



ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 30, 2013

Concepts –
Contemporary and Historical Perspectives

www.protosociology.de

© 2013 Gerhard Preyer
Frankfurt am Main
<http://www.protosociology.de>
peter@protosociology.de

Erste Auflage / first published 2013
ISSN 1611-1281

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung der Zeitschrift und seines Herausgebers unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeisung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of ProtoSociology.

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 30, 2013

Concepts—Contemporary and Historical Perspectives

CONTENTS

CONCEPTS, SENSE, AND ONTOLOGY

- What Happened to the Sense of a Concept-Word? 6
Carlo Penco
- Sense, Mentalese, and Ontology 29
Jacob Beck
- Concepts Within the Model of Triangulation 49
Maria Cristina Amoretti
- A Critique of David Chalmers' and Frank Jackson's Account of
Concepts 64
Ingo Brigandt
- The Influence of Language on Conceptualization: Three Views 89
Agustin Vicente, Fernando Martinez-Manrique

REPRESENTATIONS, CONTENTS, AND BRAIN

- Views of Concepts and of Philosophy of Mind—
from Representationalism to Contextualism 108
Sofia Miguens
- Changes in View: Concepts in Experience 124
Richard Manning
- Concepts and Fat Plants: Non-Classical Categories, Typicality Effects,
Ecological Constraints 152
Marcello Frixione

Concepts in the Brain: Neuroscience, Embodiment, and Categorization.....	167
<i>Joseph B. McCaffrey</i>	

RECALLING HISTORY:

DESCARTES, HUME, REID, KANT, OCKHAM

Conceptual Distinctions and the Concept of Substance in Descartes.....	192
<i>Alan Nelson</i>	
The Concept of Body in Hume's Treatise.....	206
<i>Miren Boehm</i>	
Conceiving without Concepts: Reid vs. The Way of Ideas	221
<i>Lewis Powell</i>	
Why the "Concept" of Spaces is not a Concept for Kant.....	238
<i>Thomas Vinci</i>	
Ockham on Concepts of Beings	251
<i>Sonja Schierbaum</i>	

ON CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY

PARADOXES IN PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY

Note on Zeno's Dichotomy	269
<i>I. M. R. Pinheiro</i>	
The Epigenic Paradox within Social Development	281
<i>Robert Kowalski</i>	
Contributors	308
Impressum	310
On ProtoSociology.....	311
Published Volumes	312
Digital Volumes available	317
Bookpublications of the Project.....	318

SENSE, MENTALESE, AND ONTOLOGY

Jacob Beck

Abstract

Modes of presentation are often posited to accommodate Frege's puzzle. Philosophers differ, however, in whether they follow Frege in identifying modes of presentation with Fregean senses, or instead take them to be formally individuated symbols of "Mentalese". Building on Fodor (1990; 1998), Margolis and Laurence (2007) defend the latter view by arguing that the mind-independence of Fregean senses renders them ontologically suspect in a way that Mentalese symbols are not. This paper shows how Fregeans can withstand this objection. Along the way, a clearer understanding emerges of what senses must be to serve as an ontologically benign alternative to symbols of Mentalese.

When Woodward and Bernstein published details of the Watergate scandal in *The Washington Post*, they called their source "Deep Throat". Upon learning of the leak, Richard Nixon surmised that Deep Throat was a traitor from within his administration. However, Nixon did not suspect that his Deputy Director of the FBI, Mark Felt, was the traitor. In fact, Nixon sent Felt a bottle of champagne several years later when he was pardoned by Ronald Reagan for authorizing illegal searches of the homes of members of the Weather Underground. Obviously, Nixon would never have intentionally done the same for Deep Throat. But Nixon didn't know that Mark Felt was Deep Throat, and neither did the public until 2005, eleven years after Nixon passed away.

Explaining Nixon's propositional attitudes requires an appeal to *modes of presentation*, which stand in a many-to-one relation to their referents. Deep Throat *was* Mark Felt, but Nixon had two modes of presentation of him. That's why Nixon was able to rationally believe both that Deep Throat is a traitor and that Mark Felt is not a traitor. This much I take to be fairly uncontroversial. The *nature* of these modes of presentation, however, is more contentious.

The traditional view traces to Frege (1892; 1918) and is systematically developed by such thinkers as Dummett (1981), Evans (1982), Peacocke (1992), and Burge (2005). It identifies modes of presentation with *senses*, abstract semantic entities that serve as the constituents of the contents of propositional attitudes, which Frege calls "thoughts" (*Gedanken*). Because thoughts are composed from senses, and the senses *Mark Felt* and *Deep Throat* are distinct, the thoughts *Mark Felt is a traitor* and *Deep Throat is a traitor* are also distinct. It was thus

possible for Nixon to rationally bear the believing relation towards the latter thought but not the former.

Recently, an alternative to the Fregean view has been developed by Fodor (1990; 1994; 1998; 2008) and others (e.g., Margolis and Laurence 2007; Schneider 2005, 2011; Rupert 2008) that seeks to banish senses in favor of *non-semantic* modes of presentation. Drawing on the language of thought hypothesis, this alternative accounts for propositional attitudes in terms of two components: referential contents that consist of objects, properties, and relations; and fine-grained, formally individuated symbols of “Mentalese” that are tokened in the brain. According to this alternative, there was no difference in the *contents* of Nixon’s representations of Mark Felt and Deep Throat; there was only a difference in the *vehicles* of those representations. Nixon had two co-extensive, yet formally distinct Mentalese symbols, MARK FELT and DEEP THROAT, which is why he was able to believe that Deep Throat is a traitor without believing that Mark Felt is a traitor.

A number of considerations have motivated this reductivist program (*reductivist* because it seeks to *reduce* modes of presentation to non-semantic entities). Here I want to focus on just one of them. Building on some remarks by Fodor (1990, 12–13; 1998, 17–21), Margolis and Laurence (2007) argue that senses are ontologically suspect in a way that Mentalese symbols are not. As they see it, the fact that senses are supposed to be mind-independent abstract semantic entities makes it difficult to see how thinkers could be related to them. While Fregeans often claim that thinkers “grasp” senses, Margolis and Laurence worry that there are no plausible accounts of what the grasping relation could be. By contrast, because Mentalese symbols exist as tokens in thinkers’ brains, they maintain that there is no corresponding problem about how thinkers are related to Mentalese symbols. Thus, Margolis and Laurence conclude that senses are unsuitable to serve as modes of presentation.

Off hand, one might have supposed that the question whether modes of presentation are semantic or non-semantic should be answered on broadly empirical grounds, such as whether scientific psychology provides evidence of successful fine-grained explanations of behavior that are couched exclusively in terms of formal, non-semantic representations. If Margolis and Laurence are right, however, then the question can be answered on a priori metaphysical grounds. Psychology needs Mentalese symbols to serve as modes of presentation to make its ontology acceptable.

