

Reason as the Male Burden: The Orthodox Church, the Female Nature and the Priesthood

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Johnstown, PA

Orthodox priests must be males. This is primarily because women are less rational and far more changeable than men. Women can certainly use logic as well as anyone else, but reason is not identical to logic. This has nothing to do with intelligence, but rather with emotional regulation.

One of the most pitiable sights is to read Orthodox prelates justifying a male priesthood trying with all their might to avoid offending women. It seems that the “patristic consensus” goes out the window when this issue arises. Without exception, the patristic consensus agrees with the argument presented here. Issues such as economics, usury and women show that the “traditionalists” are mostly for show, and usually aimed at basically harmless issues.

Traditionalist Orthodox writers are usually on the fringe of society. The “Cyprianites” seem to be an odd exception to the rule, with their impressive “Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies” connected with major names in American academia. Unfortunately, this comes at a price.

In his very old article on gender and the priesthood, the Cyprianite Metropolitan (then Archbishop) Chrysostom writes:

Shame, hence, to each of us who proclaims either the man or the woman superior, or pretends to know the proper role and nature of each. This is arrogance, immoderation, intellectual pomposity, and the usurpation of judgments which only God can make. In true spirituality, distinctions, both formal and informal, disappear.¹

These are the words of a coward. This is more inexcusable since “superiority” has not been mentioned by anyone defending the thesis here, though a few fathers do use the term. It is a very feminine, hyper-emotional argument very foreign to the metropolitan's general mindset. This article makes no claim about “superiority,” but only seeks to interpret facts, however inconvenient. It is common, in discussions about race and sex, to throw out the word “supremacist” for the sake of emotional impact. It also suggests the speaker has a very bad case.

This uncharacteristic outburst of emotion seems to be designed to show the system how harmless he is. A neologism for this is “virtue signaling.” He accepts the Regime consensus on most non-religious issues. He shows this emotionalism on no other topic and in no other forum. Where women are involved, men, most of the time, sound like idiots. Even for a good monk, the desire for female approval still rules. It is in our DNA.

His article says very little except that his version of the church believes in the equality of the sexes, a concept unknown not just to the fathers, but to any non-modern society. That mathematical equality could be applied to human behavior is a mockery. Claiming to shed some light onto the role of women in the church, he avoids every major issue and refuses to address

¹ Archbishop Chrysostomos of Etna (1981) “Women in the Orthodox Church: Brief Comments from a Spiritual Perspective.” *Orthodox Life* 31(1): 34-41.

the main questions he promises to answer.

Chrysostomos, wisely, refuses to cite sources, another uncharacteristic trait. Granted, this article was done many years ago, long before feminism dominated the mind of males absolutely. It is hence even less excusable, but there is little doubt he would defend it today. The Metropolitan writes:

Indeed, both of these arguments regarding women are faulty. In the first place, there is nothing at all truly “traditional” about assigning a certain “nature” to women. True it is, many of the great ascetic Fathers warn monks about the wiles of Eve that exist in the female character, but the counterpart of this is the submission of the male counterpart of Adam in sinning monks. Yet in no sense do we attribute to males a certain “nature,” as such, which defines their social roles.

Not a syllable of this is true. This is one of the most incorrect set of statements this writer has ever read. The entire ancient method of thought was based around such natures. John Chrysostom writes in his “The Kind of Women to be Taken as Wives,” that “God maintained the order of each sex by dividing the business of life into two parts, and assigned the more necessary and beneficial aspects to the man and the less important, inferior matter to the woman.” St. John, the metropolitan's namesake, not only are there specific natures, but they correspond with specific functions within society.

“But a Companion was made for him, one with a *nature* far different from his as the moon is from the Sun.” Its difficult to get a clearer statement than this. References to a woman's nature are found in the canons, hymns and patristic writings of the church. Gregory the Theologian calls women “self indulgent by nature.” Cyril of Alexandria says that “by nature,” the “woman's understanding is defective.” I Peter 3 makes reference to it as well.² Those familiar with the Metropolitan's work know that he's more than aware of this.

St. Ambrose rebukes him further: “Adam was deceived by Eve, not Eve by Adam. . . it is right that he whom that woman induced to sin should assume the role of guide lest he fall again through feminine instability.” This is why women cannot be priests. It is a rare woman who would deny it.

