

# Philodemus On Piety

Post by "Cassius" of December 19, 2020 at 7:53 AM

## [Quote from Don](#)

If prolepses are formed by repeated exposures to a concept or thing, I suppose a concept/prolepsis of time could be formed.

That is perhaps the ultimate question -- and that's where I think DeWitt / Velleius is correct and Diogenes Laertius is wrong, and that the primary meaning of prolepsis cannot be "a concept formed after repeated exposure to a thing." "Prolepsis" might involve some unrational process that plays into, or describes, the procedure by which the ultimate result is reached, but I think a focus on "after repeated exposure" improperly deprecates the "Pro-" or the "pre-" or the "anticipatory" words that indicate something that predated the repeated exposure.

But I certainly understand why this is confusing and I can see both sides of the argument.

As for both the time and gods example, I think it's telling that the context seems to indicate that anticipations can be both true and false to the ultimate facts, and that's again why I think that 1 - the main focus has to be pre-rational and 2- we have to get used to viewing anticipations as a faculty that reports without injection of opinion, rather than fully-formed concepts which we then accept as the equivalent of a faculty. If you equate a "concept" with a criterion of truth then you lock yourself forever into a particular opinion which would never again be changeable through that faculty, and that's not the way we view the five senses or the feelings of pain and pleasure, which are continuously reporting whatever they receive regardless of preconceived notions.

Don THANK YOU for continuing to posts these details as they are extremely helpful!