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Abstract
Is it possible to think about God without anthropomorphizing him? The fact that God has both anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic characteristics adds to theological confusion. Individual variances in God’s views might be a reflection of how individuals understand God’s portrayals. Intellectuals have argued for ages that theistic conceptions of God are excessively anthropomorphic, perplexing, and complex. The paper focused on religious language and God’s anthropomorphic identities. It employed a historico-comparative approach using library resources. The finding provides light on the limitations and potential of philosophico-religious transmission of the complex idea of anthropomorphism and offers a critical, constructive, and interpretive avenue for intellectual dialogue.

Introduction
Is it possible to think about God without thinking about him as a person? Some thinkers portray God as the universe’s omnipotent (all-powerful), omniscience (all-knowing), and omniamorous (all-loving) creator.1 Some thinkers portray God as the universe’s creator who is ‘omnipotent (all-powerful), omniscience (all-knowing), and omniamorous (all-loving).’ However, such ideas may lead to theological inconsistencies. Why is there so much suffering in the world if Christ died to alleviate it? In his course companion, Lindeman and Rai also explore the paradox of transformation.2 Spiritual conceptions are represented using the same cognitive resources as natural concepts, according to religious cognition scholars. However, it’s unclear how this process leads to culturally valid conceptions that are widely and enthusiastically accepted. The fact that God has both anthropomorphic (e.g., ‘listens to prayers’) and non-anthropomorphic traits add to the theological debates.3 Individual differences in God beliefs may
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reflect differences in how people interpret public depictions of God. Religious conceptions are one of the few types of ideas that are conveyed exclusively via culture. The results of the research will provide insight into the constraints and capabilities of cultural transmission in general. It also provides as a forum for intellectual debate on religion that is critical, constructive, and interpretative.

Discussion

The Evolution of Supernatural Concepts

The terms supernatural, paranormal, and preternatural are often used interchangeably. The latter is usually restricted to discussing powers that seem to go beyond what is physically feasible. In terms of natural events that defy natural principles, the link between the supernatural and the natural is hazy from an epistemological standpoint. Beliefs in some type of supernatural power are practically widespread, and they may be divided into two categories: deities or gods, and those with lower abilities who become involved in human affairs. Individual gods may be identified by their traits and can be named and customized. \(^4\) Gods often have superhuman abilities, although only a handful is deemed omnipotent. Culture Heroes are historical figures who have been exalted and venerated by a group of people. The gods are envisioned as great entities whose power varies only in degree, at least at initially, from that of earthly rulers. \(^5\) The concept of ‘worship’ becomes necessary as this type of god develops. The gods might also appear as a powerful earthly ruler, whose favor can be gained by entreaty, gifts, service, tributes, adoration, and bribery.

‘Gods’ were never intended to be ‘human-like’ entities. Only after the extinction of the simply naturalistic perspective still present in the Vedas did they acquire the shape of everlasting entities. \(^6\) Once systematic thought about religious practice and the rationalization of life in general, with its rising demands on the gods, a pantheon was usually created. The formation of a pantheon necessitates the specialization and categorization of distinct gods, as well as the assignment of consistent traits and differentiation of their competence. However, the growing


\(^6\) Onimhawo & Ottuh, 33
personification of the gods is not the same as or comparable to the growing divergence of competence. The functions of the Roman gods (*numina*) were considerably more set and apparent than those of the Hellenic gods.

The most fundamental issue is whether one should attempt to influence a specific god or demon by force or entreaty at all, and the response relies only on the outcome. The deity, like the magician, must exhibit his or her charm on a regular basis. Even today in China, a few spectacular victories are enough for a deity to gain reputation and power (*shen ling*), resulting in a sizable following. In such circumstances, there are ways to explain the ancient god's erratic behavior in such a manner that his status is not diminished, but rather boosted. The most remarkable example is that of Yahweh's priesthood, whose devotion to his people became deeper as Israel's fate became more precarious. Some of the most powerful and benevolent gods of heaven have few cults, not because they are too far removed from humans, but because their influence seems to be equal. Powers with a plainly diabolical nature, such as Rudra, the Hindu deity of plague, are not necessarily lesser than benevolent gods, and may have enormous power potential.

