

**IN PERSONA CHRISTI CAPITIS: A THEOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL
INQUIRY INTO THE GENDER OF THE CATHOLIC PRIESTHOOD**

OVIE, Valentine Aghoghophia, PhD

Abstract

The Catholic Church's discipline of a male-only priesthood is one of its most contentious and misunderstood teachings. Standard discourse typically pits appeals to equality and pastoral necessity against arguments from authority and tradition, resulting in a persistent theological stalemate. This paper proposes a decisive exit from this impasse by relocating the entire debate to a more fundamental level: the nature of sacramental signs themselves. It asks not whether women can be priests, but what the priesthood is within the divine economy. Through a rigorous methodological synthesis of scriptural exegesis, historical analysis, and systematic theology, the research constructs its case from the ground up, beginning with first principles of metaphysics and culminating in high Christology. It engages the strongest objections with intellectual charity before unveiling a positive thesis that challenges the very premises of the modern debate. The findings suggest that the answer to this contemporary controversy lies not in the modern concepts of rights and roles, but in the ancient and enduring language of nuptial mystery, symbolic participation, and iconic representation. For any scholar seeking a resolution beyond the well-worn patterns of argumentation, this article offers a profound and paradigm-shifting examination of the theological foundations at stake.

Keywords: *In Persona Christi Capitis*, Priesthood, Divine Sonship, Active and Passive Principles, Fittingness (*Convenientia*), Sacramental Signification, Nuptial Mystery.

Introduction

The question of women's ordination to the priesthood remains one of the most contentious and theologically complex issues within modern Catholicism. It is a debate that pits deeply held convictions about equality and justice against equally profound commitments to sacred tradition and sacramental theology. The definitive teaching of the Magisterium, as expressed in Pope John Paul II's 1994 apostolic letter *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*, is that the Church "has no authority whatsoever to confer priestly ordination on women" and that this view is to be "definitively held by all the Church's faithful." This declaration, while closing the door to doctrinal change, has not silenced a robust and persistent scholarly discourse that continues to challenge its underlying premises.

Proponents for the ordination of women advance a multi-faceted case built on several key pillars. Drawing from theological anthropology, they argue that the fundamental equality of men and women in creation and redemption renders

gender-specific roles obsolete for ministry. Historical-critical analyses are often employed to suggest that Jesus's choice of twelve male apostles was a practical concession to his cultural context rather than a binding theological principle. Furthermore, advocates frequently point to the doctrine of *ex opere operato*—that sacramental validity depends on Christ's action, not the minister's worthiness—to contend that a priest's gender is theologically irrelevant. Pastoral arguments highlight the crippling shortage of priests in many regions and the perceived injustice of excluding women from leadership roles they hold in other Christian traditions.

This paper seeks to engage this debate not through polemics but through a thorough examination of its theological foundations. It will first systematically present the five most compelling and extensive arguments advanced by scholars in favour of women's ordination. The core of the work, however, lies in its second part: a positive and educative explanation of the theological rationale for the male priesthood. This section will explore the concept of the priest acting *in persona Christi Capitis* (in the person of Christ the Head) and its connection to the spousal imagery that permeates Scripture and Tradition—where Christ, the Bridegroom, offers himself sacrificially for his Bride, the Church. The argument is not one of capability but of iconic symbolism; the male priest is seen as a natural sign that makes this nuptial mystery sacramentally present.

Finally, the paper will construct direct responses to each of the initial arguments from within this theological framework, aiming to demonstrate that the Church's discipline is a coherent affirmation of a sacramental sign rather than a mere prohibition. By concluding with a synthesis of this reasoning, the paper promises a resolution to the apparent conflict, arguing that understanding the spousal nature of the Eucharist reveals the fittingness of the tradition, not as a denial of women's dignity, but as a reflection of a complementary theology of symbolic representation.

Arguments for the Priesthood of Women

This section delineates the primary arguments advanced by proponents of the ordination of women to the priesthood. The intent is to present their position with intellectual charity and accuracy, ensuring that its rationale and internal logic are comprehensively understood. The following overview, while not necessarily exhaustive, aims to capture the most prevalent and influential lines of reasoning found within contemporary theological discourse. These arguments generally cluster around several key domains: appeals to historical precedent, theological reinterpretation of scripture and tradition, and urgent pastoral necessity.

Presenting these claims clearly is a necessary prerequisite to a rigorous critical analysis and response.

1. Scriptural Foundation for the Priesthood of Women

The case for women's ordination rests on the New Covenant's redefinition of priesthood. The Levitical system tied sacerdotal status to male genealogy (Lev. 21:16–23), but Hebrews locates the true priesthood in Christ – “not by a carnal commandment but by the power of an indestructible life” (Heb. 7; 10) – thus breaking the ontological link between priesthood and male biology. Rejecting biological essentialism, Simone de Beauvoir insisted that “one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman” (de Beauvoir 283); to make sex decisive is to re-impose a carnal limit on a ministry grounded in resurrection life. The New Testament presents priesthood as universal. Peter calls believers “a chosen people, a royal priesthood” (1 Pet. 2:9), and Revelation depicts the redeemed as “a kingdom and priests” (Rev. 5:9–10). If offering spiritual worship and mediating God's presence belong to the whole people of God, creating a new male-only sacerdotal class contradicts that universality and violates Aristotle's law of non-contradiction (“the same attribute cannot at the same time belong and not belong...”). (Aristotle 1005b19–20; Eph. 2:14.) Jesus' praxis and the early church model inclusion. He traveled with women disciples (Luke 8:1–3) and made women the first witnesses of the resurrection (John 20:11–18), granting epistemic authority where culture denied it – an effect anticipated by standpoint-aware insights and Hegel's master-slave dialectic (Hegel 111–119). At Pentecost Joel's prophecy is fulfilled: “your sons and your daughters will prophesy” (Acts 2:17). Women exercised ministry by χάρισμα (grace): Phoebe (Rom. 16:1), Junia (Rom. 16:7), Priscilla (Acts 18:26), and Philip's daughters (Acts 21:9).

