

Review of: "[Perspective] On the autonomy of mystical perception"

Kleio Akrivou¹

¹ University of Reading

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for sharing your work! It has been very interesting to read your paper.

The submission explores a very interesting and important question and is an interesting contribution to the phenomenology of (mystical) experience. It has promised effectively to offer value to inform the literature on the mystical experience as something with its own importance, salience, and distinctiveness to clearly distinguish it from other forms of perception or states of human consciousness.

I found some of your arguments a little unclear and confusing, so I think it would be best if you took step by step the assumptions behind the contribution of the work and more clearly examined and articulated them. It would be better if you more clearly identified the steps or points at which you are making a contribution and advancing understanding. For me, these are

1. The raising of the importance of other forms of human experience and consciousness beyond five-senses perception, which are there and available to us and superior to the senses. There, I think you need to more clearly define the latter.

That there is a distinctive category of such perception, which is the so-called mystical perception, which you claim is and should not be just classified as religious, but which is superior, namely more convincing and more serious, compared to religious experience. I think you are limiting this to the phenomenology of the senses, body, and mind, but this topic needs a deeper exploration to touch on metaphysics and philosophy of the human being. In this case, I think you need to talk about the philosophy, the ontology of such experiences. What and how can we define something which we classify as religion but is mystical, more than religion? It would be good to clarify if you are taking a theistic, non-theistic, or agnostic argument out of preference or because you side with one particular view, e.g., a non-theistic ontological philosophy, and why or which sources inform you in this. Is your focus on mystics at odds with religion or with a theistic ontological philosophy? I will go back to this in point 4 with some readings.

2. Then you point out the mystical mind can and should be investigated within the cognitive sciences separate from religious belief and ordinary five-senses perception. This would need a little more reading about which understandings of the mind theories correspond to the cognitive sciences approaches that can capture this.

3. You are arguing for an autonomous state of perception but before you give the definition of the mystical perception I think you need to clarify in terms of the nature of this autonomy – that it is not informed or influenced by biology, or the

cultural influence or the social surrounding one is part of, that it is not influenced by the physical location or state of the body? I think these need further clarifications. I think these need further clarifications. They will influence also the next point

4. When you give the definition I am wondering if the definition of this autonomous state of perception needs further thought (and partly more in depth look to the data or more data...). I am wondering if in the definition you would need to include a form of encounter... An encounter of a mystical nature with something or someone, God if you include a theistic thesis? Has to do with an ontological understanding of the mystical realm, is it someOne we connect which still fits the hypothesis of autonomous as I explained earlier (would it require some form of transcendence?) Encountering of a someone in the form of a non rational encounter and how would your definition change in this instance? Do you have examples to also support this version to be possible in a way which is included in your definition or informs a better definition? If not why? Then you would also need to put a boundary about what is not included in how you study or approach this encounter.

Readings which could be of interest: If you read Aristotle's metaphysics or literature about these (Aristotle, Aristotle, and Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933.) it would be helpful to clarify morepoint 3, to have a better reading of metaphysics via Aristotle and Aquinas' works which are more complete metaphysicsFor point 4, which also will inform your analysis in point 1, There is a Spanish contemporary transcendental philosopher and philosophical anthropologists whose work may be helpful as a point of reference to inform the above. His name is Leonardo Polo. Some of his works have been translated in English.

for Polo some references in English are:

Polo, Leonardo. *Why a transcendental anthropology?*. Lulu. com, 2015.

Sellés, Juan Fernando. "Leonardo Polo." *FERNÁNDEZ LABASTIDA, F. Y MERCADO, J. A., Enciclopedia filosófica on-line* (2013).

Murillo, José Ignacio. "Leonardo Polo and the Mind-Body Problem." *Journal of Polian Studies*1 (2014): 79-91.