

THE ECUMENICAL PRINCIPLES OF HUGH PRICE HUGHES.

Perhaps more than any one else, Hugh Price Hughes (1847-1902) was responsible for the path taken by Methodism in the early and middle years of the twentieth century. The contemporary 'image' of Methodism as a church strong on social conscience and inner city mission owed much to initiatives largely stimulated by him. The sub-title of Christopher Oldstone-Moore's modern biography of Hughes well sums up his contribution to Methodist and wider church life, 'Founder of a new Methodism, Conscience of a new Nonconformity' (1).

As an ecumenist, Hughes was, arguably, even more forward looking than he was in matters of purely Methodist policy and polity. His daughter, and first biographer, Dorothea, asserts,

'He was essentially, for all his impassioned bias towards his own communion, a member of the Universal Church and profoundly interested in it. Moreover, since his Oxford days, he had felt the strength and attractiveness of much in the High Church ideal, and had been led to criticise not only the attitude of Methodism but the other Protestant communities, who had from time to time withdrawn from the Established Church of this country. Fighting each for a particular liberty or aspect of truth, they had forgotten that the fold was one and that there was one shepherd'(2).

Such sentiments were certainly still unusual amongst the Methodists of a hundred and ten or some years ago. Despite the witness and theology of some impressive ecumenical pioneers amongst them, such as William James Shrewsbury and Benjamin Gregory, most Wesleyan Methodists took 'denominationalism' for granted, some even thinking it engendered a healthy competitiveness (3). It was particularly unusual for Methodists to see anything attractive in the 'high church ideal' which was credited with subverting the traditional Protestantism of the national Church and adopting a persecuting attitude towards Methodists and other free church people (4). Hughes showed wider vision, recognising that emphasis upon particular aspects of the truth, however laudable and correct in themselves, can lead to a neglect of other and equally important truths. He would, I think, have approved of the statement in the recent ARCIC document *The Gift of Authority* that it is sometimes necessary for churches to re-receive aspects of the apostolic tradition that they have neglected, forgotten, or never properly received in the first place (5).

Hughes was born in 1847. He entered the ministry of what was still a rather isolated and self-contained connexion in 1867. He fought to give Methodism a stronger sense of its responsibility to society as a whole, arguing that such a sense of responsibility was one of the key distinguishing marks of a true church as against a mere sect. By the time of his early death in 1902, he had largely succeeded in these aims. He had also done much to effect the rapprochement of Wesleyan Methodism with the smaller Methodist connexions and to bring about much closer co-operation between the mainstream free churches (6). Beyond this, he had begun to build bridges to the Church of England and reverse the drift away from Anglicanism that had, for various reasons, characterised the two previous generations of Wesleyans. He was the key Wesleyan pioneer in practical ecumenism. It is to his achievement and his method in this sphere that this paper is dedicated. Hughes was to anticipate much that has come to characterise modern ecumenical thinking. He still has lessons for us today;

otherwise, I would certainly have left him to slumber in the Lord, and the examination of his career to those whose interest is purely historical.

Significant as were Hughes' achievements, one must not over-romanticise him. He was a stormy petrel and some of his expressed sentiments, on such matters as imperialism, are rebarbative to the modern Christian mind (7) He early clashed with the leaders of the Wesleyan Connexion, then, with the exception of the contemporary Roman Catholic Church, the most authoritarian, and clerically controlled church in Christendom. As a minister in training in College, he dared to criticise an arcane Methodist custom whereby candidates for home and overseas work were separated. He did this purely in the context of an internal college debate. For such presumptuous criticism of the Conference, the Principal, Dr Osborn, wished to 'sentence' him to two further years probation, in other words, to have his ordination delayed by two years beyond the norm. The other leaders of Methodism considered this too severe, but Hughes still had to apologise for his impertinence (8). The experience did not, however, make him any less bold for the future.

