

### **notes on papers by Thomson and Parfit**

Here is some information that might help you as you read Thomson's and Parfit's papers.

#### **notes on Thomson's "People and their Bodies"**

1. On p. 158.2, the example from Locke is from the Essay Concerning Human Understanding, book II, chapter xxvii, section 15. (This chapter can be jumped to here: <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/phl302/texts/locke/locke1/Book2c.html#Chapter%20XXVII.>)
2. On p. 165.4, Thomson writes the following:

all of us . . . will say that, strictly speaking, it is not mere psychological connectedness, but rather *psychological connectedness without competitors* that is the mark of personal identity.

Taken by itself, this sentence could naturally be read to mean something different from what Thomson intends. For it could naturally be read to say that even Thomson holds that psychological connectedness without competitors is the mark of personal identity, but Thomson herself, of course, denies this. This "all of us" sentence must be read on the model of the "all of us" sentence that appears a few lines earlier. That is, it should be read to say something like the following:

all of us will . . . will agree that if something along the lines of Psychological Criterion (Connectedness) were correct, it would have to involve not mere psychological connectedness, but psychological connectedness without competitors.

#### **notes on Parfit's "Persons, Bodies, and Human Beings"**

- On p. 183.4, when Parfit refers to group B, it might appear that he is referring to the four ways in which statement B (at p. 180.8–9) could be true. This is not the case. Instead, he's referring to cases 4–7 in Figure 1. (Figure 1 should be labeled with groups A, B, C, and D, with the divisions among the groups corresponding to spaces in the list of the cases.)