

A Disjunctive Theory of Introspection: A Reflection on Zombies and Anton's Syndrome

Fiona Macpherson

Reflection on skeptical scenarios in the philosophy of perception, made vivid in the arguments from illusion and hallucination, have led to the formulation of theories of the metaphysical and epistemological nature of perceptual experience. In recent times, the locus of the debate concerning the nature of perceptual experience has been the dispute between disjunctivists and common-kind theorists. Disjunctivists have held that there are substantial dissimilarities (either metaphysical or epistemological or both) between veridical perceptual experiences occurring when one perceives and perceptual experiences involved in hallucination. Common-kind theorists have denied this.

In this paper, I examine the nature of introspection – a faculty that has often been compared and contrasted to perception. I reflect on cases where introspection goes wrong in ways analogous to that in which our perceptual faculties can go wrong and formulate, what I take to be, an attractive theory of introspection. The cases that I focus on in which things go wrong are the case of zombies and the case of subjects with Anton's syndrome. (Anton's syndrome is a condition in which people who are blind claim that they can see.) I suggest that, just as it is possible to be a disjunctivist about perception, it is possible to be a disjunctivist about introspection. I argue that this is a good view of one type of introspection, namely, introspection of states that have phenomenal character, such as perceptual experiences. It has a good account to give of the cases in which such introspection seems to go wrong and it yields a plausible metaphysical and epistemological view of the nature of introspection.

However, while I favour a disjunctive view of introspection, I do not favour a disjunctive view of perception. And, I suspect, that many disjunctivists about perception would not wish to condone my disjunctivist theory of introspection. I therefore go on to examine to what extent

disjunctivism about perception and disjunctivism about introspection are compatible, and thus to establish whether one must choose between the theories or not. I also identify why I favour a disjunctive theory of introspection but not of perception.

The structure of the paper is as follows. First, I discuss a reconstruction of an argument of Sydney Shoemaker's. The argument is valid and starts from premises, some of which concern introspection of states that have phenomenal character. The conclusion of the argument is that zombies are not possible. I believe that we have two reasons to reject the conclusion. One reason stems from consideration of the conceivability of zombies. The second reason stems from consideration of the nature of Anton's syndrome. Discussion of these two reasons comprises section two of the paper. If the conclusion of Shoemaker's argument is false then we have to reject one of its premises. It is not a straightforward matter deciding which to reject. In the third section of the paper, I propose a disjunctivist view of introspection about our states that have phenomenal character. In the fourth section, I elaborate and defend the theory and show that adopting this disjunctive view allows one to endorse the view of Anton's syndrome that I advocate. In the fifth section I show how this view provides us with a response to Shoemaker's argument. In this section I also argue that one should distinguish between different types of zombie. It turns out that Shoemaker's argument is right with respect to some zombies and wrong with respect to others. In the sixth section of the paper, I compare and contrast my disjunctive theory of introspection to disjunctivist theories of perception, explain to what extent they are compatible, and why I hold a disjunctive theory of introspection but not of perception.

1. Shoemaker's Argument

Three pieces of terminology common in the philosophy of mind are ‘phenomenal character’, ‘zombie’ and ‘ersatz states’. The first refers to that aspect of mental states, paradigmatically had by perceptual experiences, sensations, moods and emotions, which is to be identified with “what it is like” to be in such states, to use Nagel's (1974) well-worn phrase. I will take it in this paper, as is fairly standard, that ‘phenomenal character’ is a neutral term to refer to that aspect of mental states. Using the term does not commit one to a particular theory of phenomenal character; in particular, it does not commit

one to a dualist or non-physicalist or non-representationalist theory of phenomenal character (nor, of course, does it commit one to a physicalist or functionalist theory). Much has been written on the topic of the nature of phenomenal character, but entering this debate is not required for the purposes of this paper.

'Zombies', as defined in philosophy, are creatures that are functionally identical to particular normal human beings; humans that we presume have states with phenomenal character.¹ However, zombies lack all states with phenomenal character.

An 'ersatz state' is a state which has the same functional role as some mental state that has phenomenal character, but which itself lacks phenomenal character. For example, an ersatz pain is a state that has the very same functional role as a pain state, but which lacks phenomenal character – there is nothing that it is like to be in that state. Zombies are replete with ersatz states.

