**Reading report *Interpretationes***

**Title of the article:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Global evaluation:** |
| \_\_\_ The article can be published as it is  \_\_\_ The article can be published, but it requires minor modifications before print  \_\_X\_ 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:** | | |
| I feel confused about the intention of the essay. The first five pages (the introduction and the dispute with Scott Davidson) led me to expect a paper about the concept of metaphor or else a paper about the significance of Levinas’ use of metaphorical language, arguing first of all that his language should be read metaphorically. I don’t feel as if either of those are the paper I read. What I read in the remainder of the essay was instead a catalog of metaphors used by Levinas at various points in his career. Each metaphor was discussed in ways that explained something about Levinas’ philosophical intentions at that time in his career. The catalog is interesting, and the explanations are, too, but I don’t see the point or thesis that justifies them all in one paper. What I do see is a very general account of very general points about Levinas’ philosophy that few would disagree with. What is gained by presenting these arguments through an exploration of his supposed metaphorics?  Perhaps the author wants to consider a study of one or a few metaphors over the time of Levinas’ career in order to show continuity or change and make a point that accounts for that change? Or perhaps the author wants to show that the dominant metaphor changes at different moments of Levinas’ career and then argue an account of those changes?  If, however, the author’s real intention is not to explain Levinas’ general philosophical intentions through an exploration of several metaphors but to treat matters raised in the first section regarding the status of Levinas’ language, then more needs to be done to argue what it means to read Levinas metaphorically, more needs to be done to address what it would mean to take his language this way. Key here might be thinking about Levinas’ language in general and situating the essay in the context of that problem. The author’s point could be situated in debates about the status of this language, particularly problematic when it claims to speak about what opens the possibility of language in the first place or about what is beyond language and concepts. Gestures in this direction already appear in the response to Scott Davidson that opens the essay. The author takes issue with Davidson’s reading of a sentence where Levinas says “the suffering of constriction in one’s skin” is “better than a metaphor.” This would seem to indicate that he does not intend his language metaphorically—but as something beyond a metaphor, hyper-literally maybe. Why then does the author say otherwise? What notion of metaphor is the author using that lets him take Levinas’ language as such? | | |
| **Does the author clearly presents:** | |
| His/her objectives? | Mixed |
| The innovative character of his/her contribution? | No |
| The hypotheses he/she proposes? | Mixed |
| A convincing justification of his/her conceptual, theoretical or practical choices? | No |
| The research methodology employed? | NA |
| Conclusions about his/her work sufficiently justified? | Unclear |

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? | no |
| Readable without difficulties? | Yes |
| Written in a good level of the language? | yes |

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 :** |
|  |