
ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Introduction to the special issue *New Thoughts on Conceptual Engineering*

Xavier de Donato-Rodríguez

Department of Philosophy, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain

Correspondence

Xavier de Donato-Rodríguez, University of Santiago de Compostela, Department of Philosophy, Plaza de Mazarelos s/n, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain.
Email: xavier.dedonato@usc.es

Abstract

Conceptual engineering has emerged in recent times as a significant topic in current philosophical literature. The now vast list of references includes works on more general or conceptual issues, such as describing the nature of conceptual engineering, how we may respond to the different objections to it, how it is related to philosophical analysis or empirical philosophy, or toward which target conceptual engineering should be directed, among others. But research on the topic also includes applications of conceptual engineering to many different areas. This Introduction opens with a short overview of the state of the art on conceptual engineering, aiming to clarify the most important features associated with it. The Introduction moves on to introduce and discuss the eight articles collected here, whose topics range from the nature and the functionality of conceptual engineering to reconstructing the entire conceptual engineering practice. Taken as a whole, this special issue is meant to provide enlightening, informative, and thought-provoking views on the topic, its functions, targets, and challenges.

KEYWORDS

amelioration, conceptual engineering, deflationary metaontology, functional turn, implementation challenge, metalinguistic negotiation

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2025 The Author(s). *Metaphilosophy* published by Metaphilosophy LLC and John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

1 | A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF CONCEPTUAL ENGINEERING

Conceptual engineering has emerged in recent times as a significant topic in current philosophical literature. Nevertheless, and as suggested by Herman Cappelen in the preface to *Fixing Language* (2018), one of the most important books devoted to this topic, “Conceptual engineering isn't a recognized field within philosophy. I think that's unfortunate. It should be considered one of the central topics of philosophy, or perhaps even the central topic of philosophy” (Cappelen 2018, ix).

Between 2018 (when Cappelen's book was published) and 2025, a large number of papers and books have appeared on conceptual engineering. These works are not only theoretical papers focused on describing the nature of conceptual engineering, how we may respond to different objections to it (that is, the trivialization and the implementation challenges), how it is related to analysis and other philosophical methods, which functions it has or should have or toward which targets it should be directed.¹ Some works also tackle how conceptual engineering can be applied to fields like conceptual ethics, social ontology, philosophy of medicine, feminism inquiry, and analytic theology.² Perceptively, Manuel Gustavo Isaac argues (in this issue) that ‘conceptual engineering’ is the new buzzword in the world of philosophical methods. But what is conceptual engineering? The concept was initially related to Rudolf Carnap's program of explication or rational reconstruction: in this sense, Richard Creath used the term for the first time in Creath 1990, in relation to Carnap's project. After that, Brun (2016), Chalmers (2020), and Dutilh Novaes (2020) have been among other authors who have related Carnap's explication to conceptual engineering. And, in a similar vein, conceptual engineering has been also related to Sally Haslanger's (2012) ameliorative project, which suggests strategies to improve concepts such as those of gender and race. In a completely unrelated way, Simon Blackburn used the expression to refer to philosophical activity per se. Thinking about concepts like knowledge, truth, existence, and freedom, which is what we as philosophers do, inevitably implies “*reflecting* on concepts and procedures and beliefs that we normally just *use*. We are looking at the scaffolding of our thought, and doing conceptual engineering” (Blackburn 1999, 4). Other authors have seen conceptual engineering as nothing particularly new, because philosophy itself can be conceived of as conceptual engineering (see, e.g., Floridi 2011 or Eklund 2021). This is not to argue that philosophers have always done conceptual engineering; rather it suggests that one of the aims and methods of philosophy has always had to do with clarifying, revising, and in some cases replacing concepts, which is precisely the idea behind what is usually referred to as ‘conceptual engineering’. For example, Amie Thomasson (2021a) defends the idea that philosophy can be seen as conceptual engineering and views this as a sort of antidote to a form of (mis)conceiving philosophy as aiming to reveal the genuine essence of reality. This would amount to conceiving philosophy as a kind of rival of the natural sciences, which is probably not a good way to conceive it. But if philosophy is instead conceived of as being concerned with analyzing, assessing, revising, and ameliorating our concepts instead of being thought of as a way to produce discoveries about the structure of the world, then philosophy becomes a complementary activity to the sciences, even an ally of them. Thomasson puts it in this way: “As Carnap saw, it may work hand-in-hand with the sciences—with physics in asking how we should think of space and time, or with biology in asking what species concept we should use, or more broadly in asking how we should understand confirmation, evidence, and inference. Or it may work on concepts that are not the province of science at all, but still play central roles in human

¹These works include, among others: Dobler 2025, Belleri 2025, Köhler and Veluwenkamp 2024, Sękowski and Landes 2024, Jorem and Löhr 2024, Eklund 2024, Isaac 2023, Queloz and Bieber 2022, Nado 2021a and 2021c, Jorem 2021, Koch 2021, Löhr 2021, Belleri 2021, Isaac 2021, Haslanger 2020a and 2020b, Deutsch 2020, Chalmers 2020, and Koch 2019.

