who was obliged to leave asked the Archbp if he could arrange to have those several opinions distributed to the members of the Committee that they may read & study them for themselves. This was seconded by Mr. Donaldson & the Archbp replied that he would see what he could do.

Subcommittee & Administration
of the Wine.

10

during the meeting Mr Perry on reply to a
remark from Mr Lingen something about
the authority of the Bishops read a
ruling given by Lord Halsbury part of
wh was also quoted by Mr Mann in
the propositions for consideration sent
in by him.

Mr Donaldson moved ~~that~~ the adjournment
but before that was done Mr Langford
Smith gave notice of motion for
next meeting.

It was decided that the next
meeting be July 25th 1917 4¹⁵ PM.
The meeting closed with the Benediction.