1: 'The hands of a woman': Person, Image, and Ordination

After decades of gracious theological reflection on a subject she came to both unexpectedly and relatively late in her long and prolific life, Elisabeth Behr-Sigel saw nothing in the faith of the church or its theological reasoning "to prevent the Church from ordaining, i.e., blessing, a female Christian for the exercise of a ministry which is an expression of the universal priesthood of all the faithful, while at the same time pointing to him who is its one divine source."[1] A woman, she argues, was just as able to iconically point to Christ as a man. This conclusion stands at odds with her initial position, which echoed almost in its entirety the work of her friend Paul Evdokimov. Behr-Sigel shared Evdokimov's assumption of distinct male and female charisms, the latter of which precluded the participation of women in a ministry which embodied male charisms. The evolution into her mature position is chronicled and carefully examined by Sarah Hinlicky Wilson. This later position incorporates the personalism of Vladimir Lossky. According to Lossky, a key element of our common humanity is an ability to transcend ourselves.[2] The false trail of "women's charisms," which elevates a distinctive femininity by denying women their common, personal, humanity, is rejected by Behr-Sigel in the recognition that "women are not a set of charisms. They are persons with a variety of charisms who, again, transcend the nature of which they are an instance."[3] This personalism is evident in Behr-Sigel's shift regarding the Theotokos: no longer is she a representative of women in particular, but rather, "she is matrix of humanity renewed."[4]

Rather than repeat the work of Wilson and explain Behr-Sigel's theological development, I will expand on the theological insights reached by her in the last decade of her reflection by engaging two areas Behr-Sigel left mostly, though not entirely, untouched. First, I will examine Theodore the Studite's reference to the maleness of Christ in the context of his arguments for the veneration of icons. Second, I will turn to iconic images of the Theotokos which underscore her traditional role as representative of all of humanity. I will conclude by returning to Behr-Sigel's arguments for female priests in light of the insights offered by this broader examination of our rich tradition of polyvalent image and metaphor. In doing so, I hope to express my gratitude for her willingness to reconsider her own opinions, for courageously making public her deeper questions and reflections, and for graciously speaking a theology that allows a much younger feminist

---

[1] {Behr-Sigel, 2000, #529@42}
[2] {Wilson, 2008, #22991@297}
[3] {Wilson, 2008, #22991@298}
[4] {Behr-Sigel, 2001, #66618@33} CHK - wrong version?

theologian like myself the space to breathe with the Spirit in my own church.

1.1: The Iconic argument

Despite its rather recent appearance, the iconic argument continues to hold sway among Orthodox theologians opposed to the ordination of women to the priesthood. It was quite convincing to Behr-Sigel herself for many years. In this argument, the priest stands before the church as an icon of Christ, and the success of his resemblance to Christ depends on their shared maleness. Despite the fact that this argument emphasizes only the male priestly metaphors of bridegroom, husband and father, to the exclusion of more the frequent metaphors of shepherd, captain, teacher, leader, birth-giver and midwife; despite the fact that this argument focuses on the singular eucharistic function to the detriment of the many other functions of a Christian priest such as pastor, teacher, confessor, administrator; despite the argument's failure to account for the liturgical symbolism of the priest as *in person Ecclesiae*, a body typically described by the feminine figures of a bride or the Theotokos herself, but for which we have no living female symbol at the altar; despite the fact that according to Chrysostom (and consistently quoted by Behr-Sigel) the priest does not do the work but merely lends his hands to the Holy Spirit, despite all these problems with this theology, the underlying question remains, can women be icons of Christ? This is the more fundamental issue, which cannot be put aside, can women's bodies incarnate the divine?

The very asking of this question seems quite devastating for Orthodox women. Repeatedly asked by Behr-Sigel, Nonna Harrison and Valerie Karras, among others, if in the Incarnation Christ did not assume the nature of women, are women healed? After all, "what is not assumed is not healed" according to Gregory of Nazianzus, who states this in support of his contention that yes, indeed, Christ was fully *anthropos*, human.[5] The very notion of *theosis* depends on the full humanity of Christ, a humanity into which each human being is growing. This is salvation. Yet Jesus' body was, and is, male. Behr-Sigel did not extensively pursue the meaning of Christ's male body, with the exception of her exchange with the patristic scholar Nonna Harrison. As Wilson notes, her silence "reflects the wisdom of the church catholic before her."[6] By adopting the personalism of theologians such as Lossky, Behr-Sigel takes on a position in which quantifying and defining a human person by any single component denies the fullness of their humanity. From this perspective, there is little reason to examine the maleness of Christ. Yet Wilson submits that

[5] The more accurate quote is, "The unassumed is the unhealed, but what is united with God is also being saved" (*Epistle* 101.5). {Gregory of Nazianzus, 2002, #19189@158;\. See, for example, \Harrison, 1998, #266}
[6] {Wilson, 2008, #22991@284}

questions about men and women in the church will remain unresolved "until the church reaches some kind of consensus about the meaning of the incarnate Word's male human body."[7]

Opponents of female ordination, on the other hand, break the relative silence of the tradition by emphasizing the maleness of Christ. In the priest, a male body is required as a visual pointer to Christ, and only a male body can engage in priestly roles and relationships, which are presumed to be masculine in character. I will begin my arguments here, with the maleness of Christ. I will only tangentially address whether priestly roles are somehow essentially masculine, as this is returns us to the question of which of the many, polyvalent metaphors for the priesthood we choose to emphasize. Here, I am interested in the question of what it is that we 'see' in and through bodies? Is our iconic gaze meant to rest on the body itself? Is our gaze directed towards something else? If so, what is the connection between the body we see, and the quality or characteristic that it reveals? By beginning where Behr-Sigel only rarely ventured, I want to take up the difficult question of the maleness of Christ in a context where it is particularly important: icons in wood and paint, and icons in flesh and blood.