²E.g., Bendifallah et al. 2025, Stalmaszczyk 2024, Neufeld 2024, van der Linden and Schermer 2024, Mamin 2024, Oliphint 2023, Greenough et al. 2023, and Burgess, Cappelen, and Plunkett 2020.

life—concepts such as art, freedom, responsibility, consciousness, or person” (Thomasson 2021a, 10). According to Cappelen (2018), the primary goal of conceptual engineering is to assess and improve our representational devices, including our conceptual systems. David Chalmers (2020), in turn, defines conceptual engineering as the design, evaluation, and implementation of concepts, drawing a distinction between *de novo* conceptual engineering (when a new concept or framework is first introduced) and *reengineering* (when an existing concept is revised in the light of various reasons that make such revision advisable). One task of the philosopher seems to enrich our vocabulary with technical concepts (supervenience, Miranda Fricker's epistemic injustice, Saul Kripke's rigid designator, David Kaplan's character) in order to illuminate or better account for a problem, but there are also numerous examples in which the task of the philosopher has more to do with revising and fixing the content of an old concept.

In any case, conceptual engineering has been correctly identified as a prescriptive or normative activity consisting mainly in revising the extension and the intension of terms and concepts (which in their turn have been construed in different ways: as representational devices, classification procedures, abstract artifacts, and so on). Conceptual engineers are not mere analyzers of concepts or simply armchair philosophers; they aim to present themselves as concept innovators, improvers, or revisioners (Queloz 2025, 48). Or, in Jennifer Nado's words: “Conceptual engineers aim to improve or to replace rather than to analyse; to create rather than to discover. While conceptual analysts are interested in the concepts we do have, conceptual engineers are interested in the concepts we ought to have. Their project is prescriptive rather than descriptive” (Nado 2021a, 1509). Often this activity is guided by logical and epistemic reasons, but it may also be motivated by ethical, political, or social concerns. First, it can be claimed that the project is both semantically and ontologically revisionary, insofar as it seeks to fix or reconceptualize concepts that are part of our ordinary repertoire, with the critical aim of challenging defective or problematic uses—those that beg for revision for epistemological, ethical, or social reasons. Second, and given that ethical, social, and political reasons may be among the motivations for revising a concept, conceptual engineering can be expected—or at least is intended—to have practical consequences in terms of improving the very community or society whose conceptual framework is under examination. This includes, for example, correcting entrenched biases or widely shared but mistaken intuitions.

This latter remark begs for the consideration of another important feature that has also been associated with conceptual engineering: namely, the fact that conceptual engineering is a *goal-oriented* activity. After all, concepts are tools that may serve different functions and purposes. A scientific concept supplies the function of organizing experience and being used in explanations. An ethical concept serves the function of prescribing norms and providing values for human (and perhaps also nonhuman) behavior. Following this intuition, many conceptual engineering scholars have tried to emphasize the need to tackle the function of concepts in conceptual engineering. In this way, the so-called functional turn came to the fore, which is based on the idea that the *function* of concepts is what determines how we should engineer them.³ A good representative scholar in this regard is Thomasson (2017, 2020, 2021b, 2025, chap. 9, and [forthcoming](#)), who has embraced a pragmatic and functional approach to conceptual engineering that uses functional assessments in a way that is not arbitrary and that can give us grounds for criticizing conceptual choices, but without appealing to substantial metaphysical facts. First, we can evaluate a concept with respect to how well it fulfills its alleged function and whether that function is valuable at all. When this is not the case, we may aim to redesign that concept to better serve its function or to search for a new concept that could serve this purpose.

But what kind of values and goals should guide our concepts and the entire activity of conceptual engineering? Could we have a method for knowing when a conceptual change proposal should be implemented? This question becomes even more pressing in the case of concepts that

³See, e.g., Köhler and Veluwenkamp 2024, Queloz 2022, Jorem 2022, Nado 2021a and 2021b, Haslanger 2020a and 2020b, Simion and Kelp 2020, and Haslanger 2012.

have special ethical, political, or social relevance. And it is in this context that it would be desirable to have a systematic and general approach that may account for the efficiency of our engineering purposes. Some of the papers in this collection precisely try to contribute to this fundamental issue, making clear that conceptual engineering, no matter if understood in a pragmatic or in a more realistic manner, can use both conceptual and empirical methods during the process of engineering.⁴

In this special issue several of the contributions explore the functionality aspect of conceptual engineering in different ways or try to delve into the question of innovation. Other articles in the issue aim to reconstruct the whole process of conceptual engineering, with the intention of formulating models that may serve as a guide to how to proceed in this task, thus highlighting what makes conceptual engineering a specifically philosophical task. Last but not least, two of the contributions deal with the so-called implementation challenge.