The Twelve's maleness cannot be read as an eternal norm. Their appointment reconstituted Israel symbolically and reflected first-century pragmatism; after the resurrection the apostolic test is witnessing the risen Christ (Acts 1:21–22), not gender. Persisting in male-only ordination ignores the need for a “hermeneutic of suspicion” that unmask patriarchal readings (Ricoeur 33); Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza's recovery shows an early “discipleship of equals” later reshaped by institutional patriarchy (Schüssler Fiorenza 343). Excluding women is a form of misrecognition (Honneth 132): it impairs women's social esteem and ecclesial agency despite their equal bearing of the Imago Dei (Gen. 1:27) and the ontological claim of Galatians 3:28. Ordaining women, therefore, is not cultural capitulation but the faithful fulfillment of the New Covenant's logic – it removes contradiction, acknowledges the Spirit's sovereign gifting, and recognizes women as full participants in Christ's priesthood.

2. Historical Precedent and Development

The claim that ordaining women ruptures sacred tradition rests on a static view of tradition that a proper hermeneutic rejects. Tradition is not inert but dynamic, unfolding through history. As John Henry Newman argued, a great idea like the Christian faith develops organically, so what appears novel may be the flowering of a seed already present (Newman 38). Within this framework, women's historical roles in sacral authority show that the male-only priesthood is not original but a later contraction. Historical evidence confirms this. As Susan Ross demonstrates, roles such as deaconesses, widows, virgins, and abbesses carried liturgical, pastoral, and juridical authority. Deaconesses underwent a rite of ordination (χειροτονία), assisted in baptisms, and exercised oversight. Medieval abbesses often held jurisdiction equal to bishops (*jus pontificale*), hearing confessions, preaching, and managing vast resources. Saints like Hildegard of Bingen, Bridget of Sweden, and Catherine of Siena wielded spiritual authority that blurred lines between laity and clergy. As Ross notes, this diversity proves "tradition is not monolithic and has shifted over time" (Ross 253).

The exclusion of women, as Rosemary Radford Ruether shows, coincided with the Church's "institutionalization of patriarchy" during Greco-Roman acculturation (Ruether 146–147). Paul Ricoeur's "hermeneutics of suspicion" calls us to unmask such power structures (Ricoeur 33). The marginalization of women reflects not divine mandate but cultural distortion. Johann Baptist Metz's notion of anamnestic solidarity illuminates how recalling suppressed voices serves as a liberating force within tradition itself. Doctrinal development in other areas strengthens the precedent. John Jefferson Davis cites Galileo to show that the Church's readings of Scripture and nature have erred, and that tradition, "while significant, is not irreformable" (Davis 9). Following a Lakatosian model, theology must adapt its "protective belt" to account for anomalous data or risk degeneration. The overlooked history of women's leadership is such data. Ignoring it fosters a fundamentalist posture; while recovering it restores a more authentic memory. Thus, the ordination of women is not innovation but *ressourcement*—a return to the sources. It is a legitimate development of the early Church's seeds, demanded by historical consciousness and a critical purification of patriarchal accretions, in fidelity to the Gospel's radical imperative.

3. Incarnational/Christological Argument

The objection to women's ordination based on Christ's maleness is a christological error that reduces the Incarnation to biological determinism. It privileges one accidental property of Christ's humanity (male sex) over the universal ground of his human nature. As John Jefferson Davis notes, John's Prologue states, "the

Word became flesh (σὰρξ, sarx) – shared humanity – not “male” (ἀνὴρ, anēr) (Davis 10). To make maleness essential is a category mistake, elevating cultural particularity to ontological necessity and fracturing the unity of the humanity Christ redeems.

Chalcedonian orthodoxy confirms this. The Council of Chalcedon (451) taught that Christ is one person in two natures, divine and human – his assumed humanity was not “male nature” but human nature as such. Aquinas, following Aristotle, held that sex is an accident of the individual, not substance (ST III, q. 31, a. 4). Christ’s maleness was historically contingent, not the core of his humanity. To claim priesthood requires maleness is to root sacramental efficacy in accident rather than substance – philosophically incoherent and theologically dangerous. Susan Ross underscores that Christ’s salvific mission rests on shared humanity, not maleness, and excluding women “undermines their equal participation in redemption” (Ross 255). This view also reflects biological essentialism, dismantled by Simone de Beauvoir’s claim that existence precedes essence (*The Second Sex*). Christ’s identity as redeemer derives from his salvific actions, not his sex. Sacramental representation (in persona Christi) signifies Christ’s office as head and mediator, not biological similarity. As Rosemary Radford Ruether warns, using maleness as norm cloaks patriarchal assumptions in incarnational theology (Ruether 148). Such reasoning fails Paul Ricoeur’s “hermeneutic of suspicion,” which exposes ideologies disguised as timeless truths (Ricoeur, *Freud and Philosophy*).

Finally, this objection ignores Pauline theology of incorporation into Christ. Through baptism, believers “put on Christ” (Gal. 3:27) and become “one spirit with the Lord” (1 Cor. 6:17), transcending categories of sex: “neither Jew nor Greek...male nor female” (Gal. 3:28). Ordination deepens this baptismal configuration, a participation in Christ’s humanity, not a replication of his sex. To require physical resemblance is quasi-Docetic, reducing sacramental transformation to symbolic physicalism. In sum, orthodox Christology affirms that Christ assumed human nature – not male nature – as the sufficient basis for redemption. This universality grounds the capacity of any baptized person, regardless of sex, to be sacramentally configured to Christ and act in his person.