This would be a truly radical conclusion—and thus one that deserves a correspondingly intense level of scrutiny. I’ll begin in Section 1 by reviewing Margolis and Laurence’s worry that the mind-independence of senses makes it

mysterious how thinkers could grasp them. In Section 2 I'll then sharpen this worry by distinguishing several different types of mind-independence. This will lead, at the start of Section 3, to a clearer formulation of Margolis and Laurence's ontological worry about senses. In the remainder of Section 3 I will then criticize this worry, arguing that Fregeans have the resources to withstand it. Whether modes of presentation consist of Fregean senses or Mentalese symbols is thus not to be decided on ontological grounds. In the course of the discussion, two conceptions of sense will emerge: one that treats senses as abstract particulars and another that treats them as universals. In Section 4, I will argue that there are good reasons to favor the conception of senses as universals. The upshot will be a clearer understanding of what senses must be to serve as an ontologically benign alternative to symbols of Mentalese.

I. The Ontological Worry

Frege famously maintained that senses are abstract objects existing in neither the physical realm of “things” nor in the mental realm of “ideas” (*Vorstellungen*), but in a “third realm” that is reminiscent of Plato's heaven (e.g. Frege 1918, 337). Many commentators find this talk of a third realm discomfiting. How could there be these things, senses, which exist outside of space and time, in neither the mind nor the physical world? If we admit the existence of senses, aren't we committed to eerie entities?

It is important, however, to be clear about the precise nature of this worry, for we do not want to hold senses to a higher standard than we hold other abstract objects posited by scientists. As Fodor queries, “if physicists have numbers to play with, why shouldn't psychologists have propositions” (1990, 12)? In other words, if there is a serious problem about where to fit senses in the natural order, it does not plausibly stem from—and Margolis and Laurence do not view it as stemming from—a blanket nominalism that rejects the existence of any abstract objects whatsoever.

In fact, the commitment to abstract objects is closer to home than reductivists typically acknowledge. First, since reductivists usually individuate token Mentalese symbols by the formal types to which they belong, they are apparently committed to types. While a nominalist reductivist might try to identify such types with sets of their actual tokens, this response faces a serious obstacle. How are reductivists to explain the fact that there are concepts humans will never acquire—for example, because of their cognitive limitations, or because

human life will come to an end before humans have realized their full cognitive potential (Peacocke 2005, 169)? The obvious suggestion, endorsed by Margolis and Laurence (2007, 568), is to appeal to *uninstantiated* Mentalese symbol types. Margolis and Laurence thus embrace a form of Platonism, claiming that there is “no more reason to think that every mental representation type must be instantiated than there is to suppose that every property must be instantiated” (2007, 589, n. 12).¹

Second, although reductivists deny that Mentalese symbols have senses as their contents, they do not deny that Mentalese symbols have contents. They just construe these contents in a Russellian manner, taking them to consist of objects, properties, and relations. Thus, the Mentalese symbol RED refers to the property *red*. Notice, however, that properties are often conceived as abstract objects. While a nominalist reductivist might try to dispense with such abstract entities by identifying properties with their instances, reductivists such as Fodor (1990) invoke uninstantiated properties to capture the contents of our thoughts about non-existents such as phlogiston and tooth fairies.²

What, then, is the ontological problem with senses? According to Fodor, “A more plausible scruple—one I am inclined to take seriously—objects to unreduced *epistemic* relations like *grasping* propositions” (1990, 13). Margolis and Laurence elaborate that the ontological problem with senses stems not from nominalism, but from “the fact that senses are mind-independent entities that are supposed to stand apart from us, like numbers or Platonic forms” (2007, 580). In their view, this mind-independence gives rise to the problem of how people can stand in an appropriate relation to senses in order for those senses to be explanatorily relevant to their behavior. As Fregeans understand it, a person who believes that Albert is friendly has to *grasp* the senses *Albert* and *is friendly*. But this grasping relation can appear mystifying. As Margolis and Laurence write,

Clearly, *grasping* is a metaphor for a cognitive relation that needs to be explained. The problem is that it is hard to see how this can be done in a way that is consistent with the view that senses are abstract objects. Notice that the relation can't be causal, since senses, as abstract particulars, are supposed to

- 1 A nominalist reductivist might part ways with Margolis and Laurence here by appealing to possible but non-actual tokens. This would commit her to modal properties, but arguably not types. My point, however, is not that there is no way for a nominalist about Mentalese symbols to coherently maintain her nominalism, but that nominalism is not motivating the ontological worries of reductivists such as Margolis and Laurence.
- 2 Again, a die-hard nominalist might appeal to possible yet non-actual property-instances. But my point, again, is simply that nominalism is not motivating the ontological worries of Fodor or Margolis and Laurence.

fall outside the realm of physical causes and effects. But if it's not causal, the nature of the relation remains utterly mysterious. (2007, 580)

I think that Margolis and Laurence are motivated by something like the following picture. They allow that there can be these abstract objects, senses, which exist off in Plato's heaven. But they don't see how a person, who is located in the causal order of space and time, could be related to those objects. How could Joe, who's seated over here at the bar stool, be related to Plato's heaven?

It is worth considering why the same problem does not arise for the abstract objects reductivists invoke—Mentalese symbol types and properties. For Mentalese symbol types, the answer is straightforward. A thinker is cognitively related to a Mentalese symbol type by virtue of tokening that type. Just as the English word "red" can be tokened on the page, the Mentalese expression RED can be tokened in the brain. In each case the token will be located in space and time, though whereas a token of the word "red" might consist of an arrangement of ink markings, a token of the Mentalese symbol RED might consist of a pattern of neural firings.

While the question of how Mentalese symbols are related to their referents is more controversial, reductivists typically appeal to some type of lawful causal relation. Roughly: the Mentalese symbol DOG represents the property *dog* if dogs reliably cause the symbol DOG to be tokened.³ For reductivists, the symbol-referent relation is thus no more mysterious than the relation that exists between any two causally related entities.

If the relation between a thinker and a sense were at bottom a causal relation as reductivists take the relation between a Mentalese symbol and its referent to be, there would be no ontological worry about how thinkers could be related to them. Nor would there be any concern if senses were like Mentalese symbols in admitting of a type-token relation. The worry exercising Margolis and Laurence is that thinkers are not related to senses in either of these ways. The "grasping" relation that thinkers are alleged to stand in towards senses thus remains "utterly mysterious".

Following Fodor (1998, 17–21), Margolis and Laurence isolate a consequence of the failure to explicate the grasping relation. They argue that Fregeans haven't

3 This is an oversimplification because of the disjunction problem. See Fodor's (1990) asymmetric dependence theory for one influential attempt to deal with that problem. I will assume, for the sake of argument, that something like Fodor's asymmetric dependence theory can be made to work, and thus that reductivists really can provide a satisfactory account of the symbol-referent relation in broadly causal terms. This assumption has been widely, and forcefully, challenged. I propose to ignore this challenge, however, since the question of how thinkers are related to senses deserves attention even if reductivists have underestimated the difficulty of answering the parallel question of how thinkers are related to referents.

explained *how* senses can solve “the mode of presentation problem”—i.e., Frege’s puzzle of how thinkers can represent the same referent in different ways. They put this worry as follows.

Senses, like most referents, are external to our minds, and because of this it’s hard to see why we shouldn’t be able to stand in different cognitive/epistemic relations towards them as well (Fodor 1998). Just as we can have different modes of presentation for a number (the only even prime, the sum of one and one, Tim’s favorite number, etc.), we ought to be able to have different modes of presentation *for a given sense*. Or if we can’t, then there ought to be a reason why we can’t. But as Fodor points out, there doesn’t appear to be any reason why senses themselves don’t generate the mode of presentation problem. (2007, 581)

Margolis and Laurence thus place a condition of adequacy on any demystifying explanation of the grasping relation: it needs to explain why there is only one way to grasp each sense.

