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question as to whether prayer and perfection can be identified. His conclusion: "Prayer is therefore the life of the Spirit" (p. 367).

These observations, which are chiefly direct quotes of words and phrases in the Contents, should on their own be sufficient to show what a rich study of Eastern spirituality is to be found here. The author insists that it is a handbook. And that is correct. But it is a handbook that can be read through with profit, and then used with profit to extend indefinitely one’s acquaintance with the sources and the commentaries and expositions based on them. And this is where the 171 pages following the text, and particularly the Selected Bibliography of more than 110 of those pages, brims over with possibilities. Chapter One of the text is accounted for by General Bibliographic Entries in Encyclopedias and Prayer Among the Church Fathers. Then begins a series of bibliographies for practically each individual topic dealt with from Chapter Two to the Conclusion, with the name and page number of the topic given. The translator was specifically thanked in the first volume for the trouble he took to find English translations of the works in the bibliography. To either him or the general editor similar thanks are due for the effort made in this connection in this second volume. The Topical Index further contributes to the usefulness of this work, and the impressive Name Index brings home the breadth and depth of learning of the author, who is also committed to bringing theory and practice together.
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Sitire deum et illi adherere soli necessarium est omnibus viventi.¹

Heloise of the Paraclete has appeared in the volumes of TJURUNGA several times over the years.² Nevertheless, for those readers who know little of this famed abbess of the twelfth century, perhaps it is worthwhile reiterating a little of her story before focusing on yet another important aspect of her fascinating writings. Heloise of the Paraclete (d.1164) is perhaps better known for her brief, yet passionate love affair with Peter Abelard (1079–1142), arguably the greatest intellectual mind of the twelfth century. Briefly stated, in the course of their famous and spectacular love affair, Heloise became pregnant, was eventually married to Abelard in secret and bore a child whose fate, other than through


legend and speculation, is lost to us today. The whole situation incurred the wrath of her uncle who set his thugs on Abelard and had him castrated, whereupon Abelard, interpreting this act as a judgement from God, directs Heloise to a monastery and eventually follows her into monastic life himself. Yes, the story does sound rather melodramatic, to be sure, however, Heloise lived the better part of her life as a monastic both before and after her fateful intersection with Abelard. Her early and extraordinary education took place in the Benedictine convent of Argenteuil and later in Paris where she lived in the cloister close of Notre Dame Cathedral. After the tragic affair she returned to Argenteuil (ca. 1117/18), and later become the abbess of the Paraclete Benedictine community located not far from Paris and founded by Abelard himself (ca. 1129).1

As I have noted previously,2 when reading the letters that Heloise wrote to Abelard, particularly the later correspondence, one is faced with a considerable amount of difficulty when trying to reconcile the Heloise who is passionately devoted to Abelard, and the Holy Abbess of the Paraclete. However, as Constant Mews asserts in relation to her first letter: “Reading her [Heloise’s] letter simply as an outpouring of the “the heart” ignores the rhetorical skill with which she formulates her ethical argument,” and this applies to all her letters to Abelard. Thus, a closer analysis of these letters can bring the reader to a deeper understanding of why this twelfth century woman was accorded such extraordinary acclaim by her own contemporaries.

I want to approach this present investigation, from simply one perspective and a theological one at that. I would like to suggest that “Absence” is not only a metaphorical theme, but also a theological theme, which underscores both the context of, and expression within Heloise’s writings to Abelard. In these writings we discover an absent Abelard, an absent monastic rule suitable for women; an absent motherhood due to the absence of the curiously named Astralabe, their son; and, as I will demonstrate in this paper, the implicit sense of an absent, though not insignificant God. All of these moments of “absence” culminate in the “absence” of the particular identity of Heloise as she takes on the universal identity of the Christian subject in her role as Abbess of the Paraclete.

The platonist temptation, pervasive through the history of Christian theology, is to abstract the body in the discussion of the soul’s journey towards God and thus has been particularly detrimental to women’s bodies and their “otherness” in relation to men, symbolically considered more capable of imaging God in their bodies than are the bodies of women. God, the “irreducible Other”, is not found in abstraction, but in and through loving relationships with other bodies who are also “other”.

