Sofia Miguens | Gerhard Preyer (Eds.)
Consciousness and Subjectivity

Philosophische Analyse
Philosophical Analysis

Sofia Miguens | Gerhard Preyer (Eds.)

Consciousness and Subjectivity

To Dieter Henrich and Hilary Putnam

CONTENTS

Introduction:
Are There Blindspots in Thinking About Consciousness and Subjectivity?
Sofia Miguens and Gerhard Preyer

I. Blindspots

The project of this book started with a common concern about the generalization of a 'naturalized epistemology stance' in current philosophical discussions in analytic philosophy, especially in the philosophy of mind and language. Third-person approaches are dominant, or at least pervasive—in fact, the proximity of much philosophical work on mind and language with cognitive science reinforces such orientation. We believe that one consequence of such a situation within philosophy itself are blindspots in thinking about consciousness and subjectivity: issues regarding consciousness and subjectivity may simply be taken to be exhausted by addressing problems such as the place of consciousness in nature within a physicalist metaphysics, whose nature is decided and debated elsewhere, or the status of first-person authority in linguistic creatures. But is it the case that problems such as the place of consciousness in nature or the status of first-person authority exhaust the issues at stake? This may be taken to be the case in some quarters of analytic philosophy—yet issues of subjectivity and consciousness are dealt with in very different ways not only in the idealistic-phenomenological tradition central to continental philosophy but also in the analytic tradition itself. So when we first conceived of this project, we thought that a practical strategy to bring out the differences and the advantages of approaches in each tradition would be to bring together analytic, or analytically inspired, philosophers working on the continent with English-speaking philosophers. That was one intention leading to the present book. Yet, along with that intention, and since bringing it to practice involved a dialogue and a comparison of traditions in contemporary philosophy which do not, in fact, communicate very easily, the project had a more specific agenda: authors were invited to consider issues such as the way internalism/externalism debates reflect on problems of self-knowledge, first-person authority and interpretation, mediated/unmediated knowledge of self, the role of self or subject in the foundations of knowledge, the place of perspective in nature (i.e. the nature of experience), as well as on

the way the approach to such questions reflected both on a framework for cognitive science and on realist/anti-realist metaphysical commitments. Since so many topics go under 'consciousness and subjectivity' in philosophical literature and discussions, our idea was that focusing on one of these issues could throw light on the more general problem we were interested in.

Which are, then, the discussions that go under 'consciousness' and 'subjectivity' in philosophical literature and discussions? In analytic philosophy the topic of *'subjectivity'* often leads philosophers to discuss first-person perspective, self-reference, self-identification (whether regarding the use of first-person pronoun only or extending to body proper), access or presence to oneself, as in introspection, or first-person authority. Frequent starting points for discussing subjectivity as self-identification are, for instance, the way Ludwig Wittgenstein, in the *Blue and Brown Books*[1], dealt with subjective and objective uses of 'I'; the way Sydney Shoemaker, in *Self-reference and self-awareness*[2], dealt with the phenomenon of immunity to error through misidentification (he named it thus, and added 'in relation to the use of first-person pronoun'), the way Gareth Evans, in *Varieties of Reference*[3], extended these considerations from introspection to proprioception (it does not make sense to think something like this: I pick out an external object; then I ask: is this object me? Am I this?), as well as the status of *de se* beliefs, i.e. beliefs about oneself, as authors such as David Lewis, John Perry, Hector-Neri Castañeda or Roderick Chisholm discussed it[4].

In other traditions, subjectivity is not so much *one* specific issue, such as identifying oneself, but, in a way, *the* issue at the heart of philosophy; thus, approaches to subjectivity often happen under the guise of a comprehensive investigation on the nature of the 'subject' or 'reason', namely with the intention of criticizing, or renouncing to, the so called Cartesian, 'classic', conceptions of subjectivity, which identify subjectivity with a *res cogitans*, a transparent self-consciousness and *locus* for the foundation of knowledge of the world. It is not only for Descartes or for Kant, that a view of the subject

1   L. Wittgenstein 1958.
2   S. Shoemaker 1968.
3   G. Evans 1982.
4   D. Lewis 1979, J. Perry 1979, H.-N. Castañeda 1966, R. Chisholm 1981. To keep in mind one case of the kind of problems raised by the status of *de se* beliefs, here is Castañeda's 1966 Editor of Soul case: "Smith has never seen his image (…) in photographs, mirrors, ponds, etc. Suppose that at time *t* Smith does not know that he has been appointed the editor of Soul and that at *t* he comes to know that the man whose photograph lies on a certain table is the new Editor of Soul, without Smith realizing that he himself is the man in the photograph." (Castañeda 1966: 130).

lies at the centre of philosophical pursuits: two central strands of continental philosophy, the idealistic tradition and the phenomenological tradition, may also be seen as explorations of subjectivity. In the *idealistic tradition* what is at stake is becoming acquainted with ourselves while understanding the nature of understanding, or reason, and this involves not just representing the world, but also activity and feeling[5], whereas in the *phenomenological tradition*, as it was inaugurated by Husserl, the main aim was to clarify the subjective origins of sense in the condition of givenness of things[6].

As for *consciouness*, the first thing to notice is that it is somewhat more frequent—at least in analytic philosophy—to be presented with a *theory* of consciousness than with a 'theory' of subjectivity. A theory of consciousness could be a metaphysical theory of the place of consciousness in nature, making room for the *what it is like to be?, the presentation* of the world to a creature, even if only 'dimly', as it were phenomenally, i.e. without any conceptualization. Some such theories conclude that physical facts could not possibly suffice to account for this and thus prepare the ground for shunning physicalism, or materialism[7]. A theory of consciousness could also be a cognitively inspired first or second-order representational theory[8], in which case one does not take representation and phenomenal consciousness to be completely disparate natures—in fact the proposal is that consciousness can be accounted for as a certain kind of representation. A theory of consciousness could also be, especially if it comes from disciplines other than philosophy, namely cognitive psychology, cognitive neuroscience, or even cognitive-science minded philosophy, a proposal about cognitive architecture—we may think for instance of Daniel Dennett's Multiple Drafts Model[9], or Bernhard J. Baars' global

5   According to the German philosopher Dieter Henrich, one thing we may learn from the idealistic tradition is that we should come to terms with the fact that we cannot talk of mind and world apart from each other, even if we do not want to go as far as seeing stages of development of mind as corresponding to stages of development of the concept of the world, as for instance Hegel does in his system of Absolute Idealism (cf. Henrich 2003).

6   In what concerns a conception of the subject itself, it is neither thing nor pure consciousness; also proprioception as perception of one's own 'lived body' (*Leib*), has been as opposed, in the phenomenological tradition, since Husserl himself, to external bodies in the world (*Körper*), the blunt exteriority, *partes extra partes,* of the non-minded rest of nature. For an overview and discussion of the spirit and vissicitudes of the phenomenological movement, cf. J. Benoist 2001.

7   Cf. S. Kripke 1980, F. Jackson 1990, or D. Chalmers 1996.

8   Cf. for instance F. Dretske 1997 and D. Rosenthal 1997.

9   What is consciousness, if not a Cartesian Theater, i.e. a unified center for presentation of mental contents to a subject? According to Dennett 1991, given the parallel distributed processing of information in brains (i.e. at the sub-personal level), the role of the self is

workspace theory[10]. It could also be a proposal about how the representa-
tion of body proper, which takes place in the brain, through multi-layered
representations of self, makes for the 'authorship' of the flow and the 'feeling
of what happens' (António R. Damasio)[11]. The truth is, the question *What is
a theory of consciousness a theory of?* is a quite hard question to answer. This is
not just because of the 'Hard problem' of consciousness (David Chalmers[12]) or
because there are so many competing theories of content and consciousness
in analytic philosophy of mind and language, and philosophy of perception,
but especially if we think how plausible very different ideas are about what
a theory of consciousness is a theory of: the brain, the self, thoughts and
thinking, all are options. Also, the issue inevitably arises whether a theory of
consciousness is a purely, or essentially, philosophical enterprise, or not.

