Theological Dynamics for Understanding the Roman Catholic Episcopate in Britain

Introduction

As for each of the Christian denominations discussed in this book, the history, understanding, and contemporary practice of Roman Catholic translocal ministry in the UK are unique and particular. In terms of origins, the official history cites the arrival of St Augustine of Canterbury on the shores of Kent in 597AD, sent by Pope St Gregory the Great to evangelise the Isles of Britain. After 597, episcopal structures of some form were in place under the ecclesiastical governance of the See of Rome. Augustine was the first Archbishop of Canterbury, and the governmental structure he began grew and held sway until his eventual successors underwent the full break with Rome during the 16th Century. From 1688 there were no Catholic dioceses in Britain, meaning it was classed as 'mission territory'. Translocal ministry in this period took the form of four 'Apostolic vicariates', where leaders act on the direct authority of Rome as envoys, not as bishops of dioceses or archdioceses. Such is the case in modern-day Syria or Turkey, for example. The Apostolic vicariates ended in 1850 after the Catholic Emancipation act, when Pope Pius IX re-established the Catholic hierarchy with the Papal Bull *Universalis Ecclesiae* (Universal Church) promulgated on 29th Sept 1851. Pope Leo XIII then re-established the episcopate in Scotland in 1878, and so the broad picture of Catholic translocal ministry in Britain is twofold: with the Bishops's Conference of Scotland having the two archdioceses of Glasgow and St Andrews and Edinburgh, and six dioceses. England and Wales now has five metropolitan archdioceses, Westminster, Southwark, Cardiff, Birmingham and Liverpool, and seventeen dioceses.

This snapshot indicates the peculiar historical trajectory behind today's structures of Catholic Church governance. The contemporary situation accentuates this distinctiveness further. This chapter focuses on two contemporary circumstances; that British society is religiously plural in the first place, and that it evinces a marked secularity in the second. On the first point, there are not only different religious faiths here, but a vibrant plurality of Christian traditions, as witnessed by this volume. This makes life very different for UK bishop compared to one in, say, Italy, or Poland. On the second point, Britain is also undergoing a significant decline in religious practice, particularly among the more 'indigenous' and formerly Christian members of the population. Translocal leaders thus minister to regions with growing numbers of people opting-out of Church life, or knowing nothing of the Church at all. Bishops are often therefore faced with the challenge of explaining their existence and its rationale against the background of a relatively unsympathetic British media and, occasionally, an equally misunderstanding popular mindset.

This intertwining of secularity and religiosity makes the work of any Christian translocal minister in Britain highly unique, and for Catholics this uniqueness is rendered more acute by the peculiar trajectory of Catholicism having once been the established Church, before living through a period of rupture from political authority, and now in good standing with the civic order yet constitutionally separate from it. It is rare for a Catholic episcopate to operate alongside an established Protestant Church with its own diocesan structures, especially considering that many members of the Church of England consider their community to be in continuity with pre-Reformation English Christendom. To understanding the Catholic

episcopate, then, it is necessary to unpick its theological underpinnings in order to explore some key dynamics at play in this historically complex situation.

In what follows, we shall outline salient aspects of a paradigmatic presentation of episcopacy provided by the early Apostolic Father St Ignatius of Antioch, and then explore these aspects through the writings of the former bishop of Munich and Freisling, Joseph Ratzinger (later Pope Benedict XVI). Ignatius's writings often provoke certain concerns which could also apply to our contemporary situation. The first concerns are intra-ecclesial; misgivings about the immense importance which Ignatius apportions to bishops. Exploring this issue in some theological depth brings out certain core elements to the Catholic episcopate, particularly regarding its relationship with the ultimate seat of translocal (universal) leadership in the See of Rome. Exploring this vexed issue promises to help in understanding today's Catholic episcopate, particularly in relation to civil authority and other Christian traditions. The second concerns are extra-ecclesial; arising from the strongly institutional tenor of Ignatius's work. This institutional focus raises questions about the orientation taken by bishops to the world 'outside' the Church, especially in a situation of widespread secularity where the institution only has jurisdiction over a small minority, however grand its claims might be. On both the fronts just outlined, Ratzinger's writings provide resources for articulating helpful theological responses, so that contemporary Catholic translocal ministry can be brought into clear relief.