Metropolitan Chrysostomos leaves the door open for women priests in his article. Most traditionalists do the same because they fear stating the obvious. Priestesses in pagan cults are not a problem because “paganism” is not a creed. Its “doctrine” changes all the time. In any Dionysian cult, the female mind is perfect. Christianity is not such a cult.

Chrysostomos is willing to place his soul in danger to placate women. He refuses to comprehend or explain why the priesthood is exclusive to males. St. Gregory the Dialogist says, “Woman is slow in understanding and her unstable and naive mind renders her by way of natural weakness to the necessity of a strong hand in her husband. Her 'use' is two-fold: sex and motherhood.” This is yet another unflattering reference to a “female nature” and an undeniable truth.

St. Augustine says,

Woman does not possess the image of God in herself but only when taken together with the male who is her head, so that the whole substance is one image.

² I direct the Metropolitan to the work, “Holy Mothers of Orthodoxy: Women and the Church” by Eva Catafygiotu Topping. (Light and Life Publishing Company Minneapolis, Minnesota 1987).

But when she is assigned the role as helpmate, a function that pertains to her alone, then she is not the image of God. But as far as the man is concerned, he is by himself alone the image of God just as fully and completely as when he and the woman are joined together into one.³

Augustine is certainly not saying that women have no souls, but rather that there is no such thing as the modern “individual.” The extended family was the basic unit of society. Regardless, this is strong evidence that the desire to follow “the fathers” exists only when it is convenient. Traditionalist bishops, of which there are far too many, become raving modernists when economic questions arise too. They will condemn masturbation to the skies, but usury is accepted as a *fait accompli*.

St. John Chrysostom, writes further:

It does not profit a man to marry. For what is a woman but an enemy of friendship, an inescapable punishment, a necessary evil, a natural temptation, a domestic danger, delectable mischief, a fault in nature, painted with beautiful colors? The whole of her body is nothing less than phlegm, blood, bile, rheum and the fluid of digested food. If you consider what is stored up behind those lovely eyes, the angle of the nose, the mouth and the cheeks you will agree that the well proportioned body is only a whitened sepulcher.⁴

Many postmodern American males know precisely what he means, though the power of the female form make the words of St. John difficult to call to mind. Women have profited handsomely from being such a “sepulcher.” It will no doubt be said that these words “are taken out of context.” This is usually the final plea of someone who has lost an argument. It's used so much in public debate that it's become maddening. It no longer has meaning. In heaven's name, what context could negate the plain meaning of these words? This writer is well aware of the works and contexts of all the above in detail. They amplify the meaning of what's written.

Again, St. John states:

And if they would learn any thing, let them ask their own husbands at home. Thus, “not only, as it seems, are they not allowed to speak,” saith he, “at random, but not even to ask any question in the church.” Now if they ought not to ask questions, much more is their speaking at pleasure contrary to law. And what may be the cause of his setting them under so great subjection? Because the woman is in some sort a weaker being and easily carried away and light minded. Here you see why he set over them their husbands as teachers, for the benefit of both. For so he both rendered the women orderly, and the husbands he made anxious, as having to deliver to their wives very exactly what they heard.”⁵

Unfortunately for Metropolitan Chrysostomos, his namesake does use the word “superiority,” or at least its Greek version. In fact, all the fathers do. Women are eternally troublesome to men. They extract resources from them. They manipulate them. Their ability to

3 Augustine. On Marriage and Concupiscence. Text CSEL 42:2:215

4 John Chrysostom, Discourse 4 on Genesis, P.G. 54. 594

5 Concerning the Priesthood, book II, § 2; Hom, 37, 35

manipulate man's self-esteem gives them power no dictator could ever dream of.

There is no shortage of male priests in the Orthodox world. In fact, because priests can be married, there is a surplus of them. Given the number of jurisdictions, there is a monstrous inflation in the number of bishops as well, leading to a collapse in quality. There is no need for female clergy even if it were wise.

The thesis here, the patristic thesis, is that women are irrational in that their body chemistry, motives and thought processes render their reason to be far weaker than a man. Women are far more apt to use images rather than propositions in argument. Attractive women get away with it for obvious reasons. A beautiful woman constantly receiving attention from men has no reason to cultivate her logical abilities. In fact, she need not cultivate anything except her knowledge of anatomy.

