

SKEPTICISM, METAPHYSICAL REALISM AND TRANSCENDENTAL ARGUMENTS*

MARCO ANTONIO FRANGIOTTI

1. Skepticism

After all that has been said about transcendental arguments over the last three decades, it would seem that there is nothing else to be pointed out on such a topic.¹ Nevertheless, I do believe I have something to contribute to this discussion. My point is this: no response to the skeptic is valid if metaphysical realism is presupposed as the philosophical background against which he will be dealt with, no matter what kind of argument, whether transcendental or not, be put to work.

I think it is necessary to specify from the very beginning the kind of skeptic I am interested in, and with whom I am going to debate: he is someone who is not satisfied with the justification of most of his beliefs, particularly those regarding the external world. In different ways, he entertains suspicions about them and, not having found the answers, he asks us to help him. Resourceful as he is, our proposals are always brought into close examination, so that he keeps inviting us to consider counter-examples and antitheses to our alleged solutions.

He may well be a man of convictions, as we are. He may, for example, believe that, if he puts wood in the fire, it will burn. He may also believe he is a human being, with a body that interacts with other bodies

* I would like to thank CAPES, for financing my studies in the United Kingdom, and Professor Roberto Torretti, for his important suggestions.

¹ I shall use the expression "transcendental arguments" in a Strawsonian way, i.e., in reference to a kind of argumentation inspired by Kant whereby the skeptic can be neutralized. What is striking about this is the fact that Strawson and others think it is possible to do so without a previous commitment to some of the main points of Kant's doctrine.

in the world, and that the Tower of London did not disappear because he is in Paris drinking "l'eau Perrier" at the "Deux Magots" and cannot see or touch it. He takes it for granted that the world exists even if some of its parts are unobserved.

His dissatisfaction arises when he reflects upon those beliefs. He shares with us the same beliefs, but is keen to question why we trust them. In this way, it is futile to show him the trees in Gordon Square in order to prove that there are external objects, or to make him raise his hands to perceive that there are at least two external objects in space, like Moore did. He grants the existence of external objects from the very beginning. All that he is asking for is a justification of our certainties about most of our beliefs. Whatever the answer to the skeptic may be, if there is any, it has to be sought out in philosophy, not in everyday life.

This understood, I shall analyze, in section 2, the roots of the skeptic's restlessness. I shall show that skepticism is intrinsic to metaphysical realism. Based upon the results of such an analysis I shall endeavor, in section 3, to single out the general strategy of transcendental arguments, in order to show that they are open to the same criticism as metaphysical realism. Finally I shall examine, in section 4, an example of transcendental argument, namely, Putnam's brain in a vat, as a way of pointing out that an anti-skeptical argument cannot be constructed by paying attention merely to a specific proof-structure, but to the philosophical ground to which the skeptic resorts in order to make sense of his questions. In this way, Putnam's argument is shown to be ineffective against the skeptic.

2. Metaphysical Realism

Someone who was born with a disease in his eyes may see the world quite differently. For example, he may be in a similar position to a person who looks in one of those mirrors at the circus that distort forms, showing fat people as skinny, short ones as tall, etc. A man who has an eye disease like that is incapable of contemplating the world as it is for us, who do not suffer from the same disease. He is able, however, to play this disability down. A healthy man can tell him the non-distorted characteristics of the external world. The objects, the story goes, are flatter, or shorter, etc., than he sees them. His view of the world is, as it were, corrected or improved through the testimony of those who see the

world without distortion of any kind. Likewise, he may use glasses or contact lenses to compensate his visual limitations.