Again, a comparison is helpful. For reductivists, symbols of Mentalese serve as modes of presentation. Just as the English names “Mark Felt” and “Deep Throat” can have the same referent, so too can the Mentalese symbols MARK FELT and DEEP THROAT. Because thinkers “grasp” Mentalese symbols by tokening them, the worry that there might be different ways of grasping a mode of presentation never arises for the reductivist. For any given thinker and any given Mentalese symbol type, the thinker either tokens that symbol type or doesn’t. What proponents of senses thus seem to be missing is an account of what grasping could be that would make it as obvious why senses are grasped in only one way; and Margolis and Laurence worry that the mind-independence of senses makes it difficult to see what such an account could look like.

2. Varieties of Mind-Independence

As we have seen, Margolis and Laurence worry that the mind-independence of senses makes it difficult to explain the grasping relation, and (as a corollary) why senses can be grasped in only one way. In this section, I want to get clearer about the nature of this worry by teasing apart several different notions of mind-independence, and considering which, if any, are uniquely problematic for senses. The result will be a better understanding of the worry that is motivating Margolis and Laurence—and of the steps Fregeans might take to address it.

2.1. *Epistemic Mind-Independence*

Let us say that X is *epistemically mind-independent* just in case it is possible for more than one mind to be epistemically related to X . Thus, the weather, the laws of physics, and mathematical theorems are all epistemically mind-independent since more than one person can know about them. Conversely, many philosophers hold that sensations are not epistemically mind-independent since each person's sensations are private. You may *assume* that the sensation I experience when I call something "red" is the same as the sensation you experience, but you cannot *know* that the two sensations are the same since you really only know what your own sensations are like.

Frege clearly maintains that most senses are epistemically mind-independent, taking care to contrast them with ideas (roughly: mental images), which he views as accessible by only one mind (e.g., 1892, 154–55; 1918, 334–37).⁴ Thus, while Nixon and Agnew might not share any sensations, they can both grasp the thought that Deep Throat is a traitor. This observation does not take us very far towards understanding the mind-independence of senses, however, since almost everything is epistemically mind-independent, including Mentalese symbols. According to reductivists, I can learn about your Mentalese symbols through the standard tricks of the cognitive science trade, such as reaction time studies and brain scans. Epistemic mind-independence thus fails to distinguish senses from Mentalese symbols, and so cannot be what makes senses uniquely problematic.

2.2. *Causal Mind-Independence*

Another type of mind-independence is causal, where X is *causally mind-independent* just in case X cannot enter into causal relations with anything mental. Because senses are abstract objects, and thus not located in the causal framework of space or time, it is uncontroversial that they are causally mind-independent. Notice, however, that this fails to distinguish senses from Mentalese symbol *types*, which are likewise abstract and causally impotent. The causal mind-independence of senses thus cannot be what makes them uniquely problematic either.

4 *De se* senses are an important exception. Frege (1918) maintains that each thinker has a unique way of thinking about herself that is unavailable to anyone else.

2.3. Analytic Mind-Independence

A much stronger type of mind-independence is analytic, where X is *analytically mind-independent* just in case our best analysis of X —i.e., our best characterization of X 's nature—does not appeal to anything mental. Putting idealism to one side, purely physical entities such as rocks, trees, and gravity are thus analytically mind-independent. Putting psychologism to one side, mathematical entities such as numbers will also be analytically mind-independent. By contrast, mental states such as sensations and beliefs will not be analytically mind-independent. Nor will artifacts such as hammers and soccer balls that owe their functions to the intentions of minded designers, and nor will Mentalese symbols (considered as tokens or types).

Most Fregeans hold that senses are *not* analytically mind-independent either. As Burge writes of senses, “Their abstract identities are not independent of patterns of activity by thinkers in time” (2005, 58). Our best analysis of what senses are appeals to thinkers and their activities.

While it remains controversial how senses should be fully individuated, one constraint that is axiomatic among Fregeans is Frege's Criterion of Difference (Frege, 1892, 156; Evans, 1982, 18–19; Peacocke, 1992, 2), which holds that two senses, S and T , are distinct if it is possible to rationally believe that ... S ... while withholding endorsement from the thought that ... T ... (where ... T ... differs from ... S ... only in the substitution of T for S at one or more places). Thus, since it is possible to rationally believe that Deep Throat is a traitor without believing that Mark Felt is a traitor, *Deep Throat* and *Mark Felt* are distinct senses. Frege's Criterion of Difference insures that senses are sufficiently fine-grained to serve as modes of presentation. Notice, however, that it appeals to the notions of belief and rationality. In order to individuate senses, it thus makes an essential appeal to the mental states of thinkers.

While Frege's Criterion of Difference individuates senses insofar as it tells us when two senses are distinct, it doesn't tell us how to analyze the nature of individual senses. For example, it tells us that the senses *Deep Throat* and *Mark Felt* are distinct, but it doesn't tell us how the sense *Deep Throat* should be analyzed. Here too, however, the most influential approaches among contemporary Fregeans to analyzing senses appeal to mental activity. For example, according to Peacocke (1992) individual senses are to be analyzed in terms of their “possession conditions”, which state, for any given sense, the transitions in thought that a thinker must find “primitively compelling” in order to grasp the sense. For example, Peacocke holds that grasping the sense

and is a matter of finding the following inferences primitively compelling (1992, 5).⁵

$\frac{P\&Q}{P}$	$\frac{P\&Q}{Q}$	$\frac{P}{Q}$ $\frac{Q}{P\&Q}$
------------------	------------------	-----------------------------------

Whatever the merits of Peacocke’s account, it clearly denies that senses are analytically mind-independent since it analyzes senses in terms of the mental activity of thinkers, such as the *inferences* that thinkers find primitively *compelling*.⁶

Since neither senses nor Mentalese symbol types are analytically mind-independent, we have once again failed to find an ontological difference between them.

2.4. *Ontological Mind-Independence*

Let us say that X is *ontologically mind-independent* just in case X does not depend for its existence on any minds, and thus could exist if there were no minds.⁷ Some ontologically mind-independent entities are physical, such as

- 5 That is, one must find these inferences compelling, and not in virtue of inferring them from other premises.
- 6 To be sure, not everyone denies that Fregean senses are analytically mind-independent. There is a tradition, tracing at least to Kripke (1972), and echoed recently by Stalnaker (2012, 759), of interpreting senses as properties that are expressed by definite descriptions such as “the source that leaked secrets about Watergate to Woodward and Bernstein” or “the first visible body in the night sky”. But neo-Fregeans are almost universally united in rejecting this interpretation (e.g. Dummett 1981, 110–51; Evans 1982, 18; Burge 1979). As they point out, Frege never explicitly endorses it, says things about certain senses (e.g., of the first person) that are flatly incompatible with it, and defends a criterion for individuating senses (the Criterion of Difference) that would seem to count the senses of most singular and predicative concepts as distinct from definite descriptions. Moreover, whatever Frege himself thought, the theories of sense most neo-Fregeans develop are patently not descriptive. Were Margolis and Laurence to appeal to a descriptive theory of sense to argue that senses are analytically mind-independent they would thus be guilty of attacking a straw man.
- 7 One feature of this formulation is that artifacts such as hammers and soccer balls turn out not to be ontologically mind-independent since their existence piggybacks on the intentions of minded designers. This outcome could be avoided by defining ontological mind-independence as a matter of an entity’s not depending on any minds for its *continued* existence. A hammer may depend on a mind for its *initial* existence, but it could survive a nuclear holocaust that wiped out all thinkers. For our purposes, however, the choice between these two formulations is not important.

rocks and trees. But there are also many abstract objects that are plausibly ontologically mind-independent, such as the number two. In fact, even abstract objects that are not analytically mind-independent might be counted as ontologically mind-independent. For example, Platonists maintain that the property of painfulness is ontologically mind-independent because it exists independently of whether it is instantiated.

