

# Simulacra, gods and the dead

Post by "Cassius" of November 15, 2020 at 7:43 AM

Some comments on a number of posts:

[Quote from Godfrey](#)

so are you saying that that makes spirituality innate?

I singled that out as a good example of the need for a definition of spirituality. What is "spirituality"? Have we made any progress in defining what we mean there?

[Quote from Godfrey](#)

grappling with the gods

I like that phrase!

[Quote from Godfrey](#)

justice and fair play seem to be a way of connecting our sensations with our feelings.

Yes I am thinking in that direction too. Maybe more generally, "anticipations are a way of connecting our sensations with our feelings." Or at the very least, "anticipations and sensations and feelings are all connected closely" which I think is a point that DeWitt emphasizes.

[Quote from Susan Hill](#)

there is a genetic and innate neurological proclivity towards spiritual seeking/belief,

That's another sentence that cries out for clarity in "what does spiritual mean?"

[Quote from Susan Hill](#)

I'm wondering if this were the definition of a prolepsis/anticipation, how would it be different from simple "learning ability" or "the faculty of cognition", or "knowledge creation ability"?

Right Susan. That's where I think the issue is with the Diogenese Laetrius section on anticipations, and the standard position on anticipations today. Clearly there is a process of "conceptual reasoning" that coincides with your terms "learning ability" and "faculty of cognition" and "knowledge creation ability." Clearly all normal people go through life seeing

new things (cell phones for example) and forming new pictures/conceptions of groups of cell phones until they have a mental image/definition of a cell phone that they then apply to new experiences. There's no doubt that conceptual reasoning exists. The big question is whether there is any "etching" of mental operations that plants the seeds so to speak as to how that process is going to occur or the directions it is going to pursue. Even if we agree (I think most of us do) that there are no innate "ideas," there do seem to be innate "principles of operation" that will end up disposing us in certain directions.

I think a decent analogy here is that of how we distinguish a computer operating system from application software. The operating system sets the basis limits and bounds of what a computer can do to interface with the real world (including printers and hard disks and monitors) while the application program is where true "data" is dumped in over time and the conceptual assembly process gets working to do advanced calculatiing.

So think the big problem is that the standard commentators are caught in the "blank slate" Aristotelian position and they focus exclusively on conceptual reasoning, which is part of the process, but they exclude the "etching" aspect which is clearly stated in Velleius because they think that conflicts with their blank slate starting point.