4. Trinitarian Argument

The Trinitarian argument against women’s ordination, which grounds gender hierarchy in an alleged eternal subordination within the Godhead, is a profound heresy that undermines Nicene orthodoxy. As John Jefferson Davis observes, it “gravely distorts” the faith of Nicaea by reviving the subordinationism condemned in Arianism (Davis 12). The Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed affirms

the Son as “true God from true God...consubstantial (ὁμοούσιον) with the Father,” establishing the co-equality of essence, dignity, and power among the divine Persons. Subordination exists only in the economy of salvation – Christ’s incarnate obedience (Luke 22:42) – not within the eternal Trinity. To read economic subordination back into divine life “verges on Arianism” (Davis 16), effectively denying the Son’s full divinity and fracturing Trinitarian unity.

Philosophically, this mistake reflects a failure to grasp the nature of relation within divine communion. Following the Cappadocians, Augustine, and Aquinas, the Persons are constituted by relations of origin (paternity, filiation, spiration), not by rank. These eternal relations imply perfect reciprocity – *perichoresis* – not hierarchy. To impose a structure of domination onto this communion projects finite categories of power into infinite being. It mirrors, as Hegel’s master-slave dialectic shows, a fallen anthropology rather than divine ontology. Rosemary Radford Ruether rightly exposes such “hierarchical Trinitarianism” as an ideological extension of patriarchy that sacralizes male dominance (Ruether 148). In this way, subordinationist theology confuses the *immanent* with the *economic* Trinity, turning revelation into justification for social inequality.

The anthropological effects are devastating. By rooting female subordination in divine life, this theology ontologizes inequality and, as Susan Ross notes, “misapplies theological categories to enforce subordination” (Ross 256). It deifies patriarchy, denying women equal moral worth and sacramental capacity – what Axel Honneth calls a “violation of the struggle for recognition” (*The Struggle for Recognition* 132). The analogy that likens male-female hierarchy to Father-Son relation not only distorts the Trinity but implies that women’s humanity is less conformed to Christ. Such a claim erodes both the doctrine of the *homoousios* and the gospel’s inclusive vision wherein all are invited to share the divine *perichoresis* through grace. In sum, the Trinitarian argument for male-only priesthood collapses under the weight of its own heresy. It defends tradition by subverting Nicene faith – denying the equality of Persons in God and of persons in humanity.

5. Ecclesiological and Pastoral Argument

The ecclesiological and pastoral arguments for women’s ordination expose a deep contradiction between Catholic sacramental theology and ministerial practice – a tension resolvable only through theological reform. As Susan Ross notes, the priest shortage has made women the de facto spiritual leaders of countless parishes, serving as coordinators, pastoral caregivers, and worship leaders (Ross 260). The faithful experience their ministry as Spirit-filled and authentic, yet the Church deems them ontologically unfit for sacramental authority. This contradiction reveals what Johann Baptist Metz calls a “*dangerous memory*” – a lived witness that

critiques ecclesial structures in light of the Gospel. The evident fruits of the Spirit in women's ministries (Gal. 5:22–23) constitute a *sensus fidelium*, a theological sign that the Spirit is active beyond the limits of current discipline. John Jefferson Davis represents the reformist approach, arguing that "pastoral need must be weighed alongside doctrinal truth," and since no adequate theological ground for exclusion exists, women's ordination is "both legitimate and necessary" (Davis 16). His reasoning reflects pragmatic realism: a doctrine that produces pastoral dysfunction contradicts divine economy (*oikonomia*). The Spirit's guidance, therefore, is discerned not only in magisterial pronouncements but also in the concrete needs and gifts within the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:7–11).

In contrast, Rosemary Radford Ruether offers a prophetic critique: simply ordaining women without transforming the system "risks perpetuating clericalism" (Ruether 149). She envisions *women-church*—egalitarian communities embodying Gospel freedom "without clerical caste" (150). Drawing on Foucault's *Power/Knowledge*, Ruether exposes how ecclesial hierarchies construct "truth" to sustain power. Her call is not for inclusion within patriarchy but for its theological deconstruction, aligning ministry with Christ's kenotic model of authority (Mark 10:42–45). Both perspectives converge on a critical insight: the current exclusion of women from ordination is theologically incoherent and pastorally harmful. It maintains a two-tiered ecclesiology that contradicts the universal priesthood of believers and mirrors worldly domination rather than Trinitarian communion. The issue is not peripheral but central—a test of the Church's fidelity to its own doctrine of baptismal dignity, Spirit-guided discernment, and its vocation to be a sacrament of grace and reconciliation in the world.

Arguments Against the Priesthood of Women

To engage seriously with why the Catholic and Orthodox Churches reserve priestly ordination to men, one must move beyond modern sociological or political readings. The traditional position is not about women's dignity or ability—which the Church fully affirms—but about sacramental and Christological coherence grounded in the nature of signs, the Incarnation, and the metaphysical order of creation. Without this philosophical framework, the discipline appears arbitrary rather than, as the Church holds, theologically necessary—flowing from the belief that sacraments are efficacious signs instituted by Christ to make visible the invisible mysteries of salvation. At its core, the argument concerns sacramental signification. Since a sacrament causes grace through what it signifies, the natural properties of the sign are essential. The priest acts *in persona Christi capitis*—in the person of Christ the Head—and thus must be a living icon of the reality he represents. In the Eucharist, this representation is not merely functional but ontological: the priest, as sign, must visibly manifest Christ the Bridegroom, the

Eternal Son, and the active principle of divine self-gift. The maleness of the priest, therefore, is presented not as an arbitrary biological fact but as integral to this sacramental symbolism – an expression of the divine economy where Christ offers Himself in love to His Bride, the Church.

This framework rests on several interlocking premises. First, the Aristotelian-Thomistic distinction between active and passive principles undergirds creation's metaphysical order and explains how causality and representation function. Second, the doctrine of Divine Sonship reveals the eternal relation of origin within the Godhead that the priesthood sacramentally mirrors. Third, earthly human generation serves as an analogue to this divine reality, illuminating why the Son's assumption of a male human nature is theologically fitting. Consequently, while women fully share in Christ's baptismal and royal priesthood, the sacramental act of representing Christ the Bridegroom in the Eucharist belongs – within this theological vision – to men, whose sex is viewed as intrinsic to the sign of that mystery.