The plurality of approaches mentioned above could by itself make for
blindspots in the discussion—people speaking about completely different
things often simply talk past each other. But we needed a sharper example

> essential for a (virtual) unification of the mind, as is the role of higher-order mental states
> for the global kind of access at the personal level we call 'consciousness'. Being a self thus
> has to do with appearing to oneself, or representing oneself, in a certain way. The way
> Dennett sees it, a self is made up of sub-personal parts, by exploring accesses among them
> ("I propose to construct a full-fledged 'I' from sub-personal parts, by exploiting the notion
> of access"—he says in *Brainstorms*, Dennett 1978). He agrees with Rosenthal in thinking
> of state-consciousness as consisting in reportings on one's own mental states by express-
> ing higher-order mental states. Also, he proposes that only this is consciousness proper,
> in contrast with for instance behavior-guiding awareness; thus, consciousness proper is
> characteristic of linguistic creatures only. In such creatures if a self is in place and higher-
> order mental states are expressed, we may say that the illusion of the Cartesian Theater
> is perfectly real—in this sense there *is* a cartesian theater, i.e. there is self-presentation or
> self-appearing, even if there is no 'center' (in the brain). The fact that other animals are
> not like that is what makes them, in Dennett's words, unlike us: as he puts it, 'they are not
> beset by the illusion of the Cartesian Theater' (Miguens 2002).
>
> 10 B. Baars' conception of consciousness as global workspace is the idea that what is globally
> accessible in a cognitive system is 'publicly available', i.e. available for the system, in contrast
> to information processing in the subsystems, which although available for controlling
> behavior, is not 'centrally' available (Baars 1988).
>
> 11 A. R. Damasio himself wants to put forward a conception of self or consciousness according
> to which self or consciousness is *'having the body—body proper—in mind'*. The mark of the
> fact that we are embodied conscious beings, and not cartesian souls, is the fact that our
> consciousness is such that we always have the self in mind –this is what 'subjectifies'
> consciousness, makes it mine. Understanding how this embodiment makes for mine-ness
> is, in Damasio's view, clearly important for thinking about self and emotion. Cf. Damásio
> 1992, Damásio 1999, Damásio 2010.
>
> 12 Chalmers 1996. The 'hard problem' is the problem of phenomenal consciousness (one
> could ask: 'why doesn't it all go on in the dark?'); 'easy problems' concern cognitive
> functions; control of behavior, discriminatory abilities, reporting mental states, etc.

of what we meant by 'blindspot' at the beginning of the project. And in fact what initially prompted our interest in blindspots was the kind of blindness a philosopher like Donald Davidson exemplifies in his approach to subjectivity[13]. Davidson's account of subjectivity (or 'the subjective') as first-person-authority is, we believe, a case of a philosopher simply being blind to subjectivity as a question in its own right. His point is that once we get rid of the idea of subjectivity as a 'parade of objects before the mind' (the cartesian idea), all that remains is privacy and asymmetry, and these can be explained as a mere side effect of natural language in our minds[14]. Whereas Davidson officially intends to account for 'the subjective', and in investigating the possibility of truth and objective knowledge for beings such as ourselves, sets out relating the objective, the intersubjective and the subjective, the fact is, his whole approach rests on the priority of a third-person perspective, and takes behavioural evidence as touchstone (even considering that the appeal to the intersubjective in his last writings aims at taking distance from quinean-like behaviorism, itself undoubtably an even more radically third-personal approach). Still, Davidson's overall view of subjectivity as first-person authority in linguistic creatures amounts to an elimination of subjectivity and a trivialization of the problem of self-knowledge[15].

It is worth reflecting on the fact that none of this is a contingent detail in Davidson's philosophy—in fact, centering his approach of thought-world relations on language and interpretation not only makes for the positions on subjectivity and self-knowledge referred above, but also has the strange consequence that there is no place in it for perception proper, for mind's response to the world, something which we may try to grasp in terms of

---

13 Davidson is a philosopher we have both worked on, cf. G. Preyer 2011, Preyer 2011a, Miguens 2008.

14 Cf. Davidson 2001: pp. 39-52. ("What remains of the concept of subjectivity? So far as I can see two features of the subjective as classically conceived remain in place. Thoughts are private in the obvious but important sense in which property can be private, that is, belong to one person. And knowledge of thoughts is assymmetrical, in that the person who has the thought generally knows he has it in a way others cannot. But that is all there is to the subjective").

15 For Davidson, the question "What is knowing that you know what you know?" ultimately leads to an answer formulated in terms of language and interpretation. The way he sees things is the following: there is a presumption built into the nature of interpretation according to which a speaker usually knows what he means. There is no such presupposition in the interpretation of others. First-person authority explains the presuposition —it is thus a necessary feature of the interpretation of speech. That this (accounting for the condition in which I know what I mean) should be the type of answer the problem of self-knowledge requires is what we mean by trivialization.

'acquaintance', something being directly or immediately present to mind, or 'givenness' of world to mind. In Davidson's coherentist picture of knowledge and justification there is only place for 'causation of beliefs' and interpretation. There are reasons to doubt whether a theory of interpretation, with its reliance on the third-person viewpoint on the world, can ever be sufficient for accounting for the nature of subjectivity[16]. Anyway, if we look at the issues covered in many essays of this book—such as immediacy and acquaintance, presentational phenomenology, mine-ness of perceptual experience—which the authors have taken as focus for their investigations into the nature of consciousness and subjectivity, we see that those are issues one simply would not find in Davidson's philosophy, in spite of his claim to account for 'the subjective'. Yet they are issues which the authors' concern with consciousness and subjectivity naturally brought in.

II. Two Anchor Figures

Another core idea of the project, along with the intention to look for blindspots in thinking about consciousness and subjectivity and to take Davidson's conception of the subjective as first-person authority as the prime example of one such blindspot, was to invite two anchor figures, one from each of the philosophical traditions whose take on subjectivity we would, ideally, compare: the American philosopher Hilary Putnam and the German philosopher Dieter Henrich. Putnam and Henrich, to whom we dedicate this book, have something in common besides being very important figures of contemporary philosophy: they have both spent much effort in trying to make different philosophical traditions communicate. Putnam has been for a long time reading continental philosophy (authors ranging from Kant to Lévinas to Habermas) and making efforts to relate it to the analytic tradition. Henrich's teaching in Harvard—where he was Putnam's colleague—in the 1970s[17] was very important in bringing discussions on German Idealism to the analytic field. Looking at his work we see an example of the shape such communication might take: Henrich is not only a specialist of German Idealism, a period that many analytic philosophers think of as 'metaphysical phantasmagoria'[18], its developments often being regarded as "opaque and

---

16 Cf. Benoist, in this volume.
17 More precisely Henrich taught in the US, in Columbia and in Harvard, between 1975 and 1984.
18 Cf. D. S. Pacini, 2003: p. x.

