**Reading report *Interpretationes***

**Title of the article:** **A Chronology of Levinas’s Metaphorics**

|  |
| --- |
| **Global evaluation:** |
| \_\_\_ The article can be published as it is  \_\_x\_ The article can be published, but it requires minor modifications before print  \_\_\_ The article requires major modifications for a new submission to the board  \_\_\_ The article should be rejected |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **General comments about the article and suggestions to the author:** | | |
| This person has clearly read Levinas in depth and displays a thick knowledge of his metaphorical apparatus. In general, a good deep dive into Levinas’ linguistic choices. Demonstrates an understanding of the place of tension and antinomy in Levinas’ work, the way that he consistently returns to his key ideas, restating them, delving deeper into the tension.  The least convincing aspects of the argument are the disputes with other theorists. It feels as though those philosophers with whom the author is arguing are being made foils, but their characterization of those opposing positions feels a little forced. I think the author overstates the positions of their opponents. Perhaps more pertinent quotes would help?  This is a weakness in the conclusion also. The author could state their conclusions about Levinas’ use of metaphor and other rhetorical strategies to present tension. There could still be glancing references to other positions, but, again, the dispute would have to be demonstrated more clearly.  One big suggestion: look at the chronological development of Levinas’ thinking. Example: with regard to gender, he really does, in Time and the Other and in Totality and Infinity, present us (automatically it seems) with a male subject (although he complicates this in The Phenomenology of Eros; see: L'AIMÉ QUI EST L'AIMÉE: Can Levinas' Beloved Be Queer?  Robin Podolsky  European Judaism: A Journal for the New Europe  Vol. 49, No. 2 (Autumn 2016), pp. 50-70). It’s only by the time we get to Otherwise than being that he elaborates his thinking about maternity and only in later interviews in the 1990s that he is willing to consider the male/female in every person as something positive (not the Neuter).  This piece really starts to pick up around pg 11 when the author digs into their own reading of Levinas.  I would suggest a rewrite of the beginning and conclusion and some edits in the middle suggested below. | | |
| **Does the author clearly presents:** | |
| His/her objectives? | 2 |
| The innovative character of his/her contribution? | 3 |
| The hypotheses he/she proposes? | 2 |
| A convincing justification of his/her conceptual, theoretical or practical choices? | 3 |
| The research methodology employed? | 2 |
| Conclusions about his/her work sufficiently justified? | 2 |

Complete with an entire value comprise between 0 and 3 (0 meaning « poorly » and 3 meaning « very good ») or with an X if it is « without object »

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Is the article:** | |
| Well structured? | 3 |
| Readable without difficulties? | 1/2 |
| Written in a good level of the language? | 2 |

Complete with an entire value comprise between 0 and 3 (0 meaning « poorly » and 3 meaning « very good ») or with an X if it is « without object »

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments about the form and the mistakes noticed in the article :** |
| Pg 2  “This exclusive focus on transcendence diminishes the importance of the neutral ?realm of impersonal representation and signification, the dimension of exchange and commerce in which and through which the other person is presented. “ Not sure what’s meant here. Looks like some kind of reference to Buber’s I-it, but of course that is absent in Levinas.  Pg 3  Re: war: note that Levinas begins and ends Totality and infinity with a rejection of war as philosophy and then the “virile man of the state.”  Pg. 5:  Be clear on the differences between trope and metaphor  Pg 6  If you employ the phrase “negation of the negation” explain how you (and Levinas) diverge from Hegel  Pg 7  “To understand the phrase First Philosophy, one must already question the priority of priority, how the first principle arkhé is already disturbed by the anarchy of these numerous relationships.” Anarchic responsibility in Levinas is that impelled by the pre-linguistic shock of encountering the other—anarchic because it precedes all systems and voluntary contracts.  Pg. 8  Good linking of diachrony in reading with that in speech.  Pg 10  “Levinas resurrected the metaphors of idealism to critique ontology.” But he was no idealist.  Pg 15.  Please check the citation re: Macbeth—I have different page numbers in my edition. Also this whole MacBeth argument needs more development—he is only feminized in Levinas by inference.  Pg 15  Remember that the Other’s power to command lies in her very vulnerability and potential destitution. This isn’t a contradiction, but is central to L’s phenomenology of the constitution of the self through answering the summons of the other.  Also—the other is refractory to categorization, her ineffability resists the domestication of the other into the same.  Pg. 16  Why does curvature = distortion?  Pg. 17  “Most significantly, Levinas repeatedly describes the eyes of the other as exhibited in a depth that is naked and defenseless , which seemingly contradicts his metaphor of the visage exhibited in a height.  Apparent contradictions such as this can be noticed throughout Levinas’s texts.”  The above is not a contradiction. It is a phenomenology of the dis-ordered state of the subject when face-to-face with the other. He explains this paradox also. The other commands with her very vulnerability, which I understand because I too am a creature of injurable flesh. This summons recalls the “You will not murder,” a command to which we have always/already acceded.  Intro and conclusion:  See above |