The Active and Passive Principles

Aristotle's *Physics* introduces the distinction between active and passive principles as a solution to Parmenides' claim that change is impossible. Every change, Aristotle argues, requires three elements: a subject that persists (the passive principle), the new form it acquires, and the privation of that form which it previously lacked (*Physics* 1.7). The passive principle is the underlying subject possessing the potentiality to receive form – like bronze, capable of becoming a statue. Yet potentiality cannot actualize itself; it needs an agent already in act. This agent, the active principle, impresses a new form onto the passive subject – the sculptor actualizing the bronze. Aquinas crystallizes this in the *Summa Theologiae*: "Nothing can be reduced from potentiality to actuality except by something in act" (I, q.2, a.3). This ensures that all change is causally intelligible and avoids infinite regress.

This dynamic grounds Aristotle's *hylomorphic theory* in the *Metaphysics*, where every substance is a composite of matter (*hyle*) and form (*morphe*) (7.3). Matter is pure potentiality – the ultimate passive principle – while form is the active principle that determines matter's being, causing it to exist as a specific kind of thing. Within the doctrine of the four causes, the Material Cause aligns with the passive principle, while the Formal, Efficient, and Final Causes represent active principles that shape, initiate, and direct being toward its end (*Physics* 2.3). Aquinas deepened this framework by identifying prime matter (*materia prima*) as pure potentiality, entirely without actuality (*On the Principles of Nature*). It is not a physical substance but the metaphysical capacity to receive form, and therefore

cannot exist apart from it. Since potentiality always depends on act, Aquinas concluded that the entire chain of causation must terminate in a first cause that is wholly actual, unmixed with potentiality or passivity. This ultimate Active Principle—*Actus Purus*—is God, the uncaused cause who actualizes all potentiality without Himself being acted upon (*Summa Theologiae* I, q.3, a.2).

The Divine Sonship

The foundational principle for any Catholic sacramental theology, and thus for understanding the sacerdotal character, is the doctrine of Divine Sonship, an eternal metaphysical truth that originates not in creation but in the ineffable life of the Holy Trinity itself. This doctrine posits that the First Person of the Trinity, God the Father, is the absolute, unoriginate source (*principium sine principio*) and fountainhead of all divinity (*fons totius divinitatis*). From all eternity, by an act of the intellect, the Father generates the Word—the *Logos*—who is His perfect Image, His substantial Expression, and the eternal, consubstantial Son. As the Council of Nicea defined, this Son is “begotten, not made, consubstantial (*homoousios*) with the Father.” This eternal generation is not a creative act but a necessary, eternal relation of origin within the Godhead. The Father, as the primordial source and arche, contains within His divine intellect the perfect, eternal, and unchangeable Idea or Exemplar of all creation. Saint Augustine, in his profound work *On the Trinity*, elucidates that the Son is the Father’s perfect Word (*Verbum*)—not a transient sound, but the eternal, substantial Concept of the divine mind. He is the “Art of the Almighty God” (*Ars omnipotentis Dei*), the perfect Form containing within Himself the immutable and divine reasons (*rationes aeternae*) for every created thing (Augustine, *De Trinitate*, VI.10.11).

This Divine Son, the *Logos*, is thus the active principle through whom the Father brings all creation from potentiality into act. As the Prologue of Saint John’s Gospel proclaims, “All things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made” (John 1:3). Saint Paul confirms this to the Colossians, stating of the Son: “For in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or authorities—all things were created through him and for him” (Colossians 1:16). The Father, as the ultimate source of being, creates *through* the Son, the Intellectual Word, who is the active, formative principle of all that exists. This is not merely a temporal agency but an eternal ontological dependency; every creature exists only insofar as it participates in and imitates the eternal idea of itself within the Divine Word. Saint Thomas Aquinas, synthesizing this Patristic tradition, explains that the Son is the “Concept” or “Word” of the Father (*Verbum Patris*), and because the Father understands Himself and all things in this Word, the Word Himself is “the

principle of the intellectual operation” by which God creates (*Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 34, a. 3).

Therefore, the entire cosmos is a created expression of the Uncreated Word; it is a vast hierarchy of beings that participate, by imitation, in the divine perfections contained eminently within Him. This eternal reality of the Son as the active generative Principle of all creation establishes the primordial archetype. It finds a profound and participatory reflection – an analogue – within the very structure of the created order itself, most notably in the mystery of human generation.

The Earthly Sonship

Earthly sonship, especially in the generative act, serves as a created analogue of the uncreated, active principle that is the Eternal Sonship of the Logos. Within the metaphysics of causation, all finite acts of generation mirror the divine causality of God. In human generation, the male semen functions as the *principium activum* acting upon the receptive *principium passivum* of the female ovum to bring forth new life. Classical philosophy and Christian theology interpreted this not as a judgment on dignity – since both sexes share equal rational souls – but as a natural symbol of a higher metaphysical reality. As Aquinas explains, following Aristotle, “the active principle of generation is from the father, while the mother provides the matter... the woman does not have the power of the active principle of generation, but only the passive” (*Summa Theologiae*, Suppl., q. 39, a. 1). The male’s active generative power thus participates finitely in the divine, uncreated generative act of the Father through the Son. The Divine Son is the eternal, substantial Word in whom the Father expresses His whole Being and the exemplars of creation. Analogously, the human father contains the seed – a physical image of himself – that bears the formative power to initiate new life. Augustine, in *De Genesi ad Litteram*, compares this to the “hidden word” in the mind becoming vocal speech, just as the father’s seed, a “corporeal word,” manifests an interior formative power (VI.11.18–19).