1. The Antiochene Paradigm

St Ignatius of Antioch provides a well-developed theology of the episcopate early in the Church's history.[1] While he does not spell out the key doctrine of Apostolic Succession, he does offer a remarkably full iteration of the office of bishop which remains authoritative today (he is cited far more than any other Apostolic Father in the Catechism of the Catholic Church.) [2] At first glance, Ignatius's writings seem the least likely place to look for understanding today's episcopate. His approach has long been classed as 'monarchical', suggesting close analogues with earthly, political power, for the word comes from the Greek *arche*, meaning origin or power, and *mon-*, meaning one, as in 'one of power' or ruler. By giving those charged with spiritual or supposedly divine authority a name closely related to the exercise of political authority, this monarchical approach seems guilty of just the sort of 'institutional deification'[3] which makes people suspicious of strongly hierarchical ecclesiologies. These suspicions surround the dangers of giving fallible human creatures an unwarranted authority, assuming people subject to weaknesses like greed and ambition can have a divine or pseudo-divine standing.[4]

Ignatius writes, 'the hierarchy [i.e., Church governmental structure] is the earthly copy of the government which exists in heaven'.[5] This is reminiscent of Hebrews 8's contention that the earthly temple of Jewish worship is a copy or shadow of the heavenly sanctuary. There is thus, for Ignatius, a clear continuity between heavenly and earthly realities, and the Church is the focus and mirror of heavenly realities on earth. He takes this continuity to astonishing levels. Specific offices within earthly ecclesial structures are analogues or types of divine life itself. For the Greek Fathers, the word *episkopos* was of course immediately recognisable as meaning 'overseer'. The omniscient God is of course the ultimate *episkopos*, and so, for Ignatius, an earthly *episkopos* stands in an analogous position to none other than the all-seeing Father himself, who 'watches over all who love him' (Ps 145.20). This is a typological approach of the sort common in premodern Scriptural interpretation, but here being applied to concrete ecclesial realities. The Father is the

typos (type, model, or pattern) for each individual bishop. Confusingly, Ignatius also closely associates the office of bishop to the person of Christ, whom he describes similarly as 'the *episkopos* (bishop) of all'.[6] In this vein, one commentator links Ignatius's mention of the man Onesimus as the Ephesian's 'bishop in the flesh', as implying there is 'another Bishop who is not in the flesh'.[7]

Interrelating the types of both Father and Son in the office of bishop becomes less confusing by considering that Ignatius operates with a complex scheme of interrelationity and interdependence – a perichoretic indwelling, if you will - between believers and the ecclesial hierarchy, and between humanity and God. He considers that the bishop must submit to God, as Christ submitted to the will of the Father, just as members of the Church must submit to their bishop, who stands as *typos* of the Father in their respective imitation of Christ. In this way, the bishop himself imitates Christ in his submission to the all-seeing *episkopos* of the Father, and then operates as a type of the Father in his flock's submission to his ecclesial oversight. Ignatius makes frequent use of the New Testament term *Upotasso*, meaning submission or obedience to another, but he puts it in the middle-passive participle, so it exhibits a dual reference, to both the bishop and to those obedient to him.[8] Calling to mind Christ's words as he grapples with submitting to the Father's will ('let this cup pass from me' [Matt 26.39]), we encounter a Eucharistic dimension. Imitating Christ's submission, the bishop is passed the chalice of Christ's blood, giving him the authority to pass this on to his flock, whose own submission grants their communion with Christ's sacrificial offering. With this background, we can glimpse the theology behind the authoritarian-sounding statements for which Ignatius is well-known, such as 'the Lord did nothing without the Father, […] so you must not do anything without the bishop'.[9]

Another important Scriptural locus for interpreting Ignatius is found in the Johannine farewell discourses. Here, Jesus pleads with the Father for the disciples to be graced with participation in the mutual indwelling of the Father and the Son; 'that they may be one, as we are one' (John 17.22). For a Greek-speaking audience, a title like *mon-archos* would have an immediate theological application, because unity (or oneness) with the bishop enables one to share in God's Trinitarian unity or oneness, the oneness between Father and Son. *Monarchos* thus means unity with the origin, beginning, or source (*arche*) of divine life. This Trinitarian oneness was fully articulated at Nicea in 325, with the statement that Christ and the Spirit share the same divine nature (*ousia*) as the Father, being *homousious*, 'of one substance' with him. This is where one should look to discern the significance of Church unity and doctrinal homogeneity for Ignatius and the subsequent Catholic tradition. Aidan Nichols states, '[a] bishop's job is to preserve his community within the greater unity of the whole Church',[10] and this unity extends even to the ultimate unity of the Godhead itself, which is the exemplar and ground of ecclesial unity under authority, in Greek *ex-ousia*, a 'coming forth' from God's nature.