suspicious"[19], but someone who by his knowledge of the analytic tradition is able to present the idealist tradition in terms that can make it understood by philosophers trained in the analytic tradition[20]. Raising issues from the perspective of the analytic tradition means for instance describing the pursuits of the German idealists, from Kant to Hegel, in terms of a philosophy of mind, as explorations regarding issues of theories of consciousness and theories of self, such as self-consciousness, self–knowledge, self-determination, self-reference of the mental and its problems, and assessing the value of such contributions in a way that does not depend on the success of their authors in system-building[21] or in accomplishing full metaphysical programs. Of course, in the idealistic tradition along with questions regarding consciousness and self, which we also find in the analytic tradition, we find reference to a completely different set of issues supposedly involved in our becoming acquainted with ourselves, such as the connection of consciousness with action and morality or the connection between knowing and understanding oneself and knowing and understanding the historic world. In other words, mind coming to understand itself is seen as having to do not only with place in nature, and with structures for self-reference, but also with the social and historical world, questions regarding freedom being very important here. They are in fact fundamental in the Idealist tradition, so much so that, to quote Henrich (now using a language that analytic philosophers would maybe have a hard time understanding), we are led 'to take the relationship between the transcendental constitution of the person and the concept of philosophy as constitutive of philosophy'[22]. Also, since this is an approach to subjectivity we find in continental philosophy, one may more fully appreciate the importance of Henrich's work if we see it as opposing, or showing the limitations, of a very important—through the influence of Heidegger, namely—interpretation of subjectivity: the interpretation of subjectivity as self-preservation, power, authority, domination (as expressed, for instance, in the German words *Selbsterhaltung* and *Selbstermächtigung*). This is an interpretation which became very important in the last decades in Heideggerian and post-structuralist quarters, which has in fact had a new 'career' among philosophers worldwide around Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy since the 1970s, and also in the hands of those taking seriously Michel Foucault's idea according to which

---

19   Henrich 2003: p. 1.
20   Henrich's exchanges with Donald Davidson were also in our minds throughout this project. See D. Henrich (forthcoming), "Stages of a Friendship".
21   Henrich 2003: p. 10.
22   Henrich 2003: p. 7.

power renders individuals into subjects. Still it is a rather limiting view of 'subjectivity', and one that does not exhaust what the continental tradition has to offer—As it is a limiting view of German Idealism that which sees it as a position regarding exclusively the existence and persistence of objects in the world as dependent on the mind—that amounts to conflating it with Berkeleyanism, whereas so much more—regarding action, communication, morality, freedom, history—is going on. Reading and interpreting German Idealism as Henrich does may help us see all that.

As for the other philosopher to whom this book is dedicated, and who is also a contributor to it, Hilary Putnam, his work has been at the center stage of philosophy for many decades now. He has been a central reference for philosophy of mind and language since the 1960s and 1970s; being characteristically free from the orthodox shape all discussions in philosophy eventually take, he has, as is well known, stepped back from some of his own very influential views, thus becoming a critic of some mainstream positions (this happened with functionalism in the philosophy of mind, as it became associated with the representational-computational view of the mind, for instance in the work of his former student Jerry Fodor). Yet the one thing that makes Putnam so important for the consciousness and subjectivity issues of this book is the fact that having started out as a philosopher of science, interested in logic, mathematics and physics, having done very important work in philosophy of mind and philosophy of language, he has lately, gradually, become more interested in perception—in fact, it is Putnam's engagement with such discussions in the philosophy of perception that lies behind his contribution to this volume, his topic being his seventeen year reflection on John McDowell's 1994 book *Mind and World*. There was a time, as he himself admits, when perception did not seem to him to be a particularly important topic in philosophy[23]. Coming to believe otherwise made him look closer at the history of philosophy, and made him look at it in different ways, two noticeable differences in (relatively) recent Putnam being his 'reconciliation' with Wittgenstein and his discovery of J. L. Austin. This turn to perception has not only turned Putnam's attention towards consciousness—his article '*Sensation and Apperception*' in the present volume is an example of that—but also had an impact on his lifelong interest in the issue of realism.

It is thus interesting to follow Putnam's path in becoming close to the philosophy of perception, and one thing we find out in his 1999 book *The Threefold Cord* is that this was a path which led him to come close to so called

23   Cf. Putnam 1999: p. 12.

'disjunctivism' ('disjunctivism' is admitedly a strange word; it is anyway under that heading that a critique of representacionalism and of qualia, and a 'return' of direct realism is currently underways in some quarters of analytic philosophy). Three ideas might sum up disjunctivism: idea number one is the rejection of *highest common factor* views[24]; idea number two is the need to make explicit how such highest common factor views relate to a certain conception of *illusion*[25], and idea number three is the need to carefully consider one's conception of *indistinguishability* for the subject. Putnam himself gives a very clear example of what we do not mean by 'indistinguishability' in his endorsement of disjunctivism, in *The Threefold Cord*. He says: "The opposed point of view [[26]] defended by Austin and more recently by McDowell and myself in the lectures I mentioned [[27]] may be called the disjunctive view. On this view when I say that in both of the cases I described "I saw a wall covered with roses" all I am entitled to infer is that the following disjunction is true: Either I saw a wall covered with roses or it seemed to me as if I saw a wall covered with roses, but I am not at all entitled to infer that there is some significant object that is literally present in both cases" [28]. The idea criticized is then the idea according to which 'When we see a tree (or a wall covered with roses) there is some internal phenomenal state going on: some internal representation of a tree will be present in us'[29]. That is the highest common factor view, and according to it, as Putnam notes, an internal state is considered to be necessary and sufficient for the appearance in question. What is wrong with the highest common factor view is, again in Putnam's words, that if the highest common factor view is right, then there are some internal states whose *esse est percipi*[30]. This involves a view about indistinguishability—one that disjunctivist philosophers of perception, such as the English philosopher

---

24 The expression 'highest common factor' refers to the idea that there is something in common, as experiences, to perceptions, illusions and hallucinations (i.e. there is something in common to the *good* and the *bad* cases). J. McDowell introduced the term in his 1982 article *Criteria, Defeasability and Knowledge* (cf. McDowell 1998: pp. 369-394; the article was published for the first time in 1982 in the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 68). McDowell's article may, for that reason (i.e. having introduced the term 'highest common factor'), be considered a landmark in the history of disjunctivism (again, we might find this following Putnam's path in the rediscovery of the philosophical relevance of perception. Cf. Putnam 1999: p. 177, p. 216).

25 This is also taking place in McDowell 2009.

26 Putnam means 'opposed to the highest common factor argument'.

27 Putnam is talking about his Dewey Lectures which are Part I of Putnam 1999.

28 Putnam 1999: p. 129.

29 Putnam 1999: p.129.

30 Putnam 1999: p.129.

Mike Martin, have taken lots of efforts to 'deconstruct'[31]. Also attempting to deconstruct erroneous conceptions of indistinguishability Putnam explores the following example in *The Three Fold Cord*[32]:

> Rohit J. Parikh's pack of cards
> C_1 C_2…C_{100} are one hundred cards
> C_1 and C_2 look exactly alike to a subject
>   So the colour quale must be the same, let us call it C $1/2$.
> C_2 and C_3 look exactly alike to a subject
>   So the colour quale must be the same, let us call it C $2/3$.
> C_3 and C_4 look exactly alike to a subject
>   So the colour quale must be the same, let us call it C $3/4$.
>   (…)

The problem is, in R. Parikh's pack of cards C_1 and C_{20} are different colours, and *they look different* to the subject—what shall we make of this? According to Putnam what we should ultimately make of this is that the principle of the highest common factor must be false. Being able to say x and y are absolutely indistinguishable for the subject on two occasions does not license us to infer that there is such a thing as a numerically identical phenomenal state the subject is in[33]. Indistinguishability for the subject is not sufficient proof of the identity of the subject's states. Thus, as Mike Martin puts it in *The Limits of Self-Awareness,* the ultimate key to a disjunctivist approach is in fact not the characteristic paraphrasing of looks statements as '*Either* I am perceiving *or* I am suffering an illusion, or hallucination' one usually associates with it but the recognition that there are things we cannot know about ourselves 'just through reflection on the situation we find ourselves in'. In other words, the mark of disjunctivism is 'a suitable modesty in the approach to the problem of experience'[34].