Suppose now that all of us suffered from a similar disease. In that event, there would be no one to resort to, no one who could grasp a clear and genuine (non-distorted) picture of the world and *ipso facto* there would be no way of correcting our deformed visual experiences of objects outside us. In a more philosophical discourse, this collective disease may be said to be just the constitution of our cognitive capacities, i.e., our sensorial and conceptual conditions through the exercise of which alone we can grasp knowledge of objects. In that case, we would be talking about two worlds: one we grasp through the constraints of our epistemic resources; and another, somewhat hidden behind the former, completely apart from our point of view. The external object, then, would be not this printer I am seeing right now —because it is appearing within my misshapen (epistemically constrained) visual scope —, but something which can only be described from its own point of view, i.e., from a point of view that observes the object as it is without the limitations of ours. In a nutshell, the external object would be *the thing in itself*, i.e., the thing as it would be seen without the constraints of our conditions of experience. Take, for example, this table in front of me. Let us deprive it of its three dimensions, its permanence in different moments of time, its color, its impenetrability, etc. What we are left with is just a *W*, just some “thing” whose properties are thoroughly independent of the mind, but at which the mind has to arrive somehow in order to produce knowledge of objects.

The doctrine that reality has a character which is thoroughly independent of, or apart from, our cognitive apparatus, is what I understand to be the cardinal claim of *metaphysical realism*. Understood in this sense, the metaphysical realist enterprise towards the knowledge of the external world portrays the mind as playing a subsidiary role. In fact, the mind seems to be always trying to find a way to the object, whose features have to be brought into light somehow. The mind never collaborates in the generation and order of those features by any means. Hence, we are entitled to say that, within this metaphysical realist picture, our knowledge of the external world is to be thought of as dictated, at the end of the day, by the object alone, not by the mind. It is the former that, as it were, wears the trousers. Come what may, the ‘real’ world lies already made or constituted over there outside the limits of our experience, the mind endeavoring to inspect it. The metaphysical realist, like

the man with an eye disease, struggles to dispense with the experience-able (distorted) features that are given to the mind, in order to focus his attention solely on the mind-independent ones.

From the very start, then, metaphysical realism allows for the possibility that our conception of the external world is just a fake, a distorted copy of it. Unlike the man with an eye disease—who may be told the normal characteristics of the external world by healthy people—the metaphysical realist does not have at his disposal the testimony of someone who may see the world as it is in itself, apart from our human conditions. The difficulty arises as to whether his empirical knowledge matches or corresponds to the “real” world or is just a product of a deceiving agent, an evil demon, or a mad scientist, who has endowed him (us) with an irresistible commitment to a collection of illusions that have no “real” referent whatsoever. Once this gap is established, the skeptic comes up asking the metaphysical realist to bridge it. If the latter can ever build it up, that is just fine and our cognitive claims are liable to a proper philosophical foundation. Otherwise, there will be no difference between our cognitive claims and claims based on faith, pure luck or other non-philosophical sources.

Let me go back to the situation of the man with an eye disease. There is at least one source, say *X*, whereby he can grasp a genuine (non-distorted) description of the world. Despite his disability, he enjoys a comfortable position, for he is able to support and give legitimacy to his claims of knowledge. His job is to compare his visual experiences with the descriptions that *X*, a reliable source, has given to him. The metaphysical realist, though, cannot appeal to an *X*, i.e., a source that can tell him what things in themselves are like.

If otherwise, i.e., if an *X* were available, say, some entity capable of experiencing things in themselves without being constrained to our human limitations, the problem would, then, shift from one point to another. The metaphysical realist was not, before, in a position to know things in themselves; now, although *X* has this knowledge, he finds no means to acquire *X*'s knowledge so as to incorporate it into his experience. If asked by the skeptic why he is so sure that *X* *does* experience things in themselves, he will be in trouble. The man with an eye disease is not exempted from this challenge. But he has himself the means to verify whether *X* is being a reliable source or not. When *X* describes, say, a vase, the man with an eye disease can touch it and, if he is clever, he will be able to form a picture of the vase in his mind. The metaphysi-

cal realist cannot do that, for his senses do not go beyond the veil of appearances. This suggests that it is not enough to resort to an agent *X* in order to confirm that our experience of things matches the way things really are. This is a job the metaphysical realist himself has to do. He is obliged to have access to *X*'s experiences to ensure that things for us and things in themselves go hand in hand, i.e., that the first set of things corresponds to the second.