Surrounded with beta orbiters – effectively an army of servants – she rarely has to deal with problems head on. She is not held accountable for her actions. The result is an atrophied rational faculty. Furthermore, the privileged world of the attractive female is such that she has an army of men to say yes to even the most absurd delusions. If the metropolitan doesn't know what a “beta orbiter” is, then he shouldn't be speaking of these issues.

“Image thinking” dispenses with linear logic. The latter is the simple A causes B and B causes C, therefore, A causes C design. All thinking implies it. An image is a mental picture with an emotion attached to it. If something does not adhere to the image, it's false. It might be factually true, however. The former is the male mode of thought in general, the latter is the female.

Because of the emotional outbursts that such a moderate and ancient argument will evoke, I need to reassure the reader that image thinking is not a judgment on intelligence, but it is why women should never be in leadership roles. It is also not a value judgment. It is neither above nor below reason. Something can be irrational and be even greater than reason, such as intuition. To say that women are less rational than men is to say that their stability is lacking. They are very changeable. Adherence to strict doctrine is the first quality of the priest and the very last thing that typifies Woman. Women, under these strictures, would be miserable. Changing doctrine, incidentally, is the first order of business of the groups demanding female priests. This is not an accident.

The scientific evidence has long since spoken on the matter. Often, these debates are purely emotional. This means that evidence doesn't matter, but the science needs to be explained regardless. The consensus today is that early in the brain's gestation, the division between its two hemispheres are very different for the two sexes. The male corpus callosum, or the divider between the two hemispheres, is stronger and larger in the male than the female brain. This shouldn't be a surprise. The caudate nucleus in males is larger too. This is the structure that process memory logically. The gender differences in these two structures is of immense significance.⁶

It is comic to watch male researchers in terror when stumbling upon this. They try to cover up their findings by randomly condemning sexism out of the blue or firing a male intern. American researchers live in fear of being called sexist, and so it stands to reason that the major contribution in this field comes from China.

6 Bishop, KP (1997) Sex Differences in the Human Corpus Callosum: Myth or Reality? *Neuroscience and Behavior Reviews* 21(5): 581-601. The author is forced to admit that it is “reality,” though as always, dresses it up with deliberately mystifying jargon to blunt its impact.

The peer-reviewed article “Sex-Related Neuroanatomical Basis of Emotion Regulation Ability” by Fen Kong et al at the State Key Laboratory of Cognitive Neuroscience and Learning at Beijing University is not under the anti-intellectual strictures of modern feminism. The obvious conclusion of their meta-study of thousands of brains and previous work on the subject:

As expected, males significantly scored higher in emotion regulation ability than females did. More importantly, we found the sex differences in the neuroanatomical basis of emotion regulation ability. Males showed a stronger positive relation between emotion regulation ability and regional gray matter volume (rGMV) in the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. In contrast, females demonstrated a stronger positive relation between emotion regulation ability and rGMV in an anatomical cluster that extends from the left brainstem to the left hippocampus, the left amygdala and the insular cortex.⁷

This same argument, arguing the connection between hemispheric variability and emotional regulation, is demonstrated again and again in modern American neuroscience, though usually without the politically incorrect conclusion. Baron-Cohen's (2002) “The Extreme Male Brain Theory of Autism” comes to the same conclusion.⁸ It is not an uncommon conclusion at all, but, being in such a specialized field, its social impact is minimal.

Using brain imagery, G. Domes, Schulze et al (2010) “The Neural Correlates of Sex Differences in Emotional Reactivity and Emotion Regulation” also agrees with the Chinese study. The imagery studies are usually more expensive to conduct and are limited only to the largest of universities. This only increases the importance of the Chinese study.

As is to be expected, damage control has been done and vague attacks on their “methodology” have already been published to save careers, though this is just academic virtue signaling. The irrationality of women is an established fact in experience, universal cultural history and now, the use of the most advanced imaging techniques the world over. Women should not be priests or leaders of any kind for this reason.

The British Daily Mail was forced to run the story where, even when given every possible encouragement, female soldiers were not as mentally strong as men. They crack under pressure. This is not a statement of intelligence, but, yet again, one of stability.⁹ Intelligence is not the issue here – emotional regulation is. This has been replicated in militaries and police departments the world over.

