Philosophical Perspectives, 13, Epistemology, 1999

BACK TO THE THEORY OF APPEARING

William P. Alston
Syracuse University

i

Once upon a time there was a theory of perception called the "Theory of Appearing". It was quite a nice little theory; in fact I believe that, suitably understood, it is a true theory. It enjoyed some currency in the early twentieth century.[1] But like many nice theories, including more than one true theory, it fell into disfavor at court, was traduced, slandered, and scorned, was ignored by the succeeding generation, and was almost forgotten.[2] But the time has come for a reexamination, one that may lead to vindication and restitution. This paper is designed to contribute to that process.[3]

Just what is the "theory of appearing" and what is it a theory of? As we shall see , one of the advantages of the theory is that it provides in one stroke for answers to the three fundamental philosophical questions about perception:

1. What is the nature of perceptual consciousness (experience)?
2. What is it to perceive a physical object?
3. How, if at all, is perception a source of justification of beliefs about (or a source of knowledge of) the physical environment?

But it is primarily an answer to the first question. Its bearing on the other two questions stem from that. Hence I will begin with its answer to the first question. And to do that I must explain what I mean by 'perceptual consciousness (experience)'.

Sense perception, in the most generous sense of the term, involves a variety of components, including physical and physiological processes that stretch from the object perceived to the brain of the percipient, beliefs about the physical environment, and so on. But at its heart is a certain mode of consciousness. When I open my eyes in sufficient light my consciousness is informed or qualified in a certain way. I am, it is natural to say, "aware of" a variety of items disposed in what we may call the "visual field". The problem of the nature of perceptual

consciousness is just the problem of how to characterize this way of being conscious.[4] In this paper I shall be confining myself to visual perception.

Another way of explaining 'perceptual consciousness' is to say that it is the mode of consciousness that distinguishes perceiving objects from remembering them or just thinking about them. There is a readily recognizable "inner" difference between what it is like to remember or think about a certain tree and what it is like to actually see it. Perceptual consciousness is the component of actually seeing the tree that makes the difference.

As an entrée to characterizing perceptual consciousness, consider an example. I look out my study window and observe a variegated scene. There are maple, birch, and spruce trees in my front yard. Squirrels scurry across the lawn and up and down the trees. Birds fly in and out of the scene, hopping on the lawn in search of worms. Cars and vans occasionally drive by. My neighbor across the street is transplanting some geraniums. A truck pulls up in his driveway.

The most intuitively attractive way of characterizing my state of consciousness as I observe all this is to say that it consists of the *presentation* of physical objects to consciousness. Upon opening one's eyes one is *presented* with a variegated scene, consisting of objects spread out in space, displaying various characteristics, and engaging in various activities. To deliberately flaunt a controversial term, it seems that these objects are *given* to one's awareness. It seems for all the world as if I enjoy *direct*, *unmediated* awareness of those objects. There is, apparently, nothing at all "between" my mind and the objects I am perceiving. They are simply *displayed* to my awareness.

The theory of appearing (hereinafter 'TA') is distinguished from rival theories by sticking close to this natural construal. It takes perceptual consciousness to consist, most basically, in the fact that one or more objects *appear* to the subject *as so-and-so*, as round, bulgy, blue, jagged, etc. (Later we shall see that the relation of appearing is not confined to these maximally simple qualities, but we can work with them initially.) Restricting ourselves to vision, visual consciousness consists in one or more objects *looking* certain ways to one. Of course, everyone (almost everyone!) agrees that when S sees a physical object, that object looks a certain way to S. What distinguishes the theory of appearing is that it takes this *looking* to constitute the *intrinsic character* of perceptual consciousness, rather than something that requires conditions over and above the consciousness itself. Thus TA takes perceptual consciousness to be ineluctably *relational* in character. And, where one is genuinely perceiving objects, situations, and events in the external environment, it takes this to involve relations to external objects. This distinguishes it from its two traditional rivals—the sense-datum theory and the adverbial theory. According to the latter, perceptual consciousness is simply a *way* of being conscious; it does not display an "act-object" structure. As a mode of consciousness, it is not a cognition of objects. The sense-datum theory takes perceptual consciousness to consist in an awareness of objects, but the objects in question are not the familiar denizens of the physical world, but are instead spe-

cial, non-physical objects of a markedly peculiar character. TA is distinguished from both these alternatives by insisting that perceptual consciousness *is* an *awareness of* objects, which are, in normal cases, *physical objects in the environment.*

Since adverbial and sense-datum theories do not take the intrinsic character of perceptual experience to be an awareness of external objects, they must offer analyses of a physical object, X's looking P to S in terms of some relation in which X stands to the experience, other than X's looking so-and-so to S. This relation is usually specified, in whole or in part, as causal. TA does not deny that perceived objects stand in causal relations with perceptual experience, but it denies that those causal relations are constitutive of *what it is* for X to look so-and-so to a subject, S. TA construes the appearing (looking) relation as *irreducible* to theoretically more fundamental factors. X's looking a certain way to S is a bottom line concept in TA, not to be construed in terms of allegedly deeper, ontologically more fundamental concepts, such as causality, conceptualization, or tendencies to belief.

A terminological note. When one speaks, as I have been doing, of objects being *presented* or *given* to a subject, S (or to S's awareness or consciousness), TA takes this to be just another way of speaking of objects *appearing* to S. And if we speak of S's being *directly aware* of certain objects in perceptual experience, we are still reporting the same relation of appearing, or, strictly speaking, its converse.

TA, as I understand it, is not saddled with the thesis that objects only appear perceptually as what they actually are. It is not that "naive" a direct realism. I take the trouble to point this out, because terms like 'directly aware' and 'given' are frequently taken to carry such an infallibility rider. But it is a familiar fact of life that perceived objects are not always what they perceptually appear to be. And TA embodies this commonsense truism in its concept of appearing. The directness and givenness has to do with the absence of any mediation in the awareness, not with any guaranteed match between how X appears and what it is, or with any epistemic status of the belief that is engendered by the appearing. Of course, one may well accept an principle to the effect that it is reasonable to take it that things are what they perceptually seem to be, in the absence of good reasons to the contrary; but that is a long way from infallibility.

