
前言

在我的學習生涯中，支持我的人們，包括父母、親人、以及諸多師長和朋友都是以中文為主要語言的，因此在這裡我要以我們共同的母語來表達對他們的感謝。而因為上了大學以後，開始有了許多以英文為母語或不諳中文的師長以及朋友，所以在後面我會有一個以英文書寫的前言。這兩段前言的內容不是重覆的。

首先最要感謝的是我的父母，鄭松茂與張艾蓉。他們除了總是給我最完善的心理上、物質上的支持，也總是在各方面賦予我最好的培養與最大的自由。所謂最好的培養，包括父親以耳濡目染的方式加強我的推理能力及自發態度，以及母親透過身教以及為我挑選好的教育環境來養成我的寫作與其它基本能力。而最大的自由是指，雖然他們都對我的發展盡心盡力，卻從未替我未來的路做出任何選擇，而總是以輔助者的角色來陪伴我。一路走來從高中、大學的志願、碩士班、甚至到未來的博士學位，他們對我都只有支持與鼓勵。沒有如此堅毅且貼心的父母，就不會有今天的我。其中特別值得一提的是，父親年輕時便對哲學很有興趣，但無奈於當時的家庭考量，使得他未能朝這個方向發展。不過他一直保持對這方面的興趣與閱讀，並在我大學推薦甄選時，建議我選填哲學系，並給我一些相關的基本概念。雖然後來自己所走的領域和當初理解的部分差距甚遠，但進來了這個系所讓我發現了完完全全符合自己志向的事業，這樣的幸運都得感謝父親的判斷，以及母親的鼓勵。此外我的所有親人們也都全力支持我，為我驕傲；他們也同樣是我很重要的動力來源。

接下來我必需感謝我的指導老師林從一教授。我大一時林老師也剛進政大不久，同樣是新鮮人的我們都很有決心在這個環境努力。林老師是我的哲學啟蒙老師，他的哲學概論對我影響深遠。在這門課中不論是議題內容還是思考分析的方式，都深深吸引著我。後來大二的語言哲學、大三的心靈哲學，讓我更加確定對這條路的熱愛。其後透過哲學論文寫作指導這門課，我在林老師的幫助之下寫了我的學士論文「程式運轉與人格」；這是我第一次學習寫專業的學術論文，在過

程中林老師給了我許多幫助。後來在他的分析哲學課上，我第一次嘗試以英文寫期末報告，也很受他的鼓勵。大四開始旁聽林老師的研究所課程，也讓我更進一步了解學術研究的諸多面向。這七年來我與林老師的學術互動無法以幾段話就帶過，其中的進展與快樂是只有我自己能了解的。此外，由於我生性較為拘謹，林老師特有的幽默也為我的學術生活增添了一些愉快。在今年的布蘭登哲學研討會上，我們首次合寫一篇文章；我十分期待在我學成歸國後，能繼續和林老師有各種的互動與合作。對他的啓蒙與提拔之恩，我會永遠銘記在心。

接下來我要感謝的這位十分特別；他是說中文時間和我幾乎一樣長的美籍教授藍亭(Timothy Lane)。大四那一年我旁聽了藍老師在研究所開設的心靈哲學課；當時上課的同學不多，老師鼓勵我們每次準備問題積極討論。在這門課裡，我第一次學到如何把自己的想法用比較完整的方法表達出來，也確立了自己在心靈哲學這方面的興趣。藍老師的課堂是我待過最多的，我們的學術互動也總是良好且具啓發性。在課堂外，藍老師是很好的朋友，即使後來因為彼此忙碌而較少見面，我們還是會偶而聚會、打球；藍老師開玩笑說我們成了酒肉朋友。雖然後來我因現實考量而並未在論文中採用藍老師所提倡的經驗科學研究方式，但我謹記在心他所強調的嚴謹分析和實事求是態度。每當有外國學者訪問時，他也總是盡力為我引薦，我因而受益良多。他可說是我的另一位啓蒙老師，而我也十分希望未來可以與他有更進一步的合作。

