

THE SILENCE OF THE SENSES

(Revised Version)

Perhaps the most common view of perception today is that it is representational: that in perceptual experience—in our seeing, hearing, feeling, smelling, what we do—the world is represented to us as being thus and so. If we help ourselves to a far from innocent count noun, we may shorten the view's expression: a (given) perceptual experience has (given) representational content. In no case I am aware of is this view argued for. Rather it is assumed from the outset. Some, perhaps, assume it *faute de mieux*, seeing representation as better material than 'qualia' for answering a very special question as to what an experience was like: a question whose answer would identify, precisely, and once and for all, what that experience was like (e.g., visually) *for the subject*, as thus experienced. That special question, as conceived, would demand an answer mentioning nothing there is *for one* to meet in his surroundings. What follows should suggest why *nothing* answers such a very special question. Some may be moved by the thought that perceptual experience, being mental, is intentional, and that intentionality just is that sort of *aiming* at the world which representation is. If intentionality is so construed, the present brief shows it to be but one form of the mental: perception, and experience, exemplify another. In any event, perception is not representational. What follows will show why.

1. The Position: The view at issue is advanced by such philosophers as Martin Davies, Christopher Peacocke, sometimes, of late, John McDowell; also by Gilbert Harman, John Searle, Michael Tye, and Colin McGinn, among many others. (See, e.g., Harman (1990), Searle (1983), for example, pp. 47-48, Tye (1995), especially chapter 4, McGinn, (1991), pp. 29-30, and McGinn (1982).)

Martin Davies expresses it as follows:

A subject's experiences represent the world to her as being a certain way. These experiences may be correct or incorrect. ... In short, experiences have representational or semantic properties; they have content. (Davies 1992, p. 22.)

Christopher Peacocke expresses it *en passant* as follows:

A perceptual experience represents the world as being a certain way. What is the nature of the content it represents as holding? (Peacocke 1992, p. 61)

He later insists that it is crucial to distinguish ‘perceptual experiences’

from states that do not represent the world as being a certain way to the subject. (Peacocke 1992, p. 66)

The following four elements in the position will be in play here. All, I think, are non-controversially part of it. One aspect of the last, though, will emerge as optional. Nor, it will also then emerge, does present criticism turn on it.

1. The representing in question is representing such-and-such as so. ‘Represent’ and ‘representation’ have many uses. To represent may be to be an effect or trace of something. A ring on a tree trunk represents a year’s growth. Its width may also represent the drought of 1923. Again, to represent may be, in various ways, to be a stand-in, or substitute, for what is represented. A bit of plastic may represent an infantry division in a game of strategy. A squiggle on a map may represent the Lot. None of these uses of ‘represent’ is relevant to the present case. The point about perceptual experience is to be that there is a way things are according to it, that it represents things as being thus and so—where, for all that, things need not be that way. So representationalists tell us. If certain neural states, say, represent certain distal stimuli in being their effects or traces, or those yielding our awareness of them, that would not be to the present point. It would not amount to *their* representing anything as so; as if that were something they might do without its being so. For if for them to represent involves their being traces, then where there is no such thing for them to be traces of, they simply do not represent that. (If, through some fluke, a tree gains two rings in one year, then a ring does not always represent a year’s growth. It is not that a certain ring represents something—say, that there was one more year of growth—but falsely.) Similarly for the other cases here. The representing this essay is thus *not* about is, I suggest, enough to serve the purposes of serious psychology.

2. Perceptual experience has a face value. That idea is in Davies:

An experience may present the world to the subject as containing something square in front of her, and the subject may take that experience at face value and judge that there is something square in front of her. (Davies 1992, p. 23)

McDowell also proposes it:

Minimally, it must be possible to decide whether or not to judge that things are as one's experience represents them to be. How one's experience represents things to be is not under one's control, but it is up to one whether one accepts the appearance or rejects it. (McDowell 1994, p. 11)

That things are thus and so is the content of the experience, and it can also be the content of a judgment. It becomes the content of a judgment if the subject decides to take the experience at face value. (McDowell 1994, p. 26)

The idea is that any perceptual experience has a face value, at which the perceiver may take, or refuse to take, it. To take an experience at face value is to take it that such-and-such is so (in the case of perception, that one's surroundings are thus and so). So the face value of an experience is that such-and-such is so. This just repeats point 1.

Where the face value of an experience is that things are thus and so, for all that things may, or may not, be that way. This just makes explicit a feature of representing things as so. Whatever does that *ipso facto* admits of correctness, or incorrectness, according as things are, or not, as represented—in present idiom, as one would take it in taking it at face value. *Such* correctness is what truth requires. So any such thing is truth-evaluable. If 'true' is not colloquial here, we might substitute the word '*veridical*'.

A second feature of face value is that whatever gives an experience its face value, and whatever makes that value recognisable, might be present in an experience, and might have been in *that* one, even if what, at that face value, is so in fact is not. So, for example, where the face value of an experience is that there is (visibly) a pig before one, what gives it that face value cannot be the presence of a pig. Nor can it be one's seeing that.

This makes room for a third point on which McDowell, for one, insists. The face value of an experience is, again, something the experiencer can accept or reject, believe or disbelieve. So I must be able to see my experience to have such-and-such face value—that P—without yet taking it that P. So whatever I recognise in grasping its face value must be something that could be present even if not P; recognising merely *that* need not be to recognize P. (So if the face value is that there is a pig, what I grasp in grasping that fact cannot be that there is a pig.)

Discussion: McDowell speaks as if an experience's face value is a matter of how things appear, or what, or how, they appear to be. (To accept an experience at face value is to "accept the appearance"—to take things to be as they appear.) Two preliminary points about that. First, we certainly do sometimes speak of things not being what they appear to be, or as, or what, they seem. Sid and Pia appear to be trysting; but they are only conspiring to throw a surprise party for Luc. The right explanation may make a host of small actions and signs look entirely different. But, as I will show in the next section, at least in a wide swathe of central cases, where things may be or not as they appear, their appearing as they do is an utterly different and distinct phenomenon from anything being represented as so. Second, though we

are often enough confronted with appearances, that is not yet to say that the appearances, on a given occasion, add up to such a thing as 'the way things (then) appear to be'. It is a large assumption that there is, in general, such a thing as *the* way things appear to be. (For one thing, appearances are certainly not always a matter of things appearing *to be* some way at all.)

3. Being represented to is not autorepresentation. To take things to be thus and so just *is* to represent them to oneself as that way. Such representing is *all* in the attitude. It does not consist in producing, nor in awareness of, something which represents things as that way, and which one can, or does, then take as doing that (as a note held fast by a refrigerator magnet). Merely that would fall short of taking things to *be* as represented. Nor is it any part of representing things to oneself in this sense. I will call representing which just is a stance towards things being thus and so *autorepresenting*.

Autorepresentation contrasts with another phenomenon which is also representing things as a certain way. Where this is a way things are, or are not, representing things *to be* that way is representing truly, or falsely. One *might*, simply on that ground, hold the mere representing-as to be either true or false. What marks the second case of representing that I have in mind here is this: one (something) represents in this way only in, and by, making his (its) representing recognisable to *one* suitably *au fait* with its circumstances, and with the sort of project thus undertaken. Representing in this way requires producing something identifiable as present without prejudice to whether any representing is going on. On a different reading of the verb, what makes representing recognisable (what I will call a *vehicle*) may also be said to represent. (*Someone* asserts that pigs swim, thus representing things as that way; his words, 'Pigs swim' may also be said so to represent things.) I will call such representing *allorepresenting*.

In a central case, allorepresenting represents such-and-such *to be* so. This it to represent things *as* a certain way, *with* a certain force. It is to *commit*, in some form, to things so being. To recognise such representing is to have it on *some* authority, however poor or dubious, that things *are* as represented. I will call this *committed* representing. It is such representing that can be accepted or rejected (where to accept it is to take to be so that which is so according to it).

Representing *as* may be merely representing things *being* thus and so. It thus ranges wider than representing *to be*. One might represent Pia *as* the darling of the silver screen (e.g., by drawing her in an open-top Duesenberg, silk scarf fluttering, waving as to fans), without in the least suggesting that she *is* one. One might represent Sid being sick while representing him neither to be, nor to have been, so. One *ipso facto* represents things *as* (or *being*) a certain way in representing them to be that way—in doing so with such force. As Frege stresses, one can often represent things *as* some way, and do so with no such force—e.g., when one expresses some thoughts *in* (and as part of) expressing some others, as, e.g., in expressing the antecedent, and the consequent, in expressing a conditional. Representing *as* need not be committed in the way one is *per se* in representing to be—what I here call *committed* representing.

Many declarative English sentences represent things *as* a certain way, on some reading of 'represent'. There are those who think such sentences are thereby truth-evaluable, as per the idea scouted above. This is a mistake, though I will not so argue here. (But see Travis 2008.) In any case, if they were, then, on the same reading of the verb on which they represent things *as*

a certain way, they might be said also to represent things to *be* that way: that is something they are *for* doing, as a bread knife slices bread. Which might suggest them as an exemplar of another bad idea: that of a *vehicle* of truth-evaluable representing which could not be present without representing something to be so, thus without conferring such content on whatever they were present in. Again, that this is a bad idea I will not argue here. But whatever English sentences do, in recognising one—say, ‘Pigs swim’—as representing as it does, one has it on no authority at all that things are as represented—e.g., that pigs swim. *English* does not stand warrant for the things its sentences say. It would be crazy to hold *it* to such a motley of contradictory commitments. Nor, so far, is there anything other than English to do so. Nonetheless, by the second bad idea above, English sentences, viewed as truth-evaluable, may well encourage (in some) the idea that perceptual experience might represent truly or falsely.

Only committed representation can have a face value. Only with commitment is there something to accept or reject; something purportedly so. One cannot take the English sentence ‘Pigs swim’ at face value. It has none. But it will make no difference to present arguments whether the representation that occurs in perception is committed or not.

