



A PLURALIST THEORY OF PERCEPTION

NEIL MEHTA

A Pluralist Theory of Perception

A Pluralist Theory of Perception

Neil Mehta

**The MIT Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England**

© 2024 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This work is subject to a Creative Commons CC-BY-NC-ND license.

This license applies only to the work in full and not to any components included with permission. Subject to such license, all rights are reserved. No part of this book may be used to train artificial intelligence systems without permission in writing from the MIT Press.



The MIT Press would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers who provided comments on drafts of this book. The generous work of academic experts is essential for establishing the authority and quality of our publications. We acknowledge with gratitude the contributions of these otherwise uncredited readers.

This book was set in Stone Serif and Stone Sans by Westchester Publishing Services.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Mehta, Neil, author.

Title: A pluralist theory of perception / Neil Mehta.

Description: Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, [2024] | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2023036889 (print) | LCCN 2023036890 (ebook) | ISBN 9780262548281 (paperback) | ISBN 9780262379151 (epub) | ISBN 9780262379144 (pdf)

Subjects: LCSH: Consciousness. | Perception. | Pluralism.

Classification: LCC B808.9 .M374 2024 (print) | LCC B808.9 (ebook) | DDC 121/.34—dc23/eng/20240116

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2023036889>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2023036890>

For Wa Wa, Alison, and Youngmee. Others have made me a better philosopher; you have made me a better person.

Contents

Preface xi

P.1 Methodology; the Core Idea xi

P.2 Acknowledgments xiii

1 Rich Pluralism Introduced 1

1.1 An Unargued Assumption 1

1.2 Some Familiar Options: Representationalism and Naive Realism 4

1.3 A New Option: Rich Pluralism 6

1.4 The Structure of the Book 8

I The Case for Partly Revelatory Awareness 13

2 A Defense of Partial Revelation 15

2.1 Partial Revelation Introduced 16

2.2 Partial Revelation Defended (and No Revelation Undermined) 19

2.3 Full Revelation Introduced 25

2.4 Partial versus Full Revelation: Gradually Acquired Concepts 26

2.5 Partial versus Full Revelation: Gradually Revealed Essences 28

2.6 Partial versus Full Revelation: Further Arguments 30

2.7 Holistic Revelation 35

2.8 The Argument for Full Revelation Revisited 38

2.9 The Retreat from Full Revelation 39

2.10 Conclusion 40

Appendix 2A: Awareness of Intrinsic Characters 41

Appendix 2B: The Propositional Awareness Account 45

3 Partial Revelation Extended and Explained 49

3.1 Experiences Other Than Perceptions 50

3.2 Targets of Experience Other Than Sensory Qualities 54

3.3	The Beginnings of Rich Pluralism	58
3.4	The Rich Pluralist's Explanation of the Asymmetries	61
3.5	Alternative Explanations of the Asymmetries	63
3.6	In Defense of Experiential Awareness of Universals	68
3.7	Conclusion	73
4	Hard Problems of Consciousness and the External World	75
4.1	Data about the Hard Problems of the External World	75
4.2	Explanations via Extended Partial Revelation	79
4.3	Data about the Hard Problems of Consciousness; Some Failed Theories	81
4.4	A Better Theory, and Some Further Data	89
4.5	The E-Theory and Extended Partial Revelation	93
4.6	Hard Character and Hard Consciousness Defined	100
4.7	A Theory of Hard Character and Hard Consciousness	105
4.8	Some Objections to the Significance of Hard Character	109
4.9	Conclusion	112
II	Rich Pluralism versus Representationalism	115
5	Perception, Hallucination, and Illusion	117
5.1	Representations and Contents	118
5.2	Sensory Representations	120
5.3	Perception	121
5.4	Hallucination	125
5.5	Illusion	128
5.6	Intermission	130
5.7	Rich Pluralism versus Representationalism: Hallucinations	131
5.8	Rich Pluralism versus Representationalism: The Unity of Experience	132
5.9	Rich Pluralism versus Representationalism: Parsimony	132
5.10	Rich Pluralism versus Representationalism: Infallibility about Essences	135
5.11	Rich Pluralism versus Representationalism: Fallibility about Instantiation	139
5.12	Rich Pluralism versus Representationalism: The Final Verdict	141
5.13	Looking Forward	142
III	Rich Pluralism versus Naïve Realism	143
6	Awareness of Intrinsic Characters	145
6.1	The Intrinsicity Datum: A First Pass	146
6.2	The Intrinsicity Datum Generalized	148

6.3	Some Naïve Realist Explanations	151
6.4	The Intrinsicity Datum Refined; a Problem for Any Nonrevelatory Theory of Perception	156
6.5	The Intrinsicity Datum Explained via Extended Partial Revelation	158
6.6	Some Challenges to the Explanatory Adequacy of Representationalism and Rich Pluralism	162
6.7	Conclusion	168
	Appendix 6A: Campbell on Awareness of Intrinsic and Categorical Characters	170
7	Strong Referential Character	173
7.1	Strong Referential Character Introduced	174
7.2	A Simple Representationalist Account	176
7.3	The Intrinsic Awareness Account of Strong Referential Character	177
7.4	The Significance of the Intrinsic Awareness Account	181
7.5	Presentation and Apparent Presentational Character Introduced	183
7.6	Naïve Realism and the Intrinsic Awareness Account of Presentation	187
7.7	Transferring the Intrinsic Awareness Account: Representationalism and Rich Pluralism	194
7.8	Further Worries about Using Representations to Explain Presentation	196
7.9	Conclusion	197
8	Apparent Presentational Character	199
8.1	Apparent Presentational Character Revisited	199
8.2	Some Initially Tempting Accounts	200
8.3	The Categorization Account Introduced	205
8.4	Evidence for the Categorization Account	208
8.5	Can Categorization Occur within Experience Proper?	211
8.6	Other Objections and Replies	215
8.7	The Epistemology of Presentation	218
8.8	The Categorization Account versus the Causal Content Account	220
8.9	The Categorization Account versus the Perspectival Content Account	221
8.10	The Significance of the Categorization Account	227
8.11	Conclusion	229
9	A Final Assessment of Naïve Realism	231
9.1	Rich Pluralism versus Naïve Realism: The Current State of Play	231
9.2	Problems for Flexible Naïve Realism	232