III. The Inner and the Outer—Excursus on Perception

We suggested that perception proper, as having to do with acquaintance or givenness, was missing in the picture of thought-world relations of David-

---

31   Cf. for instance Martin 2009a and Martin 2009b.
32   Putnam 1999: pp.130-131.
33   Putnam 1999: p.132.
34   Martin 2009b: p.272.

son, the philosopher whose blindness to subjectivity as a issue on its own concerned us from the start. His picture of thought-world relations is one centered on language, relying on 'causation of belief' and on interpretation; we also suggested that this 'absence of perception' from the picture of thought-world relations was no accident. Now, it is important to notice that the discussions of perception, such as the ones mentioned above, do not concern perception of roses or stones or other physical objects only—in fact, what *Criteria, Defesability and Knowledge,* the article by McDowell referred above in connection with Putnam's interest in perception, discusses, is the problem of other minds. It was in such context that the idea of highest common factor views originated and its connection with a conception of illusion was explored. The problem of other minds is clearly another domain where over-simplistic inner-outer, mental-physical, distinctions may lead us astray. We might take a cognitive system such as a human and consider that the surface of his body limits the 'realm of the inner', and that outside the body lies 'pure exteriority'. The problem is, such simplistic inner-outer distinction simply will not do any of the work most issues philosophers and cognitive scientists deal with need it to do. So one of the advantages of recruiting the ongoing philosophical discussion of perception for dealing with subjectivity and consciousness issues is that insights gained in reflecting on perception can be extended from outer world to inner world to other minds, in all cases subverting the all too common prejudice according to which an inner-outer boundary, perhaps identifiable with the peripheries of our bodies, is easy to find. It is not, and one relevant example of the questions involved is precisely the discussion of the status of expression as conceived from a non-behavioristic perspective[35] that is going on in McDowell's *Criteria, Defesability and Knowledge* (CDK). So we will look a bit more carefully at that discussion.

CDK is at first sight an epistemological discussion about evidence, centering on so called 'criteria', more specifically on the defeasability of knowledge claims supported by criterial warrants (Ex: I know he is in pain *by seeing him grimacing and twisting*). We are confronted with a distinction between two kinds of evidence, "criteria" (whose status as evidence is a matter of convention or grammar) and "symptoms" (whose status as evidence is not a matter of convention or grammar but rather of empirical theory). Defeasability, that is, the epistemic liability or vulnerability of knowledge claims, is different for claims warranted by symptoms than it is for claims warranted by criteria. What is at stake anyway is 'ways of telling how things are' whether these ways

35   Cf. J. Krueger and S. Overgaard's article in this volume.

are based on criteria or on symptoms (to take two examples from CDK: we have certain sensations of wet and cold and think it is raining, we look and see that someone is in pain).

The notion of criterion was introduced by Wittgenstein in his later work and he himself used it in dealing with the problem of other minds in the *Investigations*, for instance asking: "What is the criterion for the redness of an image? For me, when it is someone else's image, what he says and does" (*Philosophical Investigations*, § 377). Now Wittgenstein's idea of criteria leads to a conception of *pretence*, and his commentators (P. M. S. Hacker, Crispin Wright, etc.), whose positions McDowell is discussing, see things like this: in sucessful deception criteria for something internal are satisfied, yet the ascription for which they are criteria would be false (for example, I see the expressions of pain, I think the person is in pain and the person is not in pain). Criteria are thus supposed to be a defeasible kind of evidence, and the very possibility of pretence is supposed to make this seem obvious. It is precisely this way of thinking of pretence (as being a case in which criteria for something internal are satisfied, although the ascription for which they are criteria would be false, thus showing criteria to be defeasible) that McDowell sets out to criticize.

He is not so much interested in exegesis, and in the specific exchanges between people such as Hacker and Wright around criteria, other minds and pretence: his interest lies in the 'epistemological assumptions' of the whole discussion. According to the traditional way of framing the problem of other minds, when we ask ourselves how is knowledge of other minds possible what seems to be at stake is inferring mental life from non-psychological evidence (behavioral information, let us call it). This behavioral information is supposed to be 'psychologically neutral' and shared by *good cases and bad cases* (this is the well known terminology of disjunctivist discussions). The good case is that in which there is behavioral information to that there is mental life and indeed there is mental life, the bad case is that in which there is behavioral information to that there is mental life and yet there is no mental life. To take an example: I see someone gesticulating as if in agony. In Case 1 there is pain, in case 2 there isn't. Still, behavioral information available for me is the same. The skeptic move is to say that, then, since such behavioral evidence, which is all that we have and will ever have, is shaky, we will never *know* that another being is in pain.

What McDowell is interested in in CDK is the assumption, the skeptic's assumption prior to the conclusion above, that a crossing from something blatantly external (behavioral evidence, taken to be psychologically neutral)

to something internal (mental life) is involved here. His point is that this assumption already underlies the descrition of Case 1 versus Case 2, and it also underlies the particular interpretation of pretence under discussion. His alternative interpretation of pretence within the framework of criteria is the following: "in pretending one causes it to appear that criteria for something internal are satisfied (i.e. one causes it to appear that someone else could know by what one says and does, that one is in, say, some 'inner state') but the criteria are not really satisfied, that is, knowledge is not really available"[36].

Now, as McDowells puts it in CDK, and this is a central step in the article, in the epistemology of other minds pretence plays a role analogous to that of illusion when considering the problem of external world. According to McDowell, when we ask 'How is knowledge of external world possible if all we have are impressions?' the problem of the external world is being framed in a way structurally similar to the framing of the problem of other minds above: "In the traditional approach to the epistemology of other minds, the concept of pretence plays a role analogous to the role of the concept of illusion in the traditional approach to the epistemology of the 'external' world. So it is not surprising to find that, just as the possibility of pretence is often thought to show the defeasability of criteria for 'inner' states of affairs, the possiblity of illusion is often thought to show the defeasability of criteria for 'external' states of affairs."[37] What is structurally similar is basically the idea that there is something the good and the bad cases share (something like 'appearances') and so the bad cases (pretence, illusion) become *mere* appearances. The skeptic's conclusion is then, obviously, that we never know the world, namely through perception, the same way we can never know that another human being is in pain. McDowell thinks there is something wrong here, something wrong in very setup of the problems (of other minds, of the external world), and in CDK he aims at putting forward an alternative approach. This is where his wittgensteinianism enters: according to McDowell what Wittgenstein is doing (with his proposal about criteria, namely) and he wants to follow is "not to propose an alteration of detail within the sceptic's position; what Wittgenstein is doing is rejecting the assumptions which generate the sceptic's problem"[38], and crucially, the assumption that there is something the good and the bad cases share, a 'highest common factor', which then makes it possible to think of bad cases as mere appearances.