He lived in an era when most ecumenical pioneers thought in terms of Protestant (including Anglican) ecumenism, but regarded approaches to Rome as being impractical or even illegitimate. Hughes perhaps did not regard all approaches to Rome as likely to be vain. In 1895, he wrote a spirited reply to the Pope's Letter *Ad Anglos* which had stressed the unique claims of Rome, in particular in distinction from the claims to catholicity being made by the Anglo-Catholic section of the Church of England. Hughes reminded the Roman authorities that the divisions of the sixteenth century had arisen in defence of genuine aspects of the apostolic tradition and Scriptural truth (9). Hughes' practical work, however, was for Protestant unity. The negative reason for this was that he, reluctantly, regarded any serious discussions with Rome as way beyond the limit of practicality, at least for the time being. The more positive reason is that he was distressed at the degree of Protestant disunity and lack of co-ordination in mission. In his trenchant and blunt way he called Protestantism a 'mob' and contrasted its lack of effective organisation with that of Rome (10).

This indeed shows he was not blind to some of the virtues of Rome despite his deep disapproval of any form of sacerdotalism. He recognised that Rome had often dealt more wisely with reformers and contrasting styles of mission and devotion than had the Protestant churches. He believed that, if Wesley had been a Roman Catholic, his work would have not occasioned the schism that it did. Thus, he averred,

'In Anglicanism...or Methodism, or any other of the Protestant communities, if a man comes along full of the zeal of the Holy Ghost, willing to use any method, conventional or unconventional, in the achievement of this purpose, he is scowled at...tied up here and tied up there, so that if in the end he wants to do his work in this world he has to clear out...But the Pope on the contrary...welcomes him, ties a rope round his waist and gives him more or less carte blanche to do as he pleases, i.e. he finds an order and so keeps both himself and the whole concern alive (11).

Here we see the germ of the idea, subsequently developed by others, that the destiny of Methodism might be to become an order within the Catholic Church,

devoted to a particular style of mission and spirituality. In such a way might be reconciled the dual aims of organic unity and the preservation, for the benefit of the whole of the Church of the distinctive emphases of Methodism that would find their place alongside other spiritualities that have permanently enriched the Church. I remember the late Fr. Michael Richards, one of the most valuable and creative members of the national and international Roman Catholic-Methodist dialogues, arguing that there was nothing positive and of permanent value in either the free church or the Anglican traditions that could not be accommodated within the Roman Catholic Church. This point remains worthy of careful pondering.

It is also interesting to note the way in which this idea has been picked up both by Methodism's foremost contemporary ecumenist, Geoffrey Wainwright and by Catholic fellow ecumenists. In his 'The Ecumenical Moment', Wainwright refers to a future destiny for world Methodism as a sort of order promoting mission and the disciplines of holiness within the Universal Church as one of a series of possible scenarios for Methodism within a reunited Church (12). In his review of the most recent report of the Roman Catholic-Methodist dialogue, *Speaking the Truth in Love*, which relates to the question of teaching office in the Church, the American Catholic ecumenist, Ralph del Colle, seizes upon the idea as a possible way of explaining Methodism ecclesially. He argues that Methodism should be seen as having a very special role in the promotion of the holiness, and through that also, the unity of the Church (13). Such an idea, I am convinced, has mileage. It was, in a sense, only because it felt that it could not otherwise, given the constraints of the dated and geographically moribund Anglican parochial structure of the eighteenth century, fulfil its mission to 'go to those who needed it most' that Methodism assumed a separate ecclesial identity. Its original aim, however, was not to form a separate church but to 'spread Scriptural holiness through out the land'. Wesley defined Methodism as nothing more than 'the old religion, the religion of the Bible, the religion of Gregory and Ephraim Syrus' (14). He saw his travelling preachers as 'extraordinary ministers, designed to provoke the ordinary ministers to jealousy' (15). The problem was, of course, that they provoked to the wrong sort of jealousy and schism resulted.

The concept of Methodism, and, indeed, perhaps, of certain other 'confessional' traditions as 'orders' within the Universal Church would also contribute to the solution of a problem that exercises some minds within the Ecumenical Movement. They question how the riches that belong to distinctive denominational traditions can be preserved for the benefit of all within an organically reunited Church. Since the mid-1970's, the Lutherans have been particularly prominent in putting forward the concept of 'unity in reconciled diversity in which parallel churches would continue to exist, albeit in relationships of the closest mutual accountability and communion. Some contemporary Methodists, despite their desire for closer co-operation with the Church of England, fear the loss of a distinctively Methodist identity in a union with a numerically much stronger church and it may be that some such relationship would calm their fears. However, the matter needs to be approached with caution since nothing must be allowed which in any way dilutes the reality of true unity in depth. A 'continuing' Methodist order, to which Methodist ministers and local churches could continue to belong without in any way compromising their communion with the rest of the Church might be the ideal solution to the conundrum.

