

IN PERSONA CHRISTI

Last year I undertook to respond to Dennis M. Ferrara's article in *Theological Studies* on the meaning of the formula *in persona Christi*.¹ Since that time, with the publication of his second essay,² my response to both, and his response to mine,³ I have gained a clearer idea of his position and been confirmed in my own. I welcome this chance for dialogue. My plan is to dispute two points in Ferrara's interpretation of St. Thomas Aquinas, indicate some troublesome consequences of his apophatic theory, and sketch out an argument from fittingness based on the nuptial analogy.

FERRARA'S INTERPRETATION OF ST. THOMAS

Regarding the teaching of St. Thomas, I wish to take up two points. First, Ferrara maintains that St. Thomas explicitly excludes the need for sexual correspondence between Christ and the ministers of his sacraments. He argues from the principle of instrumental causality, but chiefly from the fact that a woman can baptize in the case of emergency. In this case, the sex of the minister does not enter into the constitution of the sign. Thomas explains that since Christ is the chief baptizer, and in him there is neither male nor female (Gal 3:28), a woman as well as a lay man can baptize.⁴

Ferrara, like many others,⁵ concludes that since a woman can act by the power of Christ, she can act *in persona Christi*. He assumes these to be identical. But Thomas distinguishes the two⁶; he calls a woman who administers baptism

¹"Representation or Self-Effacement: The Axiom *In Persona Christi* in St. Thomas and the Magisterium," *Theological Studies* 56 (June 1994) 195-224.

²"The Ordination of Women: Tradition and Meaning," *Theological Studies* 55 (1994) 706-19.

³"Quaestio Disputata: In Persona Christi," *Theological Studies* 56 (March 1995) 61-91.

⁴Therefore, just as a layman can baptize as Christ's minister, so can a woman (*Summa theologiae* 3, q. 67, a. 4 c). Christ can use as his instrument one who uses the proper form and intends to do what the Church does (*Summa theologiae* 3, q. 67, a. 5 ad 2).

⁵Most critics overlook it. See, e.g., Eric Doyle, "The Question of Women Priests and the Argument *In Persona Christi*," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 50 (1983-1984) 212-21.

⁶For Thomas's distinction between acting "by the power" and "in the person" of Christ, see A.-M. Roguet, *Saint Thomas D'Aquin, Somme Théologique, L'Eucharistie* (Paris: Desclée & Cie, 1960) 1:393-405, at 398; and A.-G. Martimort, "The Value of a Theological Formula 'In persona Christi'," in *The Order of Priesthood: Nine Commentar-*

a "minister of Christ," a title he also uses of a lay man and even of an unbeliever who would administer baptism in an emergency. It is possible to act, then, "by the power of Christ" (and therefore, as "minister" of Christ") without acting *in persona Christi*. This is a distinction taken for granted by the Declaration *Inter insigniores* and its Commentary. *Inter insigniores* teaches that the symbolic correspondence of sex is required only "in actions which demand the character of ordination and in which Christ himself, the author of the Covenant, the Bridegroom and Head of the Church, is represented, exercising his ministry of salvation."⁷ I conclude that Thomas's principle of instrumental causality, applied to the sacramental minister, does not positively exclude a representation of Christ which involves sexual correspondence; it only shows that such symbolic correspondence is not always necessary.

This example is important because it points out that the consecration of the Eucharist *in persona Christi* requires something over and above the ministerial instrumentality required for baptism.

My second point concerns Ferrara's view that the priest, in his role as eucharistic celebrant, does not "represent" Christ at all, but instead "effaces himself" before Christ, a view that leads to his apophatic interpretation.⁸ I maintain that, for St. Thomas, the priest, acting *in persona Christi*, enters into the sacramental sign of the Eucharist; he serves not only as Christ's instrument (that is, by his power) but as his representative sign.

I find support for my position in the question, "Whether the consecration of this sacrament belongs to the priest alone?"⁹ Thomas considers two possible objections: (1) since the words are the form, whoever pronounces them effects the sacrament; and (2) a lay person united with Christ by faith and charity is competent to consecrate the Eucharist, for "every holy person is a priest." In the body of the article, St. Thomas teaches that because of its special dignity this sacrament is effected only as "in the person of Christ." The power of consecrating in the person of Christ is conferred on a priest at his ordination, when he joins the ranks of those to whom the Lord said "Do this in memory of me." In response to the objections, he asserts that power to consecrate the Eucharist lies not only in Christ's words of institution, but also in "the power delivered to the

ies on the Vatican Decree *Inter Insigniores* (Huntington IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1978) 85-97 at 92-94.