So, what is it exactly that McDowell does not agree with in the descriptions

---

36 McDowell 2009: p.76.
37 McDowell 2009: p. 76.
38 McDowell 1998: p. 383.

above of pretence and illusion in terms of good and bad cases? First of all, he thinks is that there is no such thing as a 'highest common factor' to good and bad cases. The good case and the bad case are epistemologically very different: in particular, in the good case, one knows what one knows without any inference from a highest common factor. What then is the alternative way of conceiving of things, the alternative to the highest common factor view? That is what McDowell is looking for in CDK and this is what he proposes: "But suppose we say—not at all unnaturally—that an appearance that such and such is the case can *either* be a mere appearance *or* the fact that such and such is the case making itself perceptually manifest to someone. As before, the object of experience in the deceptive case is a mere appearance. But we are not to accept that in the non-deceptive case too the object of experience is a mere appearance and hence something that falls short of the fact itself. On the contrary, the appearance that is presented to one in those cases is a matter of the fact itself being disclosed to the experiencer. So appearances are no longer conceived as in general intervening between the experiencing subject and the world."[39]

One important point of McDowell is then that the Argument from Illusion, which needs 'highest common factor views' to take hold, effects an unwarranted transition from sheer fallibility—pyrrhonian scepticism—to a veil of ideas scepticism: even in non-deceptive cases we end up having something interposing itself between the experiencing subject and the fact itself.[40] McDowell thinks that all those who accept a highest common factor view are prey to this way of thinking. His alternative proposal to highest common factor views is then that in the case of perception of the world as in the case of other minds, what in the good case is made manifest (here now, by perception) is known without any inference from a highest common factor; and knowledge does not fall short of the fact. Needless to say, this is where characteristic mcdowellian ideas such as that 'experience is openness to the world' or 'psychological fact is directly presented to view' find their place. As he himself puts it, "If we adopt the disjunctive conception of appearances, we have to take seriously the idea of an unmediated openness of the experiencing subject to 'external' reality, whereas the 'highest common factor' conception allows us to picture an interface between them. Taking the epistemology of other minds on its own, we can locate the highest common factor at the facing surfaces of other human bodies. But when we come to consider perceptual knowledge of bodies in general, the 'highest common

39   McDowell 2009: p. 80.
40   McDowell 2009: p.80.

factor' conception drives what is given to experience inward, until it can be aligned with what goes on at our own sensory surfaces. This promises to permit us a satisfying conception of an interface at which the 'inner' and the 'outer' make contact. The idea that there is an interface can seem compulsory; and the disjunctive conception of appearances flouts that intuition." (…) "Without the highest common factor view of experience, we can leave the interface out of the picture, and the traditional problems (about other minds, external world) lapse"[41].

Anyway, here we have a very different way of conceiving inner-outer relations, when thinking of mind, then the one acccording to which the surface of a human body limits the 'realm of the inner', outside which there is 'pure exteriority'. And coming to terms with conceptions of the 'inner' and the 'outer' which would allow us to think of consciousness and subjectivity in a non-prejudiced way was the third idea liying behing the project that gave origin to this book.

IV. The Contributions

Several articles in this collection approach consciousness and subjectivity by addressing problems of perception and experience. In Part I of the volume, *Consciousness and Experience*, the issues range from apperception, to presentational phenomenology, awareness of awareness, acquaintance, and inner experience. McDowell's work is nowadays often taken as a starting point for discussions of perception. This is what Putnam does in his article "*Sensation and Apperception*[42]". Starting from his 'seventeen years of reflection' on McDowell's *Mind and World* (1994) Putnam goes over McDowell's view of perception, in its changes since *Mind and World* to the much more recent "Avoiding the Myth of the Given" (2009)[43], going over his own initial reading of *Mind and World* when the book came out and then criticizing it. In so doing Putnam presents his own current views on perception, conception and consciousness. In order to spell out what he thinks is wrong—ultimately 'mysterious and untenable'—with McDowell's conceptualism (the idea that our conceptual powers or abilities are involved in the 'takings-in' of sensibil-

41 McDowell 2009: p.85.
42 It is worth reminding ourselves that this is a term for 'consciousness' used by Kant, and also by Leibniz.
43 Where McDowell tries to come to terms with C. Travis' criticisms of his views. Cf. McDowell 2009b.

ity, even if passively—which is the idea that, in the terms used in *Mind and World*, McDowell wants to oppose to the 'reduction' of the 'space of reasons' to facts about causation of our beliefs), Putnam claims one should not mistake pure sensation for apperception. *Pace* McDowell, according to Putnam it is not sensation that is conceptualized, and a tribunal: it is apperception, and apperception is for Putnam *recognition of what one is perceiving*. It is apperception that is epistemologically basic—it is involved in justification and does not simply consist of beliefs; apperceptions are 'conceptually shaped and can justify judgements'. Putnam's point may also be put by saying that much of what McDowell says in *Mind and World* is exactly right about *apperceptions*, but not about perception in general.

Recent philosophy of perception has focused on articulating the relations between the intentionality and the phenomenology of perceptual experience. Elijah Chudnoff, in "*Presentational Phenomenology*", addresses the importance of presentation or immediacy for consciousness, for various ways of being aware. His starting point is the 'presentational phenomenology of experiences', i.e. the felt aspect of experiences, which he thinks is epistemologically significant. In his article, Chudnoff wants to first give a theoretical account of the nature of this presentational phenomenology (the 'scene-immediacy', enjoying, feeling), then to argue that such presentational phenomenology has a central role in explaining why experiences which have it justify beliefs and give us knowledge. Bringing into the discussion, among others, doctrines of Husserl (on *Erfüllung*, being-filled) and Russell (on acquaintance), Chudnoff intends to articulate the sense of presence involved—according to his proposal, presentational phenomenology consists in a correlation between two intentional properties: having a certain intentional content, and making it seem as if one is aware of certain things; also, he argues that presentational phenomenology is significant for thinking not only about perception, intuition and introspection but also about imagination and recollection.

Also Michelle Montague, in "*The Content, Intentionality and Phenomenology of Experience*", looks into the nature of perception. Her problem is the relation between intentionality and phenomenology, or rather, the supposed mutual independence of intentional properties and phenomenological properties of mental states. Montague rejects such independence. She starts her discussion with a maximally inclusive conception of content (according to which the total content of a perceptual experience is everything that is given to one, experientially, in the having of the experience) and analyses three theories according to which there is in fact an intimate relationship between phenomenology and intentionality—'Bretanianism', 'standard representationalism',

and 'Fregeanism'. For brentanianism, one of the things the subject is aware of, is of having the experience. This classic view, going back to Aristotle (the idea being that conscious perceptual awareness involves awareness of awareness, i.e. that part of what we are aware of when we experience something is the experiencing itself) is a central point in Montague's discussion, namely because the two other theories analysed miss it. According to Montague, representationalism, as exemplified by authors such as Michael Tye or Fred Dretske, and fregeanism, as represented by David Chalmers and Brad Thompson, both isolate something essential yet both are phenomenologically inadequate. Basically they do not recognize the awareness of awareness thesis, which she believes is the key for explaining the relation between intentionality and phenomenology of experience.

For Donovan Wishon, again the issue is perceptual experience. In "*Perceptual Acquaintance and informational content*" he defends (contrary to what authors such as John Campbell and Michael Tye assume) that naïve realism and indirect realism are not the only possible views of perceptual experience available. Working within the framework of a Russellian notion of (non-conceptual) perceptual acquaintance, he defends that perceptual experience has a two-faced presentational character. The first 'face' is justified by the informational character of perceptual experience—which he explores by discussing the work of John Perry—the second by the self-presenting character of 'perceptual signals'. Thus we have presence of and acquaintance with both external objects and our sensations of them. Once we have that clear, we can, Wishon proposes, be direct realists about the content of perceptual experience and internalists about the qualitative character of experience. An adequate account of Russellian perceptual acquaitance is thus, for Wishon, the way to avoid 'problematic theories of perception such as naïve realism, disjunctivism and indirect realism'.