This last point naturally leads into a distinction between the givenness (direct awareness) of facts and of particulars. Many discussions fail to make this distinction, and many attacks on "the given" gain whatever plausibility they have from their conflation. TA, as I conceive it, has no traffic in the givenness (direct awareness) of facts. It is compatible with the view that awareness of facts always involves conceptual activity on the part of the subject, though it is not committed to that thesis. The givenness, presentation, direct awareness envisaged by TA has to do with concrete particulars—objects, events, processes, and the like. Indeed, it is congenial to TA to hold that one can be directly aware of objects in the environment even if, like tiny infants and lower animals, one lacks the cognitive wherewithal for any awareness of facts.

ii

I must also distinguish TA from more recent competitors that take perceptual consciousness to be ineluctably conceptual in character.[5] (Some go further and take this conceptual aspect to always be in propositional form.) We can divide *conceptualism*, as I shall term such views, into more or less extreme forms, depending on whether they also recognize a non-conceptual aspect (component) of perceptual experience. But as I use 'conceptualism', even those that do recognize a non-conceptual component deny that it constitutes any cognition of external objects. It is a purely self-enclosed matter, a wholly intra-mental affair. Such moderate conceptualisms typically use the term 'sensation' for this non-conceptual component. TA is committed to the denial of the thesis that all forms of conceptualism share, viz. that there is no nonconceptual cognition of external objects in perception. This follows from the fact that the converse of the appearing relation is a *direct, unmediated* awareness of an object. Part of what is intended by 'direct and unmediated' is that there is no mediation by concepts. X's looking P to S does not involve S's applying the concept of P to X, or thinking of X as P, or using the concept of P to "classify" X, or anything of the sort. There is no such deployment of concepts "between" S and X. S is simply aware of X as looking a certain way, and that's all there is to it.

Something needs to be said about what TA's opposition to conceptualism does and does not involve. That opposition simply consists in the insistence that perception essentially involves a mode of cognition of objects that is non-conceptual in character. Moreover it is that mode of cognition that gives perception its distinctive character vis-a-vis other modes of cognition—abstract thought, fantasy, memory, and so on. But this insistence does *not* commit TA to the denial of any of the following theses that are frequently associated with conceptualism:

1. Perception is typically conceptually structured.
2. There is (can be) no perception without conceptual structuring.
3. Conceptual-propositional thought influences the character of sensory experience.

Indeed, I accept both 1. and 3. Let me take a moment to enlarge on this. First, as to 1., I am far from being the most radical de-conceptualist. I am not so pre-Kantian as to suppose that concepts play no role in perception. When I look out my study window my visual experience bears marks, obvious on reflection, of being structured by concepts of *house*, *tree*, *grass*, *pavement*, etc. I see various parts of the scene *as* houses, trees, etc., employing the appropriate concepts in doing so. Perception is, typically, a certain kind of use of concepts, even if, as I am contending, the cognition involved is not restricted to that. My thesis is that there is a cognitive *component* of perception that is non-conceptual. Moreover it

is this component that gives perception is distinctive character. It is this component that distinguishes perception from memory, (mere) judgment, reasoning, wondering, and hypothesizing.

As for 3., it is equally obvious that one's concepts, beliefs, assumptions, and expectations affect the way things perceptually appear. There is much experimental evidence for this, but it is also apparent from common experience. My house looks very different to me after long familiarity than it did the first time I saw it. Complex musical compositions sound quite different after we have learned to recognize themes and follow their development. Again, TA need not deny this. It is a view about the *constitution*, the *intrinsic character* of experience, not about the causal influences that are responsible for that.

As for 2., though I reject it and hold that it is very likely that infants, and adults in conditions of reduced cognitive activity, perceive things without any conceptualization, I will not argue for that. In any event, it too is compatible with TA. Since TA is compatible with holding that normal perceptual experience involves conceptualization, it is compatible with holding that this is always the case, or even necessarily the case.

These disavowals are important because much of the argumentation of conceptualists is designed to support 1., 2., or 3. Such arguments have no bearing on my contentions in this paper.

There are other familiar arguments of conceptualists that, for one reason or another, do not make contact with my position. First, it is standard practice for conceptualists to contrast their position with sense-datum theory and to support their view by pointing out defects in the latter. But since the view I oppose to theirs is radically different from a sense datum theory, this is of no concern to me. Second, the same is to be said for *epistemological* attacks on 'the given', arguments to the effect that nothing is presented to us in perception in a foolproof, infallible way that renders mistake about the character of the given impossible. Though my view is that sensory experience essentially involves a *givenness* or *presentation* of something, it is definitely not committed to the epistemological views in question. Hence these arguments too pass me by.

My acknowledgement that TA is compatible with 1.-3. forces me to complicate the TA account of the nature of perceptual consciousness. What 1. says is not only that perceptual experience is typically conjoined with or gives rise to conceptualization of perceived items, but, more strongly, that our conscious awareness of those objects is typically shaped by concepts. Agreeing with that commits us to introducing concepts into the intrinsic character of the experience. It prevents us from taking perceptual experience to consist exclusively of objects appearing to us, as I have characterized that. But TA retains its cutting edge for all that. It can still take appearing as what is most fundamental to perceptual cognition, and that in two ways. First, it is what is most distinctive of perception, what distinguishes it from other modes of cognition. To bring this home, carry out an analogue of the following simple experiment. I am back in my study facing the

window opening onto my front yard. With my eyes shut I think about the scene before me. I remember the trees in my yard. I wonder whether there are squirrels and robins out there at the moment. I hypothesize that my neighbor across the street is working in his garden. That is, I form various propositional attitudes concerning what is or might be in front of me. Then I open my eyes and take a look. My cognitive condition is radically transformed. Whereas before I was just thinking about, wondering about, remembering the trees, the squirrels, the houses, and so on, these items (or some of them) are now *directly presented* to my awareness. They are *present* to me, whereas before I was merely dealing with propositions *about* them. This, I submit, is an intuitively plausible way of describing the difference, and hence a plausible way of bringing out what is distinctive of perception as a mode of cognition. The difference cannot lie in the conceptual aspect of perceptual experience; there was plenty of that before I opened my eyes. We must look to the *nonconceptual* awareness of objects to understand how perception differs from nonperceptual uses of concepts.

The second way in which TA holds that appearing is fundamental in perception is that the deployment of concepts is based on it and presupposes it. The role of concepts *in perception* is to be applied to objects of which we are perceptually aware. But that means that in perception there must be some preconceptual awareness of objects to give the concepts a point of application. Concepts without percepts are useless (in perception), to tailor Kant to my present purposes. The conceptual aspects of perceptual experience require the nonconceptual aspects as a basis.

