lecture 7

 Today we'll review some common mistakes I saw in the abstracts, edit some passages, and look at how to structure certain aspects of the body of a paper

- Today we'll review some common mistakes I saw in the abstracts, edit some passages, and look at how to structure certain aspects of the body of a paper
- On Thursday, we'll look at a practice exam and go over any questions

- Today we'll review some common mistakes I saw in the abstracts, edit some passages, and look at how to structure certain aspects of the body of a paper.
- On Thursday, we'll look at a practice exam and go over any questions.
- Then on Tuesday of next week you'll take the exam, and then we're done.

"In previous scientific tradition researchers believed that there's a conception of sufficient and necessary knowledge. It includes three parts: subjects believes P, is justified in believing in P and P is true. Nevertheless, Gettier suggested a new view of this conception. In this paper we present some advantages of his position."

comma usage

I saw two mistakes *a lot.*

The first is that you're not using commas after dependent clauses.

Remember the rule (2): Use a comma after a dependent clause that starts a sentence if the clause has three or more words

The second common mistake was that you're not using the "Oxford comma".

It should be, "I would like to thank my parents, Ayn Rand, and God."

It should *not* be "I would like to thank my parents, Ayn Rand and God.

It should be, "I would like to thank my parents, Ayn Rand, and God."

This last comma is the "Oxford comma". While in this class (including during the exam), you need to use it.

It should be, "I would like to thank my parents, Ayn Rand, and God."

This last comma is the "Oxford comma". While in this class (including during the exam), you need to use it.

Rule (5): use commas for lists of three or more items

As another example, it should be:

"I ate a hamburger, french fries, and a Coke.

It should not be:

"I ate a hamburger, french fries and a coke."

so where do we need commas?

"In previous scientific tradition researchers believed that there's a conception of sufficient and necessary knowledge. It includes three parts: subjects believes P, is justified in believing in P and P is true. Nevertheless, Gettier suggested a new view of this conception. In this paper we present some advantages of his position."

so where do we need commas?

"In previous scientific tradition, researchers believed that there's a conception of sufficient and necessary knowledge. It includes three parts: subjects believes P, is justified in believing in P, and P is true. Nevertheless, Gettier suggested a new view of this conception. In this paper, we present some advantages of his position."

some idioms you have to remember

you argue *against*, argue *for*, or object *to* a position

you *satisfy* a condition

you have or exhibit a property

an example *supports* a position (rather than "confirms" the position)

there is an interest *among* people (e.g., philosophers) *in* some topic

and we're interested in discussing a "concept" not a "conception".

"In previous scientific tradition, researchers believed that there's a conception concept of sufficient and necessary knowledge. It includes three parts: subjects believes P, is justified in believing in P, and P is true. Nevertheless, Gettier suggested a new view account of this conception concept. In this paper, we present some advantages of his position."

Another point to remember: "research(er)" and especially "scientific" is used much more narrowly in English than in Russian.

"Scientific" refers to what people in physics, chemistry, biology, and psychology do, not what philosophers do.

"In previous scientific Traditionally, researchers many believed that there's a the concept of sufficient and necessary knowledge has the following necessary and sufficint condition:. It includes three parts: a subject believes P, is justified in believing in P, and P is true. Nevertheless, Gettier suggested a new view account of this conception concept. In this paper, we present some advantages of his position."

In general, this is a nice summary. There are, however, some basic grammatical mistakes and some non-idiomatic phrases.

To indicate the decade from 1920 through 1929, you write either "1920s" or "1920's".

(I prefer the latter, because the apostrophe is unnecessary. But most would say either is OK.)

Note that "In the 1920s and 1930s in Russian intellectual thought" is a dependent clause with three or more words, so what does it need? Note that "In the 1920s and 1930s in Russian intellectual thought" is a dependent clause with three or more words, so what does it need?

A comma.

There is an interest *among* people (e.g., philosophers) *in* some topic

Based on the results obtained, I proceed to the final stage of the study, which will consist on formulating the political question in the thought of Heidegger. I will pay attention to the key aspects of Heidegger's understanding of the political, as well as the connection of politics with philosophy. I will articulate the connection between truth and history, with Heidegger's project of nihilism critique, and also his speech on the political itself (scholia/comment/author's speech?). Finally, I will cover the question of the Greek (a-letheia) and the non-Greek (correctness) of the understanding of truth in the context of the "militarized" life tested by Heidegger in the Heraclites' optics, drawing analogies with the Schmittian political and ontological instrumentation.

we discussed how to write an abstract

Absolute maximum of 250 words

Tells the reader what you believe (your thesis statement)

Also tells the reader how what you say relates to what others have said

stylistic tips

I encourage you to use the first person pronoun

E.g., "In this paper, I will argue..."
"Here, I will argue..."
"Below, I will argue..."

In general, avoid impersonal and passive voice

- E.g., "It will be argued below that..."