9.3 Problems for the Imaginative View	235
9.4 Problems for the Quality-Awareness View	238
9.5 Problems for Pluralistic Naïve Realism	241
9.6 Problems for Strange Pluralism	242
9.7 Conclusion	243
IV Other Explanatory Challenges; Concluding Thoughts	247
10 Phenomenal Character	249
10.1 A Deep Problem about Phenomenal Character	249
10.2 A Core Idea Introduced	251
10.3 The Deep Context Sensitivity of “What It’s Like”	254
10.4 A Failed Attempt at Supplying Context	261
10.5 The First Context: Hard Character	262
10.6 The Second Context: Strong Referential Character	264
10.7 The Third Context: Strong Accessible Character	266
10.8 The Fragmentation of “Phenomenal Character”	270
10.9 The Deep Problem Dissolved	272
10.10 Conclusion	274
11 Arguments from Hallucination	275
11.1 A Basic Argument from Hallucination	275
11.2 A Screening-Off Argument	277
11.3 An Argument from Introspective Access	281
11.4 Conclusion	287
12 Conclusion	289
12.1 Part I Revisited: A List of Options	289
12.2 Part II Revisited: Rich Pluralism versus Representationalism	290
12.3 Part III Revisited: Rich Pluralism versus Naïve Realism	291
12.4 Part IV Revisited: Remaining Problems	293
12.5 Conclusion	294
Glossary	295
Notes	305
References	331
Index	341

Preface

Perception and consciousness make for a complex knot. Many have tried to undo it, often showing great ingenuity in the process, but I believe that they have left things tied up in the end. In this book, I try to do better. I defend a radical new theory of perception and consciousness (and, for that matter, of hallucination, illusion, and more).

P.1 Methodology; the Core Idea

One natural methodology is to begin with our *commonsense theory* of perception and to assume that we are justified in accepting this theory unless powerful defeaters are found. I think that this methodology is misguided. In my view, a theory enjoys no justification whatsoever simply in virtue of being commonsense. Any theory, commonsense or otherwise, is justified purely by its theoretical virtues—its simplicity, explanatory power, fruitfulness, and so on. Thus, when I was writing this book, I did not start with theories at all. I started with *data* and used these to guide me in assessing old theories and constructing new ones.

I take an ecumenical attitude toward different sources of data: the correct theory, I take it, should explain *all* of the data, whether it comes from armchair introspection or scientific inquiry. That said, my emphasis in this book is firmly on data from armchair introspection.

I take this approach for two reasons. On the one side, my considered judgment is that most of the (non-introspective) scientific data are too low level to discriminate between different high-level philosophical theories of perception: these data can often be given a representationalist, naïve realist, or other interpretation. On the other side, I think that the introspective

data identified in the book are more high level and *do* discriminate between different philosophical theories of perception.¹ Ultimately, however, I welcome any empirical arguments that others might make, and I sometimes advance such arguments myself.

As I was writing this book, I began by making a list of familiar data: data pertaining to revelation, the hard problems of consciousness, presentation, knowledge of reference, and much, much more. I then attempted to extend these data as systematically as I could. For example, it is a familiar datum that perception positions us to know, in a special way, what we are referring to. This inspired me to ask whether the same was true of any other kinds of experiences—hallucinations, sensations, sensory imaginings, episodic memories. In this way, I uncovered a great deal of new data that fell into complex and surprising patterns.

Only then did theory enter the picture. I toyed with dozens of theories—old, new, and often radically different from one another—in search of the most elegant possible explanation of these patterns. The result was surprising: the usual representationalist and naïve realist options had a lot of trouble explaining the data. The problem was that these theories, though otherwise disparate, were all *monistic*: they all shared the seemingly benign assumption that to consciously perceive is to deploy exactly one kind of sensory awareness. But this assumption seemed to fit the data poorly.

I realized that by discarding monism, I could construct a new theory with great explanatory power. I call this theory *rich pluralism*. The rich pluralist's signature idea is that what it is to perceive is to deploy two very different kinds of sensory awareness in concert. First, there is a *representational* form of sensory awareness whose targets include *particulars*. This distinguishes perceptions from hallucinations. Second, there is a *nonrepresentational* form of sensory awareness whose targets are *certain universals*—the sensory qualities. This latter form of sensory awareness constitutes one kind of consciousness, it is common to perceptions and hallucinations, and it reveals part of the very essences of its targets. I call it *deep awareness*.

Rich pluralism appears to be less parsimonious than monism. Surprisingly, it is not: the adequate monistic theories, those that can explain all of the data, end up being even more complex than rich pluralism. Thus, the sophisticated apparatus of rich pluralism is not a luxury. It is the bare minimum that we need, the most spartan theory that can do the work. Or so I will argue.

P.2 Acknowledgments

The academy is not like life: we are enriched rather than impoverished by our debts. That is fortunate, for my debts have piled up over the course of this project.

My largest debts are to Brian Cutter and Boyd Millar, whose engagement has vastly improved the book. Brian and Boyd read many manuscripts of articles leading up to the book, gave me detailed comments on multiple complete drafts of the book, and took part in the book workshop. I have to add that Brian's comments on an early draft were, quite simply, the best philosophical comments that I have ever received.

I am also grateful to the other participants in the book workshop—Keith Allen, Heather Logue, and Umrao Sethi—for six hours of heady discussion, and to Keith and Umrao for also having read and commented on substantial portions of an earlier draft. I also thank Ivan Ivanov and Craig French for detailed written comments on the entire manuscript, Alex Moran for written comments on the entire manuscript *and* an illuminating two-hour conversation about the book, and Ori Beck for spending four hours patiently walking me through his concerns on every chapter. All of these individuals kindly revealed much that was previously hidden from my sight.

It will also become apparent to the reader that I have taken much inspiration from the work of Mark Johnston. His 2004 paper “The Obscure Object of Hallucination” is my favorite article on the philosophy of perception. The differences between my theory and his are numerous, but still, they are theories grown from the same seed.