再來我要感謝我口試委員方萬全教授。在我大學時期，中央研究院歐美所在數年間辦理了「新實用主義哲學研討會」，在這個場合我對方老師印象深刻。方老師犀利的分析和嚴謹的治學，都是身為後輩的我的最好榜樣。後來有幸在東吳大學上了一整年方老師的兼任課程，更令我受益良多。此外，我也常透過方老師借閱到最新的書籍，這也對我的研究很有幫助。特別值得一提的是在新實用主義的場合裡我也結識了鄧育仁教授與何志青教授，他們在各個會議的表現也讓我學習不少。在當鄧老師的兼任助理一學期的一段日子，每週都有機會與他討論；我們對哲學的許多看法都不相近，因此也總是有最刺激的辯論。與何老師的學術接觸雖然比較不直接，但這幾年下來也聽過數次他的演講，在他身上學到不少思考。自己在學生時代就可以從中央研究院受益如此良多，也是我始料未及的。

我的另一位口試委員鄭凱元教授也同樣影響我多年。自大學時代的台灣哲學學會以及其它許多場合，都看得到鄭老師的身影。雖然因為地緣關係使得我沒有機會參與鄭老師的課堂，但我們在會議上和私底下也都常交換意見。鄭老師與我年紀相對接近，也使得我們亦師亦友的情誼更為特別。在討論的過程中，鄭老師總是對我充滿鼓勵，我期許自己以後也能以這樣正面積極的態度來面對後輩們。

在此我要特別感謝德籍教授文哲(Christian Wenzel)；我與文哲老師很早就常在研討會上碰面，但一直到我進入碩士階段才真正與他結識。在文哲老師於本所兼課期間，我們隔週五早上碰面，下午討論這兩週大家各自的進展。我和文哲老師分享許多哲學興趣與處事態度，即使因地緣關係而較少碰面，卻常以電子郵件保持聯繫。我期許自己在未來能學好德文，以閱讀他的德文作品，並與他更深入

討論德國哲學。這是個很困難的任務，但在他的鼓勵之下我會盡力去嘗試。

在研究的具體內容方面，影響我最深的是梁益堉教授。在梁老師的帶領之下，我讀了 McDowell 的 *Mind and World* 的前半兩次，以及 A. D. Smith 的 *The Problem of Perception* 兩次。其中前者幾乎決定了我現在以及未來的哲學走向，而後者奠定了我對知覺相關議題的基本想法。此外，除了內容本身，梁老師細緻的讀書與討論方式對我也有很大幫助。可惜我碩士的後兩年梁老師因個人規劃而暫時未在研究所開課，不過我很期待將來有更多機會與梁老師在課堂與其它場合討論，想必屆時也會如以往一般，有十分豐富的收穫。

關於課堂上的學習，林正弘教授是另一位讓我受益良多的老師。林老師是台灣哲學界的老前輩，雖然他本人總是過於謙虛，但其實他的重要性與貢獻是整個社群有目共睹的。在這樣的狀況下，他卻總是和學生沒有距離，以最淺顯易懂的方式來教導我們。在林老師的課堂上，我常不太說話，靜靜地聽老師的講解，還有笑話。比較遺憾的是我因為時間分配的關係，上的課集中於林老師知識論方面的課程，希望將來有機會可以和林老師學習科學哲學的部分；也希望這位可敬的長者長保身體健康，做更多後輩的榜樣。

我也在米建國教授的課堂上學習很多。米老師與學生打成一片，也十分熱衷於舉辦活動；我除了要感謝他在課堂上的指導外，更要謝謝他總是努力籌辦富有意義的活動，包括迷你課程與許多大型研討會。去年我在東吳的國際分析哲學會議上發表文章，也是米老師提供的機會。那是我第一次以英文在許多西方學者面前發表，是很好的經驗。未來我也會以米老師為榜樣，為哲學社群盡一己之力。

在碩士生涯的初期，透過趙之振教授的讀書會我研讀了 Sellars 的 'Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind'，對我後來了解 McDowell 的想法很有幫助。趙老師細膩的分析讓我印象深刻，在會議上的發表也總讓我很有收穫。趙老師也十分關心學生，即使我們分屬不同學校，我仍受到他許多照顧；很期待今後有更多機會向他學習。與趙老師同在清大的吳瑞媛教授也同樣對我照顧有加。在大學時，我就對吳老師犀利的提問以及對哲學的熱忱印象深刻。吳老師也對舉辦活動很有熱情，清大的當代哲學家系列便是由她及其同事共同努力創辦並維持至今。透過這個活動，我有更多機會去了解 Davidson、Peacocke、McDowell、Brandom 的思想。在最近的這一次，吳老師讓我有機會與林從一老師合寫文章與 Brandom 本人討論，對我是很重要的經驗。未來我也會積極參與這個活動，共同延續這個重要且美好的傳統。