Shoemaker (1975) has argued that there could not be ersatz mental states. He illustrates the point using an example involving a genuine pain state that has phenomenal character and a putative ersatz pain state. Suppose, simplifying for the sake of argument, that the functional role of genuine pain states is as follows: they are caused by bodily damage and they cause observable behaviour such as crying and running away, and cause the formation of a judgment that the subject of the state is in pain, where this involves the subject judging, in effect (that is, even if they would not express their judgment using just these words), that they are in a state with a nasty phenomenal character and that this judgment, in turn, causes the subject to produce the words, "I'm in pain". Now suppose that there could be an ersatz pain state. This would be a state that had the very same causal role. It would be caused by bodily damage and then it, in turn, would cause behaviour such as crying and running away, and cause the formation of a judgment that the subject of the state is in pain, where this involves the subject judging, in effect, that they are in a state with a nasty phenomenal character, and then it, in turn, would cause the subject to produce the words "I'm in pain". Shoemaker argues that if there could be such ersatz states then this would introduce an intolerable skepticism concerning the knowledge we – subjects who have states

¹ Sometimes zombies are defined as being functionally identical to humans, sometimes physically identical and sometimes both. It is functional identity that matters here.

that have phenomenal character – typically take ourselves to have about our own phenomenal states. He says:

with what right does each of us reject the suggestion that perhaps his own case is such a case, and that he himself is devoid of states having qualitative character? Indeed, with what right do we reject the suggestion that perhaps no one ever has any feelings (or other states having qualitative character) at all? ... To hold that it is logically possible (or, worse, nomologically possible) that a state lacking qualitative character should be functionally identical to a state having qualitative character is to make qualitative character irrelevant ... to what we can take ourselves to know in knowing about our own mental states... [If] we take qualitative character to be something that can be known in the ways we take human feelings to be knowable (at minimum, if it can be known introspectively), then it is not possible, not even logically possible, for a state that lacks qualitative character to be functionally identical to a state that has it.² (1975: 295-7)

Thus, Shoemaker urges, we should reject the idea that ersatz states are nomologically or logically possible and thus preserve the idea that we can, and often do, have knowledge that we are in a state with phenomenal character.³

Now, picking up on the idea mooted in the first sentence of the above quotation, we can imagine a subject that completely lacks states with phenomenal character – a zombie – and formulate a version of Shoemaker's argument that shows that zombies are not possible. Although Shoemaker (1975) does not explicitly present such an argument, I will, nonetheless, call the following argument 'Shoemaker's zombie argument'.

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| Premise 1 | If zombies are possible then ersatz states are possible. |
| Premise 2 | If ersatz states are possible we do not know whether we have states with phenomenal character |
| Premise 3 | It is not the case that we do not know whether we have states with phenomenal character |
| Conclusion 1 | It is not the case that ersatz states are possible
(by modus tollens using premises 2 and 3) |

² Shoemaker's term 'qualitative character' can be taken to be interchangeable with 'phenomenal character'.

³ Of course the man on the Clapham omnibus would not typically express his knowledge using this terminology, but that is beside the point.

Conclusion 2 It is not the case that zombies are possible
(by modus tollens using conclusion 1 – hence premises 2
and 3 – and premise 1)

I find this argument, *prima facie*, problematic. As the argument is valid, we either have to accept the conclusion or reject one or more of the premises. Yet, the premises all seem like ones we should accept. Premise one, one might think, looks to be simply definitional of a zombie. Premise two expresses the skeptical worry that Shoemaker claims ersatz states would engender. Premise three looks to be a plausible claim about self-knowledge that we really do not want to give up. However, I think that we have two good reasons to reject the conclusion. This is why the argument is *prima facie* troubling. I do not want to accept the conclusion, yet it is not obvious that any premise should be denied. This paper addresses the question of what one should do in the face of this apparent dilemma.

In the next section, I will give the two reasons that I believe support the rejection of the conclusion. But, in the rest of this section, I would like to make a few other comments on the argument.

As I said at the start of the paper, I will be outlining a theory of introspection that is constructed by thinking about cases in which introspection apparently goes wrong. This is a methodology similar to that commonly used in philosophy of perception. One can think of Shoemaker's zombie argument as akin to the argument from hallucination, which is frequently considered in philosophy of perception. The argument from hallucination starts from the claim that it is a possibility that any, or even all, of our perceptual experiences could have been had when hallucinating and thus when not seeing the world. This alleged possibility is then used to raise the skeptical challenge of whether we really know about the objects and properties that appear to be before us when we have visual experiences or, if we do, how we can have such knowledge, given that the argument claims that the experiences we have are compatible with us not seeing and merely hallucinating. In a similar fashion, the zombie argument suggests the possibility that any, or all, of our introspective judgments to the effect that we are in a state with phenomenal character might be had when there is no state with phenomenal character being introspected. It can be used to raise the skeptical

challenge of whether we really know that we are in states with phenomenal character or, if we do, how we can have such knowledge given that the argument claims that the introspective judgments we make are compatible with us not introspecting states with phenomenal character. It is this skeptical challenge that is articulated in the second premise of Shoemaker's zombie argument.