Twentieth century French philosopher, Michel de Certeau maintains a sort of ontological necessity for this sense of absence in the human person.3 It is, in fact, the ground of possibility for the human person, without which personhood in terms of community and integrated relationship to the “Other”/God and “others”, eludes us. This absence is precisely where we come to recognise our own being as incomplete without others, yet, paradoxically, we can never attain full access to this other. They will always remain, to some degree at least, “other”, absent, or “different” in relation to us.

The writings of Heloise reveal a woman, determined to struggle with her own difference, and with this fundamental sense of absence of others and God. As much, Heloise’s spirituality can be located in Certeau’s identification of the subject who is,

... a believer who must find a way to believe in a world from which God has become absent, one who seeks an excessive modus loquendi in order to reach beyond the limits imposed by a given language and society to speak of and to a God who is irreducibly — even cruelly — other.4

The excess in avenues of “absence” in Heloise’s rhetoric, absence of Abelard, of Astralabe, of a rule for women, of God, marks this modus loquendi. It is a mode, as I shall argue, of embodied or incarnational speech and perhaps it is this feature that can be defined as especially feminine speech.

In Etienne Gilson’s classic study of Heloise and Abelard, he states unequivocally the popular claim that God is absent in the letters of Heloise.5

However, this claim runs counter to the whole project of Heloise’s intentions in writing to Abelard, at least as she states it. God is at least as pervasively present, even in his absence, in her writing as is her focus on her undoubtedly less famous yet extensively discussed emphasis on Abelard. Heloise’s is indeed a “love story” but one often not taken to its ultimate end, that of Divine Love.

1. The Early Letters

In Heloise’s early love letters to Abelard before their entry into monastic life, references to, and about God abound. As scholars note, Heloise’s profound use of religious vocabulary throughout these early letters is much more pronounced than that of Abelard’s.8 She expresses God’s absence in a desire for his presence through her use of the subjunctive. She expresses her hope that it will be God who is present to them, with them in their love for each other, and in protecting all aspects of Abelard’s life: “May the Ruler of heaven mediate here between us. May he accompany our faith, which stands firm in mutual love … and may the nurturing right hand of God protect you within and without.”12 It is this desire in absence that drives her rhetoric and thus, her relationship with Abelard is simultaneously a relationship with God, and she claims that their love actually resides in God: “Beloved to Beloved: whatever there can be more blessed in God, whatever more honest and joyful among mortals” 13 There is no division between her love for Abelard, and for God. One is contained within the other.


11 Particularty in Letters 3, 5, 25, 38, 49, 60 and 86.

12 Cell regnat us sit nobis hic mediator. Si socius fidei que constat amore sauti … Asea dei destra te protegit inas et extra. Letter 38B.


God is thus, all-pervasive for Heloise: God mediates between them;14 God witnesses to her love on numerous occasions;15 God is their future;16 God governs everything;17 Well-being is in God’s survey;18 God is the bestower of gifts including philosophy;19 God accompanies their faith, nurtures them and provides for them20; She sings “Glory to God” for their love;21 God is faithful to them even in their sinfulness;22 and ultimately, God has a primary position even in relation to Heloise’s love for Abelard: “Since you have become everything to me, except for the grace of God alone …”23

Mews maintains that in these letters, “She [Heloise] goes beyond Scripture … to emphasise that there is no discontinuity between the love which comes from her heart (amor) and selfless love (dilectio)” 24 However, the assumption made here is that the biblical text exhibits this discontinuity. On the contrary, Heloise’s inclusion of the “love that comes from the heart” is indicative of an embodied language and thoroughly consistent with the biblical message. The command to love God and neighbour in both the Old and the New Testament, stresses the idea of love from the heart.25 Simply stated, the “heart” here operates as integral to the entire human person, body, mind and spirit.26 Any departure of love from its connection to the heart, from an embodied reality, is not consistent with the message contained within Scripture.