2 | AN OVERVIEW OF THE ARTICLES IN THIS COLLECTION

In his paper “The Hallmark Problem for Conceptual Engineering,” Manuel Gustavo Isaac argues in favor of conceptual engineering as a radically innovative philosophical method, though one that may not have exclusively philosophical purposes. Isaac’s “hallmark problem” addresses the question of what, if anything, should be distinctive in conceptual engineering as a philosophical method. The author proceeds in an unusual way: he starts with the phrase ‘conceptual engineering’ and then identifies a suitable phenomenon carrying out an analysis of the ‘engineering’ label and its associated connotations. What arises from this is a framework that suggests that philosophy is a problem-oriented activity. Isaac’s argument also entails a method for assessing different options that try to make sense of the ‘engineering’ label in order to develop a model for the engineering process. This is taken to be a narrow way of understanding the ‘engineering’ label, which requires the target objects of the engineering to be functional and to possess some measurement criteria for ameliorating the target devices’ functionality. In this sense, Isaac combines three compatible accounts of the engineering process (the componential, the relational, and the dynamic) to reconstruct the engineering process for conceptual engineering as a flexible, nonlinear, and iterative set of step-by-step operations. What arises from this is a way of presenting conceptual engineering as an activity to be intentionally guided and with an aim and purpose in view (against Cappelen’s ‘anti-luminosity condition’).

Reconstructive models of the process of conceptual engineering like those provided by Brun (2016) and Isaac, Koch, and Nefdt (2022)—and also by Isaac in this volume—are of formidable utility for approaching conceptual engineering as a method. The general pattern of four stages—description, evaluation, improvement, and implementation—provided by Isaac, Koch, and Nefdt (2022) is followed as a template by Concha Martínez-Vidal in her contribution to this collection, entitled “Proofs, Computers, and the *A Priori*: Is There Anything to Fix?” In her article, she wonders whether there is a need to engineer our concept of proof, given that computers are increasingly being used as tools for mathematical proofs that otherwise are very difficult (perhaps not even possible) to obtain. While some authors argue that the use of computers in these cases vitiates the a priori nature of the proofs, Martínez-Vidal aims to ponder whether the concept of proof should be extended to include these cases, and whether the alleged a priori character of proofs is in need of revision. She departs here from 1976 computer-aided proof of a conjecture known since the nineteenth century: the so-called Four-Color Theorem, according to which any map can

⁴That empirical methods are not only possible but also desirable or even necessary in conceptual engineering has been highlighted by different authors: Landes 2025, Nado 2021b, Andow 2020, Koch 2019, and, e.g., Löhr and Veluwenkamp’s article in this issue.

use no more than four colors without painting adjacent regions with the same color. A formalization of this theorem came later, in 2005, when Canadian computer scientist Georges Gonthier used a proof assistant called Rocq to verify this result. By employing the concepts of the shareability and the transferability of a proof used by Silvia De Toffoli (2021), Martínez-Vidal argues that having computer-generated proofs verified by proof assistants can be a way of obtaining proofs that would be shareable and transferable. Shareability means that the proof can eventually be grasped by a human mind. In turn, transferability means that the sequence of propositions per se constitutes a proof, regardless of the method used for carrying out the proof. On the one hand, what computers do at the software level is a finite deduction, so that their results can be considered transferable ones. On the other hand, for human mathematicians it would be possible to recognize that some computers are doing what they are supposed to do correctly, so that mathematicians can justifiably believe that those computers are reliable devices for doing mathematical proofs. If we could reconstruct in human style every proof carried out by any computer (something that we cannot discard), then computer-aided proofs would clearly be shareable. Martínez-Vidal considers this to be sufficient for granting that computer-aided proofs are a priori and that, therefore, there is no need to change our concept of proof.

