

Guide on contributing to *PhilosophyIdeas*

If you follow these guidelines, you are welcome to submit ideas to be incorporated into the collection of philosophical ideas (mainly analytic, so far) at *PhilosophyIdeas.com*. Email your contribution to petermagibson@gmail.com. The following are descriptions of fields of data which will be pasted into an Access database table; it is important not to exceed the length of each field, where that is specified (as excess characters will be lost). Fields marked * are compulsory.

***Idea:** *max of 255 characters*. This is the main text of the idea. I am not strict about getting it verbatim, and cheerfully 'shoehorn' ideas to fit. If I do serious damage to the original, I confess that it is 'compressed' in my Reaction field. The main criterion is that the original author would not be upset.

Gist: *max of 120 characters*. The key field. Get the idea down to one line of plain English which any educated person can understand. Aim for maximum clarity, without losing vital nuances. (I'll do this if you leave the field blank). If only Kant had practised this art.

Clarif: If there is a technical term that might baffle a beginner, give a short explanation.

Brief: *max of 46 characters*. A real challenge. Squash the idea down to about a third of a Tweet! These are used for indexing, and maybe for other things in the future.

Type: put 'V' (the default) for a simple view of the author, put 'C' for a critical remark about another author, or put 'D' for a report of another writer's view. (I'll do this if you leave it blank)

***Source1:** I distinguish between a 'text' and a 'book'. Thus Plato's 'Republic' is the text, and an edition of it is a book (ponder the ontology some other time). I even split modern works in this way, since an essay may reappear in a different book (or journal). Source1 is the title of the text which originated this idea. I will assign a number to the text, so you don't need to type it out in full for each idea. State the title of the text, its date and its author in full once, then abbreviate it in any further ideas from that text (a number would do).

***Ref1:** this is a reference in Source1. It should be as generic as possible, such as a section number (e.g. 3.2) or a Greek standard reference (e.g. 1024a08). Failing all else, use the page number (in the form 'p.347').

Source2: not always needed. This is a text which quotes Source1 (Type V), or comments on Source1 (C), or summarises Source1 (D). Again I need full details of this second text, which can be subsequently abbreviated.

Ref2: Like Ref1, for the second text, if there is one.

***Book/Journal:** I will assign a number to this as well, so you must give me full details the first time it is used. I would like the whole lot – author, editor, publisher, title, date, volume.

***Page:** a plain number, the page in the book for the main idea.

Theme: If you go to the Theme|Structure on the website, and expand the whole list, those are the available themes. Occasionally I add a new theme, but that is not done lightly these days. If you go to Download Indexes on the website, you can download and print off the theme structure. A theme should be assigned in the form **8.B.2.h** (if you look that up you should find 'Identity nihilism'). This operation is tricky, because only one assignment is allowed. I will do it if you leave it blank (which is fine). Assignment is interesting.

Reaction: *Max 255 characters (including your initials at the end)*. I encourage you to add a reaction. It makes the compilation process much more active and interesting. I would like more variety in the views expressed. Eventually this part will become interactive, and your reaction will launch a discussion (I hope).

XRef: a fairly recent feature is to cite the numbers of interesting ideas for comparison (objections, or further illuminations). If you think two of your ideas need linking, indicate that somehow (and I will add the numbers). If you are aware of a relevant idea on the website, give its number. This is a good feature, but hard to achieve.

Template *paste this into a Word doc. Feel free to devise your own system, or use the online form at http://www.philosophyideas.com/collaborator/collaborator_form.asp*

*Idea (255 max)	
Type your idea in the space under this one. This particular sample paragraph is exactly 255 characters long, so it is a model for your required length, in an equally-spaced font. You don't have to fill the space, but exceeding it is strictly forbidden.	
Gist (120)	
A Gist is a one sentence summary and should not exceed the length of this 120 word sentence, though it could be shorter	
Brief (46)	*Source1
This is the compressed version and needs skill	
*Book/Journal (full details)	*Ref1:
	Source2
*Page:	V/C/D:
XRef	Theme (in 8.B.2.h format)
	Ref2:
Clarification (255, but keep it short, or omit)	
Reaction (255, with initials)	
Your reaction should not exceed the length of this 255 word paragraph. I try to give a personal response or actual opinion about an idea, but sometimes I confine myself to further elucidation. Best to write something, but skip if there is little to say	

Example (Idea 14305 on the website):

*Idea (255 max)	
Type your idea in the space under this one. This particular sample paragraph is exactly 255 characters long, so it is a model for your required length, in an equally-spaced font. You don't have to fill the space, but exceeding it is strictly forbidden.	
If a wooden match was completely burned up yesterday, and never placed in water at any time, is it not the case, therefore, that the match is soluble (in the truth-functional view). This follows just from the antecedent being false.	
Gist (120)	
A Gist is a one sentence summary and should not exceed the length of this 120 word sentence, though it could be shorter	
In the truth-functional account a burnt-up match was soluble because it never entered water	
Brief (46)	*Source1
This is the compressed version and needs skill A match is soluble if never immersed?	Testability and Meaning, 1937, Rudolph Carnap
*Book/Journal (full details)	*Ref1: I.440
'Dispositions', Stephen Mumford, 1998, OUP	Source2
*Page: 46	Type: V
XRef	Theme (in 8.B.2.h format)
Idea 14290	9.A.7.c
Clarification (255, but keep it short, or omit)	
-	
Reaction (255, with initials)	
Your reaction should not exceed the length of this 255 word paragraph. I try to give a personal response or actual opinion about an idea, but sometimes I confine myself to further elucidation. Best to write something, but skip if there is little to say	
This, along with Edgington's nice example of the 'conditional command' (Idea 14290), seems conclusive against the truth-functional account. The only defence possible is some sort of pragmatic account about implicature. PG	