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**Review of English Language and Philosophy Definitions for Assignment 1.3**

My impressions of your Definitions piece, throughout, were very positive! I am interested in increasing my knowledge of English and Philosophy and you achieved that expectation. You unpack these definitions very well and I feel that your piece was well composed. Please consider some of my suggestions and comments.

**Purpose:** You clearly define your purpose (paragraph #1) in easy, concise language. You do mention that your audience are (hypothetically) High School or University students studying English and Philosophy. You also mention that these definitions are some of your favourite words. However, I do not see a specific purpose for your definitions. Why should a Philosophy or English student use or need these definitions? Perhaps you could add a short sentence at the end of this paragraph that states clearly why these definitions are useful for your audience.

**Definitions/Audience:**

**Overall, your definitions were accessible for those who are have not been exposed to the subject(s). Your Sentence Definition, I believe, could be slightly shortened. You use two sentences to describe this definition when one would suffice. I understand that it is difficult to describe “Saudade,” a non-English word, without discussing the feeling it is describes. But I feel, for the sake of brevity, that you could cut some of the origins section and use this in an expanded definition.**

**Jargon, Grammar, and Language:**

**As a student of history, I am accustomed to and appreciate jargon and flowery-language. In this assignment, however, we are attempting to provide accessible definitions, divorced from complex language. In your expanded definition (Pharmakon) you provide an excellent sentence definition. I would cut “constellation” from paragraph #5, sentence #2, and replace this with a word that isn’t as ambiguous for the reader (you are correct in your meaning but there are different synonyms for this word). Instead, you could use “set” or something to the same effect.**

**In terms of grammar, I notice that you may have left out one or two commas. In paragraph #7, sentence #4, you may have forgotten to add a comma after “Thus.” Therefore, the sentence has a clause issue and I would recommend having a quick re-read for grammar mistakes etc.**

**Organization:**

I feel that organization of your piece was excellent. Using bold and underlined sub-headings helped me to understand the flow of the document and to gain a better understanding of your definitions. I especially enjoyed your break down of **Pharmakon into Definition, Etymology, and Modern Usage. Furthermore, I thought your ability to show two an English and a Philosophical usage of the word was smart and demonstrated how this word could be understood in different contexts, for different audiences. The only word of caution I have here is that I believe that you should have picked one audience, rather than two. This may sound counter-intuitive but I feel that providing multiple understandings could confuse a reader, who is not versed in both subjects.**

**Visuals:**

As mentioned previously, your organization of the piece was very pleasing to eye and to the mind. Yet, I feel that we were supposed to add a figure of some sort? Maybe I am wrong here or perhaps that requirement is for those definitions that need this aid.

**Research:**

I can find no fault in you research at all! In fact, I commend you for use of Derrida (his Lexicology work has informed much of my own work) and I enjoyed your excellent breakdown of his argument vis-à-vis Socrates’ backing of Speech. All in all, a great read!