Methodological Paradoxes

In the first case, anthropomorphism and its sister phenomena, animism, might be seen as the unavoidable occasional faults of perceptual and conceptual systems. They arise in religion, as well as other forms of cognition and behavior, since they are plausible if in hindsight incorrect interpretations of things and events, as well as ways of influencing them. Of course, just because they're mistakes doesn't mean they can't be useful. Religious thinking and activity are often used as weapons for social control or emotional assurance, as thinkers as different as Freud, Durkheim, and Marx have argued. However, although such applications might assist explain why religious thinking and activity are actively promoted and moulded into certain forms, they cannot explain why such thought and action exist in the first place and are reasonable. They emerge and are plausible for cognitive reasons: people live in a complicated and ultimately incomprehensible
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environment in which the most significant components are human, capable of concealment, and perceived as inherently unobservable.\textsuperscript{11} This is a reality with which we are equipped to interact thanks to our understanding of mind, as well as associated sensitivity to phenomena like motion, faces, and apparent indications of design, as well as matching social action skills. Animism and anthropomorphism, both unsystematized and systematized as religion, necessarily exist in this world and thanks to these capabilities.

Anxiety over anthropomorphism may be seen in the Hebrew Bible. In following centuries' Jewish texts, this grew much more apparent. Early and medieval Christian theology was affected by Greek philosophy’s anti-anthropomorphic inclinations. Yahweh appears to Abraham in the amazing story of Genesis 18:1-15, and the two have a meal and an intimate interaction. The development of weaker beliefs was linked to anthropomorphism as well, but in the opposite direction. Anthropomorphic God concepts are not theologically correct, but those who believe in them claim to have received more religious education.\textsuperscript{12} Despite overt contradictions between properties of humans, for example, limited knowledge, power, and vitality, and the properties of God, their beliefs seem to grow stronger over time, thus, public representations of God in Western culture range from highly anthropomorphic to highly abstract. The relationship between acceptance of an anthropomorphic conception of God and associated beliefs and practices was investigated. Anthropomorphic conceptions of God bring an entire ontology with them for interpreting religious ideas, as well as the ontology of human beings and human affairs. This appears to guide both reasoning about supernatural phenomena and reasoning about natural phenomena’s supernatural underpinnings.

It is obvious that the interaction between a people’s conceptions of religious ideas and how they accept those ideas as true or false amounts to serious conceptual paradoxes. One might expect atheists to interpret religious ideas more concretely than theists, but the opposite was discovered. One possible explanation for this disparity is that atheists abandoned concrete interpretations early in their religious growth in an effort to sustain belief, but eventually found abstract interpretations untenable as well. Anthropomorphic notions of God do not necessarily generate concrete theologies; rather the contrary may be true.\textsuperscript{13} People may conclude that God has human characteristics after understanding that angels and Satan are largely human in look and
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conduct. Alternatively, all three creatures may be educated about in tandem as part of a concrete theology formed entirely from religious education.

While this interpretation is not implausible, there are a number of reasons to doubt it. Theological information, for example, is likely to be just as vague as religious information, leaving lots of room for interpretation, thus, identifying social groups that have more definite ideas than others may provide greater insight into the nature and origins of those beliefs. For example, one may look at the theologies of young infants and see how they evolve through time, or compare them to those of members of the same cultural unit, such as a church or family.

People are looking for factual and logical evidence, which religions cannot always provide. True knowledge, according to logical positivists, can only be achieved by empirical or logical/linguistic verification. However, empirical reasons may be argued to be irrelevant in the context of metaphysical knowing claims. Perhaps scholars are losing the purpose of religion when one tries to apply approaches from other fields of study to religion. Religious evidence, validity, and justification are still important notions in many religious arguments. One may debate whether religion is only a product of the mind to satisfy a psychological need, or if faith needs any evidence at all. Regardless of physical proof, faith, intuition, language, and emotion may lead people to religious understanding.