Yet the analogy is one of dissimilarity as much as likeness. The Divine Son is eternally generated without matter or separation, while the human son arises temporally through material causation. The father’s seed contains not a miniature human but a formative *actus* that organizes the matter supplied by the mother toward the actualization of a new person. As Aquinas teaches, “the active power in the semen is derived from the soul of the father... an instrument of the soul, just as the hand is” (*Summa Contra Gentiles* II.89.9). The soul itself is created directly by God, yet the father’s generative act disposes the matter for that creation. Thus, earthly sonship, with its active masculine principle functions as a natural icon of divine generation. The Incarnation, wherein the Eternal Son assumes male

humanity, consummates this analogy, revealing the fittingness of His sex as the perfect intersection of the divine and created orders.

Whether the Maleness of Christ is a Contingent Accident or Necessity

The question of whether Christ's maleness was contingent or fittingly necessary lies at the intersection of Christology, anthropology, and sacramental theology. Although the Divine Logos could have assumed either sex, the divine economy reveals that His assumption of male humanity was not arbitrary but *supremely fitting* (*conveniens*). This fittingness arises from three interrelated principles: the analogy between Divine Sonship and earthly generation, the logic of sacramental signification, and the Thomistic notion of fitting necessity. First, the Person of the Incarnate Word is that of eternal Sonship. The Divine Son, as the active generative principle through whom the Father creates all things (John 1:3; Col 1:16), eternally proceeds as the Father's substantial Image. Earthly generation analogically reflects this divine order: the male, as *principium activum*, provides the formative seed that disposes matter toward new life, while the female is receptive and nurturing. Aquinas, synthesizing Aristotle, explains that "the active principle of generation is from the father, while the mother provides the matter" (*Summa Theologiae*, Suppl., q. 39, a. 1). Hence, for the Eternal Son – the active principle of all creation – it was fitting to assume the sex that most perfectly signifies His generative and efficient causality. The male sex thus becomes the natural sign of the Son as the active source of life and order, expressing in flesh what He is eternally in divinity.

Second, this fittingness follows Aquinas's distinction between two modes of necessity: one *absolute* and one *of convenience* (*Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 1, a. 2). Christ's maleness was not absolutely required, but it was necessary for the Incarnation to attain its end "better and more conveniently." The Incarnation reveals the invisible God (Col 1:15) and accomplishes redemption as a nuptial mystery. Scripture presents God's covenantal love in spousal terms – Bridegroom and Bride (Isa 54:5; Hos 2:16–20; Eph 5:25–27) – fulfilled in Christ's self-gift to His Church. A male incarnation, therefore, most fittingly manifests this spousal dynamic and preserves the perfect congruence between the "Son of God" and the "Son of Man," a harmony that would be obscured in "Daughter of Man."

Third, the fittingness accords with Aquinas's principle that every act has a *principle* and a *term* (*Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 93, a. 1). In the Incarnation, the acting principle is the Divine Son – the eternal Active Cause – while the assumed human nature is the term. For perfect conformity, the human nature must analogically mirror the principle: as the male is the active, efficient cause in generation, so the assumed humanity fittingly manifests the Son's eternal mode of causality. Thus, Christ's male sex is not a matter of sociological contingency but of sacramental

signification. As Aquinas notes, sacraments cause grace by signifying it (III, q. 60, a. 1); therefore, the natural properties of the sign are essential. Christ's maleness signifies His active, generative, and spousal role as the Divine Bridegroom, rendering it a necessity of fittingness (*necessitas convenientiae*) within the divine economy. In sum, while the maleness of Christ was not metaphysically inevitable, it was the most fitting expression of who the Eternal Son is and what the Incarnation accomplishes – a sacramental icon of divine generation, causality, and nuptial love.

The Sacramental Fittingness of the Male Priesthood

To comprehend the fittingness of a male priesthood, one must first apprehend the ontological nature of the sacerdotal office itself. The priesthood is not merely a functional ministry of leadership but a sacramental reality ordered towards the *recapitulation* and *re-presentation* of the Logos's active generative principle within the economy of salvation. Its primary end is the sanctification of the faithful through the administration of the sacraments, an action accomplished *in persona Christi Capitis* – in the person of Christ the Head. This phrase denotes that the priest does not act on his own authority nor merely as a delegate of the community, but as an instrumental cause whose personal agency is taken up and subsumed by the primary agency of Christ Himself. The summit of this priestly action is found in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, a sacrament which, as Saint Thomas Aquinas elucidates, is fundamentally distinct from all others in its mode of perfection.

As Aquinas establishes, the other sacraments are "perfected in the use of the consecrated matter" (e.g., the washing with water in Baptism, the anointing with chrism in Confirmation). Their matter receives a spiritual power through a blessing (*benedictio*), enabling it to serve as an instrumental cause of grace when used by the minister. The Eucharist, however, is "accomplished by the consecration of the matter" itself. This consecration is not a mere blessing imparting a spiritual quality but a "miraculous change of the substance" – Transubstantiation – which "can only be done by God." Consequently, the priestly minister "has no other act save the pronouncing of the words." This dictates the unique form of the sacrament. The forms of the other sacraments are spoken in the person of the minister ("I baptize you," "I confirm you"), by way of command ("Receive the power"), or by way of entreaty ("By this anointing..."). In stark contrast, the sacramental form of the Eucharist, "This is My Body," "This is the chalice of My Blood," is "pronounced as if Christ were speaking in person." The priest's voice becomes the instrument through which Christ Himself, the Eternal High Priest, speaks and acts, effecting the substantial conversion. The minister is thus utterly transparent to the divine action; his role is to pronounce the words

that serve as the instrumental vehicle for Christ's own efficacious utterance (*Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 78, a. 1, co.).