The main point is now this. If we are represented to in perception, that cannot be autorepresentation. Further, it must be allorepresentation. For one thing, perception is, if anything, a source of information as to how things are in our surroundings. Autorepresentation is not a *source* of information at all. It *registers*, or pretends to. For another, our current autorepresenting does not leave us any option of taking it at face value or refusing to. To autorepresent something just is to accept it. Things will not count as having been represented to me as so merely because I autorepresent them, that is, take them to be so. *This* passive does not work that way.

Committed allorepresentation is a source of reasons of a certain distinctive sort for thinking things: a reason for thinking that things are thus and so *may* be that they were represented to one as that way. Current autorepresentation is no source of reasons for one to think things. Past autorepresentation may be. That I used to think that pigs swim may indicate that they do. Perhaps I used to know about such things. Uncommitted allorepresentation as such gives no reason for thinking things. The *occurrence*, or instancing, of a certain uncommitted allorepresentation at a certain time and place may give a reason for thinking something. For, like any other occurrence, it may *mean* something. The reason it gives will thus be of just the same sort as the reason those bald patches on the cat give for thinking it has mange.

4. The relevant representing must be recognisable by us. If we are going to be represented *to* in experience, then the relevant representing must be something we can appreciate for the representing that it is. If, in a perceptual experience, things are represented to us as being thus and so, then we must be able to appreciate the experience as representing as so what it thus does; to appreciate what it is that is so according to it. This need not mean that we can characterise such representational content accurately, or formulate it explicitly. But we should be able to recognise, where needed, of particular ways things may or may not be, whether that is what the experience represented to us as so—whether that is what one would take to be so in taking the experience at face value—whether, for example, the experience is one according to which a certain stick is bent, or rather one according to which that stick is straight. The core idea is: you cannot represent things to people as so in a way they simply cannot recognise as doing that.

I suppose, for working purposes, that what would make the representational content of experience recognisable to the perceiver—if experience represented anything as so—would be, in some sense or other, the way things then look, or appear, or, again, their looking, or appearing, as they do. So, in some sense of ‘looks’ or ‘appears’, if things look, or appear, as they do on a given occasion, that should leave exactly one representational content for *that* particular experience to have. On that occasion, at least, a different content would have required things to look, or appear, different.

The relevant sense of ‘looks’, or ‘appears’, can be negotiated later. In fact, the representationalist can have more or less free choice. But I take it that it would be cheating if, say, ‘looks like things are thus and so’ turned out just to *mean* ‘things are represented to the perceiver as being thus and so’. Looks in that sense might *be* representational content; but they could not be that by which an experience is recognizable as having the representational content that it does.

The idea here is that one could tell the representational content of an experience by the way, in it, things looked. I will call such content *looks-indexed*. I will, *pro tem*, take this to be part of the view in question, and, accordingly, use it. Eventually, I will be able to do without it, with no loss of results.

To sum up, then, the position on which in perception we are represented to, as I will construe it here, has four significant points.

1. The representation in question consists in representing things as so (thus, truly/veridically, or falsely/non-veridically).
2. It has, or gives perceptual experience, a face value, at which it can be taken or declined (or discounted).
3. It is not autorepresentation. (It is allorepresentation, though here, not crucially.)
4. Where we are thus represented to, we can recognise that, and how, this is so; most pertinently, we can appreciate what it is that is thus represented to us as so. Provisionally, I suppose it is (in some sense) the way things look that lets us do that.

2. Misleading: By perceiving I can learn things. Walking through a park near Lisbon, my nose tells me, and my eyes confirm, that there are eucalyptus. Seeing Luc and Pia touch hands at dinner makes all the pieces fall into place. By perceiving I can also be misled, at least because what I see (hear, feel, smell) may be misleading. A touch need not mean what it seemed to. An odour may be artificially produced. For *what* I perceive to be misleading, nothing need be *represented* as so. Perhaps *none* of the ways perception may mislead involves anything being represented to us as so. Perhaps in perception things are *not* represented to us as being thus and so. That was Austin’s view. He put it this way:

Though the phrase ‘deceived by our senses’ is a common metaphor, it is

a metaphor; and this is worth noting, for in what follows [in Ayer] the same metaphor is frequently taken up by the expression ‘veridical’ and taken very seriously. In fact, of course, our senses are dumb—though Descartes and others speak of ‘the testimony of the senses,’ our senses do not *tell* us anything, true or false. (Austin 1962, p. 11)

Austin’s idea is that, rather than *representing* anything as so, our senses merely bring our surroundings into view; afford us some sort of awareness of them. It is then for us to make of what is in our view what we can, or do. Austin speaks as if he is taking issue with Descartes. There are, indeed, large differences between Austin and Descartes as to what it is we can see. (One main thing Austin saw and Descartes missed is, to label it, occasion-sensitivity, here, notably, the sensitivity to occasions for the counting, of what someone counts as having seen in some episode of viewing, and what awareness is mediated by the *visual* awareness he thus enjoys.) Prescinding from such issues, the two are allies on this particular point. Over a wider area which includes perception, Descartes said this:

By the mere intellect I do no more than perceive the ideas that are matters for judgment; and precisely so regarded the intellect contains, properly speaking, no error. (Descartes 1971, p. 99 (fourth meditation))

Whence, then, do my errors originate? Surely just from this: my will extends more widely than my understanding, and yet I do not restrain it within the same bounds, but apply it to what I do not understand. (Descartes 1971, pp. 96-97)

Sensory experience is, for Descartes, one more case where I am simply confronted with ‘ideas’. I cannot be confronted correctly or incorrectly, veridically or deceptively. I simply confront what is there. Perception leads me astray only where I *judge* erroneously, failing to make out what I confront for what it is. The possibility of error thus arises with, and only with, autorepresentation. If that is the only point at which such possibility arises, then there is no room for allrepresentation in perception; no place other than autorepresentation for what is liable to be veridical or not.

Part of the point here is that perception is, first and foremost, a source of *unmediated* awareness. I will call awareness of X *mediated* if it is hostage to awareness of something else: that further awareness is part of what entitles one to take it that X is so, or present; so part of what qualifies one as aware of that. In unmediated awareness, one’s entitlement to take it that X is hostage to no more than some form of awareness of X itself (such as seeing it). Seeing your car in the drive makes me aware that you are home. That is mediated awareness that you are home; unmediated awareness that your car is in the drive.

Another part of the point is that *perception*, as such, simply places our surroundings in view; affords us awareness of them. There is no commitment to their *being* one way or another. It confronts us with what is there, so that, by attending, noting, recognising, and otherwise exercising what capacities we have, *we* may, in some respect or other, make out what is there for what it is—or, again, fail to. It makes us aware, to some extent, of things (around us) being as they are. It is then up to us to make out, or try to, which particular ways that is. Perception cannot present things as being other than they are. It cannot present some way things are *not* as what is so. That would not be mere confrontation. So it cannot represent anything as so. Representing, by nature, is liable to be of what is not so.

Such is a view, and, so far, only that. On it, in perception things are *not* presented, or represented, to us as being thus and so. They are just presented to us, full stop. It is in making out, or trying to, what it is that we confront that we *take* things, rightly or wrongly, to be thus and so. Autorepresentation is the only representation in perceptual experience as such. Austin and the representationalist are thus at odds. The question who is right remains thus far open. The immediate point is that *misleading* perceptual experiences do not count in the representationalist's favour.

Perceptual experience *may* be misleading. Things may not be what they seem, or what they appear to be. On Austin's view, it is *what* is perceived, or experienced—what is actually presented to us—that may thus mislead. The form of misleading that is thus central is modelled in the following. Sid shows up for dinner drunk. That much we can all see. That he is drunk (at this hour) may mean that it will be a long and boring evening. Or, again, it may mean that, once again, he has lost his job. If it does mean that, then from what we see—that he is drunk—we may gain mediated awareness of those further facts. So far, perception is informative; not misleading.

What we see, hear, etc., may be informative because it bears factive meaning. Factive meaning is, crucially, something utterly different from representation. The most obvious point is this: if A factively means B, then if (*since*) A, B. If Sid did not lose his job, then his drunkenness does not mean that. By contrast, if B is not so, that is no bar to something having represented it as so. Just this makes room for representing falsely, so for *any* representing things to be so.

There is a subtler, and at least equally important, difference. Suppose that there are various things one might understand by someone's being fired. On one understanding, but not another, perhaps, being rified ('downsized') is being fired. Suppose that, on some understanding of being fired, Sid's drunkenness factively means that he was fired. On what understanding? That question is answered purely by how the world is, in fact, arranged. Just what would make Sid get drunk (at such an early hour)? By contrast, suppose Pia informs us that Sid has been fired. On what understanding of being fired has she thus represented this as so? That question is not answered by looking to the world. It is not a question of what, in Sid's history, would cause thus and so. It is rather a question of what Pia has committed herself to—that is, of for what she is rightly held responsible; of what ought to be expected of her by virtue of her representing as she did.

The contrast between factive meaning and representation also shows up in the structure of reasons. That A factively means B, once recognized, makes A proof of B. That B was represented as so leaves it open how good the reason is for thinking B. For all that, the issue

may or may not be settled.

Misleading is not yet in the picture. To put it there, suppose that Sid is drunk, but was not fired. Then, perhaps, things are not what they appeared to be. Our experience may thus have been misleading. What would make it misleading is just this: given the way Sid is, one might have expected his drunkenness to mean that he was fired; such was to be expected. Similarly, seeing Luc and Pia's flat strewn with broken crockery, one might reasonably suppose there to have been a tiff. For all that, there may not have been one. Too much champagne at brunch may have led to an excess of exuberance. Where A might reasonably, or rightly, be expected factively to mean B, I will say that A indicates B. Indicating is no more representing something as so than factively meaning is. What one may expect things to mean depends as much as what they in fact mean on how world is arranged—here, on what *as a rule* co-occurs with what (though the relevant rule may vary with one's cognitive position).

A, in indicating B, may be misleading just by virtue of what it might have been expected to mean. What one *might* have expected might fail to be so. (Leaving work, Sid happened onto a vodka tasting which, atypically, he failed to resist.) So something we perceive, or experience, may indicate what is not so. What it indicates is what there is reason to think, even when it is not, in fact, so. That is *one* way perceptual experience may be misleading, other than by representing something as so.

