

I find it interesting that Hartshorne says in one place, “the divine mode of relativity . . . has the structure of perfect memory” (“Religion in Process Philosophy”: 247). He doesn’t say, in other words, that the divine mode of relativity simply *is* perfect memory; he says that it has *the structure* of such memory.

But what is that “structure”? In his own terms, it is “transparent relatedness, which completely, or if you will, ‘absolutely,’ sums up that to which it is relative. The ‘transparency’ of the divine relativity is the meaning of ‘omniscient.’” If this is so, however, then, clearly, “transparent” is but another way of saying “complete,” which itself is only another term for “*all*-inclusive,” as distinct from only “*some*-inclusive.” But then “perfect memory,” as such, is really only a metaphysically dispensable symbol or metaphor—just as, significantly, “transparent relatedness” interprets the meaning of “omniscience,” not the other way around.

5 October 2004