One response to the skeptical challenge, as it is raised by the argument from hallucination, is dismissive. One might think that the argument raises the mere possibility of error, and one might think that such a mere possibility does not undermine our claims to know things by perception. And one might adopt a similar response to the skeptical worries raised by Shoemaker's zombie argument. Thus, one might think that the mere possibility of introspective error does not undermine our claims to have knowledge of our own states with phenomenal character, and thus that premise two is false.

I have two responses. First, *ultimately*, I agree that the mere possibility of error does not show that we cannot have knowledge. The purpose of this paper is to spell out exactly why, and in what circumstances, one can think that that is the case. However, I think that the possibility of error does raise a challenge – and one that ought to be addressed, not simply dismissed. The task of explaining how we can have knowledge, given the possibility of error, has to be undertaken, and I believe that it is a substantial task.

Second, note that in the perceptual case, those who endorse the idea that the mere possibility of error does not undermine our knowledge need to, and often do, differentiate between those possibilities that undermine our claims to knowledge and those that do not. For example, a 'safety principle' might be invoked that claims a subject only knows that p if, in all close possible worlds, if the subject believes that p , then p is true.⁴ The point of such a principle is to claim that only if the possibility of hallucinating without realising that one is, rather than perceiving, is in a nearby possible world – as opposed to a distant one – would our claim to know something by perception be undermined by the possibility of error. Alternatively, a form of reliabilism might be endorsed to the effect that if perception is a reliable process then it can yield knowledge, even if there are unreliable methods of forming beliefs

⁴ See, for example, Sosa (1999) and Pritchard (2005).

too, such as hallucinating.⁵ Thus possibilities of error whilst using a reliable process do not undermine our knowledge, but possibilities in other circumstances may. There are other responses that play a similar role of differentiating the possibilities that it is claimed raise a skeptical challenge and those that do not.

I do not find such responses particularly attractive responses to skepticism. They do not address the question of whether our beliefs are ever justified. These theories do not tell us whether we do know things – they can only tell us the conditions that would be required for knowledge.⁶ Thus, the theories provide what I will call conditional responses to skepticism. They say, *if* certain external conditions are met, then we know. Now perhaps this is the best we can do in response to external world skepticism, but it seems to me that this answer is *particularly unsatisfactory* when it comes to knowledge of my own mind. The knowledge that I have that I am not in the sceptical situation – my knowledge that I do have states with phenomenal character – is not conditional. I know that I have states with phenomenal character unconditionally. I know it, even though I don't know whether the externalist conditions apply.

To make the same point another way, it has been frequently pointed out that if the conditions that such externalists require for knowledge are in place, and on account of that we can be rightly said to have justified beliefs and knowledge, we would still not be able to make rational claims that we know things because whether or not we are justified or whether or not we know is a matter beyond our ken. For example, Crispin Wright says:

Cartesian doubt is already a second order doubt — a doubt about the extent of the knowledge we can rationally lay claim to. (2008: 401)

Now while this doubt may seem near insurmountable with respect to our knowledge of the external world, is it with respect to our internal world? Surely we *are* in a position, with respect to knowledge of our own minds, to make the rational claim that we know that we are in states with phenomenal character. If

⁵ See, for example, Goldman 1979.

⁶ See Klein, P. (2009: section 1).

so, the externalist approach cannot do justice to the epistemic situation that we find ourselves in with respect to introspective knowledge.

In fact, something even stronger seems to be the case here. I could know that I have states with phenomenal character even if the externalist conditions did not hold. For example, if the safety principle didn't apply to my situation – that is, if in the actual world I were in a state with phenomenal character, but in close possible worlds I were not in a state with phenomenal character but nevertheless falsely believed I was in a state with phenomenal character – then I still think that I could know that I am in a state with phenomenal character now in this world. Similarly, suppose introspection is not a reliable process because both zombies and non-zombies use introspection to ascertain whether or not they are in states with phenomenal character and I am the only non-zombie on Earth so most cases of introspecting lead to false beliefs about being in states with phenomenal character. Still, in such circumstances, I think that if I were in a state with phenomenal character, I could know that I were. In short, it seems to me that the introspective knowledge that I have of my own consciousness does not depend for its existence on conditions external to me. This intuition may be thought by some to be controversial, and I have not argued for it here, but it is a standard internalist one and if, like me, you share it then you will have all the more reason to adopt my account of introspection.