Our perceiving what means, or indicates, something is not the only way for perceptual experience to be informative. Meaning and indicating provide avenues of mediated awareness. Unmediated awareness may also be informative. There is such a thing as learning that there is a pig before one by seeing it. One might think that meaning and indicating similarly fail to exhaust the ways for perceptual experience to be misleading, or to misinform. But there is no parallel. Unmediated awareness is a way of being informed; not one of being misinformed, nor a further way to be misled. That there *is* such a thing is precisely no reason to think that perceptual experience is not only of what means or indicates, but also what *represents* things to be so.

It may be the pig's presence that makes me aware that there is a pig before me, thanks to my *seeing* it. I do not then *erroneously* take it to be there. If there is a pig to do any misleading, then that is one score on which I am not misled. Equally for my seeing one. If I am misled into taking a pig to be before me when there is none, I am misled by something else. The rear half of a pig, protruding from behind the barn, might do that if there is only a rear half there (perhaps mechanically animated). It *would* do so if I took it to mean there was a whole pig, thus inferring what, even if indicated, was not so. (If it is not just a rear half, perhaps one sees a *pig*, rear view.) Indications of a pig, or what I take for such, may lead me to conclusions. That is not for them, or anything, to *represent* something to me as so.

So far, there are no signs of something in perception to mislead other than by being taken to indicate what is not so. There are thus no signs yet that we are ever misled by, or in, having something *represented* to us as so. Visual illusions have been alleged to do this. Here is McDowell on that point:

In the Müller-Lyer illusion, one's experience represents the two lines as being unequally long, but someone in the know will refrain from

judging that that is how things are. (McDowell 1994, p. 11, footnote)

But is this so? In the Müller-Lyer, two lines are contrived (by means of accompanying wedges) to have a certain look. They do not just *seem* to have that look; they actually so look. (As the illusion's robustness testifies.) Two lines may well have that look because one *is* longer than the other. That is a familiar way for things to be. Depending on circumstances, that look may thus *indicate* that it is two lines of unequal length that one confronts. Or one might take it to. Unequal length *might* be what is to be expected; or at least what *is* expected. *Thus* may someone be misled by a Müller-Lyer. False expectations arise here in the wrong view of what something (a look) means, though perhaps a right view of what it *ought* to. What one gets wrong is the arrangement of the world: how the misleading seen thing in fact relates to other things. That mistake neither requires, nor suggests, that in this illusion one line is represented to us as being longer than the other, or that anything else is represented as so.

The phenomena of misleading experience do not suggest that in experience things are represented to us as so. That is no proof that they are not. We must examine that idea more closely.

3. Visual Appearance: If in perceptual experience things are represented to us as being so, that will be distinct from, and in addition to, things being indicated, or factively meant, by one or another thing we see (hear, etc.). It will be an additional way to be aware of our surroundings, giving different sorts of reasons for thinking things. If not-P, then *nothing* factively meant that P; though not-P cannot, by itself, rule out its having been represented as so that P. As for indicating, if P is to be expected, that is *per se* reason to think that P, whereas if P was *represented* as so, that may or may not be reason to think so, depending on the value of that representing. (Representation yields only mediated awareness of what it represents as so, though, for the moment, I will not press that point.) Being represented to in perception would also be utterly distinct from the autorepresentation that goes with making out, or noting, *what* one perceives. Does perception make room for such a further phenomenon? This section begins a case that it does not.

Someone to whom, in perceptual experience, things can be represented as so is someone who can take, and treat, his perceptual experiences as having the representational content they do; who can see, appreciate, what it is that is so according to them. If perception is representational, then we philosophers are, presumably, in that position. So where there is a question as to whether such-and-such is or is not so according to such-and-such experience, or was, or was not, represented as so in that experience, that is a question the answer to which should be, at least as a rule, or often, intuitively, or tolerably, clear, to us, among others—at least on suitable reflection.

One idea would be that it is looks-indexing that makes such facts available to us: the representational content of an experience can be read off of the way, in it, things looked. I will begin to examine that idea by distinguishing, and exploring, two different notions of looks. Neither, I will show, makes room for it. On the first, looks are something fit genuinely to make representational content recognisable. But they do not decide any particular representational content for any given experience to have. On the second, looks are not what might make content available to us. The most they might do would just be to *be* that content. In fact,

though, they are a matter, not of representing, but rather of what is indicated. They do not point to any phenomenon in perception beyond that. Many expressions which speak of looks—though not all—*can* be used to express either notion. I will thus distinguish the notions simply in terms of when, on each, things would look thus and so. (There are, though, expressions reserved for the second notion only.)

On the first notion, something looks thus-and-so, or like such-and-such, where it looks the way such-and-such, or things which are (were) thus and so, does (would, might) look. (Caveat: Pia may look like her sister on a bad day, or so look in this light, or to Sid, without looking like her sister.) On this notion, Pia may look (rather, very much, exactly) like (the spitting image of) her sister. That man on the bench looks old. (He looks the way an old man would, or might.) The shirt looks blue (in this light)—as a blue shirt (so viewed) does, or might. The sun, at sunset, may look red. A van Meegeren may look (uncannily) like a Vermeer. A copy of a Vermeer, made by an amateur in the museum, may look (just like) the original. Or, perhaps, it may turn out looking more like a van Meegeren. Pia, having been dragged through the brambles by her dog, may look as though she had been in a fight. That is how one may well have looked had one been in a fight.

Pia looks like her sister. They resemble each other. For *that* to be true is not yet for either to look any particular way. But if she looks like her sister, there is a look, or are looks, both share. Pia *has* these looks, simply in looking as she does. Such a look may be identified by an exemplar—her sister, or, perhaps, herself. Given the example, what remains to be understood is in what way something must be like it in *visual* appearance for *that* thing's looking as it does to be another exemplar of the look in question. Whether something has the look is settled simply by its visual effect. It has the look, perhaps, only under given conditions for producing that effect—only when viewed *thus* (e.g., from a certain angle). The look may be detectable only by one with suitable visual equipment. But to have the look (viewed *thus*) is to have it *full stop*—independent of how its so looking bears on whether to take it to *be* any given thing it thus looks *like*. I will call looks on this understanding of a look *visual looks*, or, sometimes, because of the way they are fixed by exemplars, *visual looks*.

If Pia looks like her sister, there is a way she should be to be what she *thus* looks like: she should be her sister. If Pia's imitation of her sister nonplussed looks uncannily like her sister nonplussed, then, again, there is a way things should be to be what they *thus* look like: it should be her sister, nonplussed. How things should be to be the way they look, full stop, is another matter. Pia's looking even exactly like her sister does not yet mean that whenever one see *Pia*, things are not the way they look. Otherwise, *no* experience of seeing Pia, and, by parity, none of seeing her sister, would be one in which things were the way they looked. Seeing Pia, or her sister, to be present could *never* be taking experience at face value. No experience of seeing either one could be veridical. So it cannot be that what is required for Pia being what she looks like in looking like her sister is what is required for things being as they look where she is present, or where one sees her, full stop. The simple point is: how things should be to be the way they look (on a given occasion, or in a given experience) is not decided by how things should be to be the way they look in such-and-such looking thus and so. There are already intimations of why it cannot be so decided.

If perception is representational, then, for any perceptual experience, there must be a way things are according to it. If such content is looks-indexed, then things looking as they do on a given occasion must fix *what* representational content experience then has. Specific facts

as to what things look like on this first notion of looks gain no purchase on what is thus required. How things must be to be what they *thus* look like does not decide how things must be to be the way they look; so nor, by that route, any way they must be to be as they (supposedly) are according to an experience in which things did so look. It is still open, perhaps, that things looking as they do points to some representational content for an experience to have; things looking thus and so does not. That is the first simple point.

Which ways things looked on an occasion and what they then looked like, is, in general, an occasion-sensitive matter: these are questions whose (true) answers vary with the occasion for posing them. (See Travis 2008 for more on occasion sensitivity.) For whether X looks like Y is very liable to depend on how comparisons are made. If Pia is blissfully asleep while her sister, bleary-eyed and insomniac, stares blankly at the flickering screen, they still look alike if you view the matter in one way, but not if you view it in another. Similarly, Pia will still look like Pia in ten year's time—when the matter is viewed in one way, but, sadly, not when it is viewed in another. Again, in the case of the Müller-Lyer, the two lines look like two lines of unequal length if you view the matter in one way (ignoring the wedges), but not if you view it in another. Given this, how comparisons *are* to be made for assessing the truth of a particular claim that X looks like Y will vary with precisely what was said in making it. On an occasion for describing a given perceptual experience, there may be definite things one *would* then say in saying X to look, or have looked, like Y—so, again, things one would not. But what one would say on some one such occasion does not decide, of that experience as such, how things looking as they then did relates to how things should be to be the way they then looked.

On an occasion for saying what, in an experience, things looked like, some comparisons may be natural, or right, or even possible, and others not. For all of what is thus sometimes so, in looking like Y, X also shares a look with many things. It looks as each of these does, or might, on some correct way of saying what things look like. If Pia looks like her sister, she also, on some understanding, looks the way she herself does, so might, or would, look. On some understanding or other, she looks (just) like any of indefinitely many different things. There is thus a substantial problem. Which facts as to Pia's looking (like) thus and so matter, and how, to how things should be to be the way they look simpliciter? Which looks, if any, matter to what is thus represented as so? And how? And why?

Our initial simple point now deepens. One cannot move from the various *ways* things should be to be the various *ways* they look to the *way* things should be to be the *way* they look. For those various ways move in mutually exclusive directions: things could be some of them only in not being others. For looks to identify a content, one needs a principled way of ignoring some of the specific ways things look, and attending only to others. That would be a policy for fixing, in terms of looks, what is so according to an experience, so when it would be deceptive, non-veridical, or misleading in the sought-for further way. If representational content is looks-indexed, the question becomes when looks—the *way* things look—would be deceptive, false, or misleading, so when a specific *way* things look would contribute to making them so. That question, posed of given (experienced) looks as such, clearly has no answer.