Once again, we have no basis for distinguishing senses from Mentalese symbol types since both emerge as ontologically mind-independent, at least for Platonists. Senses are ontologically mind-independent since they are abstract objects that are supposed to exist independently of any particular thinker. True thoughts are *discovered*, not invented. Likewise, Platonists will maintain that Mentalese symbol types are ontologically mind-independent because they can exist without being instantiated—and as we have seen, Margolis and Laurence endorse Platonism in order to explain the fact that there are concepts that no one will possess.

2.5. *Strong Ontological Mind-Independence*

Let us say that X is a *universal* just in case X can have instances, and that X is a *particular* only if X is not a universal. We can then say that X is *strongly ontologically mind-independent* just in case (i) X is ontologically mind-independent and (ii) either X is a particular or some instances of X 's are ontologically mind-independent. This category allows us to draw a distinction between two types of ontologically mind-independent abstract objects.

On the one hand, there are abstract universals such as painfulness whose instances are never ontologically mind-independent. Platonists maintain that if there were no minds, painfulness would still exist as a universal and is therefore ontologically mind-independent. But there is little question that without minds there wouldn't be any *instances* of pain, and thus that painfulness is not *strongly* ontologically mind-independent. Likewise, even if Mentalese symbol *types* do not depend on minds for their existence, Mentalese symbol *tokens* surely do. Thus, Mentalese symbol types are not *strongly* ontologically mind-independent either.

On the other hand, there are abstract objects that will count as strongly ontologically mind-independent. First, there are abstract universals such as triangularity, redness, and primeness, whose instances are (at least typically) ontologically mind-independent. Second, and more importantly for our purposes, there are *abstract particulars*—abstract objects that do not have instances. For

example, many philosophers claim that individual numbers are abstract particulars. If that's right, then the number two will count as strongly ontologically mind-independent since it will not be the sort of thing that can be instantiated.

We have come, at last, to what I believe Margolis and Laurence see as the fundamental difference between senses and Mentalese symbol types. Because they take senses to be abstract particulars, Margolis and Laurence conclude that senses are unlike Mentalese symbol types in being strongly ontologically mind-independent. As a result, grasping a sense cannot be a matter of tokening a type or instantiating a property, leaving the grasping relation "utterly mysterious".

3. Defusing the Ontological Worry

3.1. *The Ontological Worry Reformulated*

We can now reconstruct Margolis and Laurence's ontological worry about senses.

- (1) If senses are both causally mind-independent and strongly ontologically mind-independent, the grasping relation that thinkers are alleged to stand in towards senses is mysterious.
- (2) Senses are causally mind-independent.
- (3) Senses are strongly ontologically mind-independent.

Thus,

- (4) The grasping relation that thinkers are alleged to stand in towards senses is mysterious.

The argument is clearly valid, and I take premise (2) to be uncontroversial, so my focus will be on premises (1) and (3). I will argue that both premises are questionable.

3.2. *Against Premise (1)*

Premise (1) is predicated on the assumption that we only have two models for explaining how a mind could be related to a sense: a causal model and a

tokening/instantiation model. If senses, as abstract objects, are causally mind-independent, the first model can't apply to them; and if senses, as abstract particulars, are strongly ontologically mind-independent, the second model can't apply to them. Thus, if senses are both causally and strongly ontologically mind-independent we are left no explanation of what grasping a sense could be.

There is, however, a forceful objection to premise (1) that Margolis and Laurence do not consider. The objection comes into focus when we reconsider the analogy that they draw between senses and numbers. Numbers are often taken to be abstract particulars, and thus both causally and strongly ontologically mind-independent. According to this common conception, the number two is not located in space or time, is causally inert, and does not have any instances. But notice how absurd it would be to conclude that physical objects couldn't stand in a relation to numbers—for example, that the coins in my pocket couldn't possibly total five, that today's air temperature couldn't be 28 degrees Centigrade, or that the length of my nightstand couldn't be two-thirds of a meter. Of course, the relation here isn't causal. The coins in my pocket are not causally related to the number five. Nor is the relation plausibly akin to that between a universal and its instances. The number 28 is not tokened or otherwise instantiated in the air, nor is the fraction two-thirds instantiated in my nightstand.⁸ So there has to be some way of being related to abstract particulars that is not a matter of causation or instantiation. The question thus arises: could thinkers not be related to senses in the same way that objects and magnitudes are related to numbers?

The answer will surely depend on how we understand the relation between objects or magnitudes and numbers. This is a vexed issue, but one plausible account appeals to the idea of a structural mapping, such as an isomorphism. Both numbers and magnitudes are structured, and sometimes it works out that there is an orderly mapping between their structures. As a result, we can *index* objects and magnitudes to numbers once we settle on a criterion of individuation for the objects, or a scale of measurement for the magnitudes.

8 When we consider cardinalities there is, perhaps, a greater temptation to view natural numbers as universals, and thus to say that the coins in my pocket instantiate the number five. I think, however, that this view is optional, and that there is a coherent alternative view that distinguishes cardinalities from their associated natural numbers. According to this alternative view, while the coins in my pocket might instantiate a particular cardinality, they do not instantiate the natural number that we associate with that cardinality. In any case, nothing turns on this issue. Even if natural numbers can sometimes be instantiated, the fact that numbers can also be used in ways where they are not instantiated, as when they are used to measure temperatures and lengths, is sufficient to suggest the alternative model of how abstract objects can be related to worldly entities that I am about to discuss.

For example, we can map the coins in my pocket to the number five because we have settled on a particular way of individuating those coins (roughly: by a criterion of spatiotemporal separability), and a mapping to the natural numbers that respects the successor relation. Similarly, we can map physical lengths to real numbers once we settle on a scale of measurement (e.g. metric units) because physical lengths correspond in an orderly way to real numbers once such a scale is imposed. It is likewise open to the proponent of senses to maintain that the minds of thinkers have an internal structure that just so happens to map in an orderly way onto the structure of senses. On this view, grasping a sense is a matter of having a mind that is indexed to that sense according to the best available mapping.