I have received feedback on various pieces of the manuscript from many others: Malcolm Keating, Mohan Matthen, Adam Pautz, Susanna Schellenberg, Daniel Stoljar, and audiences at the 2020 and 2021 Online Colloquia in the Philosophy of Perception, the Australian National University, the Institute of Philosophy in London, Monash University, the National University of Singapore, the University of Cambridge, the University of Melbourne, the University of New South Wales, the University of Sydney, the University of York, and Yale-NUS College. I also thank my undergraduate students who worked through some very early drafts in my 2019 *Perception* seminar: Farheen Asim, Fred Chang, Siddharth Chatterjee, Zhi Heng Chia, Joseph Han (who also proofread an earlier version of the entire manuscript), Dara Hanson, Elaine Li, Allison Love, Yi Ming Ng, Gena Soh, Joshua

Tan, Yong Li Tng, Xianda Wen, Cassandra Woo, and Keith Yee. I must also acknowledge the detailed, and very useful, written feedback that I received from several anonymous referees.

I am deeply grateful to all of these readers. They have made the book much better than it otherwise would have been.

1 Rich Pluralism Introduced

You consciously see a ripe mango, one that is ovoid and orange, under mundane circumstances. The central question in philosophy of perception is: what is it for you to enjoy a conscious perception such as this?

1.1 An Unargued Assumption

I will shortly introduce a major assumption about how to answer this question. First, however, I must clarify a crucial notion: the notion of *awareness*.

Awareness can be characterized in relation to *knowledge*, which has four relevant features. First, knowledge is a relation between subjects and propositions. Second, instances of knowledge are, in and of themselves, free from error. That, together with the first feature, entails that one can only know true propositions, never false ones. Third, to know a proposition, a subject must have a special kind of *nonaccidental* (non-Gettiered) *connection* to it; accidentally true beliefs are not knowledge. Finally, knowledge is—I assume—a natural kind. In other words, the category of knowledge is metaphysically real, or structural, or joint-carving; it is not metaphysically arbitrary or gerrymandered.

I understand *awareness* as being broader than knowledge with respect to the first feature, while sharing the remaining features. In particular:

First, awareness can, in principle, relate subjects to entities of many different kinds: not just propositions but also objects, properties, states of affairs, and so on. Second, instances of awareness are, in and of themselves, free from error. That, together with the first feature, entails that awareness cannot be directed at false propositions, nonexistent objects, nonexistent properties, nonobtaining states of affairs, and so forth. (Note

well: awareness *can* be directed at uninstantiated universals, as long as the subject does not *thereby* erroneously take the uninstantiated universal to be instantiated.) Third, to be aware of something, a subject must have a special kind of nonaccidental connection to it. Finally, awareness and its subkinds are natural kinds; the category of awareness is metaphysically real, or structural, or joint-carving, and so are any subkinds of awareness, such as knowing, remembering, and (I will suggest) perceiving.

Knowledge has a fifth feature: all instances of knowledge have *contents*. I will clarify the notion of content in chapter 5, but for now, note that I do *not* assume that all instances of awareness share this feature. Certainly *some* instances of awareness have contents: again, all instances of knowledge are, by definition, instances of awareness. But perhaps some instances of awareness—such as instances of perceptual awareness—do not have contents.

Now that we understand the notion of awareness, I can introduce an assumption that I will make throughout this book. It is this:

The **framing assumption**: When you (consciously) see the mango, you are sensorily aware of it and its color and shape. In addition, whether you (consciously) see or hallucinate a mango, you are not sensorily aware of any peculiar mental entities.

(Throughout the book, bold type is used to mark terms that can be found in the glossary.) The framing assumption is supported by familiar arguments, and among contemporary philosophers of perception, it is widely, though not universally, accepted. Thus, I will provide scant defense of it. My focus will be on clarifying, in four parts, what the assumption means.

The first part of the assumption is that when you see the mango, you enjoy some form of *awareness*. This is sometimes known as the *act-object view*, and I find it plausible just on the basis of introspection. When I reflect on a conscious perception of an ovoid orange mango, it seems obvious to me that I am aware of *something*—a particular object and some of its properties.

This assumption has consequences for the *adverbialist* theory of perception. According to this theory, all that happens when you consciously see the mango is that you undergo certain mental modifications that are appropriately caused by the mango.¹ If these mental modifications do not involve awareness of anything, then the act-object view rules out adverbialism.²

The second part of the framing assumption is that when you see the mango, your awareness is *sensory* (rather than, say, cognitive). To appreciate the significance of this addition, consider the *dual-component* theory of perception, which says that when you consciously see the mango, you have

(i) a *sensation* that directly causes (ii) a *belief* that there is an ovoid orange mango in front of you.³ The sensation is sensory, but it is not a form of awareness, and the belief might be a form of awareness—it might amount to knowledge—but it is not sensory. Thus, the dual-component theory is inconsistent with the second part of the framing assumption.

To unpack the rest of the framing assumption, we must distinguish between *direct* and *indirect* awareness. The basic idea is that to be *indirectly* aware of something is to be aware of it *by* being aware of something else; to be *directly* aware of something is to be aware of it, but not by being aware of something else. For instance, you might see a shadow and thereby become aware that there is a person rounding the corner. Plausibly, you are directly aware of the shadow but only indirectly aware of the person. There are many different ways of making this distinction precise, but for present purposes, we need not choose among them.⁴

I will simply use the term *sensory awareness* to refer only to *direct* awareness. Thus, the third part of the framing assumption is that when you see the mango, your awareness of it, and its color and shape, is *direct*. This view, too, is plausible on the basis of introspection. I do not seem to be aware of the mango, or its color and shape, *by* being aware of other things. I seem to be aware of them directly.

The fourth and last part of the framing assumption is that when you see a mango, or even just hallucinate one, you are *not* (directly) sensorily aware of peculiar mental entities. Perhaps your conscious perception of a mango can make you sensorily aware of the perception itself or of properties like the blurriness or sharpness of your vision: your perception and the properties of blurriness and sharpness are ordinary mental events and properties, not peculiar ones. But I assume that neither your perception of a mango, nor a hallucination of one, will make you sensorily aware of a private mental object that is ovoid and yellow. I also assume that the perception and the hallucination will not make you sensorily aware of internal “mental paints” instead of, or in addition to, external shapes and colors.⁵ This assumption is supported by introspective and theoretical considerations. On the introspective side, seeing or hallucinating a mango does not *seem* to make you aware of peculiar mental entities.⁶ On the theoretical side are well-known problems that I will not review here.

