

Point 1: In line 19, insert a comma after books : In Scholem's other books, even....

Point 2: In line 35, spelling of scholars > scholars needs to be fixed.

Point 3: Between lines 43-48 you have a long run on sentence which needs to be simplified into separate clauses. In its current form, the sentence is confusing.

Point 4: Section one should lay bare the specific thesis you are looking to proffer. In its current form, I am unclear what that thesis is.

Point 5: In lines 55-59, your note that neurological studies lend support to the structuralist view you are looking to defend, but then seem to imply that such studies are not credible for making the case you want to make. If you are not sympathetic with neurological studies of mystical experiences, then why reference such as support for the view you are defending?

Point 6: Between lines 60 and 63, you should identify and explain the differences between the two opposing camps.

Point 7: In line 69, "made flesh" reads awkwardly; perhaps an alternative word choice is desirable.

Point 8: In lines 79-85 you reference the Linguistic Turn. If I am not mistaken, the linguistic turn in philosophy, generally speaking, began at the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century. Perhaps you may want to specify the linguistic turn you are appealing to.

Point 9: In line 94, "text" . "textual".

Point 10: In line 98, change "Since" to "since".

Point 11: In lines 96 – 104 you are siding with a philosophy of mind that is seemingly reductionistic. Is this so? Are you defending the identity thesis of eliminative materialism, or some kind of behaviorism or functionalism? What about alternative theories of dualism, such as epiphenomenalism or panpsychism?

Point 12: In line 107, the word "large" is vague. Please specify.

Point 13: In lines 133-117, this sentence should be simplified into two separate clauses.

Point 14: In lines 118-121, this sentence can be, for the sake of clarity, simplified into two separate clauses.

Point 15: In paragraph lines 113-121, is it true that Katz et al deny the physiological/neurological underpinnings for what some want to characterize as mystical experience, or do they simply omit discussion of such? Please clarify.

Point 16: In lines 122-130, you are broadly assuming that there is linear, one-way causal relation between modifications of the brain and modifications of consciousness. These assumptions should be fleshed out further. After all, a panpsychism will argue that changes in the brain do not modify consciousness per se but instead how we receive such. For example, changes to a specific radio does not affect the radio signal which it receives.

Point 17: In lines 136-137 you state what the purpose of the article is. However, this should be stated at the beginning of the paper.

Point 18: In line 142 you may want to briefly enumerate the four genres numerically.