

- 25 Lonergan, *Method*, 76—81.
- 26 Max Scheler, *The Nature of Sympathy*, tr. Peter Heath (Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, Inc., 1970), 8—12, 238—257.
- 27 Bernard J.F. Lonergan, 'The Natural Desire to See God', *Collection*, 84—95; Helminiak, 'One in Christ', 398—405.
- 28 Cf. Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *De Constitutione Christi Ontologica et Psychologica* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1958); *De Deo Trino: II: Pars Systematica* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1964), 153—161; 'Christ as Subject: A Reply', *Collection*, 164—197.
- 29 Bernard J.F. Lonergan, 'Cognitive Structure', *Collection*, 221—239; *Method*, 9: '... different levels of consciousness ... have to be distinguished .... There is the *empirical* level on which we sense, perceive, imagine, feel, speak, move. There is an *intellectual* level on which we inquire, come to understand, express what we have understood, work out the presuppositions and implications of our expression. There is the *rational* level on which we reflect, marshal the evidence, pass judgment on the truth or falsity, certainty or probability, of a statement. There is the *responsible* level on which we are concerned with ourselves, our own operations, our goals, and so deliberate about possible courses of action, evaluate them, decide, and carry out our decisions'.
- 30 Lonergan, *De Deo Trino*, 161—171.
- 31 Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato* (Rome: Gregoria University Press, 1964), 235—243.
- 32 For another explicit example of Lonergan's thought applied to spiritual theology, cf. James Robertson Price, 'Conversion and the Doctrine of Grace in Bernard Lonergan and John Climacus', *Anglican Theological Review*, 62 (1980) : 338—362.

## Response

### St Augustine and R.R.R. on women

Father Edmund Hill OP is quite right to take exception (in November 1985—*Response*) to the translation of the passage from Augustine's *De Trinitate* in my article 'The Liberation of Christology from Patriarchy' (July/August 1985, p. 326) since, due to a typographical error in my manuscript, the most important line in that text was left out. The text should read:

How then did the apostle tell us that the man is the image of God and therefore he is forbidden to cover his head, but that the woman is not so, and therefore she is commanded to cover hers? Unless forsooth according to that which I have said already, when I was treating of the nature of the human

mind, that the woman, together with her own husband, is the image of God, so that the whole substance may be one image, but when she is referred to separately in her quality as a helpmeet, which regards the woman alone, *then she is not the image of God, but, as regards the man alone, he is the image of God as fully and completely as when the woman too is joined with him in one.* (7,7,10)

However, Father Hill's note is astonishing on other counts. First, he apparently doesn't think that either women or men exist primarily, as real individual or social persons. What exists primarily is generic essences, such as 'mind', and, within 'mind', half minds, called the 'masculine mind' and the 'feminine mind'. As a woman I have no acquaintance with what Father Hill calls the 'feminine mind', but I suspect that it doesn't have much to do with thinking very clearly.

Secondly, although he scores the mistakes of 'feminist critics' in his note of twelve years ago, he shows no signs of having read any feminist critical theologians either then or since. More than eighteen years ago Kari Børresen, in her magisterial study of theological anthropology in Augustine and Aquinas, *Subordination and Equivalence, Nature and Role of Women in Augustine and Aquinas* (French, 1968: English translation, 1981), showed that, not only does Augustine regard the mind-body hierarchy as analogous to the male-female hierarchy, but he assumes that this applies to their actual social identities as well, in the order of nature and, even more, in the fallen state, where women become the symbol and social embodiment of 'carnality'. Thus in the *Soliloquies* 1, 10 Augustine declares that 'I feel that nothing so casts the manly mind from its heights as the fondling of women and those bodily contacts which belong to the married state' and in his exegesis on the Sermon on the Mount, Augustine advises Christian husbands to love their wives sexually with the same asperity as one would 'love one's enemy'. In his treatises on marriage Augustine defends Old Testament polygamy, but not polyandry, on the grounds that 'nature allows multiplicity in subjugations, but demands singularity in dominations' (*On the Good of Marriage* 17, 20). I urge Father Hill to read Kari Børresen's book before writing any more critical notes against feminists.

**Dr Rosemary Radford Ruether**  
Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary  
2121 Sheridan Road  
Evanston  
Illinois 60201, U.S.A.