Conceptual Considerations

Religious Language

If God is infinite, words used to describe finite creatures may not be sufficient to describe God. Eastern religious traditions' divine doctrines differ drastically from those of Abrahamic religions. The issue of religious language has received little attention in Eastern philosophy. It refers to the ambiguity in meaning of terms predicated of God. Practitioners of Abrahamic religious traditions are concerned about the problem of religious language because it has the potential to undermine those traditions. In these traditions, speaking about God is essential to both personal praxis and organized celebration. The Abrahamic faiths are vulnerable to accusations that their sacred texts and teachings are unintelligible because they lack the ability
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to speak about God and understand what is said.\textsuperscript{16} The issue of religious language is a philosophical one that should be resolved in order to give a framework for comprehending God claims in both the house of worship and scholarship. Extensive conversations in the field of religious philosophy will become incoherent if there is no suitable answer. If human communication about God is impossible, these assertions about God would be incoherent.

\textit{Anthropomorphic constructionism}

Anthropomorphism is the portrayal of God as a human being, complete with human physical appearance and emotions such as jealousy, fury, and love. Other religious philosophies argue that seeing an omniscient, omnipresent God as human is impossible.\textsuperscript{17} Xenophanes, a Greek philosopher who lived in the fifth century BC, was the first in the West to criticize anthropomorphism.\textsuperscript{18} Although Ethiopians characterized gods as dark-skinned, northerners in Thrace painted gods as having red hair and blue eyes, according to Xenophanes. He came to the conclusion that human images of gods usually reveal more about the creators than about the almighty. The worship of gods in the appearance of animals, known as theriomorphism, has been accused of being superior to Christianity (Greek \textit{therion}, 'animal'; \textit{morphe}, 'shape').\textsuperscript{19} Because it incorporates humanity into the divine nature, both Jewish and Islamic theologians have accused Christianity of anthropomorphism. Jesus Christ, according to Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, was both fully human and fully divine.

Anthropomorphism is the perception of a divine being or entities in human form in religion and mythology. It is the acknowledgement of these entities' human traits. Love, battle, fertility, beauty, and the seasons were all portrayed by anthropomorphic deities at one time or another.\textsuperscript{20} Anthropomorphism in literature and other media spawned the furry fandom subculture.\textsuperscript{21} The use of anthropomorphic language, which implies that animals have feelings and motives, has long
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been seen to indicate a lack of impartiality. Anthropomorphism is a cognitive process in which individuals assume attributes of non-human creatures based on their preconceptions about other humans. It may also be used as a coping mechanism for loneliness when no other human relationships are available. People are more prone to anthropomorphize when elicited agent knowledge is low and affectivity and sociality are high. These three factors can be influenced by a variety of dispositional, situational, developmental, and cultural variables, such as the need for cognition, social disconnection, cultural ideologies, uncertainty avoidance, and so on. Even if an artificially intelligent computer or robot has not been designed with human emotions, it often feels such feelings spontaneously in science fiction. Anthropomorphism is the deliberate use of anthropomorphic analogies to explain the behavior of artificial intelligence by humans. To believe that an intelligent robot would naturally find a woman attractive and be driven to mate with her is an example of anthropomorphism. Another example is the Dario Floreano experiments, in which certain robots developed the ability to ‘deceive’ other robots into eating poison and dying.

Another view is pandeism (or Pantheism), which holds that God is identical to the cosmos, but that God no longer exists in a manner that can be touched, hence this notion can only be demonstrated to exist by reason. Pandeism believes that God created the whole cosmos, and that the universe is currently the totality of God, but that the universe will eventually fold back into one single entity, God Himself, who created everything. Why would God create a cosmos just to forsake it, according to pandeism? In terms of pantheism, this raises the issue of how the cosmos came to be and what its goal and purpose are. Pantheists believe that everything is a part of an all-encompassing, indwelling, ethereal God, or that God and the Universe are the same.
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The idea that natural law, existence, and the Universe, which is the sum total of all that is, was, and will be, is represented in the theological principle of an abstract ‘god’ rather than an individual, creative Divine Being or Beings of any kind, is emphasized by further examination. This is the major difference between them and Panentheists and Pandeists. As a result, although many faiths claim to include Pantheistic aspects, they are more often Panentheistic or Pandeistic.