One reason is that women are susceptible to the Corticotropinreleasing factor (CRF), a hormone that comes with negative stress. Dr Rita Valentino of The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia was able to release the findings of her study because she is female. She writes, “But researchers already know that CRF regulation is disrupted in stress-related psychiatric disorders, so this research may be relevant to the underlying human biology. This may help to explain why women are twice as vulnerable as men to stress-related disorders.”¹⁰ Women cannot be priests because they are emotionally unstable. Yet again, science supports the ancient consensus.

7 Human Brain Mapping 31: 758–769

8 Baron-Cohen, P (2002) The Extreme Male Brain Theory of Autism. Trends in Cognitive Sciences 6: 248–254

9 Bleier, D (2015) All Five Women who Entered Army's Ranger School are Dropped after Failing the Four-day Physical Assessment Period. Daily Mail

10 McRae, F (2010) Women more Prone to Emotional Stress than Men “Because of Sensitivity to Hormone.” Daily Mail

The priesthood, ideally, is a position of authority, so power interests have a role. Many of us who have been involved in Slavic parishes in the USA realize, however, that men do not run these churches, the older *babushkas* do. They are the force for conservatism, not the rationalist male. In that sense, the image thinking is more like “iconic” thought. It's quite appropriate. The problem with realizing this fact is that power is not the issue. Women already dominate parishes. So why is it even a question?

Christ was surrounded by women. This is evidence for the veracity of the Resurrection, since it was first proclaimed by females. A woman's testimony was not permitted in court. Women stayed by Christ's side at the cross while the Apostles hid themselves. Women were his most vocal supporters. At the same time, Christ only made men clergy, apostles or disciples.

The same inability to control emotional states that makes women unfit to be clergy made them withstand the fear that dominated the Apostles. Their loyalty and communal focus allowed them to stand firm while the more logical Apostles were saving their own skin. Their emotionalism can be for the good while the male rationalism can be for the evil, as in this case. Male rationality has to be checked by the emotions of his mate. One cannot function without the other.

The married priesthood, as very few note, means that the priest's wife shares in his ministry. She bakes the communion bread, the very first step in its consecration. If marriage makes “one flesh,” then women are priests to this extent. Modern individualism, soaked in the sexual revolution, rejects the “one flesh” idea and sees marriage as an outdated phenomenon. Husband and wife are two isolated individuals in the modern mentality that have come together for some utilitarian purpose. Orthodox and patristic thought rejects this superficiality. In fact, reason itself rejects it.

The Roman Cardinal Mauro Piacenza writes, “the Church is not a political government in which it is right to demand adequate representation. The Church is something quite different; the Church is the Body of Christ and, in her, each one is a part according to what Christ established.” This is an excellent argument highlighting the total misunderstanding of the “church” in the minds of modernists. He was asked “But can someone really participate in the life of the Church without having effective power and responsibility?” He responded to this silly question:

Who said that participation in the life of the Church is a question of power? If this were the case, we would unmask the real equivocation in conceiving the Church herself not as she is – human and divine – but simply as one of the many human associations, maybe the greatest and most noble, given her history; she would then have to be “administered” by a division of power.¹¹

This brilliant response gets to the heart of the matter. The demand for female priests is not about the church at all. At least, it is about a false and distorted image of it. The arguments of the feminists writing on church matters are merely about power. As if to underscore their irrationality, an Irish feminist wrote this concerning a papal decision to bar women from the diaconate: “[The bishops] were free to act independently of Rome, for they were not under pressure to implement the permanent diaconate. However, they chose to reinforce the caste

¹¹ Quoted from Gaspari, A (2011) Cardinal Piacenza on Women Priests, Celibacy and the Power of Rome: Prefect of the Congregation for the Clergy Speaks on Service and Unity. The World Union of Catholic Women's Organisations

system in the Church by strengthening the clerical order.”

This “over the top” rhetoric is common among feminist authors. It doesn't even make sense. It's raw emotion. Because Rome has stated that they will maintain an all-male diaconate, the church is said to mimic the Hindu caste system. The title of her piece is “Once Again, Women are Being Cast out of the Catholic Church.” Even the title is overflowing with emotion. At no time were women “cast” from the church because they cannot be deacons. The point here is made.