Hughes' concern for unity was intimately related to his concern for mission and an holistic Christian practice that went beyond the traditional pietistic concerns of Wesleyan Methodism and evangelical Christianity in general. Following an Anglican mentor, B. F. Westcott, he held that true religion must always take account of God, the world and the individual (16). He was convinced that the Church must not limit itself to personal evangelism. It must also seek to transform society. Not being a theologian in the strict sense, Hughes did not develop systematically his understanding of the whole counsel of God for the world and the coming Kingdom. This he left to his slightly junior, and much more theologically distinguished, contemporary, John Scott Lidgett (1854-1953), also a leading Methodist ecumenical pioneer (17). Hughes was deeply concerned that the disunity of the Protestant churches weakened both their witness and their power to transform society. In 1891, with yet another Methodist ecumenical pioneer, Henry Lunn, he established the *Review of the Churches*, a journal dedicated to progressive and ecumenical thinking in the churches. He wrote

Nothing tends to demoralise any army so much as strife in its own ranks. The buoyancy, the confidence of primitive Christianity has almost been lost in consequence of the heartrending and hope-shattering strife. Above all, the odium theologicum has brought the Christian churches into public contempt, and has furnished the enemies of Christianity with their most persuasive and crushing arguments. As a result of our disunion, the overwhelming majority of the human race are heathen. These evils are so colossal that we ought to be prepared, for the sake of union, to sacrifice everything except loyalty to Christ (18).

Hughes was to play a key part in the movement for closer co-operation amongst the Free churches. He was instrumental in setting up the national Council of Evangelical Free Churches, a step which he hoped, mistakenly as it turned out, would lead to organic unity amongst them (19). Hughes was quite convinced that closer co-operation amongst the churches could and should only be a stage on the way. Of the churches he said,

'However much they might fraternise and co-operate they would never succeed till they united. The ungodly world would never believe in any church fraternal sentiment until they were united-until they acted instead of talked' (20)

This is a warning even more relevant to our contemporary situation where we may be tempted to feel that the existing degree of good will and co-operation between the churches constitutes an adequate level of ecumenical progress.

Nor was Hughes content simply with free church unity. In the early 1890s he certainly hoped for a wider unity with the Church of England. He was impressed with the way in which the Lambeth Fathers of 1888 had constructed what came to be called the Lambeth Quadrilateral. He pointed out that many of the nonconformists of 1662 who had left the Church of England out of conscience but in deep sorrow would have been able to accept the principles of the Quadrilateral. He pointed out that the principle of episcopacy was set forth, but no contentious beliefs about the absolute necessity of belief in the apostolic succession were adumbrated. He emphasised that the principle of Scriptural authority was underlined, with no mention of the importance of tradition. The insistence on the historic creeds should create no difficulty since the trinitarian free churches accepted the statements in them even if they did not use them at all frequently in worship. Above all, there was no insistence,

as there had been in 1662 upon the use of one set prayer book. Hughes felt the Anglicans had shown themselves liberally minded and it was for the free churches to show themselves similarly generous in not insisting upon every one of their traditional nostrums (21).