Were *X* taken as a reliable source in advance, without further ado, the metaphysical realist would not need to have direct access to its experiences and the correspondence problem would be liable to a proper solution. Taking this into account, the realist might either, like Descartes, let God play *X*'s role (for He is by definition all benevolent and would never deceive us); or, like Leibniz, claim that there is a pre-established harmony between the representational world and the reality in itself, as though they were two watches ticking in perfect synchronization. Now, the appeal to a divine entity is less an explanation than a further complication which leads us nowhere. Likewise, the hypothesis of a perfect syntony between those two worlds requires either the conception of a Supreme Being, who would be thought of as ultimately responsible for the creation and maintenance of such alleged harmony—which means we would go back to the problems of the Cartesian solution—or a lucky coincidence, which can hardly be considered a philosophical explanation. It seems, then, that the reality in itself and God are on the same footing: all that is required is the way to reach them so as to justify our claims of knowledge of the external world. But each one is opaque to our experience; unless the faith in God is called into the discussion—and the skeptic would immediately repudiate this strategy—the establishing of the correspondence seems to lie beyond our cognitive capacities.

Let me put this point in another way. If the metaphysical realist believes he is in possession of a reliable method to bridge the gap between experience and the external world, he must be prepared to face not only the skeptic, who is going to challenge him, but anyone else who may think he also has a reliable description of the world. When he comes across another metaphysical realist, they may be keen to put their views together, in the hope that those views coincide. If this happens, it seems to me that we are no better off, for the skeptic may raise the possibility of finding a third metaphysical realist who has a quite different view that clashes with the former ones. Unless the first two have at their disposal

the means to reach the definitive set of characteristics of things in themselves, they do not obstruct the skeptic's reservations. In the absence of those means, they have to admit that the skeptic has made a point and that the real world might well not be as their theories describe it.

Keeping these considerations in mind, it seems that the metaphysical realist has failed to explain to the skeptic *what* it is that is external, independent of our awareness, distinct from our thoughts. The metaphysical realist puts himself in a situation where no possible description *Y* is satisfactory, for the things of which *Y* is a property are not cognitively reachable and cannot be shown to possess either *Y* or $\sim Y$. In that context, the skeptic finds himself just at the point he started, asking for a satisfactory answer to his demands for the justification of our knowledge of externality. From those considerations I can conclude that metaphysical realism is not an adequate, a persuasive philosophical background against which the skeptic will find his answers. Quite otherwise, it yields a picture of the external world wherein the skeptic feels quite comfortable to continue challenging our empirical beliefs.

3. Transcendental Arguments

The users of transcendental arguments advise us to reason against the skeptic as follows: if we can prove that the beliefs we entertain about the external world serve as pre-conditions of intelligible thought, i.e., if we can prove that without them we can by no means think consistently, the skeptical challenge will backfire. The skeptic's refusal to accept the truth of propositions about the beliefs which are under his suspicion implies the incomprehensibility of his own doubts. Transcendental arguments, thus, can be said to show not that a proposition is true, but that it must be taken to be true if some indispensable sphere of thought or experience is to be possible.²

In that way, the complex problem of whether or not there is an external world independent of our awareness of it, for example, can be disentangled not by proceeding from a given premise in order to reach a certain conclusion which solves the initial problem, i.e., by deductively drawing certain conclusions from premises already known as being true.

² Cf. Griffiths 1969, p. 167; Lacey 1976, p. 244.

In fact, the procedure seems to go in the opposite direction. Given that we are able to have comprehensible experience or thought, without which the skeptic could not formulate his doubt comprehensibly, it is asked what are the conditions of intelligibility. In this case, propositions about certain beliefs which are under skeptical fire are taken as true for the sake of what is stated as a starting point, namely, that we are capable of thinking intelligibly. As Strawson says, "it is only because the solution is possible that the problem exists. So with all transcendental arguments".³ In other words, it is only because we have always been capable of identifying objects in such and such ways according to our conceptual scheme that an inquiry into the conditions under which alone we can do this is possible at all.

