

SECOND WRITING ASSIGNMENT

Please email me your assignment in MS Word format by Friday, October 21 **at noon**. Assignments turned in after that are considered late, so plan accordingly! Late assignments are penalized 1/3 grade for each day late.

I am looking for clear, concise explanations — for most answers, a medium-sized paragraph or two should suffice. See the guidelines below.

1. What is the difference between types and tokens? Use this distinction to distinguish the type–type identity theory from the token-token identity theory.
2. What is supervenience? Explain why the token-token identity theory does not guarantee the supervenience of the mental on the physical.
3. On the topic-neutral analysis:
 - a. Why does Smart think he *needs* to give a topic-neutral analysis of mental terms? State as clearly as you can the *objection* he thinks he needs to answer. (This is Objection #3 in Smart's article. You aren't giving Smart's *response* yet; in this case it's important to be clear on the *problem*.)
 - b. What is Smart's topic-neutral analysis of mental terms, and how is it supposed to answer the objection described in question 3a?
4. On identity theory versus functionalism:
 - a. Explain the distinction between first-order and second-order properties. (Remember how difficult it was to grasp this distinction. I'm looking for a *quality* explanation, one that would allow someone unfamiliar with the distinction to grasp it. See the guidelines below.)
 - b. Use this distinction to explain the difference between functionalism and the kind of identity theory that Braddon-Mitchell and Jackson favor in chapter 6.
5. Is the kind of identity theory that Braddon-Mitchell and Jackson favor (let's call it *BMJ identity*) a type-type identity theory or merely a token-token identity theory? Critically discuss.
6. On pages 52–54, Braddon-Mitchell and Jackson discuss their proposal for how the functionalist should describe behavior. At the end of this section they write:

We saw earlier...that we should not be chauvinists about what realizes the various functional roles. Equally, we should not be chauvinists about the kind of body and, accordingly, the kind of bodily behavior that are distinctive of creatures with a mental life....

What is Braddon-Mitchell & Jackson's proposal? (You may have to extrapolate a bit from their rather brief discussion.) How is this proposal supposed to help functionalists avoid chauvinism? Are there chauvinism charges that it does not deflect? Critically discuss.

Guidelines

Please use a large, easy to read font (12 point); double spacing; standard margins; page numbers; correct spelling and grammar.

The questions on this second assignment are, again, fairly straightforward. With the exception of the two last questions, they all concern material we have explicitly covered in lecture, and so it should not be difficult to find the right answer. Your grade is going to be a function of the *quality* of your explanation: how *clearly* have you explained the concepts, distinctions, views, arguments, or objections?

- I want to see evidence that you understand the material. Clear, well-structured writing is excellent evidence of your mastery of the material. In class you sometimes know that you have a thought or question — you know what you want to say — but you can't quite put it into words. In your writing you should aim for *clarity*: aim for finding just the right words.
- The intended audience for your answers is neither me nor the other students in the class — you know we are familiar with the view and the vocabulary in which it is stated. Your aim is rather to make the view, distinction, or argument easily understandable to someone *completely unfamiliar* with the material. Pretend your reader is a fellow phil/mind student who missed all the lectures on identity theory and functionalism, and your assignment is all they have to catch them up. If you introduce a bit of new terminology you think your fellow student won't know, you should explain what it means.
 - ⇒ You may assume your reader is familiar with basic logical and philosophical vocabulary; e.g., you may assume your reader knows what it is for an argument to be *valid*, or *sound*. Examples of other basic vocabulary: concept, property, necessary & sufficient conditions, implication, evidence. (Of course these terms have a very specific meaning in philosophy, so while you don't need to define them in your writing, you should make sure you use them correctly. Check the Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy if you're unsure about a term — see course website for link.)
- By far the best way to show that you genuinely understand the material is to express the view, distinction, or argument **in your own words**, using your own examples to illustrate them if necessary. If you just paraphrase the lectures or readings, that shows only that you have the fairly low-grade skill of paraphrase, and not that you genuinely understand the material. Do not use quotations, unless you think a crucial claim either is so dense or so confused that it has to be unpacked word-by-word.
- Try to avoid loose use of logical language (“therefore”, “thus”, “it follows”, “prove”, “refute”, “false”, “true”). If you mean to say that a point or a claim is *true*, do not say that it is *valid*. Only arguments can be valid. Do not use “thus” or “therefore” or “it follows” to make assertions or state opinions; these words should be reserved for stating the conclusion of a chain of reasoning.

You may find it helpful to consult [Jim Pryor's paper writing guidelines](#) (see the course website for link). Even if done a great deal of philosophical writing, you'll benefit from reading these guidelines.