Drawing their inspiration from techniques used in responsible artifact design, Guido Löhr and Herman Veluwenkamp use in their contribution to this collection a well-established framework known as Value Sensitive Design (VSD), initially proposed by Batya Friedman in the 1990s as a tool for dealing with the engineering process in conceptual ethics, a tool that eventually remains neutral to the kind of answers we give to questions like what concepts are or what the target of our engineering is or should be. In tune with the technological design framework, we should proceed through a series of steps from the description of the challenges through the specification of values and norms to the building of a prototype based on certain design requirements. Given this, Löhr and Weluwenkamp propose to apply VSD to conceptual engineering as a model for assessing and designing concepts. They use the example of the concept ‘colleague’ in the context of disruptive technologies as a case study: Could chatbots and droid-like robots be considered colleagues when used in emotional support or in health care and elderly care? To apply VSD to conceptual engineering involves the following phases: first, carrying out a context and stakeholder analysis, which would mainly involve an empirical investigation about the concept at stake, how it is used and in which contexts, how it is related to other concepts, who the (direct or indirect) stakeholders are, and what their values are. In the present case, relevant values could be that the device in question protects persons from harm or might respond to their emotions. In a second phase, a list of more specific values is made, and these values must then be translated into norms. In doing so, conceptual investigation—more particularly, conceptual engineering—plays an important role. Then comes the phase of transforming values into conceptual design requirements, which is also mainly a conceptual one. If we, for example, discover that responsibility for the good or bad things that may occur in the interaction between robots and their users is a requirement for being able to be a real colleague, then this would mean, given that robots cannot yet be considered morally responsible agents, either that the concept ‘colleague’ cannot be applicable to robots or that we should introduce a new concept, that of a robot-colleague, which could supply some though not all of the functions associated with colleagues. Finally, there comes the phase of presentation and implementation, which again involves empirical investigation. For example, we should ask whether the stakeholders are satisfied with the new concept and want to implement it; this would depend on whether the new concept really encapsulates the expected functions and values in an appropriate way.

Otávio Bueno's contribution to this special issue is intimately related to Mona Simion and Christoph Kelp (2020), who argue that P. F. Strawson's challenge can be met if we first understand conceptual engineering in terms of searching conceptual innovation rather than as fixing

conceptual defects. A second component would be to show that the engineering of a concept has been successful in terms of its correct functioning. Conceptual engineers should consequently proceed by proposing designed functions to be fulfilled by a concept, functions that turn into etiological ones—those that explain the existence of a trait by the function it has—when the concept works efficiently and achieves what is designed to do. But functional discourse is not often very informative as long as we lack a mechanism that may explain the success of the concept. Bueno challenges the existence of a conflict between improving defective concepts and delivering conceptual innovation, providing a mechanism for implementing conceptual innovation, which is a point that Simion and Kelp miss. If we want to focus on innovation, Bueno argues, we should turn to conceptual refinement, which allows us to account for innovation much better than function does. This means that we do not need to begin by focusing on existing defective concepts that we need to fix, as was the case in Carnap's and Cappelen's approaches. Instead, we need to draw attention to the process of conceptual development that eventually leads to innovation. This process involves articulating concepts by specifying counterexamples that present difficulties for the old concepts to deal with and by defining strategies that increase conceptual content, something needed in order to account for new cases. Bueno illustrates all this with examples taken from physics (Dirac's different interpretations to account for the negative energy solutions to his equation that finally led to the concept of positron) and from logic (the conceptual refinements leading to paraconsistent logics), but I assume his framework could eventually be applied to social and political concepts as well. Another advantage of Bueno's approach would be that it also entails the possibility of paving the way for an understanding of innovation in relation to *de novo* conceptual engineering (see Eklund 2024 for a problematization of the relation between conceptual engineering and conceptual innovation).

In order to better explain Jonathan Knowles's contribution to this issue, it is necessary first to explain Thomasson's "easy" ontology approach, which Knowles responds to. Thomasson (2015) holds a metaontological deflationism that sinks its roots into Carnap's approach to ontological questions. According to this view, we should reject any substantial position about existence (as hard metaphysicians demand). In order to answer ontological questions, it suffices to see whether the application conditions associated with a term are fulfilled, so that just conceptual and linguistic competence is needed for giving an answer, plus perhaps deference to experts and deference to the world. In addition to this, Thomasson favors a simple first-order realism that consists in affirming the existence of certain entities as a consequence of an easy inference that starts with an uncontroversial claim (such as, there are particles arranged tablewise) and then, through a conceptual truth (such as, if there are particles arranged tablewise, then there is a table), obtains a consequence that takes the form of a derived ontological claim (such as, there is a table). As a result, Thomasson calls this position an "easy approach to ontology." In this framework, ontological disputes become "easy" to resolve and do not depend on discovering anything substantial regarding the existence of a given sort of entity. Thomasson does not think that ontological disputes are merely verbal or just pointless. Instead, she relies on what has been called "metalinguistic negotiation," originally applied to conceptual ethics.⁵ A metalinguistic negotiation is a dispute "wherein the speakers' metalinguistic use of a term does not simply involve exchanging factual information about language, but rather negotiating its appropriate use" (Plunkett and Sundell 2013, 15). According to Thomasson, some (not all) metaphysical debates could be better conceived of as metalinguistic negotiations about how we ought to use a concept or a term. In his article included here, Knowles argues, *contra* Thomasson, that this conception is undesirable but also unnecessary for a philosopher who rejects hard metaphysics (metaphysical realism) and embraces a kind of anti-representationalism (essentially the rejection of the idea that language mirrors reality).

