

Deutsch, Max, *The Myth of the Intuitive: Experimental Philosophy and Philosophical Method*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2015, pp. xx + 194, US\$35 (hardback).

Max Deutsch's *The Myth of the Intuitive* is an exceptionally clearly written response to attempts to cast doubt on certain philosophical claims by showing that intuitions about those claims vary. These attempts assume that 'many philosophical arguments treat the fact that certain contents are intuitive as evidence for those very contents' (2015: 36). But, Deutsch claims, this is a myth. Philosophers never treat intuitions as evidence in this sense. Instead, philosophers argue for their claims. Even paradigmatic responses to thought experiments, such as Gettier's claim that the characters he describes have justified true belief without knowledge, are argued for; or so Deutsch tries to show by close reading of relevant texts (including a variety of responses to Gettier, as well as Kripke's Gödel-Schmidt case, Jackson's Mary case, and several others).

One may well ask what justifies the premises of these putative arguments. Perhaps intuitions are still waiting in the wings? Deutsch thinks not: what justifies the premises is further argument. There is, of course, the old and deep problem of finding something to stop the regress of justification; but Deutsch claims that this is a problem for any foundationalist view and that there is no particular worry about philosophy.

The book also contains discussions of Williamson's idea that the experimental philosophers' critique leads to a damaging form of scepticism, and certain other replies to experimental philosophers (including the idea that professional philosophers' intuitions are driven by some relevant expertise). It does not engage with theories of intuition in any detail, instead defending a 'no-theory' view (that for the purposes of debating the role of intuition in philosophy, it is best to avoid substantive characterisations of intuition, and to rely instead on a list of examples.) Nor does it engage with the details of the experimental philosophers' surveys and their results; instead, Deutsch just grants (at least for the sake of argument) that the surveys demonstrate variation in intuition (as their proponents claim). Proponents of intuition, experimental philosophers, and their critics may be disappointed to find their favourite detail of the debate is not discussed. But this keeps the book readable, and if Deutsch is right, these details matter little. The result is a distinctive and interesting account of what philosophy is all about.

Derek Ball

University of St Andrews