⁷Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Declaration on the Question of the Admission of Women to the Ministerial Priesthood* (Washington DC: U.S.C.C., 1977) art. 5.

⁸In this, he is consciously challenging the position of *Inter Insigniores*: "The Christian priesthood is therefore of a sacramental nature: the priest is a sign, the supernatural effectiveness of which comes from the ordination received, but a sign that must be perceptible and which the faithful must be able to recognize with ease" (art. 5).

⁹*Summa theologiae* 3, q. 82, a. 1.

priest" at his ordination.¹⁰ The instrumentality is not just in words of consecration but also *in the person who speaks them*.

In the other sacraments, the form is pronounced by the minister speaking in his own person,¹¹ but in this one "the form is pronounced *as in the person of Christ himself speaking*."¹² Ferrara picks up on the difference—the "mere utterance of the words of Christ"—without paying sufficient attention to the indispensability of an ordained priest.¹³ Others can quote the words of Christ; he alone can pronounce them by signifying, by making the sign. He says "this" with reference to what lies before him, and this bread and wine become Christ's Body and Blood. He says "my," and it is Christ who speaks in him. In his mouth, these words really accomplish here and now, with respect to these elements, what they signify.¹⁴

Elsewhere Thomas clearly links the pronunciation of the words with being Christ's image. Just as "the celebration of this sacrament is a definite *image* representing Christ's Passion, which is his true sacrifice," he writes, so the "the priest also bears Christ's *image*, in whose person and by whose power he pronounces the words of consecration."¹⁵ The priest himself, then, enters into the constitution of the sacramental sign by taking Christ's role.

ASSESSMENT OF FERRARA'S APOPHATIC INTERPRETATION

Ferrara's apophatic interpretation of acting *in persona Christi* virtually eliminates the embodied reality of the priest; at best, his voice is heard. The priest's difference (or nonidentity, or radical otherness) from Christ, he claims, constitutes the *sacramentum tantum Eucharistiae*.¹⁶ Acting *in persona Christi*, he says,

¹⁰"The consecrating virtue is not only in the words of consecration, but also in the power delivered to the priest when he is dedicated and ordained For the instrumental power lies in the several instruments through which the principal agent works" (*Summa theologiae* 3, q. 82, a. 1 ad 1; see also ad 2).

¹¹The priest as a minister of Christ pronounces the sacramental words as his own: e.g., "I baptize you." He exercises his own proper, though instrumental, activity.

¹²*Summa theologiae* 3, q. 78, a. 1.

¹³Here, Thomas moves beyond his predecessors. See B.-D. Marliangeas, *Clés pour une théologie du ministère In persona Christi In persona Ecclesiae* (Paris: Beauchesne 1978) 89-99.

¹⁴*Summa theologiae* 3, q. 78, a. 5 c.

¹⁵*Summa theologiae* 3, q. 83, a. 1c and ad 3 (my emphasis). See also *Summa theologiae* 3, q. 22, a. 4 c, where Thomas argues that just as the priest of the Old Law was a figure of Christ by anticipation, the priest of the New Law acts in his person.

¹⁶Ferrara, "Representation," 214-15. The Commentary on *Inter Insigniores* identifies the male priest as the *sacramentum tantum* (*Declaration* [Washington DC: N.C.C.B., 1977] 32).

instead of adding "some kind of representation of Christ to the priest's mere instrumentality," "reduces it to the barest minimum."¹⁷

My difficulty with his theory is that it fails to explain how the instrumentality of a priest differs from that of a baptized—or even an unbaptized—layperson. If being visibly "other" than the Lord is the only qualification, we are all candidates! If the priest's identifying qualification is his difference from Christ the Priest, what relates his activity to Christ's? Consider the consequences of this position. If in speaking the words of consecration, he does no more than quote the Lord, the elements before him are not transformed into his Body and Blood. If the priest consciously affirms historical distance, recalling the past as past in the eucharistic anamnesis, then he only commemorates the sacrifice of the cross without making it present. Again, for Thomas, the sacraments cause by signifying. If the priest is not a sacramental *sign* of Christ, the efficacy of the Eucharist belongs to Christ alone, and it remains in the past. But this reduces eucharistic worship to a simple memorial. The priest, who is without sacramental significance, is thereby left without efficacy and thus without effect here and now.¹⁸