我也曾上過兩次陳瑞麟教授的課程；陳老師因聽力受損，求學與研究過程一路都比我們艱辛許多，然而在他身上我總看到堅毅與樂觀。在課堂研討會上，陳老師不厭其煩地透過紙筆來與他人溝通，其中對學術的熱愛深深感動我。在去年國際分析哲學會議後，我與陳老師及師母帶著學者一同前往阿里山及附近景點健行，老師與師母對我非常照顧，那短短幾天帶給我美好的回憶。

彭孟堯教授近年來在研究所較少開課，但我在他大學部的心靈哲學課程中受益良多。彭老師專長的心靈哲學部分與我的興趣重疊，討論起來特別有意思。很

期待以後有機會能在彭老師的研究所課堂上，更深入討論彼此都有興趣的議題。看到彭老師的時候，通常也是看到王文方教授的時候。因為時間安排關係，我還沒有機會在王老師的課堂上學習。王老師為人風趣，在聚會中常是話題的焦點，加上酒量奇佳，身邊總是很熱鬧。透過王老師，我也和來自 Iowa 哲學系的老師聊了更多有趣的事；在學術圈內能有如此快樂的記憶，讓我很珍惜。

楊金穆教授也是我很早便認識的師長之一；楊老師因為採用英式的師徒制，我未能有機會在課堂上接受他的教導。不過楊老師常在研討會出現，此外我們也在誠品書店遇見數次，因此也有不少交流機會。楊老師為人好客，我也被他招待過很多次；希望未來成為同事後，能與他有更多實質的學術交流。

雖然領域不盡相同，這幾年我和苑舉正教授常因研討會而有機會碰面。苑老師對學術充滿熱情，總是精力飽滿地在討論場合中發問。他也很喜歡和我聊學術圈內的事，一起彼此勉勵。苑老師的專長科學哲學也是我需要加強的部分，希望以後有機會能和苑老師多學習。

侯維之教授也是近年來常在研討會遇見的老師。侯老師發表時清晰有力，下了台後卻總是一派輕鬆，令我印象深刻。每次在會間或會後的空檔時間，我們總少不了有趣的話題。侯老師是另一位我因地緣關係而無法多接觸的老師，同樣也只能寄望於將來，能夠與他有更密切的學術互動。

剛步入職業生涯的鄭喜恆教授是我去清大參加活動時總會遇到的老師；雖然我比較少看到他發表文章的場合，但他在會中的提問常引發我更多思考。鄭老師主要研究的實用主義以及相關的早期分析哲學也是我很有興趣的部分，將來想必也有許多需要向他請益之處。

雖然到目前為止交流不多，與蔡政宏教授的互動也值得一記。蔡老師是林正弘老師的學生，以前偶有機會碰面，也在林老師的課堂討論過幾次。蔡老師剛加入東吳的哲學團隊，我不僅為他們的學生高興，也為自己以後比較有機會和他討論而高興。蔡老師剛步入職業生涯，學術表現就令人讚賞，是後輩的最佳榜樣。

我也必需感謝帶領我進入康德哲學的張鼎國教授。大二的一整年我修習了張老師的康德哲學，對我有深遠的影響；這門課和林從一老師的語言哲學同樣讓我對哲學產生了無比的熱忱，而這也解釋了為什麼至今我還是繼續接觸康德及其它德國哲學。此外我也上過張老師的德國觀念論和詮釋學，雖然都是大學部的課，但對我後來對德國哲學的自修奠下良好的基礎。

在大學時代，蔡美麗教授也給了我很大的幫助。剛進哲學系的頭兩年，聽不懂的課比懂的多得多，而蔡老師的課程總是淺顯易懂而不失深度，對那時的我有很大學業上以及心理上的幫助。上研究所後，我旁聽了蔡老師討論康德第三批判的課堂；雖然當時因為時間安排而未能完整參與，但我還是從中學習許多，蔡老師即將退休，未來或許沒有機會在課堂上再交流，但我仍期盼能在其它場合見面。