This indexing view of grasping a sense raises many questions. What is the analog of the criterion of individuation or scale of measurement for minds? What makes one mapping better than others? Might there be considerable indeterminacy in how senses are indexed to thinkers? My present point, however, is not that the indexing view can definitely be developed into a compelling account of grasping a sense, but that Margolis and Laurence ignore it altogether. If senses are supposed to be like numbers, and numbers can be helpfully indexed to objects and magnitudes, the question at least deserves asking whether thinkers can be helpfully indexed to senses. Only if we were confident that the answer is “no” would we have reason to accept premise (1).

3.3. *Against Premise (3)*

The obvious alternative to identifying senses with abstract particulars is identifying them with abstract universals that are instantiated by thinkers. In that case, senses would be like painfulness and Mentalese symbol types, and so there would be no special obstacle to explaining the grasping relation. To grasp a sense would just be to instantiate a universal—a mental property or type. The challenge is to explain what sort of property or type senses could be. There are surely many possibilities. Here I will focus on just two of them.

One possibility is to equate senses with dispositions, and the grasping of a sense with the instantiation of a disposition. This view has echoes in Peacocke’s (1992) account of possession conditions: to find a mental transition “primitively compelling” is, roughly, to be disposed to undertake it in a primitive way. The sense *and*, for example, might be analyzed as the disposition—shared by all persons who can think conjunctive thoughts—to draw the inferences associated with the introduction and elimination rules for conjunction. Thinkers

then count as grasping the sense if and only if they have, or instantiate, this disposition. (Note: the instantiation of a disposition is to be distinguished from the manifestation of a disposition. A glass can instantiate the disposition of fragility at a time, t , even if it isn't breaking at t . Likewise, if senses are dispositions then a thinker can grasp a sense at t even if she isn't manifesting that sense at t .)

A second possibility takes senses to be capacities or abilities, and the grasping of a sense to be the instantiation of a capacity or ability.⁹ (Again, the instantiation of an ability is to be distinguished from the exercise of an ability. At the present moment you have, or instantiate, many abilities that you are not currently exercising.) This idea sits naturally with the theory of sense developed by Evans (1982), who explicitly maintains that episodes of thinking are structured from the exercise of distinct abilities.

Thus, someone who thinks that John is happy and that Harry is happy exercises on two occasions the conceptual ability which we call 'possessing the concept of happiness'. And similarly someone who thinks that John is happy and that John is sad exercises on two occasions a single ability, the ability to think of, or think about, John. (Evans 1982, 101)

For Evans, "possessing the concept of happiness" and "grasping the sense *happiness*" are equivalent bits of jargon, both of which are to be cashed out in terms of having a particular ability.

Notice that these two accounts of senses do not claim to be reductive. In identifying a sense with a disposition or ability, one need not insist that those dispositions or abilities can be explicated in non-semantic or non-mental terms. Indeed, most Fregeans deny that senses can be so explicated. But that's to be expected. Most dispositions and abilities can only be explicated by way of a small circle of closely related terms. For example, the property of being a comedian is, plausibly, best analyzed in terms of a disposition or ability, though the chances of reductively explicating that disposition or ability without the help of comedic terms such as "funny" or "laughter" seem slim.

To be clear, while neo-Fregeans often identify the *grasping* of a sense with the possession or instantiation of a certain type of disposition or ability, and the *thinking* of a thought with the manifestation or exercise of certain dispositions or abilities, I am not aware of anyone who unequivocally identifies senses

9 One advantage of this approach over a dispositional approach is that there are certain senses that we grasp but are not disposed to employ. I might grasp the sense associated with a racial epithet, but nevertheless fail to be disposed to draw any of the transitions associated with that epithet (i.e., fail to find any of the transitions associated with that epithet "primitively compelling").

themselves with dispositions, abilities, or any other universal.¹⁰ But I am now suggesting that we could take this extra step, which would then provide us with a simple explanation of how thinkers can be related to senses. If grasping a sense were just instantiating a universal, there would be no more of an ontological worry about how thinkers are related to senses than of how thinkers are related to Mentalese symbol types. Notice, moreover, that we would also have a straightforward explanation of why senses can solve Frege's puzzle. Because everyone who instantiates a given sense shares a *way* of being related to a referent—a way that is embodied in the disposition or ability that constitutes the sense—there is no issue of there being radically different ways to grasp a sense.

This last point deserves greater emphasis. Margolis and Laurence are led to worry about how senses can solve Frege's puzzle because of the misleading analogy they draw between grasping a sense and thinking about a number. As they point out, there are different ways to think about the number two. I can think of it as the successor of one, as the only even prime, or as my favorite number. All of these different ways of thinking about the number two have nothing in common except the number two. Thus, if grasping a sense were like thinking about a number, the various ways of grasping a sense would have nothing more in common than their referent, in which case senses could not be used to solve Frege's puzzle. But if senses are universals, the analogy is wrongheaded. Just as thinking about the color red is to be distinguished from instantiating that color, thinking about a sense is to be distinguished from grasping a sense. My handkerchief instantiates the color red, but it cannot think about that color. Similarly, if grasping a sense is a matter of having the disposition or ability to draw the inferences associated with the introduction and elimination rules for conjunction, my five-year-old cousin grasps the sense *and*. He can and does draw those inferences. But he clearly lacks the higher-order disposition or ability to think about the sense *and*—i.e., he lacks the disposition or ability to think about the disposition or ability to draw the inferences associated with the introduction and elimination rules for conjunction. Once this distinction between grasping a sense and thinking about a sense is kept firmly in mind, there is no obstacle to using senses to distinguish co-referential concepts.

Treating senses as abstract universals clearly undermines premise (3), and seems to be compatible with the thrust of the interpretations of sense given by Peacocke, Evans, and other Fregeans. So why do Margolis and Laurence

10 Perhaps Burge (2005, 29–30) comes the closest. Replying to the worry that the grasping relation is mysterious, he comments that the “role” of senses is to “type-identify explanatory kinds”, including psychological capacities, states, and events, and thus that the grasping relation is no more problematic than the relation between a biological kind and its instances.

assume that senses must be abstract particulars? I am not entirely certain, but it is notable that at one point they write that the difference between Mentalese symbols and senses is that senses “don’t admit of a type-token distinction” (2007, 589, n. 7; see also Sutton 2004). So perhaps they reason that there is nothing left for senses to be but abstract particulars. If this is their reasoning, however, then it is doubly problematic. It is problematic, first, because the claim that senses do not admit of a type-token distinction is open to question and goes undefended. For example, if senses were abilities, it is not obvious that they would fail to admit of a type-token distinction. Perhaps what all thinkers have in common who grasp a sense is just that they token a certain ability type. Second, while all types are plausibly universals (they have tokens as their instances), the converse is doubtful. There are plausibly some universals that are not types. Paradigmatic properties such as redness are often conceived as having instances, and thus as being universals, but are unlike types at least in that they are more readily expressed by predicates than by singular terms.¹¹ Thus, even if Margolis and Laurence were right that senses weren’t types, it wouldn’t follow that they weren’t universals.

Admittedly, Frege never writes of senses being instantiated, and his appeal to “grasping a sense” (e.g., 1892, 153; 1897, 237; 1918, 328) does not seem on its face to invoke the instantiation relation. So perhaps Margolis and Laurence are motivated by a desire to remain felicitous to Frege’s texts. But whatever the historical Frege may have thought, the idea that grasping a sense is a matter of instantiating an ability is not foreign to contemporary Fregeans, among whom the phrase “grasping a sense” has become something of a term of art. As Burge writes, “Grasping a thought is simply a misleading metaphor. Any view should cash out the metaphor in terms of having a certain ability to think” (2005, 30).