Looks on this first notion might make representational content recognisable, even bear it, were there any. They are *visible* features; not features of the content had (such as requiring such-and-such for truth). The trouble is that they are unfit to index content. For as to that they point in no one direction.

In looking like her sister Pia shares a look with countless other things—herself, a wax replica of herself in Madame Tussaud's, a good hologram, a body double, an actress made up to play the role of her, a Pia-clone, and so on ad inf. For each of these, there is a way things should be to be what they *thus* look like: Pia should be, respectively, herself, her sister, a wax dummy, a hologram, an actress, a clone, and so on. An experience that represented all that as so would be incoherent. Representation cannot fit into this picture unless something selects *which* facts as to what Pia looks like bear on it. It is no part of what perception is—of how it opens our surroundings to our view—that in perceiving one is to appreciate one set of facts as to what things look like, and ignore others. Looks, on this first notion of them, are thus not a route by which we might be represented to in perception.

Seeing Pia on terrasse may make us think any of many things—one for each of the things she then looks like. What it makes us think depends on our current proclivities to think things. Believing Pia is in foreign climes may raise the odds that we will take her for her sister. But it can hardly be that what perception represents to us as so is a matter of what we are anyway prone to believe or conclude. If you represent Pia to me as in Greece, I cannot turn that into your representing her as in Athens merely by so concluding. For us to take Pia for her sister is for us to autorepresent. It is a matter of what we *think* we see; of taking what we see for something else. Being represented to has no role in the etiology of such mistakes. They involve nothing purporting falsely to inform. Nor can autorepresentation be conjured into being represented to.

What goes for Pia goes for peccaries. What goes for peccaries goes for something's being blue. A peccary, confronted in the right way, may look exactly like a pig (or it may do to us novices). It also, of course, looks just the way a peccary might look (so confronted). It may also look like a tapir, a clever dummy pig, a wax imitation peccary, and so on. Experience cannot coherently represent it to us as both a peccary and wax (and a pig, and so on). Similarly, a shirt may look like a blue shirt. In looking as it does, it will also look the way a white shirt would when illuminated in certain ways, or when in certain conditions. It may also look like countless other things. Some such fact might index the representational content of things so looking. But only on condition that the other such facts do not. The problem now is: *what* decides that it is some one such fact, and no other, which plays that role.

Suppose that, in looking blue, some shirt looks a way one can exhibit by exhibiting a certain colour—say, by holding up a blue paint chip. Is it, in that case, represented to us as being blue? It looks the way a blue shirt does, or might, illuminated in a certain way. But that is not decisive. We are not on the track of representation here unless there is (as there clearly is) such a thing as a shirt merely looking, but not actually being blue. Choose a way for that to happen. Perhaps the shirt has been dipped in rapidly disappearing ink. Perhaps (like certain sculptures) it constantly changes colour, depending on exact conditions of viewing. Or perhaps, up close, it is a pointilliste motley. Insofar as these are ways of failing to be blue, they provide us with further things the shirt looks like. It looks just the way some pointilliste motley would (viewed from a distance), and so on. So our problem re-arises: which of these facts matter (and how) to what was represented to us as so?

The point generalises. Take any way things may be said to look. Now take any way that things may fail to be what they would need to be to be what they *thus* look like. That is *another* way things may be said then to look: they look just the way they would if *that*, rather than the first thing, were the way things are. So this second way for things to be—for them not to be

that first thing they may be said to look like—could, if it in fact obtained, make it the case that things were not the way they looked only if something decided that only the first thing things looked like, and not the second, mattered to things being as they looked full stop. By the same token, the obtaining of this second thing, or of anything else that made things fail to be that first thing, would make for misrepresentation in perception only if something decided that it was only the first fact about looks, and not the second, or any other such, that indexed representational content. Perception does not do such selecting for us.

The conclusion so far is that *on our first notion of looks*, looking like such-and-such cannot contribute to determining how things should be to be the way they look *simpliciter*. For, so far as it goes, there is no particular way things should be to be the way they look *simpliciter*. For that reason, things looking like such-and-such, or looking such-and-such ways, on this first notion of looks, cannot index anything as represented to us as being so.

A wax lemon may be so artfully done that it is only with great difficulty, if at all, that it can be told, by sight, from the real thing. For most purposes, it can thus be said to look (just like) a (real) lemon. It is enough for it to look that way that it is sufficiently similar in looks to the real thing; that there is a suitable visually decidable resemblance. The look in question is visual; shared by anything looking suitably the same way as an exemplar. Precisely because the look *is* visual in this sense, it would be rash in general to conclude from something's *thus* looking (just) like a lemon that it is one—unless one may suppose that, in the case at hand, such looks have a certain factive meaning. Nor, for that reason, can we conclude from the mere fact of the wax looking like a lemon in this sense that it should be one for *things* to be the way they look. Its lemon-like look suggests no such thing. So the fact of its looking like a lemon does not help make it so that it is represented to us as being one.

We *do* sometimes say, 'It looks like it is a lemon', the 'it' referring to the lemon, or functioning as dummy subject, where the item must be a lemon for *things* to be the way they thus look. What that shows is that there is another notion of looking like. I turn to that notion next.

4. Thinkable Appearance: Consider, first, words like these: 'It looks like (looks as if, looks as though) Pia will sink the putt/that painting is a Vermeer/ Pia's sister is in town.' Here what the grammatical object speaks of which is said to enjoy a certain status. Here 'looks like' takes a sentential object. Grammatically, its subject might be viewed as a dummy. One might also think of the subject here as just *things*, in that catholic sense of 'things' in which it is a *bêtise* to ask which ones. Things being as they are, or simply the way things are, is what makes it look as if Pia will sink the putt, or the painting is a Vermeer. Or, more exactly, it is what is in evidence, made known, as to how things are—what, from the relevant position, has been, or can be, recognised as to this, which makes things look this way.

I will take the central case to be one in which the speaker, in saying this, represents himself as subscribing to a view as to how things are: while the mentioned proposition (e.g., that the painting is a Vermeer), has not quite been established, nevertheless it is the thing for one to suppose, at least *pro tem*, given what is known, or revealed, of how things are. Going only on what is known (or revealed), such is what one *would* suppose. If that is the central case, there are, of course, derivatives. Van Meegeren's task was to fool the Nazis into buying

fake Vermeers. Complimenting him on his success at that, I might say, 'It looks just as if that painting is a Vermeer', knowing full well that it is not: there is a position from which things would so look—the position we hope the Nazis to occupy. From that position—the position of one not in the know as Van Meegeren and I are—that it is a Vermeer would be the thing to think. (Now we need only hope that the Nazis are rational about this.)

What matters here is not how cases are divided into primary and derivative, but rather the general sort of thing that is said on such a use of 'looks like' or 'looks as if'. It is a remark about the thing to think, or at least what the speaker finds the thing to think. Now the central point is this: awareness that something is the thing to think (or, on some qualification, the qualified thing to think), is not *visual* awareness. So wherever 'looks like' has anything like the suggested readings, awareness of it looking like P will not be visual, or perceptual awareness. The point holds wherever 'looks like' takes a sentential complement, or at least where that complement is to be understood as what does the mentioned looking. For there is nothing which that Pia will sink the putt, or that the painting is a Vermeer, looks like. *That such-and-such* is not the sort of thing to have a look. Unlike, say, the lemon on the counter, it is not the sort of thing to form images—a point of Frege's, who thus says of 'see' what might be said of 'looks like' on such uses: that it really speaks of a form of thought, or judgement. (See 1897: 153.)

I will call the looks spoken of on such uses of 'looks like', 'looks as if', etc., *thinkable looks*. They are not looks to be achieved simply by assuming the right shape, coloration, etc. They are not possessed by what *is* shaped and coloured as such; not instanced in the world simply in objects, or scenes, looking as they do, being such as to form the visual images they would. They are rather what is to be made of things by a thinker relevantly *au fait* with the world, and knowing enough of what to make of what he is thus aware of.

Suppose that, beginning with, 'It looks like Pia will sink the putt', we substitute for 'Pia will sink the putt', 'it is a lemon', the 'it' referring, say, to a very lifelike wax lemon. Then the first 'it' remains 'dummy'. That is, we get: *things look as if that thing is a lemon*. We thus get the use just discussed. But in 'It looks as if it is a lemon', the two 'it's may be coreferential. This *may* just be an idiomatic variant of the locution already discussed (as when one says, 'that putt looks as if it will be sunk'). But it may also bear a different understanding. What remains so, on this understanding, is that it is a way of attributing a certain status to (the proposition) that that thing is a lemon; one having to do with its credibility, or likelihood. What may change here is what is represented as conferring that status: it is what the lemon, in looking as it does, makes evident as to how things are which gives the proposition that status. Where 'looks like' is so read, all the above points hold, most crucially that awareness of the object looking like a lemon (where that is its looking to be one, or its making things look as if it were) is not *perceptual* awareness—Frege's point applied again.

The second notion of *look* I mean to present here is thus one on which looking is a matter of some proposition enjoying some status or other *in re* being the thing to think. Looking like, on this notion, is a matter of things, or something, having a certain rational force regarding some given proposition; a certain bearing on the thing to think. Such looks, thinkable looks, are not visual looks in the present sense. The *locution*, 'It looks like (it is) a lemon' (coreferential 'it's) and its kin may sometimes speak of visual looks—of it looking (in some respect or degree, to be understood from context) as a lemon would. A visual look is a look exemplified, *per se*, in a given thing looking as it does—a thing, that is, liable to have a

look, liable to form images. However one understands *looking like a lemon*, or *looking pockmarked*, or *looking waxy*, or any other look a wax lemon might have—however waxy, or pitted, something must look to count as looking waxy, or pitted, in the meaning of the act—whether a given object has (or given doings have) that look is decided solely by (or in) its (their) looking as it does (they do). It is a matter of *visual* comparisons. Whereas whether, e.g., some object looks like (it is) a lemon, where this speaks of thinkable looks, is never decided simply by its looking as it does. To adapt a point of Austin's, when wax lemons get good enough, and are widely enough distributed, it will cease to be true that you can tell by looking whether something is a lemon, so that what now makes things look that way, so makes there be a certain thinkable look, may cease to do so. Things will no longer so thinkably-look.