Instead of saying that an atheist believes it is false or probably false that there is a God, a more accurate description of atheism is that an atheist is someone who rejects belief in God for the following reasons: for an anthropomorphic God, the atheist rejects belief in God because it is false or probably false that there is a God; for a non-anthropomorphic God, the atheist rejects belief in God because the concept of such a God is absurd; While the religious would prefer to turn to the gods for ultimate moral direction in the relativistic environment of the Sophistic Enlightenment, philosophic and sophistic intellectuals questioned such assurance, pointing out the foolishness and immorality of traditional epic descriptions of the gods. Protagoras started his written essay on the gods. I have no way of knowing whether or if gods exist, or what kind of gods they may be. Knowledge is hampered by a number of factors, including the subject’s obscurity and the shortness of human life.

God’s Anthropomorphic Identities

While there is a vast range of supernatural notions found across the globe, Boyer claims that supernatural creatures in general act similarly to humans. He uses Greek mythology as an example, which is more like to a current soap opera than other religious systems. People project human qualities onto non-human components of the environment, because it makes those aspects more familiar. According to Rossano, as people started to live in bigger groupings, they may have constructed gods to enforce morality. Morality may be reinforced in small groups by social factors such as gossip or reputation. According to him, humankind established an excellent
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approach for limiting selfishness and forming more cooperative societies by integrating ever-watchful gods and spirits.

The Bible has been the primary source of God conceptions in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Because the Bible 'contains many distinct pictures, thoughts, and methods of thinking about' God, there are always disagreements over how God should be imagined and understood. God is known by numerous names in the Hebrew and Christian Bibles, one of which is Elohim.\textsuperscript{33} In the Quran and hadith, God is characterized and referred to by several names or traits, the most prevalent of which are Al-Rahman, which means 'Most Compassionate,' and Al-Rahim, which means 'Most Merciful'.\textsuperscript{34} Many of these names are also found in the Bahá’ Faith’s scriptures. Vaishnavism, a Hindu sect, offers a list of Krishna’s titles and names.

God’s gender might be seen as a literal or metaphorical characteristic of a god who, according to traditional western philosophy, transcends physical form. One of the gods in polytheistic faiths is usually assigned a gender, enabling them to engage sexually with each other and maybe with humans. God has no counterpart with whom to have sexual relations in most monotheistic faiths. Except in Genesis 1:26-27, where biblical writers generally allude to God using masculine or paternal terms and symbols, Hosea 11:3-4, Deuteronomy 32:18, Isaiah 66:13, Isaiah 49:15, Isaiah 42:14, Psalm 131:2 (a mother); Deuteronomy 32:11-12 (a mother eagle); and Matthew 23:37 and Luke 13:34 (a mother eagle) (a mother hen).\textsuperscript{35} Classical theists (such as ancient Greco-Medieval philosophers, Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox Christians, many Jews and Muslims, and some Protestants) speak of God as a divinely simple ‘nothing’ that is completely transcendent (totally independent of everything else) and has attributes such as immutability, impassibility, and timelessness.\textsuperscript{36} Theistic personalism theologians argue that God is most generally the ground of all being, immanent in and transcendent over the entire world of reality, with immanence and transcendence being the contrapletes of personality, as held by Rene Descartes, Isaac Newton, Alvin Plantinga, Richard Swinburne, William Lane Craig, and most
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modern evangelicals.\textsuperscript{37} Jung\textsuperscript{38} equated religious ideas of God with transcendental metaphors of higher consciousness, describing God as an eternally flowing current of vital energy that endlessly changes shape as an eternally unmoved, unchangeable essence.