In "*Personal-Level Representation*" Uriah Kriegel argues, recruiting the personal–sub personal distinction put forward by Dennett, against what he calls 'the current orthodoxy on mental representation', which he characterizes by means of an ontological tenet (mental representation is a two place relation between representing state and represented entity), a semantic tenet (such relation is basically information-theoretic), and a methodological tenet (representations are posited on third-person explanatory grounds). Starting from an extensive and detailed discussion of Fred Dretske's information-theoretic (and teleosemantic) theory of mental representation, which he thinks is the 'most elegant' and 'most plausible', Kriegel's main contention is that the picture of mental representation which emerges from this is satisfactory for the

sub-personal level only, and that a theory of representation which leaves us empty handed where it concerns personal level representation (i.e. representation proper), is indeed not, properly speaking, a theory of representation. He finally defends that a suitable conception of personal-level representation would have to start from alternatives to each one of the three ideas above, conceiving of personal level representation as a three place and not a two place relation (x represents y to z); acknowledging that the prospects for accounting for the representing-to component in information-theoretic terms are unpromising and making room, methodologically, for first-person experience and not just for states and processes posited on theoretical, third-personal, grounds. The contrast between these two ways of seeing the nature of representation has, Kriegel believes, a wider significance for philosophy of mind.

In "*While Under the Influence*" Charles Travis aims at outlining a Fregean approach to the nature of subjectivity by investigating belief and in particular some shapes believing cannot take, such as the belief 'P and I do not believe that P' (what he calls 'Moore's anomaly' and uses, in his article, as his way into 'the inner world'). In Travis's terms, believing is' being under the influence' of the way things are, submitting to it. It is also enjoying a 'special sort of access to oneself', a 'way of standing towards oneself'. This is the case not only in plain believing that p but also in the case of believing oneself to believe something (i.e. when I encounter my own believing that P). In order to account for Moore's anomaly Travis suggests that we need to consider belief as an attitude held with a certain *force*; it is such force that in 'normal' cases fills the space between *representing things as being a certain way* (they do not have to be that way) and *representing things to be* that way. In Moore's cases nothing fills the space. In the case of our encountering our own beliefs that P Travis also analyses 'pyrrhonian attitudes', i.e. attitudes towards what might be objects of belief—holding them is for me to see myself as occupying a certain position towards things which is believing that P. Travis examines the role and importance of such pyrrhonian attitudes in our mental lives as believers, namely the gaps and productivity associated with them, which he thinks are due to our being 'too close to oneself to be able to judge', a position comparable to the one we are in in regard to fregean *Vorstellungen*. According to Travis, such could be the status of imaginings and seeings-as, i.e. experiences that are not neatly either receptive or spontaneous. The whole article in fact amounts to a conception of inner experience within Travis' general project of bringing 'Frege's message to the philosophy of mind'.

Part II of the volume, *Subjectivity and the First-Person*, includes, among other

contributions, non-analytic approaches to the nature of subjectivity as well as approaches to *de se* beliefs, that is, beliefs about oneself, and to the nature of first-person as (a) perspective.

   We have been pointing out that one major problem for a naturalized epistemology stance is that the epistemological third-person focus risks leaving out, or even rendering impossible, an adequate understanding of consciousness and subjectivity. If we look back in time, this was already Husserl's concern, in his critique of 19th century experimental psychology and naturalism. He argued that the mental is not an observable event in the world but *Erlebtes* (lived, experienced), and unified in the monadic unity of consciousness (the phenomenologist's 'mine-ness'). Viewing things this way has led to non-naturalistic analyses of self-consciousness and self-knowledge in contemporary non-analytic philosophy. In his article "*Varieties of Subjectivity*" Manfred Frank defines 'subjectivity' as "the class of mental activities and experiences for which it is essential that they be familiar with themselves" (*vertraut sein mit sich selbst)*. It is neither privacy nor personhood which interest Frank, but rather this general structure, characteristic of all beings capable of mental acts. Self-consciousness and self-knowledge, the two 'varieties of subjectivity' Frank has in mind, are, in the first case, anonymous or non-conceptual self-awareness, and in the second case knowledge of oneself with cognitive content. Taking the perspective of what he calls "the German idealistic-phenomenological tradition" Frank spells out what it is in that tradition that makes it possible to argue that there are quite serious obstacles to the very idea of 'naturalizing' the mental, or subjectivity thus defined. He interprets 'naturalizing' as reduction of mental facts to natural facts, and defends that the reasons that speak against the reducibility of subjectivity concern questions of principle. In his article he tries to show that these apply to both self-consciousness and self-knowledge. He also argues that these two varieties are not specifications of a common kind, even if they share the above mentioned characteristic of 'self-familiarity'[44].

   In "*The Problem of Subjectivity: Dieter Henrich's Turn*", Gerhard Preyer analyses Henrich's philosophy of subjectivity, which, he thinks, connects transcendental and *Existenz*-philosophy, and is in harmony with the core idea of his revisionary metaphysics, the idea that subjectivity is not self-grounded. Preyer considers the relation between self-reference (the *pour soi*), which is not a part of the natural world, body (proper) as a whole (*Leib*), free choice and practical self-determination (*Selbstbestimmung*). He thus reconstructs Hen-

---

44   On the structure of subjectivity, see also, M. Frank 2011.

rich's concept of subjectivity as conscious self-reference starting from *primary self-consciousness*, i.e. *immediate* consciousness, which cannot be characterized as an intentional relation. Preyer then argues that self-reference is neither higher-order thought (i.e. a meta-representation of thought), nor a belief (*de dicto* or *de re*) about oneself (here he agrees with M. Frank and N. Feit) but self-acquaintance. He also discusses Henrich's analysis of freedom and its limitation by the principle of consequence. This leads him to a system-theoretical redescription of subjectivity as relation between *Existenz,* characterized by self-transcendence, and the decision of self-determination, caused by states of exception. Ultimately, this provides a different perspective on subjectivity, one which focuses on the relation between *self-acquaintance* and *Existenz*.

David Lewis has asked whether there are attitudes which are not attitudes towards propositions[45], and set out to explore connections between *de se*, *de dicto* and *de re* beliefs. This is a territory also explored by people such as Hector-Neri Castañeda[46] or John Perry[47], a territory where one central problem is the contrast between beliefs about oneself one expresses using the first-person pronoun ('I live on the highest mountain') and beliefs in which a thinker thinks of himself, maybe unknowingly, the way he normally thinks about someone else ('The old man lives on the highest mountain'). The contrast makes all the difference for what one is licensed to infer: think of the situation where I know that I live on the highest mountain and I know that Cato lives on the highest mountain yet I do not know that I am Cato. It is a feature of *de se* attributions that the thinker's certainty is somehow tied to the *I*-perspective and cannot be substituted, logically, for example, by a definite description. When I believe something about myself I do not have to characterize myself by means of descriptions, as is the case in third-person attitudes; also I may have doubts about my picture in the mirror, or about propositions concerning my environment, yet I could not doubt that I myself am in a certain state[48].