She continues, “I call on the women and men of Ireland to stand in solidarity with theologically educated women and refuse to accept male deacons. Do not collude in your own oppression.” Without realizing it, she makes the case for an all male clergy.¹² “Theologically educated” must have an eccentric meaning here. The church fathers certainly have spoken on the issue long ago.

Robert Hovoda is typical of the male feminist. Using overly academic language to make simple points, he associates feminism with being “educated” and “progressive.” He opines:

One must say, therefore, that even if it were possible to separate the head from the body and seek to make perceptible and recognizable in the ministry of bishop or presbyter only the head, the Incarnate Word, the male person is inadequate to the full reality which faith contemplates. The sacraments of initiation, Baptism-Confirmation-Eucharist (far more fundamental and decisive in our transformation in Christ, in our becoming “signs” of Christ, than ordination to the presbyterate or episcopate), are the most obvious indication of where faith stands on the issue of identification with Christ.¹³

His point is simply that Christ is not fully understood in the church without full female participation. “Participation” is identical with a policy of a unisex priesthood. The argument is wildly illogical and makes a huge number of unwarranted assumptions, but this is not atypical of this movement. Even its terms are not properly defined. He partakes in the same illogical, over-emotional rhetoric of women in general. The male feminist is a sorry specimen indeed.

The broader point is that the church is not foremost in their mind. This is demonstrated, again using a quasi-Catholic author, Mary Hunt:

The “No” is to more members of a clerical caste, even women, who are set aside for a specific function. While for some clerics this has meant access to ecclesiastical power, women know that being set apart really means being marginalized. Most male clergy have felt the same way, being told that they should not participate in politics, that they must not have an emotional/relational life, and that their social role is to keep the sanctuary lights burning. Such marginalization would be nothing new for women, but I strongly advise against accepting it as the price for full ministry. All ministers of the Gospel belong in the world.¹⁴

12 Cornyn, AM (2000) Once again, women are being cast out of the Catholic Church. Sunday Independent.

13 Hovoda, R (1977) Recognizing Christ in Women Priests. From Women Priests, Arlene Swidler and Leonard Swidler, Paulist Press, 251-252

14 Hunt, Mary (1978) Roman Catholic Ministry: Patriarchal Past, Feminist Future. New Woman, New Church, New Priestly Ministry; Proceedings of the Second Conference on the Ordination of Roman Catholic Women, Baltimore, U.S.A. pp 31 - 43.

Yet again, “caste” and “power” are the dominant words, showing the emotional nature of the logic. Emotional rhetoric often takes a small amount of evidence and turns it into an avalanche of assumed proof. One can minister the Gospel without being a priest, as Hunt knows. The Gospel that Miss Hunt is promoting has little relation to the books in the Bible. She argues for a clerical “sexuality unfettered by guilt” and other such vague and trite slogans. The arguments of this movement prove precisely why women cannot be priests.

As is the norm, this sort of faux-theorizing remains the domain of upper class male university professors and those trying to be like them. It is nothing other than virtue signaling. The illogical rhetoric above is one of the reasons why the hierarchy exists: to keep the pseudo-intellectual, overly emotional and obsessively fashion-conscious as far away as possible from the altar. To argue that female authors are exceptionally emotional leads to a predictable set of intensely emotional outbursts as a refutation. Worse, they cannot see the irony in that.

Sexuality is a woman's primary weapon. It is the primary form of their domination and control over the male ego. This writer has written elsewhere that the modern west is an extreme and totalitarian matriarchy. Women, especially attractive women, rule men without mercy. Access to the bedroom and the pitiable control over male self-esteem are well-known and painful levers of this irresponsible domination. Every single man reading this has experienced this phenomenon.

The *Harvard Business Review* states that women control upwards of \$90 trillion yearly in economic power the world over. It reports: “Women make the decision in the purchases of 94% of home furnishings, 92% of vacations, 91% of homes, 60% of automobiles, and 51% of consumer electronics.” How much of this income have they earned?