1.2: Extending Behr-Sigel's Critique

My central contention is this: with Behr-Sigel, I argue that sex colors but does not dictate our humanity. Sex is essential to being human, but our humanity can never be fully described nor reduced to our sex. Rather, the sexed body is one particular, and essential, characteristic of being human which highlights the uniqueness of the individual. I will make my case using the work of Theodore the Studite, one of the few late-ancient theologians to discuss the maleness of Christ. Theodore gives us a frame with which to consider the radical particularity of Christ's maleness. I will then take the threads on which Theodore weaves his arguments, and consider the radical female particularity of the Theotokos. I move from the maleness of Christ to the femaleness of the Theotokos because arguments which exclude women from the priesthood are as much about supposedly archetypical feminine qualities as they are about the masculine qualities of men or the priestly office. Interpretations of the Theotokos have been at the crux of Orthodox arguments about the character of 'Woman' as essentially passive, receptive, and humble. With Behr-Sigel, I argue that this a erroneously limited view of the Mother of God, who is consistently described by Behr-Sigel through the words of Nicholas Cabasilas as a "co-worker" with God. I will build on Behr-Sigel's critique of modern interpretations of the Theotokos and her femininity by attending to

[7] {Wilson, 2008, #22991@285}

more traditional verbal and iconic portrayals of the Theotokos. These visions of the Mother of God bear little resemblance to the romantic ideals of nineteenth- and twentieth-century womanhood.

By examining more closely the particularity of sex in wood and flesh icons, I am extending Behr-Sigel's insight regarding human persons into icons themselves, and then back into human beings. Icons are not only windows into heaven, but are glimpses into the unique, irreducible, and mysterious personhood of human beings who transcend themselves in pursuit of *theosis*.

2: Particularity: The Maleness of Christ

The seemingly modern concern with bodily particularity was shared by the defenders of icons over a millennia and a half ago, though for very different reasons. Like modern 'materialists' of every stripe, Theodore the Studite (759-826) could not imagine human beings without bodies. Concerned with the reality of Christ's body and its ability to be seen, touched, and therefore 'written,' he laid a foundation for the crucial value of bodily difference as a constituent element of human uniqueness. Further, he offers us the insight that difference and variety increases the glory and honor offered to God.

2.1: Theodore of Studios

Theodore wrote in response to the iconoclast Council of 815. These second-wave iconoclasts were no longer concerned purely with the question of idolatry as they admitted the possibility of creating icons. Their objection was to the veneration of icons, concerned that laity, through an ignorant act of veneration might worship the wood and paint of icons as itself divine, thereby worshipping the creation rather than the Creator. In 815, icons were permitted in churches if they were out of reach, hung high enough on the walls that they could not be touched. Icons could be made but not "used."[8] At issue was the proper order of worship, and the implied conflation between image and prototype, which for iconoclasts are *homoousios*, of the same substance or essence (*ousia*) with one another.[9]

Theodore was not content with treating icons as mere teaching tools.[10] He believed icons were essential to worship, and wanted to bring icons back within reach of the people, recognizing in their persistent veneration a genuine honoring of the *person* depicted. Rather than summarize the

[8] {Henry, 1984, #75335@78-79}

[9] {Henry, 1984, #75335@82; Pelikan, 1974, #79640@109} The problem, declares Theodore's literary opponent, is that "Christ's flesh is always venerated together with His divinity, because they are united inseparably; but the icon is not united inseparably with Him" (*Ref.* I.12). {Theodore the Studite, 2001, #16054@32}

entirety of Theodore's reasoning, I will focus on three threads within his larger argument. One thread argues that it is the uniqueness of individual persons that makes it possible to 'write' icons at all. This thread is significant for its insights into what makes human beings distinct from one another. The second thread argues that an icon and its prototype do not share the same nature or material, but that the image shares in the grace and honor of the person depicted. It is only through the sharing of grace and honor that we can say that divinity is present in an icon. The third and final thread is that icons are *necessary*, since an image that *could* be made *should* be made, and further, that the greater the diversity of materials used to portray the image, the greater the glory and honor offered to God.

2.2: Writing Humanity

The ability to 'sense' the divine in icons starts with the Incarnation. In accord with Gregory of Nazianzus' principle that "what is not assumed is not saved," Theodore argues that Christ assumes the entirety of our human nature (*Ref.* III.A.4). A human being is recognized "with the mind and thought" as that which is "animate, rational, mortal, and capable of thought and understanding" (*Ref.* III.A.16, 4).[11] Yet no human being is recognized in the mind without being seen by the eye as he or she exists as a particular, embodied individual (*Ref.* III.I.A.16). "For example," says Theodore,

Peter is not portrayed insofar as he is animate, rational, mortal, and capable of thought and understanding; for this does not define Peter only, but also Paul and John, and all those of the same species. But insofar as he adds along with the common definition certain properties, such as a long or short nose, curly hair, a good complexion, bright eyes, he is distinguished from the other individuals of the same species (καὶ πάντας τοὺς ὑπὸ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶδος). (Ref. III.A.34).[12]

We can only speak of a general human nature because of what we see in particular, unique, human beings (*Ref.* III.A.15).[13] Each bodily characteristic is shared among some but not all individuals, yet these common qualities converge in a single human being with a name, who we understand to be like no other human being. Peter is utterly unique from Paul. For Theodore, the

[10] This was the primary focus of Theodore's predecessor, the first-wave defender of icons, John of Damascus.
[11] {Theodore the Studite, 2001, #16054@83, 78}
[12] {Theodore the Studite, 2001, #16054@90-91}
[13] Theodore consistently refers to the ability to "see." However, I suspect that had he been asked, he would have agreed that the blind are able to recognize a human person utilizing other senses. See the recent work of Susan Ashbrook Harvey and Bissera Pentcheva on the incorporation of the senses into Orthodox worship. {Harvey, 2006, #49328; Pentcheva, 2006, #84798; Pentcheva, 2010, #38605} While Pentcheva notes a hierarchy of sense with sight reigning, I will refer to the "senses" rather than sight only.

significance of this radical particularity is that it allows us to recognize, and then write Christ as distinct from other human beings.[14]

It is here that we run directly into the 'problem' of Jesus' maleness. Among these shared differences is biological sex. "Maleness and femaleness," says Theodore,

> are sought only in the forms of bodies, since none of the differences which characterize the sexes can be recognized in bodiless beings. Therefore, if Christ were uncircumscribable, as being without a body, He would also be without the difference of sex. But He was born male…therefore He is circumscribed" (*Ref.* III.A.4).[15]

Theodore's reference to biological sex is in keeping with his overarching goal: circumscribability. Christ had a sexed male body, sexed bodies can be circumscribed, therefore, Christ can be circumscribed. However, Theodore is quite clear that maleness and femaleness exists only in bodies. If there is no body, there is no sex. Biological sex is one of many essential hypostatic properties which enable us to recognize one another as distinct in our bodies. It is also one of many qualities through which we can see our common nature, a window into our humanity.