To the end of seeking free church-Anglican unity, he was instrumental, along with his friend Henry Lunn, in sponsoring a series of Reunion Conferences at Grindelwald in Switzerland (22). He believed in the complementarity of Anglican and free church strengths. He was prepared to go much further than most free church contemporaries in meeting Anglican concerns. Unfortunately, he proved ahead of his time and was unable to carry sufficient Anglicans or free church folk with him (23). Just how far ahead he was of the vast majority of his contemporaries in Wesleyan Methodism can be seen from the editorial comments of the Methodist Recorder on the Grindelwald Conference and on Hughes' role in particular. Hughes was regarded as a man whose generosity of heart sometimes ran away with him and led him to advocate positions that Methodism could not underwrite. He was held, perhaps quite reasonably, to underestimate the terrific work of 'reception' that would be needed to reconcile two churches that had drifted further and further apart over the previous hundred years and particularly since the rise of the Oxford Movement. The 'unchurching' of Methodism, and indeed all non-episcopal churches, by the Tractarians had deeply offended Methodists who believed that the traditional Protestantism of the establishment had been fatally undermined, perhaps irrecoverably. While Hughes was prepared to accept episcopacy as a fact provided there was liberty of interpretation of its significance and no re-ordination of free church ministers, the Recorder manifested a suspicion that was no doubt widespread, arguing that the 'principle of the historic episcopate' was only a euphemism for 'sacerdotalism'. This, in turn (though the Recorder did not specifically mention the matter) involved the idea of grace as exclusively conveyed in the sacraments administered by episcopally ordained clergy, an idea then and now unacceptable to Methodists. It was not and is not that Methodists denied the 'divine institution and perpetual obligation of the sacraments', but they followed Wesley's teaching in believing that Christians should use 'all the means of grace', both the 'instituted' means ie. Those prescribed in Scripture which included the reading and preaching of the word and prayer as well as the sacraments, and the 'prudential' that is those aids to growth in grace, of later development and proven value though not mandated in Scripture as such. There is still an important ecumenical conversation to be had on the *range* of and *use* of the means of grace (24). A tentative beginning towards such a dialogue can be discerned in the international Roman Catholic-Methodist report of 2001, *Speaking the Truth in Love*.

Hughes had perceived the essential complementarity of many of the strengths of the divided churches. Thus, he said that he wished to see welded together the Anglican sense of responsibility for the whole nation and the nonconformist prophetic sense of protest against injustice (25). When advocating closer free church unity, he emphasised the way in which a united free church would be enriched by common sharing of all the strengths of the previously separate denominations. He believed that:

‘The zeal and compact organisation of a united Methodism, allied with the intellectualism of Congregationalism, the rugged independence of the Baptists and the lofty spirituality of the Society of Friends, formed an ideal combination which should be endued with a true sense of their place in the Catholic Church and the heritage that he thought they could claim in it.’(26)

To a degree, Hughes was anticipating both the later thought of Cardinal Willebrands on the existence of a variety of authentic *typoi* or styles of Christian life living together within the Universal Church and the present Holy Father’s statement that the period of separation has seen ‘a rich embellishment of the *koinonia*’ through the diverse styles of Christian spirituality and witness that have grown up within the separated churches (27). We can see from the preceding quotation that Hughes held the same opinion as the present Pope, that such gifts were, of course, meant to edify the *whole* Church and that acknowledgement of their development in separation was no reason for seeking as ardently as possible to overcome that separation.

How far one can assume that *all* traditions have developed and maintained genuinely authentic *typoi* of the rounded, corporate Christian life is perhaps disputable. It is difficult, perhaps, for any Tradition, even those of churches that in some sense or other identify full ecclesiality in terms of communion with themselves, to claim that it has not been distorted by the process of estrangement from other Christian communions. Avery Dulles points out that there may be authentic Christian values better stressed and practised outside of the Roman Catholic Church than within it. There was a sense in which Vatican II was about reclaiming or the Roman Catholic Church full participation in all the magnificent piety of the Christian tradition, particularly that of the east which had so long been largely forgotten and ignored in the West (28). A mark of the true ecumenist is his or her acknowledgement of the debt that he or she owes to traditions other than their own and of the need of their tradition to ‘re-receive’ (to use the most recent language of ARCIC) truths that may either have been forgotten or never properly received in the first place (29).

Hughes certainly understood that the ‘tradition’ of contemporary Methodism suffered both from defects that were inherent in the limitations of Wesley’s own approach and others which were the result of distortions and hardening of the ecclesial arteries since the time of Wesley (30). Hughes argued that for a fully rounded appreciation of the faith a balance needed to be kept between the emphases of Pauline theology, which had been so influential on both the sixteenth century reformers and the Wesleys, and the emphases of synoptic and Johannine theology, with their stress on Incarnation. He argued that the full understanding of that ‘hungering and thirsting after righteousness, commended by our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount was inclusive both of ‘civic righteousness and personal salvation’ (31). The Methodism of previous generations had tended to focus on the latter at the expense of the former.