⁵See Burgess and Plunkett 2013, Plunkett and Sundell 2013, Plunkett 2015, and Plunkett and Sundell 2023.

Knowles thinks it is undesirable because it reduces the philosopher who claims to be doing metaphysics “to a kind of political activist.” Moreover, Knowles contends that a philosopher sympathizing with anti-representationalism could still maintain that the task of the metaphysician makes perfect sense, thereby not excluding the traditional sense of metaphysical inquiry (although rejecting the idea that metaphysics is a kind of inquiry about ‘fundamental reality’). In this framework, metaphysical questions may, though do not necessarily, have practical implications, and metaphysical debates may well be framed in metalinguistic terms but could not be reduced to a mere discussion or negotiation on how to use certain words.

Two of the articles in this issue focus on what is called the “implementation challenge”: Delia Belleri's and Isabella Bartoli's, respectively. The implementation challenge has to do with the idea that if conceptual engineers attempt to revise or replace our defective concepts, it seems they must be able to change the meaning of those concepts, otherwise their work would be useless, if not possible at all. And this seems to be so, as the meaning of concepts and words allegedly depend on external factors over which we, as speakers, do not have control. So, how is it possible to implement conceptual engineering given this situation?⁶ If, on the contrary, the meaning of our concepts or terms depends on internal factors (an individual's attitudes), as semantic internalists argue, the challenge reappears: How would it be possible for conceptual engineers to change the meaning of terms/words if they do not have any control over those individual factors? What is new in Belleri's article is precisely the urge to design a version of the implementation challenge that is metasemantically and ontologically neutral, as it does not assume any substantial thesis about meanings and about how they are fixed. This neutrally articulated challenge—the “uptake challenge,” as Belleri calls it—persists no matter which kind of metasemantics we favor. According to this neutralization strategy, the challenge is reformulated in this way in her article: “Assuming that implementing conceptual change involves changing linguistic usage, this process is hindered by the lack of control that anyone has over the way speakers use language.” Belleri then focuses on what exactly the “lack of control” is and, more particularly, on the concept of “control” and its meaning here.

In her analysis, Belleri argues that control is a phenomenon that is both gradable (is not a matter of yes or no) and relative to some specific goals, aims, or purposes. Understood in this way, conceptual engineers can still be considered to have a relative, though significant, control over language use. If so, conceptual engineers could peacefully live believing that no matter how difficult it might be to change a community's language use, their task can still be regarded as one that makes sense.

This is precisely what a conceptual engineer aims to achieve in the case of social and political terms (such as ‘woman’, ‘race’, ‘disability’, ‘democracy’). A conceptual engineer of Sally Haslanger's style would expect to be able to change certain deceitful linguistic usages that nonetheless are unfortunately widespread in our society, to the extent that they often provoke harm and generate intransigence toward social change. Bartoli's article is a significant contribution in this sense, as it explores the implementation challenge's implications for the conceptual engineering's project in the case of socially and politically relevant terms and concepts. Bartoli argues that social externalism leaves open the possibility of conceptual implementation, in spite of the obstacles involved in the revision of socially and politically significant terms. Social externalism argues that the meaning of a term used by speakers is determined by their social environment, more specifically by the usage of the experts within the speakers' linguistic community. But this kind of externalism is compatible with successful conceptual implementation (Koch 2021, Engelhardt 2024). Social communities can exert pressure to raise awareness in the rest of society about the need to revise or substitute

⁶See Burgess and Plunkett 2013, Cappelen 2018, Deutsch 2020, and Jorem 2021, among others.