Neither does the Rule of Benedict, a rule with which Heloise would have been familiar, make a distinction between the love of the heart, amor, selfless love, dilectio or caritas, the term used for the general expression of Christian love. All three expressions of love are used interchangeably by Benedict as

14 See Letter 3, 38B.
15 See Letters 11, 23, 53, 55, 86.
16 See Letter 3, Letter 32.
17 See Letters 3, 49, 84.
18 See Letters 7, 25.
19 See Letters 5 and 27.
20 See Letters 38B, 49, 60.
21 See Letter 45.
22 See Letter 60.
23 Cum omnis focius ss mulch excepta solius dei gracia Letter 79.
25 See Deut. 6:5; S of S 5:1–4; Matt 22:37; Mk 12:30, 33; Lk 10:27, John 5:42; Rom 5:5; 2 Thes 3:5; 1.
by Heloise. The language of the “heart” is markedly evident in this Rule. The whole Benedictine project is to come to this love of God from the heart: “But as we progress in the monastic life and in faith, our hearts will swell with the unspeakable sweetness of love, enabling us to race along the way of God’s commandments.” For Benedict, the heart is the area where the person encounters God, and one cannot encounter God without a body or the use of embodied language.

2. Later Correspondence

Ward suggests that Heloise starts out the more overtly religious in her writing than Abelard and that “To some extent their later career reverses these positions”. Turning now to this later correspondence, written well after both Heloise and Abelard entered monasteries, it becomes obvious when analysing her letters as a whole, that God is no less prominent in her thinking here than in her previous letters, indeed, God remains central in her rhetoric.

In her first letter to Abelard, her project in replying to his Historia calamitatum is, undoubtedly, to re-establish her relationship with him and to experience his presence in his absence, at least in the form of letters. However, this re-establishment is within the context of a larger framework of monastic identity, an identity for which Abelard himself is responsible as founder of her community.

From the outset, Heloise clearly identifies herself and her community as “handmaids of God”. This phrase of identity is repeated at the beginning of each of her three later letters. It is all very well for him to write a letter of consolation to his friend, but Abelard’s primary responsibility is to her and the community as: “For you, after God, are the sole founder of this place, the sole builder of this oratory, the sole creator of this community.” Even here, God clearly takes a primary position in Heloise’s life as in the earlier love letters and she expands this with full Trinitarian force in a later letter. It is God who helps the community grow in its purpose, but it needs care from its earthly founder, Abelard, who is just as integral to their identity. Any absence of God then, is profoundly linked to the absence of Abelard and his neglect of his duty to both Heloise herself and to her community.

As in the early letters, it is God who continues to witness to this love she has for Abelard and she gives voice to the selfless nature of this love with blatant honesty:

I can expect no reward for this from God for it is certain that I have done nothing as yet for love of him. When you hurried towards God I followed you, indeed, I went first to take the veil — perhaps you were thinking how Lot’s wife turned back when you made me put on the religious habit and take my vows before you gave yourself to God.

Heloise’s rhetoric here, is used to point an accusing finger at Abelard’s lack of trust in her devotion, but also to truthfully admit to the distance of God, that is, God’s absence, in relation to her entry into monastic life. She moves from her devotion to Abelard, to his devotion to her and the community which longs to serve this God.

Clearly, Heloise understands her own identity only through her relationship with, and love for, Abelard. Without Abelard, she can have no identity, and particularly no identity in God. Her greeting to this letter attests to this integration of all

---


30 Procopio vero conversations et fides, dilatato loco univariabilis dilectionis ducecindae curritur ut mancipium Dei. RB Pro 49. See heart language in RB Pro 1, 10, 26, 28, 40, 49; 2:9, 12; 3:8; 4:1, 24, 28, 50; 5:17-18; 7:3, 8, 14, 18, 37, 48, 51, 62, 65; 9:10; 12:4; 20:3; 39:9; 49:4; 52:4.