在碩士的最後階段認識了羅麗君教授也是一件很令人高興的事。羅老師待學生親切，上課認真並清楚，讓我對現象學有了初步的認識。在跨領域的狀況能有那麼好的討論，讓我很珍惜。至今對現象學粗淺的了解，也讓我在意識學會的期

刊 *Psyche* 出版了第一篇書評。希望今後有更多機會透過羅老師對現象學有更進一步的理解。

最後我想感謝的是謝世民教授。謝老師與我領域不同，但他對於參與活動和討論孜孜不倦，因此在研討會上常聽到他的想法與評論。在西方學者面前，謝老師總會很熱心地把我介紹給他們。相信未來也還是能夠常在活動中見到謝老師的身影，也希望以後能夠有領域間合作的機會。

在學長姊方面，特別感謝大一時帶我走過西洋哲學史的王靈康學長、大二時帶康德讀書會的蔡幸芝學姊、還有因領域相近而常保聯絡的張卜文學長。祝福你們各自的學業順利，也期待以後與你們當同事的日子。

同學的部分我要特別感謝翟君剛。我們從大一就認識，並常常一起閒晃，走過快樂的大學生活。他比我早開始對哲學有興趣，而在我也決定更投入以後，我們便總是一起去參加各種活動，從一開始的台哲會、中研院的新實用主義研討會、清大的當代哲學家系列，到後來東吳的迷你課程、北京的中英澳康德哲學暑期班、倫敦的 Sellars 會議、還有為時一學期的 U. C. Berkeley 訪問學生、以及兩次美國哲學學會的年會；期間的中小型活動更是不計其數。我相信我們創下的學術活動參與紀錄是不會被打破的。在這些活動中，我們都學到很多很多，從一開始幾乎類似的背景，到現在漸漸區分出彼此的差異，但卻仍保持重疊的研究領域，真的很難能可貴。透過參與這些活動，我們也有很多機會一起旅遊，也因此一起體驗了哲學以外的人生面向。他對於旅遊以及許多生活上的事都比我有研究，我不僅常受到他的照顧，也從他身上學習了很多。此外他也總是人群中歡笑的來源，透過他我和其它朋友也有了更多的互動，這樣的體驗真的很難得也很重要。近年我們都要申請美國的博士班，我祝福他順利進入心目中的學校就讀，並希望像以前一樣，與我在人生的路上一起努力、一起成長、一起分享。

我也要感謝和翟君剛與我常玩在一起的蘇郁庭。他因為家住較遠，大學一開始不太常參與活動，但後來因為住宿的關係，我們得以更常碰面；他特別喜歡玩一些男生的東西，我們也因此保留了中學時代青少年的一面。碩二時我們在翟君剛的介紹下一起去補習 GRE，三人一起準備考試；其中的歡笑遠遠大於辛苦。後來我們也一起出國考試，並參加康德暑期班。雖然蘇郁庭與我們的領域不同，但我們還是常一同討論，是很好的學術伙伴。今後我們三人也會是很好的同事。

政大的學術伙伴還包括一起組成康德讀書會的吳晉緯、陳鳴諍、林正昊、李政國、以及薛明立等人。晉緯與政國為討論帶入現象學的成份，鳴諍與正昊則是康德專業，常提點我們必要的相關知識。明立是一路和我一起努力的學弟，從大學時代的懵懂，到現在已漸有能力做獨立研究；雖然還是帶著一點傻氣，但其間的進步讓我倍感欣慰。期許大家都勇敢朝哲學之路繼續邁進。

台大的伙伴李國揚和梁慧川與東吳的伙伴呂柏駒總是讓討論更加豐富，而私下我們也都是好朋友。東吳的學弟妹高寬蓉、徐國益、鄭俊憲、康立孝、德龍也給我許多幫助與陪伴。這幾年下來，政大以及其它學校有太多朋友以各種方式支持我，實在無法一一致謝；我會記得以往與你們走過的日子，並期待以後繼續和

你們分享的時光。

碩士生涯最後的一兩年我常待在系上，和許多好友們度過難忘的校園生活；以下只能就記憶所及列出最常見面的幾位，他們是熊、小招、柏安、小玉、老談、蔣盃、沈汪、對不起、周大為、阿金、瑞清、small 君、小花、連媽媽、小天、李伊、何追星、孝儀、安琪、鈺娟、亞筠、雅倩、士奇、以及小蘭學姊和阿仁學長。很謝謝你們還有很多我一時遺漏的人們，你們都是我碩士生涯的快樂來源。