The third and fourth parts of the framing assumption are both violated by the once-popular *sense-datum theory*. This theory says that when you

consciously see an ovoid orange mango, you are not sensorily aware of the mango itself, contrary to the third part of the assumption. Instead, you are sensorily aware of a peculiar mental entity, a *sense-datum*, that is ovoid and orange, contrary to the fourth part of the assumption. Thus, I set the sense-datum theory aside.

In sum, I assume without argument that when you see the mango, you are sensorily (and thus, by definition, directly) aware of it and its color and shape, but you are not sensorily aware of any peculiar mental entities. Given this framing assumption, what are our theoretical options?

1.2 Some Familiar Options: Representationalism and Naïve Realism

The contemporary philosophy of perception is dominated by two approaches: **representationalism** and **naïve realism**. For now, I will be loose in characterizing these theories, as well as the underlying notion of a representation. Increasingly precise definitions will be developed over the course of this book.

Representationalists think that consciously perceiving is purely a matter of having *representational* awareness of things, where *representations* are mental states or events that are subject to a certain kind of error. On this view, when you see the mango, you *successfully* represent it, in a distinctively sensory way, as being orange and ovoid. By contrast, when you hallucinate a mango, you deploy *failed* sensory representations of something that is orange and ovoid. Thus, there is a deep similarity between conscious perceptions and conscious hallucinations.

Naïve realists, by contrast, say that consciously perceiving is purely a matter of having *nonrepresentational* awareness of things—a kind of awareness that is immune to error, in a certain sense. The idea is that when you see the mango, you enjoy nonrepresentational awareness of it, its orangeness, and its ovoidness. There are many naïve realist accounts of hallucinations, but most of them agree that a matching hallucination of a mango does not involve nonrepresentational awareness of any object that is orange and ovoid. On these views, conscious hallucinations are very different in kind from conscious perceptions.

Representationalists and naïve realists disagree about whether consciously perceiving is a matter of having representational or nonrepresentational awareness, but buried under this disagreement is a shared assumption: on all versions of these views developed so far, it is agreed that

there is *just one kind of sensory awareness* here. More precisely, both parties have—universally, as far as I know—accepted:

Monism: What it is for you to consciously see, for example, an ovoid orange mango is for you to deploy *exactly one kind of sensory awareness*.⁷

Monism is really a cluster of views rather than a single one, for there is some vagueness in demarcating *kinds* of awareness. Still, we do not need a perfectly precise articulation of the monist thesis. Its spirit is clear: there is no major distinction in kind between, say, your awareness of the *mango* and your awareness of *ovoidness and orangeness*. With this understanding in mind, we can see what an enormously natural starting point monism is.

Widespread and natural as it is, I think that monism is false. I endorse:

Pluralism: What it is for you to consciously see, for example, an ovoid orange mango is for you to deploy *two very different kinds of sensory awareness* in concert.

“Dualism” might be a more accurate label, but that term already has a well-entrenched meaning in the philosophy of mind. Thus, I have chosen a different label.

What drives me to pluralism is the idea—defended in great detail across this book—that when you see a mango, your awareness of the mango behaves *very differently* from your awareness of ovoidness and orangeness. Your awareness of ovoidness and orangeness reveals to you part of the very essences of those qualities, it generates hard problems of consciousness and the external world, and there are strong reasons to think that it occurs even in conscious hallucinations. By contrast, your awareness of the mango does not reveal anything about the essence of that object, it does not generate any hard problems of consciousness or the external world, and there is little reason to think that it occurs in conscious hallucinations. Pluralism lets us explain these asymmetries by positing one kind of awareness of the mango and a very different kind of awareness of ovoidness and orangeness.

It is possible to develop pluralistic versions of representationalism or naïve realism: we could concede that conscious perception consists of two very different kinds of sensory awareness, while maintaining that both kinds of awareness are representational or that neither are. However, I prefer a third option: I think that our awareness of particular mangoes is representational, while our awareness of ovoidness and orangeness is nonrepresentational. I call this theory **rich pluralism**.

In the next section, I give an overview of rich pluralism. The overview is dense and is not intended to be fully digested now. My aim is just to impart a holistic impression of the theory, so that you will know how its various pieces fit together as you advance through the book.

1.3 A New Option: Rich Pluralism

Rich pluralism is simply my very specific version of pluralism. I call it this because it is pluralism “enriched” with many further claims: if a thesis is defended anywhere in this book, then it is a commitment of rich pluralism.⁸

In this section, I will stake out three posits that are especially central to rich pluralism.

1. The rich pluralist begins by positing **deep awareness**, which has several distinctive features. First, deep awareness constitutes **hard consciousness**—roughly, the kind of consciousness that generates the hard problems of consciousness and the external world. It therefore occurs in all (hard-) conscious experiences, including conscious perceptions, hallucinations, sensory imaginings, and episodic memories. Second, at least in the sensory experiences of beings like us, the only targets of deep awareness are certain universals—the *sensory qualities*, which include colors and shapes. (What I am calling *targets* of awareness are more commonly referred to as *objects* of awareness. But I wish to avoid ambiguity: universals might be targets of awareness, but they are not objects, in the normal sense.)

Third, deep awareness reveals a substantial part—not necessarily all!—of the essences of its targets. For example, when you consciously see a mango, you are deeply aware of ovoidness and orangeness. This reveals to you many essential truths about these sensory qualities: for example, that it lies in the nature of orange to be more similar to yellow than to green and to be instantiated only in something that is spatio-temporally extended.

Fourth, deep awareness is nonrepresentational: it is, in a certain sense, immune to error. One consequence of this is that your deep awareness of orange cannot err about the essence of that color. Another consequence is that even when you consciously *hallucinate* something orange, you continue to have genuine deep awareness of orange, and a substantial

portion of the very essence of that color continues to be revealed to you, just as in conscious perception.

2. The rich pluralist goes on to posit a second, very different kind of awareness: **successful sensory representation**. This contrasts with deep awareness in all of the respects just discussed. First, there is no constitutive link between successful sensory representation and consciousness. Successful sensory representation, *sans* deep awareness, equally occurs in the unconscious perceptions of simple creatures and super-blindseers. Second, whereas deep awareness only targets certain universals, successful sensory representation routinely targets particulars (and perhaps universals as well): when you see the mango, you successfully sensorily represent *it* and *its particular instances* of ovoidness and orangeness. Third, successful sensory representation does not reveal any part of the essences of its targets: seeing the mango does not reveal to you that it is essentially a fruit or even that it is essentially spatially extended.