33 See Ep. II, Hicks, p. 46, (Radice, p. 48).


36 See Ep. II, Hicks, p. 48, (Radice, p. 49). "I planted the seed and Apollo watered it; but God made it grow." (justa illud apostolic: Ego plantavi, Apollo irrigavit; Deus autem incrementum dedit.)

37 See Ep. II, Hicks, pp. 49, 52, (Radice, pp. 51, 54).

38 See Ep. II, Hicks, p. 52, (Radice, p. 54).

39 Por usum itaque uti obdistit Deum obsecro ut quo modo potes tuam michi presentiam reddas, consolationem videlicet michi aliqam rescribendo, hoc saltem pacuo ut sic recreare divino aequor vacem obsequo. Ep. II, Hicks, p. 53, (Radice, p. 54).
aspects of her identity in her thinking: “To her lord, or rather father; to her husband, or rather brother; from her handmaid, or rather daughter; from his wife, or rather sister: to Abelard from Heloise” 39 There is no confusion or division in Heloise here as some have claimed. She is all these identities at once.

Abelard’s response to this letter is a complete misunderstanding of her project. He continues to absent God by absconding himself from her, as he does not recognize himself as necessary to her devotion to God. His focus in this letter becomes himself, not Heloise and her community. Indeed, in this letter, it sounds as if the whole purpose of Heloise and the community is to pray for him, his salvation and protection, and nothing else.

Heloise’s Letter IV begins: “To her only one after Christ, from his only one in Christ” 40 God may well be absent from Heloise’s life, however, for better or for worse, God’s presence continues to embrace their relationship. Her purpose here is to bring Abelard to recognize her genuine and honest struggle to admit God’s presence while he remains absent. She argues that it is Abelard’s role to commend them to God not the reverse, as he had suggested. 41 Abelard has so filled them with grief with his emphasis on himself and his woes, that they are now distracted from their primary purpose:

“Besides, what time will there be then which will be fitting for prayer, when extreme distress will allow us no peace... Or when the frantic mind, far from being resigned, may even (if I may say so) rage against God himself, and provoke him with complaints instead of placating him with prayers?” 42

This is by no means an attempt to push God out of her rhetoric as Gilson so confidently claims. On the contrary, in a language that moves beyond the boundaries of acceptable rhetoric, an “excessive modus loquendi”, she presents a series of impassioned accusations against her own bodily incontinence and Abelard’s absence in relation to the care he ought show her in the seeking of God under such conditions. 43 This desire to seek God authentically provides the complete context for the reading of this letter with its otherwise shocking confessions and bluntly honest self-assessment from Heloise.

Wilson and McLeod suggest that Heloise here claims a position of humility in her honest appraisal of her own sinfulness. They also assert that: “Abelard has presented himself as separated from his past arrogance: physically mutilated but spiritually whole. Now Heloise presents herself as inextricably involved with her past: physically whole but spiritually mutilated.” 44 However, this stance of humility, a very characteristic monastic virtue, 45 affirms Heloise’s spiritual supremacy over Abelard. It is Abelard who remains both physically and spiritually mutilated in his lack of humble assessment of his life, and it is Heloise who remains both physically and spiritually whole as she never denies her sinfulness nor her body’s fragility. In the Rule of Benedict’s chapter on humility, the twelfth and final step to spiritual perfection claims that: “Constantly aware of his guilt for sins, he should consider himself to be already standing before the terrifying judgment of God”. 46 Heloise reflects this final step in all but her struggle to find a God worthy of her repentance.

She describes an unjust God, a God who was absent in punishment when they deserved it and seemingly present, reapng revenge when they had atoned for their lust through their more than chaste marriage. 47 She cries out: “O God — if it is lawful to say it — cruel to me in everything. O merciless mercy”. 48 What is so unmistakably absent here is a God of mercy and justice. Heloise confesses having no relationship with such an unjust God, but seeks rather the absent God of mercy. Alluding to St Paul, she cries: “In my utter wretchedness, that cry from a suffering soul could well be mine: ‘Miserable creature that I am who is there to rescue me out of the body doomed to this death?’ Would that I could truly faithfully answer: “the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord” 49 Abelard must therefore, not praise her but pray for her, not so that she might be considered holy but simply that: “In whatever corner of heaven God shall place me, it will be enough for me” 50