What is missing from Ferrara's analysis is attention to the sacramental character, the *res et sacramentum*. Orders, like Baptism, is not only a transitory rite but an abiding reality. And the *res et sacramentum* is both an effect of the sacrament and a contributing factor to the making of sacraments.¹⁹ More fundamentally, what is missing from Ferrara's theory is formal attention to the sacrament of Orders. Since only a priest is competent to speak the words of consecration, analysis of the ritual event must include him. The signification of the sacramental words in the Eucharist, in fact, is causally linked to the significance of the person who speaks them. The ordained priest functions not only by the power but in the person of Christ—as Thomas says—"whose role he plays by the power of Holy Orders."²⁰ The active presence of Christ as the host of a meal at which others are guests, and as the one who gives himself in an act of sacrifice, is made visible in the person of the priest.²¹

But does this visibility require the symbolic correspondence of sex? Certainly it is the character of Orders, not maleness, that makes the priest

¹⁷Ferrara, "Representation," 205. Ferrara offers this purely instrumental understanding as an alternative to what he believes to be a naive and even blasphemous representationalism (212-13, 219-23).

¹⁸Such is the reasoning of Donald J. Keefe, "Sacramental Sexuality and the Ordination of Women," *Communio* 5 (1978) 228-51, at 238-40.

¹⁹Liam G. Walsh, *The Sacraments of Initiation* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1989) 61. "The interconnectedness of the sacraments can sometimes require a competence in the minister that is given by a prior sacrament. This arises when the signification of the sacramental words and actions depends on the significance of the person who says and does them, and he gets that signification from another sacrament" (*ibid.*, 60).

²⁰*Summa theologiae* 3, q. 83, a. 7 ad 3; 3, q. 82, a. 1 ad 1.

²¹Walsh, *Sacraments of Initiation*, 242-43; see also 278-79.

Christ's representative. The character (*res et sacramentum*), however, is spiritual and invisible. On the level of the sign (*sacramentum tantum*) the priest must both have received ordination and take the part of Christ.²² The natural resemblance between the sign and what is signified is, according to St. Thomas, not constitutive of a sacrament. It is, however, a condition for sacramental signs to signify.²³ On the basis of this analysis, I believe it can be argued that a baptized male is the fitting "sacrament" (*sacramentum tantum*) for signifying and thus bringing about the reality (*res*), that is, the active presence of Christ the Head and Bridegroom of the Church, in those sacraments which require the character (*sacramentum et res*) of priestly ordination.²⁴

AN ARGUMENT FROM FITTINGNESS BASED ON THE NUPTIAL ANALOGY

Thomas Aquinas did not explicitly coordinate his view that the priest is Christ's sacramental sign with his judgment that the female sex is an impediment to receiving Orders.²⁵ He begins, rather, from the premise that women are in a state of subjection and are therefore unable to signify public eminence in the natural order ("eminence of degree"); from this he concludes that women are unable to receive the sacrament which signifies preeminence in the ecclesial community, Holy Orders.²⁶ Today, the magisterium has rejected Thomas's faulty anthropological premise,²⁷ but continues to insist that being female is an impediment to priestly ordination. Why? Even if this judgment is grounded in the will of Christ and the unanimous witness of the tradition, what fittingness or meaningfulness can this arrangement have? Is its meaning still related to the sacramental signification of sexuality, and if so, how?

The argument from fittingness which the magisterium has offered—some of it in the form of a "meditation" on the sacramental significance of sexual differentiation—invokes the analogy of marriage, the nuptial relation of Christ

²²Commentary, *Declaration* (Washington DC: U.S.C.C., 1977) 32.

²³See Christopher Kiesling, "Aquinas on Persons' Representation in Sacraments," in *Women Priests: A Catholic Commentary on the Vatican Declaration*, ed. Leonard Swidler and Arlene Swidler (New York: Paulist, 1977) 254-55. Kiesling points out that maleness is not the basis, but only the condition for constituting a person as Christ's representative image in the priesthood.