Fourth, successful sensory representation is, as the name suggests, a form of representation. It therefore has an error-ridden counterpart: part of what it is to hallucinate an ovoid orange mango is to deploy a *failed* sensory representation, one that merely *purports* to represent a particular mango and its particular instances of ovoidness and orangeness. Successful sensory representations of a mango and its property-instances constitute awareness of those targets; failed sensory representations do not.

Although the rich pluralist thinks that deep awareness and successful sensory representation are very different, they also think that, in conscious perception, they are *woven together*. More precisely, the rich pluralist says that what it is to consciously see an ovoid orange mango is (i) to be deeply aware of universals such as ovoidness and orangeness; (ii) to successfully sensorily represent the particular mango and its particular instances of ovoidness and orangeness, via a perceptual relation to them; and (iii) to sensorily represent these property-instances *as* instances of the universals that the subject is deeply aware of. Condition (iii) is what ties together these different kinds of awareness; it is what makes any conscious perception a unified mental event.

3. The rich pluralist's theory has one last major piece, which describes something that is accidental to most experiences but essential to hallucinations. They say that on the basis of our deep awareness, our sensory

representations, and various contextual clues, we automatically and sub-personally *take* any experience to belong to certain kinds—for example, to be a perception, sensation, or sensory imagining. In simple creatures, this is a purely nonconceptual matter; it might consist of nothing more than simple behavioral dispositions. For sophisticated creatures like us, it also consists partly in *categorization*: the automatic, subpersonal application of various concepts, both to the targets of the experience and to the experience itself. In our focal case, you categorize what you see *as* an ovoid orange mango. More than this, you categorize the mango as a mind-independent object, and you categorize your experience as a perception.

These ideas about taking and categorization are hardly new. But the rich pluralist puts them to work in novel ways. They draw on them to explain why, in sophisticated subjects like us, perceptual experiences and sensations typically seem to *just present* particulars, which in turn seem to be *mind independent* or *mind dependent*, respectively. The rich pluralist says that these appearances are constituted by our categorizing our experiences in certain ways on the basis of their overall **gestalts**. They draw on these ideas again in their theory of hallucination: they say that what it is to be a hallucination is to be a sensory representation that is not a perception but is mistakenly taken for one.

That is rich pluralism in compressed form. The rest of the book will carefully unwind the theory.

1.4 The Structure of the Book

This book is divided into four parts.

Part I defends a thesis that I call **extended partial revelation**. This thesis is meant to characterize what is distinctive about *experience*, as opposed to, say, mere thought. The thesis states that, in the first instance, experience reveals to us a substantial portion of the very essences of certain universals, the *sensory qualities*, but it does not reveal any portion of the essences of anything else—for example, not of particulars.

I offer two separate arguments for extended partial revelation. Chapters 2 and 3 provide a direct argument: I gather many specific essential truths and show that extended partial revelation correctly predicts whether or not each one can be revealed in experience. Chapter 4 buttresses that

with an indirect argument: I suggest that extended partial revelation best explains why some questions constitute hard problems of consciousness and the external world, while other, very similar questions do not.

Extended partial revelation is a crucial part of the motivation for rich pluralism. For this thesis suggests that when you see an ovoid orange mango, your experience makes you sensorily aware of *some* targets, like ovoidness and orangeness, in a way that is partly essence-revealing, while making you sensorily aware of *other* targets, like the mango, in a way that is not at all essence-revealing. There are many possible explanations of this difference. But, over the course of the book, I argue that the best explanation is that you are deploying two very different kinds of awareness in concert: a *partly* revelatory, *nonrepresentational* awareness of ovoidness and orangeness, together with a *nonrevelatory, representational* awareness of the mango and its instances of ovoidness and orangeness.

This book considers two main competitors to rich pluralism. (Most other competitors violate the framing assumption and are set aside.) The first competitor is *representationalism*, which I understand as the view that (i) to perceive is to deploy at least one kind of sensory awareness, typically of external particulars and their properties (or property-instances), and (ii) every kind of sensory awareness constitutive of perception is *representational* (i.e., subject to a certain kind of error). The second competitor is *naïve realism*, the view that accepts (i) but adds that (iii) every kind of sensory awareness constitutive of perception is *nonrepresentational* (i.e., immune to error, in a certain sense). As far as I know, all actual representationalists and naïve realists are monists. Still, in both of these definitions, clause (i) includes the phrase “at least one,” so as to leave room for pluralistic versions of these theories.

Part II of the book—which consists of just a single chapter, chapter 5—argues that rich pluralism is superior to any form of representationalism, whether monistic or pluralistic. The basic thought is that the rich pluralist accepts all of the usual representationalist posits; they just add further posits about deep (i.e., partly essence-revealing) awareness. Thus, the rich pluralist gains automatic access to the core explanatory advantages of representationalism. In addition, rich pluralism is—surprisingly—just as parsimonious as adequate forms of representationalism. However, any form of representationalism faces a serious problem: because it says that our awareness of sensory qualities is representational, it predicts that

experiences can err about the essences of the sensory qualities. In fact, this is impossible. Rich pluralists get things right: they say that our awareness of the sensory qualities is nonrepresentational and thus immune to this kind of error.

Part III of the book argues that rich pluralism is superior to any form of naïve realism, whether monistic or pluralistic. I start by identifying four major motivations for naïve realism. Naïve realism is thought to have an advantage in explaining why conscious perception (i) *reveals the intrinsic characters* of things (chapter 6), (ii) positions us to gain a certain special kind of *knowledge of reference* (chapter 7), (iii) simply *presents* the world to us (also chapter 7), and (iv) (correctly) *introspectively seems* to present the world to us (chapter 8). I argue that naïve realists have overlooked much of the data: many of the ideas above extend to conscious hallucinations, episodic memories, and sensory imaginings. I then develop the best accounts of the full range of data—where, lo and behold, several of these accounts require us to accept extended partial revelation. I go on to show that these accounts are compatible not only with certain versions of naïve realism but also with certain versions of representationalism and rich pluralism. I conclude that naïve realism brings no particular explanatory advantages to the table.