39 Domno suo, avno patri, conhuso suo, immo fratris; ancilla sua, immo fistilla; ipsus uxor, immo soror; Abelardos Helosa. Ep. IV. Hicks, p. 45, (Radice, p. 47).
40 Unico suo post Christum, unica sua in Christo. Ep. IV. Hicks, p. 61, (Radice, p. 63).
41 See Ep. IV. Hicks, p. 61, (Radice, p. 63).
42 out quot orationis tempus tunc est commodeum, quando summa perturbatio michi permittet quodam ... cum mens inscrie in ipsum — ut diacum — deum magis trahat quam poscata non tam orationibus ipsum placet quam queremonis irritabit? Ep. IV. Hicks, p. 62, (Radice, p. 64).
43 See Ep. IV. Hicks, p. 61, (Radice, p. 64).
45 See, RB 7 — On Humility
46 renum se omni hora de poscessis suis aetematis tam se horrendo judico represanteri aetemiter, RB 7:64, my emphasis added.
47 See Ep. II, Hicks, pp. 63—64, (Radice, pp. 65—66).
48 O! — si fac sit dicta — cruidem nephel per omnia Deum! Ep. IV. Hicks, p. 63, (Radice, p. 65).
49 O vere me miseration et illa conquisione ingemenscit omnies dignissimam: “Infelix ego homo! Quis me liberabit de corpore mortis injustis?” Ultimam et quod sequitur veraciter addere quaeam: Gratia Dei per Iesuanum Christum Dominum nostrum.” Ep. IV. Hicks, p. 67, (Radice, p. 69).
50 Quoquoneque me angudio cell Dei collocset auti michi facies: nullus ibi eumquam invisidit, cum singulis quod habebat suffosum. Ep. IV. Hicks, p. 69, (Radice, p. 71).
Georgiana maintains that here Heloise is, “quitting the battle for perfection”. But what I am questioning is the definition of this so-called “perfection”. Heloise is not “quitting the battle for perfection” at all, rather, her felt sense of an absent God is thoroughly consonant with the monastic mind which searches constantly, humbly and truthfully for this God. Her, so-called, “rage against God” merely attests to her monastic sensibility particularly in the light of the daily round of liturgy to which Heloise and all monastics were, and still are, exposed. Here, she would have heard the psalmist’s own complaints and “rage against God” set in the context of prayer and praise and these psalms she would have made her own.

In Abelard’s response to Heloise’s dramatic pleas there is not the particularity of their relationship in God as expressed in the earlier love letters. He continues to absent God by absenting himself from Heloise’s love. In his exegesis of the “Song of Songs”, curiously enough, one of the most embodied and passionate books of the Bible, he uses the metaphor of the Black bride to allegorise away the particular body of Heloise. The body and its difference, has no place in any discussion of “ longing for God” in Abelard’s religious understanding. Justice for the body is not his concern. As such, he effectively erases any possibility of subjectivity for Heloise and her sisters, as well as any possibility of their encounter with God.

Heloise’s language will not allow her room to compromise on this subjectivity in her search for a just God, a God of love, and it is in her final letter that this is evidenced in it fullest extent. Heloise absents her particular self with an “excessive modus quoquei”, expressed here as an expansion of herself into the body of her community as Abbess. The same thoughts and arguments continue to occupy Heloise’s heart as in the earlier letters, but now it is a broader canvas on which she paints her understanding of the feminine desire for God.

Beginning, as before, by claiming their identity as “handmaids of God”, she first asks for a history of monastic women, that is, a history of the search for God by women, a history, interestingly enough, rich in male-female relationships. This request parallels her desire, in the previous letters, that Abelard consider the history of her own relationship with God and with him.

