




Analysis of Otherness in Damien Hirst's Works from the Perspective of Emmanuel Levinas's Worldview (Case Study of Three Works by Damien Hirst)

Marzieh. Mahmoudi¹, Nafiseh. Namdianpour^{2*}, Homa. Nozad³

¹ PhD student, Department of Philosophy of Art, Hamedan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Hamedan, Iran

² Assistant Professor Department Of Art, Ramsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ramsar, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Art, Lahijan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Lahijan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: N.namadianpour@yahoo.com

Received: 2024-05-25	Revised: 2024-08-12	Accepted: 2024-08-20	Published: 2024-09-24
EDITOR: Sandeep Kotwal  Knowledge Management Division, National Health Systems Resource Centre, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi, India. Email: sandkotwal@gmail.com			
REVIEWER 1: Jingjing Wang  Law School, Peking University (PKU), Peking, China jingwang@vip.sina.com			
REVIEWER 2: Vanessa Indama  Public Administration Department, Basilan State College, Isabela City, Basilan, Philippines. Email: vanesindama@gmail.com			

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the first paragraph, the sentence “Descartes introduces the issue of the subject and object in philosophy...” needs more precise referencing. Provide the original source (e.g., *Meditations* or *Discourse on Method*) rather than a generalized mention.

The introduction cites “Damien Hirst, a British artist, has used animal carcasses in his collections...”. This section would benefit from clearer justification of why Hirst’s works were chosen over other contemporary artists dealing with death/animality.

When citing “Sabaghian concludes that Levinas ascribes little value to artistic expression”, the argument would benefit from a direct quotation from Levinas’s texts to support this claim, avoiding overreliance on secondary interpretations.

In the section “The Other in the History of Thought”, the narrative “Strangers, monsters, giants, demons, and gods...” is vivid but lacks academic precision. Suggest condensing or grounding these images in specific philosophical or anthropological sources.

The explanation of Hegel’s master–slave dialectic (paragraph beginning “Hegel, in his dialectic of master and slave...”) is oversimplified. Expand by connecting Hegel’s recognition theory to Levinas’s critique of ontology for more robust theoretical grounding.

In “Levinas stresses the notion of being summoned by the other, asserting that ‘language is always a response...’”, the reference should include page numbers for scholarly accuracy.

In the opening of this section, “When discussing animal rights, it is crucial to remember that we are not speaking of fictional characters such as Mickey Mouse or Winnie the Pooh...” This phrasing is informal and out of place in a scholarly article. Recommend replacing with a more formal framing.

In the section on “Mother and Child Divided”, the text says: “The audience cannot ethically remain indifferent...”. This strong claim requires evidence from critical reception or reviews rather than assuming uniform audience response.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The introduction ends with: “Thus, the present study examines the representation of the ‘other’ in Damien Hirst’s works.” It would strengthen the paper to explicitly formulate research questions or hypotheses here.

In the section on previous studies, the text notes: “Mansouri and Mokhtabad (2018) concluded...”. This review is brief and descriptive; a critical comparison highlighting gaps these studies left unaddressed would better justify the contribution.

The article says: “Unlike these prior studies, the present research avoids reiterating such theories...”. This statement risks underplaying the connection to earlier scholarship. Suggest reframing to show continuity and distinction, not complete detachment.

The comparison of animal suffering to “Auschwitz during World War II” (later in the section) is rhetorically powerful but academically sensitive. The authors should contextualize this analogy with references to established scholarship (e.g., Derrida’s *The Animal That Therefore I Am* or Agamben) to avoid sensationalism.

The enumeration of exploitation forms (food, clothing, testing, etc.) is detailed but descriptive. Suggest linking this directly to Levinasian ethics—how does each form of exploitation exemplify the reduction of the Other to the Same?

In the paragraph on “A Thousand Years”, the description is strong, but the analysis ends with “...create a scene that shocks and disgusts.” This evaluative phrase is subjective. Reframe in terms of phenomenological response (e.g., invoking horror, responsibility, or indifference).

In discussing “The Physical Impossibility of Death in the Mind of Someone Living”, the text asks: “...what compels humans to see a dead animal as art?” This rhetorical question should be followed by an analytical response, not left unanswered.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.