However, I show that if the naïve realist is to account for the full range of sensory events—including perceptions, hallucinations, sensory imaginings, and episodic memories, all of which come in conscious and unconscious varieties—then they must greatly complicate their theory. The rich pluralist's account is far more elegant, making it the better choice (chapter 9).

At this point, I conclude with some firmness that rich pluralism is superior to any other theory of perception.

Part IV of the book handles some remaining explanatory challenges—challenges that seem hard to meet on any theory of perception. In chapter 10, I address a deep problem about the *phenomenal character* of perception: it seems that this *must* be shared between conscious perceptions and matching hallucinations, and yet that it *cannot* be shared between them. I argue that philosophers have used the term “phenomenal character” with at least three different concepts and at least two different referents in mind. This dissolves the deep problem: there is one kind of phenomenal character that conscious perceptions and matching hallucinations must share and a different kind that they cannot share. In chapter 11, I rebut a series of

arguments from hallucination. Chapter 12 concludes with a holistic summary of my case for rich pluralism.

Let me close with a methodological remark. Some philosophers seem content to argue that their theories of perception are supported by *some* compelling motivations and are not *refuted* by well-known objections. I am unimpressed by these arguments. The same can be said of *any* major theory of perception: motivations are abundant, refutations scarce.

This book makes more probing arguments. Regarding motivations, I show that *many converging ones* support rich pluralism and that the theory can honor *all* of the core motivations of its major competitors. Regarding objections, I show that rich pluralism can block *all* of the well-known ones *at little cost*. More generally, I try to develop the very best versions of my opponent's positions; to examine the full range of data, not just a prejudicial slice; and to openly admit the vices of my theory and the virtues of its rivals. I do all of this in search of the theory that is best, not just in some narrow respect, but overall.

Rich pluralism, I am convinced, is that theory.

References

- Allen, K. 2011. "Revelation and the nature of colour." *Dialectica* 65 (2): 153–176.
- Allen, K. 2015. "Hallucination and imagination." *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 93 (2): 287–302.
- Allen, K. 2020. "The value of perception." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 100 (3): 633–656.
- Alston, W. 1999. "Back to the theory of appearing." *Philosophical Perspectives* 13: 181–203.
- Andrews, A. 2020. "Acquiring a concept of visual experience." *Philosophical Quarterly* 70 (279): 223–245.
- Bayne, T. 2009. "Perception and the reach of phenomenal content." *Philosophical Quarterly* 59 (236): 385–404.
- Bayne, T., and M. Montague. 2011. *Cognitive phenomenology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bayne, T. 2022. "The puzzle of cognitive phenomenology." In *Oxford studies in philosophy of mind*, vol. 1, ed. Uriah Kriegel. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, O. 2019. "Rethinking naïve realism." *Philosophical Studies* 176: 607–633.
- Bengson, J., E. Grube, and D. Korman. 2011. "A new framework for conceptualism." *Noûs* 45 (1): 167–189.
- Berger, J., and B. Nanay. 2016. "Relationalism and unconscious perception." *Analysis* 76 (4): 426–433.
- Block, N. 1980. "Troubles with functionalism." In *Readings in the philosophy of psychology*, vol. 1, ed. N. Block, 268–305. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Block, N. 1995. "On a confusion about a function of consciousness." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 18: 227–287.

- Block, N. 1996. "Mental paint and mental latex." *Philosophical Issues* 7: 19–49.
- Brewer, B. 2011. *Perception and its objects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Broad, C. 1952. "Some elementary reflexions on sense-perception." *Philosophy* 27: 3–17.
- Broi, A. 2020. "Revelation and phenomenal relations." *Philosophical Quarterly* 70 (278): 22–42.
- Burge, T. 2010. *Origins of objectivity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Byrne, A. 2004. "What phenomenal consciousness is like." In *Higher-order theories of consciousness: An anthology*, ed. R. Gennaro, 203–226. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Byrne, A. 2006. "Color and the mind-body problem." *Dialectica* 60 (3): 223–244.
- Byrne, A. 2009. "Experience and content." *Philosophical Quarterly* 59 (236): 429–451.
- Byrne, A., and D. Hilbert. 2007. "Color primitivism." *Erkenntnis* 66: 73–105.
- Campbell, J. 1993. "A simple view of colour." In *Reality: Representation and projection*, ed. J. Haldane and C. Wright, 257–268. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, J. 2002. *Reference and consciousness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, J. 2005. "Transparency versus revelation in color perception." *Philosophical Topics* 33 (1): 105–115.
- Campbell, J., and Q. Cassam. 2014. *Berkeley's puzzle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carruthers, P., and B. Veillet. 2011. "The case against cognitive phenomenology." In *Cognitive phenomenology*, ed. T. Bayne and M. Montague, 35–56. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chalmers, D. 1996. *The conscious mind*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chalmers, D. 2004. "The representational character of experience." In *The future for philosophy*, ed. B. Leiter, 153–181. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chalmers, D. 2018. "The meta-problem of consciousness." *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 29 (9–10): 6–61.
- Conduct, M. 2012. "Naïve realism without disjunctivism about experience." *Consciousness and Cognition* 21 (2): 727–736.
- Correia, F., and A. Skiles. 2019. "Grounding, essence, and identity." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 98 (3): 642–670.
- Crane, T. 2006. "Is there a perceptual relation?" In *Perceptual experience*, ed. T. Gendler and J. Hawthorne, 126–146. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- D'Ambrosio, J. 2019. "A new perceptual adverbialism." *Journal of Philosophy* 116 (8): 413–446.