My reservation about transcendental arguments is this. The skeptic seems to have little to lose by acquiescing in the commitment that the users of transcendental arguments press him to make towards intelligible thought. He might plausibly contend that, as far as he is concerned, he is indeed committed to accepting that the beliefs about the external world *have to be taken* as true. Even before formulating the challenge, he may take it for granted that we must see those beliefs as holding, either because of his commitment to comprehensible thought or because of his natural instincts. He can say, for example, that, without empirical beliefs, we would never be able to survive. Like Hume, he may point out that, when life is taken into account, when he is playing backgammon with his friends, philosophical doubts about the existence of an external world seems not only artificial, but also contrary to our everyday practices.⁴ Granted that he, the skeptic, is committed to considering some of his beliefs as true, this does not imply they *are really true*. For the sake of either intelligibility or survival, he will never say otherwise. This obligation, however, is beside the point. What is at issue is whether propositions about those beliefs properly describe objective states of affairs and not whether those propositions have to be admitted as true.⁵

³ Strawson 1959, p. 40.

⁴ "We may well ask, *What causes induce us to believe in the existence of body?* but 'tis vain to ask, *Whether there be body or not?* That is a point, which we must take for granted in all our reasonings" (Hume, T 187).

⁵ This point is made by Stroud when he objects Strawson's view. Nevertheless, Stroud does not seem to be clearly aware that his own position is a metaphysical realist one. That is why, at the end of the day, he surrenders to skepticism as the only epistemological alternative. By criticizing the philosophical background against which

To spell this out, the skeptic may easily protect his doubts from the users of transcendental arguments by an appeal to metaphysical realism. Since the world in itself lies beyond our awareness, a connection between his empirical beliefs and intelligible thought does not provide him the required access to that world and *eo ipso* does not justify his claims of knowledge of the external world. In the face of it, he can concede that, within the experiential field, commitments of the type proposed by the users of transcendental arguments have to be taken as true, but it is still at issue whether some of the members of this set of beliefs—the empirical ones—actually match or correspond to the reality behind the veil of appearances.

Thus, in my opinion, if transcendental arguments assume metaphysical realist grounds, the best they can do is to extract from the skeptic a commitment which does not even scratch his real worries. This is tantamount to saying that the skeptic can always seek refuge in the metaphysical realist picture and hence that, given this picture, he is always free to continue entertaining the same doubts about his empirical beliefs.

In this way, I take it that the answer to the skeptic, if there is any, cannot be achieved by means of a special kind of structure of argumentation alone, as the users of transcendental arguments seem to assume. The reply to the skeptic must start by addressing the conception of the external world. Once we allow metaphysical realism into play, our anti-skeptical efforts will take us nowhere.

4. Putnam's Transcendental Argument

This conclusion can be reinforced if we consider a recent, well-known example of a transcendental argument. I have in mind Putnam's discussion of the brain in a vat hypothesis. The reason for this choice is simple: it is a question of great controversy in recent days and the detractors seem to be at the same level as the defenders. My tactic will be basically the same as the one I used in the last section. I will try to show that Putnam leaves untouched the possibility that the skeptic can

alone the skeptic can raise his doubts, I believe that it is possible to allow for the constitution of a sound Epistemology far away from metaphysical realism and, thus, to set the skeptic aside. But since this project is pretty wide, I shall not deal with it in this paper.

appeal to a metaphysical realist picture and thereby carry on doubting about the justification of his empirical beliefs.

The vat hypothesis can be sketched as follows. It is possible to imagine a world in which the sentient creatures who inhabit it, and who have ever existed, are brains residing in a vat of nutrients, perhaps controlled by a sophisticated computer created and managed by an evil scientist. These brains have always been in such a situation that what they seem to observe, or feel, or hear, or touch, is in fact the result of computer-controlled electronic impulses. The experiences for each brain provided by the automatic apparatus duplicate in detail the experiences of actual human beings and other sentient creatures. Keeping this in mind, the skeptic suggests, as it is predictable, that such a *Gedankenexperiment* might, for all we know, be not mere fantasy but *our* actual situation. How can we possibly know that we are not in just the kind of situation described?