Secondly she requires a Rule suitable for women. To have the needs of the particularity of the body, the female, included in her dialogue with Abelard, has been consistent there throughout her letters. Now she presents it in the communal context. This body cannot be transcended in the monastic search for God and remains central to her communal project, the community’s journey, a different journey towards God, a journey in the female body, unique, or other, from that of the male.

Again, her purpose, as always, is to make Abelard understand that his presence and relationship with the community, is intimately linked with their ability to seek God. At the end of this letter, she repeats the words as she used in Letter II, when she appeals to him thus: “…for after God you are the founder of this place, through God you are the creator of our community, with God you should be the director of our religious life”. Heloise’s spirituality and her critique of the Benedictine Rule must be viewed in the light of various reform movements in monasticism that were in full swing around her at the time. She stands within the midst of the endless controversies between the spiritual interpretation of the Rule by the Black Benedictines of Cluny and the uncritically strict adherence to the demands of this primitive Rule by the White Cistercians, headed by Bernard of Clairvaux. Heloise’s attempt to make a case for adapting and even rewriting the Holy Rule for women, is a presentation of a woman’s voice about a woman’s way to God in the sea of voices from the male monastic world of her times.

Her assertion is that the Rule is not inherently a literalist universal Rule and should not be understood as such. In her commentary and critique of the Rule of Benedict, she seeks to find the God of justice for women, whom she so emotively articulated as personally absent in her previous letters. This justice is expressed in the recognition of their sexual difference: “What, I wonder, when he adapts everything to the quality of men and seasons, so that all his regulations can be carried out by everyone without complaint — what provision would he make for women if he laid down a Rule for them like that for men?” This is precisely her role as Abbess as the Rule itself indicates: “…he will accommodate and adapt himself to them all in accordance with the disposition and intelligence of each individual … he must arrange everything so

86
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86
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that there is always what the strong desire and the weak do not shrink from." 36 Not to consider "difference", is totally unreasonable and unjust for Heloise in her times, as it was for Benedict in his times. Without some justice there can be no search for God for women.

Again, Benedict’s virtue of humility is evident as she critiques the Rule with her emphasis on the weakness of women’s bodies. Though perhaps distasteful to us today, we must not be led away from Heloise’s own purpose in her times. As I have suggested previously, she is not presenting a case for women’s inferiority to men, but rather arguing their superiority, particularly in relation to women’s search for God in the living out of the Benedictine life: “Equality, of virtue, for Heloise, should not be judged simply by rigid adherence to the same set of Rules. This is not justice! It is not God. It is not love! This is not even what Benedict himself, intended”. 37 Heloise explains this equality in terms of the life women live as monastics compared to the highest ranks within the Church: “It should be sufficient for our infirmity, and indeed, a high tribute to it, if we live continently and without possessions, wholly occupied by service of God, and in doing so equal the leaders of the church themselves in our way of life.” 38 Accordingly, Heloise sets forth her “ethics of intention” in the seeking of God in the monastic life, using the language of the heart:

Such devotion of the heart is valued the more highly by God the less it is concerned with outward things, and we serve him with greater humility and think more of our duty to him the less we put our trust in outward things. 39

The Rule is after all only a guide for beginners and Heloise notes this from the exact words of Benedict herself.40 The end of monastic life is Love — God. It is this end that Rules should serve not the other way round. Thus, rules can be changed so that God can be better served in love. This is, after all the point of the Christian life, nothing more and nothing less. In an obvious critique of the argued extremes of the monastic reformers of her day, she writes: "Would... 41... secundum usum (rati) expugne quoddam temporum... Hoc ergo oblique testumina... matri virum, unus omnino tempore, ut et forte sit quod cognoscit et infirma non reperiant... Ep. VI, Hics, p. 92, (Radice, p. 96-7) See RB 2: 64ff.


Satis nostre esse iniquitati et maximum imputati debet, sse continentem ac sunt proprietate viventis, et, officios occupate divinos, ipsum Ecclesie et vice... Ep. VI, Hics, p. 95, (Radice, p. 100).