One might worry that allowing senses to be instantiated collapses the distinction between senses and Mentalese symbol types. But it is one thing to instantiate a semantically individuated disposition or ability, and quite another matter to instantiate a formally individuated symbol. For one thing, symbols of Mentalese are supposed to be narrowly individuated in terms of the intrinsic properties of thinkers. Most contemporary Fregeans, by contrast, individuate senses widely, in relation to the environment. Additionally, senses have their

11 Drawing on Wollheim (1968), Wetzel (2009, xii) points to other differences between paradigmatic properties and types: types (e.g., the letter “A”, the grizzly bear, Old Glory) are all objects, but paradigmatic properties (e.g., redness, triangularity, happiness) are not; types share more qualities with their tokens than properties share with their instances (e.g., the grizzly bear and its tokens are both brown, furry, ferocious, etc., but the property of redness shares little with its instances); and properties never exemplify their defining qualities (e.g., redness isn’t red) but types do (e.g., Old Glory is rectangular).

semantic properties essentially. Each sense is individuated by its semantic value, the contribution it makes to the truth conditions of the thoughts it can enter into. By contrast, symbols of Mentalese are individuated formally, by analogy to the orthographic properties of expressions in written languages. A symbol of Mentalese may have a semantic value, but it will have that semantic value only contingently—just as the orthographically individuated expressions of written languages have their semantic values only contingently. Thus, even if senses were abstract universals the debate between Fregeans and reductivists would remain substantive.

4. What Senses Must Be

In the course of evaluating Margolis and Laurence's argument, we encountered two conceptions of senses and, correspondingly, two conceptions of grasping a sense. According to the first, senses are abstract particulars like numbers, and grasping a sense is a matter of being indexed to a sense in a maximally perspicuous structural mapping. According to the second, senses are universals such as abilities or dispositions, and grasping a sense is a matter of instantiating a universal. So far, I have remained neutral between these two conceptions. I believe, however, that the second view is preferable to the first.

The problem with taking senses to be abstract particulars like numbers is that it makes a mystery of their analytic mind-dependence. If senses were like numbers, we would have no explanation of why they are always analyzed in terms of the minds of thinkers. On most plausible accounts, numbers aren't analyzed in terms of physical objects such as coins or magnitudes such as temperatures. Nor are they plausibly analyzed in terms mental attributes. While some think that our best analysis of numbers appeals to Hume's principle, and others think that numbers simply are certain sets, almost no one holds that numbers are best analyzed by reference to physical objects or minds. By contrast, contemporary Fregeans almost always analyze senses in terms of the mental.

The problem I am raising is *not* that it is unprecedented for an entity to be both analytically mind-dependent and strongly ontologically mind-independent. Consider the view that identifies red with whatever physical property gives rise to such-and-such experiences in normal human perceivers in normal conditions. Suppose that, as it turns out, the physical property meeting this definition is a certain gerrymandered set of spectral reflectances that we can call P. Clearly P does not depend for its existence on any minds. A ripe to-

mato has its particular spectral reflectance independently of whether anyone is ever around to notice it. Thus, red will be ontologically mind-independent on this view of color. But if we accept that the best *analysis* of red nevertheless appeals to the *experiences* of normal perceivers—and the gerrymandered nature of P suggests that it does—we will have to accept that P is analytically mind-*dependent*.

This example shows that there is nothing incoherent about something's being analytically mind-dependent and strongly ontologically mind-independent. There is, however, a big difference between senses and colors. On the view of colors in question, we have two ways of individuating them: as whatever causes certain experiences in us; and as spectral reflectance properties of physical objects. The naturalness of the first mode of individuation might make it primary, but the second mode of individuation is there all the same. By contrast, senses do not have this dual existence. Our *only* way of individuating them is in terms of the minds of thinkers. It is thus much harder to see how their analytic mind-dependence can be squared with their strong ontological mind-independence.

To put the point another way, there are two ways for an abstract object to be strongly ontologically mind-independent: by having no instances (being an abstract particular) or by having non-mental instances. Colors are strongly ontologically mind-independent because they meet the latter condition; they have non-mental, purely physical instances. As a result, there is a way of individuating colors that appeals to the purely physical. But on a view that treats senses as strongly ontologically mind-independent they have *no* instances. As a result, they cannot be individuated according to some purely physical criterion in the way that colors can. In itself, this does not rule out the possibility that senses could be individuated, like numbers, in some way that is neither mental nor physical. But in point of fact, mental activity appears to be the only route we have to their individuation.

To be sure, there is no *contradiction* in the supposition that senses are both analytically mind-dependent and abstract particulars. One could hold that senses have a real objective existence as abstract particulars, but that we just don't know enough about them in order to explicate their natures except by relation to our own minds. But at the same time, nor can I think of any reason to take this possibility seriously.

Like Margolis and Laurence, I have been criticizing senses conceived as abstract particulars. There is, however, a significant difference between Margolis and Laurence's criticism and mine. Margolis and Laurence worry how senses can be *grasped* if they are abstract particulars. I argued, however, that the availability of an indexing view undermines this worry. The problem with sup-

posing that senses are abstract particulars is rather that it fails to explain why our full understanding of senses comes from the mental activity of thinkers. In other words, the problem is not how senses as abstract particulars can be grasped, but why the entirety of our knowledge of them derives from their being grasped.

If I'm right, Fregeans should not look to numbers for their model of mental contents, but to abilities, dispositions, or other universals. From an ontological perspective, senses and Mentalese symbols will thus be related to thinkers in much the same way, as a universal to its instance. The choice between them will, therefore, not turn on matters of ontology, but on more earthly considerations, such as empirical evidence for the reality of a purely formal level of psychological explanation. That is surely as it should be.¹²

References

- Burge, T. 1979. Sinning against Frege. *Philosophical Review* 88: 398–432.
- . 2005. *Truth, Thought, Reason: Essays on Frege*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dummett, M. 1981. *Frege: Philosophy of Language, 2nd edition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Evans, G. 1982. *The Varieties of Reference*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fodor, J. 1990. *A Theory of Content and Other Essays*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- . 1994. *The Elm and the Expert*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- . 1998. *Concepts: Where Cognitive Science Went Wrong*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2008. *LOT 2: The Language of Thought Revisited*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frege, G. 1892. On Sinn and Bedeutung. In *The Frege Reader*, edited by M. Beaney, 151–71. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997.
- . 1897. Logic. In *The Frege Reader*, edited by M. Beaney, 227–50. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997.
- . 1918. Thought. In *The Frege Reader*, edited by M. Beaney, 325–45. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997.
- Kripke, S. 1972. Naming and Necessity. In *Semantics of Natural Language*, edited by D. Davidson and G. Harman. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Margolis, E. and S. Laurence 2007. The Ontology of Concepts—Abstract Objects or Mental Representations? *Noûs* 41: 561–93
- Peacocke, C. 1992. *A Study of Concepts*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- . 2005. Rationale and Maxims in the Study of Concepts. *Noûs* 39: 167–78.