在康德暑期班認識的潘潘、倩、小詣、拉風、曉旭；在 Berkeley 認識的 Andy、Inas、Jess、Justin、Leo、Pius，都是我的對岸好友。在兩岸問題還沒解決之前，我已經在那裡找到了很多同伴。現在大家四散各地，期待有一天再聚首。

雖然這本碩士論文只是很小的成就，但我希望藉此前言記錄下充實我校園生活的人們，希望他們也和我一樣快樂、希望我們以後還是可以一起快樂。

Preface

In my academic life I am indebted to many people who can read my gratitude only through English, so I have this preface for them. I cannot list all of them and expatiate on my indebtedness, to be sure. My preceding preface in Chinese contains things I want to say to my families, teachers, and friends, and I shall not repeat them here. Since 2006, I have had more chances to meet western people, and those experiences are very important. In what follows I shall identify those who help me most.

I would like to express my highest gratitude to Professor John McDowell. I first met him at ‘Conference on McDowell’s Philosophy’ held by National Tsing-Hua University in March 2006, Taipei. During the three-day conference, McDowell gave his ‘Intention in Action’ lectures, and paid much attention to queries and criticisms from philosophers in Taiwan. At the time I talked to him during the panel discussions and meals. Although I did not understand most of what he said due to my inability in real-life English, he was very nice to me and to everyone else at that occasion. After he went back to Pittsburgh I wrote emails to him for some questions, and he kindly replied me in details. Three months later, I met him again at ‘Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind after 50 Years: Commemorating the 50th Anniversary of Sellars’s Lectures in the University of London.’ And the latest meeting between us was at the Eastern APA annual meeting at Washington D. C., December 2006. There we had a coffee, with my best friend Wesley Chai, and we discussed my paper ‘Towards a Conceptualist Account of Action: Answering Phenomenological Considerations.’ McDowell read the paper carefully and told what he thought about it. The paper have evolved into a new piece ‘Self, Action, and Passivity,’ which is currently under review. After that I keep him posted about my progress, sometimes with questions, and he always replies me with worm helps. In this essay I venture to defend and sometimes

elaborate his views, and in my final episode I express my misgivings about his project: though I myself is all for the project, I do not think we McDowellians have provided the last word about relevant issues. Maybe he will not happy with what I say about him, but I hope he will understand that my reservations are due to my hope to improve the project. Anyway, I will keep trying and I really appreciate his good will. I could not imagine that I can have so much help from a person like him.

At the Sellars conference I also met Professor Robert Brandom, Paul Coates, Tim Crane, Willem deVries, M. G. F. Martin, James O'Shea, Jay Rosenberg, Johanna Seibt, Paul Snowdon, Meredith Williams, and Michael Williams; all of them are very nice to me. That conference influences me permanently, so I would like to especially thank the director of Institute of Philosophy, Tim Crane, who helped me about the trip and had some discussions with me during the conference. Although I express my dissatisfactions about his various thoughts on perception, I respect him personally and expect good discussions between us in the future. I have incessant email correspondences with Paul Coates, Willem deVries, and Jay Rosenberg. I haven't had chance to peruse Coates's book *The Metaphysics of Perception: Wilfrid Sellars, Perceptual Consciousness and Critical Realism*, but I hope I can read it as soon as possible, maybe during my military service. I always benefit from exchanges with deVries; he is one among those who really care about students; in particular he comments on my 'Openness and the Social Initiation into the Space of Reasons,' co-authored with my supervisor Lin, presented at 'Conference on Brandom's Philosophy.' I draw some of the materials from that paper in my first and second episodes here. Brandom offers many opinions about the paper, and we discussed a lot during his trip to Taiwan; my history of meeting Brandom in this or that conference is too long, so let me skip it and just express my special thanks to him. And I am really sorry about Jay; he was always nice to me and he brought happiness to wherever he was. Although I am not a dualist, I hope he knows my appreciation and how he has influenced me on my works. I want to say thanks again to everyone I listed above; this conference means a lot to me.

