

Priestly Patriarchal Presumption vs. the Jahwist Divine Feminine

Dominion theology elaborates on “flat earth” philosophy and on a presumed human-centric cosmology. The great doctor of the Church, Thomas Aquinas, wrote the Christian rationale (Scholastic Philosophy) of dominion theology based on the 2000-year-old science (philosophy) of Aristotle.

The presumptive philosophy of earth-human centrism and of literal belief in and application of the Adam and Eve Creation Story cannot be rationalized credibly in light of quantum science and cosmological evolution. Scholasticism deserves respect as far as it goes, and in so far as it corresponds with 21st century intelligence.

Common sense does not credibly allow the undeveloped science of a prior age to drive faith and reason in a later age. Faith/science truths are sustained by informed awareness and authentic understanding of human relationships in the Order of Nature, the *Naturalis Sacramentum Ordinis*.

Fixation in dominion culture enables wrongdoing against woman and nature. Creation reflects its Creator as life reflects intelligence. Woman and man together matter like faith and reason matter to each other: no reason, no faith; no faith, no reason. Divinity consciousness is emotional/rational intelligence, the doing together of femininity/masculinity, of faith/reason.

The Divine Feminine personifies faith as the Divine Masculine personifies reason. Divinity consciousness self-reflects in emotional intelligence (faith) and rational intelligence (reason); humanity self-reflects in divinity as divinity self-reflects in humanity — humanity is the otherness of divinity as divinity is the otherness of humanity. Oneness resides in the ambiguity of twoness (female/male) as twoness (parents) and oneness (child) are the unity of three.

Trinity is personified resonance embodied in wisdom consciousness—Trimorphic Protennoia. www.divinicom.com

“...science can only be created by those who are thoroughly imbued with the aspirations toward truth and understanding. This source of feeling, however, springs from the sphere of religion. To this there also belongs the faith in the possibility that the regulations valid for the world of existence are rational, that is, comprehensible to reason. I cannot conceive of a genuine scientist without that profound faith. The situation may be expressed by an image: Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind.” Albert Einstein

[Quoted by David Toolan, SJ, “At Home in the Cosmos”, pg. 243, © 2001, Orbis Books, P.O. Box 308, Maryknoll, NY 10545-0308]

To the prejudice of Christian credibility, Scholastic Philosophy/ Theology yet embody the inauthentic presumptions of original patriarchal culture that prevail in imperial Christian ecclesiology.

Thomas Aquinas, THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA

BRITANNICA GREAT BOOKS, No. 19

William Benton, Publisher,

© 1952

Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Question XCII: The Production of Woman. (In Four Articles) Page 488

Article I. Whether Woman Should Have Been Made in the First Production of Things?

I answer: It was necessary for woman to be made...a helper of man (as a helper in the work of generation), not, indeed, as a helpmate in other works...since man can be more efficiently helped by another man in other works...

But man is yet further ordered to still nobler vital action, and that is **to understand**. [Emphasis added] Therefore there was greater reason for the distinction of these two forces (generation and reason), so that the female should be produced separately from males.

Reply to Objection 1. in relation to universal nature, woman is not misbegotten, but is included in nature's intention as ordered to the work of generation...in producing nature, God formed not only the male but also the female.

Reply to Objection 2. ...good order would have been wanting in the human family if some were not governed by others wiser than themselves. So by such a kind of subjection woman is naturally subject to man because in man the **discretion of reason predominates** [emphasis added]

Article 2. Whether Woman Should Have Been Made from Man?

I answer: that when all things were first formed, it was more suitable for the woman to be made from the man...First, in order thus to give the first man a certain dignity, so that just as God is the principle of the whole universe, so the first man, in the likeness of God, was the principle of the whole human race...Secondly, that man might love woman all the more, and cleave to her more closely, knowing her to be fashioned from himself...Thirdly, it was suitable for the woman to be made out of her principle...Fourthly, there is a sacramental reason for this. For by this is signified that the Church takes her origin from Christ.

Reply to Objection 2. ...the Divine Power, being infinite, can produce things of the same species out of any matter, such as man from the slime of the earth and woman from man.

Reply to Objection 3. A certain affinity arises from natural generation, and this is an impediment to matrimony. Woman, however, was not produced from man by natural generation, but by the Divine Power alone. Hence, Eve is not called the daughter of Adam.

Article 3. Whether the Woman Was Fittingly Made from the Rib of Man?

I answer that, It was right for the woman to be made from the rib of man. First, to signify the social union of man and woman, for the woman should neither use

authority over man, and so she was not made from the head; nor was it right for her to be subject to man's contempt as his slave, so she was not made from his feet. Secondly, for the sacramental significance; for from the side of Christ sleeping on the Cross the Sacraments flowed—namely, blood and water on which the Church was established.