12 I'm indebted to Richard Heck for discussion, and to Eli Chudnoff, Wayne Davis, Brian Huss, Muhammad Ali Khalidi, and Jon Litland for written comments on earlier drafts.

- Rupert, R.D. 2008. Frege's Puzzle and Frege Cases: Defending a Quasi-Syntactic Solution. *Cognitive Systems Research* 9: 76–91.
- Schneider, S. 2005. Direct Reference, Psychological Explanation, and Frege Cases. *Mind & Language* 20: 423–47.
- . 2011. *The Language of Thought: New Philosophical Directions*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Stalnaker, R. 2012. Intellectualism and the Objects of Knowledge. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 85: 754–61.
- Sutton, J. 2004. Are Concepts Mental Representations or Abstracta? *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 68: 89–108.
- Wetzel, L. 2009. *Types and Tokens*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Wollheim, R. 1968. *Art and Its Objects*. New York: Harper and Row.

IMPRESSUM

ProtoSociology: *An International Journal of Interdisciplinary
Research* – issn 1611-1281

Editor: Gerhard Preyer

Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Dep. of Social Sciences

Editorial staff: Georg Peter

Project Multiple Modernities: Reuß-Markus Krauß (East-Asia Representative)

Layout and digital publication: Georg Peter

Editorial office: ProtoSociology, Stephan-Heise-Str. 56, 60488 Frankfurt am Main, Germany, phone: (049)069-769461,

Email: preyer@em.uni-frankfurt.de, peter@protosociology.de

Bank: Dresdner Bank AG, Frankfurt am Main, account: 44 121 168 01, BLZ:

500 800 00-SWIFT-BIC: DRES DE FF IBAN DE60 5008 0000 4412 1168 01

Die Zeitschrift soll 1/2jährlich erscheinen. Die Anzahl der jährlich erscheinenden Hefte und Sonderhefte bleibt jedoch vorbehalten.

Copyright: Die in dieser Zeitschrift veröffentlichten Beiträge sind urheberrechtlich geschützt. Alle Rechte sind vorbehalten. Übersetzungen, Nachdruck, Vervielfältigung auf fotomechanischem oder ähnlichem Weg oder im Magnettonverfahren, Wiedergabe durch Vortrag, Funk- und Fernsehsendungen sowie Speicherung in Datenverarbeitungsanlagen, auch auszugsweise, sind nur mit Genehmigung des Herausgebers möglich. Für eingereichte Beiträge wird keine Haftung übernommen. Weitere Publikationsrechte von Artikeln bleiben vorbehalten. Zweitpublikationen seitens des Autors werden eingeräumt. Bei einer Zweitpublikation ist das Heft (Nummer, Titel, Erscheinungsjahr) der PROTOSOCIOLOGY zu zitieren. Für unaufgefordert eingesandte Manuskripte wird keine Haftung übernommen. Gerichtsstand ist Frankfurt am Main.

Copyright: All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher. Additional publications of the articles are reserved. The authors retain the personal right to re-use their own articles. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients is granted by *PROTOSOCIOLOGY*, provided that the base fee is paid directly to VG Wort, Goethestr. 49, 80336 München RFA. The publisher accepts no responsibility for submitted manuscripts.

ON PROTO SOCIOLOGY

Protosociology plays an important role among philosophy journals with connected contributions on important and breaking topics – such the nature and special features of collective cognitive states – that do not receive such generous attention in other journals. It is worth serious consideration for inclusion in a library's philosophy collection.

Margaret Gilbert, Storrs (USA)

The relatively young journal Protosociology has become an important forum for discussion in the philosophy of social science and of sociality and, more broadly, for theoretical discussion in social science. It is especially interesting and important that such new fields as social metaphysics and social epistemology as well as research related to collective intentionality and its applications have acquired a prominent place in the agenda of Protosociology.

Raimo Tuomela

Protosociology occupies an important position in the European intellectual scene, bridging philosophy, economics, sociology and related disciplines. Its volumes on rationality bring together concerns in all these topics, and present an important challenge to the cognitive sciences.

Donald Davidson, Berkeley (USA)

Protosociology publishes original papers of great interest that deal with fundamental issues in the human and social science. No academic library is complete without it.

Nicholas Rescher, Pittsburgh (USA)

Protosociology has been remarkably successful in publishing interesting work from different tradition and different disciplines and, as the title signals, in giving that work a new, eye-catching slant.

Philipp Pettit, Canberra, Australia

Protosociology is a truly premier interdisciplinary journal that publishes articles and reviews on timely topics written by and for a wide range of international scholars. The recent volumes on rationality are remarkable for their breadth and depth. Protosociology would be a great addition to any library.

Roger Gibson, St. Louis (USA)

Published Volumes

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 29, 2012

China's Modernization II – Edited by Georg Peter and Reuß-Markus Krauß

Contents

ON CONTEMPARY THEORY OF MODERNISATION

Multiple Modernities and the Theory of Indeterminacy – On the Development and Theoretical Foundations of the Historical Sociology of Shmuel N. Eisenstadt
Manussos Marangudakis

CHANGING CHINA: DEALING WITH DIVERSITY

Dissent of China's Public Intellectuals in the Post-Mao Era
Merle Goldman

Modernization of Law in China – its Meaning, Achievements, Obstacles and Prospect
Qingbo Zhang

China's State in the Trenches: A Gramscian Analysis of Civil Society and Rights-Based Litigation
Scott Wilson

Manufacturing Dissent: Domestic and International Ramifications of China's Summer of Labor Unrest
Francis Schortgen and Shalendra Sharma

NEOLIBERALISM AND THE CHANGES IN EAST ASIAN WELFARE AND EDUCATION

Business Opportunities and Philanthropic Initiatives: Private Entrepreneurs, Welfare Provision and the Prospects for Social Change in China
Beatriz Carrillo Garcia

Time, Politics and Homelessness in Contemporary Japan
Ritu Vij

Educational Modernisation Across the Taiwan Straits: Pedagogical Transformation in Primary School Moral Education Textbooks in the PRC and Taiwan
David C. Schak

Is China Saving Global Capitalism from the Global Crisis?
Ho-fung Hung

ON CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY

International Development, Paradox and Phronesis
Robert Kowalski

Précis of "The World in the Head"
Robert Cummins

Communication, Cooperation and Conflict
Steffen Borge

15.- Euro. Order and download:
<http://www.protosociology.de>

Published Volumes

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 28, 2011

China's Modernization I – Edited by Georg Peter and Reuß-Markus Krauß

Contents

CHANGING CHINA: DEALING WITH DIVERSITY

Class, Citizenship and Individualization in
China's Modernization
Björn Alpermann

Chinese Nation-Building as, Instead of,
and Before Globalization
Andrew Kipnis

Principles for Cosmopolitan Societies:
Values for Cosmopolitan Places
John R. Gibbins

ON MODERNIZATION: LAW, BUSINESS, AND ECONOMY IN CHINA

Modernizing Chinese Law: The Protection
of Private Property in China
Sanzhu Zhu

Chinese Organizations as Groups of
People – Towards a Chinese Business
Administration
Peter J. Peverelli

Income Gaps in Economic Development:
Differences among Regions, Occupational
Groups and Ethnic Groups
Ma Rong