a given concept; more important, they can be successful to the extent that, after some years, those changes are finally implemented. For example, relevant experts could be convinced by a social demand that has been increasingly imposed. At this point, Bartoli examines some fundamental difficulties that surprisingly have been neglected in the literature both on conceptual engineering and on social externalism. As Bartoli argues, “[M]embers of those groups that are adversely affected by certain dominant concepts are often the ones proposing meaning changes aimed at promoting social justice,” but of course many times these groups are marginalized minorities and lack the social and political power necessary both to induce any changes and to persuade the rest of society. Bartoli particularly explores three kinds of strategy that conceptual engineers could implement in conceptual revisions within social externalism: (i) targeting the experts, (ii) being the experts, and (iii) shifting patterns of deference among lay speakers to make them semantically defer to a new social group of speakers. She explores these strategies using the framework of two different notions of experts and their roles in fixing linguistic meaning. According to the first strategy (power metasemantics), experts are those who are simply able to convince us to have some usages instead of others. According to the second strategy (virtue metasemantics), experts are those who are in a positive epistemic position in relation to the subject matter. Whereas virtue metasemantics is seriously undermined by a kind of epistemic circularity, power metasemantics leaves a door open to conceptual implementation, though this also becomes strongly hampered by the social structures that determine the nature of the speakers who may exert the needed authority to either revise or fix the meaning of terms. I take this conclusion to not be fully skeptical, as it does not undermine the relevance of the conceptual engineering's project in social and political cases. It just points to the difficulties conceptual engineering may have in a society in which intolerance and inequalities unfortunately reign.

Neil Gascoigne's paper concedes that to challenge the idea that biological differences are not determinative of role is surely something to be celebrated, but Gascoigne also criticizes what usually counts as the alternative to the mainstream biological understanding, as gender as a theoretical posit is also unsatisfactory: “As a role specification it begs the question concerning the authority in virtue of which some person or group determines what are and are not the legitimate roles for, say, women.” Moreover, gender-identity concepts could be considered parasitic on sexual difference, as they were originally introduced to put into question biological essentialism. Gascoigne then considers different ways of articulating trans realist positions like those defended by Judith Butler and Paul Preciado. It seems that the best way to understand these thinkers is as trying to eliminate the old-fashioned concept of woman, based on biological categories, and to replace it by a new one, let us say woman*. The trans realist is then placed in a sort of dilemma: a first way of constructing gender identity involves considering gender as something fixed by certain criteria (those socially construed), but then whether someone avowing “I am a woman” yet not satisfying these criteria ought to be considered a liar, misled, or deluded. The alternative would be to think that someone's avowing sincerely that she is a woman would suffice to establish that she is a woman*. But then there wouldn't be discernible, objective constraints on what woman* allegedly means. Moreover, to think that all depends on a first-person authority may undermine the basis for a really transformative reflection on mainstream practices. In this sense, Gascoigne's paper is an invitation to discuss whether certain proposals of conceptual change that are taken to be progressive by its supporters really are progressive.

In short, all the contributions to this collection can serve as stimulation to rethink and reconceive many of the issues involved in the conceptual engineering agenda.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Introduction is the result of a research project funded by the BBVA Foundation, entitled “Conceptual Engineering and Epistemic Disagreement: A Deflationist Ontosemantic

Perspective,” active between July 2022 and December 2023. I want to thank Laura Lojo and Otto Bohlmann for their help with the revision of the text.

