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COMMENTS ON THE PAPER

Referees are asked to comment briefly on:

Historical and philosophical significance of the topic

The author’s topic is quite significant in my view. The discussion of universality in Aristotle’s ethics is not only important for scholarship on Plato and Aristotle, but also for ethics more generally.

Contribution made to scholarship on the topic

I have read most of the literature on this issue, but I have not seen anyone explain how the distinction between descriptive and prescriptive judgments is relevant to issues about universal judgments and those that hold for the most part in Aristotle. The author’s emphasis on this distinction is important, and the handling of its implications in the article was particularly enlightening.

Completeness of the discussion

The author’s treatment of the issues he identifies is thorough and complete. The author states his thesis clearly, motivates the key problems, and offers plausible resolutions of those problems. Important objections are considered too. The connection drawn to Mill’s logic was insightful.

Familiarity with primary sources in their original language, appropriate editions, and/or relevant secondary literature

I have no criticisms here. The author considers the best resources I know in this area

Strengths and weaknesses of the paper

The main strengths of this paper are: 1) the choice of an interesting and important thesis, 2) the author’s command of the literature on the topic, 3) the author’s ability to clearly identify the main problems and provide resolutions to those problems in light of likely objections.

The only weakness I can see, and it is a minor one, is that I would have preferred to see the main argument of the paper laid our formally or more explicitly so that it would be more clear throughout which premise of this argument is at stake. Many readers might find this distracting, but I would have found it helpful.

Readability

The paper was quite easy to follow and read.

RECOMMENDATION

JHP has a large backlog of articles to be published. We therefore cannot publish articles that are competent but make no extraordinary contribution to the literature. Please keep this in mind when you recommend publication or conditional acceptance of an article.

Please choose one of the following recommendations:

**1. Outright Acceptance: Publish in present form.**

2. Conditional Acceptance: Publish after minor revisions.

3. Revise and Resubmit: Paper not publishable in present form, reject but invite resubmission of a revised version.

4. Final Rejection: Reject without an invitation to revise and resubmit.

I think the paper should be published as it stands. I learned much from it, and found the paper quite easy to read. It is well organized, carefully argued, and thorough.
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