- Denby, D. 2014. "Essence and intrinsicity." In *Companion to intrinsic properties*, ed. R. Francescotti. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Dokic, J., and J. Martin. 2012. "Disjunctivism, hallucinations, and metacognition." *WIREs Cognitive Science* 3: 533–543.
- Dretske, F. 1995. *Naturalizing the mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Evans, G. 1982. *The varieties of reference*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Farrell, J. 2016. "'What it is like' talk is not technical talk." *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 23 (9–10): 50–65.
- Fine, K. 1994. "Essence and modality." *Philosophical Perspectives* 8: 1–16.
- Fish, W. 2008. "Relationalism and the problems of consciousness." *Teorema* 27 (3): 167–180.
- Fish, W. 2009. *Perception, hallucination, and illusion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fish, W. 2013. "High-level properties and visual experience." *Philosophical Studies* 162: 43–55.
- Gaskin, R. 2019. "A defence of the resemblance meaning of 'What it's like'." *Mind* 128 (511): 673–698.
- Genone, J. 2016. "Recent work on naïve realism." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 53 (1): 1–24.
- Goff, P. 2017. *Consciousness and fundamental reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gomes, A. 2017. "Naïve realism in Kantian phrase." *Mind* 126: 529–578.
- Grice, H. 1961. "The causal theory of perception." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 35: 121–153.
- Harman, G. 1990. "The intrinsic quality of experience." *Philosophical Perspectives* 4: 31–52.
- Heck, R. 2000. "Nonconceptual content and the space of reasons." *Philosophical Review* 109: 483–523.
- Hellie, B. 2007a. "Factive phenomenal characters." *Philosophical Perspectives* 21: 259–306.
- Hellie, B. 2007b. "'There's something it's like' and the structure of consciousness." *Philosophical Review* 116: 441–463.
- Hellie, B. 2013. "The multidisjunctive conception of hallucination." In *Hallucination*, ed. F. Macpherson and D. Platchias, 149–173. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hill, C. 2014. *Meaning, mind, and knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hopkins, R. 2012. "What Perky did not show." *Analysis* 72: 431–439.

- Hopkins, R. 2013. "Perky, phenomenal similarity and photographs: Reply to Nanay." *Analysis* 73 (1): 77–80.
- Ivanov, I. 2019. "How to tell essence (when you sense one)." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 49 (2): 147–168.
- Jackson, F. 1982. "Epiphenomenal qualia." *Philosophical Quarterly* 32: 127–36.
- Johnston, M. 1992. "How to speak of the colors." *Philosophical Studies* 68: 221–263.
- Johnston, M. 2004. "The obscure object of hallucination." *Philosophical Studies* 120: 113–183.
- Johnston, M. 2006. "Better than mere knowledge? The function of sensory awareness." In *Perceptual experience*, ed. T. Gendler and J. Hawthorne, 260–290. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kappes, Y. 2020. "Phenomenal relations and collective essence." *Philosophical Quarterly* 70 (281): 800–808.
- Kennedy, M. 2009. "Heirs of nothing: The implications of transparency." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 79 (3): 574–604.
- Kripke, S. 1972. *Naming and necessity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Langsam, H. 2017. "The intuitive case for naïve realism." *Philosophical Explorations* 20 (1): 106–122.
- Leslie, S. 2011. "Essence, plenitude, and paradox." *Philosophical Perspectives* 25: 277–296.
- Levin, J. 2007. "What is a phenomenal concept?" In *Phenomenal concepts and phenomenal knowledge*, ed. T. Alter and S. Walter, 87–110. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levine, J. 1983. "Materialism and qualia: The explanatory gap." *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 64: 354–361.
- Levine, J. 2001. *Purple haze: The puzzle of consciousness*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levine, J. 2006. "Conscious awareness and self-representation." In *Self-representational approaches to consciousness*, ed. U. Kriegel and K. Williford. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lewis, D. 1970. "How to define theoretical terms." *Journal of Philosophy* 67 (13): 427–446.
- Lewis, D. 1983. "New work for a theory of universals." *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 61 (4): 343–377.
- Lewis, D. 1995. "Should a materialist believe in qualia?" *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 73 (1): 140–144.

- Logue, H. 2012. "Why naïve realism?" *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 112 (2): 211–237.
- Logue, H. 2013. "Good news for the disjunctivist about the bad cases." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 86 (1): 105–133.
- Lormand, E. 2004. "The explanatory stopgap." *Philosophical Review* 113: 303–357.
- Lycan, W. 1996. *Consciousness and experience*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mackie, P. 2006. *How things might have been: Individuals, kinds, and essential properties*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mackie, P. 2020. "Perception, mind-independence, and Berkeley." *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 98 (3): 449–464.
- Mandelbaum, E. 2018. "Seeing and conceptualizing: Modularity and the shallow contents of perception." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 97 (2): 267–283.
- Martin, M. 1997. "The reality of appearances." In *Thought and ontology*, ed. M. Sainsbury. Milan, Italy: Franco Angeli.
- Martin, M. 1998. "Setting things before the mind." *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement* 43: 157–179.
- Martin, M. 2001. "Out of the past: Episodic recall as retained acquaintance." In *Time and memory*, ed. C. Hoerl and T. McCormack, 257–284. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, M. 2002. "The transparency of experience." *Mind and Language* 17 (4): 376–425.
- Martin, M. 2004. "The limits of self-awareness." *Philosophical Studies* 120: 37–89.
- Martin, M. 2006. "On being alienated." In *Perceptual experience*, ed. T. Gendler and J. Hawthorne, 354–410. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Masrour, F. 2011. "Is perceptual phenomenology thin?" *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 83 (2): 366–397.
- McClelland, T. 2014. "The problem of consciousness: Easy, hard, or tricky?" *Topoi* 2017 (36): 17–30.
- McClelland, T. 2016. "Gappiness and the case for liberalism about phenomenal properties." *Philosophical Quarterly* 66 (264): 536–558.
- McLaughlin, B. 2003. "The place of color in nature." In *Colour perception: Mind and the physical world*, ed. R. Mausfeld and D. Heyer, 475–502. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mehta, N. 2014. "The limited role of particulars in phenomenal experience." *Journal of Philosophy* 111 (6): 311–331.