REFERENCES

- Andow, James. 2020. “Fully Experimental Conceptual Engineering.” *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*. Published online: 2 Dec. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2020.1850339>
- Bartoli, Isabella. In this issue (2025). “Social Externalism and the Implementation Challenge: Revising Socially and Politically Significant Terms.”
- Belleri, Delia. 2021. “Downplaying the Change of Subject Objection to Conceptual Engineering.” *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*. Published online: 30 Mar. 2021: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2021.1908161>
- Belleri, Delia. 2025. “‘You’re Changing the Subject’: An Unfair Objection to Conceptual Engineering?” *Philosophical Quarterly* 75, no. 3: 858–77.
- Belleri, Delia. In this issue (2025). “Conceptual Engineering, Language Use, and the Neutral Implementation Challenge.”
- Bendifallah, Lina, Julie Abbo, Igor Douven, and Heather Burnett. 2025. “Conceptual Spaces for Conceptual Engineering? Feminism as a Case Study.” *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* 16, no. 1: 199–229.
- Blackburn, Simon. 1999. *Thinking: A Compelling Introduction to Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brun, Georg. 2016. “Explication as a Method of Conceptual Re-engineering.” *Erkenntnis* 81:6, 1211–41.
- Bueno, Otávio. In this issue (2025). “Conceptual Engineering: Conceptual Innovation via Conceptual Refinement.”
- Burgess, Alexis, and David Plunkett. 2013. “Conceptual Ethics I/II.” *Philosophy Compass* 8, no. 12: 1091–1101; 1102–10.
- Burgess, Alexis, Herman Cappelen, and David Plunkett, eds. 2020. *Conceptual Engineering and Conceptual Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cappelen, Herman. 2018. *Fixing Language: An Essay on Conceptual Engineering*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chalmers, David. 2020. “What Is Conceptual Engineering and What Should It Be?” *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*. Published online: 16 Sep. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2020.1817141>
- Creath, Richard, ed. 1990. *Dear Carnap, Dear Van: The Quine-Carnap Correspondence and Related Work*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- De Toffoli, Silvia. 2021. “Groundwork for a Fallibilist Account of Mathematics.” *Philosophical Quarterly* 71, no. 4: 823–44.
- Deutsch, Max. 2020. “Speaker’s Reference, Stipulation, and a Dilemma for Conceptual Engineers.” *Philosophical Studies* 177: 3935–57.
- Dobler, Tamara. 2025. “Pluralist Conceptual Engineering.” *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy* 68, no. 2: 224–50.
- Dutilh Novaes, Catarina. 2020. “Carnap Meets Foucault: Conceptual Engineering and Genealogical Investigations.” *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2020.1860122>.
- Eklund, Matti. 2021. “Conceptual Engineering in Philosophy.” In *The Routledge Handbook of Social and Political Philosophy of Language*, edited by Justin Khoo and Rachel Katharine Sterken, 15–20. London: Routledge.
- Eklund, Matti. 2024. “Conceptual Engineering and Conceptual Innovation.” *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*. Published online 31 July 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2024.2384066>
- Engelhardt, Jeff. 2024. *Nonideal Theory and Content Externalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Floridi, Luciano. 2011. “A Defence of Constructionism: Philosophy as Conceptual Engineering.” *Metaphilosophy* 42, no. 3: 282–304.
- Gascoigne, Neil. In this issue (2025). “Changing ‘Sex.’”
- Greenough, Patrick, Jean Gové, and Ian Church. 2023. “Conceptual Engineering for Analytic Theology.” *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy* Published online: 22 Aug. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2023.2244007>
- Haslanger, Sally. 2012. *Resisting Reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haslanger Sally. 2020a. “Going On, Not in the Same Way.” In *Conceptual Engineering and Conceptual Ethics*, edited by Alexis Burgess, Herman Cappelen, and David Plunkett, 230–60. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haslanger, Sally. 2020b. “How Not to Change the Subject.” In *Shifting Concepts: The Philosophy and Psychology of Conceptual Variation*, edited by Teresa Marques and Åsa Wikforss, 235–59. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Isaac, Manuel Gustavo. 2021. “What Should Conceptual Engineering Be All About?” *Philosophia: A Global Journal of Philosophy* 49, no. 5: 2041–51.
- Isaac, Manuel Gustavo. 2023. “Which Concept of Concept for Conceptual Engineering?” *Erkenntnis* 88, no. 5: 2145–69.
- Isaac, Manuel Gustavo. In this issue (2025). “The Hallmark Problem for Conceptual Engineering.”
- Isaac, Manuel Gustavo, Steffen Koch, and Ryan Nefdt. 2022. “Conceptual Engineering: A Road Map to Practice.” *Philosophy Compass* 17, no. 10: 1–15.