Many philosophers have sought to reconcile God's qualities and their consequences. God's omniscience, for example, may seem to indicate that God knows how free agents will choose to behave. If God is aware of this, their seeming free choice may be deceptive, or foreknowledge may not entail predestination.\textsuperscript{39} Some theists acknowledge that only some of the reasons for God's existence are strong, but contend that faith is a result of risk, not reason.\textsuperscript{40} Each monotheistic religion has a separate name for its deity, some of which correspond to cultural conceptions about the god's identity and traits. Many religious followers believe in angels, saints, jinn, devils, and devas, as well as other, less powerful spiritual creatures. God is called \textit{Elohim} (God), \textit{Adonai} (Lord), and other names in the Hebrew Bible, as well as the name \textit{YHWH} or \textit{Yhweh}.

\section*{What makes Religious Language Right about God's Anthropomorphic Identities}

Researchers were motivated by social cognition to develop embodied theories of human communication behavior. These explanations connect humans' unrivaled linguistic abilities back to basic capacities like grasping, action comprehension, and imitation.\textsuperscript{41} Humans may now convey their intentions via symbolic actions, thanks to the evolutionary shift from the capacity to copy to gesture-based communication. Multiple layers of recursive theory of mind activity are required for this form of communication.

\textit{Faith versus reason assumption}

Faith and reason are both forms of authority that may be used to support views. Faith entails a position toward a claim that is not, at least for the time being, verifiable by reason. There

\begin{itemize}
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are two types of faith: evidence-sensitive and evidence-insensitive faith. The former sees faith as tightly linked to verifiable facts, whereas the latter sees faith as just a religious believer's act. The primary philosophical difficulty in the dilemma of religion and reason is determining how faith's authority should be defined. In the process of justifying or establishing a religious belief as true or justified, reason and authority of reason interact. There are four fundamental types of interaction between the goals, objects, or processes of reason and religion - in this case, the goals and methods of both seem to be extremely similar. Reason and faith are thought to be separate in the Reformed Christian paradigm. Faith is trans-rational in the sense that it is higher than reason. Another viewpoint is that religious belief is irrational, and hence cannot be evaluated rationally.

Each may be compartmentalized, and there can be conversation between them. Natural theology is a common example of strong compatibilism. It may take one of two forms: it can start with scientific assertions that are supported by legitimate theological claims, or it can start with scientific claims that are supported by valid theological claims. Alternatively, it may begin with common statements within a religious tradition and improve them using scientific reasoning. Some natural theologians have sought to bring religion and reason together in a unified metaphysical theory.

Some modern philosophers, most notably the logical positivists, have disputed that religion has any authority to control any realm of thinking or human life, claiming instead that all meaningful assertions and ideas are subject to comprehensive rational analysis. This has made it difficult for religious philosophers to explain how a language that is openly non-rational or trans-rational may retain significant cognitive content.

**Historical assumption**

The most common basis for religious belief is the incidence of religious experiences or the weight of evidence from individuals who claim to have had religious experiences. Those who anthropomorphize God do so on the basis of their religious experience. Many individuals have stated that they have sensed God's presence, according to the argument. Consider the following...
sketch of some of the debate's movements and countermoves in order to spark additional inquiry.

According to theists, more impersonal Divine experiences represent only one facet of God. Hindus believe that having a firsthand experience of God is merely one step in the soul's path to truth. How one resolves the debate will be determined by one's overall philosophical opinions in a variety of areas. If you downplay the significance of religious experience and hold a high bar for the burden of evidence for any religious viewpoint, the traditional arguments for God's existence are unlikely to persuade you. If, on the other hand, you believe theistic arguments are logical and that religious witness offers some evidence for theism, you may be more sympathetic to theistic arguments.

The miraculous argument begins with particular unusual happenings. It claims that they give evidence for believing in a supernatural actor or, more modestly, for doubting the soundness of a naturalistic worldview. Since David Hume's denial of miracles, the argument has gotten a lot of philosophical attention. The argument can be given a rough edge in various ways, for example, imagine that if you do not believe in God and there is a God, hell is waiting for you, it can be presented as an appeal to individual self-interest, or it can be presented more broadly, for example, believers whose lives are bound together can realize some of the goods comprising a mature religious life. The subject of whether cognitive science of religion has any bearing on the truth or rationality of religious devotion is gaining traction.