Ignatius's monarchialism provokes strong reactions, and this might well be the case for this volume's ecumenical readership. For simplicity, we can group common reservations around the challenges of navigating two particular issues with ecclesiastical power. The first of these is *intra*-ecclesial. On this front, many readers involved in Christian ministry might consider Ignatius's words about a homogenous indwelling of the *episkopi* and God at best optimistic or at worst, severely naïve. Commentators feel uneasy about divine typology applying to historical subjects, insofar as any earthly power, or power at least wielded 'on' earth, could be appropriated for some form of denominational triumphalism.[11] Such reservations invariably turn to the status

awarded to one particular bishop, the bishop of Rome. Seeking to understand this status, brings us to one of the most divisive touchstones in Christianity, which is particularly relevant here given the troubled British history.

The second set of reservations are *extra*-ecclesial, pointing to the tension between a Church of 'institutional deification' and the world outside it. In a society where Church membership is on a marked downward trend, and a secular mindset, while not fully definitive, is still widespread and influential, one of the sticking-points for many in viewing Catholicism is the strong sense of Church authority. This is especially when that authority speaks out on deeply counter cultural issues, like maintaining ordination is for males only, resisting the British government's legal redefinition of marriage in 2013, and the neuralgic debates around abortion. On issues like these, episcopal authority is often represented as a juridical form of governance looming menacingly in the background. There is thus tension between a society predicated to some degree on personal and individual autonomy, with a seemingly ancient and outdated model of obedience and submission to a corporate teaching authority. If power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely, Ignatian episcopal monarchialism seems rather worrying.

2. More Recent Reflections

2.1 Intra-ecclesial Dynamics

Taking-up the gauntlet thrown by Ignatius, let us now gather resources to enable us to tackle the issues outlined above. Joseph Ratzinger's work offers certain distinctions which show that episcopal power is in fact limited. Studying this limitation necessitates a discussion of the Papacy, which is particularly important given the peculiarities of the British situation. The first step is to outline Ratzinger's position that, during Ignatius's time, *episkopi* were not necessarily translocal in the sense of having an office which pertains in all places, but often only had jurisdiction in a particular region. Ratzinger points out that the Biblical expression 'twelve apostles' (REFS) includes two distinct terms. The first, 'the twelve', was 'simply an eschatological symbol of the restoration of God's people', a connection with 'the final restoration of the twelve tribes' of Israel.[12] With the emergence of the second term 'apostles', however, Ratzinger argues that the twelve are 'no longer limited to the Jewish people', for an apostle is 'sent forth to all the corners of the world'.[13] Universal translocality is intrinsically linked with apostleship. Ratzinger gives St Paul as an example, claiming he never had oversight ('was never the bishop') of 'any particular place'.[14] He then argues that after the Apostolic Age (dates), the office of bishop was initially distinct from apostolic office, meaning it was a local office. It is perhaps the last of the original apostles dying out that caused their missionary mandate (Matt 28.18-20) to be handed-over to their successors. From that point, we read, bishops 'have concern […] for the Church as whole spread throughout the world'.[15] This is the origin of the Apostolic Succession, the passing on of Christ's teaching to specific individuals, the overseers who now both manage local affairs and participate in the translocal apostolic mandate. Those who receive this mandate thus make up the college of bishops, or *collegium*, which 'has taken the place of the *collegium* of the apostles'. The collegium points to the profound interconnection of the bearers of these offices with each other. Someone could only rightly be called an apostle if the message proclaimed was the same truth proclaimed by the other apostles, and so an 'apostle had his function by belonging to others who together with him formed the apostolic community'. Interdependence is thus a key aspect to episcopal office, for it defines how, today, 'each bishop has his office only by belonging

to the *collegium*'.[1] As put by *Lumen Gentium*, 'one is constituted a member of the Episcopal body in virtue of […] hierarchical communion with the head and members of the body'. (22)

