

# Review of: "Hard problems in the philosophy of mind"

Andrew P J Mullins<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Notre Dame Australia

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you Alexandros. My first reaction is to question the form of this paper. Is it a draft of a chapter in a book? As a paper it is too broad, long, and largely a summary of the literature.

However the nub of your interest seems to sit in these words:

*I then expressed my opinion that the source of reality is a Mind, God, who, in a mysterious way, has direct access to each created person and selected them even before they existed. My belief that the foundation and source of reality is personal (a Mind) rather than impersonal is based on my perception of a chasm in value between the personal and the impersonal. The physical seems to me to be insignificant compared to the mental, in fact subservient to it; it is from the mental that it acquires its relative value, even its relative existence. As I've mentioned, I find that even a single, finite, human person is infinitely more valuable than all of the vast impersonal, inanimate universe. Hence the structure of reality must have mental foundations, rather than the mental being a product of impersonal foundations.*

I hope I am doing you justice. If this is the key proposition of the paper, I suggest that you make this the focus from the start and set out to argue your position, though you need to propose a coherent model. I am very sympathetic to this intuition and to what you are seeking to achieve but it is necessary to harness clear arguments to support the view. This would require a reworking of your structure to focus, front and centre, on the task of the paper.

The scriptural references can offer some illustration but are not philosophical arguments. And in any case your approach seems open to the standard critiques in response to every dualistic system. These would require some answer.

Essentially, it seems to me, you are suggesting, without arguing for, a some form of metaphysical participation. You may be very interested to explore the work of Norris Clarke, Fabro, te Velde who read Aquinas in this fashion, in decisive contrast to the Aristotelian hylomorphism that you present in your paper. I have drawn on them for the work I have published in that space.

and I hope these comments are useful. I have not been able to spend as much time as I would like on 'lit review' aspect of your paper.

Andy Mullins

apjm.vic@gmail.com