My point here is that the maleness of Jesus is important. But its importance is not as a *common* attribute which says something about the behavior, qualities or charisms of all who share in the attribute, but as a marker of distinction, of difference, of uniqueness. For Theodore, there is no intermediate state between a common humanity shared by Peter, Paul, and Jesus, and the maleness of their bodies which serves to distinguish them from one another. At no point does Theodore even hint at the idea that Peter, Paul and Jesus have something in common that sets them apart from female human beings such as Mary or Martha. On the contrary, Theodore states quite clearly that Christ is identical to his Father in respect to his divinity, but to his mother in respect to his humanity (*Ref.* III.B.2). Christ's humanity is identical to a 'female humanity.' For Theodore, the point is that there are only infinitely diverse individuals through whom we see general humanity.

Theodore gives us an anthropological thread which we must take seriously, human particularity is a diverse witness to a shared humanity. This thread undermines a facil attempt to describe human beings through the shared lens of a particular hypostatic quality. The moment

---

[14] Like all human beings Christ, "assumed human nature in general, yet He assumed it as contemplated in an individual manner; for this reason the possibility of circumscription exists" (*Ref.* III.A.17). {Theodore the Studite, 2001, #16054@84}

[15] {Theodore the Studite, 2001, #16054@94} Theodore is not the only theologian to refer to the maleness of Christ. Nonna Harrison discusses other examples, among them Gregory the Theologian in *Or.* 45, 13. Harrison's article is a

human beings are defined through only one aspect of their uniqueness, in this case, their sex, uniqueness itself drops away. If Theodore is right, an Orthodox theology of icons depends on both particularity and uniqueness. Without radical particularity, that is, uniqueness, there could be no icons of Christ. While I can hardly make any sort of direct line of connection here, I think it is fair to say that the emphasis on uniqueness as constitutive of personhood in figures such as Lossky and John Zizioulas reflect this aspect of the Orthodox tradition.

2.3: Resemblence and Homynymy

Before moving to the question of the theological significance of sex and its controversial partner, gender, I would like to briefly highlight two other threads in Theodore. These threads have nothing to do with the maleness of Christ, but they highlight important aspects of the analogy created between the wood and paint used to write icons, and the flesh and bones of human beings who are icons of the divine.

Theodore's iconoclast opponents apparently blurred the distinction between the flesh of Christ and his divinity, but thought it quite obvious that the material of icons were distinct from body of Christ, and therefore, not to be venerated (*Ref.* I.12). In response, Theodore contends that since Christ has both a human and divine nature, what is written is *not* the divine nature, but Jesus' human qualities which contain but do not limit the divine.[16] Divinity is present in the icon not because the material is itself deified, but "by a relative participation, because they share in the grace and the honor" (*Ref.* I.12).[17] The nature of sacred objects remains distinct from the nature of that which they represent, just as within Christ his human and divine natures remain distinct. What connects the nature of the image with the nature of its prototype are shared resemblance and name.[18] The use of the word "resemblance" might seem to confirm arguments that human beings who symbolize Christ must resemble him by sharing his sex. Yet given that sex is only one of Jesus' many, individuating qualities, arguments based on this understanding of resemblance must also account for other qualities, such as hair, skin color, height, etc. The question is, what 'creates'

careful and thorough discussion of the nuanced use of gendered language, imagery and allegory in patristic sources. See {Harrison, 1998, #266}

[16] {Theodore the Studite, 2001, #16054@82}

[17] {Theodore the Studite, 2001, #16054@33}

[18] "Insofar as the image resembles the prototype, it shares its whole veneration on the basis of resemblance, not bringing into veneration the material in which it appears; for this is the nature (*physis*) of the image, to be identified according to likeness with the prototype, but to differ according to the principle of its essence (*ousia*). For this reason the image has homonymy with the prototype. But if it were wholly similar, what we have said has collapsed, and the image is simply

resemblance? What allows for the sharing of a name, the sharing of which directs veneration from physical materials to the person depicted? For a moment, I will put these questions aside in order to draw out the third, and final, thread I am drawing from Theodore.

2.4: The Glory of Diversity

In a distinctly Aristotelian move, Theodore argues that an image which is not written, like a seal which is not impressed, is ineffective, idle, a failure:

The seal shows its desire for honor when it makes itself available for impression in many different materials. In the same way, although we believe that Christ's own image is in Him as He has a human form, nevertheless when we see His image materially depicted in different ways, we praise His greatness more magnificently. For the failure to go forth into a material imprint eliminates His existence in human form (*Ref.* III.D.10).[19]

First, note here that Christ without an image *fails* as a prototype (*Ref.* III.D.9).[20] Theodore is arguing for the *necessary* use of icons in worship. It is not enough to say that we are able to 'write' Christ, but we *must* do so. This is Theodore's affirmation of icons as objects of veneration, not simply teaching tools. If it is possible to portray Christ in material form, it is better to do so. Following from this, it is also better to portray Christ with diverse materials. This diversity of materials used *enhances* the glory of the one portrayed.

2.5: Connections and Correlations

So how do these three threads connect serve to develop the insights of Behr-Sigel regarding the ordination of women?

One thread elevates the human body and its characteristics as indicators of human uniqueness. Bodiliness is essential, it is the only way we can be human. But this does not then justify some sort of sex or gender essentialism. The problem with arguments which group the characteristics, qualities and roles of human beings based on shared bodily characteristics is not that they are overestimate the significance of the body. Rather, it is that they underestimate the uniqueness of one body from another. Theodore's use of bodily particularity as the very means of

---

the prototype. However, it resembles the prototype in its whole likeness, but not in its nature" (*Ref.* III.D.6). {Theodore the Studite, 2001, #16054@111}

[19] {Theodore the Studite, 2001, #16054@112} Theodore's work is a series of *Refutations*, thus the abbreviated use of "*Ref.*" followed by the number, section and paragraph. Page numbers will always be given in the footnotes. Patrick Henry points out that Theodore's terminology is Aristotelian even as he retians the Neoplatonic commitments of both Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and John of Damascus. {Henry, 1976, #55044@27}

[20] {Theodore the Studite, 2001, #16054@112}

distinguishing one person from another, as the means through which we can 'write' Jesus and know that he is not Paul or Peter or John or Mary, places before us the option of acknowledging the importance of bodies as places of difference, of uniqueness.

