

Studies in Brain and Mind

Volume 8

Editor-in-Chief

Gualtiero Piccinini, University of Missouri - St. Louis, U.S.A.

Editorial Board

Berit Brogaard, University of Missouri - St. Louis, U.S.A.

Carl Craver, Washington University, U.S.A.

Edouard Machery, University of Pittsburgh, U.S.A.

Oron Shagrir, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

Mark Sprevak, University of Edinburgh, Scotland, U.K.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/6540>

Eva Schmidt

Modest Nonconceptualism

Epistemology, Phenomenology, and Content

 Springer

Eva Schmidt
Philosophy Department
Saarland University
Saarbrücken, Germany

Studies in Brain and Mind

ISBN 978-3-319-18901-7

ISBN 978-3-319-18902-4 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-18902-4

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015944326

Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2015

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Acknowledgments

This book is a descendant of my dissertation. I started my research into matters of conceptual and nonconceptual content in late 2005 on Sven Walters advice, and I thank him for pointing me in the direction of this intriguing topic. I am greatly indebted to my supervisor Heinz-Dieter Heckmann and my advisors Niko Strobach and Frank Hofmann for their support and their very helpful comments. I am obliged to the faculty of the Department of Philosophy at Saarland University for stimulating discussions of my work, especially to Susanne Mantel, Uwe Meixner, Ulrich Nortmann, and Corina Stroessner. Moreover, I would like to thank Assaf Weksler, Axel Schubert, and Oliver Petersen for reading and commenting on the sections of the book.

I have presented parts of the book on a number of occasions, and I am thankful to the audience for the enlightening discussions. In 2009, I gave presentations at the GAP.7 conference in Bremen and the Second European Graduate School in Philosophy of Language, Mind and Science in Lausanne. In 2011, I presented at the conference on the Theory-Ladenness of Experience in Düsseldorf and at the European Epistemology Network Meeting in Lund. In 2012, I presented at the workshop on Perception and Knowledge in Graz and at the workshop on New Work on Concepts in Luxembourg. Finally, in 2013, I gave presentations at the workshop on Minds without Magic in Bielefeld and at the workshop on Epistemic Justification and Reasons in Luxembourg. Among the many helpful commentators, I am especially grateful to Annalisa Coliva, Tim Crane, Marian David, Christian Nimtz, Raphael van Riel, Susanna Schellenberg, Maja Spener, Mark Textor, Michael Tye, and Timothy Williamson.

Material from Sect. 6.2 has been published as “The Argument from Animal and Infant Perception” in *Teorema*. The section has profited considerably from the suggestions of an anonymous referee. Parts of Chap. 8 have been published in the *Journal for General Philosophy of Science* as “Does Perceptual Content have to be Objective? A Defense of Nonconceptualism.” Here as well, my thanks go to the anonymous referees for their extremely helpful comments. I would also like to thank an anonymous referee for Springer for the comments and Gualtiero Piccinini for his support in preparing the manuscript for Springer’s *Studies in Brain and Mind* series.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to my family for their persistent support and patience. Most of all, I thank Robert McGee for his advice with respect to both organization and philosophy and for encouraging me in my philosophical pursuits.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Content, Concepts, Concept Possession	7
2.1	Content: Correctness Conditions, Propositions, Internal Perspective	7
2.1.1	Correctness Conditions	8
2.1.2	Propositions and Other Abstract Objects	10
2.1.3	Internal Perspective	15
2.2	Concepts and Concept Possession	21
2.2.1	Three Conceptions of Concepts	21
2.2.2	The Relation Between Concepts and Conceptual Abilities	28
3	Nonconceptual Content	31
3.1	The State View and the Content View	31
3.2	The Relation Between the State View and the Content View	33
3.3	Even More Varieties of Nonconceptualism	38
3.4	Defending the State-to-Content Principle	46
3.4.1	Existing Defenses of the State-to-Content Principle	47
3.4.2	A Better Defense of the State-to-Content Principle	58
3.5	Summary	71
4	Arguments from Phenomenology	73
4.1	The Argument from Fineness of Grain	74
4.1.1	Arguments from Fineness of Grain, Richness, and Determinateness	74
4.1.2	The Demonstrative Strategy Against the Argument from the Fineness of Grain	78
4.1.3	Demonstrative <i>Concepts</i> ?	80
4.1.4	Demonstration via General Concepts	86
4.1.5	Conceptualizable, But Not Conceptualized	91
4.1.6	The Phenomenal Adequacy of Demonstrative Perceptual Contents	92
4.1.7	Conclusion	97