All of this is just for the sake of ensuring that visual looks and thinkable looks are not conflated. Holding them safely apart, we may ask which sort of look might give either reason, or means, for taking perceptual experience to have representational, truth-evaluable, content. *Visual* looks are the sort of thing to be decided just by looking. Any given such look is such as to be exhibited in some given range of cases, where what members of the range need to share in common is some identifiable *visual* resemblance. On this notion of *look*, something looking waxy, or pitted, or like a lemon, or a Vermeer, need carry no suggestion that it *is* waxy, pitted, a lemon, or a Vermeer. Its right to membership in the given class is in no way compromised by absence of such suggestion. The trouble now, as discussed already, is that there are too many things something would look *like* in looking the way it thus does—all the things, in fact, which belong to the class of things which so look. It might as well *be* any of these as any other, purely so far as its *visual* looks go. Nothing in its visual looks distinguishes any of these as what it ought to *be* to be as represented, if for it to look visually as it does were for anything to be represented as so. Visual looks, properly wielded, might be the *vehicle* of some representing; but *they*, on their own, hardly identify what that representing would be.

So we might look to the second notion for means to identify such content. This notion, thinkable looks, *is* a matter of what can be gathered from, or what is suggested by, the facts at hand, or those visibly (audibly, etc.) on hand. So it cannot look as if X on this notion where it is perfectly plain that X is not so. Further, it look as if X only where one has not actually seen, or observed (for himself) that X is so; in which case there would be nothing to gather.

On this second notion, if it looks as if Pia's sister is approaching, or as if the painting is a Vermeer, then there is a way things should be, *simpliciter*, for things to be the way they thus look: Pia's sister should be approaching; the painting should actually be a Vermeer. For all that, it may not be Pia's sister approaching. It may be Pia's sister, but retreating, or no one at all, mere light and shadows. In that case, *something* is deceptive (whereas Pia looking, on the first notion, like her sister without being her does not yet make anything deceptive). It is perhaps just this feature of looks on this second notion that makes perception appear (to some) to represent things as so. But all depends here on what it is that is deceptive.

If perception represented things to us as thus and so, there would have to be, for any instance of it, a way things were according to it. Looks, on this second notion, where, or insofar as, there are any, identify something such a way *might* be. So far, that is all to the good for the representationalist. They are not, on the other hand, what might serve as *vehicles* of content—the sort of thing that might make representing recognisable to one. There is no particular visual look present in, or by, things looking like/as if X where this is a thinkable look. Things look like X in this sense *wherever* X is how things should be to be the way they

look. Such is not a further fact made recognisable by things so looking. Nor, if the way things should be to be the way they look were the way they should be to be as represented, would looks in this sense be some perceptible cue to *that* fact. If perception were representational, looks in this second sense might *be* its representational content; but they could not be what made that content recognizable for us.

But for it to look such-and-such way, where this is a thinkable look, cannot be for it to be represented *to the perceiver* that such-and-such is so. *Perhaps* for it so to look to *me* is for me so to (auto-)represent things to *myself* (though not for me to be represented to from any other source). For it so to look full stop might be (roughly) for it to be the thing for *one* to autorepresent (unless specially in the know), going on what there is here for *one* to go one. But it is certainly not for *me* to be represented to, either by myself, or from some other source.

Suppose I say, 'It looks to Sid as if the painting is a Vermeer', or again, 'as if Pia will win the tournament (will sink the putt)'. I thus credit Sid with a certain view of a certain matter. I say him to take it, perhaps tentatively, hesitantly, with some uncertainty, that, e.g., Pia will win the tournament. (I will not speak correctly if Sid knows full well that Pia will win the tournament, or that the painting is a Vermeer. But it will be safe to waive that point here. I will not speak *truly* if Sid does not think the painting is (even probably) a Vermeer, or etc.)

Suppose, now, that I say simply 'It looks as if Pia will sink the putt' (or whatever). To begin with, that is properly understood as (*inter alia*, perhaps) an expression of my own—perhaps tentative and hesitant—view of the matter: I think, or am inclined to think, going on the facts in hand, that she will sink it. I may have done no more than say how things thus seem to me; in which case I could have spoken more explicitly by saying 'It looks *to me* as if Pia will sink the putt.' Here speaking of looks indicates explicitly that I am going by what I take it can be gathered from the facts in hand, or from things looking as they do. (Thus my view is about what I have not actually observed.)

But there may be more to an 'It looks as if P' than that. If I say, 'It looks as if this car has been repainted', I may be saying that, again going by the looks—by what is observable, or perhaps more generally, by all the facts in hand—*one can conclude* with some, though perhaps not complete, certainty, that the car has been repainted. That, according to me, is what the looks, or the facts in hand, indicate. I am mistaken if they do not indicate that: I mistake a bit of undercoat for the original colour, say. Whether I am right or wrong depends on what things (factively) mean (or ought to)—a crucial feature of this second notion.

It may look to Sid as if the painting is a Vermeer when, in fact, it does not at all look as if it is a Vermeer; it has all the characteristics of a van Meegeren—a subject matter and style of dress, say, never found in Vermeer. There are observer-independent facts as to what looks to be the case, however occasion-sensitive a matter it is what counts as such a fact. When would a painting not, in fact, look like a Vermeer? When, for example, the woman sweeping the courtyard is using a type of broom not made until the 18th century, or is wearing a hat never worn in Holland; or when the brush strokes are a bit too broad to be Vermeer's, or feather in the wrong way, or the pigments are a bit off. When does it not look as if Pia will sink the putt? When, for example, the ball is on a straight course for the hole, where it would have to be off to the right to catch the roll nearer the cup. When would it not look as if there are fresh roses in the vase? When, for example, the petals (if you look closely) are a bit too waxy to be real; or, again, when one is in an artificial flower shop. When would it not look as if Pia (marked as she

is) had been in a fight? When, for example, her dog often drags her through brambles, so that you cannot tell by looking whether she has been in a fight or not.

We are now on familiar ground. The thing about the broom is that it *means* (factively) that the painting was not done by Vermeer. Or if, unaccountably, Vermeer painted such a broom, then, though it does not mean that, one might have expected it to. Conversely, if, on inspection, the looks (first notion) really are distinctively the looks of a Vermeer—if that is the way he painted—then that *indicates* that it is a Vermeer. In which case, on this second use of ‘look’, it looks, so far, like (as if) it is a Vermeer. One may so conclude. Again, the course of the ball means that it will catch the lie wrong, and hence miss the cup. If it does not miss—there is a freak gust of wind, or the earth moves—then, though that course did not mean that she would miss, one might rightly have expected so.

What things look like on this use of ‘looks’ is thus a matter of what things mean factively, or indicate; of how the world is contingently arranged. That is precisely not a matter of things being represented as so. Representation simply does not work that way. Whether it was represented to us as so that Pia will sink the putt is never a matter of whether her sinking it was indicated. Nor, by contrast with factive meaning, can it be decided by whether she did in fact sink it, so that if not, then, *ipso facto*, no such thing was represented as so.

So we have two notions of looks, neither of which allows looks to decide what was *represented* as so. Things looking (visual looks) as they do fixes no way things should be to be the way they look full stop; nor, *a fortiori*, to be as represented. Things just have too many visual looks in looking visually as they do. It/things looking like/as if what it does/they do (thinkable looks) fixes a way things should be to be the way they look full stop. But to take that to fix what was *represented* as so would collapse representation into indicating, or factive meaning, and thus to lose it altogether.

I have now distinguished two notions *looks*—a distinction Frege drew (see 1897, 1918). There are *visual* looks, objects of *visual* awareness. And there are *thinkable* looks—objects of judgement, or thought. There are two main sorts of statements of visual looks: one ascribing some such look in particular; the other merely noting a resemblance between the looks of one thing and that of another. ‘Pia looks just like her sister’ may be used for either thing: one may identify a look in citing her sister as instancing it (so that things are as said only if Pia looks *thus*, for something ‘thus’ may thus refer to); or one may merely say Pia and her sister to resemble one another visually. Statements about thinkable looks also come in two notable varieties: so to speak, committed or not. ‘That painting looks just like (looks to be) a Vermeer’ may express a judgement as to what is probably so, or ought to be supposed so, given the speaker’s exposure to how things are. Or it may express no such commitment on the speaker’s part, merely say what *someone* would suppose, on given available grounds, if not further in the know. For example, an accomplice might say this to van Meegeren, knowing the painting to be a van Meegeren. This variety in statements does not disturb the underlying taxonomy of looks.

5. Hybrids: Neither notion suits the representationalist. He might thus seek a third. Both the temptation and its execution are visible in McDowell’s effort to explain a notion of ‘ostensibly seeing’. Ostensibly seeing is to be either of two cases. One disjunct is simply seeing something

to be so—say, there to be a pig before one. One has the pig manifestly in view. In terms McDowell favours, its presence stands revealed. The other disjunct is a class of ringers for the first. It is not obvious just which class McDowell means to capture. In any case, he appeals to *some* notion of looks for doing so. As he explains things,

Ostensible seeings are experiences in which it looks to their subject as if things are a certain way.

He then says this about the relevant notion of looks:

Even if one does judge that things are as they look, having them look that way to one is not the same as judging that they are that way. In some cases, perhaps, one does judge that things are a certain way when they look that way. But ... unless there are grounds for suspicion, such as odd lighting conditions, having it look to one as if things are a certain way—ostensibly seeing things to be that way—*becomes* accepting that things are that way by a sort of default. (McDowell 1998, pp. 438-439, italics mine)

McDowell clearly cannot mean ‘looks as if (indicative)’ in its normal English sense. So read, for it to look to one as if X *is* for one to take it that X; for one’s mind to be made up. It is not to keep the option of accepting, or rejecting, ‘at face value’, that things are that way. Nor is it to be in a condition that may *evolve* into judgement. It *is* to judge. This fits with the first disjunct of what McDowell means to capture. Where I *see* the pig to be before me, my mind *is* made up. Nothing remains (on that score) for me to take at face value or not. The world has already drawn credence from me. To see that such-and-such is so is to take it to be so.