Bringing the vexed issue of the papacy into view, Ratzinger notes the *collegium* is not the only instance of an office of succession in the early Church. He claims that there is another distinct office imparted from Jesus Christ to St Peter. The two offices of 'the twelve' and 'the apostles' intermingle in the disciples, but with Peter a third office is bestowed: 'the rock'. Like 'the twelve' this is linked to the symbolism of Israel (cf. 2 Sam 22.3; Ps 18.2;). In Catholic tradition Peter is essentially a leader of the twelve, based not only on the classical (but contentious) reading of Matthew 16.18., but also in episodes like that in Acts 1.15-26, where his decision-making seems authoritative over his other apostolic brethren. St John Chrysostom comments that this passage 'shows the degree of his authority'.[16] Ratzinger also draws attention to the fact that particular eminence was given by early Christians to those Sees with an apostolic origin, of which three were considered Petrine: Antioch, Alexandra and Rome, with Rome as preeminent, being the site of Peter's martyrdom. As early as Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, according to Ratzinger, the ecclesial authority of Rome has a normative role, in measuring 'the standard of the authentic apostolic tradition as a whole'.[17]

The issue of Petrine succession, and its normative priority, is at the core of intra-ecclesial reservations to monarchical approaches to the episcopate. This is because it restrains the apparently limitless power of bishops, yet does so by giving authority to one particular bishop in a way which proves unacceptable to other Christian traditions. It thereby demarcates a key identity marker of the Catholic episcopate, particularly in the British context. This also applies, arguably, to other faiths. This is because Petrine pre-eminence seems to be an instance of precisely the sort of audacious thinking about the proximity of humanity and God that is at root in the scandal of the Incarnation (1 Cor).

To survey into the rationale behind Petrine primacy, let us first consider Karl Heim's point that, '[j]ust as Peter belongs to the company of the apostles and at the same time assumes a special role within it, so too the successor of Peter is in the *communio* of the college of bishops'.(661-2 n64). That is, the Petrine office resides in the global episcopal *collegium*, not outside it. Similarly, Ratzinger states that the episcopate and the 'primacy' 'are intrinsically linked', that 'there cannot be one without the other' (p. IBID). Heribert Schauf gives the image of 'an ellipse with two foci, primacy and episcopate', to characterise this complex relationship (665 n.73). In this sense, we read, 'the Lord himself established [the rock] both *beside* and *together* with the office of the 'twelve' [the *collegium*]' (665 n. 75). Petrine authority is therefore actually limited. Ratzinger argues that the division it represents from much of Christendom results from the 'confusion and mixture of three distinct functions enjoyed by the pope' (p. 666). These functions are (i) the bishop of the diocese of Rome (ii) Patriarch of the Latin Church (iii) 'holder of the office of the Rock' established by Jesus. (p. 666-7 n.82). It is only the third of these which is of 'divine right' and provides primacy over other bishops, it is only this which succeeds from Peter himself. As bishop and patriarch, the pope 'stands not over, but next to' his peers (p. 668 n.85). The 'supreme apostolic authority over the whole Church' (p. 668-9) is not something to be wielded willy-nilly by meddling in local affairs, but pertains in its fullness only in particular statements which will fulfil certain conditions. These are statements which are made '*ex cathedra*' (with the full authority of the office of the rock) and which apply to matters of faith and morals.

[1] DeClue p. 655 n40 quote

What the pope says about, say, political matters (not faith and morals), in a setting which does not invoke his supreme office (like a newspaper interview, or synodal position paper), is the voice of a bishop and patriarch, and not normatively authoritative in an ultimate sense.[18]