Another thread establishes that God is not glorified by homogeneity, but by difference. In this, Theodore stands in awe before a God who is glorified and honored in wood and oil, stones, and bits of glass, as well as by diverse icons of Christ and the saints. The many ways of portraying God evoke greater worship in Theodore. As it should! What better way to be visually reminded that God is everywhere and in all things?

Yet it is the thread of Theodore's argument in which he insists that the material of the image does not share a common nature with the person imaged that presses us to clarify precisely what it is that is being shared. Divinity is not present because of the material, but because of the honor and glory of the one the material resembles. It is this language of resemblance which seems to support the insistence that Jesus can only be represented by a body which 'resembles' him, a male body. Yet it is one thing to state quite correctly that if Jesus were not uniquely male, we would have neither Incarnation or icons. It is quite another to infer from this that it is only through maleness that we can see Christ, and in Christ, God. This arbitrarily elevates one single characteristic, maleness, as the sole bodily criteria for 'resemblance.' The greater mistake though, is in thinking that because males somehow "look like" Jesus they can represent Jesus in the same way that the figure within the icon indicates Jesus. Notice the visual analogy that is created here between the male body and an icon. Yet what aspect of the male body is analogous to the icon? Is it the the material, the paint, wood, stone or glass? Is it the visual form of the figure, a male human being that is necessary to point to Christ?

Both correlations fundamentally ignore what it is that makes a body worthy of honor and glory in such a way that the church recognizes that embodied person as a saint. A given image, made of the same materials and certainly similar colors, could be Jesus, or it could be Judas. Note that in both of these cases, both images are also male. Further, in an icon, what distinguishes one figure from the other may be as subtle as the whether the eyes are looking directly at us or suspiciously averted. It could be indicated in the nimbus of light surrounding the head of one, but missing in the another. It is most likely obvious in the names inscribed next to the figure.[21] Note that in each of these cases, the material and its form is not all that is 'speaking' to us.

[21] The appropriate recognition of figures was so important that inscriptions were required in order to avoid mistaken identity or taking the figure itself as a magical symbol.

Rather, icons use a certain visual language which draws on a set of narratives in which the subject of the icon is always situated. We know that a nimbus is a visual symbol of holiness. We also know that the three men fallen on the ground, shoes thrown to the side, are the disciples witnessing the transfiguration. We know this because we see icons at the same time as we hear the stories of the people within them. Icons of saints visually refer to the life of the saint, whether the simple cross held by a martyr, or the many panels of the busy Nicholas. Icons are never just about the material or the form, but the virtuous *action* of the subject. We know saints are saints because of how they lived their lives. We know them through the loving, caring, just, and merciful relationships they formed. This is what is being honored and glorified in images of saints, a life lived as virtuous participation in God, a life marked by *theosis*. *Theosis* is, among other things, a life lived according to the virtues exemplified by Jesus in his own life. We see Christ not simply in the body, but in what the body does, in how it relates. The icon is a sacrament, according to Evdokimov, a "vehicle for personal presence"[22] and witness to the virtuous life of the saint. A male body only represents the divine when it is engaged in virtuous relationships. Maleness in and of itself does not necessarily point to divinity. But this does not exclude the possibility that perhaps divinity is only visible through maleness.

2.6: Related Problems

Here is the real cluster of related problems. Are we only able to call to mind Christ when visually presented with a male body? Or is there something of God, incarnated in Christ, which can only be revealed via a male body? What is this 'something' that both must be revealed by the priest to establish a connection to the divine, and can only be done by a male body? While the first question keeps us comfortably in the realm of biological sex and the shared qualities of male bodies, it also implies that it is the shape of the body that we see, rather than what the body does, how the body relates. This is hardly constitutes an iconic vision of the body. The latter two questions however, move us into a much more complicated area, that of gender. While we cannot easily separate sex and gender, at root, gender refers to those qualities, characteristics, and roles that we believe to be associated with particular sexed bodies. Are the virtuous relationships of Christ, or a saint, gendered?

While Theodore and his contemporaries make very few if any statements about gender, modern theologies regarding the priesthood are almost entirely about gender. These theologies,

[22] {Evdokimov, 1990, #89794@178, 179}

whether put forward tangentially by Evdokimov or explicitly by Hopko, clearly distinguish between masculine and feminine roles, characteristics, qualities, and even even virtues. From this, they then argue that there is something in the role of the priest that is essentially masculine. Because it deserves its own extended treatment, I will put aside the question priestly metaphors and functions, and their relationship to gender. Instead, I will take the threads offered to us by Theodore, and turn, as Behr-Sigel did, to the Theotokos in order to question the very notion of gender essentialism in light of bodily particularity.

3: Feminine Virtues?

Behr-Sigel, speaking in 1996, rejected her previously held notion that the Theotokos represented 'Woman.' This rejection was part and parcel of her rejection of the idea of distinctly female charisms. Instead, she emphasized the unique vocation of Mary as the mother of God, a vocation which "precludes imitation of her."[23] By returning to biblical texts, and insisting on Mary's unique calling, Behr-Sigel objects both to gender complementarians who would read into Mary a model of submissiveness for all women, and feminist essentialists who see in her a champion of womanhood. In order to make her argument, Behr-Sigel turns to the fourteenth-century work of Nicholas Cabasilas who sees in the Theotokos the free and faithful response required of any human being when God calls them into new life. Behr-Sigel rightly advocated for a return to biblical texts as a source for 'seeing' Mary. This may be precisely because Evdokimov based his argument for female archetypes on icons, primarily the *eleousa* style, the most famous example of which is the 'Virgin of Vladimir.' [Image: Vladimirskaya]

Certainly, biblical work on Mary must be done, though in this area, we Orthodox have much to gain from our Protestant and Catholic sisters and brothers. A uniquely Orthodox argument however, cannot ignore icons. So, in order to develop her argument further, like Evdokimov, I will turn to icons of the Virgin. My primary question is this: what exactly does the Orthodox iconic tradition regard as the 'femininity' of the Mother of God? In order to answer this question, I will "read" three "types" of Marian icons in parallel to liturgical and theological texts of the Orthodox tradition. As will become very clear, the Theotokos does not easily conform to the romantic sensibilities which permeate nineteenth and twentieth-century expositions of the feminine.[24] My

[23] {Behr-Sigel, 2001, #66618@37}

[24] I use the term "romantic" intentionally. Jaroslav Pelikan notes that Mary as the "eternal Feminine" has served as an archetype of womanhood in a way that Christ has never done for manhood. {Pelikan, 1996, #56217@165-75} Pelikan's own exposition of this archetypical role is an extended exegesis of Goethe's *Faust*. It is no coincidence that the

argument here is straightforward: throughout the tradition, the radical particularity of the obviously Theotokos uniquely reveals a full range of human virtue and relationships.