Hughes was also aware of distortions that had grown up in separated Methodism. Methodism had lost much of the pragmatic flexibility that had characterised the Wesleys and needed to recover this virtue in an age of rapid social change. The liturgical and sacramental heritage of Methodism had been weakened in the over-reaction against the sacramentarian claims of the Oxford Movement. Hughes was determined to regain both for Methodism, reintroducing the Order of Morning Prayer,

the Anglican service of Mattins, in some of his churches. That order had continued to be used in some of the larger churches of the Connexion and Hughes vigorously defended the continued use of the Book of Common Prayer. He dismissed the arguments of those who extolled extempore prayer alone and were dismissive of liturgy on principle. Advocate as he was of the very proper place of revivalism in church life, he also argued that 'regularity and continuity in worship were also essential to the success of God's purposes on earth'. Of his Barry Road Church he said, 'My chapel here is a striking illustration of the immense advantage of a devout and reverent liturgical service' (32). Hughes was anxious to reassert the truth so strongly emphasised a half century earlier by William Shrewsbury that the Methodists were 'the debtors of all', Anglican, Puritan and Continental Protestant and that they had a priceless dual heritage of liturgical and extempore worship (33).

In his keenness to recover the original vitality of the types of Christian life that he believed his own Methodist tradition to represent, Hughes was a fore-runner of many later ecumenists of other traditions. Later, Orthodox, such as John Zizioulas, and Roman Catholics, such as Henri de Lubac, were to recall their respective traditions to re-receive the fullness of the patristic tradition unsullied by later medieval or even more modern distortions. In emphasising the experiential element in Methodism, whilst also recalling it to the fullness of its 'catholic' heritage, Hughes anticipated the thinking of such modern Wesley scholars as Ted Runyon with his emphasis upon orthodoxy, orthopraxy and orthopathy as all integral to the Methodist theological and ascetical tradition (34). The true ecumenist is, as was Hughes, both passionate for the integrity and fullness of his own tradition and deeply committed to learning from the rest of Christendom and 'receiving' true gifts and insights from whatever quarter the Holy Spirit may see fit to give them.

Hughes was well ahead of almost all his Methodist, and, indeed, other free church contemporaries in the extent to which he was prepared to empathise with many Anglican concerns. It is true that he was a doughty opponent of 'sacerdotalism', by which he and his free church and evangelical Anglican contemporaries meant exclusive claims concerning the sole availability of grace in sacraments administered by duly episcopally ordained priests. He also set store by the ancient maxim, 'Ubi Christus ibi ecclesia' and was dismissive of any attempt to unchurch other Christian communities, however structured (35). He did, however, concede that the Anglicans had a strong case for urging the claims of episcopal government. He accepted that episcopacy had been the virtually unanimous custom and rule of the Church between the late second century and the sixteenth. He regarded its role in a reunited Church as inevitable. He even thought a good case could be made out for it on the grounds of pastoral and missionary effectiveness (36). He also sympathised with the Anglican case for use of the historic creeds and carefully constructed catechisms. He insisted, despite the doubts of many in the free churches who took a strongly 'Liberal Protestant' line and thus tended to disapprove of creeds as too prescriptive, that the new Free Church Council should adopt a credal statement, not merely to witness to evangelical free church unity, but also 'that we might edify our brethren on the hilltop yonder, who will see how closely allied we are with them in thought and feeling on many essential matters' (37).

Hughes was also, by the standards of free churchmen of his time, relatively tender to Anglican sensitivities over identity. He said of the Church of England, 'She is an

ancient and great church and we must not allow ourselves to underestimate her in any way or speak slightly concerning her' (38). In an age when so many free churchmen were strong opponents of 'establishment', Hughes maintained a moderate stance. He fully accepted that the conversion of the nation and the christianisation of society did not depend on there being an established church. He believed that the ideal was the Cavourian one of 'a free church in a free state'. He did not, however, wish to engender bitterness by joining in the agitation, widespread amongst the contemporary free churches for the disestablishment of the Church of England. (39).