This theological structure reveals the Eucharist as the supreme manifestation of Christ's active generative principle within the sacramental order. Just as the Divine *Logos* was the active, formative principle in the first creation ("through him all things were made"), so in this work of the New Creation, He is the sole active principle who, by His divine fiat, generates His own real presence under the species of bread and wine. This is an act of supreme efficient causality, analogous to the original act of creation *ex nihilo*, though here it is a conversion of substances. It is in this specific context that the question of the minister's fittingness arises. Given that the sacrament is perfected by Christ speaking *in persona sua*, the physicality of the minister might seem irrelevant. Yet, Catholic sacramental theology insists that the signs employed must be natural and fitting, meaning they should possess a natural capacity or analogy that makes them apt instruments for signifying and effecting the grace they convey.

It is here that the natural symbolism of the sexes becomes theologically salient. The priest, acting *in persona Christi Capitis*, is an instrumental cause. For an instrument to be fittingly deployed, it should possess a natural proportionality or aptitude to the end for which it is used and to the nature of the primary agent who wields it. A sculptor, for instance, may use a chisel made of hardened steel to shape marble; the chisel participates in the sculptor's artistic power precisely because its natural hardness and sharpness make it a fitting instrument for carving. While the sculptor could theoretically use a soft clay tool, it would be profoundly unfitting and ineffective. Analogously, Christ, the primary agent in the Eucharist, is the Eternal Son, the active generative Principle of all life. His incarnation as a male was not accidental but fitting, as it made visible in a human nature the active, generative, and spousal character of His divine person.

The male human being, by his natural constitution, is the icon of this active generative principle within the order of human procreation. His physiological role is that of the initiator, the one who provides the active, formative seed. This is not a statement of superiority – as the female provides the equally essential matter and nurturing receptacle – but a distinction of role that serves as a natural sign. Therefore, when Christ chooses a human instrument to stand *in persona sua* and pronounce the words of consecration – an act which is the supreme sacramental instantiation of His active, life-generating power – it is eminently fitting that the instrument be male. The male priest, in his very embodied masculinity, constitutes a natural sign that participates analogically in the same active, generative principle that Christ exercises divinely in the Eucharist. His maleness is a natural suitability (*convenientia naturalis*) that makes him a fitting instrument for this specific action,

providing a perceptible continuity between the natural sign and the supernatural reality it signifies and instruments.

This is a matter of fittingness, not of absolute necessity born of divine incapacity. God's omnipotence is not constrained by His own ordinances; He could undoubtedly work through any instrument He chooses. However, divine wisdom operates through harmony and analogy, choosing the means that are most proportionate to the end. To use a female person as the instrumental cause for an act that is the sacramental analogue of divine generative power would introduce a dissonance between the natural sign of the minister and the supernatural reality being affected. It would obscure the spousal symbolism of the Eucharist, wherein Christ the Bridegroom offers His body for His Bride, the Church (Ephesians 5:25-27). The male priesthood, therefore, is not a statement on the dignity of women but a consequence of the sacramental economy's reliance on fitting and Christologically-established signs to make present, with maximum clarity and efficacy, the mysteries of faith. It ensures that the instrument is conformed, in a natural way, to the nature of the primary Agent and the specific act He performs through it.

Secondly, building upon the foundational understanding of the priest as an instrumental cause acting *in persona Christi*, a further dimension of fittingness emerges from the priest's role as a mediator. It is essential to distinguish between the unique, substantial mediation of Jesus Christ and the participatory, sacramental mediation of the priest. Christ alone is the one Mediator between God and men (1 Tim. 2:5) by virtue of His hypostatic union, possessing *substantially* both the divine nature and a human nature. The priest, however, participates in this mediation *instrumentally* and *sacramentally*. For any mediator to function fittingly, he must possess a natural affinity or proportionality to both parties he seeks to join. In the sacramental order, the priest mediates between Christ, the Divine Bridegroom (the active font of grace), and the Church, His Bride (the receptive recipient of grace). To be a fitting instrument of this mediation, the priest must therefore share in something of both principles.

The priest shares in the active principle of Christ (*in persona Christi*) precisely through his ordination, which configures him to Christ the Head and High Priest, enabling him to perform sacred actions by Christ's own authority. Simultaneously, the priest shares in the passive, receptive principle of the Church (*in persona Ecclesiae*) because he is himself a member of the faithful, a beneficiary of the redemption he administers, and a recipient of the very graces that flow through his ministerial actions. He both confers the sacrament and receives its sustaining grace. This dual participation is essential to his mediating role. The male sex, as

established, is the natural icon of the active generative principle within the human order.

The female sex, in its profound and complementary dignity, is the natural icon of the receptive, nurturing, and generative principle, a reality perfectly embodied by the Church, who receives the seed of God's Word and brings forth spiritual children. Consequently, while a woman possesses to a supreme degree the natural aptitude to signify the receptive, ecclesial dimension of the mediation, she lacks the natural analogical capacity to signify the *active, generative* dimension of the mediation that flows from Christ the Head. A male priest, by his embodied masculinity, naturally signifies both poles of the mediation: he acts with the active authority of Christ (*in persona Christi*) and, as a member of the Church, he receives and is sanctified by that same grace (*in persona Ecclesiae*). His maleness provides the natural sign of the active principle; his humanity and his membership in the Church ensure his receptivity. This integral natural symbolism makes his mediation fittingly transparent to the entire Christ-Church mystery.

Thirdly, the nature of a sacrament itself demands this congruence between the visible sign and the invisible reality. A sacrament is an efficacious sign, an outward manifestation of an inward grace, and its external elements are chosen by divine wisdom for their natural aptitude to signify what they effect. This principle of *congruitas* (fittingness) extends to the minister, who is a living and integral part of the sacramental sign. As Thomas Aquinas teaches, the sacraments cause grace by signifying it, and thus the natural properties of the matter, form, and minister contribute to the integrity and clarity of the sign (*Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 60, a. 1). The "invisible minister" of every sacrament, most especially the Eucharist, is ultimately Christ Himself. The visible human minister is the instrumental sign through which Christ's own ministry is made perceptibly present. Therefore, for the sign to be perfect, the visible minister must possess a natural suitability to the nature and action of the invisible Minister.