Since TA is opposed to conceptualism, a complete defense of it would involve going into what can be said for and against conceptualism. I don't have time for that here.[6] In any event, I can't see that conceptualists present any significant arguments for their position, once it is distinguished from theses like 1.-3. above, with which it is often conflated. They typically just announce the position, as if it were too obvious to require support, with perhaps a suggestion that it had been established by Kant. (This despite the fact that they would never dream of accepting Kant's arguments for it.) But though I cannot treat the matter properly here, still conceptualism is so deeply entrenched in contemporary thought that I will say just a word in the hope of neutralizing one pull toward that position. TA holds that visual consciousness is, at bottom, a matter of various X's looking P to S. But, says the conceptualist, that itself essentially involves concepts. X's looking so-and-so to me (looking round, red, like a house or a tree) *is* just for me to see X *as* round, red, as a house, or as a tree. That is, it is to *take* X to be a house, which involves applying the concept of a house to it. Hence the supposed nonconceptual awareness of X's looking some way to S turns out to involve the use of concepts after all.[7]

Though this argument can sound impressive, and though it has been convincing to many, it will not survive careful scrutiny. The move from 'X looks P to S' to 'S sees X as P' looks plausible. But if we understand the latter as 'S (visually) *takes*, *believes*, or *judges* X to be a house', the position is hopeless. It is

perfectly clear that X can look P to me without my believing it to be P. If I know that X is a white object in red light it can look red to me without my taking (believing, judging) it to be red. And if I know that X is a house facade on a movie set, it can look like a house to me without my taking it to be a house. Hence, if a conceptualist construal of 'X looks P to S' is to have a chance, it will have to dissociate 'apply the concept of P to X' from any implication of 'believe that X is P'. And this is possible. One can be using the concept of a house to visually mark out an object from the rest of the observed scene without believing that it is, in fact, a house.

But this more modest thesis fares no better. The most decisive reason for this is that X can look P to S even if S lacks the concept of P. Where that happens, there is the look without the corresponding concept application. Something may look like a mango to me (present the kind of appearance that mangoes typically present to normal perceivers in this kind of situation) even though I lack the concept of a mango. Hence X's looking P to S cannot *be* S's using the concept of P in perceiving X.

This negative judgment may be resisted by pointing out that I couldn't report or believe that X looks like a mango without using the concept of a mango. But that is neither here nor there with respect to what it is for X to look like a mango to me. The supposition that it does is based on a confusion between the fact that *p* and the belief, report, or thought that *p*. Without the concept of a mango I can't *realize* that X looked like a mango to me. But in the same way if I lack the concept of a muscular spasm I cannot realize or report that I am having a muscular spasm. That doesn't show that *having* a muscular spasm involves using the concept of a muscular spasm. And the same is to be said of looks.

Another reason for rejecting the conceptualist understanding of 'looks' has to do with the richness of perceptual appearances, particularly visual appearances. When I look at my front lawn, it presents much more content to my awareness than I can possibly capture in concepts. There are indefinitely complex shadings of color and texture among the leaves and branches of each of the trees. That is perceptually *presented* to me in all its detail, but I can make only the faintest stab at encoding it in concepts. My repertoire of visual property and visual relation concepts is much too limited and much too crude to capture more than a tiny proportion of this. This is the situation sometimes expressed by saying that while perceptual experience has an 'analog' character, concepts are 'digital'.[8] Since looks are enormously more complex than any conceptualization available to us, the former cannot consist of the latter.

iii

It will help to further characterize TA if I say something about the range of properties that can replace 'P' in 'X appears P to S'. Discussion of such matters are usually carried on in terms of what we may call 'simple sensory qualities'—colors, shapes, pitches, intensities and timbres of sounds, roughness and smooth-

ness, heat and cold, ways of smelling and tasting. But note that in this essay I have failed to go along with this restriction, including such looks as "like a house" and "like a mango" To explain how I view the matter I must make some distinctions between types of concepts of how something looks.

I will not be able to offer a comprehensive account, but there is one distinction that is crucial for the present issue. Chisholm and others have distinguished what I will call *phenomenal* and *comparative* look-concepts. The basic distinction is this. A phenomenal look-concept is simply the concept of the distinctive phenomenal qualitative character of a look. It is something one cannot understand without having experienced that kind of look. S cannot understand the phenomenal concept of *looking red* without having experienced things looking red.[9] Whereas a comparative looks-concept is a concept of the way in which a perceivable object of a certain sort typically or normally looks, or looks under certain circumstances. The latter involves the concept of the sort of object in question, and it does not involve a specification of the phenomenal distinctiveness of the look in question. Thus, given that the relation of appearance featured in TA involves a nonconceptual mode of cognition, it would seem that no way of looking that is specified by a comparative concept, including *looks like a mango*, could be an appearance in that sense.

To see that this does not follow we only need to recognize the distinction between looks and look-concepts. The distinction between phenomenal and comparative is a distinction between look-concepts, not between looks. One and the same look can, in principle, be conceptualized in both ways. With simple sensory qualities this is a live possibility. In saying 'X looks red' I can mean either (a) *X presents an appearance with the distinctive phenomenal quality of redness* (phenomenal concept) or (b) *X looks the way red objects typically look* (or something more complicated of this sort). Where more complex looks are concerned, such as *look like a sugar maple tree*, we virtually always use comparative concepts, for the very good reason that we are unable to analyze the look into its sensory quality components and their interrelations. Nevertheless, there is in principle a phenomenal concept of that look that would, if we could get our hands on it, make the phenomenal distinctiveness of the look explicit. Of course with respect to kind terms, the 'typical look' is an enormous disjunction of looks rather than a single uniform look. Not all houses or all sugar maple trees or all mangoes look exactly alike, not by a long shot. But with respect to any look in the disjunction, a phenomenal concept that captures it is possible in principle, though typically not in practice. This must be possible, for there must be some set of organizations of sensory qualities such that by being visually aware of an example of that, we are capable of recognizing the object as a sugar maple tree or as a mango. When I recognize something as a sugar maple just by the way it looks there is some configuration of vari-colored shapes that enables me to do so.

Hence, we can allow an enormous range of substitutions for 'P' in our formula. 'P' ranges over not only simple sensory qualities, but over any character-

istic look that is such as to be perceptually recognizable as such, even if we are able to pick out that look only by a comparative concept.

iv

Now I want to come back to the opposition between TA and its traditional rivals, sense-datum theory and adverbial theory, and say why I take TA to win these battles. Since sense datum theory has been almost universally abandoned, for good and sufficient reason, I need not spend time bad mouthing it. But the adverbial theory is the current favorite, and I need to make explicit why I consider it inferior to TA. Here I need to recur to my distinction between the three fundamental philosophical questions about perception. So far the discussion has been restricted to the first., the nature of perceptual consciousness. It was on that issue that I was most concerned to contrast TA with conceptualism.[10] With adverbialism, however, I feel that to show the superiority of TA I must bring in the other questions as well. But before doing that I will say a few words about how the rivals stack up on the first question.