This means that the American consumer economy is female controlled. The same article states that about 50% of all future economic growth in the US will be directly controlled by women. Not caused by them, but controlled by them. Given the existence of female networks, government grants and social force, over half of the new businesses in the US are controlled by women

Women control almost 70% of the consumer spending on the planet. Women own over 40% of America's business. This does not tell us how much they control. Women control the majority of the wealth in American businesses today. Male earnings have not risen in 30 years. The cost of living and the number of things people are forced to spend money on means men are becoming poor, and fast. Women's earnings have risen over 35% since 1979.¹⁵

Most college students are female, most graduate degrees are awarded to females, and of all management positions in the USA, 52% are occupied by women. Importantly though, formal positions of power rarely tell the whole story.¹⁶ What really matters is the control over self-identification, ego gratification, self-esteem and self-image. This is purely a woman's field. In the July issue of the *Atlantic*, the lead story was “The End of Men.” Feminism is not about gaining power, its about defending it.

David Stove, the Australian philosopher at the University of Sydney, tried to deal with how the female role as almost total universality of women's roles being nurturing, family-based ones. Can it be an accident?

15 Silverstein, MJ and Kate Sayre (2009) *The Female Economy*. Harvard Business Review
<https://hbr.org/2009/09/the-female-economy>

16 Rosin, H. (2010) *The End of Men*. The Atlantic, June

[The feminist] has to offer some definite explanation of why the intellectual capacity of women has so consistently met with obstacles it could not overcome, and his explanation must be one which is consistent with the equality-theory. It would obviously be no good, for example, if he were to say, "The main interfering factor has been the aggressiveness, sexual exclusiveness, and superior cunning of males." This suggestion, considered in itself, is by no means without merit: aggressiveness, sexual exclusiveness, and superior cunning are definite and detectable things, and I at least believe that they actually do operate in males, and do impede, to some extent, the intellectual performance of women. But of course the suggestion is not one which an equality-theorist can adopt, since to ascribe superior cunning to males is to contradict the very intellectual equality for which he contends.¹⁷

Dr. Rowe was met with disciplinary action as a result of this article, partly because this argument is very hard to refute. He was forced into an unfavorable retirement after a local media storm. Universally, women have had the identical roles and men have had the identical view of a woman's use of reason. He concludes, "The main reason why I believe, and the main reason why nearly everyone always has believed, that the intellectual capacity of women is inferior to that of men, is just this: that the intellectual performance of women is inferior to that of men."

In other words, if women were man's equal, men would not be able to subject them to their position for millennia and convince them it's perfectly natural. Suddenly, in 1970, men realized that we're "all the same." While this writer doesn't share the harsh language of Rowe, the essential argument is irrefutable.

Therefore, the American male is facing a matriarchy of massive proportions. This power is being wielded by those with very little control over their emotions. The recent "Women's March" proved the utter dominance of emotionalism in feminist politics. Hundreds of them dressed up in vagina costumes to protest their image as over-theatrical and emotional. In truth, the purpose of the vagina march was not clear.

They were led by a man, George Soros, who created this entire "movement." In fact, the entire American corporate establishment financed this march. Feminism exists because the capitalist elite wanted to depress wages. Stalin had his own feminist movement in the 1930s to deal with a labor shortage in his crash-industrialization program. Feminism is the creation of men and it is maintained by them.¹⁸

Men seek the approval of females while females loathe men who seek their good graces. The disastrous article by Metropolitan Chrysostomos was another of these toadying attempts to gain female approval. It was a very poor and overemotional form of virtue signaling very much unlike his other, later work. It is embarrassing.

17 Rowe, D (1999) *Against the Idols of the Age*. Transaction, 125

18 It should be noted that the "corporate sponsors" page of the "Woman's March" is not accessible though the website. It must be searched for separately. It's almost like they're trying to hide it. Every major corporate NGO is listed including the Communist Party USA, listed next to Soros' Move On and the Association of Newspaper Publishers. Happily, the National Hypertension Institute is represented for those who get too emotional for their own health. Planned Parenthood was the main financier of the March. This is mentioned only to highlight that corporate American is financing this "woman's" movement which itself proves the thesis of this paper. (see <https://www.womensmarch.com/partners/>).

Even more, it is an attempt to gain establishment approval; to show the world he's not an "extremist." Women are not priests because they are not as capable as men in the use of reason. Because of their instability, they've been universally granted a fairly restricted space in society. Regardless, their power in American society is totalitarian and getting worse. Articles such as the one my Metropolitan Chrysostomos are not helping anyone.