The vat skeptic starts off admitting that it is in principle possible that I am a brain in a vat inhabiting a vat world in which the thinking beings are also envatted, and that a computer stimulates us so as to produce an illusion of an external, spatial world. If I were envatted, then I am not, for example, in front of my computer typing my thoughts, so that the propositions "I am a brain in a vat" and "I am now in front of my Mac" are mutually exclusive. In other words, if I accept the truth of the former, and that means I really conclude I am envatted, then I cannot accept the truth of the latter. Likewise, if I accept the truth of the latter, then I cannot accept the truth of the former. Now, the vat skeptic challenges my knowledge of my being now in front of my Mac, which is to say, he claims I have no rational guarantee that what I take it to be my present situation and, concomitantly, my overall view of the world, is in fact the case.

Putnam proposes a way of undermining the skeptical hypothesis that matches our general description of transcendental arguments. This hypothesis is, according to him, self-defeating. Roughly speaking, he focuses his account on the possibility of our being able to refer to objects in a vat situation. If I were a brain in a vat, then terms like "table", "chair", "elephant", as used by me, would refer not to actual tables, chairs and elephants, but to whatever images the computer or the mad scientist behind the computer causes me to have. In that event, words like "brain" and "vat" would not refer to actual brains and vats but to those images, and the proposition "I am a brain in a vat" could not be

true. Putnam claims that, if the hypothesis is true, then it is false. In other words, if it is indeed the case that I am an envatted brain, then, when I utter “I am a brain in a vat”, I am not referring to “real” brains or vats, so that the proposition is to be regarded as false. In this way, as any other user of transcendental arguments, Putnam tries to reduce the vat hypothesis to an absurdity. We can only suppose that we are brains in a vat because we are not brains in a vat.⁶

To prove that the hypothesis in question is self-defeating, Putnam’s argument refers us to the semantics of the sentence “I am a brain in a vat”. If this sentence is uttered by a brain in a vat, then it cannot be true. The reason, according to Putnam, is that non envatted brains refer to things in a very different way from the way envatted brains do. Vat expressions are empty, for there are, according to the vat hypothesis, no objects in the vat world —except brains, vats, a computer and perhaps a mad neuro-scientist— to which vat expressions might correspond. My mental vat-states would be indistinguishable from my experiential, “external” states. My expression “Mac” and the expression “Mac-image”, i.e., the vat illusion of my Mac in front of me, would be both caused by electronic impulses. In that case, while the term “Mac” pronounced or thought by a non envatted brain refers to a Mac, when pronounced or thought by an envatted brain, it refers to “Mac-image”, so that it does not refer to any “real” thing at all. This is so because there is no object for the vat term “Mac”, which thus becomes deprived of a proper referent. Thus, propositions about “Mac-image” cannot be true. In other words, the vat utterance “my Mac is now in front of me” would be true if and only if the envatted utterer were having the experience of a non vat Mac. But since according to the hypothesis brains in a vat cannot have such experiences, the utterance is, Putnam contends, necessarily false. Now, the same observations can be made if we substitute for the vat sentence “My Mac is now in front of me” the vat sentence “I am a brain in vat”. That is the very heart of Putnam’s strategy. If I were a brain in a vat, the sentence “I am a brain in a vat” would be *false*. Therefore, the sentence “I am a brain in a vat” is self-defeating, for if it is true —i.e., if I am an envatted brain—, then it is false, i.e., then I am not an envatted brain.

Let us be careful here. If by being in a vat condition I cannot judge in a determinate way anything about the world or about myself, that means I am incapable of establishing the truth value of propositions in general.

⁶ Cf. Putnam 1981, pp. 6-9.