The idea in supernatural forces seems to be cognitively natural and simple to propagate, according to cognitive science of religion. Some, notably Alvin Plantinga, have used the naturalness of religion thesis to suggest that we have scientific evidence for Calvin's sensus divinitatis. Others have said that cognitive science of religion exacerbates the issue of divine concealment.

**Theodical assumption**
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In the greater good defense, evil may be seen as either a necessary component of achieving greater good or as a separate entity from these benefits. It has been speculatively expanded by some who propose a defense rather than a theodicy to encompass additional ills that may be caused by supernatural powers other than God. The Augustinian paradigm, according to John Hick, fails, but the Irenaean model is trustworthy. Some contend that the concept of a best possible universe, like the concept of the greatest possible number, is illogical. It has been suggested that Divine excellences have top bounds or maxima that are not measurable in a sequential manner. Someone who claims that there is no reason for evil to exist or that there is no justification for God to let it appears to suggest that if there was, they would see it. Is it obvious that if there were a purpose for the presence of evil, we would perceive it in the cosmic case? William Rowe believes that a viable explanation for God’s justification for letting evil should be discernible.

Some philosophers have argued that we have strong cause to be dubious about our ability to judge whether or not an all-good God would allow allegedly gratuitous harms. Some depictions of the hereafter seem to have no influence on how we react to the scale of evil in the present. The issues brought by evil and suffering are many, and current philosophers from both religious and non-religious perspectives are addressing them. Meister and Taliaferro’s six-volume The History of Evil, which has over 130 writers from practically every theological and secular perspective. If you don’t believe it matters whether or not people live on after they die, then speculation is pointless. But suppose the hereafter is seen as ethically interwoven with this life, providing opportunities for moral and spiritual reformation, transfiguration of the wicked, rejuvenation, and new life opportunities. These considerations might then be used to counter arguments based on the existence of evil.

Functional explanation
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The functional explanation of anthropomorphic identities of God (the God of religion) is discoverable in the functional description of religion. A functional definition of religion is one that considers what religion accomplishes and how it functions in terms of its social/psychological context. This can refer to religion’s social functions, such as group cohesion, social order, and defense of group interests, or its psychological functions, such as providing stories, symbols, and rituals that help people identify with role models, be motivated, find consolation, and find answers to existential questions, among other things. Religion is a cohesive collection of ideas and activities about holy objects.

A- Posteriori epistemological explanation

The cosmological and teleological arguments are a posteriori arguments. The cosmological argument is based on the idea that there is at least one strong entity who is self-existing or whose existence is independent of other beings. This might be a more local, restricted idea of a being uncaused in the real world, as in certain forms of the ontological argument. If successful, the argument would provide cause to believe that such an entity exists. It may not be sufficient to support a complete depiction of God in religion, but it would contradict naturalistic alternatives and give some rationale for theism.

Some theistic arguments would need seeing diverse arguments as mutually reinforcing. Part of the argument may be stated as proof that the universe is the kind of reality that an intelligent entity would create, and then arguing that positing this source is more logical than agnosticism. The teleological argument, if successful in arguing for an intelligent, trans-cosmos source, may give some reason to believe that the cosmological argument’s First Cause is purposive. The teleological argument is used by theists to bring attention to the cosmos’ structure and stability, the formation of vegetative and animal life, awareness, morality, rational agents, and other topics. In our instance, deliberate, purposeful explanations seem to be valid and may actually account for the character and recurrence of occurrences.

Darwinian theories of biological evolution will not always help us understand why there are rules or creatures in the first place. The teleological argument attempts to show why positing a purposeful intelligence is rational and preferable to naturalism. To reinforce and reintroduce the

uniqueness issue, some skeptics invoke the idea that the universe has an endless history. In theory, worlds that seem chaotic, unpredictable, or based on principles that stifle the creation of life are feasible. Some contend that if we can trust our cognitive capabilities, we may be certain that they are not the result of naturalistic causes.