- Mehta, N. 2019. "Phenomenal, normative, and other explanatory gaps: A general diagnosis." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 98 (3): 567–591.
- Mendelovici, A. 2018. *The phenomenal basis of intentionality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Millar, B. 2014a. "The phenomenological directness of perceptual experience." *Philosophical Studies* 170: 235–253.
- Millar, B. 2014b. "The phenomenological problem of perception." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 88 (3): 625–654.
- Millar, B. 2017. "Thinking with sensations." *Journal of Philosophy* 114 (3): 134–154.
- Milner, A. D., and M. Goodale. 2008. "Two visual systems re-viewed." *Neuropsychologia* 46: 774–785.
- Miracchi, L. 2017. "Perception first." *Journal of Philosophy* 114 (12): 629–677.
- Miyazono, K. 2021. "Visual experiences without presentational phenomenology." *Ergo* 8 (19): 551–576.
- Moore, G. E. 1903. "The refutation of idealism." *Mind* 12: 433–453.
- Nagel, T. 1974. "What is it like to be a bat?" *Philosophical Review* 83 (4): 435–450.
- Nanay, B. 2012a. "Perceiving tropes." *Erkenntnis* 77 (1): 1–14.
- Nanay, B. 2012b. "The philosophical implications of the Perky experiments: Reply to Hopkins." *Analysis* 72 (3): 439–443.
- Neta, R. 2008. "In defence of disjunctivism." In *Disjunctivism: Perception, action, knowledge*, ed. A. Haddock and F. Macpherson, 311–329. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nudds, M. 2009. "Recent work in perception: Naïve realism and its opponents." *Analysis Reviews* 69 (2): 334–346.
- Pautz, A. 2007. "Intentionalism and perceptual presence." *Philosophical Perspectives* 21 (1): 495–541.
- Pautz, A. 2009. "What are the contents of experiences?" *Philosophical Quarterly* 59 (236): 483–507.
- Pautz, A. 2013. "Do the benefits of naïve realism outweigh the costs? Comments on Fish, *Perception, Hallucination and Illusion*." *Philosophical Studies* 163: 25–36.
- Pautz, A. 2010. "Do theories of consciousness rest on a mistake?" *Philosophical Issues* 20 (1): 333–367.
- Pautz, A. 2020. "Representationalism about consciousness." In *The Oxford handbook of the philosophy of consciousness*, ed. U. Kriegel, 405–434. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Perky, C. 1910. "An experimental study of imagination." *American Journal of Psychology* 21: 422–452.
- Phillips, I. 2020. "Blindsight is qualitatively degraded vision." *Psychological Review* 128 (3): 558–584.
- Potter, M., B. Wyble, C. Haggmann, and E. McCourt. 2014. "Detecting meaning in RSVP at 13 ms per picture." *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* 76 (2): 270–279.
- Price, R. 2009. "Aspect-switching and visual phenomenal character." *Philosophical Quarterly* 59 (236): 508–518.
- Quilty-Dunn, J. 2015. "Believing in perceiving: known illusions and the classical dual-component theory." *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 96: 550–575.
- Rosenthal, D. 2005. *Consciousness and mind*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Russell, B. 1911. "Knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge by description." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 11 (1): 108–128.
- Saad, B. 2016. "How to befriend zombies: A guide for physicalists." *Philosophical Studies* 173: 2353–2375.
- Schaffer, J. 2016. "Grounding in the image of causation." *Philosophical Studies* 173 (1): 49–100.
- Schaffer, J. 2017. "The ground between the gaps." *Philosophers' Imprint* 17 (11): 1–26.
- Schellenberg, S. 2018. *The unity of perception: Content, consciousness, evidence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schroer, R. 2010. "Where's the beef? Phenomenal concepts as both demonstrative and substantial." *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 88 (3): 505–522.
- Schroer, R. 2014. "The Goldilocks problem of the specificity of visual phenomenal content." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 44 (3–4): 476–495.
- Schwitzgebel, E. 2008. "The unreliability of naive introspection." *Philosophical Review* 117 (2): 245–273.
- Schwitzgebel, E. 2012. "Introspection, what?" In *Introspection and consciousness*, ed. D. Smithies and D. Stoljar. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schwitzgebel, E. 2016. "Phenomenal consciousness, defined and defended as innocently as I can manage." *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 23 (11–12): 224–235.
- Searle, J. 1983. *Intentionality: An essay in the philosophy of mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sethi, U. 2020. "Sensible over-determination." *Philosophical Quarterly* 70 (280): 588–616.

- Sethi, U. 2021a. "Mind-dependence in Berkeley and the problem of perception." *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 99 (4): 648–668.
- Sethi, U. 2021b. "The varieties of instantiation." *Journal of the American Philosophical Association* 7 (3): 417–437.
- Shoemaker, S. 1982. "The inverted spectrum." *Journal of Philosophy* 79: 357–381.
- Sider, T. 2011. *Writing the book of the world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Siegel, S. 2004. "Indiscriminability and the phenomenal." *Philosophical Studies* 120 (1–3): 91–112.
- Siegel, S. 2006. "Which properties are represented in perception?" In *Perceptual experience*, ed. T. Gendler and J. Hawthorne, 481–503. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Siegel, S. 2008. "The epistemic conception of hallucination." In *Disjunctivism*, eds A. Haddock and F. Macpherson, 205–224. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Siegel, S. 2009. "The visual experience of causation." *Philosophical Quarterly* 59 (236): 519–540.
- Siegel, S. 2010. *The contents of visual experience*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Snowdon, P. 2010. "On the what-it-is-likeness of experience." *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 48 (1): 8–27.
- Soteriou, M. 2005. "The subjective view of experience and its objective commitments." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 105: 177–190.
- Soteriou, M. 2016. *Disjunctivism*. New York: Routledge.
- Spencer, J. 2020. "The limits of neo-Aristotelian plenitude (and its conceptual neighbors)." *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 101: 74–92.
- Stoljar, D. 2016. "The semantics of 'What it's like' and the nature of consciousness." *Mind* 125: 1161–1198.
- Sturgeon, S. 1998. "Visual experience." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 98 (1): 179–200.
- Sturgeon, S. 2000. *Matters of mind*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sturgeon, S. 2008. "Disjunctivism about visual experience." In *Disjunctivism: Perception, action, knowledge*, ed. A. Haddock and F. Macpherson, 112–143. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sundström, P. 2018. "How physicalists can—and cannot—explain the seeming 'absurdity' of physicalism." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 97 (3): 681–703.

Swindle, P. 1916. "Positive after-images of long duration." *American Journal of Psychology* 27 (3): 324–333.

Tye, M. 1995. *Ten problems of consciousness: A representational theory of the phenomenal mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Tye, M. 2002. "Representationalism and the transparency of experience." *Noûs* 36 (1): 137–51.

Tye, M. 2009. *Consciousness revisited: Materialism without phenomenal concepts*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Tye, M. 2019. "What uninformed Mary can teach us." In *The knowledge argument*, ed. Sam Coleman, 269–279. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, A. 2018. "Metaphysical causation." *Noûs* 52 (4): 723–751.

Wilson, J. 2014. "No work for a theory of grounding." *Inquiry* 57 (5–6): 535–579.