3.1: Types

Icons of the Virgin Mary generally portray her in the company of Christ, theologically stressing the Incarnation in which the fully divine Christ receives his full humanity from his mother, the Theotokos.[25] We can loosely identify four main types of images that are easily distinguished from one another. The earliest Mother of God *orans* (see Figure 1) depicts the Virgin with arms upraised in an ancient gesture of prayer and supplication. The Virgin Enthroned (see Figure 2) seats her in a place of royal authority, the "Queen of Heaven." As the *hodegetria* (see Figure 3), a term meaning "she who leads the way," Mary gestures with one hand towards the Christ-child she holds with her other arm. Finally, the most recently developed type is the Virgin *eleousa* (see Figure 4), named for the Greek word "mercy."[26] Each type has associated versions, often distinguished by famous sanctuaries in which an image was housed, cities that they are reputed to have saved from devastation, the perceived role of the icon in a significant historical event, or by particularly important emotive or theological features of the icon itself. I will only address the first three types, though I will briefly comment on the *elousa* tradition in light of human virtues.

3.2: Hodegetria

The *hodegetria* ("she who leads the way") type is linked to a prototype purportedly 'written' by St. Luke who sent it to "Theophilus" along with his famous text on the early church.[27] In this type, the Virgin carries in one arm (usually the left) her son; both figures are upright and gazing out at the beholder. Christ sits as if enthroned in her arms, positioned as *pantocrator* (See Figure 3).[28] With her

---

Russian theology of the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, strongly influenced by German romanticism, should likewise construct archetypical descriptions of womanhood exemplified by the Theotokos. Evdokimov's anthropology and theology is heavily shaped by nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russian thinkers such as Soloviev, Bhukarov, and Bulgakov, all of whom were strongly influenced by German romanticism and Faust's "eternal feminine." {Pelikan, 1996, #56217@165*ff*; Valliere, 2000, #398}

[25] The exception to this is the very early *Orans* types which will be discussed below, and the Virgin in her intercessory role, appearing in most *deesis* icons with John the Baptist (or St. Nicholas) and and Christ as judge.

[26] Ouspensky and Lossky add a fifth, the Mother of God of the Passion. This type appears in Serbia in the fourteenth century, and is rarely included by other (especially Byzantine oriented) scholars as a main type of Marian iconography. {Ouspensky and Lossky, 1982, #146@102}

[27] According to legend, it was later brought to Constantinople in the fifth-century by the Empress Eudocia (422-462) as a gift for her sister-in-law Pulcheria (399-453).

[28] Like the Virgin, icons of Christ also have types, though fewer (as Maguire argues, there is significantly less theological freedom in portraying Christ than his Mother). The *acheiropoietos* (ἀχειροποίητος) or "made without hands" derives from legends in which Christ's face was impressed upon a piece of linen, and depict only Christ's head framed with his halo and a cloth. Christ *pantocrator* portrays the divine Christ, fully human, often though not always seated on a throne.

free hand the Virgin gestures towards Christ, "leading" or "pointing" the way. Mary's eyes draw the viewer in, and her hand directs our gaze to her son who offers a blessing. This is an icon of dynamic participation in which the beholder is drawn in by a gaze, pointed towards Christ-Emmanuel, and receives a blessing.[29] This style emphasizes, like its descendent the *eleousa*, the sacrificial nature of motherly love. It does so, however in the context of war.

The rise of this style's popularity and connection to the Constantinopolitan Marian cult is, according to Bissera Pentcheva, a story of imperial power in the context of a perpetually warring Byzantine empire.[30] **[Image: Hodegetria 1]** In war-torn Byzantium, virginal motherhood is framed as a source of invincibility and sacrifice, "a model of selfless love indispensable for any state recruiting armies."[31] The *hodegetria* appears at the center of the narratives of a crucial battle during the Avar siege, fought on August 7, 626. In these accounts, the Virgin "gave courage," won "uncontested victory" by "inflicting horror and fear," simultaneously protecting and destroying.[32] She "sank men and boats together," filling the water with dead bodies; she "alone fought this battle and won the victory."[33] As Pentcheva notes, it is the Theomater's virginal motherhood, the ability to conquer nature by bearing a son without seed, that makes her an ideal source of her purity and

---

In one hand he holds a scroll or book, with the other he offers a blessing. The *mandorla* which surrounds him indicates divine light and infinity. Depending on the size of the image, Christ may be surrounded by angelic figures and symbols of the four gospels.

[29] Ouspensky and Lossky call this a "a gesture of presentation" by a mother of her Son. {Ouspensky and Lossky, 1982, #146@81} {\Apparently not enamored with this style, Cavernos says only that it is "more hieratic", the "most austere form of the Holy Virgin" with a "passionless" expression. This is the sum total of his analysis. \Kontoglous and Cavarnos, 1985, #25257@110}

[30] The Byzantine empire saw virtually no peace in its effort to recover territory lost as a result of the disintegration of the Roman empire. Under Justinian I (reigned 527-565), the empire fought the Vandals and Ostrogoths to the west, and peace with the Sassanid Persions allowed his successors to defend against the constant press of Bulgars, Slavs and Avars. The brief respite under Maurice (reigned 582-602) ended with his murder, used a pretext for Persian reclamation of Mesopotamia, Damascus and Jerusalem. While Haraclius(reigned 610-641) fought the Persians to the east, the Avars and Slavs laid siege to Constantinople only to be repelled on August 7, 626, according to 'eyewitness' accounts, by the Virgin herself, brandishing a sword. Both Heraclius in the East and his representative in the capitol, the Patriarch Servius, carried icons as battle standards. Heraclius carried an *acheiropoietos* ("made without hands") image of Christ, and Sergius an icon of the Theotokos. {Cameron, 1979, #34705@24} Though victorious, the siege and ongoing wars with the Persians to the east left Byzantine territories vulnerable to Arab attack from the south for centuries to follow. The empire was (again briefly) stabilized only at end of the ninth century.