"This paper will be an examination of the thought of..."

here's a short and great abstract

"A counterpossible conditional is a counterfactual with an impossible antecedent. Common sense delivers the view that some such conditionals are true, and some are false. In recent publications, Timothy Williamson has defended the view that all are true. In this paper, we defend the common sense view against Williamson's objections."

here's a short and great abstract

"A counterpossible conditional is a counterfactual with an impossible antecedent. Common sense delivers the view that some such conditionals are true, and some are false. In recent publications, Timothy Williamson has defended the view that all are true. In this paper, we defend the common sense view against Williamson's objections."

last class, we discussed a good way to write a "summary" paragraph Often, this has the form of:

Sentence 1: Topic sentence Sentence 2: Modifies topic sentence Sentence 3-n: Provides textual evidence that you are summarizing the view accurately Sentence n+1 (optional): Concluding sentence

Gettier

Sentence 1 (topic sentence): "Various attempts have been made in recent years to state necessary and sufficient conditions for someone's knowing a given proposition." Sentence 2 (modifies topic sentence): "The attempts have often been such that they can be stated in a form similar to the following:

- (a) S knows that P IFF (i.e., if and only if)
- (i) P is true,
- (ii) S believes that P, and
- (iii) S is justified in believing that P."

Sentences 2 (textual evidence): "For example, Chisholm has held that the following gives the necessary and sufficient conditions for knowledge:

- (b) S knows that P IFF (i.e., if and only if)
- (i) S accepts P,
- (ii) S has adequate evidence for P, and

(iii) P is true."

Sentence 3 (textual evidence): "Ayer has stated the necessary and sufficient conditions for knowledge as follows:

- (c) S knows that P IFF
- (i) P is true,
- (ii) S is sure that P is true, and
- (iii) S has the right to be sure that P is true."

Abstract

Introduction

Body paragraphs

Abstract

Introduction

Body paragraphs

The body paragraphs are of course broken up into sections.

Typically, Section 1 is where you describe the person or people whose work you'll be responding to.

So, the "summary paragraphs" I described above will often be mainly in Section 1.

Abstract

Introduction

Body paragraphs Sections 1-n

Abstract

Introduction

Sections 1-n

- Section 1 typically summarizes the view you're responding to

Abstract

Introduction

Sections 1-n

- Section 1 typically summarizes the view you're responding to

Introduction

- This can be multiple paragraphs or pages
- However, the standard is that the *last paragraph* should summarize how your paper is structured

This paragraph doesn't have a name, but I'll call it the "structure paragraph"

the structure of the structure paragraph

Typically, the first sentences indicates (i.e., "signposts") that this is the structure paragraph.

E.g., "Here is how this paper is structured." "Here's the plan." (quite colloquial) "The paper is organized as follows." Then, each subsequent sentence indicates what will occur in each section.

For instance, Sentence 2 might be: "In Section 1, I will review the argument that...".

Then, Section 3 might be: "In Section 2, I will present my criticism of that argument."

Berto et al. (2018)

We will proceed as follows. In Section 2, we recall some motivations for both vacuism and nonvacuism, and sketch a sample nonvacuist semantics for counterfactuals using impossible worlds, to serve as a target for Williamson's arguments. In Section 3, we present and rebut three arguments Williamson has given against nonvacuist semantics like the one we give. In Section 4, we present and rebut three attempts Williamson has made to undermine the intuitions that provide the most direct support for nonvacuism. In Section 5 we end by arguing that Williamson's modal epistemology is not only compatible with nonvacuism, but actually leads in its direction.

Berto et al. (2018)

We will proceed as follows. In Section 2, we recall some motivations for both vacuism and nonvacuism, and sketch a sample nonvacuist semantics for counterfactuals using impossible worlds, to serve as a target for Williamson's arguments. In Section 3, we present and rebut three arguments Williamson has given against nonvacuist semantics like the one we give. In Section 4, we present and rebut three attempts Williamson has made to undermine the intuitions that provide the most direct support for nonvacuism. In Section 5 we end by arguing that Williamson's modal epistemology is not only compatible with nonvacuism, but actually leads in its direction.

Berto et al. (2018)

We will proceed as follows. In Section 2, we recall some motivations for both vacuism and nonvacuism, and sketch a sample nonvacuist semantics for counterfactuals using impossible worlds, to serve as a target for Williamson's arguments. In Section 3, we present and rebut three arguments Williamson has given against nonvacuist semantics like the one we give. In Section 4, we present and rebut three attempts Williamson has made to undermine the intuitions that provide the most direct support for nonvacuism. In Section 5, we end by arguing that Williamson's modal epistemology is not only compatible with nonvacuism, but actually leads in its direction.

Sider (2002)

Section I describes the problem of descriptive power for linguistic ersatzism. Section II introduces the theory to be defended and describes its solution to the problem of descriptive power. Section III then gives an extensive formal development of the theory. Section IV replies to objections, and section V compares the theory with modal fictionalism.

Same basic structure, but note that Sider leaves off the topic sentence here. (I think it's better to have one.)

Abstract

Introduction Last paragraph is the "structure paragraph"

Sections 1-n - Section 1 typically summarizes the view you're responding to