I take it to be a substantial advantage of my theory of introspection that it shows how we can know that we are in states with phenomenal character unconditionally – even if we don't know what external conditions hold, and in spite of the external conditions that hold. At the very least, non-externalist approaches to the problem of skepticism, particularly in the introspective case, are worth exploring. One should take this paper as such an exploration.

Earlier in this section I said that I believe that Shoemaker's zombie argument raises sceptical possibilities in the same way that the argument from hallucination does (even if I think that there are dissimilarities in the plausible responses to that form of skepticism). However, one might challenge this analogy. One might think it distinctive of the argument from hallucination that the evidence that one has when perceiving and hallucinating that one uses to form one's perceptual beliefs is the same – the same type of perceptual

experience – and this commonality of evidence is crucial in raising this kind of skeptical worry.⁷ One might think that the situation is not the same in the introspective case. When one has states with phenomenal character and is not a zombie, typically the evidence that one has and that one uses to form the belief that you are in a state with phenomenal character is a state with phenomenal character. But zombies, by definition, don't have this evidence; they lack states with phenomenal character. Thus, there is no commonality of evidence in the two cases.

In response, I think that Shoemaker's argument raises the worry that the difference of evidence that we normally think obtains in the case of internal knowledge is screened-off from us. The thought is this: you might be convinced that you don't just have beliefs that you have phenomenal character – you also have the requisite phenomenal character which constitutes your evidence for your beliefs about it. But the zombie will be likewise convinced. The zombie really believes that they are in a state with phenomenal character and not just in a state of believing that they are. No matter how convinced you are that you have further evidence than the zombie, so too the zombie is convinced. So the worry becomes, do you really have access to different evidence from the zombie? Isn't all you have access to your beliefs about phenomenal character and doesn't the zombie share those too?

Ultimately, of course, I want to reject this picture. I don't think that our phenomenal character is screened-off from us by our beliefs about phenomenal character. But I think that we need to respond to the potential worry that it might be. We need to make sure that we have a theory of introspection that shows how I can have knowledge of my phenomenal character, despite the possibility of zombies. My disjunctivist theory of introspection will do precisely that.

2. Rejecting Shoemaker's Conclusion: Possibility and Anton's Syndrome

Recall the final conclusion of Shoemaker's argument: it is not the case that zombies are possible. Why should one reject the conclusion? There are two

⁷ Of course not all philosophers will accept this point. Particularly, perceptual disjunctivists will try to resist this. But I am here exploring only one line of thought that might be brought to bear against the sceptical challenge under discussion.

reasons. The first reason is that zombies either are conceivable or, at least, appear to be so. Although the relation between conceivability and possibility is hotly disputed in the literature, I am inclined to think that the conceivability or apparent conceivability of zombies provides us with a reason, even if a defeasible one, to think that they are possible.

I believe the onus is on someone who denies that zombies are possible to show us why, despite their apparent conceivability, they are either not possible or not conceivable.⁸ For example, when Kripke (1970) argued that water was necessarily H₂O, he was faced with an objection that it seemed to some that they could conceive of water that turned out not to be H₂O. Such people would have no doubt said that they could imagine going to another planet, finding water on it, and carrying out scientific analysis of the water that revealed it to be XYZ and not H₂O.⁹ But Kripke had a fitting reply. He said that such people were not conceiving of *water* not being H₂O. Rather, they were conceiving of some clear colourless liquid, perhaps a liquid that filled the same functional role as water on Earth (for example, filled the rivers and fell as precipitation), turning out to be XYZ. Of course, as is well known, Kripke held that this type of strategy was unavailable to explain away cases where one imagined some element of the mind that had phenomenal character was present while some physical feature of the world was not present. While there can be a difference between water and something that appears to be water, he claimed that there was no difference between something that was a phenomenal state, like a pain or a feeling of heat, and something that merely appeared to be, or felt like, that phenomenal state. He would presumably have extended this reasoning to cases like that of the zombie, where one imagines some element of the mind that has phenomenal character being absent while some functional role is present, arguing that there is no easy way to explain away the apparent conceivability of such cases for there is no difference between the absence and the apparent absence of a phenomenal state. Thus, I believe the *prima facie* conceivability of zombies gives us some reason to reject the conclusion of Shoemaker's zombie argument.