So reading it may not fit well with what McDowell means to capture in the other disjunct. What unites the ringers in the cases where it looks to me as if there is a pig before me is nothing other than the fact that I so take it—that I am, thus, fooled. No visual look, for example, is present in all these cases. There need not even be any such thing as a visual look in every such case—certainly not a porcine one. This class would not be the same as the class in which things look as they would were there a pig before me (however exactly one identifies that class). What all its members would share in common with all instances of the first disjunct is only a bit of autorepresentation, not a visual likeness. Looking as if X is meant to be a feature shared by all instances of either disjunct. But autorepresentation is implausibly the right feature.

It is clear to some extent what notion McDowell wants. First, it should be possible, on it, for it to look (to N) as if X, while, for all that, *not* X (so that there may be a face value). Second, it should be possible for it to look to N as if X, on this notion, even when N is entirely

agnostic as to whether X (so that looks may be taken or left at face value). So, too,, it should be possible for it to look as if X, on the notion, even though X is not to be concluded, even tentatively, from—is not indicated at all by—the facts in hand, or placed by the experience in hand. It looks as if it is a Vermeer; we *know* it is a van Meegeren.

The relevant sense must make this attitude coherent, ‘That, anyway, is how things look (to me); as to what there is reason to think, that is quite another matter.’ For that, the way things (first sense) look (to N)—what is fixed by their visual looks, so viewed—must fix how, in the relevant sense, they look to N.

There is nothing wrong with a notion that works in that way. Though there are ordinary means of expressing it, McDowell may choose whatever means he like. It is the next step that makes everything goes wrong. For McDowell also wants a look in his sense to carry as such a given import: for it to be present is, as such, for such-and-such thereby (at least) to be suggested; so for there to be a way things should be to be the way they look full stop. Only then could there be such a thing as judging (all the more refusing to judge) that things are as they look. Only then could there be any such thing to judge; such a thing as things being, or not, as they look.

This feature of McDowell’s notion makes looking in his sense contrast with having a visual look. A visual look, like any other visible thing, may sometimes indicate something. But that is a contingent matter. A porcine look sometimes indicates a pig, but need not. All that visual looks fix as to how things look fixes *no* particular way things should be to be the way they look full stop. (Nor would fixing what is indicated fix what *representation* requires.) But, in meeting the first desideratum, what is thus fixed *would* fix how things look to N in McDowell’s sense. So how things look to N in that sense cannot fix what way things should be to be the way they look. The two desiderata cannot consistently be fulfilled by *any* notion of looks.

McDowell wants to mix two immiscible notions. Looking as if X is to be what unites the two disjuncts of McDowell’s ‘ostensibly seeing’. It is to be what is in common to a pig being visibly before me, and the relevant cases of the mere appearance of that. For that he needs a look in his sense to be identified (as present or absent in any given case) as looks in our first sense are: there will be a ringer wherever things (as seen by me) look suitably as they would were there a pig before me. Just so is the occurrence of a ringer independent of what is indicated by, or what I make of, things (as viewed by me) looking as they do. Just that holds looks in his sense apart both from autorepresentation and from indicating. McDowell must draw on our first notion of a look to block that collapse. Such looks are just what is independent of indicating, and of autorepresentation.

McDowell thus needs looks in our first sense, so visual looks, to have intrinsic import: for such a look to do what a thinkable look does: to make, *per se*, for a way things should be to be the way they look full stop. Only that would give an appearance the right shape to evolve into a judgement—would allow one to *judge*, or take it, that X where, or in, not doubting that things are as they look. There must already be a *that X* in the way things thus look for there to be something to doubt or not.

The problem with this combination—a feature from one notion, a feature from the other—is that no visual look, nor any look in our first sense, *has* any intrinsic import. Its presence *cannot* mean as such that there is some way things should be to be the way they look

simpliciter. The reasons for that have already been rehearsed. In brief, depending on exactly how one individuates such looks, either a given such look is the look of things being countless different rival ways—Pia approaching, her sister approaching, etc.—or it inevitably cohabits with the looks of things being those ways, where, again, there is nothing to choose from among these looks those which show how things should be to be the way they look *simpliciter*.

There is, and can be, no notion of look to serve McDowell's purpose. It is the purpose that is at fault. McDowell's bind here is just the representationalist's. Looks that allowed us to appreciate that it was being represented to us as so that such-and-such would be identifiable as visual looks are, and not simply by what would be so if things were as they looked. If their mere presence fixed *how* things were represented to us as being then, in doing that, they would fix a way things should be to be the way they look full stop. Such looks would combine features of our first and second notion. But those features do not combine. The representationalist, like McDowell, places an impossible set of demands on looks.

6. Responses: It is hard to say (since they themselves do not) why representationalists are unimpressed by the above points. Perhaps they disown some of the position I ascribed to them (those 4 points by which, at the start, I fixed the representationalism here at issue). Perhaps they think of representation as occurring in perception otherwise than as portrayed above. I will explore these possibilities by considering Gilbert Harman's version of the view (Harman 1990). That version illustrates as well as any what might tempt one down representationalism's primrose path. Discussing an undefended position, though, inevitably involves guesswork.

Of those four points, the first two—that the relevant representing is of such-and-such as so, and that it gives perceptual experience a face value—are taken from the mouths of representationalists. Anyone who renounces these points is not my target. As for the third point, the crucial part is that the relevant representing not be autorepresenting. Perceptual experience is a form of awareness of our surroundings. Perhaps we cannot have such awareness without registering at least some of what is around us. Perhaps to do that just is to autorepresent things as so. I take no stand here. If a representationalist wants to say no more than this, I will not cavil. McDowell, for one, insists that it is not all he wants to say. (Being represented to, though not yet, may *become*, a judgement.) And it is not all one does say in insisting that in perception we are represented to.

Not all representationalists speak explicitly of things being represented *to* (or *for*) *the perceiver* as so. But they are my target if they maintain the following: first, that a perceptual experience has a particular representational content (its content), viz., that such-and-such is so; second, that the perceiver can recognise this feature of it (as he would in grasping when the experience would be veridical, when not); third, that this is a content the perceiver may accept or reject (where accepting would be taking, or coming to take, what is thus represented as so to be so). To abbreviate, you are my target if you think experiences have a face value. This places at least all cited authors within my target range.

There is no more than the above in the idea that the relevant representation is allrepresentation, though the point need not be pressed. Allrepresentation requires something to do the representing. But that something can just be the perceptual experience

itself, or else (the fact of) things looking as they did. A representationalist need not balk at that.

As for point 4, a representationalist *could*, I think, disown the idea that content is looks-indexed. That is suggested by something Harman says. I thus drop the requirement, retaining only the requirement that this content is recognisable. That will prove not to help the representationalist's case.

I will focus on four points in Harman's view. Three are in this passage:

Eloise is aware of the tree as a tree that she is now seeing. So, we can suppose, she is aware of some features of her current visual experience. In particular, she is aware that her visual experience has the feature of being an experience of seeing a tree. That is to be aware of an intentional feature of her experience; she is aware that her experience has a certain content. (Harman 1990, p. 38)

Harman speaks of Eloise's awareness of the tree as a tree that she is now seeing. Of course, she may *see* the tree without any such awareness. She may mistake it for a power pole, or a mastodon leg, or be unable to make out *what* it is. If she *is* aware of the 'intentional' feature Harman claims she is (whatever he means by 'intentional'), this is, to repeat a point, not *visual* awareness. Insofar as her *visual* experience consists of (the objects of her) visual awareness, it includes awareness of no such feature. She may *know* what she sees for what it is. This is for *her* to represent things to *herself* as a certain way. So far, there is no other source of representational content *for* her to be aware of.

In any case, Harman's take on the situation suggests the following points:

A. When we are aware of something being so, or present, that is *represented* to us as so, or present. We are aware of seeing a tree, its brown trunk, its partly occluding other trees, etc. It is accordingly represented to us as so that there is a tree, it has a brown trunk, etc.

B. We are aware of being represented to (of the experience's (supposed) face value). (Harman 1990, p. 46.) We are aware of our experience having the representational content that it does; of what is so according to it.

C. To be aware that one's experience is an experience of such-and-such (or simply to be aware of experiencing such-and-such) is to be aware of

its being represented to one that such-and-such. Experiencing seeing a tree is, *per se*, experiencing being represented to.

In all these cases, by Frege's point, the relevant form of awareness could not be *perceptual* (e.g., visual) awareness. One may, of course, be visually aware of the tree. But not that one's experience has the feature of being of seeing a tree.

Harman also says this:

Look at a tree and try to turn your attention to intrinsic features of your visual experience. I predict you will find that the only features there to turn your attention to will be features of the presented tree, including relational features of the tree "from here". (Harman 1990, p. 39)

Neither a tree nor its features (being, looking, perhaps seeming, certain ways) does any representing. But that there is a tree which is, looks, etc., thus and so is what is represented as so. So the point here is to be:

D. We are not aware of anything, other than, perhaps, the experience itself, which does the relevant representing, or bears the relevant content. We are aware of the familiar objects of perception, and of no further vehicle which contains a representation of them as present.

Points B and D suggest how a representationalist might reject my initial point 4. They at least suggest that when I see a tree before me, it need not be that I have noted some looks on grounds of which I take that to be so. Nor *need* it be some look, or looks, from which I can see that I am so represented to. It is unclear that Harman would actually deny that the relevant content is looks-indexed. But anyway, if, in this case, it need not be gathered from (awareness of) something else that such-and-such is represented as so, then someone might deny it.