In "*Self-Ascription and Self-Awareness*" Neil Feit deals with the cognitive attitudes expressed with 'I' and their place within the realm of attitudes by recruiting the property theory of mental content developed by Lewis, Chisholm and himself. In contrast with standard accounts of content of attitudes, according to which such contents are propositions, people like Lewis and Chisholm defended that contents of beliefs are not propositions but proper-

---

45   D. Lewis 1979: pp. 513-43.
46   For a critique of Lewis see Castañeda 1987: pp. 405-50.
47   J. Perry 1979: pp. 3-21.
48   Chisholm 1981.

ties. Thus, according to the property theory of mental content, the belief relation is 'the necessarily reflexive relation of self-ascribing a property'. To believe something—whether it is a belief *de se* or not—is to self-ascribe a property. Feit wants to use this conception as the beggining of a solution to the problem of *de se* beliefs, that is, beliefs about oneself, thus addressing the difficulty of specifying the content of such beliefs. To use one of Feit's own examples, this should make it possible to deal, unlike standard accounts of content of beliefs, with cases such as this one: Valerie could believe Valerie is a spy without believing that she herself is a spy, if she fails to realize that she is Valerie. One of the advantages of the view is that what makes the attitude *de se* is built into the attitude itself, so there is no need to postulate extra baggage such as a 'self-concept'. In his article Feit then proceeds to answer several objections to the view, regarding its possible incoherence, such as the cases of animals and children, and of belief systems of people who deny the existence of the self. Finally, he accounts for immunity to error through misidentification from the perspective of the property theory of mental content defended.

In spite of the different background of the authors, the articles of Frank, Preyer, and Feit converge in one point: the idea that unmediated self-reference is a fundamental feature of consciousness; attributes of consciousness exemplified by me are given to me immediately, I do not come to know, by some attribution, that they apply to me. Self-knowledge is thus not knowledge of a classification of an entity; someone who ascribes attributes of consciousness to himself has something like a pre-attributive knowledge.

In "*First Person is not just a perspective—thought, reality and the limits of interpretation*" French philosopher and phenomenologist Jocelyn Benoist tackles those that are for him the two cornerstones of an account of mind: the irreducibility of the point of view of first person and the genuineness of acquaintance with the world. One main point of the article is that the assimetry between first and third person is stronger than any mere perspectivism might allow for. The real question is whether consciousness and subjectivity could ever be accounted for from the outside. Benoist proceeds with the pretext of an analysis of Robert B. Brandom's proposal in *Making It Explicit* of doing exactly that: reconstituting intentionality from the viewpoint of the third person in terms of perspectives. It is, in particular, Brandom's recovery of the notion of intentionality *de re* that Benoist thinks misses something in a way which is illuminating. Brandom's idea is that the representational dimension of propositional content of thought and talk is conferred by a social dimension—which ultimately means that representation as such works as an ascriptional device. For Benoist the very legitimacy of such an exclusive

viewpoint of interpretation in philosophy of mind is highly questionable. Finally, Benoist compares Brandom's approach with that of McDowell, which involves, by contrast, according to him, the 'substantial recognition of the first person' and its irreducibility.

In his article "*First-Person Perspective and Immunity to Error through Misidentification*" Shaun Gallagher deals with a possible line of objection to the principle of immunity to error through misidentification (IEM), a principle which one might think should apply without exception to ways of referring to, or experiencing, oneself. He explores problematic cases of self-identification in psychiatry, neurology and cognitive science which make us think that it is indeed possible to mistakenly identify a body (or body parts, or thoughts, or actions) other than my own as being mine, or being me, or not be able to identify my body (or body parts, or thoughts, or actions) as being mine. Two such cases are somatoparaphrenia (i.e. cases of patients who deny the ownership of their own limbs in spite of feeling them) and the Rubber Hand illusion (illusory feeling of ownership of a hand that is not one's own). Gallagher focuses on the senses of self-agency and self-ownership, analyses and distinguishes them, specifies what makes for each, thus separating components of the phenomenologists sense of 'mine-ness' built into every experience. Finally, Gallagher proposes that we should keep the formulation of IEM (which, he thinks, stands) as independent as possible from particular modes of access to self-experience—the reason is that the aspect of experiences which remains self-specific and retains the characteristics of IEM is first-person perspective only.

From the phenomenological tradition but also from an author like William James, we get a *Leitmotiv* in thinking about consciousness and subjectivity: the 'mine-ness' of the flow of consciousness. Yet what is this mine-ness? Is it identifiable with self-awareness at a personal level of a fully conscious human, or does it, as it were, go 'deeper', being present at more impersonal levels? Thor Grünbaum's article "*First Person Thinking and Minimal Self-Consciousness*" focuses on minimal self-consciousness, which is not a person's being aware of herself, but an aspect of sensations, perceptions, and propositional attitudes which does not require conceptual abilites or attention. Unlike many philosophers who accept minimal self-consciousness, Grünbaum does not think that a theory of minimal self-consciousness is a conceptual truth, and thus sets out to argue for it, puting forward an argument by elimination. Throughout the article he contrasts an anonymity theory of the mineness of experience, which he argues is false, with the minimal self-awareness theory, which he defends. According to the anonymity theory, conscious experience is im-

personal, according to minimal self-awareness theory, conscious experience entails minimal self-awareness. One further and central problem Grünbaum deals with in the article is the problem of explaining first person self-reference in thinking—Grünbaum argues that anonymity theory 'falls short of supplying us with a convincing account' and only minimal self-awareness theory meets the challenge. Without claiming that phenomenal consciousness is a sort of reference-fixing self-knowledge, Grünbaum claims that first-person reference in thinking is indeed grounded on phenomenal consciousness; he then appeals to the understanding experience to describe how that can be.

For a number of years, the Theory of Mind paradigm has framed debates on social cognition. Within Theory of Mind, "mindreading" or "mentalizing"—the ability to attribute mental states to others, and in so doing attributing intentions and interpreting behavior—is said to be at the basis of social understanding. A related supposition is that the mind is localized inside the head, directly available only to the introspecting individual. Accordingly, various mindreading mechanisms, imaginative simulations, or subpersonal neural simulations have been proposed that purportedly allow us to represent what is happening in the minds of others and understand their thoughts and intentions. In their article "*Seeing Subjectivity: defending a Perceptual Account of Other Minds*" Joel Krueger and Søren Overgaard argue that the perception of others remains ambiguous at a crucial juncture and thus requires further clarification if it is to explain how it is we gain epistemic access to the minds of others. This ambiguity lies in the way the term "expression" tends to be deployed in describing how another's gestures, facial expressions, and behavior can be expressive of their (purportedly) "inner" mental life. Krueger and Overgaard take "expression" in a constitutive sense as the idea that certain bodily actions (and perhaps certain body-related traits) are expressive of mental phenomena in that they actually *constitute* proper parts of some mental phenomena. They straddle both internal (that is, neural) and external (that is, extra-neural, gross bodily, environmental) operations, and are thus available for perception by others. Put this way, their claim is clearly a version of the extended mind thesis. In addition to developing several lines of argument, they draw upon empirical research from, among other sources, gesture studies and developmental psychology, to support the claim. From their point of view a constitutive reading of "expression" helps clarify the epistemic function of bodily actions in giving us direct perceptual access to (parts of) the minds of others.

Finally, in their article "*The Paradoxes of Subjectivity and the Projective Structure*

of Consciousness", David Rudrauf, Kenneth Williford and Gregory Landini address the paradoxes of subjectivity (i.e. aspects they take to be difficult to model), namely the elusiveness of the subject ('that to which the world appears') and the subject–object, observer-observed, duality within the unity of consciousness. The model they offer of the 'projective structure of consciousness', which is a projective geometry model, attempts to account for phenomenological descriptions by means of a mathematical framework.