⁸ Of course, one might claim that Shoemaker's zombie argument is a way to show why. I agree, and think that in face of both the argument and the point about conceivability we have a dialectical stalemate. However, that itself is reason to doubt the conclusion of the argument, if there are no further considerations to adduce. It is in that sense only that the onus is on someone to tell us why zombies are either not conceivable or not possible despite their being conceivable.

⁹ This scenario was presented by Putnam (1973).

The conceivability of zombies gives us a reason to believe in the logical and metaphysical possibility of zombies and of ersatz states. But recall that Shoemaker was even more concerned by the nomological possibility of ersatz states. The second reason to doubt Shoemaker's argument is a reason to think that such states, or at least states with the problematic feature of ersatz states, are nomologically possible, and perhaps indeed actual. The remainder of this section of the paper deals with this reason, which arises on consideration of Anton's syndrome.

Anton's syndrome is a classified as a delusion. The DSM-IV definition of a delusion is:

A false belief ... that is firmly sustained despite ... incontrovertible and obvious proof or evidence to the contrary. (1994: 765)

Other delusions include the Capgras delusion, whose sufferers believe that someone close to them (commonly a spouse) has been replaced by an identical impostor, and the Cotard delusion, whose sufferers believe that they are dead.

Anton's syndrome is a delusion in which subjects who are blind report that they can see. Moreover, they report that they can see particular things on particular occasions. They often try to explain away their failure to identify things in front of them by maintaining that they can see but that there is a problem on that specific occasion, such as the lights are dim, or they are not wearing the correct glasses, or they were not paying attention when asked.¹⁰

Here are three excerpts of a dialogue between a doctor (G. G.) and a subject (H. S.) who has Anton's syndrome, that helps to illuminate the condition and which brings out a variety of features of the delusion:

G. G.: What can you see of me?

H. S.: The head and ... you are wearing a white coat.

¹⁰ See, for example, Goldenberg et al. (1995), Hirstein (2005), McDaniel and McDaniel (1991), Raney and Nielsen (1942), Redlich and Dorsey (1945), Stuss and Benson (1986), and Swartz and Brust (1984). It has often been determined that sufferers have some form of brain damage. There are no reports of Anton's syndrome in congenitally blind subjects but Anton's syndrome can come and go over a continued period of blindness.

G. G.: (covers his face with a black fan – the part of the conversation in italics takes place while the face is hidden behind the fan): *Do you see my eyes?*

H. S.: *Yes.*

G. G.: *Do I wear glasses?*

H. S.: *I think not.*

G. G.: *Do you see whether I wear glasses?*

H. S.: *I think that you do not wear glasses but I am not sure whether this is right.*

G. G.: *Do you see whether I have a beard?*

H. S.: *I do not think so.*

G. G.: *Is there anything particular about my face?*

H. S.: *No.*

G. G.: *Do you see my face?*

H. S.: *Yes.*

G. G.: *Is my face light or dark?*

H. S.: *You've got some brown tan, not very light.*

G. G.: *Are my hairs long or short?*

H. S.: *A normal haircut.* (Goldenberg *et al.* 1995: 1377-8)

The doctor was, in fact, wearing a white coat. The subject, H. S., did not know this, however, and was drawing on her general knowledge of the situation (that doctors typically wear white coats) when giving an account of what she could see, as Anton's syndrome sufferers often do.

G. G.: (opens and shuts scissors): Do you have an idea what that might be?

H. S.: Are those scissors?

G. G.: Do you see them?

H. S.: Only vaguely. I guessed a little.

G. G. (silently hides scissors beneath the table [the part of the conversation in italics takes place while they are hidden]) *What can you see of these scissors?*

H. S.: Upside are the handles where you take them, and below them is the part for cutting.

G. G.: Are you seeing this?

H. S.: Yes. (Goldenberg et al. 1995: 1378)

In this case, it looks as if H. S. is using information gleaned from other sensory modalities, here audition, when making claims about what she can see.

[H. S. has claimed to see an exercise book.]

G. G.: Is there anything on its cover?

H. S.: I think there is something written on it.

G. G.: What could that be?

H. S.: I do not know.

G. G.: Do you see what type of writing that is?

H. S.: I do not know how to call that type of writing. There are small letters.

G. G.: Capital letters?

H. S.: No, no capital letters

G. G.: Latin Script?

H. S.: Yes. (Goldenberg et al. 1995: 1379)

In this final dialogue, we can see that what the subject says about what they can see appears to be influenced by the series of leading questions from the doctor.