Recognition capacities may be of different sorts. In some cases, we can recognise a such-and-such, or its presence, and there is a story to be told about how we do that: certain observable features of the environment, to which we are perceptually sensitive (whether we note them or not) are a mark, for us, of the presence, or absence, of the relevant thing. Psychologists, I think, hope that facial recognition works like that. I suppose that my ability to tell a pig when I see one (such as it is) normally does too. In other cases, though, perhaps there is no such story. We can tell, as a rule, when the thing is present. But there is no describable function from other observable features of a situation to the cases in which we would recognise its presence. That idea, I think, is not absurd. If not, and if we are represented

to in experience, then perhaps our ability to detect the content of such representing works like that. Point 4 can thus be weakened to allow this possibility. What remains is that the relevant being represented to is recognisable.

If we are represented to in perception, perhaps we can just tell how things are thus represented to us; there is no saying precisely how we can tell. It is still so, on Harman's view, that we *can* tell; that we are aware of being represented to, and appreciate how things are thus represented. That raises two questions. First, *what* is it that we thus tell? When would an experience have given representational content? Or, for a given experience, just what content does it have? Second, in cases where we do see things, how does our being represented to relate to our seeing what we do?

I begin with the first question. I have already said why I think it has no answer. There is, I have argued, nothing in a perceptual experience to make it count as having some one representational content as opposed to countless others. Harman, though, says something that may *sound* like an answer. It is important to see why it is not one. But first we must face a peculiarity in Harman's speech. I thus turn to his point D.

Harman insists that when Eloise is aware of seeing a tree, she is thereby aware that her experience has a certain *intentional* feature; namely, one of having such-and-such content. Exactly not, one would have thought. Intentionality, as usually conceived, is world-directedness. It is being hostage to the world's favour for some success which the intentional item, as such, aims at. Whereas seeing is, *per se*, a success. For one to see a tree is for there to be one. There is nothing seeing as such aims at that has not already been achieved if it occurs at all. Which would make seeing a tree precisely *not* an intentional feature of experience.

Harman, though, rejects this view of seeing. Following Miss Anscombe, he believes that he can see things that are not there. So when he says Eloise to see a tree, he does not mean it to follow that there is one. If there is one, the seeing was a success. But she might have seen one anyway, on his proprietary use, even if there were not. That may well make seeing intentional. In due course we will see good reason (aside from the obvious ones) not to talk that way. For the moment, though, I will need to put the relevant point in two ways. First, I will use 'see' to mean what it does; thus, as a success verb. Then I will try to speak in Harman's way.

So, what representational content does a given perceptual experience have? What might make any answer to this question right of a given case? Harman tells us that if Eloise sees a tree before her, then it is represented to her as so that there is a tree before her. Taking 'see' to mean *see*, one naturally thinks of the case where there *is* a tree before her. Harman's dictum then applies equally whether she takes what she sees for a tree, or it so much as looks, or appears to her much like a tree, or whether, in fact, it *does* look like one, or this can even be told by looking. (The tree may be obscured, in haze, or in disguise.) Taking 'see' for *see*, we now know that her experience represents a tree to be before her when there *is* one, and she sees it. But it is characteristic of representing that something may be *represented* to be so when it is not—a possibility allowed by Harman in using 'see a tree' to speak of something Eloise may do when there *is* none. A question thus arise for Harman. In which cases in which there is none would it be represented to Eloise that there was? More generally, where she sees a tree, what *else* does her experience represent to her as so? In particular, when, and why, would it be representing things that were in fact false? Where *part* of the content of Eloise's experience is

that there is a tree before her, what more content, if any, is there? More pointedly, what makes the correct answer here correct?

There are familiar constraints on a reply. The cases where it is falsely represented as so to Eloise that such-and-such had better not just be those where she takes that such-and-such to be so—e.g., where she falsely takes there to be a pig before her. That would reduce representation in perception to autorepresentation. That is not the view in question. Similarly, they had better not just be the cases where porcine presence is *indicated*: where a pig was to be expected, going by the looks. Nor, equally, should they just be cases where the perceiver *did* expect a pig going by the looks. For, as has been made clear, indicating is not representing. If representing merely echoed everything already indicated, it would be a (very annoying) wheel idling.

If how an experience represents things is fixed, somehow, by what the experience was like, one will not find the material for fixing this in visual looks, for reasons already given. If looks matter at all—whether in specifiable ways or not—one is forced to the other side of the divide: to looks for which there is, *per se*, a way things should be to be the way they look, that is, *thinkable* looks, the *import* of things looking as they do. That move gets one nowhere. For one thing, it only moves us into the domain of indicating. But should looks, or what an experience is like, matter at all to its representational content? Again, that we are represented to in experience is meant to be a familiar phenomenon; something we can tell is happening. It is not just events occurring in visual processing mechanisms of which we are all ignorant. It should not come as a complete surprise someday, to be sprung on us by future neurophysiologists, that we are thus represented to (uselessly, of course, since we were all ignorant of it). So yes. But, for reasons covered, there is just nothing in what perceptual experience is like to make the representational content of a given one some given thing as opposed to indefinitely many rivals.

Let us now try to use ‘see’ in Harman’s way. I will write this ‘see*’. The idea is to be: I see* a pig before me just in case either there is a pig before me and I see it (and, perhaps, some further condition as to my seeing it as, or to be, a pig), or What should follow this ‘or’? The familiar problems arise. Is it a condition on this disjunct of seeing* a pig that I see what looks like a pig? Or that things look as they would, or might, if I were seeing a pig? Or, anyway, that they so look *to me*? In all of this, seeing* would be very different from seeing. And it would do no more to bring representing into the picture that such looks do—a matter already discussed. Are the relevant cases just those in which I take myself to see a pig before me? Is autorepresentation the crucial feature here? If Harman wants to speak that peculiarly, fine. But now there is no plausibility in the idea that a pig is represented to me as there every time I see* one. *Must* I be so represented to in order to autorepresent? Can I not sometimes just take a pig to be *indicated* when it is not? In any case, since being represented to is one thing, and autorepresentation another, it still remains to say *in general* where the former phenomenon would occur. (To make the phenomena *necessarily* coextensive would just remove being represented to from the scene altogether.)

Perhaps, then, the relevant cases are just those in which the way things look suggests, or indicates, that there is a pig before me. (From the way that snout is twitching, I would say that it is a pig.) Again, a very strange use of ‘see’—to cover precisely what I cannot see, but must infer. But let that pass. For, again, suggesting, or indicating, is not representing. If these are supposed to be the cases in which it is represented to me as so that there is a pig before me,

then such representation is entirely otiose; a mere re-rehearsing of what experience has otherwise made plain.

Or perhaps the relevant cases are just those where things look as the presence of a pig does, or might. (Without further explanation, this picks out no definite class of cases. But that does not matter to the present point.) There will then be *many* diverse cases where one sees* a pig. It cannot be that in all of these it is represented to one as so that there is a pig before one. That idea, applied to *all* the things one would thus see* in any given case of *seeing* (e.g., a pig), would make representation in perception incoherent, thus not intelligibly representation. Too many things would thereby be represented as so at once. There are just too many things things look like.

Follow the 'or' with whatever you like, and it cannot be so that to see* a pig is to have it represented to one as so that there is one. The problems in filling the blank are just one reason among many why it is, as a rule, a bad idea to claim to see things that are not there. Just what are we to understand you to be doing? Harman's problems in answering our first question, and, more particularly, in saying just what seeing* is supposed to be, are just McDowell's in trying to make sense of ostensibly seeing. Ostensible seeing could, no doubt, just serve as seeing* if only we knew what it was.

I turn now to the second major question. Suppose there is a pig before me, and I see it. That is one case in which, according to Harman, it is represented to me as so that there is a pig before me. Just what is the relation supposed to be between these two things—my seeing the pig, and my being thus represented to? There are two ways of conceiving the matter. On the one, I have two separate sources of information. I am aware of two different things: first, the pig; second, being represented to. Awareness of neither carries with it, *ipso facto*, awareness of the other. I see the pig; it is otherwise intimated to me, redundantly, that there is one. On the other, there is but one source. I am represented to, and cognisant of that. To be aware of all that I thus am just *is* my seeing a pig—where there is one that I see. My awareness of being represented to then constitutes that awareness which seeing a pig (to be) before me is.

On the two-source view, I experience, in the relevant cases, its being represented to me as so that there is a pig before me. I am unmediatedly aware of that. Sometimes, when there *is* a pig before me, I am also unmediatedly aware of something else: the pig before me. I see it, *and*, in addition, it is represented to me as so. I thus have, twice over, reason to take it that there is a pig, each reason different in kind, each independent of the other. Perhaps whenever I see a pig, this other experience, being represented to, tags along. But it is never my sole source of awareness of the pig. It is an extra intimation or porcine presence. Sanity would be hard won if representation in experience were thus both inescapable and redundant—like a relative at the movies, reciting what you have just seen. Where I see a pig, that further intimation of one is gratuitous. Where I do not, and no pig is indicated, it carries no conviction. But experience is obviously not that way. No one thinks it is.

What remains is the one-source model. On it, on a given occasion of its being represented by my experience as so that there is a pig before me, there is whatever I would then *ipso facto* experience simply in experiencing that to be represented to me—something which, on the model, I might experience with or without pig before me. Then (since I do experience seeing a pig) there is whatever it is I then experience in seeing a pig before me. The idea is: though the first could occur, or could have, without the second, where both occur this

is simply because, under those circumstances, experiencing the first just counts as experiencing the second. Under those circumstances, where I experience the first, I could not also count as failing to experience the second.

In experiencing the first thing, I am aware, in a certain way, of certain things. *Mutatis mutandis* for my experiencing the second thing. By hypothesis, all there is for me to be aware of in the second instance is what there is for me to be aware of in the first, plus whatever experiencing that much then makes for me experiencing. So I am aware of no more than whatever I am in my experiencing the first, plus whatever that awareness then amounts to awareness of. So what I am aware of in seeing a pig (to be before me) is no more than that.