Hughes was insistent that Methodism 'as the last branch of the Church Catholic, ought to be most elastic and imaginative' (40). Certainly, he showed far more flexibility of thought and approach than many of his contemporaries in Methodism. His breadth of approach was linked to his Wesleyan emphasis upon 'apostolic recognition'. What counted for Hughes, as it had come to count for Wesley and for the classical Wesleyan ecclesiologists was not the possession of a particular ministerial structure, but the presence of the Spirit within the Church. Thus, writing in the *Contemporary Review*, he asserted,

'Wherever we discover any group of associated Christians with the unmistakable signs of supernatural grace, whenever such a group is instrumental in the conversion of sinners and in the edification of the saints, we have the decisive evidence of the presence, approval, blessing and imprimatur of Jesus Christ'. In the catechism just mentioned, he wrote, 'the essential mark of the Catholic Church is the presence of Christ through his indwelling Spirit, manifested in Holy Life and fellowship' (41).

It is not, as we have already averred, that Hughes was indifferent to questions of 'order', but he regarded them as strictly secondary. To a degree, but only a degree, Vatican II caught up with the insights of Hughes and the Wesleyan tradition when it affirmed the very real role as 'ecclesial communities', as such, in the salvation of their faithful. Perhaps in the end, the question is a pneumatological one. While Methodists recognise that the 'pastoral office' and proper transmission of that office are important to the Church, they also assert that, at least on occasion, the Holy Spirit has constituted churches by 'extraordinary means' (42). It is not that the value of an episcopal and pastoral succession in cementing and expressing the koinonia of the Church is to be denied so much as that it is incomplete without the balancing doctrine of 'apostolic recognition' whereby the apostles, and their authorised successors in the ministry, have always had a duty to recognise, receive and connect those churches founded independently of their own initiative with their churches. As Peter himself said, when recognising what was then the new work of the Spirit amongst the gentiles, 'Who am I that I should resist God?' (43).

I may say, that I think I see signs of promising developments in dealing with this thorny problem. In his *L'Eglise Locale*, the later Fr. Tillard referred to the 'Pauline' role of the Bishop of Rome, in 'recognising the unforeseeable action of God' (44). Could this perhaps come to include a recognition of the ecclesial authenticity, and thus of the ministries of churches which, at the moment Rome does not feel able to recognise as churches in the fullest sense? The present Holy Father has talked of ecumenical dialogue as 'making surprising discoveries possible' (45). At a

forthcoming consultation on the role of the Holy Spirit in ecumenism, to be held in Italy in October, a group of ecumenists, representative of all the main Christian traditions, will be looking at how a renewed exploration of the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church can help us in such matters.

From all of this, we can see that Hughes was well ahead of his time, and, indeed, ahead even of where some Methodists still are today. We must, however, neither romanticise him nor over-estimate his achievement. Despite his assiduous courting of many Anglicans, he was unable to move free church-Anglican unity into the realm of practical politics and it took the vastly changed circumstances of the post-World War I situation to allow further developments to occur. Nor were even his hopes for free church unity achieved. For far too many free church people, the new Free Church Council remained a purely consultative body, allowing more co-operation over matters of common concern and having effectively a far more anti-Anglican orientation than Hughes would really have wanted. What he contributed was vital, but, as with so much else in ecumenism, its fruits remain yet to be fully harvested.

References.