The standard interpretation of delusions is the two-factor theory. The theory posits that in delusions the subject has:

- (1) an anomalous experience that explains why they form the delusional belief

- (2) an abnormality in their reasoning process that explains why the subject does not reject that belief in the face of what should be conclusive counter-evidence.¹¹

For example, in the Capgras delusion, it might be claimed that subjects have an anomalous experience of the feeling of unfamiliarity when looking at their spouse. They form the hypothesis or belief that they are not looking at their spouse, but at an impostor. Some abnormality in their reasoning process then explains why this belief is not overturned in the face of conclusive counter-evidence.

The explanation that is most commonly offered of Anton's syndrome, in line with the two-factor theory, is that subjects are undergoing a visual experience – or one rather like it, such as an experience had when visually imagining – as of the object, say a jotter, which they claim to see. This then leads them to form the hypothesis or belief that they are seeing a jotter, which is not overturned in the face of conclusive counter-evidence. Such evidence may include the fact that the doctor has told them that they are blind and that what they claim to see is frequently not there, and the evidence from their own non-visual senses, such as touch, which frequently conflicts with the subjects' claims about what they are seeing.

However, it is not obvious that the two-factor theory is the best theory of Anton's syndrome. There is a competing explanation. The alternative is that the subjects are not undergoing a visual experience at all. They merely judge that they can see and can see particular objects and properties on certain

¹¹ See Davis et al. (2001) and (2005). It is important to note that I will be suggesting an alternative to two-factor theories that posit an anomalous conscious experience as the first factor. This is how two-factor theories were originally explicated in the literature. It is possible to hold a theory that does posit two factors to explain delusions but in which the first factor does not involve a conscious experience. It may seem obvious that two factors are required to explain delusions: one factor to explain the formation of the delusional judgment, another to explain why this judgment is maintained in the face of conclusive counter-evidence. (The possibility of someone who forms the delusional judgment but who then jettisons it when faced with counter-evidence, attests to the need for two factors of this kind.) Anton's syndrome is slightly more complicated than standard delusions in that it seems that two judgments are involved: the judgment that a visual experience is being had and the judgment that the subject is seeing. As we will see, there are people who make the former judgment but not the latter: Charles Bonnet subjects. And it would seem possible to have people who make the former judgment and who then formed the second judgment but who then relinquish it in the face of counter-evidence. This suggests that perhaps at least three factors are required to explain Anton's subjects. (Perhaps even four factors are required if Anton's syndrome subjects are not having visual experiences but judge that they do, and if it is possible to have subjects who form this judgment but then give it up in the face of counter-evidence.) Thus, the thrust of my argument will not be that it is not the case that two or more factors are required to explain Anton's syndrome. Rather, it will be that one of the factors required to explain it is not a conscious visual experience.

occasions. I will not make a full and thorough case for this here, but I will give three reasons that cast doubt on the claim that the subjects are undergoing a visual experience.

The first reason to doubt the two-factor theory is that, according to it, the existence of the visual experiences is supposed to explain rationally why the subject forms the belief that they are seeing. It is supposed to make the formation of such a belief reasonable: the subject who forms such a belief forms it on account of a reason accessible to them – the visual experience that they have. But, it is not obvious that having such an experience completely explains in rational terms the formation of the belief. This is because having visual experiences is not sufficient for a blind person to form the belief that they are seeing.

Consider a different condition, known to psychologists as Charles Bonnet syndrome. In this syndrome, blind subjects, who are otherwise normal, report complex, vivid, visual hallucinations. But many report that they are not tempted for a moment to believe that they are seeing. The following quote about such subjects is telling:

The patients described the content of their hallucinations as people, animals, plants, a large variety of inanimate objects, and sometimes complete scenes... The hallucinations occurred both in black and white or colour. They could be clearer, equally clear, or less clear in comparison to reality... 49 patients (82%) stated they were always immediately aware of the unreal nature of their hallucinations. (Teunisee et al. 1996: 795)

One might think that the experiences in Anton's syndrome are more like perceptual experiences than those in Charles Bonnet syndrome, and that this explains why the Anton's subjects believe that they can see, whilst the Charles Bonnet subjects do not. However, this is not true. Vivid and complex experiences that are like perceptual experiences involved in seeing are often reported in Charles Bonnet syndrome, whilst the experiences of Anton's subjects are frequently described as vague, blurry and reflective of poor vision (Raney and Nielsen 1942 and Goldenberg et al. 1995). Thus, it is not the case that the Anton's experiences are more vivid compared to the experiences in the Charles Bonnet cases, which might have explained why only the Anton's subjects form the belief that they are seeing.

