

500423540

Dr. Tristram McPherson

First Short Essay

Words: 1345

Preliminary analysis and argument of Jenkins' paper

- 1) Jenkins' argument structures are logical and efficient.
- 2) In order to flirt, the flirter needs to have some sort of intention.
- 3) However, a behaviour can be absolutely defined as flirting if and only if at any conditions, the behaviour is flirting.
- 4) It is more common that we have a certain flirtee that want to flirt first
- 5) We can not flirt with abstract concepts, theories, and knowledge; flirtee should be object with biological appearance.
- 6) Conclusion: Flirting is a behaviour that in any conditions, someone is disposed to improve romance and sex to salience for the flirtee.

Since Jenkins gives her definition of flirting, I consider that I generally agree her arguments except the final condition; and I want to improve that definition by adding some restrictions on special conditions. In this paper, I will discuss the rigour and logic of the structure of her paper which is the advantage that I want to learn and emulate; and then argue the parts that I disagree with her and through this process, I may get the restrictions that I want to add to Jenkins' definition.

At the beginning of Jenkins' paper, she set up a hook by asking several questions to guide the main content of her thesis which she wants to argue. It is a good strategy because these questions can not only directly lead to the topic, so that Jenkins can enter the argument quickly, but also let her audience start thinking about what she will discuss and argue. Besides, She also guide the audience to leave a bias toward the result that she wants to make her argument more convincing.

After that Jenkins gives the definition of flirting from the *Oxford English Dictionary*, and directly contradicts this definition; she thinks that this definition is false to her, and starts her argument that After making some important distinctions, we can redefine the flirting(Jenkins, Flirting Sec. 4). Then, Jenkins uses many examples and arguments as premises to make the conclusion that "flirting is intentional which flirter disposed to raise flirter-flirtee romance and/or sex to salience"(Jenkins, Flirting Sec. 8 & Sec.14). However, this conclusion is divided into two parts. After giving examples and arguments, she makes the first part of the conclusion that flirting is always intentional(Jenkins, Flirting Sec. 8). She further elaborates what is the specific purpose; in the course of the argument, Jenkins gives four conclusions that she used sufficient premises to prove that these conclusions are all inaccurate so that she concludes the second part of her conclusion.

Finally, Jenkins discusses the deeper argument that flirter intends to flirt with somebody instead of it must be someone whom the flirter intends to flirt according to the basis of the conclusion that she has already concluded in the previous section, and makes a conclusion for the whole paper she writes.

Throughout, in Jenkins' paper, her argumentation process is excellent and very rigorous; the whole paper does not waste every part of the argumentation and words. Besides, each process has corresponding, and sufficient preferences to support her conclusions. This is a perfect philosophical argument paper and worthy of deep study and reference for other different argument fields.

However, here is a question that worth considering is Jenkins makes an argument that she means that it is possible to flirt with non-people(Jenkins, Flirting Sec. 20). I propose that flirting with non-people is impossible. Notice that I want to explain that people can insult and flirt with computer characters or the characters in movies, TV series, animation, and game; however, I consider that this kind of flirting should not be count as flirting with non-people, because these characters are actually existing which means we have the basic knowledge of their appearance. It is a completely different situation from what I think about non-people, which you flirt with someone that you have imagined. There are even news reports that a Japanese man is married to Hatsune Miku, a virtual quadratic element singer. Here, the point is when you flirt with some virtual characters, you or maybe the flirtee will be disposed to raise flirter-flirtee romance and sex to salience, so your intention is accord with the definition of flirting.

Importantly, I would like to make it clear that the flirting I mention here is that no matter what the circumstances, your behaviour is defined as flirting. So, for Jenkins' argument that somebody might count as flirting when she flirts with a purely imaginary person(Jenkins, Flirting Sec. 19). It has possibility that these people will not count as flirting after she explains to them, so her behaviour should not be considered as flirting. Her argument in this part of paper is not rigorous, and can not play a strong role; furthermore, this rigorous in premises lead to her part of the conclusion, it is possible to flirt without flirting with anyone at all(Jenkins, Flirting Sec. 19), is not convincing enough.

Furthermore, I want to argue a question whether it is possible to flirt without having specific flirtee in mind, which means that the idea of flirting does not have to be preceded by a specific flirtee. I would say no for this question. A person intends to flirt only if he or she has specific flirtee. Remember what is the intention of flirting? It is disposed to raise flirter-flirtee romance and sex to salience. It may already be easier to understand that we can not dispose to improve romance and sex to salience when we have no specific objective. It is more common to start with a certain person to get you to flirt. Imagine this situation, will you suddenly feel like that you want to flirt with a person or persons? Or you will more likely to meet someone whom you want to flirt whether (s)he is or not your boyfriend/ girlfriend. It is obvious that you have a certain objective before you intend

to flirt. And normally, what we called the previous behaviour that person or persons want to “flirt” is fall in love. It will never be counted as flirting in any situations.

Besides, in Jenkins’ paper, she gives an idea that somebody may flirt with ideas, theories, thinking, and so on is possible and metaphorical(Jenkins, Flirting Sec. 21& 22). However, I want to challenge this argument by pointing out the definition about flirting: disposed to improve romance and sex to salience; how could a person has this kind of disposition to ideas, theories? That sounds impractical. I should admit that a person can have a certain degree of special emotion to knowledge, ideas, and so on; however, I prefer to say that this feeling a thirst for knowledge and a desire to explore it; I do not consider that we should count this behaviour as flirting. So this arguments is not valid. Additionally, I want to add a restriction on Jenkins’ definition that flirting can happen in objects which have similar biological appearance. So the premises about flirting with ideas, theories contradict the previous definition of flirting. Therefore, I disagree with this argument and consider it is not persuasive.

In short, I want to claim that I support her definition that Flirting is a behaviour that someone is disposed to improve romance and sex to salience for the flirtee intentionally, and consider that Jenkins’ definition of flirting, and the premises of her conclusion are well founded. However, I disagree with her following argument about whether flirting can be happen with non-people, and argue with her. I admit that she has an improvement on the existing dictionary definition. Maybe we can have a further discussion and philosophical reflection on this topic in a different visual angle.

Resource

Jenkins, Carrie. “ The Philosophy of flirting.” In *Dating: Philosophy for Everyone*. Eds. Kristie Miller and Marlene Clark. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 2010. 13-18.