If this is so, then, in my vat condition, the proposition "I am a brain in a vat", as thought by me, cannot be said to be false, much less true. If we stick to the hypothesis that I am a brain in a vat, anything *I* can possibly state in a vat condition is nothing more than *flatus vocis*, i.e., a mere grunt or a set of meaningless sounds. That being so, Putnam is only entitled to affirm that the proposition "I am a brain in a vat" is false *provided* that he is *not* a brain in a vat. Only if he makes this non-vat assumption can he state propositions with a definite truth value. That is, Putnam's claim that the proposition "I am a brain in vat" is false only if it is true, will not do unless he assumes a non vat standpoint. Only by means of this assumption can the proposition be regarded true or false. But this is exactly what is at stake: what makes me so sure that my alleged non vat situation is not "actually" a vat one?⁷

The recourse to an alleged non problematic (non vat) point of view takes us back where we started, namely, to the metaphysical realist picture, for it reinstates the idea of a super-sensible world apart from the world we experience through the senses and which is under fire by the skeptic. Within such a picture the skeptic may easily contend that, even if we take as true that we are not brains in a vat, this claim can only be made within *our* view of the world. Nevertheless, it is still to be proved on what grounds we take for granted that our point of view does coincide with the way the world *really* is. Therefore, by not challenging the metaphysical realist background in his response to the vat skeptic, Putnam allows this latter to raise his worries based on the idea of a totally mind-independent world, bringing back all those reservations I exposed earlier on.⁸

⁷ A slightly similar conclusion, although drawn from different premises and without exploring the metaphysical realist background of Putnam's position, is given by Brueckner: "I can conclude from this that I am a normal human being rather than a BIV —and thereby lay the skepticism problem to rest— only if I can assume that I mean by 'I may be a BIV' what normal human beings mean by it. But I am entitled to that assumption only if I am entitled to assume that I am a normal human being speaking English rather than a BIV speaking vat-English. This must be *shown* by an anti-skeptical argument, not assumed in advance" (Brueckner 1986, p. 160; cf. McIntyre 1984, p. 60).

⁸ I am aware that Putnam is *not* a metaphysical realist. He rather presents his view as a "demythologized Kantianism", without "things in themselves and transcendental egos" (Putnam 1978, pp. 5-6), calling it internal realism (cf. Putnam 1981, p. 49 ff.). Within it, he acknowledges, the vat hypothesis is just a fairy tale, for it can only be told from a God's Eye point of view (cf. *ibid.*, p. 50). I do not intend to quarrel with Putnam about his Kantian-like approach. My point is rather that he deals with the vat hypothesis

As a matter of fact, the skeptical worries about the rational credentials of our empirical knowledge can only arise if there is presupposed from the very beginning a reality in itself to which the experiential world must somehow correspond. Putnam does not seem to try to undermine the skeptical riddle by denying such a background; he rather boasts that he has defeated the skeptic within that troublesome territory. The point I am making, however, is that on the metaphysical realist basis the skeptic is unbeatable. There is no way of bridging the gap between our view of the world and "the way the world really is".

For this reason, it is hard to see Putnam's argument rebutting the skeptic. What the skeptic attacks is the supposedly rational basis whereupon we are entitled to decide what is true and what is false. Putnam struggles to drag the non vat world into the vat one, i.e., he manages to interpret a possible vat situation by means of an alleged non vat viewpoint. The skeptic, however, reasons the other way round, i.e., he casts doubts about the soundness of our conceptualizing and judging what is true or false.⁹ The question is not from what standpoint I can judge my present situation but rather how I can judge my present situation provided that my standpoint is being bombarded and seems to lack a proper foundation. If I do not have an unshaken standpoint, I might lack the required conceptual framework to take account of my situation.¹⁰ It might well be the case that I could not really *understand* the proposition "I am a brain in a vat". As a consequence, I could not determine, for a given proposition, whether it is true or false.

