



R & R

David Chalmers

Triangle



object

content

phenomenology



Topics

- 1. The essential tension
 - 2. The nature of perceptual content
 - 3. The grounds of perceptual content
 - 4. Constraints from epistemology
-

The Essential Tension 1

- 1. Perception is relational
- 2. Perception is representational
- 3. Perception cannot be both relational and representational

The Essential Tension 2

- 1. Perception is fundamentally relational
 - 2. Perception is fundamentally representational
 - 3. Perception cannot be both fundamentally relational and fundamentally representational
-

The Essential Tension 3

- 1. Perceptual experience is fundamentally relational
 - 2. Perceptual experience is fundamentally representational
 - 3. Perceptual experience cannot be both fundamentally relational and fundamentally representational
-

The Essential Tension 4

- 1. The content of a (good) experience is object-involving
 - 2. The phenomenology of an experience is not object-involving
 - 3. The phenomenology of an experience determines its content.
-

The Essential Tension 5

- 1. The phenomenological content of a (good) experience is object-involving
- 2. The phenomenological content of an experience is not object-involving

The Essential Tension 6

- 1. The phenomenology of a (good) experience is object-involving
- 2. The phenomenology of an experience is not object-involving

The Essential Tension 7

- 1. The phenomenology of a (good) experience is essentially presentational
 - 2. If phenomenology is presentational, it is not representational.
 - 3. The phenomenology of experience is essentially representational.
-

The Nature of Content

- How can an account of perceptual content respect its relational and representational character?

The Nature of Content

- Basic worry:
 - 1. In good cases, content is prima facie singular
 - 2. In bad cases, content is prima facie non-singular (general)
 - 3. The same content is present in good and bad cases

The Nature of Content

- Reject 1 (only general content)
 - Internalists, Kati, Searle, etc...
 - Reject 2 (only singular content)
 - Meinongians?
 - Reject 3 (different contents)
 - Disjunctivists about phenomenology (Bill, Martin, etc)?
 - Disjunctivists about content (Susanna, Tye, etc)
 - Complex contents (Susanna)
 - Multiple contents (Heather)
-

Two-Dimensional Account

- An experience of a red object has multiple contents: 1-intension, 2-intension, enriched intension
 - 1-intension: True at centered worlds where the object causing the experience at the center is red (and ...)
 - 2-intension: True at worlds where the actual object causing the experience is red (and ...)
-

2D Account

- 1-intension can be seen as a structure:
 - $\langle \text{the object causing this}^* \text{ experience, red, such and such center-relative location} \rangle$
- 2-intension can be seen as a structure
 - $\langle O, \text{red}, L \rangle$
 - $\langle --, \text{red}, L \rangle$

Strong and Weak Veridicality

- N.B. This account supposes that the standard of veridicality is *strong veridicality*: such that “veridical hallucinations” and “veridical illusions” are nonveridical
 - If one invokes *weak veridicality* (such that these are veridical), one gets
 - 1-intension: <the object at such-and-such center-relative location, red>
 - 2-intension:<the object at L, red>?
 - <O, red>?
-

2D Account

- On my view, Fregean contents of sentences -- and experiences -- are enriched propositions
 - Structures of *enriched intensions*, each of which can be seen as ordered pairs of 1-intensions and extensions
 - Fregean content of an experience might be
 - <<the object causing this experience, O>, <the color disposed to cause this sort of experience, red>, <the location in such-and-such relation to center, L>>
 - Cf. <<MOP(O), MOP(P)>>
-

2D Account

- Enriched propositions are structurally analogous to Schellenberg propositions $\langle \text{MOP}(O), \text{MOP}(P) \rangle$
 - An enriched intension is a (potentially gappy) de re mode of presentation
 - A 1-intension is a mode-of-presentation-type
-

2D Account

- Enriched propositions are analogous to Schellenberg propositions $\langle \text{MOP}(O), \text{MOP}(P) \rangle$
 - An enriched intension is a (potentially gappy) de re mode of presentation
 - A 1-intension is a mode-of-presentation-type
- Unlike S-propositions, we have a layer of content (1-intension) determined by phenomenology
- Reconciling complex contents and multiple contents!

