

Hartshorne allows that “infinitely flexible love . . . may be unimaginable, but,” he replies, “we are here conceiving, not imagining” (*RV*: 101). But what guarantees that the words, “infinitely flexible love,” succeed in capturing a thought, or concept—as distinct from being either hopelessly unclear or outright self-contradictory? And even if they are thus successful, what does, or could, “infinitely flexible love” possibly add to “universal individual,” defined purely formally, or transcendently—except either something conceptual but nonliteral, because merely metaphorical, symbolic, or analogical; or something conceptual but redundant, because only verbally distinguishable from what is already included in the meaning of “universal individual”?

18 June 2005