²⁴Baptism configures both male and female believers to Christ, so it seems to follow that some additional condition or characteristic, in fact, a "natural resemblance," is required to signify Christ in this particular relationship to the Church.

²⁵There remains the possibility that he thought it too obvious to mention. Stray references, such as the comparison of the bishop to Christ as Bridegroom (*Summa theologiae Suppl.* q. 40, a. 4 ad 4; *SCG* 4.76.7) suggest as much.

²⁶See *Summa theologiae* 3, q. 65, a. 1; *ST Suppl.* q. 39, a. 3 ad 4.

²⁷Pope John Paul II, *Mulieris Dignitatem* (August 1988) arts. 10 and 24; *Inter Insigniores*, art. 5.

the Bridegroom to the Church, his Bride.²⁸ I will sketch out one way in which this nuptial analogy affords some insight into the fittingness of reserving priestly ordination to men.

I will presuppose that the sign value of sexuality is fundamentally relational and marital, or nuptial. The meaning of being male and female is discovered not by considering man and woman independently, standing side by side, but by considering them in face-to-face encounter, as made "for" one another, as "ordered to" one another. Sexual symbolism, then, accentuates the irreducible difference of the two ways of being embodied persons in a common humanity. This difference, however, is not antagonistic, but is the condition for marital communion, a reciprocal gift of self which gives rise to new life.

The nuptial analogy has long been used to express the relation of Christ and the Church. The famous elaboration in Ephesians 5, is the primary New Testament source, but it only carries forward the Old Testament image of a maritally structured Covenant between God and the Chosen People. The image of salvation—communion with God—is the Covenant, the "two-in-one-flesh" relation of bridegroom and bride.

By contrast with other New Testament analogies—Christ as Head and Church as Body, or Christ as Shepherd and Church as Flock—nuptial symbolism highlights what may be considered the "interpersonal" character of the Christ-Church relationship.²⁹ Unlike "Body" or "Flock," this image compares the community of the redeemed to a person, a woman, a Bride. Like Israel, the Church as Bride is, of course, a collective, feminine symbol. Christ as Bridegroom, however, is actually, not just symbolically, a man; so Bridegroom is a sex-specific image in the concrete.

The "one flesh" of the New Covenant results from the communion of two (Eph 5:31-32).³⁰ This I take to be the primary focus of the comparison. This analogy requires and preserves the distinction of subjects and calls to mind their irreducible difference. It reveals the driving force of the relationship as love, a free gift of self. And it is characterized by mutuality and reciprocity. The New Covenant which the Bridegroom instituted with the sacrifice of the Cross requires the Bride's response. Just as there is no marriage without both bridegroom and bride, so there is no New Covenant without covenant partners. This underlines a typically Catholic emphasis on the active contribution of the Church, first

²⁸*Inter Insigniores*, art. 5; *Mulieris Dignitatem*, arts. 25-27; *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, arts. 22-23. St. Thomas's contemporary, St. Bonaventure, appealed to the nuptial relationship between Christ and the Church to explain why Orders is reserved to men, making explicit the assumption that the priest must be male because he represents Christ who is male.

²⁹See my "The Priest as Sacrament of Christ the Bridegroom," *Worship* 66 (November 1992) 498-517, at 509-12, for a fuller discussion of this point.

³⁰For a thorough analysis of the Covenant as the overarching motif of Christian revelation, see Donald J. Keefe, *Covenantal Theology: The Eucharistic Order of History*, 2 vols. (Lanham MD: University Press of America, 1991).

symbolized in Mary's response, as Christ's partner in mediating the mystery of redemption.³¹

Can the nuptial analogy be brought to bear on the mystery of the Eucharist? (Pope John Paul II calls it "the Sacrament of the Bridegroom and the Bride."³²) It seems plausible, since it is an ancient and prominent biblical symbol of the Covenant relation of Christ and the Church, and the Eucharist is a celebration of that Covenant. What would this mean in the concrete liturgical action of the Church at worship?

