**Academic Review**

“Secularism and the right to spirituality: work, leisure, and contemplation”

**General comments:**

- Make sure that the phrasing you choose fits with the academic tone.

- Attention needs to be paid throughout to making the English more idiomatic, while the text could benefit from more signposting language to help it flow more naturally and logically.

- I would privilege the present tense over the past tense when discussing the views of the different philosophers and scholars.

- In the in-text references to Dreyfus and Kelly (2011), the former author’s name has been misspelled (Dreyfuss) in several places.

**Introduction**

In the introduction, do you think it would be helpful to give a concrete definition of “spirituality”?

**Section 2**

You ask whether this section contributes to the article. Yes, I think so, because it gives helpful background information about the central themes of your paper. However, it lacks clarity in places, so I have suggested reformulations.

**Section 2a**

**Para 1:** You write *“…despair is the result of life in which a person doesn’t realize one of them*” (finitude or infinity).

This needs clarifying; what you say here might not be clear to the reader who is not familiar with Kirkegaard. As you are aware, Kirkegaard talks about different types of despair. My understanding is that he says a person needs both finitude and infinitude… we need to moderate between the two… and despair comes from being too submerged in either one or the other. This paragraph almost gives the impression that Kirkegaard focuses mainly on one type (despair derived from an excess of finitude) and that he himself uses the term “secular despair” which I suspect is misleading. I’ve suggested ways of reworking the paragraph to recognize all of this and to give more explanation.

**Section 2c**

Your analysis of Dreyfus and Kelly’s philosophical perspective and Taylor’s criticism lacks clarity in places and needs padding out. I hope I’ve understood your intended meanings by reformulating the paragraphs.

**Section 3a**

**Footnote 5:** You have asked whether this footnote in needed. I think that it’s worth including since some elements are helpful, but it is very long and needs condensing. I hope my reworking of the footnote reflects your meaning. For example, I do not think it is accurate to say that your own understanding of work is “in accordance with” Arendt’s observations regarding the victory of the *animal laborans*. Labour that is tied up with the survival of the individual is not (as far as I understand) what characterizes your vision of work (even if it is part of it). I have moved the text referring to *animal laborans* to footnote 7, where I think it works better.

**Section 3b**

I don’t think you need to give so many different examples of leisure; I’ve made the lists more concise.

**Section 5**

**Para 7:** I’m not entirely convinced about the validity of the point you make about greater access to spirituality among the wealthy (and in section 2b where you talk about spiritual practices up for grabs on the “free market”). You talk about “strong upper-middle class individuals and families” being able to transcend the work/leisure 1 seesaw but what is it, exactly, that they can financially afford that people from less privileged backgrounds do not have access to? Do you mean things like costly yoga or meditation classes? Even those who are financially challenged can access things like yoga and tai chi tutorials online, music lessons, life coaching tutorials, etc. So is it entirely accurate to say that “the only spiritual options” left to those who are less privileged are “poor and damaging”?