

In my doing of thinksheets, I have arrived at the one whose number is my birth-year. I'm embarrassed to mention it, for I can't see that this fact is of any earthly use to anybody else; yet I'm bold to state it, because the gut purpose of my thinksheets is not to be of any earthly use to anybody else, but to make a "theological" offering to God--theology being, according to P.T. Forsyth (122, A.M. Hunter, P.T.FORSYTH, Westm./74), "faith thinking." And I am confident that anyone of competence in thinking, as I take myself to be, who exhibits "faith thinking," can be of help to anyone who, being both of faith and a thinker, attends hopefully to any instance of "faith thinking."

1. The more we grant male/female equality (at least in some of its dimensions, viz., political and economic), the more we are free to see and celebrate differences between the sexes. The present happy coincidence of (1) feminist liberation and (2) increasing knowledge of sexual differentiation frees us, as women and men, to rejoice in God's gift of different ways that men and women "think." Here, I have a number of concerns: (1) "The greater glory of God," not to say it in medieval Latin; (2) The better relating of the sexes; and (3) An advance in the cophilosophizing of male/female.

2. A simple fact: The older I get, the more impressed I am that women outthink men and vice versa. I'm awed, humbled, by the fact that the divergence in thinking-style corresponds to the divergence of sexual organs: why should it not? The category "the person" exists in the suprahuman: we humans are female-person and male-person. Male-person (testosterone-driven) thinks penilely, probingly, "scientifically" (whichever skinbag the person doing this thinking inhabits): female-person (estrogen-driven) thinks comprehensively, unitively, relationally, gestatively (womblikely). This is a divine insult to the Greek-Renaissance notion of "the individual," who does not exist either in the state of nature or in the state of grace.

3. Few thinkers get to be "seminal" in the sense that their idea-genes continue over generations and centuries: Anselm is one. The Renaissance took his thinking to be masculine: his "proof" of God's existence was taken to mean the "probing" (Latin, probare), masculine-penetrating action of reason. But recourse to the locus classicus of his argument, viz., PROSLOGION 2-4, reveals that his driving concern is not rational "proof" but total-conscious "understanding" (Latin, intelligere)--the feminine kind of consciousness and of thinking. I am so ignorant as to imagine that I am the first to observe this Renaissance-sexist overlay on Anselm--but fairly sure that at least you, dear reader, not having thought of it before, may profit from the observation....Wrestling with Anselm's Latin, I noticed that not he but his critics used probare: clearly and consistently, he preferred intelligere. His formula was "faith seeking understanding" (which Karl Barth used as the subtitle of his ANSELM, World/62)....World's translation being "Faith in Search of Understanding." Anselm accepted the challenge of his critics' probare, but only to incorporate it into his intelligere; the point of "probing" (same root as "proof") is "understanding."

4. My lifelong fascination with and concern for "science" prompts me here to this observation: Anselm, a fountain of Western science, used "probing" (questioning) intelligence in the interest not of power-over-nature (which is the direction "modern science" took) but in the interest of "understanding" moved by "the glory of God." Power-science has led to the rape of the earth and even the threatening of the existence of our species: Anselm's appreciation-science is post-modern.