Moreover, one might have thought that the experiences in Anton's syndrome and those in Charles Bonnet syndrome differ as to whether they are under the conscious control of the subjects of the syndrome. If those in Anton's syndrome are not consciously willed, but those in Charles Bonnet syndrome are, then this might explain why only the Anton's subjects believe they can see. However, in both syndromes the experiences are not under the conscious control of the subjects of the syndrome. Therefore, the difference in the beliefs formed by Anton's and Charles Bonnet subjects cannot be attributed to such a factor.

Another reason to question whether the Anton's subjects are having visual experiences comes from detailed study of their reports. Consider the dialogues between G. G. and H. S. above. Sometimes H. S. reports that she sees some objects (such as the eyes of the doctor), but then she cannot report on the presence or absence of obvious features of those objects (such as whether there are glasses on top of the eyes). Moreover, what H. S. reports as being what she sees is clearly influenced by information gleaned from her other senses (as when she hears the snipping noise of the scissors), what people say is in front of her, and leading questions (as in the case of the writing on the exercise book). Moreover, subjects often change their reports of what they see in response to similar factors. These facts are not conclusive, but they suggest that perhaps such subjects are not having visual experiences at all.

It might be objected at this point that the above facts about the reports of H. S. would be fully explained if what is happening in Anton's subjects is that their visual experiences are changing in response to information gained from their other senses or from information given by others or from leading questions. Thus, perhaps what other people say and what noises the subject hears interact with the subject's experiences and changes their content and character.

Now while this could happen, note how unusual that would make the subjects' experiences. Imagine that you are sitting in front of a doctor. You visually experience the doctor and his white coat. Then the doctor mentions that he is bald and you suddenly now visually experience his baldness. An accomplice now tells you that the doctor is lying and that in fact he has long hair. Now you have a visual experience as of the long hair of the doctor. Suddenly the doctor mentions that he is thinking of dying his hair and only

now do you experience the colour of his hair.¹² Further, all of a sudden you hear a snipping sound and suddenly you visually experience a pair of scissors in the hand of the doctor. You are asked to comment on the writing on a book. You cannot make it out, but as the doctor asks you more and more questions so your visual experience alters, allowing you to at least comment on the font of the letters, if not what words the letters spell out. Such a pattern of experiences would be highly unusual. A normal person would certainly be disturbed by such a pattern and would report this. But Anton's subjects do not. Again, this fact is not conclusive, but highly suggestive that perhaps Anton's subjects do not undergo visual experiences at all.

My preferred alternative explanation is that Anton's subjects lack visual experience and, in the face of this, they confabulate. In describing what is happening as confabulation, I am not suggesting that the patient deliberately lies or makes something up. On the contrary, I assume the confabulation in such cases is not premeditated nor under the control of the subject.

Psychologists report that subjects are prone to this type of confabulation in response to a lack of information or in response to an absence of relevant experience. The confabulation in Anton's syndrome appears to be an instance of this kind of confabulation and would thus not be unusual.¹³ In the case of Anton's subjects, what is confabulated is nonetheless responsive to the subject's doxastic background. The beliefs that they do form reflect, and are coherent and consistent with, what the subject believes to be true of the world. They draw upon the, often minimal, information or misinformation that they already possess about the world in forming their beliefs about what they see.

So, on my account, the Anton's subjects lack visual experience and, faced with such an absence, confabulate and report that they are seeing. No doubt the organic brain damage that such subjects have suffered is responsible for this happening. However, what the subjects report that they see is intelligible. It is intelligible in light of their doxastic background. Their beliefs –

¹² Note that this is precisely what Goldenberg et al. suppose is happening, although they don't comment on quite how bizarre this situation is: "Visual sensations could also be *induced* by telling the patient that in front of her was a visible object." (1995: 1379, emphasis added).

