1. Description of Grant-Supported Activity.

The IUSB Faculty Research Grant supported research that followed up on work that was begun both during my 2006 IUSB Faculty Research Grant (“Investigation and Defense of Options for Theories of Emergence”) as well as work I have been doing since on physicalism and ontological emergence. The first goal of this project was to complete the revision of a paper in which I develop a taxonomy of eight different possible theories of emergence with the aim of developing a positive defense of one of these theories. My second goal was to write a paper in response to a recent article decrying the possibility of a special type of emergence called ontological emergence. Third, I intended to revise and resubmit to a journal a paper clarifying the case against a posteriori physicalism, one of the more popular physicalist positions in philosophy today.

At the beginning of the summer I actually received a “revise and resubmit” response from a paper I had submitted to *Philosophia Christi* entitled “Dembski’s Specification Condition and the Role of Cognitive Abilities.” Work on this paper was not a part of the initial grant proposal (it encompasses issues in my secondary research interest of epistemology), but I did take the first three weeks of the summer to revise this paper and resubmit it, believing it had an excellent chance at publication. And, as a matter of fact, a few weeks later it was accepted for publication.

The next four weeks I spent revising the paper “Clarifying the Case against A Posteriori Physicalism”. Doing so required me acquiring and reading portions of two new books and several articles that had been brought to my attention by the reviewer related to my project in the paper. The paper analyzes two different arguments against a posteriori physicalism, highlighting their similarities and differences and making the case that both arguments depend upon a particular controversial thesis, one that I then break down into smaller parts and analyze I made substantial revisions to the paper, which included reformulating one of the main arguments against a posteriori physicalism to make it more clear and precise and also adding some additional reasons for thinking that both arguments actually depend upon the main thesis.

The final part of the project I worked on was revision of a paper in which I develop a taxonomy of eight different possible theories of emergence with the aim of developing a positive defense of one of these theories. I reviewed about a half a dozen new pieces that have been in the literature over the last year or two, adding some of their insights to my taxonomy. I also was able to write a considerable portion of the section where I defend my preferred theory of emergence, a theory that incorporates the supervenience of emergent properties on physical properties yet with the contribution of novel causal powers (at least novel causal power tokens) by these emergent properties.

2. Were you able to complete the project? Describe any difficulty you had.
My choice to spend the first part of the summer revising my paper for Philosophia Christi, which turned out to be a good idea as it was accepted for publication, prevented me from completing the final part of my original project, which was to write a response paper to Heard’s 2006 challenge to the notion of ontological emergence. I do have a start on this paper now, and it is a project that I’d like to complete within the next year. Otherwise, I did complete what I intended to do over the summer.

I did not encounter any particular difficulties, other than some of my own internal struggles with perfectionism and wanting to write the most complete paper possible. This is especially true of my paper on the taxonomy of different theories of emergence, where I continually revise the taxonomy and scuttle theories back and forth between the different categories within the taxonomy. It is some complicated material to sort out, and eventually I’ll be satisfied enough with it to send it out for publication.

3. Did, or will, the project result in a specific product—a manuscript, composition, syllabus, etc. If so, please describe and indicate state of development.

As I mentioned the paper I revised at the beginning of the summer for Philosophia Christi was accepted for publication. The paper “Clarifying the Case against A Posteriori Physicalism” that I revised was ultimately rejected by Australasian Journal of Philosophy but with many more substantive comments. I heeded these comments and revised the paper again, and it is currently under review at Pacific Philosophical Quarterly. Finally, my work on a taxonomy of theories of emergence has been submitted to the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association, and I am waiting to hear whether the paper has been accepted.