In the celebration of the Eucharist "Christ himself, the author of the Covenant, the Bridegroom and Head of the Church, is represented, exercising his ministry of salvation"³³ on behalf of the Church. The male priest gives visibility to the presence of Christ "facing" the Church as he renews sacramentally the once-for-all sacrifice of the Cross. Acting *in persona Christi* is not simply a theatrical representation, in which a male actor is required to portray a man, and a female actor, a woman. (If this were the case, men could not share in the symbolization of the Church as Bride!) The assembly gathered for the Eucharist is a *sacramental* reality, not a theater troupe. This is an organically structured, internally differentiated priestly community, within which the priest takes the role of Christ the Bridegroom vis-à-vis the other baptized who are united with Christ as his Bride. The liturgical roles are distinguished by the two ways, different in kind and not only in degree, of sharing in the priesthood of Christ.³⁴

It is possible to see a certain correlation between the mutual differentiation of roles—the common and ministerial priesthood—in the Church and the mutual differentiation or complementarity of the sexes, signified by the nuptial relation.³⁵ The sacramental signification of masculinity and femininity illuminates the distinction, loving communion, and interdependence of the two ways of sharing in Christ's priesthood.

Those who participate by virtue of priestly ordination are men who, in addition to baptism, are related in another way to Jesus Christ and, in him, to his Church. The priest (and pre-eminently, the bishop) acts *in persona Christi capitis* in the Church, making Christ visible by exercising his triple ministry, by his authority, in service to the priestly people.³⁶ He is both "in" the Church and

³¹See Monica Migliorino Miller, *Sexuality and Authority in the Catholic Church* (Scranton: University of Scranton Press, 1995) for the development of this idea.

³²*Mulieris Dignitatem*, art. 26.

³³*Inter Insigniores*, art. 5.

³⁴*Lumen Gentium* 10. See also Pope John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici* (December 1988) art. 51.

³⁵I take this to be at least a significant part of the argument from fittingness advanced by the magisterium. See John McDade, "Gender Matters: Women and Priesthood," *The Month* 255 (July 1994) 254-59, for further development of this argument.

³⁶*Lumen Gentium* 10, 21, 28; *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 33; *Presbyterorum Ordinis* 2, 6.

"for," or "in relation to" the Church as a sacramental sign of Christ the Bridegroom.³⁷ St. Augustine's comment, "For you I am a bishop, with you I am a Christian," is often cited to elucidate this point.³⁸

Those who participate by virtue of the sacraments of initiation (the "baptized") constitute the Bride. The Bride-Church is a collective subject, not an individual person, and it is a community of men and women, since the baptized are "one in Christ" without regard to difference of sex (Gal 3:28).³⁹ In the exercise of their royal priesthood, they accept the gift of Christ's love, return the love of the Church as "Bride," and mediate the gift of salvation through loving service to their neighbor.

These two ways of sharing in Christ's priesthood are ordered to one another and mutually interdependent.⁴⁰ The ministerial or hierarchical priesthood exists to serve and promote the exercise of the common priesthood. The common priesthood, through Christ's ministry mediated by the ordained and under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, is empowered to make its own indispensable contribution to the Church's holiness, worship, and mission for the salvation of the world.⁴¹ In an analogous way, the contributions of husband and wife are irreducibly distinct and equally necessary in marriage and family.

The Bridegroom-Bride analogy, then, sheds light on this internal differentiation of the priestly community. The visible, sacramental representation of Christ by the ordained priest who takes his role as Bridegroom is a reminder that the eucharistic celebration of the New Covenant both makes possible and requires the active participation of the "Bride," the royal priesthood of the baptized.

VARIATION ON THE "SUBORDINATIONIST" ARGUMENT?

I have deliberately left to one side another dimension of the nuptial analogy, the "headship" dimension. Those who have been following this discussion know that Pope John Paul II has reread the passage from Ephesians on which the nuptial analogy is based, using the opening verse, "Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ" (Eph 5:21) as the key. As presented in current papal teaching, the nuptial analogy does not presuppose a "hierarchical" model of marriage in its human analogue. In the relationship between husband and wife, the pope writes, the "subjection" is mutual, but in the relationship between Christ

³⁷Pope John Paul II, *Pastores Dabo Vobis* (1992) art. 16. Cardinal Pio Laghi, in a talk at Mundelein Seminary (April 1994), called attention to an error in the English translation: *sacerdos non tantum in Ecclesia, sed etiam erga Ecclesiam* is incorrectly rendered "the priest is placed not only in the church but also in the *forefront* of the church." It should read "but also in *relation* to the church." See arts. 16 and 22.

³⁸*Ibid.*, art. 20.

³⁹*Mulieris Dignitatem*, art. 25.

⁴⁰*Lumen Gentium* 10.