[31] {Pentcheva, 2006, #83608@61}

[32] From Theodore Synkellos, *De obsidione Constantinopolitana*, in *Traduction et commentaire*, ed. Makk, sect XIX, p. 82. {Cited in \Pentcheva, 2006, #83608@64} Among contemporary accounts are those of the Avar's themselves. Averil Cameron refers to a text in which the khagan of the Avars saw a veiled lady walking the ramparts of the city. See *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, 2 vols. (Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae, Bonn, 1832), i, p. 725, line 9; Joannes Scylitzes, in *Georgius Cedrenus*, Compendium historiarum, ed. I. Bekker, 2 vols. (C.S.H.B., Bonn, 1838-9), i, p. 728, lines 23 ff. Noted in {Cameron, 1979, #34705@5-6, n. 12}

[33] From Theodore Synkellos, *De obsidione Constantinopolitana*, in *Traduction et commentaire*, ed. Makk, sect XXXIII, p. 87. {\Cited in \Pentcheva, 2006, #83608@64} Among "eyewitness" accounts which include Mary's active participation in battle are a poem by George of Pisidia, a sermon attributed to Theodore Synkellos, and an excerpt in the *Chronicon*

power.[34] **[Image: Hodegetria 2]** The Akathist to the Virgin, written in this time period, hymns Mary in the final two stanzas as, among other things, "Thunder, striking down the enemy," "precious Diadem of godly kings," "Tower of the Church," "impregnable fortress of the Kingdom," and the one through "whom enemies are cast down."[35] By the tenth-century, the *blachernitissa*, an icon which when not carried by emperors on military campaigns was stored at the Blachernai monastery, was referred to as the "general," the "guardian of the army," and the "invincible weapon."[36]

These appellations hardly emphasize the supposedly 'feminine' virtues emphasized a thousand years later. The context of war-torn Byzantium does not require feminine passivity, intuition or stillness. Byzantines needed a warrior queen. This association of the Theotokos with battle remains in our contemporary Orthodox liturgy. Scripture readings for the Feast of the Dormition from the Book of Judith (Judith 15-16) associate Mary with military victory. Judith not only used her sex appeal to infiltrate the tent of the enemy leader and return with his head, she also gave battle instructions preceding and following her gory task. She, like the Theotokos, functioned as *Strategos*, "general."[37] Even the "Mother of Tenderness" rises to do battle when her children are in danger, inspiring the poet George of Pisidia to exclaim to her, "Hail, general of active vigilance!"[38]

This violent vision of Mary may be only slightly more palatable to modern feminists than subsequent narratives that emphasize her obediental receptivity. Further, its use in worship illustrates the dangerous marriage in Orthodox practice between political success and divine sanction. My point here, however, is that this vision meets the needs of an embattled society by unabashedly framing the virtuous qualities of the Virgin as the actions of a triumphant (and rather brutal) conquerer.

3.3: Virgin Enthroned

Paschale. {Demoen, 1997, #72297@716-26; \George of Pisidia, *Bellum Avaricum* in \George of Pisidia and Pertusi, 1959, #17560@176-224; Theodorus et al., 1975, #76275}

[34] {$George of Pisidia and Pertusi, 1959, #17560@\176, vv. 1-9\ Cited in \Pentcheva, 2006, #83608@65}

[35] {Pentcheva, 2006, #83608@66} Pentcheva adds other sources in addition to the Akathist hymn, specifically, three middle Byzantine texts: a tenth-century prayer said before battle, a commemorative service for dead soldiers, and a *parakletikos kanon* of the early eleventh-century. See pp. 67-69, and notes 43-57 on pp. 216-217.

[36] {Pentcheva, 2006, #83608@63} Pentcheva is citing Psellos, *Chronographia*, III.10-11, in *Imperatori di Bisanzo*, ed. Impellizzeri, I, 84; English tr. in *Fourteen Byzantine Rulers*, tr. Sewter, 69-70 (on Romanos III Argyros); Attaleiates, *Historia*, Bon ed., 152-153 (on Romanos IV Diogenes). As a toponymic term, *Blachernitissa* identifies the site of an icon's storage. A number of styles are often identified by this term. For further discussion of the development of this novel image, which conflates the ancient *orans* image of the Theotokos with that of her holding a medallion of the Christ Child, see ibid., 76, 145*ff*.

[37] In the Septuagint, this same word is used to describe Judith.

[38] {$George of Pisidia and Pertusi, 1959, #17560@182-83, vv. 130*ff*;\ Cited in \Pentcheva, 2006, #83608@65}

By pairing the Virgin Enthroned and the Virgin of the Sign with theological texts from the Orthodox tradition, we continue to see the ways in which the Theotokos defies reduction to a single set of ideal virtues, qualities, or roles. The majestic Virgin Enthroned (see Figure 2) seats the Theotokos on a jeweled throne, a place of royal authority as the "Queen of Heaven." Her "stern" gaze and upright posture underscore her central role as Mother of God, "austere and inflexible."[39] In the south vestibule of Hagia Sophia, she is flanked by the Emperor John Comnenus (1118-1143) and his consort Irene who offer her donations (image: imperial). A sixth-century encaustic places two warrior saints dressed in civilian attire, Theodore and George, on either side, underscoring her imperial rather than military presence (image: theo/george).[40]

Yet the earliest known *Life of the Virgin* bears no stamp of imperial influence. Its purported author, Maximus the Confessor, suffered horribly in imperial hands. In it, the Virgin is the "queen and leader" over the children of her elderly husband Joseph, the "leader and teacher and ruler of all the members of his family…."[41] As a "disciple" of her son, this early text portrays the faithful and steadfast Mary as the leader of the many women who followed Jesus, including the "zealous and outstanding" female "apostle," Mary Magdalene.[42] After the resurrection the text claims that the Virgin Mary accompanies John in his preaching. Yet says the author, "so that her honor would be unique and not joined with the apostles, but so that she would send them forth and not be sent forth, and so that she would lead the believing people and direct the church in Jerusalem with James the brother of the Lord who was appointed as bishop there," Mary returned to Jerusalem.[43] There, she remained "at the center of the world" as "queen of all."[44] As a leader in the Jerusalem church, "she was not only an inspiration and a teacher of endurance and ministry to the blessed apostles and the other believers, but she was also a co-minister with the disciples of the Lord, and she helped