Nonetheless, Papal proclamation fulfilling the two conditions just outlined limits the *collegium* of bishops. Petrine Primacy requires that bishops must be in alignment with the Pope on issues of faith and morals promulgated *ex cathedra*. That is, only in communion with Rome is the 'oneness' of the *mon-archos* as universally translocal overseer guaranteed. Communion with Rome provides universality, or better, catholicity. Ratzinger writes, '[o]nly communion with Rome gives [the bishops] Catholicity and that fullness of apostolicity without which they would not be true bishops'.(p. 661-2) The imitation of the divine life of Ignatius's typological approach is not therefore without theological rationale, even if this rationale will of course not sit easily with members of other traditions. But its description should help our understanding of Catholic episcopacy in the religiously plural British context, and also its unsettled history. This issue has long been mentioned in relation to tensions between Catholic bishops and civil authority, insofar as it seems render Papal authority supreme over the state. But this should not be the case except in highly exceptional circumstances (if civil authority enforces some practice antithetical to a Catholic teaching on faith and morals proclaimed *ex cathedra*). This point was therefore not fully understood by people like John Locke, or William Blackstone, who complained that Catholics had 'principles' of their religion that 'extend to a subversion of the civil government'. If they wanted to be 'upon the footing of good subjects' he said, they must 'renounce the supremacy of the pope'.[19]

2.2 Extra-ecclesial Dynamics

The second set of reservations raise the question of how episcopal office can and should relate to the world outside the Church, in and for which it operates and functions. This is particularly pressing today, due to the place given to personal autonomy and individual decision making in the contemporary mindset. Ignatius's language of submission and suchlike, is unlikely to carry much traction with 21st Century readers for whom 'submission' sounds dangerously close to oppression, or even totalitarianism. There is also here a real danger of exclusivism by investing translocal leaders with immense authority on the basis of a supposedly heightened proximity to God, against the background of widespread secularism. This threatens to make the business of being a bishop something which works only against the world, and focused on opposition to, and correction of, the populace within a diocesan jurisdiction.

In assessing whether the office of bishop in contemporary Britain is inevitably exclusivist, Ratzinger again provides valuable resources. Exclusivism tends to heteronomous authority, to a jealous guarding of ecclesial power thought to trump any misgivings centered in personal judgement and autonomy. Ratzinger tackles this problem by demonstrating that the dichotomy between individual autonomy on the one hand, and collective (Church) heteronomy on the other, is actually not the most accurate way to approach matters. For Ignatius, both the bishop and the flock stand under the same command for 'submission'. Similarly, Ratzinger argues that not only members of the flock, but indeed all humanity, stand ultimately under God's authority. Now, of course, few in a deeply secularised society might explicitly recognise or acknowledge that authority in a confessionally religious sense, but the crucial point is that

Ratzinger maintains that humanity is always orientated toward truth; committed atheist and Christian alike. Ratzinger considers that truth converges on human experience through the conscience, which he defines as an innate orientation to truth embedded in human subjectivity, yet something which can only encounter the fullness of truth in the revelation of Jesus Christ (John 14.6).

Ratzinger uses this insight to explore important aspects to being a bishop. He does so by seeking not to lapse into either making individual human conscience an ultimate authority over Church teaching, nor make Church authority a heteronomous imposition from some merely external institution. When Church teaching is at variance from the great swathes of the populace, the issue is not a dichotomy between individual judgements and institutional authority, but between two different forms of conscience: the individual conscience, and the collective, ecclesial conscience. This distinction arose in Ratzinger's writing when Catholic Church teaching on artificial contraception codified in the document *Humanae Vitae* in 1968?. The problematic reception of this document led to a newspaper statement by the West German Bishops Conference, which agreed with the official teaching, but stated that regarding those who disagree, 'a responsible decision made in conscience must be respected by all'.[20] This deeply concerned Ratzinger, insofar as it seemed to push the respect of individual conscience (well-established in Catholic doctrine, cf. ???) to the point of implying individual judgements of conscience supersede Church teaching. But Ratzinger does not respond by simply imposing Church authority on people. Rather, he presents such difficulties as essentially a conflict of differing consciences, an individual struggle to accept the teaching, and an ecclesial call to adhere to it. By approaching the issue in this way, Ratzinger gives us two key facets for understanding the role of a bishop in the face of increasing secularisation.