⁴¹See Pope John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici*, arts. 19-23.

and the Church the "subjection" is unilateral; it is only on the part of the Church.⁴² In other words, he distinguishes the likeness from the "unlikeness" in the analogy. The "Bride"-Church which is subject to Christ is a collective subject, a community which includes all the redeemed, men as well as women, but a woman as bride is only the *symbol* of the Church.⁴³ The real dependence of the Church on Christ does not, then, translate into support for a hierarchical relationship between the spouses, or between the sexes generally.

Ferrara asks: if the nuptial relationship is no longer understood to be hierarchically ordered, how can it signify the Christ-Church relationship, which is hierarchically ordered?⁴⁴ I venture this response: the points of comparison in the nuptial analogy are the distinction, loving communion, and mutual interdependence that characterize the relationship between Christ and the Church. This relationship is sacramentally represented when the priest takes Christ's role vis-à-vis the other baptized in the eucharistic celebration of the New Covenant, and when the baptized offer themselves to God in union with Christ and worthily receive his Body and Blood. This analogy undergirds the distinct but interdependent roles of the ministerial and the common priesthood. Considered in its nuptial dimension, this analogy does *not* point to Christ as Head and source of the Church.

Whereas the human analogue, the nuptial relationship, is not hierarchically ordered, the relationship between Christ and the Church is: it is both nuptial and hierarchical. (In Ephesians 5, the two analogies—Head-Body, Bridegroom-Bride—are interwoven.) The priest who ministers *in persona Christi capitis*—unlike the husband in Christian marriage—is called upon to exercise Christ's hierarchical authority with respect to the rest of the baptized. He has not "arrogated" this authority to himself, but has been given the apostolic charge through Holy Orders.

Only men are called to symbolize Christ the Head, that is, the *eminence* of Christ vis-à-vis the Church. The eminence symbolized, however, belongs not to men as men, as Thomas thought,⁴⁵ but only to Christ as Head of the Church and Author of the Covenant. In the sacrament of Orders, it is fitting that priests be

⁴²*Mulieris Dignitatem*, art. 24. Christ has, however, freely "subjected" himself to the Church, by loving her and giving himself up for her (Eph 5:25).

⁴³Art. 25.

⁴⁴This, I believe, is the force of Ferrara's argument that "the nuptial image, far from transcending the subordinationist framework . . . is simply a variant of it (Dennis M. Ferrara, "Reply to Sara Butler," *Theological Studies* 56 [1995] 81-91, at 87). In his earlier article he suggested that the hierarchical interpretation of acting *in persona Christi capitis* is, in the end, only "a restatement in sacramental terms of the traditional subordinationist argument against the ordination of women" ("Representation," 217).

⁴⁵For Thomas this reflected the divine plan of creation: the man, by reason of natural superiority, was charged with governing the woman, whose natural inferiority made her subject to him (*Summa theologiae* 1, q. 92, a. 1 ad 2).

male not because only men can signify public eminence, but in order to signify, by way of natural resemblance, "Christ himself who was and remains a man"⁴⁶ in his nuptial relationship with the Church.

In any event, the kind of "headship" or authority Christ models is a headship of self-donating love and service, of laying down his life for the beloved.⁴⁷ As feminist Christology commonly acknowledges, the maleness of Christ symbolizes at least this—the subversion of patriarchy by the example of a male Redeemer who makes a complete gift of self. Those who exercise his authority vis-à-vis the other baptized are called, by his example, to imitate his sacrificial service and to use his authority only in fidelity to the Gospel.

My argument is this: the person of the priest enters into the sacramental sign of the Eucharist in such a way that his natural resemblance to Christ by reason of maleness contributes to the signification of the redemptive relationship between Christ and the Church. This is only an argument from fittingness; it presupposes that Jesus chose twelve men and entrusted them with the "apostolic charge," associating them with himself as his representatives, and that this pattern is normative for admission to the ministerial priesthood.⁴⁸

SARA BUTLER, M.S.B.T.

Mundelein Seminary, University of St. Mary of the Lake
Mundelein, Illinois

⁴⁶*Inter Insigniores*, art. 5.

⁴⁷The "headship" of the husband is affirmed, but he does not act *in persona Christi capitis* with respect to his wife.

⁴⁸Pope John Paul II, *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* (1994) art. 2.