- Jorem, Sigurd. 2021. "Conceptual Engineering and the Implementation Problem." *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy* 64: 186–211.
- Jorem, Sigurd. 2022. "The Good, the Bad and the Insignificant—Assessing Concept Functions for Conceptual Engineering." *Synthese* 200, no. 106: 1–20.
- Jorem, Sigurd, and Guido Löhr. 2024. "Inferentialist Conceptual Engineering." *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy* 67, no. 3: 932–53.
- Knowles, Jonathan. In this issue (2025). "Should Metaphysics Be (Re)conceived as Metalinguistic Negotiation?"
- Koch, Steffen. 2019. "Carnapian Explications, Experimental Philosophy, and Fruitful Concepts." *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy* 62, no. 6: 700–717.
- Koch, Steffen. 2021. "The Externalist Challenge to Conceptual Engineering." *Synthese* 198, no. 1: 327–48.
- Köhler, Sebastian, and Herman Veluwenkamp. 2024. "Conceptual Engineering: For What Matters." *Mind* 133, no. 530: 400–427.
- Landes, Ethan. 2025. "Conceptual Engineering Should Be Empirical." *Erkenntnis*. Published online 11 Feb. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10670-025-00923-x>
- Löhr, Guido. 2021. "Commitment Engineering: Conceptual Engineering Without Representations." *Synthese* 199: 13035–52.
- Löhr, Guido, and Herman Veluwenkamp. In this issue (2025). "Rethinking Philosophical Methodology: Conceptual Engineering Meets Value Sensitive Design."
- Mamin, Cyril. 2024. "Realism and Social Kinds in Conceptual Amelioration." In *Conceptual Engineering: Methodological and Metaphilosophical Issues*, edited by Piotr Stalmaszczyk, 205–26. Paderborn: Brill Mentis.
- Martinez-Vidal, Concha. In this issue (2025). "Proofs, Computers, and the *A Priori*: Is There Anything to Fix?"
- Nado, Jennifer. 2021a. "Conceptual Engineering, Truth, and Efficacy." *Synthese* 198, no. 7: 1507–27.
- Nado, Jennifer. 2021b. "Conceptual Engineering via Experimental Philosophy." *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy* 64, nos. 1–2: 76–96.
- Nado, Jennifer. 2021c. "Classification Procedures as the Targets of Conceptual Engineering." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 106, no. 1: 136–56.
- Neufeld, Eleonore. 2024. "Engineering Social Concepts: Feasibility and Causal Models." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 109, no. 3: 819–37.
- Olihint, Jared. 2023. "Common Ground Between Social Ontology, Conceptual Engineering, and Conceptual Ethics." *Journal of Social Ontology* 9, no. 1: 53–67.
- Plunkett, David. 2015. "Which Concepts Should We Use? Metalinguistic Negotiations and the Methodology of Philosophy." *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy* 58, nos. 7–8: 828–74.
- Plunkett, David, and Timothy Sundell. 2013. "Disagreement and the Semantics of Normative and Evaluative Terms." *Philosophers' Imprint* 13, no. 23: 1–37.
- Plunkett, David, and Timothy Sundell. 2023. "Varieties of Metalinguistic Negotiation." *Topoi* 42, no. 4: 983–99.
- Queloz, Matthieu. 2022. "Genealogy, Evaluation, and Engineering." *Monist* 105, no. 4: 435–51.
- Queloz, Matthieu. 2025. *The Ethics of Conceptualization: Tailoring Thought and Language to Need*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Queloz, Matthieu, and Friedemann Bieber. 2022. "Conceptual Engineering and the Politics of Implementation." *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 103: 670–91.
- Sękowski, Krzysztof, and Ethan Landes. 2024. "Conceptual Engineering Is Old News." *Philosophical Quarterly*. Published online 31 July 2024.
- Simion, Mona, and Christoph Kelp. 2020. "Conceptual Innovation, Function First." *Noûs* 54, no. 4: 985–1002.
- Stalmaszczyk, Piotr, ed. 2024. *Conceptual Engineering: Methodological and Metaphilosophical Issues*. Paderborn: Brill Mentis.
- Thomasson, Amie. 2015. *Ontology Made Easy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thomasson, Amie. 2017. "Metaphysics and Conceptual Negotiation." *Philosophical Issues* 27: 364–82.
- Thomasson, Amie. 2020. "A Pragmatic Method for Normative Conceptual Work." In *Conceptual Engineering and Conceptual Ethics*, edited by Alexis Burgess, Herman Cappelen, and David Plunkett, 435–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomasson, Amie. 2021a. "Philosophy as Conceptual Engineering." *Philosopher* 109, no. 3: 7–14.
- Thomasson, Amie. 2021b. "Conceptual Engineering: When Do We Need It? How Can We Do It?" *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*. Published online: 16 Nov. 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2021.2000118>
- Thomasson, Amie. 2025. *Rethinking Metaphysics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thomasson, Amie. Forthcoming. "Functions in Conceptual Engineering." In *Philosophy of Biological Functions*, edited by Zdenka Brzović, Justin Garson, and Predrag Šustar. New York: Routledge.
- van der Linden, Rik, and Maartje Schermer. 2024. "Conceptual Engineering Health: A Historical-Philosophical Analysis of the Concept of Positive Health." In *A Pragmatic Approach to Conceptualization of Health and Disease*, edited by Maartje Schermer and Nicholas Binney, 245–68. Cham: Springer.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Xavier de Donato-Rodríguez is an associate professor at the University of Santiago de Compostela. His research interests include epistemology, ontology, philosophy of science, and argumentation theory. He has published book chapters with Routledge and Springer as well as articles in *Synthese*, *Erkenntnis*, *Theoria*, *Ratio*, *Argumentation*, *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, and other peer-reviewed international journals. He has coedited the book *Deflationist Conceptions of Abstract Objects* (forthcoming from Springer as *Synthese Library* volume 516).

How to cite this article: de Donato-Rodríguez, Xavier. 2025. "Introduction to the Special Issue *New Thoughts on Conceptual Engineering*." *Metaphilosophy* 56(3-4): 283–293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/meta.70007>.