

The only criticism

a) your definition of personality pg 11 Ap. Upon that definition
Should not the human nature of Christ be a person?

b). I confess I do not understand in what sense or the
"transient dynamism" no man is more than an instrumental
cause. Doubtless this will come clear in the body of the essay.

Q. 1. . . both a) & b). Does this allow sufficiently for choice between
good and good, or between good and better??

d). Right - in your use of term "non-act." But the ~~word~~
expression in itself indicates one & kind of non-activity, no action,
which you don't mean at all.

d). Right - though may not several different things be all reasonable?
and may not "reasonable" admit degrees?

e). I confess I do not understand this fully.

"If the will does not, then there is historical determination"
but by the will."

Premising that I do not fully understand, the objection
that keeps & my mind is that if the will determines itself,
it is intrinsically impossible to find out from any psychological
analysis what that determination would be.

If you speak a parte post, then all clear.

Q. 3. - a). It seems to me this analysis is somewhat superficial,
as leaving out of account that the intellect is a free faculty and
the will an intelligent faculty, so & speaks - i.e. the will may
determine the choice of the intellect's activity. I don't otherwise can
we account for error? - May it not be that the will, through
the intellect, specifies which phantom is to come into consciousness?
Thus, I doubt if the phantom specifies cut out, in the sense you mean.

of 10). - of criticism of a).

7 - par 1 - I now grasp more what you mean, & consequently modify what I said p 7 e). & 3, a).

par 2. - end - But a free instrument. / Quere to.

Of 10. - Excellent & true. With the exception that there must be an apparent not reason, a motive, for sin. In a law court, certain apparent reasons will be judged an adequate - & sufficient - motive. Others will not. But, in the last analysis, the motive is not sufficient, & the unintelligibility remains. This is confirmed by judges common statements that no motive is ever really sufficient, e.g. for murder.

12 - Par. 2. I said qui - So it is, by fore. But they are not really invicti!

last par. - I think you use "person" a bit differently than Thomas??

Personality = status substantive individuum rationali, " id quod quod est loc.

But you are practically correct - - Agam ask why X's human nature was not a human person.

your Sketch - One or two criticisms to give. But it is excellent.