After the Sellars conference, Wesley and I flew to Beijing for 'Philosophy Summer School in China, 2006 Session: Kant's Philosophy.' We had Professor Sebastian Gardner, Onora O'Neill, Thomas Pogge, and Garrath Williams as our speakers. I was in Williams's seminar 'Kant's Concept of Reason in the First Critique.' He always elegantly put what he wanted to get across. I also talked a lot to Pogge and Gardner during the open discussion sessions. I thank all of them for their patience. My term paper "'Refutation of Idealism" Reconsidered' earns a distinction ranked 6th. I met Pogge again during his trip in Taiwan in March 2008, and we had a good time. I hope I can learn more about Kant from them in the future.

Right after that, Wesley and I visited U. C. Berkeley as visiting students in fall 2006. We enrolled in three seminars: Professor Hubert Dreyfus's and Hannah Ginsborg's 'McDowell and Merleau-Ponty,' Barry Stroud's 'Meaning, Understanding, and the Attribution of Attitudes,' and Brandon Fitelson's and Sherrilyn Roush's 'Knowledge and Its Limits.' In Dreyfus's and Ginsborg's seminar we discussed McDowell's *Mind and World* and part of Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception*. I have become a McDowellian before the seminar, so I decided to defend McDowell against phenomenological considerations, and my major opponent was Dreyfus, one of the instructors. He kindly accepted my challenges, though never really convinced by me; we become good friends and I hope to learn more from him. I gained much help from Ginsborg during her office hours; she was always nice to me and took my writings seriously. The term paper now evolves into 'Self, Action, and Passivity,' as mentioned above. And it constitutes my main arguments of the fourth episode here. By the way, I would like to thank J. C. Berendzen for sending me his draft on Dreyfus's criticisms against McDowell. Joseph Rouse also helps me at this point, through emails and his paper 'Mind, Body, and World: Todes and McDowell on Bodies and Language'; he is extremely patient to reply me and I really appreciate this. In Stroud's seminar we focused on Kripke's *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language*, and I also benefited a lot from his office hours. The term paper, 'Between the Cartesian and the Rylean: Lessons from Kripke's Semantic Skepticism,' has evolved into 'The Skeptical Paradox and the Nature of Self,' which is also under review; it constitutes the main part of my third episode here. In Fitelson's and Roush's seminar we wrought on Timothy Williamson's *Knowledge and Its Limits*. The book itself is highly challenging, and the members of the seminar made the situation even harder for us: they were just too good; I shall mention Kenny Easwaran, Mike Titelbaum, and Professor Jonathan Vogel from U. C. Davies. But I still managed to develop my own thoughts in my term paper 'A Subjective Notion of "Evidence",' and its descendent 'Evaluating Williamson's Anti-Skepticism' has been published in *Sorites* 21. I am not good at this kind of epistemology, but I took the seminar very seriously. I thank both Fitelson and Roush for their help and patience. Timothy Williamson also presented in the seminar once as a guest, and I thank him for answering my premature questions. I was also an audience of Professor John Campbell's 'Theory of Meaning,' Alva Noë's 'Nature of Mind,' and John Searle's 'Philosophy of Mind.' Campbell's humor made the lecture extremely interesting, Noë's eloquence made the lecture highly productive, and Searle's rigor made the lecture very exciting. Besides, I learned a lot from all of their office hours. Finally, let me express my special thanks to Professor John MacFarlane and Marga Vega. Wesley and I met MacFarlane at the conference 'Logic and Cognition' at Guanzhou, summer

2005. He was very nice to us and he later helped us apply for the status of visiting student of U. C. Berkeley. I am sorry for myself that at that time I was not in his seminars or lectures for practical reasons, and I hope I can learn more from him in the future. I also met Henry Jackman at that conference, and I met him again at the Eastern APA 2006. I thank him for discussing with me both in person and in emails, in particular on my piece 'Openness and the Social Initiation into the Space of Reasons.' Marga was a teaching assistant of Searle's lecture, and I was in her tutorial group. We talked a lot during the sessions and we had coffee together from time to time. She encouraged me a lot and that was very important for me: people in the philosophy department there were just too good, and I was sort of terrified. Anyway I express my gratitude to all of the people I met there. Life in Berkeley is just wonderful.

