

What If Anything Has Changed About Human Nature In the Last 2000 Years?

Post by "Bryan" of January 9, 2024 at 11:54 AM

[Quote from Don](#)

Which comes first? Did the "image" arise in the mind after you "think" of something, or did you think of something and then the image arises in the mind?

I should not have said 'think' but maintained the use of 'focus.' Thank you for the correction! It seems that this is the very reason Epicurus used 'focus' (ἡ ἐπιβολή) instead of a word for thinking (ὁ λογισμός, ὁ λόγος, ἡ νόησις, ἡ γνῶσις, ἡ δόξα, etc).

Epicurus was pointing to the pre-rational image that strikes us. If we choose to 'think' of something, we must first mentally 'focus' on it.

[Quote from BrainToBeing](#)

"God the Father" However, what if all of it is a form of prolepsis.

People have a natural mental image of the gods, but this natural sense can be quickly obfuscated by culture/opinion. Epicurus lived in a world where depictions of gods were as common as seeing a statue of Mickey Mouse at Disneyland. The gods in ancient Greece were extremely reified by the culture.

We now have the opposite problem. We come from many generations of people who suffered under the idea (from Judaism, and present in Protestantism) that god cannot be pictured and should not be imagined.

If images of friendship and thinking about 'the characteristics of friendship' were considered for thousands years to be a serious mental transgression, we would eventually expect some people to come to the conclusion that friendship is not real.

Just because, from one viewpoint, some clouds are obfuscating a distant tower does not mean the tower does not exist.

A pencil is worthy to be called a pencil if its fundamental characteristics (συμβεβηκότα) are of a pencil. Just like 'justice,' we cannot deny the existence of the word or category of 'god' so then we must take that label, look around the universe, and put the label on something that exists and is worthy of the label.