Reply to Objection 1. we say that the crowds were fed with five loaves, or that woman was made from the rib, because an addition was made to be the already existing matter of the loaves and of the rib.

Reply to Objection 2. the rib belonged to the integral perfection of Adam, not as an individual, but as the principle of the human race; just as the semen belongs to the perfection of the begetter, and is released by a natural and pleasurable operation. Much more, therefore, was it possible that by Divine Power the body of the woman should be produced from man's rib without pain.

LETTERS, COMMONWEAL, November 19, 2010, Page 2

SECONDARY IMAGE? “In ‘Long Goodbye’ (October 22) Cathleen Kaveny notes the response of women she spoke with concerning the recent Vatican ‘PR gaffe’ that seemed to link ‘as sacramental crimes the sexual abuse of minors and any attempt to ordain women’: they suspect that the hierarchy retains ‘a seemingly inexpugnable disrespect for—and even fear of—women.’ ...Aquinas thinks that ‘in a secondary sense the image of God is found in man, and not in woman, for man is the beginning and end of every creature.’ Consequently, ‘woman is naturally subject to man, because in man the discernment of reason predominates,’ thus the male, not the female, ‘is most perfectly like God according as his intellectual nature can most imitate God.’ ...Seven centuries after Aquinas, that view prevails covertly in common practice and in words...” D. W. Odell, Altamont, NY

Eucharist as Conscience

Female sensitivity, the ground-state of vitality, emotes life in the interpersonal vision of conscionable necessity. Even as male dominion diminishes the graciousness of human/divine collaboration, so female graciousness amplifies the consciousness of Eucharist, and accesses Eucharistic graces in biological transformation. More than ever, religion/culture requires the full complement of female sensitivity in enabling Eucharistic grace and Sacrament.

Clerical insensitivity toward female/natural grace now imposes deep frustration on Church, people and nature. In areal sense, the narcissistic withdrawal of hierarchy into male exclusivism has created a crisis of failed insight, and fails the larger church in cosmic consciousness and universal conscience. Hierarchically cultured short sight and frustration of essential Motherhood denies the inclusive grace of purposeful divinity at work in nature and communal conscience.

What institutional fixation in clerical (male) narcissism has done is frustrate Eucharistic; this frustration can only be undone by seeing beyond clerical short sight

and acquiring the clearer vision of fully human conscience — what is the consciousness of Love motivating the conscience of divine/ human transformation.

The fixity of male-clericalism in denying essential feminism in Church and priesthood compels laity to seek a Eucharistic solution that is inclusive, universal and holistic. The shriveled consciousness of clericalism needs to be offset by enlarged public consciousness. The vision correction of clerical myopia is in the feminine sense of priesthood, Eucharist and the nature/ nurture of motherhood.

The grace inherent in conscious Sacrament is the moral sense of universal Eucharist, which is the cosmic heart of the transformational processes celebrated incrementally in the advance of wisdom, age, and grace — leading to the inevitable awareness of Ultimate Reality, Love. Ultimate Reality is Eucharist, the transforming process of human ascendancy into greater Godlikeness, into higher consciousness.

In this Seventh year of the Third Millennium it is appropriate to return even a Seventh time and reflect on Ultimate Reality. In religious lore, the number Seven suggests perfection. Fullness is represented in the Seven days of the week, in the Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit, and in the Seven Sacraments. The intentional Gifts of Holy Spirit daily motivate the Graces of Sacrament.

Universal Sacrament groans to birth Eucharistic consciousness into live sensitivity. Eucharistic conscience is motivated in female grace and motivates female grace; female grace authenticates nature/life in mindfulness and the holiness of the God/Land/Human Covenant.

Trinity & Sexual Ambiguity

The sexual ambiguity of nature, of the human person, requires reflective self-denial and self-affirmation. In self-denial the person of self is distinguished in maleness and femaleness; sexual individuality perpetuates sexual authenticity. Ambiguity requires both, affirmation and denial—denial of self, not of other. When we deny the sexual otherness in self, we deny the full Self of Divinity. This is the sin of radical clericalism, the denial of the Divine Feminine.

The contradiction of duality is the mystery of paradox. The mystery of Eucharist is a Grand Paradox, not a contradiction. Eucharist is communication of self with other; Eucharist is consciousness of self-transformation into other; Eucharist is conscience enabling self-transformation into other; we are not today what we were yesterday; we will not be tomorrow what we are today, and yet the paradox is that in transformation we remain the same self, yesterday, today, tomorrow, in oneness with all other even though the immanence of substance is fleeting and transitory.

Otherness is a special quality that endures in perpetuity. In constant “resurrection” the self endures in the transformation of other. Baptism celebrates the paradox of Eucharistic entry into perpetual transformation, the iterations of birth/death—the perpetual paradox of humanity in the likeness of divinity.