The first facet is the bishop's own interiority, and the second, his activities vis-à-vis the world. In the first place, Catholic tradition holds that Church teaching succeeds continuously from the apostles, and develops through history by the ongoing articulation of Christ's revelation in the lives of the Church's historical subjects. It is thus the sedimentation of human experience, of people unearthing hitherto hidden riches and insights (cf. ALL ITS RICHNESS) of the revelation first given definitively in the Scriptures, hence the term for tradition; 'deposit of faith' (*depositum fidei*). Uncovering new dimensions of this revelation for novel historical circumstances, or speaking out to enforce aspects of it threatened by new developments in the world, or discerning how best to transmit that teaching today, are therefore things bishops must do through the cultivation of their consciences. That is, through attuning their own orientations to truth to the fullness of truth in Jesus, Christ as 'truth as person',[21] and the witness of that truth held to proceed through history in the Church.

Those charged with the authority to speak out, and make pronouncements through synods and conferences, must adopt a marked interior attentiveness, enabling them to hear and respond to the conscience of the Church as best as possible. In this sense, the rootedness of the bishop in prayer is absolutely central. Bishops are called to place their own inclinations to one side, and to seek to encounter the truth as fully and as accurately as possible. Collective decision making by bishops, then, should not about campaigning and politicking, but about working together from an interior disposition of readiness to be addressed by God through conscience. As Ratzinger states, 'conscience is the place where faith dwells' and so 'conscience of faith' must be 'formed to be open from within, alert and listening'.[22] Synod and conference gatherings of

bishops are significant, says Ratzinger, as a means by which bishops' consciences can be informed through hearing God's Word 'distinctly', not about 'lots of decisions and position papers'. The work of collective decision making, then, is about making 'consciences clearer and thus more free on the basis of truth'. The discussion between bishops at these events should therefore be envisaged as an 'effort of communal listening', and also speaking, or rather, an 'emergence and verbalisation of the truth that is already present in conscience'.[23] In this sense, bishops are 'servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God' (1 Cor. 4:1; LG 21)

The second consequence of Ratzinger's focus on differentiating individual and ecclesial conscience affects bishops' relations with the world, with the people inhabiting their translocal jurisdictions. One need not overlabour the point that individual consciences are often not aligned with Church teaching, and that society frequently adopts directions which seem antithetical to Christ's self-revelation. But the job of a bishop in such situations is not to impose Christ's teaching, as such. Rather, a bishop is seen as seeking to cultivate a society in which individual consciences are well-formed, and given the means to make good moral decisions: forming people to be orientated to the truth which only finds its proper home in Jesus. This helps to explain the operational realities with which bishops expend much of their time, particularly on Catholic education, which is focused particularly on forming people in their personhood. It also contributes some of the rationale behind working with domestic and international aid agencies, in keeping with Dietrich Bonhoeffer's statement that 'If the hungry do not come to faith, the guilt falls on those who denied them bread'.[24] Ensuring optimum conditions for the proper cultivation of conscience, enabling others to be alert, attentive and responsive to truth, is therefore at the heart of the bishop's calling as 'teacher', calling to mind the common pre-conciliar term for the episcopate: *ecclesia docens*, or 'teaching Church'.[25] This final aspect of the episcopal calling is highly important given the widespread secularity of our contemporary British situation.

---

[1] For key doctrinal documents on the Catholic episcopate, see *Lumen Gentium* chapter III, *Christus Dominus*, and the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* 2nd ed. (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1999), §§874-896. For Ignatius of Antioch on the episcopate, see particularly his letter to the Ephesians and to Polycarp, in William R. Schoedel, *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985). For a discussion on the episcopate in the full Ignatian corpus, see Kevin M. Clarke, '*"Being Bishoped by" God: The Theology of the Episcopacy According to St. Ignatius of Antioch',* Nova et Vetera*,* Volume 14, Number 1, Winter 2016, pp. 227-243.

[2] Clarke, p. 240 n43

[3] Ibid., p. 230 n17

[4] cf. Terence L. Nichols, *That All May Be One: Hierarchy and Participation in the Church*, (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1997), p. 4 and p. 97, which claims 'we [...] see [in Ignatius] the "capturing" of the activity of the Spirit by the bishop, and the equation of the bishop with Christ'

[5] John Lawson, *A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961), p. 121

[6] Ignatius, Magnesians 3.1, Schoedel, p. 108

[7] Clarke p. 237, quote from Ignatius, Ephesians 1, Schoedel, p. 40

[8] Clarke, p. 223

[9] From Ignatius, Magnesians 7.1, Schoedel p. 116. The full clause continues "and the presbyters". I have left to one side the question of where priests or presbyters fit into this scheme.