THINKING DIFFERENTIATIONS: CHINESE ORIGIN AND THE WESTERN CULTURE

Signs and Wonders: Christianity and Hy-
brid Modernity in China
Richard Madsen

Confucianism, Puritanism, and the Tran-
scendental: China and America
Thorsten Botz-Bornstein

China and the Town Square Test
Jeffrey N. Wasserstrom

Metaphor, Poetry and Cultural Implicature..
Ying Zhang

ON CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY

Can Science Change our Notion of Exis-
tence?
Jody Azzouni

The Epistemological Significance of Prac-
tices
Alan Millar

On Cappelen and Hawthorne's "Relativism
and Monadic Truth"
J. Adam Carter

15.- Euro. Order and download:
<http://www.protosociology.de>

Published Volumes

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 27, 2011

Modernization in Times of Globalization II

Contents

NEW THEORETICAL APPROACHES

Religion, International Relations and
Transdisciplinarity
Roland Robertson

Modernization, Rationalization and Glo-
balization
Raymond Boudon

Modernity Confronts Capitalism: From
a Moral Framework to a Countercultural
Critique to a Human-Centered Political
Economy
Ino Rossi

Three Dimensions of Subjective Globaliza-
tion
Manfred B. Steger and Paul James

Transnational Diasporas: A New Era or a
New Myth?
Eliezer Ben-Rafael

The Discursive Politics of Modernization:
Catachresis and Materialization
Terrell Carver

THE PROBLEM OF SOCIAL ORDER IN A DISORDERED TIME

From Order to Violence: Modernization
Reconfigured
David E. Apter

Institutional Transfer and Varieties of
Capitalism in
Transnational Societies
Carlos H. Waisman

Media Distortion – A Phenomenological
Inquiry Into
the Relation between News and Public
Opinion
Louis Kontos

Labor Migration in Israel:
The Creation of a Non-free Workforce
Rebeca Rajzman and Adriana Kemp

ON CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY

Deference and the Use Theory
Michael Devitt

Constitution and Composition: Three Ap-
proaches to their Relation
Simon J. Evnine

15.- Euro. Order and download:
<http://www.protosociology.de>

Published Volumes

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 26, 2009

Modernization in Times of Globalization I

Contents

MULTIPLE MODERNIZATION

Contemporary Globalization, New Inter-civilizational Visions and Hegemonies: Transformation of Nation-States
Shmuel N. Eisenstadt

Multipolarity means thinking plural: Modernities
Jan Nederveen Pieterse

Postmodernism and Globalization
Omar Lizardo and Michael Strand

Latin American Modernities: Global, Transnational, Multiple, Open-Ended
Luis Roniger

Institutions, Modernity, and Modernization
Fei-Ling Wang

THE STRUCTURE OF THE GLOBAL LEGAL SYSTEM

Modern Society and Global Legal System as Normative Order of Primary and Secondary Social Systems
Werner Krawietz

International Justice and the Basic Needs Principle
David Copp

CASE STUDIES

Spatial Struggles: State Disenchantment and Popular Re-appropriation of Space in Rural Southeast China
Mayfair Mei-hui Yang

Re-Engineering the "Chinese Soul" in Shanghai?
Aihwa Ong

Territorial Stigmatization in the Age of Advanced Marginality
Loïc Wacquant

Quixote, Bond, Rambo: Cultural Icons of Hegemonic Decline
Albert J. Bergesen

ON CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY

Implicature, Appropriateness and Warranted Assertability
Ron Wilburn

Is the Whole More than the Sum of its Parts?
Matthias Thiemann

270 pages, 15.- Euro. Order
<http://www.protosociology.de>

Published Volumes

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Double Volume 25, 2008

*Philosophy of Mathematics –
Set Theory, Measuring Theories, and Nominalism*

Preface

Gerhard Preyer, Georg Peter

PART I:

SET THEORY, INCONSISTENCY, AND MEASURING THEORIES

Douglas Patterson

*Representationalism and Set-Theoretic
Paradox*

Mark Colyvan

Who's Afraid of Inconsistent Mathematics?

Andrew Arana

Logical and Semantic Purity

Wilhelm K. Essler

*On Using Measuring Numbers according to
Measuring Theories*

PART II

THE CHALLENGE OF NOMINALISM

Jody Azzouni

*The Compulsion to Believe: Logical Infer-
ence and Normativity*

Otávio Bueno

Nominalism and Mathematical Intuition

Yvonne Raley

*Jobless Objects: Mathematical Posits in
Crisis*

Susan Vineberg

*Is Indispensability Still a Problem for
Fictionalism?*

PART III

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Madeline Muntersbjorn

Mill, Frege and the Unity of Mathematics

Raffaella De Rosa and Otávio Bueno

Descartes on Mathematical Essences

ON CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY

Nicholas Rescher

Presumption and the Judgement of Elites.

Steven I. Miller, Marcel Fredericks, Frank
J. Perino

*Social Science Research and Policymaking:
Meta-Analysis and Paradox Hidden Indexi-
cals and Pronouns..*

Nikola Kompa

*Review: Stephen Schiffer, The Things We
Mean*

J. Gregory Keller

Agency Implies Weakness of Wil

250 pages, 15,- Euro. Order:
<http://www.protosociology.de>

ProtoSociology

DIGITAL VOLUMES AVAILABLE

- Vol. 30 Concepts – Contemporary and Historical Perspectives
- Vol. 29 China's Modernization II
- Vol. 28 China's Modernization I
- Vol. 27 Modernization in Times of Globalization II
- Vol. 26 Modernization in Times of Globalization I
- Vol. 25 Philosophy of Mathematics –
Set Theory, Measuring Theories, and Nominalism
- Vol. 24 Shmuel N. Eisenstadt: Multiple Modernities –
A Paradigm of Cultural and Social Evolution
- Vol. 23 Facts, Slingshots and Anti-Representationalism
On Stephen Neale's Facing Facts
- Vol. 22 Compositionality, Concepts and Representations II:
New Problems in Cognitive Science
- Vol. 21 Compositionality, Concepts and Representations I:
New Problems in Cognitive Science
- Vol. 20 World-SystemAnalysis: Contemporary Research and Directions
- Vol. 18/19 Understanding the Social II: The Philosophy of Sociality
- Vol. 17 Semantic Theory and Reported Speech
- Vol. 16 Understanding the Social I: New Perspectives from Epistemology
- Vol. 15 On a Sociology of Borderlines: Social Process in Time of Globalization
- Vol. 14 Folk Psychology, Mental Concepts and the Ascription of Attitudes
- Vol. 13 Reasoning and Argumentation
- Vol. 12 After the Received View – Developments in the Theory of Science
- Vol. 11 Cognitive Semantics II – Externalism in Debate (free download!)
- Vol. 10 Cognitive Semantics I – Conceptions of Meaning
- Vol. 8/9 Rationality II & III (double volume)

Order and download directly from our homepage:

www.protosociology.de

15.- Euro each

For subscription or additional question: peter@science-digital.com

ProtoSociology. Editor: Gerhard Preyer, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main FB 3: Department of Social Sciences. Editorial staff: Georg Peter.
Editorial office: Stephan-Heise-Str. 56, D-60488 Frankfurt am Main