Quid quidem animo devota tanto major in Deo habetur, quanto in exterioribus minus est annum occupates, et tanto humilis et deservamus ac magis debere cogi fam. quanto de exterioribus qui suntminus commendantes. Ep. VI, Hics, p. 103, (Radice, p. 105).


That our religion could rise to this height — to carry out the Gospel, not to go beyond it, lest we attempt to be more than Christians!”42

To find God, for a female, is not so dependent on rules but is thoroughly dependent on love and justice. After all, in her times men with their rules, rules, rules, fail in their attempts43 and their outward show by rules merely disguises a fundamental absence of God and the absence of love.

3. Conclusion

Heloise’s spirituality humanises the quest for God in line with Benedict’s ideals. It is a corrective to all attempts to ignore, deny, overcome or transcend, the embodied nature of humanity, be that of the male or the female. Her identity is founded on her relationships with others, and she will not speak of God without any of these relationships. In the words of Certeau, Heloise’s language is, “… a new ‘style’ of practice which resists the violence of conceptualisation by seeking to speak of the Other only through particular others” 44 Her identity is founded on her relationships with others: lover to beloved, wife to husband, mother to son, sister to her religious sisters and abbess to her community and she will not speak of God without any of these relationships. The absence and presence of God is contingent on the absence and presence of these other bodies.

I want to suggest that this spirituality unearthed in Heloise’s writings is not only relevant to our world today, it is vital. Firstly, Heloise’s spirituality stands in disturbingly stark contrast to a spirituality that piously claims sure knowledge of God’s presence and God’s will in the face of the incomprehensible injustices that our world experiences today. Heloise presents us with a spirituality that can humbly cry aloud with the psalmist of the scriptures, “Where is God?” at the unfathomable mystery of injustice. Natural disasters like tsunamis and epidemics which claim the lives of so many innocent people, cannot be explained away simplistically as the will or punishment of God. Nor can those who claim to be religiously devout preach the presence of a God of love, while at the same time justify complacency and even complicit involvement in racial, ethnic, economic and political oppressions. Heloise refuses to avoid the discomfort that a “cruelly absent God” can cause in the human condition.

41 Alque utruncum ad hoc nostra religio concordare possit ut Evangelium inspirerat, non transcenderet, nec pluteum christianse appetterem esse. Ep. VI, Hics, p. 93, (Radice, p. 98).

42 See Ep VI, Hics, p. 96, (Radice, pp. 100-101).

Secondly, Heloise’s spirituality is not one blindly dependent on institutions with their doctrines, rules and outward expressions of holiness. Christianity is about the practice of authentic love of others in and through their difference not rules. A rule that negates the particularity of any body, and women’s bodies in particular, negates their subjectivity and leaves God, and therefore love, absent in their lives. You cannot find God without a body and you cannot be that body without loving others. Heloise’s spirituality speaks directly to religious institutions that claim exclusive right to God through rules and regulations. She resists not institutions and rules, but both the urge to universalise rules for their own sake and the false freedom of individualism.

Both are temptations to exist without others: the former seeking refuge within institutions, the latter seeking it in his or her own interior. The first fears the other which announces the future, the second fears the other which remembers the past.44

Thirdly, Heloise’s sense of being fully incarnated in the world is a redefining of “spiritual perfection”, one that includes rather than excludes. Her spirituality deals with the reality of difference and bodies in a way that demands an authentic love of the other and thus the possibility of really loving the ultimate Other — God. This is not an “essentially non-heroic”45 spirituality as Georgianna asserts. Heloise’s spirituality demands a level of humility that the modern world, driven as it is by ideals of the autonomous free individual, find very uncomfortable to admit. To admit the other, one must admit to an absence in being, to an incompleteness that recognises the need of the other who is different, not because they are the same, but precisely because they are different. This is a spirituality marked by unity in difference, rather than a fear of difference. Absence, and the experience of absence bring about the ability to recognise and appreciate difference. This is without doubt, a more heroic spirituality particularly in our world today, marked as it is by fear of the other, the different, in racial tensions, ethnic divides and radical disconnections between peoples. This is surely a spirituality worth further elucidation.

---