1. Oldstone-Moore, C. Hugh Price Hughes- *Founder of a New Methodism, Conscience of a new Nonconformity*, Cardiff (University of Wales Press) 1999.
2. *The Life of Hugh Price Hughes* by His daughter, London (Hodder & Stoughton), 1904. p. 387 for this quotation.
3. The key works by them are Shrewsbury, W.J., *A Scriptural Account of the Wesleyan Methodist Economy*, London, 1840, and Gregory, B. *The Holy Catholic Church*, London, 1873.
4. The standard work on Wesleyan relations with the Church of England, including reactions to the Oxford Movement is Turner, J.M. *Conflict and Reconciliation, Studies in Methodism and Ecumenicalism*, 1740-1982, London (Epworth), 1985.
5. *Gift of Authority*, paras. 25, 31, cited in One in Christ, 1999, no 3, pp. 252, 254.
6. He clashed frequently with Rigg and other Wesleyan conservatives on this issue. They were less than enamoured with the idea of Methodist reunion, believing that the Wesleyan understanding of the ministry and connexionalism were incompatible with those of the other Methodist churches. See especially Rigg, J. H. *Principles of Church Organisation*, 1897, pp.322-342. For an expression of the conservative views.
7. See eg. *Life*, op cit, pp. 554-574- The Imperial Idea of the State.
8. Oldstone-Moore, op cit, p. 26.
9. *Life*, op cit, pp. 393-4.
10. *Ibid*, p. 442.
11. *ibid*, pp. 394-5.
12. Wainwright, G. *The Ecumenical Moment*, Grand Rapids, 1983, pp. 196-9.
13. In his assessment for the Vatican of the report of the fifth quinquennium of the Roman Catholic-Methodist Dialogue, *Speaking the Truth in Love* (Lake Junaluska, 2001). Commentary and Reflections on Speaking the Truth in Love: Teaching Authority among Catholics and Methodists.
14. *Wesley Works*, vol. 3, p. 585. (Abingdon edition)

15. cited in Rupp, G. and Davies R.E. (eds) *A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain*, vol 4. p. 84.
16. Oldstone-Moore, p. 29.
17. For Scott Lidgett, see his *God, Christ and the Church*, London, 1927 and my summary of his ecclesiology in my *Love Bade Me Welcome-A British Methodist Statement on the Church*, London, 2002, pp. 89-98.
18. cited in Oldstone Moore, pp. 236-7?
19. *ibid*, pp. 236-8
20. *ibid*, p. 236.
21. *Life*, pp. 388-9.
22. *ibid*, pp. 383-5.
23. *ibid*, p. 393; Oldstone-Moore, pp. 236-7.
24. For the comments of the Methodist Recorder on the Grindelwald Conferences, see the issues for 25. 8. 1892, 1, 8, 15, 29. 9. 92. For Wesley on the means of grace see.
25. *ibid*, p. 230.
26. *Life*, p. 440.
27. For Cardinal Willebrands' notion of *typoi*, see the Tablet 24.1.1970. For the Pope on 'embellishment of the koinonia, see *Ut Unum Sint*, Rome, 1995, para 85.
28. See the *Decree on the Eastern churches*, cited in Abbott, W.M. *Documents of Vatican II*, London/Dublin, 1966, pp. 373-386.
29. *Gift of Authority*, op cit, para 31.
30. Oldstone-Moore, pp. 125, 156, 221. He reminded Methodist of the essentially experimental and innovative approach of Wesley, both of which had tended to be forgotten in practice in nineteenth century Wesleyan thinking.
31. *ibid*, p. 243.
32. *ibid*, pp. 32-4.
33. Shrewsbury, op cit, pp. 89-90.
34. Runyon, T. *The New Creation*, Nashville, 1998, pp. 147-9.
35. Hughes maintained vigorously the traditional Wesleyan position that no one system of church organisation or ministry was prescribed in Scripture and, therefore, none could be regarded as binding for all time.
36. Oldstone-Moore, p. 228.
37. *Life*, pp. 463-9.
38. *ibid*, pp. 471-2.
39. *ibid*, pp. 481-5. Note esp. p. 485. 'His aim throughout his life was to associate, not dissociate Christian men, and for this reason he did not encourage any act of aggression in his own lifetime on the part of free churchmen, though *in theory* (my italics) he was an advocate of disestablishment.
40. *ibid*, p. 458.
41. *ibid*, p. 448.
42. The locus classicus for a discussion of this is in Gregory, op cit, (the Fernley Lecture for 1873), pp. 38-50 where he discusses the formation of early churches, independent of apostolic initiative, as described in the early chapters of Acts.
43. *ibid*, p. 49, quoting Peter, in Acts 11:17, 'Who am I that I could withstand God?'
44. Tillard, J-M, *L'Eglise Locale*, Paris, 1995, p. 540.
45. John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint*, Rome, 1995, para 38.

(talk originally presented to the Chester conference of the Ecumenical Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary in 2008 and subsequently published by them as a pamphlet in 2010)