The Basis of Content

- Is the content of experience fundamental or derivative?
 - Strong Intentionalist: content is fundamental, at personal level
 - (Reductive intentionalist: content derives from something subpersonal)
 - Weak Intentionalist: Content of experience derives from something else at the personal level
 - Non-Intentionalist: Experiences lack content
-

The Basis of Content

- Kati, Bill, Tim offer accounts on which (some) content of experience is derivative
 - Kati: Content derives from (non-intentional) sensations plus (intentional) cognition
 - Bill: Content in bad cases derives from content in good cases, which derives from relations to objects.
 - Tim: Propositional content of seeing-that derives from non-propositional content of experience, plus the way it grounds knowledge.
-

The Basis of Content

- Bill: Representational content derives from relations to objects
 - Inverse view: Relations to object derive from representational content
 - Q: Which is prior: representation or relations?
-

The Basis of Content

- Kati, Tim: Propositional content of experiences derives from non-propositional aspects of experience plus cognition, inferential connections
 - Inverse View: Propositional content of cognition derives from (propositional?) content of experience plus inferential connections, etc
 - Q: Which is prior: content of experience or content of thought?
-

Epistemology as a Guide to Experience

- Strategy: Use data/desiderata about the epistemological role of experience as a guide to its nature
 - Knowledge of external world: McDowell, Heather
 - Knowledge of colours: Pautz
 - Knowledge of other minds: Tim
 - Introspective knowledge: Alex, Daniel
 - Some of these lines support representationalism, some relationism, some neither.
-

The Introspective Challenge

Introspective knowledge is a challenge for both representationalism and relationism.

Both views are often allied with a *transparency thesis*: when we have an experience, we are aware of (properties of) the objects of the experience, but not of (properties of) the experience itself.

Given transparency, it is hard to see how we can so easily come to know when having a phi-experience, that we are having a phi-experience.

The Introspective Challenge

- 1. Transparency
 - 2. If transparency, introspective knowledge of an experience must be grounded in knowledge of objects of experience
 - 3. Introspective knowledge of an experience cannot (generally) be grounded in knowledge of objects of experience
 - 4. We have introspective knowledge of experiences.
 - Alex denies 3, Daniel denies 1&2, Dretske denies 4?
-

Denying Transparency

- I deny transparency (as stated). When we have an experience, we are aware of the object/content, but we are also aware of a relation to the object/content.
 - E.g. aware of my seeing of the cup, or of my visually representing redness.
 - This seems introspectively right -- so transparency isn't a phenomenological datum.
 - N.B. Compatible with other formulations of transparency: e.g. we attend to experience by attending to the object.
-

Residual Challenge

- How can a (strong) representationalist or relationist explain/accommodate our awareness of these relations to object or content?
 - Inferential or reliabilist story -- don't yield internalist justification?
 - It would be nice if something about the *nature* of experience explains the ease of introspective knowledge, just as it might explain perceptual knowledge
 - Not clear that representationalism/relationism as they stand have the resources to do this.
-

Self-Awareness

- Suggestion: Supplement representationalism/relationism with the Brentano-style view that experience essentially involves a self-referential relation to the experience itself
 - Either an (acquaintance) relation to the experience -- Russell?
 - Or a representation of the experience -- Kriegel.
 - E.g. Self-relational relationism:
 - Experience involves a relation to an object, and an acquaintance relation to the obtaining of that relation
 - Self-representational representationalism
 - Experience involves a representation of a content, and a representation of that representing of the content.
-

Acquaintance with Experience

- My view: experience essentially involves acquaintance with the phenomenal properties of experience
 - This helps explain the distinctive certainty of introspective knowledge, and the distinctive formation of phenomenal concepts
 - Disjunctivism, etc seem much more plausible for introspective states than for perceptual states.
 - The world-directed aspect of phenomenal properties are best understood as representational properties: phenomenal representation of certain Edenic contents
 - N.B. phenomenal representation essentially involves acquaintance with phenomenal representation.
-

Ecumenical Conclusion

- So experience essentially involves an acquaintance relation to instances of representational properties.
 - I.e. experience is both essentially relational and essentially representational
 - Self-relational representationalism!
-

Group Hug

- Kum ba ya.