My basic point is very simple, and one that I have learned from experience shows little promise of carrying conviction to my opponents. It consists in reminding one of what seems to be the obvious fact that in perceptual experience one is directly aware of various objects in the immediate physical environment, and pointing out how strong the reasons would have to be to justify us in denying this. What can be more obvious than that when I open my eyes and look out the window a multiplicity of objects, variously disposed in space, is presented to my awareness? And what I am claiming to be obvious is not just that when I am actually seeing a tree something is appearing to me in a certain way. The adverbial theorist will presumably agree with that, though in a moment I will deny that he is entitled to claim that we are ever *perceptually* aware of external objects in anything like the way we ordinarily suppose ourselves to be. I am also claiming it to be obvious, on the face of it, that whenever I enjoy visual experience I am directly aware of *something(s)* as bearing visual qualities, *whether or not I am in effective cognitive contact with objects in my environment.* Sensory consciousness, whether involved in veridical perception or in hallucination, seems for all the world to be a direct presentation of objects to awareness, appearing in one or another way. And the adverbial theory is specifically constructed to represent sensory consciousness not as a consciousness *of* something, but rather as a *way* of being conscious.[11] I must confess that this seems to me to be false to the facts. To be sure, if I were forced by coercive arguments to abandon that conviction I would try to summon up the resolve to do so. But very strong reasons are required.[12]

And adverbialists, and sense datum theorists as well, suppose that there are such strong reasons, chief among which is the phenomenon of complete hallucination, "seeing" things that aren't there.[13] According to a widely accepted line of argument, hallucinatory experience can be indistinguishable from the real thing.

Even if it can't, we will presumably want to count it as being distinctively perceptual experience. And, it is argued, this shows that we can't regard it as intrinsic to perceptual experience that there is a direct awareness of objects. Consider the familiar dagger of Macbeth.

> Is this a dagger which I see before me,
> The handle toward my hand? Come, let me clutch thee:
> I have thee not, and yet I see thee still. (Macbeth, Act II, scene 1)

Of what object was Macbeth directly aware when he took himself to be seeing a dagger? It seems that we must reply, "None". Nothing was being presented to his consciousness. And hence we can't suppose that being directly aware of objects is an intrinsic character of perceptual experience. If we are perceptually aware of objects in veridical perception, it must be because of some further conditions that go beyond merely having the experience.

Thus it seems that if we are to save TA, we will have to find something that was appearing to Macbeth as a dagger, the handle toward his hand. I will turn to the search for a suitable candidate in a moment. But first let's note that this is not the only option for TA, even if it is the only option for retaining it in the original form. Another possibility is to restrict TA to cases of veridical perception, where 'veridical' means, not the object's actually being as it appears to be, but rather there being an external object that one is genuinely perceiving. If we take this line, we will say that in hallucinations, and in other cases of apparently being directly aware of objects in sense experience where there are no such objects—dreams, for example, if they qualify—there is nothing appearing to the subject, even though it seems to the subject that there is. If we restrict the terms 'perception', 'perceptual experience', etc. to veridical perception, we will have to brand hallucinations and dreams as "pseudo-perceptual".

The usual objection to this move is that it is possible for hallucinations (and, perhaps, dreams) to be introspectibly indistinguishable from veridical perception. And this is taken to show that the same account has to be given of all such experiences. Since there is no difficulty in applying an adverbial or sense datum account over the whole range (no more difficulty, that is, than in applying them to veridical sense experience), this is taken to be a conclusive support for one or the other of these alternatives. But this is a non sequitur. There is no sufficient reason to suppose that introspective indistinguishability entails sameness of ontological structure. Why should we suppose that introspection provides a complete insight into ontological constitution? Why suppose that there are no differences in the latter that are not disclosed to the former? Why shouldn't an experience be phenomenally just as if something were appearing to one even though nothing is? Once we ask these questions, we see that the above argument rests on groundless prejudices. If the demands of theory require it, we are free to take introspectively indistinguishable states of affairs as significantly different in ontology.

But even if this is a live option, it is not the most attractive one. It would obviously be more satisfying, intellectually, to devise an account that, while otherwise adequate, applies to the whole range of experiences that seem to the subject to be of a perceptual sort. And so I will consider what the possibilities are of construing hallucinations in terms of TA.

This is a good time to make explicit something that has been implicit in this discussion, viz., *appears to S as P* does not bear the usual marks of an "intentional" relation. For one thing, if X appears P to S, and X=Y, it follows that Y appears P to S. The relation is refreshingly transparent. And more to the present point, *X appears P to S* entails *X exists*. No "intentional inexistence" here. This is a relation that requires two actually existing terms. Nothing can look a certain way to me unless it is "there" to look that way. I can't be directly aware of something that doesn't exist. It is this feature of the relation that gives rise to the present difficulty over hallucinations. If Macbeth's hallucination of a dagger is to be handled by TA, we must find something actually existing that looked dagger-like to Macbeth. And what might that be?

There are various candidates. One is the air occupying the region where the dagger appears to be. Another is the portion of space apparently occupied by the dagger. A less plausible candidate would be the part of the brain playing a causal role in the production of that experience. Of these alternatives I prefer the first. Whenever we have what might be called, by an Irish bull, an ordinary run of the mill visual hallucination, in which the hallucinatory object(s) is (are) embedded in a veridically perceived setting, the visually hallucinated object(s) will appear to be located somewhere in front of the perceiver, Since there will always be *something* physical in that region, that something can be taken as what looks to the perceiver to be radically other than what it is. But this account will not handle more total hallucinations or dreams, if dreams are to be put under the rubric of "perceptual experience". However, there is another answer that will presumably handle anything we would want to count as a non-veridical sensory experience, viz., that what appears to the subject is a particularly vivid mental image.[14]

It is currently popular to eschew commitment to mental images, and that for a variety of reasons. A recognition of mental images is incompatible with materialism and/or with ontological economy. An attempt to characterize them gives rise to many of the same puzzles as those familiarly associated with sense-data. We can account for everything without them. It is incoherent to suppose that something can be both a genuine object of awareness and also existentially dependent on awareness. And so on. I don't have space here to go into these issues properly, but I will make two brief points about this list of objections. With respect to the last, even if a mental image is existentially mind-dependent, there is no reason to regard it as generated by the awareness of which it is the object. And as for materialism, I have no tendency to accept it anyway. But the main point I want to make in this paper about the "commitment" to mental images made by this form of TA is that it need not take them to be ontologically ultimate in order

to regard them as objects of direct awareness in some cases of sensory consciousness. After all, we need not take tables and chairs to be ontologically fundamental in order to suppose that sometimes it is a table or chair that is appearing to me in a certain way. My former colleague, Peter van Inwagen, notoriously denies that tables and chairs exist; yet, speaking with the vulgar, he is prepared to acknowledge that sometimes the desk in my office looks a certain way to me.[15] And so with mental images. It might be that the ontology at which we shall arrive when we reach that far-off divine event to which inquiry moves will replace our talk about mental images with talk about brain states and processes. Speaking in the material mode, imagistic mental representation may really be a matter of certain kinds of brain functioning. TA need not deny that possibility. The philosophical theory of perception proceeds at a certain level, in terms of a certain familiar conceptual scheme. The very questions that we seek to answer in such a theory arise in the context of using that scheme, a scheme that involves percipient organisms interacting with an environment of familiar middle-sized physical objects, what Wilfrid Sellars called the "manifest image". Philosophical problems of perception, as they have generally been conceived, have to do with how best to construe perception within that framework, a framework that includes tables and chairs, as well as mental images, however derivative ontologically these might turn out to be.