4.2	The Argument from Situation-Dependence and Inextricability.....	97
4.2.1	Context-Dependence	98
4.2.2	Object-Dependence and Inextricability	98
4.2.3	Presentation of the Argument	100
4.2.4	A Conceptualist Reply: Situation-Dependent Concepts	102
5	The Argument from Contradictory Contents.....	105
5.1	Presentation of the Argument	105
5.2	Two Clarifications: Only One Concept, Only One Content.....	110
5.3	The First Objection: Two Distinct Contents	111
5.4	The Second Objection: Against (PCI)	114
5.5	Nonconceptual Content and Contradictions	120
5.6	Results	122
6	Arguments from Concept Possession	125
6.1	The Argument from Memory Experience	125
6.1.1	Presentation of the Argument	125
6.1.2	The First Objection: Mary Did Not See the Dodecahedron ..	128
6.1.3	The Second Objection: Other Concepts of the Die.....	132
6.1.4	Content and Cognitive Appreciation.....	135
6.1.5	Results.....	138
6.2	The Argument from Animal and Infant Perception	139
6.2.1	The Argument.....	139
6.2.2	Motivating Premise (1): Content, But No Concepts	140
6.2.3	Motivating Premise (3): Content Overlap	143
6.2.4	The First Objection: Abandon the Generality Constraint	145
6.2.5	The Second Objection: Mere Perceptual Sensitivity	150
6.2.6	Results.....	152
6.3	The Argument from Concept Acquisition	153
6.3.1	Introduction	154
6.3.2	Presentation of the Argument	156
6.3.3	The First Conceptualist Response: Innate Concepts	158
6.3.4	The Second Conceptualist Response: Undemanding Concept Acquisition.....	160
6.3.5	Acquiring Perceptual-Demonstrative Concepts	162
6.3.6	Results.....	166
7	The Epistemological Objection	167
7.1	The Myth of the Given.....	168
7.1.1	Some Epistemological Background.....	168
7.1.2	The Dilemma for the Foundationalist.....	172
7.1.3	The Conceptualist Solution: Taking the First Horn of the Dilemma	175
7.2	The First Objection: The Logical Space of Reasons	177
7.2.1	Clarifying ‘Logical Space’	177
7.2.2	The Argument from the Logical Space of Reasons	179

- 7.2.3 A Defense of Nonconceptualism: The Logical Space of Content 181
- 7.3 The Second Objection: Reasons Must Have Conceptual and Propositional Format 184
 - 7.3.1 The Argument 184
 - 7.3.2 The Modest Nonconceptualist Reply 188
 - 7.3.3 Problems for the Modest Nonconceptualist Account 198
- 7.4 The Third Objection: An Argument from Cognitive Access..... 210
 - 7.4.1 Access Internalism and Conceptualism..... 210
 - 7.4.2 The First Nonconceptualist Reply: Accessible Nonconceptual Contents..... 216
 - 7.4.3 The Second Nonconceptualist Reply: No Need for Occurrent Access 220
 - 7.4.4 Mentalism as an Alternative to Access Internalism 224
- 7.5 Results on the Epistemological Objection 228
- 8 The Objection from Objectivity 233**
 - 8.1 The Argument 234
 - 8.2 The First Reply: No Need for Conceptual Content 237
 - 8.3 The Second Reply: No Need for a Belief-Based World-View 238
 - 8.4 The Third Reply: No Need for Presentation *as* Objective 242
 - 8.5 A Conceptualist Comeback: Objective₂ Content Is Not Genuine 250
 - 8.6 Results 254
- 9 Modest Nonconceptualism Vindicated 257**
 - 9.1 Taking Stock 257
 - 9.2 Modest Nonconceptualism 260
- Bibliography 263**

List of Figures

Fig. 5.1	The Müller-Lyer drawing (Müller-Lyer 1889).....	111
Fig. 5.2	The Necker cube (Necker 1832).....	112
Fig. 6.1	An octahedron	126
Fig. 6.2	A dodecahedron	126