How may awareness of X amount to awareness of Y? It may just be that; or it may make for that—be all or part of what makes one count as aware of Y. I may experience all I do just in its being represented to me that there is a pig before me without a pig before me. So for me to be aware of what I am precisely in experiencing that cannot just *be* for me to be aware as I am of (seeing) a pig before me. What it might do, sometimes, where there is a pig before me, is make for awareness of that. It, and surrounding conditions, may make me count as aware of that. The hope must be that the awareness this delivers is that which I have in seeing a pig to be before me.

As a rule, awareness of something else plus satisfaction of surrounding conditions cannot add up to that awareness of porcine presence which we have in seeing one (to be there)—in my terms, unmediated awareness. Or, more exactly, if X is something there might be even without Y, then awareness of X (and whatever accompanies it *per se* in a particular case) cannot qualify as unmediated awareness of Y—the sort one might have in seeing Y. The rule holds where X is its being represented to one that Y is so (or present), where representation takes any of the forms we are familiar with. It holds equally, in familiar cases, where X is whatever is a part of the being represented to as such—uttering some words, say.

For example, Pia may learn there are pigs about by being told. She might, that is, if she is, or was, aware of being told. Being told, in that case, may qualify her as aware that there are pigs about. It might do that; but only sometimes. Not, for one thing, if she refuses, or omits, to *take* there to be pigs about. Not, for another, if she was not told because it was so—if that telling did not mean that there were pigs about. And not, for a third, if she was not entitled to rely on that. All these are things that sometimes happen. So her being told qualifies her as aware that there are pigs only given certain quite substantial contingencies.

These features make for mediated awareness, if any. They distinguish mediated from unmediated awareness. With the unmediated awareness one has in seeing there to be pigs (in seeing pigs), Pia cannot refuse, or omit, to take pigs to be present. The limitation is grammatical, not psychological. To see there to be pigs about is, *inter alia*, to be aware of their presence, thus of seeing *pigs*. One's stance on that score is thus set; one's mind made up. Further, if what she is thus aware of—the presence of pigs—*means* that there are pigs, that is not something it might or might not do all depending. So no substantial entitlement is needed, where one goes on that, to take there to be pigs.

The difference between seeing pigs and merely having it represented to one that there are pigs is not exhausted by such marks. In that unmediated awareness of a pig which is seeing it to be there, it is the pig itself whose presence forms my cognitive responses to it. It is its doings themselves which make me privy to them. I need not follow at one remove, by

following the career of something else, and taking the pig's career to be what it then must be. I need not, in particular, keep track of how I am being represented to, or of whatever it is (surely not the pig) that does the representing. Its being represented to me as so that there are pigs about *may* make me aware that there are; but (in familiar cases) it cannot deliver awareness of that sort—awareness in which no more than the relevant porcine doings is required for keeping me *au fait* with the changing, or changeable, porcine state of affairs; in which I need follow nothing else to keep abreast of its continuation or extinction.

I have so far spoken of a *familiar* form of being represented to: being told. What it delivers is at best mediated awareness of what is told. That should be undisputed. Why might one think that representation could work differently where it is in, or as part of, a perceptual experience that something is represented as so? Here is a line of thought. In your representing it to me as so that there are pigs about, there is both more and less for me to be aware of than there is when there are pigs about. There must be more; for even if you produce a virtual reality pig simulation, there must be something to indicate that this is to be taken as representing what is so, rather than, say, as representing what it would be like if it were so. There will also be less: the pig itself is no part of your representing; and, typically, your representing will look and sound nothing like a pig before me. By contrast, the line goes, where, in a visual experience, it is represented to me as so that there is a pig before me, such differences, or any that are phenomenological, are all erased. There need be, in such an experience, no more for me to be aware of than there might be where I saw a pig to be before me. There need not be quite as much for me to be aware of as there is where there is a pig before me, since there need be no pig (such representation can be false). But such an experience will be just like one of seeing a pig before me in this sense: in it things will look, or seem, just as a pig before me would, or might. There need be nothing further it is like for an experience to be one in which I am so represented to; and nothing less will do. So I have such an experience *just* where things look, or seem, that way.

The idea does not work. On the one-source model, I need be aware of nothing more in my experience than I am in my awareness of being represented to for it to be (made) so that I see a pig before me—that I am aware of its so being as I thus would be. Nor could I be aware of less—it is not as if I have some other way of being, or qualifying as, aware that a pig is present. But all I am thus aware of is what might be there for me to be aware of even if there were no pig. That leaves room for me, fully recognising all that, to refuse to take it that there is a pig there; room for all that not to mean that there is a pig there (even if, in fact, there is one); and so on. The marks of mediated awareness of a pig before me thus remain. And that would not be seeing one to be there. Perhaps I may sometimes count as having been aware, in a given experience, of the presence of a pig, and sometimes count merely as having been aware of things looking that way. It would be a mistake to take that to mean that my awareness of things looking that way could ever count as awareness of a pig before me, or could make for more than mediated awareness of that.

The idea is anyway a non-starter, for familiar reasons. On it, a visual experience is to be one in which it is represented to me as so that there is a pig before me just where in it things look as they would, or might, were there a pig before me. One could draw the look in question. It is, if anything, a visual look; thus equally a way things would, or might look if any of countless other things were so—e.g., if there were a peccary before me. So, on the idea, this would also be an experience in which it was represented to me as so—e.g.—that there was a

peccary before me. Nor would that be a matter of representing two different things as before me. The idea thus gives visual experiences incoherent content.

There is a fundamental problem. On the idea, an experience is identified as one in which it is represented to me as so that there is a pig before me by the way, in it, things look or seem, or by their looking, or seeming, as they do. As we have seen, there is nothing in things looking as they do to make anything the way things should be for an experience to be veridical—if it did represent, for things to be as represented. The one-source model requires our being represented to in perceptual experience to be representation of an extraordinary kind. But the idea of such extraordinary representation is bankrupt. The postulated representing is to be found neither in *what* we experience, nor in our responses to it, where one finds but autorepresenting. The one-source model thus fails. That leaves no room in perceptual experience for things to be represented to us as so. Autorepresentation aside, perceiving what we do *has* no representational content.

Harman writes,

Perceptual experience represents a particular environment of the perceiver. ... The content of perceptual representation is functionally defined in part by the ways in which this representation normally arises in perception and in part by the ways in which the representation is normally used to guide actions. (Harman 1990, p. 46)

Perhaps it is experience's sources, and not its looks, that give it content. But that idea leads nowhere. Issues of normalcy arise for repeatably enjoyable experience types. Whereas what we need to fix content for are particular experiences, such as the visual experience I am having now, say, with a pig before me. Any particular experience instances countless types. Which of these matter to its content? Certain types obviously cannot. My experience belongs to the type *seeing a pig*. But that I do, in fact, see one cannot make that represented to me as so. On Harman's account, a tree is represented to Eloise as before her just where, in his proprietary sense, she sees one. Whether she does that is meant to be a matter of how things look (to her)—on *some* notion of looking. So perhaps it is looks that, somehow, type experiences relevantly. These had better be visual looks on pain of misreading autorepresentation as being represented to.

We may, perhaps, ask how experiences so typed 'normally' arise—in my life, in human existence, or whatever. Perhaps some one such type is thus due to porcine presence. (Which?) Its action-guiding force might, for all that, be almost anything, depending on how one autorepresents an instance of it. One who takes himself to see a peccary in some one instance will be guided differently from one who thus takes himself to see a pig. But autorepresenting cannot fix how one was represented to. The proposal is thus left with nothing other than such a type—and thus with no particular action-guiding force—as that by which content is to be fixed. So any experience of this type, so mine, will be one in which a pig was represented to the perceiver to be before him—even where he plainly saw a peccary.

But do visual looks identify types that thus matter to content? Do *they* matter to content in some determinate way? We have seen why they do not. If they did, they would give an experience a face value. Where things were not, in fact, as they are according to that face value, the experience would be, *ipso facto*, deceptive, or non-veridical. To trust the experience would be to take it at face value. If looks fix, or identify, face value, that would be to take things to be as they look. But visual looks do not make *any* way the way things should be to be the way they look; nor do we suppose they do; nor is it them as such in which we trust. So they cannot type experiences that fix content. Nor does anything else. (Not, e.g., what they indicate.)

The fundamental problem is this. Being represented to in experience was meant to be a familiar phenomenon. That an experience would be deceptive, or non-veridical, unless such-and-such were so is something an experiencer was supposed to recognise about it. There is no such familiar phenomenon. There is thus no such work for sources of experience to do. Perception is not the stuff of which things might be represented to us as so. It is, in a crucial way, not an intentional phenomenon.¹

CHARLES TRAVIS

3 June 2010

References

Austin, J. L. 1962: *Sense and Sensibilia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Davies, M. 1992: "Perceptual Content and Local Supervenience", *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, vol. 92, 1992.

Descartes, R., 1971: *Meditations on First Philosophy*, in *Descartes: Philosophical Writings*, translated and edited by G. E. M. Anscombe and P. T. Geach, Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1971.

Harman, G. 1990: "The Intrinsic Quality of Experience", *Philosophical Perspectives*, vol. 4 (1990), pp. 31-52.

McGinn, C. 1982: *The Character of Mind*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

_____ 1991: *The Problem of Consciousness*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.

McDowell, J. 1994: *Mind and World*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1994.

_____ 1998: "Having the World in View: Sellars, Kant and Intentionality" (The Woodbridge

¹ I am deeply grateful to the editor of *Mind* (Mike Martin) for his patient, insightful and no doubt time-consuming efforts, for which this essay is vastly better than it might have been. He is not thereby accountable for any views expressed. The credit stands, still enthusiastically given, though some change in vocabulary has proven wise.

- Lectures), *The Journal of Philosophy*, vol. XCV, n. 9, September 1998, pp. 438-439.
- Peacocke, C. 1992: *A Study of Concepts*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1992.
- Searle, J. 1983: *Intentionality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Travis, C. 1997: "Pragmatics", in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Language*, Crispin Wright and Bob Hale, eds., Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
- _____ 2006: *Thought's Footing*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Tye, M. 1995: *Ten Problems of Consciousness*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1995.