But if mental images are not ontologically ultimate, why countenance them at all? For the same sort of reason as that for which we countenance many other non-ultimates, like our tables and chairs, viz., that there is considerable empirical support for propositions and systems thereof concerning the entities in question, and because thinking in terms of them enables us to handle a variety of considerations better than any otherwise feasible alternative. In addition to putative introspective acquaintance with mental images, a variety of recent psychological experiments have provided evidence that mental images can be inspected, rotated, and scrutinized for information in much the same way as perceived external objects, and that perceivers sometimes perceptually identify external objects as mental images and vice versa. All that encourages the supposition that vivid mental images can *appear* to subjects in basically the same way as external perceived objects.

v

The strength of the theory of appearing cannot be fully appreciated until we bring in the other two main philosophical problems of perception and look at its solution to them. The second of the questions I enumerated at the beginning of this paper is: what is it to perceive a physical object? What are the necessary and sufficient conditions for seeing a chair? What does it take to see a certain physical object, over and above being in a certain state of sensory consciousness?

When we think of the problem in this last form, a striking difference between TA and its two rivals comes to light. For those cases in which it is an external

physical object that is appearing in a certain way to the subject, TA already specifies a perceptual relation to a physical object in its account of sensory consciousness itself. So in those cases TA's answer to the question: "What has to be added to sensory consciousness to get a perception of an external object?", is "Nothing". And where something other than an external object is the only thing appearing to the subject, no addition would do the trick. Thus the account of object perception given by the theory of appearing is of breathtaking simplicity. To see a tree is simply for that tree to look a certain way to one.[16] I shall have more to say about this answer in a bit. But first let's consider what resources the other theories of sensory consciousness have for answering the question.

It is clear that both the adverbial and the sense datum theories of perceptual consciousness require additional conditions for external object perception. I can be conscious in a certain way, and I can be aware of certain sense-data, without perceiving any external physical object. That consciousness, or myself as a bearer of that consciousness, must be in an appropriate sort of relation to the tree if it is to be the case that I see the tree, by virtue of enjoying that sensory consciousness. (Call theories that lay down such a condition *externalist theories*.) What sort of relation will do the trick? Two have been stressed in the history of the subject: causal and doxastic, mostly the former. Some theorists have tried to work out some form of the view that to perceive a tree in having experience, E, is for the tree to play a certain causal role in the production of E. Others have started from the idea that what one perceives in having E is what E leads one to form beliefs about. And still others have combined these and, sometimes, other suggestions in a more complex account. Since philosophy is long and lectures are, relatively, short, and since I have already argued in print that no externalist theory can provide necessary and sufficient conditions for object perception,[17] I will leave all that to one side here and concentrate on what seems to me to be a more fundamental objection to such views.

Suppose, contrary to what I argued in the essay just alluded to, that some externalist theory specifies relational conditions that coincide with object perception exactly across all possible worlds. It still would not be an acceptable account of object perception. Suppose, for example, that we could specify a certain causal role in the production of sense experience such that (necessarily) one sees x, in having a certain visual experience, if and only if x plays that role in producing that experience. Would having an experience (construed in a sense-datum or adverbial way) causally related in that way to x *constitute* seeing x? NO. No matter how x *causally* contributes to the production of an experience, I do not *see*, or otherwise perceive, x in having that experience unless x *presents itself to my experience* as an object. How could the fact that x plays a role in *bringing about* that experience make it true that I *see* x? The experience itself is, by hypothesis, either an awareness of some sense-datum distinct from x, or it is simply a way of being conscious. x is not *presented* or *given* to my awareness in the experience. That being the case, no causal relation of x to the experience could make it true that I *see* x or, indeed, that I am *aware* of x in any way at all. Causality

is no substitute for awareness; there is no magic by which an item becomes an object of awareness just by virtue of standing in a causal relation to experience. One way of seeing this is to ask why, given that the experience itself is either an awareness of a sense-datum or just a way of being conscious, we should suppose that one of the causal contributors to the experience thereby acquires the status of a perceived object, while the others do not. What possible explanation could there be for this astounding fact? There are innumerable causal influences on a given sensory experience that no one supposes to be perceptual objects. Why make an exception for one such influence? Another way of seeing the point is to consider experiences that are quite properly construed in an adverbial way, like feeling depressed, relieved, or exhilarated, experiences that virtually no one supposes to involve the awareness of some object. Yet these experiences too have their causes, and the experiences carry information about those causes. Why not pick out one of those as what one is aware of in having the experience? And if we do not, what rationale is there for treating these experiences differently from sensory experience? Why is it that causal relationships endow some experiences and not others with the status of being a perception of something? How can this double standard be justified? I am at a loss to see what plausible answer external theorists can give to this question.

These points about causal accounts apply equally to other externalist accounts. Consider, for another example, the view that what it is for one to perceive x is that one's sensory experience gives rise to a belief about x. The fact that a belief about a certain tree arises from an experience of something else, or of nothing, cannot constitute *seeing* that tree. Seeing a tree is something different from forming or having a belief about it (or forming a tendency to a belief about it...), even if seeing a tree typically gives rise to beliefs about it. Seeing x is an *intuitive* awareness of x, and thereby differs from any belief about x, or anything else that essentially involves propositional structure. Whatever sort of extensional equivalence there might be between seeing x and something having to do with beliefs about x, the latter could not be what seeing X *is*.

The fact is that externalist theories, by keeping physical objects out of their account of sensory experience, have thrown away any chance of explaining physical object perception . The most fundamental component in our concept of perception is that it is an *intuitive*, rather than a discursive, cognition of objects; it is a matter of having objects *presented* to one's consciousness, rather than a matter of thinking about them, or bringing them under general concepts, or making judgments about them. Much less is it just a matter of a causal relation between the object and one's experience of something else or of nothing. That's not what perception is. At most, we might agree to *say* that we perceive a tree under those conditions. But all the saying in the world won't make it so. If the tree is not present to my visual awareness I don't perceive it, whatever people say. It is the *presentational* feature of perception that gets lost in externalist accounts of object perception.[18]

Why is this point not more generally appreciated? I suspect that the reason is this. The construction of an account of object perception on the basis of sense-

datum or adverbial theories takes place after the theorist is already convinced that this is the account that must be given of sensory consciousness. He then looks around for the closest approximation one can make to the perception of external objects, given that constraint. In doing so he makes use of our commonsense judgments as to when a subject perceives a certain external object, judgments that are made on the basis of a quite different way of looking at the matter. He then does the best he can to find relations of external objects to sense experience that will hold when and only when the subject really is perceiving the object in question. He fails to note that even if he did succeed in securing extensional equivalence he would only have succeeded in mapping real perception onto his scheme. He would not have succeeded in bringing out what *constitutes* perceiving an object. He fails to note this because he does not realize that he has been relying all along on an alien conception of perception (an intuitive awareness of objects) to determine the cases to which his account is to be responsible.