In evolutionary epistemology, the dependability of cognitive capabilities is explained in terms of trial and error that leads to survival. Some atheists believe that faith in God has been essential to people’s survival, despite the fact that this belief is completely wrong. Fine tuning arguments claim that life would not exist if various physical parameters did not have numerical values that fall within a defined range of values that allow life to exist. Even modest alterations to the nuclear weak force, for example, would not have permitted stars to form, nor would stars have survived if the electromagnetic to gravity ratio had been considerably different.

Religions provide answers to questions such as why humans exist, how they should conduct their lives, and what motivates human behavior, as well as explanations regarding the natural world. The link between believers and the information provided by their faiths is complicated and wide-ranging. Some individuals turn to religion to satisfy a psychological need, while others turn to religion for direction on life’s broader problems, sometimes in moments of powerlessness. Religious proof may take the shape of language for believers. This is generally done via written books such as the Bible, Torah, and Koran. One problem with utilizing (inspired) language to prove God’s existence and anthropomorphize him is that it might lead to circular reasoning. Language does play an important part in the transmission of religious knowledge, which is greatly influenced by cultural, historical, and geographic circumstances.

**Socio-cultural**

Embodied simulations explain these at the neurological, behavioral, and phenomenological levels. Social constructivist theories, for example, concentrate on the negotiated creation of meaning within a socio-cultural environment without elucidating how these mental structures are processed in the brain. Theories abound on how embodied simulations might serve as a source of semantic material for social cognition. Humans were never the only ones involved in our
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social interactions. There was always a strong selection pressure to be able to read the minds of both aggressive (such as bears) and friendly creatures (e.g., dogs during co-hunting). Furthermore, people have traditionally ascribed Anthropomorphism is the application of human characteristics to both living and non-living entities. After a flood, for example, the river god is furious, they have a better understanding of their surroundings.

Metaphoric explanation

God's anthropomorphic identities are metaphoric. Humans' conceptual worlds, according to Gibbs, Gould and Andric, are essentially metaphorical, regulating their day-to-day experiences. A metaphor is a mapping from a known source domain to a new destination domain that makes sense. Our physical experiences often serve as the source domain since many of our intuitions, knowledge, and assumptions are strongly anchored in our bodies. Bodily experiences, on the other hand, take place in a socio-cultural environment and are classified according to cultural assumptions. Understanding action-related phrases necessitates an internal simulation of the activities stated in the sentences, which is mediated by the same motor representation that is engaged in their execution. Visualizing the metaphorical meaning was made easier by seeing, copying, or imagining the gripping action before listening to the grasp the notion metaphor. Performing or picturing suitable body motions before reading metaphorical words increased participants' understanding of these sentences in reading time tests.

Pomorphic explanation

Most organized faiths have pomorphic views of God. Do people conceive God in terms of gender if they believe in Him? Is there anything about their God that reminds them of a human being? Is their God a member of their knowledge community, if so? There is the need to investigate anthropomorphic responses to visual stimuli. Many philosophers have attempted to stay clear of an all-too-human view of God. Should the issue of anthropomorphism, however, invariably
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lead to religious skepticism? At some time throughout their life, some individuals have strong religious experiences, while others have recounted something similar after having a near-death experience.

A Synthetic Departure

Is it possible to think about God without thinking of him as anthropomorphic? Some believe God created the cosmos and is omnipotent and omniscient. Others think God has both anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic characteristics. Religious beliefs are one of the few kinds of concepts that are transmitted solely via culture. In the first situation, anthropomorphism and its sister phenomenon, animism, might be seen as inescapable flaws in perceptual and conceptual systems. They appear in religion, as well as other types of cognition and conduct, since they are reasonable if wrong explanations of things and happenings in retrospect. Of course, just because they are errors does not rule out the possibility of their being beneficial. Looking at the link between acceptance of an anthropomorphic picture of God and associated beliefs and actions, anthropomorphic conceptions of God may not always lead to concrete theologies; however, the opposite may be true. After seeing that angels and Satan are mostly human in appearance and behaviour, people may assume that God possesses human features.