2006 was really a long year. Before the Sellars's conference, I met Professor Gregory Landini, David McCarty, and Danielle Macbeth in Taipei. McCarty and Landini were the instructors of 'Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* and Early Analytic Philosophy,' and Macbeth was the instructor of 'Frege's Logic.' The two courses were held by the philosophy department of Soochow University. All of them were very nice to me, and I keep in touch with them through emails. In particular, Macbeth helped me with my paper 'Openness and the Social Initiation into the Space of Reasons.' Later I met all of them again at 'Soochow International Conference on Analytic Philosophy' in June 2007. There I presented 'The Skeptical Paradox and the Nature of Self,' and I was indebted to Professor Richard Fumerton, Edwin Mares, Francesco Orilia, Christopher Pincock, Scott Soames, and Kenneth Williford for helpful comments. In particular, Fumerton spent an afternoon with me for discussing some of my thoughts, and that indirectly influenced what I say in this essay.

2008 is another fruitful year. In May, I met Professor Alan Hájek at 'Workshop of Research Method in Philosophy,' again held by Soochow University. There I learned much about research and academic writing from him. More importantly, I discuss with him my draft 'Disjunctivism, Intentionalism, and the Argument from Illusion,' which is extracted from my fifth episode. Hájek carefully went through much of the draft and commented on various points. The piece is still under revision, and Hájek's suggestions on the structure of it are well taken.

Professor Ernest Sosa is the other one who helps me greatly about the draft I am working on. We first met each other in 2006, at the conference 'Naturalized Epistemology and Philosophy of Science,' still another activity held by Soochow. Sosa visited again in 2008 for the first 'Soochow Lecture in Philosophy,' titled 'The Nature and Scope of Human Knowledge.' I learned much from this highly original lecture, and I also benefited from my discussion with Sosa on the draft I mentioned above. His philosophical as well as editorial suggestions are extremely helpful. I hope

I can engage his thinking further in the future.

After the Soochow Lecture, I participated the 12th annual meeting of ‘Association for the Scientific Study of Consciousness,’ held in Taipei. There I talked to many people, but I shall only mention a few. At that occasion I met Professor Ned Block again. I first met him at ‘Consciousness and Concept’ in 2005, where we also had Susan Carey, Stan Dehaene, Susan Hurley, Victor Lamme, and Alva Noë. Block is very nice to me, and all of his talks are clear and solid. He also spent some time on my draft; I appreciate his good will very much. I also want to give my very special thanks to Professor David Rosenthal. He is extremely friendly, and we spent few days together for discussing various things, including this essay. I am also indebted to Tim Bayne, Andrew Brook, Thomas Metzinger, Kristina Musholt, and Patrick Wilken. My interactions with them during the four days are intensive, but the most important part for me is their encouragements. At the present stage I am really wondering about my academic future, but after this meeting I feel more confident with myself. I am truly grateful for all of them. There are just too many thanks to say.

Because there are just too many, let me mention those who also helped me at some points without identifying the details. They are Professor Henry Allison, José Luis Bermúdez, Bill Brewer, Nicholas Bunnin, Alex Byrne, David Chalmers, Murray Clarke, Jonathan Dancy, Jerry Fodor, James Genone, Roger Gibson, Ronald Giere, Patrick Hawley, Benj Hellie, Matthew Kennedy, Hilary Kornblith, Heikki Koskinen, Ernest Lepore, Lilian Alweissl, Michael Luntley, Fiona Macpherson, Marie McGinn, Adam Morton, Timothy O’Connor, Scott Sturgeon, Daniel Whiting, and Allen Wood. Not all of them help me about this essay directly, and I think many of them don’t even remember me, but what they said to me, even only in emails, shape my thinking in one way or another. I hope they will feel fine if one day they find that their names are mentioned in a master thesis, written by a nobody.

Finally I hope to express my gratitude to Professor Donald Davidson, whom I never have a chance to talk to. I met him when he came to Taiwan in 2002 for ‘Conference on Davidson’s Philosophy,’ held by Tsing-Hua University. I was an undergraduate sophomore at that time, and I was too shy to talk to him. But since then I read a lot from him, especially papers in his *Subjective, Intersubjective, Objective*. His thinking paves a way for me to access McDowell’s thinking. And my use of ‘episode’ instead of ‘chapter’ in this essay is inspired by him, for I spent plenty of efforts envisaging the structure of the essay, and I hope I can finally have ‘a nice arrangement of episodes’ for it. Besides, sometimes respect is transitive, and in the present case my respect extends to Professor W. V. O. Quine. Although the present essay is not Quinean in any significant sense, this big name nevertheless influences me throughout my earliest days in philosophy; I dedicate my title ‘World and Subject’ to him.