

Information and Advice for Submitting to the *JHP*

The *Journal of the History of Philosophy* received more than [300 submissions in 2022](#), yet only has space to publish about 28 articles per year. Many submissions offer interesting, promising, and competently written studies of works from the history of philosophy, yet are not accepted, often because they fall short in ways that would be relatively easy to remedy with some time and attention.

When a paper is sent to referees for review, the editorial team asks them to comment on the following:

- The historical and philosophical significance of the topic;
- The contribution that the paper makes to scholarship on the topic;
- The completeness of the discussion;
- Familiarity with primary sources in their original language, appropriate editions, and/or relevant secondary literature;
- Strengths and weaknesses of the paper;
- Readability.

Referees are also advised that because the *JHP* has a large backlog of articles, we cannot publish articles that are competent but make no extraordinary contribution to the literature.

It is the *JHP*'s policy not to consider for review revisions of papers that have received a final rejection, even if they have been significantly modified.

The above criteria identify what the external referees are looking for. However, the editorial team also must decide whether or not to send the paper for review in the first place. Features that the editors look for when a paper is first received include the following:

- A very clear thesis, and a cogent argument supporting it, with plenty of textual evidence;
- Expositions of the work of philosophers or traditions that appeal to close readings of primary texts, rather than to summaries or expositions by others;
- Where appropriate, discussion of the original language for key terms;
- Evidence that the author is familiar with a large portion of the relevant secondary literature on the topic, including (where appropriate) articles and books not in English;
- Interpretations that, when relevant, consider the historical and philosophical context, showing that the evidence for the author's interpretation is not just textual, but also historical, systematic, developmental, religious, political, or philological;
- Discussion of how the interpretation offered differs from those already found in the secondary literature—that is, evidence of originality;
- Discussion of the broader significance and payoff of the interpretation;
- Clear, precise writing that would be accessible to non-specialists;
- Polished writing (few or no typographical or grammatical errors);

- Compliance with the journal’s limit of 14,000 words (including bibliography and footnotes).

The *JHP* follows the *Chicago Manual of Style* in nearly all formatting issues; information can be found on the *JHP* Style Sheet on the journal’s website. However, your paper does not need to follow the *JHP* Style Sheet to be submitted; if your paper is accepted, you will be asked to reformat it at that point.

Your paper should include an abstract, keywords, and a bibliography (organized alphabetically by author’s name) listing all and only sources cited in the paper.

Please ensure that your paper is fully anonymized. Remove identifying references that appear (unbeknownst to many authors) in the document’s “Properties” section, which is found under “File” in MS Word. If you need to refer to your own work, we advise that you mention its authorship as you would for any other paper and refer to it in the third person (as if someone else wrote it).

Papers should be sent as e-mail attachments in Microsoft Word™ to jhp@philosophy.wisc.edu. Along with your paper, provide a letter of submission indicating that the work is original, has not appeared in print, and is not under consideration elsewhere. This letter should include your present academic/institutional affiliation.

After you submit your paper, you will receive a confirmation email, and the editorial team will begin reviewing your paper. If we determine that your paper should not receive further review, you will hear from us in about 2 weeks. If you do not hear from us within that time, you should assume that your paper is under review. The average review time for a submission is about 3 months.