The partisans of one of these theories may reply that even though she isn't giving us everything the ordinary concept of seeing an object leads us to expect, still this is the closest we can come. But *is* this the closest we can come? My claim is that TA makes possible a much closer approximation; indeed, that it makes possible an exact correspondence with our pre-theoretical expectations. Until that claim is disposed of, the offer of a second-best account will not be very tempting.

vi

Here are few possible (and indeed actual) objections to TA's answers to our first two questions.

1. TA represents perceptual experience as, so to say, floating in a vacuum, unconnected with things it obviously is connected with. We know that such experience is engendered by specific kinds of processes in specific regions of the brain. And in veridical perception those brain processes result from a chain of causes stretching back to the perceived object. But for the sake of complete coverage, including hallucinations, ignore the latter and concentrate on the proximate causes in the brain. Is it supposed to be a miracle that these neural transactions in the brain bring it about that the subject is in the irreducible appearing relation with something that is posited by TA? How can patterns of neural excitations in the brain possibly bring about any such result? Isn't it completely mysterious that and how this should be so?

In response, TA need not regard this as a miracle. It can hold that there are discoverable nomological relations relating an appearing relation of a certain sort to patterns of neural excitation. And by virtue of those nomological relations the appearings can, to vary the terminology, be thought of as supervenient on the brain processes. TA has no objection to accepting the causal dependence of appearing on the physical; the objection is only to the supposition that spelling out such causes tells us what X's appearing to S as P *is*. Thus TA cannot accept a kind of supervenience that involves a logical, much less conceptual, necessity that the

appearing obtains only when the appropriate kind of brain process does. To do so would be to abandon its fundamental claim that the appearing relation is an irreducible one. The necessity involved in the supervenience will, at most, be a nomological necessity. But that kind of supervenience can be unreservedly embraced by TA.

2. But the mere fact that TA takes the appearing relation to be fundamental and irreducible means that it is incompatible with materialism and so will be opposed by materialists for that reason. Moreover, the non-materiality of appearing is not just a conceptual matter. It is not just that in *thinking* of X's appearing to S as P we are not thinking of it in materialist terms. If we were to try to suppose that the appearing relation is something material that we are conceptualizing in other terms, we would fail. I am at a loss to think of what material relation the appearing relation might be, once we reject any reduction of it to the causal chain that eventuates in the perceptual experience. And so TA is opposed to materialism in any form. Since materialism holds no attraction for me, I can cheerfully accept that. Even if we could make the notion of a material state or process determinate enough to know what counts as such and what does not—and I don't see that we can—I would not be tempted to suppose that all states and processes are material. But it must be admitted that an ideally complete defense of TA would involve a critique of materialism, something that must be saved for another occasion.

3. But even those innocent of materialist tendencies might find it mysterious how neurophysical processes in the brain could engender an appearing relation as construed by TA. In a way this is just a particular example of the mystery attaching to body-mind causal relations, but it has some special features. The more familiar cases of brain processes giving rise to conscious mental states may be easier to swallow, even with a heavy dose of mystery, just because the mental states (feelings, sensations, and thoughts) are purely intra-mental—just as much "in the head" as the neurophysiological causes. By contrast, it seems more difficult to see how a relation between the mind and an external physical object could be supervenient on patterns of neural excitation in the brain. Nevertheless, in both cases the stumbling block is in the how, and that is equally opaque for both. So long as we recognize mental entities of whatever sort that have non-physical intrinsic characteristics and recognize them as stemming from physical causes, we have to humble our pride by acknowledging more things in heaven and earth than we can fully understand.

4. There are also more general objections to any thesis that in normal perception one is directly aware of external physical objects. Given the fact that there is a tortuous causal chain between the perceived object and the experience involved in perceiving it, how can we suppose that that experience is a *direct* awareness of the object? Isn't it clear that, at best, one's experience of the object is very indirect? But, so far as I can see, this line of thought stems from an indefensible conflation of causal mediation and cognitive mediation. From the fact that I am not proximately caused by the tree to have the experience in which the trees presents itself to my awareness (or, to avoid begging the question, in which

I perceive the tree), it does not follow that my *experience* of the tree is not direct but via being aware of something else. At least no one, to my knowledge, has given a convincing argument that causal mediation carries with it cognitive mediation.

I take the upshot of the discussion in this section to be the following.

1. We are unable to integrate TA's account of the nature of perceptual consciousness with the rest of what we believe in as satisfactory a fashion as one might wish.
2. But there are strong reasons for supposing TA to be a correct account of perceptual consciousness.
3. As in many other cases, when faced with this kind of tension the better part of wisdom would seem to be to hold fast to what we have strong reasons for accepting, even if it engenders some problems elsewhere, and hope that further reflection will reveal how to enable us to hold onto to the advantages while reducing the disadvantages.

vii

Finally, I will look briefly at the last of our three questions, the conditions of justification for perceptual beliefs about the physical environment. Upon undergoing a certain visual experience, I believe there to be a beech tree in front of me. We ordinarily suppose that I am justified in believing this by virtue of the fact that the belief is based on that experience. (If we are prudent, we will only suppose that the belief is thereby *prima facie* justified, i.e., justified in the absence of sufficient overriding considerations. This "prima facie" qualification is to be understood in the ensuing discussion.) Why should we suppose this? How, if at all, is the experience a source of justification?

A comprehensive discussion of this issue would distinguish between two ways in which this is thought of: (1) the experience contributes to the justification of the belief by way of knowledge of (justified belief about) the experience providing reasons for the belief; (2) the experience provides justification directly without going through beliefs about itself. In the quick and dirty treatment the limits of this essay impose I will confine myself to the latter, direct alternative.

Another complexity will be set aside with the same excuse, viz., the way in which a perceptual belief is sometimes justified partly by the sensory experience on which it is based and partly by "background" beliefs. For example, there may be many persons who are visually indistinguishable from you at the distance and angle from which I currently see you. But if I know that you are at the conference I am attending, that knowledge, when added to the way you look, can push my degree of justification in believing that this is you up above some minimal level. In the ensuing I will ignore this complexity and confine myself to (actual or possible) cases in which all the justification is contributed by the perceptual ex-

perience, so as to focus on my central concern here—how different accounts of perception treat this source of justification.