The term of the Eucharistic consecration—its final cause and supreme effect—is the Real Presence of Christ, achieved through the miraculous conversion of transubstantiation. This is an act of sheer efficient causality, the supreme instantiation of the Divine *Logos's* active generative power within the created order. The form of the sacrament, "This is My Body..." is pronounced by the priest not in his own person but as the transparent instrument of Christ speaking *in persona sua*. Therefore, the visible image of this invisible, divine Agent should itself be an icon that participates analogically, on the natural plane, in the same mode of active causality. The male sex, as the natural principle of active generation in human biology, possesses this analogical suitability. It is a created participation in the broader metaphysical principle of active causality, of which divine generation

and transubstantiation are the supreme exemplars. While the priest's natural generative power is in no way the cause of transubstantiation – which is effected by God alone – his embodied masculinity serves as a fitting natural sign that makes the invisible action of the Primary Agent intelligibly and harmoniously present. It ensures a continuity between the natural order of signification and the supernatural order of grace, preventing a dissonance that would obscure the sacrament's meaning. The female sex, which icons the equally essential but receptively generative principle, would not provide this specific natural analogy to *active* efficient causality, thus rendering the total sacramental sign less perfectly proportioned to the reality it is ordained to signify and effect.

Thus, the cumulative force of this inquiry leads to a single, coherent conclusion. The argument has proceeded from first principles: the metaphysical distinction between active and passive causes provides the foundational architecture of reality. This architecture is perfectly realized in the eternal generation of the Divine Son, the active Principle of creation. It is reflected analogically in the natural order of human generation. It was made sacramentally visible in the fitting Incarnation of the Eternal Son as a male. Consequently, the priest, who acts *in persona Christi Capitis* to re-present this same Christ's spousal sacrifice, must constitute a natural sign that embodies the bridegroom-hood of the Divine Logos. The reservation of priestly ordination to men is therefore not an arbitrary prohibition but the safeguarding of a sacramental sign's integrity.

In conclusion, the reservation of priestly ordination to males is thus shown to be a matter of profound sacramental fittingness, rooted in the nature of the Eucharist, the role of the priest as mediator, and the inherent logic of sacramental signs. It is a consequence of a theological ecosystem wherein nature is not negated but assumed and perfected by grace, ensuring that every element of the sign – including the embodied masculinity of the minister – conspires harmoniously to make present the mystery of Christ, the Eternal Bridegroom, giving His life for His Bride, the Church.

Response to the Arguments for Female Priesthood

On the argument that restricting women from priesthood is suppressive from the OT:

Philosophically, restriction may be understood in two distinct senses. In the first, a restriction is unjust when it violates the essence of a being, suppressing its natural capacity for self-expression and flourishing – for example, forbidding a rational being to think or speak. Such limits negate the freedom proper to human nature. In the second sense, however, restriction can be just and liberating when it safeguards essence, removing distortions that hinder authentic fulfillment. Moral

law, for instance, forbids lying not to suppress speech but to protect truth, allowing speech to serve its proper end. Thus, ordered restrictions are not oppressive but protective, orienting freedom toward the good. Applied to the question of women's ordination, the Church's restriction must be understood in this second sense. The priesthood is not a position of social power but a sacramental reality: the priest is configured to Christ as the active, generative principle and Bridegroom who represents Him in His spousal relation to the Church. Because this generative symbolism pertains to the essence of the sacrament, the male sex constitutes an essential element of the priestly sign. Hence, the restriction is not against the essence of woman, but for the essence of priesthood.

This distinction clarifies why the restriction is not oppressive. Just as men are not demeaned by their incapacity for motherhood—since motherhood belongs essentially to the female sex—so too women are not demeaned by the inability to receive priestly ordination. Both cases preserve the integrity of roles that arise from essence rather than arbitrary exclusion. The restriction thus functions not as suppression but as boundary for the sake of essence, ensuring that both priesthood and womanhood flourish according to their divinely instituted meanings. Women's dignity finds full expression in other forms of vocation—spiritual motherhood, religious consecration, teaching, prophecy, and holiness. The Church's discipline, therefore, protects the coherence of sacramental symbolism and upholds, rather than diminishes, the dignity proper to woman.

On the Argument from Historical Precedence

A frequent argument for ordaining women to the priesthood appeals to supposed historical precedents of women in liturgical roles during the Patristic and medieval periods. While women, particularly deaconesses, indeed held recognized ministries in the early Church, historical and theological evidence shows their roles were distinct in nature, scope, and sacramental meaning from priestly ordination. These offices arose from pastoral necessity and cultural propriety, not from a challenge to the male-characterized priesthood. The strongest evidence concerns the order of deaconesses in the Eastern churches. Their functions—outlined in the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the Byzantine codex *Barberini gr. 336*—included anointing women before baptism, catechizing female converts, mediating between bishops and women, and ministering to the sick (Parenti and Velkovska 163; Gryson 108). These essential ministries existed to preserve modesty and ensure pastoral care in a gender-segregated society, not to assert equality in holy orders.

Although the Byzantine rite used *cheirotomia* (χειροτομία) for the deaconess's installation, its prayers and rubrics reveal a distinct office. The *Barberini* prayer

emphasizes holiness and service but omits references to the altar, Eucharist, or Gospel proclamation—the core duties of male deacons (Karras 288–290). The bishop's laying of hands on the neck rather than the head (*cheirothesia*) further marks a qualitative difference (Parenti and Velkovska 163; Karras 289). Thus, the deaconess was instituted for dedicated ministry, not as part of the sacramental priesthood shared by male deacons, priests, and bishops. Claims of medieval female priests or bishops are similarly unfounded. As Macy notes, terms like *presbyterae* or *episcopae* (112) more likely referred to priests' wives, abbesses with administrative authority, or women holding honorary titles, not ordained ministers performing sacramental duties (Macy 115–118). Hence, the existence of deaconesses and other female ministers cannot serve as precedent for priestly ordination. The evidence demonstrates that the Church, while valuing women's service, maintained a consistent theological distinction between pastoral ministries and the sacramental priesthood. To interpret these roles as evidence of women's ordination is to impose modern meanings upon historical forms.