---

[39] "Stern" is used multiple times by Lossky and Ouspensky to describe this type. {Ouspensky and Lossky, 1982, #146@89} "Austere and inflexible are the only two adjectives Cavarnos applies to this image, which he incorrectly labels as *Platytera*, an epithet more appropriate to the Virgin of the Sign. See {Kontoglous and Cavarnos, 1985, #25257@110}

[40] Pentcheva notes that it was not until the late tenth and eleventh centuries that warrior saints appear in battle-dress, reflecting a shifting value regarding war and the Virgin's battle role. {Pentcheva, 2006, #83608@85, 89}

[41] {Maximus the Confessor and Shoemaker, Forthcoming, #74982@18} I am especially grateful to Stephen Shoemaker who offered his unpublished translation of this amazing text which unabashadly (though not without complications) portrays the Virgin Mary and other women as disciples and apostles who fully share in the ministry of the early church. The page numbers refer to section numbers of the text as translated by Shoemaker. Shoemaker has discussed the text and its implications in a number of articles. See {Shoemaker, 2005, #46306; -Shoemaker, 2006, #21772; -Shoemaker, 2006, #100461; -Shoemaker, 2006, #12128}

[42] She, was "to put it briefly, as the blessed apostle Peter was zealous and outstanding among the [male] disciples, so was Mary Magdalene among the myrrhbearers and women…." {Maximus the Confessor and Shoemaker, Forthcoming, #74982@71}

[43] {Maximus the Confessor and Shoemaker, Forthcoming, #74982@98}

with the preaching, and she shared mentally in their struggles and torments and imprisonments."[45] It was the Virgin who counseled and taught the apostles, who directed their preaching, and to whom they would return to report their success and their sufferings.[46]

What if this text, lost to public view until recently, shapes our 'reading' of the Virgin Enthroned? The Queen of Heaven sits on her throne holding in her lap the Word of God. She is the woman to whom we in the church come for leadership. As one of the first followers of Christ, as the one who heard his questions as a child and his teaching as an adult, who accompanied him in his ministry, who directed the many women who followed him (to the scandal of his contemporaries), this queen is no figurative ruler. She teaches the Word as one who dandled him on her knee. As a capable and knowledgable woman, she leads the people of God, in part by encouraging them to persevere through suffering and to exercise their God-given gifts as ministers. She directs the disciples of God to go forth and preach the good news of her Son. As queen and leader of the Church, she continues to be surrounded by the saints whose lives reflect the transformation of the good news. She is a woman capable of leading, bearing authority, teaching, exercising wisdom and pastoral compassion.

3.4: Virgin of the Sign

The perception of a capable and virtuous woman who stands at the center of the community of the saints is both deepened and expanded in the Virgin of the Sign **(Image: NS Sign)** This "most revered" type incorporates an *orans* image with the presence of Christ over her breast.[47] It is Christ's presence on her breast or in her womb that adds the epithet "the Sign," from Isaiah 7.14: "Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Look, the young woman is with child and shall bear a son, and shall name him Immanuel." In this earliest type of icon, the Theotokos takes on a twofold role. First, as *homo adorans*, she stands before us as one who is engaged in the essential act of being human, worship.[48] Here, the Virgin models for us and invites us into an essential element of a more full humanity, delighting in God. Second, she stands before us as the church at prayer, a symbolic role emphasized in both Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism.

The presence of Jesus on the Virgin's breast emphasizes that both worship and prayer are an

---

[44] {Maximus the Confessor and Shoemaker, Forthcoming, #74982@95}
[45] {Maximus the Confessor and Shoemaker, Forthcoming, #74982@98}
[46] {Maximus the Confessor and Shoemaker, Forthcoming, #74982@99}
[47] {Ouspensky and Lossky, 1982, #146@77}
[48] According to Alexander Schmemann, whose work will be explored in more detail below, making Christ present in prayer is *the* task of humanity as *homo adorans* and the church. {Schmemann, 1988, #520@101}

experience of "God-with-us," Immanuel. The Virgin of the Sign underscores that prayer is always shared between at least two 'persons.' Prayer, whether it is prayer of supplication, gratitude, contemplation, or transformation, includes the one praying and Christ via the Spirit who prays with, and *from within*, the person. Note that the prayers of both the individual and the corporate body is tied to the presence of Jesus by visually linking Jesus to the body of a woman. In this icon, we see ourselves in Mary, hands raised in prayer with Christ whom, like the Virgin, we bear in our bodies. The one within the church also prays *within us* as the church. This is not a simple reminder that prayer is never a solitary experience, but that Christ participates in the world *through* the prayer of the people of God. The famous Yaroslavl Virgin **(Image: Yaroslavl)** depicts Christ's hands raised in parallel to the Virgin's, visually underscoring the shared prayer between Mother and Son, church and Christ, individual and Christ. Christ, incarnate through the womb of this praying woman, is incarnated again and again as the one who prays within us. Like most icons of the Virgin, this image reminds us that the early arguments for the term *Theotokos* underscored not Mary's role, but the full divinity of the one whom she bore. In the Virgin, the infinite dwells within the finite. Likewise, the church at prayer is the place where infinity dwells.

Yet the church here is not an abstract image or a concept, but a woman. It is typical to portray the relationship between humanity and God as a *receptive* woman who responds to the *initiative* of a male deity. This all too common view reifies outdated Aristotelian biology. **(Image: Krug)** Worse, it glosses over the significance of the "strange and new exchange" in which Christ takes his flesh from a young woman, by which, Symeon the New Theologian continues, Christ makes the saints "sharers of His own, deified flesh."[49] The flesh God 'uses' to communicate divinity is not some special, divine flesh, but the free-offering of a faithful young woman.[50] For Symeon, the flesh and blood of the Eucharist is the flesh of both mother and son:

Just as we all receive of His fulness, so do we all partake of the immaculate flesh of His all-holy Mother which He assumed, and so, just as Christ our God, true God, became her son; even so we, too—O, the ineffable love for mankind!—become sons of His mother, the Theotokos, and brothers of Christ Himself, as through the all-immaculate and ineffable marriage which took place with and in her….[51]

The salvific effects of the Eucharist are not simply initiated by a woman who agrees to bear the Son of God who then becomes our offering. The woman herself is present in the flesh of her

[49] {*First Ethical Discourse*, IX. \Symeon the New Theologian, 1995, #79926@58}
[50] {*First Ethical Discourse*, IX. \Symeon the New Theologian, 1995, #79926@59}

son. The altar table bears a son *and* a mother, the "flesh of the Lord," says Symeon, "is the flesh of the Theotokos."[52]