Our question, then, is this: just how is it, if at all, that having a sensory experience of a certain sort renders me justified in a certain perceptual belief about a perceived object?[19] The sense datum and adverbial theories are not in a good position to answer this question. Why should the fact that I am conscious in a certain *way*, or the fact that I am aware of a sense-datum of a certain sort, warrant me in supposing that the tree in front of me has leaves on it? Partisans of these views have labored mightily to exhibit some plausibility in such a supposition. These attempts have ranged over various forms of phenomenalism and, on the realist side, attempts to show that sensory awareness of a certain sort is a reliable sign of certain external physical facts. Confining ourselves to the realist versions, note that these attempts are unable to make use of anything we have learned about the physical world from perception. For by doing so they would be assuming that, somehow, sensory experience is a source of justification for perceptual beliefs, just what they are trying to establish. And, bereft of empirical support, they have been signally unsuccessful in their endeavor. This has led the likes of Moore, Price, and Chisholm to adopt the desperate expedient of simply laying it down that perceptual beliefs, when formed in the normal manner on the basis of sense-experience, are prima facie credible (justified). They possess a certain credibility just by virtue of being beliefs about the present immediate environment that are formed on the basis of experience. But if one asks these philosophers why we should suppose that such beliefs enjoy this intrinsic credibility, they have nothing to appeal to other than the fact that we generally suppose this to be the case, the fact that accepting this principle yields particular applications that are in line with our predilections, and the fact that the supposition enables us to avoid scepticism about perceptual knowledge.

In contrast to this less than satisfactory situation, the theory of appearing has a natural and plausible account of the justification of perceptual beliefs. My visual experience justifies me in supposing that the large object I see in front of me is a beech tree just because what appears to me, as being in front of me, looks like a beech tree. We have no need either to construct elaborate inferences from purely subjective experiences to an external reality, or to lay down obiter dicta concerning intrinsic prima facie justification. We can simply appeal to the natural and plausible principle that whatever appears to one as so-and-so is thereby likely, in the absence of sufficient indications to the contrary, to be so-and-so. We are able to justifiably form beliefs about the external environment on the basis of our perceptual experience because objects in the external environment appear to us in that experience in such a way as to be constitutive of the character of the experience. And the beliefs so formed are prima facie justified just because they *register* what is presented there, they "read it off of" experience, possibly corrected in the light of whatever independent knowledge we bring to bear. This not only supports the claim that beliefs about the external world can be justified by sense experience but also throws light on how this is brought off.

But things are not quite this straightforward. Suppose, as I have been granting, that hallucinatory experience can be phenomenologically indistinguishable from veridical sense perception. In that case what are we to say of an hallucinatory experience of a computer that, so far as the subject can tell just by having the experience, is a case of a computer's visually appearing to have the sentence 'Perception is a mode of experience' (call this sentence 'P') displayed on the screen? Does this experience provide prima facie justification for the belief that there is a computer in front of him with P displayed on the screen? And if so, then, on TA, it is not only X's (actually) appearing P to S that justifies a belief that X is P.

There are two positions TA can take on this issue, each position tailored to a different form of perceptual belief. In the formulation just given an existentially quantified belief was involved: (B1) *there is a (real) computer in front of me displaying P*. In the unlikely event that the experience is hallucinatory, we can say that B1 is prima facie justified by the experience, but is, of course, subject to being overriden by the fact that the experience is hallucinatory. But we might also think of the basic kind of perceptual belief as being *de re*, with the "re" in question picked out as what looks a certain way to S, in this case, looks like a computer displaying P on the screen. The *de re* perceptual belief could be formulated as (B2): *that is a computer with P displayed on the screen*. Again, the belief is *prima facie* justified by the experience, since it attributes to the perceived object what it appears to be. And again if the experience is hallucinatory, that prima facie justification will be overriden when the true nature of the experience comes to light.

Whichever type of perceptual belief we take as basic, there are ways of getting to the other. If we start with (B2), it requires only an existential generalization, plus the addition of 'in front of me' to get to (B1). The reverse route is a bit trickier. If we follow Chisholm's suggestions in his 1982, we look for some unique way in which the (putative) computer looks (perhaps looking like a computer directly in front of me now) and introduce a singular referring expression on the basis of that. Thus concealed in these two procedures are two familiarly different approaches to singular reference. Starting with (B1) we get singular reference via uniquely exemplified descriptions, while starting with (B2) we begin with "direct" reference to perceptually discriminated objects.

There are two reasons for preferring the account that takes (B2) as basic. First the *de re* perceptual belief seems to be developmentally the more fundamental of the two. Presumably very young children form beliefs about *that* (where the "that" is picked out perceptually) before they have learned to work with uniquely exemplified ways of appearing. Second, and more germane to the present epistemological issue, this approach sticks more closely to the distinctive character of TA. On the TA account of perceptual experience, it puts us in a position to make direct reference to what it is we perceive, what it is that is appearing to us as so-and-so. The natural way, then, to exploit TA's account of perceptual experience for epistemological purposes is to take that experience as providing *prima facie* justification for a belief about whatever is thus appearing to the subject. If

that is an external physical object, the belief is about that; if it is a visual image the belief is about that, even though the subject may suppose the object in question to be an object in the physical environment. In either case, the further epistemological fate of the belief depends on what, if anything, overrides that prima facie justification.

To be sure, if we took the other approach with (B1) as primary, we could still apply the TA account to the justification problem, though it would be more complicated. Here we build the ontological status of what appears into the belief about it. (Remember that (B1) is *there is a (real) computer in front of me displaying P.*) This represents a heavier commitment by the believer, and a correspondingly heavier demand on the justifier. Nevertheless, we can still hold that the fact that this is what the subject seems to be seeing prima facie justifies the belief, on the plausible principle that if one seems to be seeing an X that is P, then it is prima facie justified that this is what one is seeing. However, and this is the main reason for the epistemological preference for the other approach, this makes the position less different from the "prima facie credibility" approach of sense-datum and adverbial theorists like Price, Moore, and Chisholm. But it still has the distinctive character that the "seeming to see an X that is P" that is involved here is based on the notion of something's appearing to S as so-and-so, and only adds a further supposition to that.

It may be objected that even if my *X's looking P provides prima facie justification for supposing that X is P* principle holds for simple sensory P's like *red* and *round*, it will not hold for more complex P's, such as natural kinds like *apple tree* or *collie*. For in these latter cases the belief that, e.g., X is an apple tree involves too sophisticated a conceptual content to be even *prima facie* justified by a look. But this distinction doesn't survive scrutiny. Just as the complete mastery of a concept like *round* includes the ability to recognize round things by their look, so it is with a concept like *apple tree*. One can have some concept of an apple tree without being able to visually recognize apple trees. But for a complete mastery of any concept of a visually perceivable object, property, or kind, one must have the perceptual recognition skill. No doubt, the acquisition of the more complex concepts involves acquiring a lot of knowledge, perceptual and otherwise. Learning how to visually recognize apple trees would not be the earliest such achievement. But, given the possession of the concept, which is required in any event for as much as forming the belief that X is an apple tree, no further propositional knowledge need be involved in becoming justified in supposing that a perceived object is an apple tree.