On the Incarnational and Trinitarian Arguments

On the Incarnational and Trinitarian Arguments: The core premises of these objections have been addressed substantively within the positive argument of this paper. The Christological argument is answered by the analysis of Christ's maleness as a matter of fittingness rather than biological essentialism (pp. 16-18). The Trinitarian argument is preemptively countered by the orthodox presentation of Divine Sonship and the perichoretic equality of the Trinitarian persons, which rejects all forms of subordinationism (pp. 11-13). Therefore, a separate rebuttal is redundant.

Ecclesiastical and Pastoral Arguments for Female Ordination

Advocates of female ordination often appeal to pastoral necessity, especially amid the global priest shortage. Ross observes that in many underserved communities women already assume vital pastoral roles, a situation some argue should be regularized through ordination. John Jefferson Davis acknowledges the urgency of this pastoral need but warns that "pastoral need must be weighed alongside doctrinal truth" (15). While the shortage is grave, any solution must be judged not merely by effectiveness but by fidelity to the sacramental order. From a Catholic and Orthodox standpoint, ordaining women misunderstands both the Church's authority over the sacraments and the sacramental nature of Holy Orders. According to the Council of Trent, the sacraments are divine institutions, not human constructs (Session VII, Canon 6). The Church administers but does not create them; therefore, she cannot alter their essential elements—matter, form, or minister. The sacraments "contain the grace which they signify" and confer it ex

opere operato only because Christ established their form (Session VII, Canon 6). To modify any essential element would sever the link between sign and grace, exceeding ecclesial authority (*ultra vires*). Thus, no pastoral urgency permits altering what Christ instituted.

Applied to Holy Orders, this means the sacrament's matter and form—and particularly its minister—are divinely fixed. The minister must be a baptized male, capable of signifying Christ the Bridegroom in His spousal relation to the Church. This is not a disciplinary matter like celibacy but a theological one rooted in divine law. A female priest would not simply change Church policy but alter the sacramental sign itself, rendering it invalid. The Eucharist celebrated under such conditions would lose its efficacy, for the visible sign would no longer convey the invisible grace it signifies. Hence, ordaining women would not resolve the spiritual famine but deepen doctrinal confusion. The true remedy for priestly scarcity lies elsewhere: renewed prayer for vocations, intentional discipleship, and greater recognition of women's indispensable but non-sacerdotal ministries, as Ross highlights. To pursue ordination as a pragmatic fix would create a theological rupture that obscures Christ's presence in the priesthood.

Conclusion

From the metaphysical distinction of active and passive principles to the sacramental symbolism of Christ the Bridegroom, the Church's logic remains coherent: priestly ordination is reserved to men not arbitrarily but by sacramental fittingness. The priest acts *in persona Christi Capitis*—in the person of Christ the Head—whose masculinity signifies His generative, spousal love (John Paul II, *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* 2). Christ's male humanity was fitting for revealing His eternal Sonship; likewise, the male priesthood preserves that sign. This restriction safeguards, rather than diminishes, the equal dignity of women by ensuring that the visible sacrament remains transparent to the mystery it conveys.

Works Cited

- Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. Translated by W. D. Ross, Oxford UP, 1924.
- Augustine of Hippo. *The Literal Meaning of Genesis (De Genesi ad Litteram)*.
Translated by John Hammond Taylor, S.J., Newman Press, 1982.
- . *On the Trinity*. Translated by Arthur West Haddan, NPNF1, vol. 3, 1887.
- Council of Trent. *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent*. Edited and translated by J. Waterworth, London, 1848.
- Davis, John Jefferson. "Incarnation, Trinity, and the Ordination of Women to the Priesthood." *Priscilla Papers*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2010, pp. 9-17.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier, Vintage Books, 2011.
- Gryson, Roger. *The Ministry of Women in the Early Church*. Translated by Jean Laporte and Mary Louise Hall, Liturgical Press, 1976.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A. V. Miller, Oxford UP, 1977.
- Honneth, Axel. *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Translated by Joel Anderson, Polity Press, 1995.
- John Damascene. *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*. Translated by S.D.F. Salmond, NPNF2, vol. 9, 1899.
- John Paul II. *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*. Apostolic Letter, 22 May 1994. The Holy See, www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_letters/1994/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_19940522_ordinatio-sacerdotalis.html.
- Karras, Valerie A. "Female Deacons in the Byzantine Church." *Church History*, vol. 73, no. 2, 2004, pp. 272-316. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/4146467.
- Macy, Gary. *The Hidden History of Women's Ordination: Female Clergy in the Medieval West*. Oxford UP, 2008.

- Newman, John Henry. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. 1845. U of Notre Dame P, 1989.
- Parenti, Stefano, and Elena Velkovska, editors. *L'Euchologe Barberini gr. 336*. 2nd ed., Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*. Translated by Denis Savage, Yale UP, 1970.
- Ross, Susan A. "Can Women Become Priests? A Catholic Feminist Perspective." *Philosophy & Theology*, vol. 17, no. 1/2, 2005, pp. 249–267.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. "Should Women Want Women Priests or Women-Church?" *Feminist Theology*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2011, pp. 145–152.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. Crossroad, 1983.
- Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Contra Gentiles*. Translated by James F. Anderson, U of Notre Dame P, 1975.
- . *Summa Theologica*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Benziger Bros., 1947.