Theological data is likely to be as ambiguous as religious data, allowing plenty of space for interpretation. Identifying social groups with more defined views than others may reveal more about the nature and origins of such beliefs. One may, for example, examine the theologies of newborn children to observe how they change over time, or compare them to those of members of the same cultural unit, such as a church or family. Words used to describe finite things may not be adequate to describe God if God is infinite. The divine doctrines of Eastern religious traditions
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differ significantly from those of Abrahamic religions. Because they lack the capacity to talk about God, the Abrahamic religions are subject to allegations that their holy writings and teachings are incoherent.

Religious language is a philosophical issue that should be addressed to provide a framework for understanding God claims. In religion and mythology, anthropomorphism is the vision of a divine person or beings in human form. It is the acceptance of these beings' human characteristics. When elicited agent knowledge is low and affectivity and sociality are strong, people are more likely to anthropomorphize. For instance, even though an artificially intelligent computer or robot is not programmed to sense human emotions, it often does so in science fiction. In anthropomorphizing, one may appeal to pandeism (or Pantheism), another viewpoint which claims that God is similar to the world but no longer exists in a tangible form. Furthermore, it holds that God created the whole universe and that the universe is now God's entirety. Many religions claim to include Pantheistic elements; however they are more often Panentheistic or Pandeistic.

In the Judeo-Christian tradition, the Bible has been the major source of God ideas. God is described and alluded to by numerous names or characteristics in the Quran and hadith. People may have created gods to impose morality when they began to live in larger groups. In small groups, social variables such as gossip or reputation may support morality. Deity's gender might be interpreted as a literal or symbolic feature of a god who, according to classical Western thought, transcends physical form. In polytheistic beliefs, one of the gods is frequently ascribed a gender, allowing them to interact sexually with one another and sometimes with humans. In most monotheistic beliefs, God has no counterpart with whom to have sexual intercourse.

Many philosophers have endeavored to avoid a too humanistic picture of God. The anthropomorphism accusation was pursued with such zeal that it resembled a witch hunt. God is the only being in Islam who is both transcendent and wonderful. Several poetical phrases are used in the Qur'an to establish a divine but confusing modality in reference to God. There are a

---

few verses in the Qur’an that, if taken literally, might lead to anthropomorphic gods. Metaphysics could be viewed as a completely logical explanation of observed reality, according to a philosophical approach. In its pronouncements about God, a metaphysics that remains true to itself and has its own internal standard reaches certainty.

**Conclusion**

Anthropomorphism and its sibling phenomena, animism, are seen to be unavoidable defects in perceptual and conceptual systems. People are more prone to anthropomorphize when their elicited agent knowledge is low and their affectivity and sociality are high. When people start to dwell in greater groupings, they may have established gods to enforce morality. Faith and reason are two distinct sorts of authority that may be used to support opposing viewpoints. The two types of faith are evidence-sensitive faith and evidence-insensitive faith. If one dismisses the relevance of religious experience, traditional arguments for God’s existence are unlikely to persuade you.

Some contend that the concept of a world in the best-case scenario is unreasonable. The cosmological argument is based on the premise that at least one strong entity exists independently of other things. The teleological argument aims to show why believing in a purposeful intelligence is both plausible and preferable to naturalism hence, the ability and curiosity to anthropomorphize God. Some atheists believe that faith in God has aided people’s survival hence they appeal to anthropomorphism. The Qur’an has a few passages that, if interpreted literally, might lead to anthropomorphic gods. Metaphysics may be thought of as a logical explanation for observable reality in this regard. The study certainly, has provided answer to the question, that is, it not possible to conceive about God without considering him to be anthropomorphic. Certainly, God is omnipotent and omniscient, having created the universe. Therefore, God has both anthropomorphic and anthropomorphic traits.
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