At bottom, the reason for the epistemological superiority of the Theory of Appearing is that for it, but not its rivals, the external object about which, in normal perception, the perceptual belief is formed is *within* the sensory experience itself , appearing to be so-and-so. Or, to put it more soberly, on the Theory of Appearing, what the experience *is*, in veridical perception, is a certain external object's appearing as so-and-so to the subject. Since the link with that object is already embodied in the constitution of the experience itself, one can readily

understand that, and how, the experience provides justification for beliefs about that object. Whereas on the other views, the object, and the physical environment generally, is "outside" the experience itself. The intrinsic character of the experience can be adequately characterized without mentioning any environmental object. Hence it is a further job to forge links between the experience and the object so as to provide support for the justification claim; and attempts to do this have not been convincing.

I conclude that the theory of appearing is superior to its rivals with respect to each of the main problems of the philosophy of perception, and that the confluence of these three superiorities makes a powerful cumulative case for that theory as the best overall account of perception.

Notes

1. The theory is espoused in Hicks 1938, in Prichard 1909, and in Barnes 1944, among other places. A clear statement, without a whole hearted endorsement, is found in Moore 1922, 244–247.
2. The criticisms in Price 1932, Ch. III, Chisholm 1950, and Jackson 1977 have been thought, mistakenly I believe, to be decisive.
3. There have been some recent stirrings of a revival. See, e.g., Langsam 1997. The view of "non-epistemic seeing" in Dretske 1969 is a close relative.
4. In this paper I am ruling out of court without a hearing the view of Armstrong and Pitcher that a distinctive mode of consciousness is not a basic, irreducible component of perception but can be understood as a process of belief acquisition. See Armstrong 1961 and Pitcher 1971.
5. For some recent pro-conceptualist writings, see Peacocke 1983, Pendlebury 1987, Runzo 1977 and 1982, and Searle 1983.
6. For a detailed discussion of the pros and cons of conceptualism see Alston 1998.
7. See Runzo 1977, 214–215; Searle 1983, 40–42.
8. See Dretske, 1981, Ch. 6; Peacocke 1992.
9. That is not to say that nothing other than the experience is required to grasp the concept. Experiences of the character in question constitute a necessary condition for concept possession, not a sufficient condition.
10. Conceptualists have various distinctive things to say about the other questions as well, but that will have to be reserved for another occasion.
11. We shouldn't suppose that the theories are in agreement on the nature of sensory experience in veridical perception and only differ on hallucinations and the like. On the contrary, the adverbial theory, as we shall see in the next section, holds that sensory consciousness is merely a *way* of being conscious wherever it occurs, and that veridical perception differs from hallucination, not by the kind of consciousness involved but by its being related in certain ways to external objects.
12. In Butchvarov 1980 the author presents strong reasons for regarding adverbial theories as unintelligible, but I have no time to go into that.
13. It has to be complete hallucination in the sense of apparently seeing things that are not physically there at all. What are generally called perceptual "illusions" in the literature present no problem to TA, since it allows that an object may perceptually appear as other than it actually is. So long as there is an actual object that looks some way or

other, TA can handle it. It is not threatened by straight sticks partially submerged that look bent, square towers in the distance that look round, and so on. But the hallucination need not be complete in the sense of the visual or other sensory field involving no real objects at all, in order to pose the present problem. Macbeth could have been genuinely perceiving various things in the room where he hallucinated the dagger. And there would still be a problem as to how to give a TA characterization of the perceptual experience involved in seeming to see the dagger.

14. I owe this suggestion to Hirst 1959, Ch. II.
15. See van Inwagen 1990, especially sections 9 and 10.
16. This verbal formula could be accepted by all theories of object perception. But the Theory of Appearing is distinctive by virtue of understanding 'appear' here as a basic, irreducible relation. As noted above, the alternative theories take the fact of x's visually appearing to one to be analyzable in one way or another, and hence to be, in principle, reducible to that analysis.
17. See Alston 1990. The main target in that essay is Goldman 1977, which, in my view, contains by far the most sophisticated of these externalist views.
18. The last three paragraphs constitute a generalization of the traditional complaint against sense-datum theories that on those views we do not really perceive external physical objects.
19. There has been quite a bit of to-do recently over whether sensory experience can play any justificatory role at all vis-a-vis perceptual beliefs (or any other sorts of belief). A lot of this has stemmed from Davidson's contention, in Davidson 1986, that experience cannot play a justificatory role because it plays only a causal role. With all the time in the world I would go into this, but since I don't have that I won't.

References

Alston, William P. 1990, "Externalist Theories of Perception", *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, L (Supplement), 73–97.

_____ 1998, "Perception and Conception", in *Pragmatism, Reason, & Norms*, ed. Kenneth R. Westphal (New York: Fordham University Press), 59–87.

Armstrong, David M. 1961, *Perception and the Physical World* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Barnes, W. F. H. 1944, "The Myth of Sense-Data", *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, XLV (1944–45).

Butchvarov, Panayot 1980, "Adverbial Theories of Consciousness", *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, V, 261–280.

Chisholm, R. M. 1950, "The Theory of Appearing", in Max black, ed. *Philosophical Analysis* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press), 102–118.

_____ 1982, "A Version of Foundationalism" in *The Foundations of Knowing* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).

Davidson, Donald, "A Coherence Theory of Truth and Knowledge", in Ernest Lepore, ed., *Truth and Interpretation: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Donald Davidson* (New York: Blackwell).

Dretske, Fred 1969, *Seeing and Knowing* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

_____ 1981, *Knowledge and the Flow of Information* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Goldman, Alvin 1977, "Perceptual Objects", *Synthese*, 35, 257–284.

Hicks, G. Dawes 1938, *Critical Realism* (London: Macmillan).

Hirst, R. J. 1959, *The Problems of Perception* (London: George Allen & Unwin).

Jackson, Frank 1977, *Perception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Langsam, Harold 1997, "The Theory of Appearing Defended", *Philosophical Studies*, 87: 33–59.

Moore, G. E. 1922, "Some Judgments of Perception", in *Philosophical Studies* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

Peacocke, Christopher 1983, *Sense and Content* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

_____ 1992, "Scenarios, Concepts, and Perception", in Tim Crane, ed., *The Contents of Experience* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Pendlebury, Michael 1987, "Perceptual Representation", *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 87, 91–106.

Pitcher, George 1971, *A Theory of Perception* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Price, H. H. 1932, *Perception* (London: Methuen)

Prichard, H. A. 1909, *Kant's Theory of Knowledge* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Runzo, Joseph 1977, "The Propositional Structure of Perception", *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 14, no. 3, 211–220.

_____ 1982, "The Radical Conceptualization of Perceptual Experience", *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 19, no. 3, 205–217.

Searle, John 1983, *Intentionality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Van Inwagen, Peter 1990. *Material Beings* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).