Phenomenologically, they believe, subjectivity of consciousness should be understood as for-me-ness, facet-less self-givenness, awareness of itself prior to reflection, synchronic and diachronic unity, and reflective structure, among other characteristics. Some questions such descriptions raise concern the nature of the 'subject-pole' and of the 'hidden depths' lying behind it. The authors believe such questions can be addressed by means of appealing to the topological structure of a projected phenomenal space; for instance the elusiveness of the subject-pole, or 'Cartesian spectator', can be accounted for by the fact that the geometric origin of the three-dimensional phenomenal space has to be excluded from the projective space for its construction. Throughout the article, many classic phenomenological concepts such as self-givenness, noetico-noematic structure, and adumbrations (*Abschattungen*) are recovered within the mathematic model, all finding their place in the authors' view of the projective structure of consciousness.

In this book we have brought together authors with very different backgrounds, and working in contemporary philosophy within very different philosophical frameworks, from philosophy of cognitive science to the German phenomenological-idealistic tradition; we are very happy with that. One thing those different contexts have in common is that they give rise to analyses of consciousness and subjectivity. Together, the authors have put to work in such analyses a panoply of instruments which analytic and continental philosophy have developed, from phenomenology's self-givenness and awareness of itself prior to reflection, to idealist tradition idea of 'familiarity of mental states with themselves' and focus on relations between *Selbstbewusstsein* (self-consciousness), and *Selbstbestimmung* (self-determination), to Russellian acquaintance, Wittgenstein's subjective and objective uses of 'I', Moore's paradox, immunity to error through misidentification, *de se* beliefs, sense of agency, sense of ownership, to the sufficiency or lack of sufficiency of the interpretational stance in the theory of mind for authors such as McDowell and Brandom. We hope the different approaches will make for interesting comparative reading. Such is this book's contribution to our initial plan. We also hope thus to remove some of the blindspots which worried us at the

start, some of which, at least, had to do with the very absence of exchange between traditions in contemporary philosophy.

The *Consciousness and Subjectivity* project was initiated in 2008 and planned by Sofia Miguens (University of Porto, Department of Philosophy and Institute of Philosophy, Mind Language and Action Group, MLAG, Portugal) and Gerhard Preyer (ProtoSociology, Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main, Germany).[49]

Porto—Frankfurt am Main 2011

References

Austin, J. L. 1962. *Sense and Sensibilia*, Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Baars, B. 1988. *A Cognitive Theory of Consciousness*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Benoist, J. 2001. *L'idée de phénoménologie*. Paris, Beauchesne.

Byrne, A. & Logue, H. 2009. *Disjunctivism. Contemporary Readings.* Cambrige MA, MIT Press.

Castañeda, H.N. 1966. 'He': A study on the Logic of Self-Consciousness. *Ratio* 7: 130–157.

Chalmers, D. 1996. *The Conscious Mind. In Search of a Fundamental Theory*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Chisholm, R. 1981. *The First Person. An Essay on Reference and Intentionality*. Brighton 1981.

Damásio, A. 1992. The Selfless Consciousness, *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 15: pp. 208-209.

—. 1999. *The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion on the Making of Consciousness.* New York, Harcourt Brace.

—. 2010. *Self Comes to Mind—Constructing the Conscious Brain*. London, Random House.

Davidson, D. 2001. *Subjective, Intersubjective, Objective.* Oxford, Oxford University Press

—. 2001. The Myth of the Subjective. In Davidson 2001: pp. 39-52.

Dennett, D. 1981 [1978]. *Brainstorms—Philosophical Essays on Mind and Psychology.* Cambridge MA, MIT Press

—. 1978b. Towards a Cognitive Theory of Consciousness. In *Brainstorms.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 149–173.

—. 1991. *Consciousness Explained*. Boston, Little Brown.

49 This may be followed in the webpage of the project at the University of Porto, Portugal, at http://mlag.up.pt and Protosociology An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Project www.protosociology.de, www.gesellschaftswissenschaften.uni-frankfurt.de/gpreyer

—. 1998. *Brainchildren—Essays on Designing Minds,* London, Penguin

—. 1998a. Animal Consciousness. In *Brainchildren*. London: Penguin.

Dretske, F. 1997. Conscious Experience. In *Mind* 102, 406 (April): pp 263–283.

Evans, G. 1982. *Varieties of Reference.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Frank, M. 2011. *Ansichten der Subjektivität*. Frankfurt a. M.

Henrich, D. 2003. *Between Kant and Hegel—Lectures on German Idealism*. Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press.

—. 2003a. From Kant to Hegel. In Henrich 2003.

—. (forthcoming). Stages of a Friendship.

Jackson, F. 1990. Epiphenomenal Qualia (1982). In W. Lycan, *Mind and Cognition—a Reader.* Oxford, Blackwell: pp. 469–477.

Kripke, S. 1980. *Naming and Necessity*. Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press.

Lewis, D. 1979. Attitudes *de Dicto* and *De Se*. In *Philosophical Review* 88: pp. 513–43.

Lepore E. and K. Ludwig 2005. *Donald Davidson—Meaning, Truth , Language and Reality*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Martin, M. G. F. 1998. An eye directed outward. In Wright, C., Smith, B. & McDonald, C., *Knowing Our Own Minds*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

—. 2006. On being alienated. In T. Szabo Gendler & J. Hawthorne, *Perceptual Experience*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

—. 2009a. The reality of appearances. In Byrne, A. & Logue, H, 2009, *Disjunctivism—Contemporary Readings*. Cambrige MA, MIT Press.

—. 2009b. The limits of self-awareness. In Byrne, A. & Logue, H.: pp. 271–317

McDowell, John, 2009, Criteria, Defeasability and Knowledge. In Byrne & Logue (abridged version; full version in McDowell 1998, *Meaning, Knowledge and Reality,* Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, as Essay 17; article originally published in 1982).

—. 2009a. *Having the World in View*. Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press.

—. 2009b. Avoiding the Myth of the Given. In McDowell 2009.

Miguens, S. 2002. *Uma Teoria Fisicalista do Conteúdo e da Consciência—D. Dennett e os debates da filosofia da mente.* Porto, Campo das Letras.

—. 2008. *Será que a minha mente está dentro da minha cabeça? Da ciência cognitiva à filosofia.* Porto, Campo das Letras.

—. 2008a. Subjectividade, Intersubjectividade e Linguagem natural—a partir de D. Davidson. In Miguens 2008

Pacini, David S. 2003. Foreword: Remembrance Through Disenchantment. In D. Pacini ed., Dieter Henrich, *Between Kant and Hegel—Lectures on German Idealism*. Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 2003.

Perry, J. 1979. The Problem of the Essential Indexical. In *Nous* 23: pp. 3–21.

Preyer, G. 2011. *Donald Davidson's Philosophy—From Radical Interpretation to Radical Contextualism.* Frankfurt am Main, Humanities Online.

—. 2011a. On the Externalism of Triangulation. In M. C. Amoretti & G. Preyer eds., *Triangulation. From an Epistemological Point of View*. Frankfurt a. M., Ontos Verlag.

Putnam, H. 1994. Sense, non sense and the senses, *The Journal of Philosophy* 91 (September), n.9: pp. 445–517.

—. 1994. *The Threefold Cord*. New York, Columbia University Press.

Rosenthal, D. 1997. A Theory of Consciousness. In Block, Flanagan & Guzeldere, *The Nature of Consciousness—Philosophical Debates*. Cambridge MA, MIT Press.

Shoemaker, S. 1968. Self-reference and self-awareness, *Journal of Philosophy* 65: 555–567.

Wittgenstein, L. 1953. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Wittgenstein, L. 1958. *The Blue and Brown Books*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Part I
Consciousness and Experience