

The conceptuality / terminology of theistic religion includes distinctive concepts / terms of two main types: one type for the strictly ultimate reality that "God" is not the only, but only one "optional" way of re-presenting; and the other type for the realities—persons or things—that, in turn, re-present God (as strictly ultimate reality). Meister Eckhart's "*deitas*" is an example of the first type of concept / term, the New Testament, "υιος του θεου," of the second.

Significantly, "*deitas*" is as "'God'-dependent" as "υιος του θεου." And the same is true, *mutatis mutandis*, of the M^hayana Buddhist distinction between "dharmakaya-as-suchness" and "dharmakaya-as-compassion."

The task of the philosopher of religion, presumably, is to introduce a "novel verbal characterization, rationally coordinated," that is, as one could say in Hick's terms, "less upayic." I submit that "the whole," in the sense of "the one that is all," or "the one from, through, and to (or for) which are all things" is just the concept / term that is called for.

24 May 2009