

## **On Daniel Hill's definition of suicide**

*Author:* Terence Rajivan Edward

*Abstract.* Daniel Hill's definition of suicide seems vulnerable to a counterexample in which someone kills themselves under some other intention, such as "I remove this useless part of the social organism." Also Humeans pose a problem for him.

*Draft version:* Version 1 (November 7th 2022)

*"A bundle theory of the self*

*Is no so good for my elf"*

Daniel Hill offers the following definition of suicide:

*A* commits suicide if and only if *A* intends that he or she kill himself or herself (under the description 'I kill myself') by an act *x*, and this intention is fully satisfied. (2011: 192)

But does the description "I kill myself" have to capture the content of the intention? What if they conceive of themselves as a cell within the social organism, metaphorically speaking, and they think the good of the whole, of the organism, takes priority over the good of any part? They kill themselves under the intention "I remove this useless part of the social organism"?

The definition would also seem to face the worry that people who do not believe in the self, such as Humeans, cannot commit suicide! Surely a Humean can commit suicide.

## **Reference**

Hill, D. 2011 "What is it to commit suicide?" *Ratio* 24: 192-205.