In this talk I will discuss two problematic distinctions—one in epistemology: the
distinction between inferential and non-inferential justification, and one in the
philosophy of mind: the distinction between personal and sub-personal explanation.
I argue that, in each case, it is a mistake to expect a strict dichotomy—at any rate, a
dichotomy anything like that suggested by standard accounts of the distinction—and
that a more nuanced understanding of the mental and the epistemic landscape can
help us make progress with some hard questions in first-order epistemology. I end
by explaining why a certain kind of inferential integration is of epistemic relevance.