[10] Aidan Nichols, O.P., *The Thought of Benedict XVI: An Introduction to the Theology of Joseph Ratzinger* (New York: Burns & Oates, 2005), p. 247

[11] cf. T. L. Nichols, p. 4 'a misunderstanding of hierarchy as domination has (1) resulted in the factioning of the Body of Christ into different denominations, (2) led to a loff of credibility and to decline in modern Catholicism'

[12] Joseph Ratzinger, 'The Pastoral Implications of Episcopal Collegiality,' in *Concilium*, vol. 1: The Church and Mankind (Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1965), p. 40

[13] Richard G. DeClue, 'Primacy and Collegiality in the Works of Joseph Ratzinger', *Communio: International Catholic Review*, Vol. 35.4 (Winter 2008): pp. 642-670, p. 645
[14] Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith: The Church as Communion*, trans. Henry Taylor (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005), p. 188
[15] DeClue, p. 652
[16] St John Chrysostom, Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles 3, quoted in *The Navarre Bible: Acts of the Apostles*, trans. Michael Adams, (Dublin, Ireland: Four Courts Press, 1989), p. 37
[17] Ratzinger, *Called to Communion*, p. 69
[18] These conditions are articulated in the Apostolic Constitution *Ineffabilis Deus* from 1854
[19] William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Bl. Comm. IV, c.4 ss. iii.2, p. 54, https://www.gutenberg.org/files/30802/30802-h/30802-h.htm
[20] D. Vincent Twomey, *Pope Benedict XVI: The Conscience of Our Age: A Theological Portrait* (San Francisco: Ignatius Pres), 2007), pp. 20-1
[21] For a discussion of Pope Benedict's papal motto ('co-worker in truth'), see Pope Benedict XVI and Peter Seewald, *Last Testament: in his own words*, trans Jacob Phillips, (London: Bloomsbury), 2016, p. 241
[22] Joseph Ratzinger, 'The Structure and Task of the Synod of Bishops', in Lieven Boeve and Gerard Mannion (eds), *The Ratzinger Reader*, (London: T&T Clark, 2010), pp. 201-207, p. 207
[23] Ibid.
[24] Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Bonhoeffer Works Volume 6: Ethics*, (Minneapolis; Fortress Press, 2005), p. 163
[24] As discussed in John C. Heenan, 'A Glance at the Position of the Roman Catholic Church' in William Glyn Hughes Simon (ed), *Bishops*, (London: The Faith Press, 1962) pp. 67-75, p. 67

Bibliography

Catechism of the Catholic Church 2nd ed. (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1999)

The Navarre Bible: Acts of the Apostles, trans. Michael Adams, (Dublin, Ireland: Four Courts Press, 1989)

Blackstone, William, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Project Gutenberg Ebook Commentaries, [Online]

Boeve, Lieven and Gerard Mannion (eds), *The Ratzinger Reader*, (London: T&T Clark) 2010

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, *Bonhoeffer Works Volume 6: Ethics*, (Minneapolis; Fortress Press, 2005)

Clarke, Kevin M., '*"Being Bishoped by" God: The Theology of the Episcopacy According to St. Ignatius of Antioch',* Nova et Vetera*,* Volume 14, Number 1, Winter 2016, pp. 227-243

DeClue, Richard G., 'Primacy and Collegiality in the Works of Joseph Ratzinger', *Communio: International Catholic Review*, Vol. 35.4 (Winter 2008)

Lawson, John, *A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961)

Nichols, O.P., Aidan, *The Thought of Benedict XVI: An Introduction to the Theology of Joseph Ratzinger* (New York: Burns & Oates, 2005)

Nichols, Terence L., *That All May Be One: Hierarchy and Participation in the Church*, (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1997)

Ratzinger, Joseph, 'The Pastoral Implications of Episcopal Collegiality,' in *Concilium*, vol. 1: The Church and Mankind (Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1965)

Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal, *Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith: The Church as Communion*, trans. Henry Taylor (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005)

Schoedel, William R., *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985)

Simon, William Glyn Hughes Simon (ed), *Bishops*, (London: The Faith Press, 1962)

Twomey, Vincent D., *Pope Benedict XVI: The Conscience of Our Age: A Theological Portrait* (San Francisco: Ignatius Pres), 2007)