Symeon pushes his imagery even further, undoubtedly discomfiting his all-male monastic audience, perhaps taking advantage of the veneration of the Virgin typical among monastics in order to press them to think more deeply about their life of faith, lived through their bodies. According to Symeon, we not only take in the flesh of the mother in the flesh of the Son via the Eucharist, but the Son becomes like his mother, giving birth to new children. While Mary ceases from conception and bearing children, "her son both engendered and continues to the present to engender those who believe in Him and keep His holy commandments."[53] Christ not only "engenders" but gives birth: "the immortal and incorruptible Word of the immortal and incorruptible God, however, begets and gives birth to immortal and incorruptible children, after having first been born of the virgin by the Holy Spirit."[54] Paradoxically, this birthing *by* Christ is simultaneously a birthing *of* Christ. The Word is a "kind of seed" that is conceived in the hearts of the faithful.[55] Addressing an all-male monastic community, Symeon declares "Blessed is he who has seen the light of the world take form within himself, for he, having Christ as an embryo within, shall be reckoned His mother, as He Himself Who does not lie has promised, saying: 'Here are my mother and brothers and friends' [Lk 8:2]."[56] Faithful Christians, born of Christ their Mother, become women who receive the Spirit, women who bear and birth Christ, women who are his mother. Christ births the church from within, birthing each believer. And like the Virgin of the Sign, the believer "carries God consciously within himself as light, carries Him Who has brought all things into being and created them, including the One who carries Him now."[57]

Like all icons of the Theotokos, the Virgin of the Sign does not support a simple 'one-way' reading. Male and female conceive and bear, male and female give flesh to one another, and in their shared flesh grow to the maturity of one who gives birth to God through spiritual effort and virtuous practice. Given this reading of the Virgin of the Sign, how is it possible to so neatly divide the Christian experience into appropriate male and female roles and modes of being? If the flesh of Christ is that of a woman, if it is a woman whose flesh we eat, if to see God incarnate is to see

---

[51] {*First Ethical Discourse*, X. \Symeon the New Theologian, 1995, #79926@59}
[52] {*First Ethical Discourse*, X. \Symeon the New Theologian, 1995, #79926@60}
[53] {*First Ethical Discourse*, X. \Symeon the New Theologian, 1995, #79926@59}
[54] {*First Ethical Discourse*, X. \Symeon the New Theologian, 1995, #79926@60}
[55] {*First Ethical Discourse*, X. \Symeon the New Theologian, 1995, #79926@56}
[56] {*Tenth Ethical Discourse*. \Symeon the New Theologian, 1995, #79926@168}
[57] {*Eleventh Ethical Discourse*. \Symeon the New Theologian, 1995, #79926@135}

someone who is made of the flesh of a woman, if Christ himself is a woman who births the faithful, if the Christian life is to conceive and bear God precisely as this woman has already done, on what basis do we forbid the flesh of women in any space of the Church, the body of women from imaging the body of Christ, the hands of a woman from distributing the flesh and blood of Christ?

4: Conclusion

More can be said about these icons, yet to conclude, I would like to bring together my two sets of arguments. By starting with the radical particularity of Christ's maleness, I argue that Behr-Sigel's turn towards personalism, and the radical uniqueness of each person has iconic roots. This is an area of personalist anthropology which simply has not been explored. Most personalist arguments derive from philosophy and particular interpretation of patristic authors. The iconic affirmation of the radical particularity of the saints, each man and woman exemplifying a common virtuous life in and through their distinct bodies presents distinctly Orthodox contribution to theological personalism. Like Christ in Theodore's theology, it is only through the female body of the Virgin that we see her virtues, her humanity. The body matters, and certainly shapes our view. After all, we only know the Theotokos as a woman and a mother. Yet her motherhood, as experienced throughout the breadth of the Orthodox tradition is immensely diverse in its expressions. It is present in her suffering love, her victorious striding, her pointing of the way, and her standing before us, bearing the church in prayer. She is more honored than the Cherubim not only because she bore Christ, but because she continues to bear Christ in the lives of her people. We honor and glorify not her body, for this would be idolatry, but through her body, we glorify the God who entered and continues to enter the world through her.

Further, and I think most importantly, in the Theotokos our vision is not restricted, but *expanded.* This challenges recent iconic readings whose purpose is to limit human uniqueness by assuming that a body can only exemplify certain gifts, roles, qualities, characteristics and virtues. This is precisely how Behr-Sigel chose to respond to, and depart from her mentor, Evdokimov. To his fear that the ordination of women might result in the loss of distinctly feminine gifts, she responds: "Is this concern not grounded in a monolithic-masculine conception of the ecclesial office? Couldn't one hand the office over to women, to shape it in such a way that meant

no loss, but rather a clarification of the feminine-motherly?"[58] Clarifying the feminine-motherly in light of the diverse images and interpretations of the Theotokos certainly expands what it means to be a mother, and perhaps a woman. It is possible that it expands it to such a degree that even using the phrase "feminine-motherly" is too restrictive. After all, not all women of faith have been mothers, and according to Symeon, all men and women of faith are called to be mothers.

Mary is, as the tradition constantly witness, the first-born of humanity. As icons of Christ, it is the radical uniqueness of each person, who is both seen in and shaped by their bodies, that is made visible as we pursue *theosis*. It is this uniqueness at the very root of each individual human being which prevents icons from being symbols which interfere with our vision of God, but instead the presence of persons who invite us into life in Christ. Likewise, arguments which obfuscate the uniqueness of individual persons only obscure the presence of God within them. It may be that other arguments prevent women from being ordained priests, though they are rapidly falling by the wayside. However, a properly iconic argument simply cannot do so, since bodily icons call for greater diversity, not less. They call for more expressions of the work of Christ in and through the bodies of the faithful. Behr-Sigel's question remains pertinent:

Removing himself as individual, the priest—minister, meaning servant—turns his hands and his tongue over to Christ. Why could these hands and this tongue not be those of a Christian woman, baptized and chrismated, called by virtue of her personal gifts to a ministry of pastoral guidance, which implies presiding over the eucharist?[59]

[58] From Behr-Sigel, "Ordination von Frauen," p. 69. Cited in {Wilson, 2008, #22991@129}
[59] {Behr-Sigel, 2004, #75871}