To be more precise, Putnam argues that, if I assume that the proposition "I am a brain in a vat" is true, then I must admit that it is false, but he does not argue in favor of the basis of our certainty about what is true and what is false. It has to be proved that we are not mistaken with respect to what *we* can refer to. Without such a proof, we might not be able to account for the truth or the falsity of propositions. In that case, we might be able to suppose neither the antecedent of the conditional, i.e., that the proposition "I am a brain in a vat" is true, nor the consequent, i.e. that this proposition is false.

from the outside of his internal realism. As a result, like any other user of transcendental arguments, he fails to address the key point of my quarrel with the skeptic, namely, the conception of the external world.

⁹ Cf. Putnam 1981, p. 14.

¹⁰ Nagel 1986, p. 73; cf. Sacks 1989, chap. 3, *passim*.

There still remains, thus, the task of determining the legitimacy of our decision procedure; it is exactly towards this legitimacy that the skeptical doubts are directed. The skeptic would be able to accept that, for the sake of intelligibly conveying my thoughts, I am bound to believe that I am not a brain in a vat, that I am capable of properly referring to external objects. This, however, does not rebut his doubts: from the fact that I am bound to believe that I can refer to external objects it does not necessarily follow that I can indeed refer to external objects.¹¹ It might well be part of the vat illusion that I must be committed to maintaining that my belief in properly referring to external objects is sound and that, as a consequence, I am not capable of thinking intelligibly, but only of vat thinking. Unless means are provided for me to be sure that what I refer to is indeed an external object, I do not actually defeat the skeptic.

From those remarks it follows that Putnam's claim that if the proposition "I am a brain in a vat" is true then it is false when pronounced by an envatted being cannot be sustained. Before starting his alleged anti-skeptical argument, Putnam has to provide us the necessary and legitimate means through which alone our certainties about what is true and false are well founded. The same applies, *pace* Strawson and others, to any user of transcendental arguments.

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

REFERENCES

- Bieri, P. et al. (1979). *Transcendental Arguments and Science*, Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Brueckner, A.L. (1986). "Brains in a Vat", *The Journal of Philosophy* **83**:148-167.
- _____ (1983). "Transcendental Arguments I", *Nous* **17**:551-575.
- _____ (1984). "Transcendental Arguments II", *Nous* **18**:197-225..
- Bubner, R. (1974). "Kant, Transcendental Arguments, and the Problem of the Deduction", *Review of Metaphysics* **28**:453-467.
- Coppock, P. (1987). "Putnam's Transcendental Argument", *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* **68**:14-28.
- Genova, A. C. (1984). "Good Transcendental Arguments", *Kantstudien* **75**:469-495.

¹¹ In this point I am in thorough agreement with Stroud. His problem, however, is that he does not abandon the metaphysical realist picture and concludes that there is no satisfactory way of defeating the skeptic (cf. Stroud 1968, pp. 252 ff.).

- Griffiths, A.P. (1969). "Transcendental Arguments", *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, suppl. vol. 43, pp. 165-180.
- Hume, D. (T). *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lacey, A. R. (1986). *A Dictionary of Philosophy*, London: Routledge.
- McIntyre, A. J. (1984). "Putnam's Brains", *Analysis*, 44:59-61.
- Nagel, T. (1986). *The View From Nowhere*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Putnam, H. (1978). *Meaning and the Moral Sciences*, London: Routledge.
- _____ (1981). *Reason, Truth and History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, M. (1989). *The World We Found*, London: Duckworth.
- Strawson, P. (1966). *The Bounds of Sense*, London: Methuen.
- _____ (1959). *Individuals*, London: Methuen.
- _____ (1985). *Skepticism & Naturalism: Some Varieties*, London: Methuen.
- Stroud, B. (1977). *Hume*, London: Routledge.
- _____ (1984). *The Significance of Philosophical Scepticism*, Oxford: Clarendon
- _____ (1968). "Transcendental Arguments", *Journal of Philosophy* 65:241-256.
- Walker, R.C.S. (1982). *Kant*, London: Routledge.