¹³ See for example, Gazzaniga and LeDoux (1978) and Gazzaniga (1998). They note that split brain subjects often confabulate about their behaviour when they, or the relevant hemisphere of their brain that is posited to contain language, lacks access to visual experience accessible only to the other hemisphere. As Joseph puts it, "confabulation is ... likely when the language axis is functionally isolated from a particular source of information about which the patient is questioned" (1986: 516).

be they based on general knowledge, or on what their other senses tell them, including what they hear other people saying – influence what they report seeing. This theory renders the Anton's subjects as reasonable or rational as the competing two-factor theory. (Though not, of course, *completely* reasonable or rational for the subjects report seeing and experiencing when they are not according to this theory.) It explains why the reports of the subjects do not look like typical reports of visual experiences: the subjects are not reporting what they do because they have certain visual experiences. Rather, as the subjects' background beliefs change, so to does what is confabulated. Finally, this theory is more parsimonious than the two-factor theory making it at least a very plausible alternative to it.

Anton's subjects seem to make two types of judgments.¹⁴ First, they report, and thus seem to judge, that they are seeing things. But, second, they also report, and thus seem to judge, that they are having visual experiences. To use technical vocabulary, which the subjects themselves would probably not use, they seem to judge that they are in states with visual phenomenal character. They report that they have visual “perceptions” or “sensations” and comment that they are ‘blurry’ or ‘vague’ or ‘weak’¹⁵. Goldenberg et al. say of H. S. that:

The patient insisted on the visual nature of her sensation. She recognised that her visual sensations were not like normal visual perceptions, but at the same time would not accept the possibility that they were only mental images.
(1995: 1378)

Suppose that Anton's subjects do make such judgments. The two-factor theory would say that the first type of judgment is false, whilst the second type is true. My confabulation theory would say that both types of judgment are false.

With an overview of Anton's syndrome in place, let us now return to considering their place in the overall dialectic. Clearly, if there are *actual* cases (as my theory says there are) in which subjects judge that they are in a state

¹⁴ The reason I qualify this statement with “seem” will become apparent at the end of section three below.

¹⁵ Whether blurriness is a property of experience or can be explained merely in terms of how the world is represented to be by some experiences (as representationalists would believe) is disputed in the literature. The same debate could, no doubt, be had about weakness and vagueness. I do not wish to take a stance on this issue here. One might agree with the representationalist yet nonetheless think that attributions of such qualities to their “perceptions” or “sensations” by naïve subjects reflect their thoughts about their experience, which is the only point I wish to make here.

with phenomenal character when they are not then they are relevant to an assessment of Shoemaker's argument. They would be cases that whilst not ersatz cases – cases in which a state that lacks phenomenal character has *exactly* the functional role of a state that has phenomenal character – nonetheless share the feature of ersatz states that raises the skeptical worry concerning introspective knowledge. They would be cases in which someone falsely judges that they are in a state with phenomenal character (in this case a visual phenomenal state) when they are not.¹⁶ It is the possibility of judging that one is in a phenomenal state, such as a pain or a visual experience, when one is not, that raises the skeptical worry that perhaps any or all of our judgments are false and that we are not in a phenomenal state when we judge that we are. If my theory of Anton's syndrome is correct then this shows that such cases are actual. Even if my theory turns out to be false, by looking at this case in detail we seem to have opened up the nomological possibility, and, at the very least, the metaphysical possibility, of there being such cases. And it is, of course, the mere possibility of such cases that is required for Shoemaker's argument to get off the ground.

To reiterate the above in another way, define the simplest 'good case' as being a case where a subject has a state with phenomenal character and then introspects and judges that they are in a state with phenomenal character. Define the simplest 'bad case' as being a case in which a subject is not in a state with phenomenal character but nonetheless judges that they are.¹⁷ It is the existence of bad cases that raises skeptical worries. The conceivability of zombie cases and my account of Anton's subjects provide reasons to believe in the metaphysical and nomological possibility of such cases.

¹⁶ Not only am I not claiming here that Anton's subjects have ersatz states, I hope that it is obvious that I am not claiming that Anton's subjects are zombies. For example, when Anton's subjects report that they are in a state with no visual phenomenal character, they are probably in some states with phenomenal character, such as auditory or haptic states. Thus, when I say that Anton's subjects seem to falsely judge that they are in a state with phenomenal character I mean, of course, that they seem to judge that they are in a state with phenomenal character over and above the states that they are in that actually do have phenomenal character. One can easily imagine a 'pure' Anton's case in which the subject has no phenomenal states (for example suppose we temporarily deaden all their other senses) and then they go on and form the erroneous judgment that they are having a state with phenomenal character.

¹⁷ Zombies are cases that fit the simplest bad case description. Anton's subjects that conform to my confabulation theory typically will not, as no doubt they will often be in *some* phenomenal states when they judge that they are having a phenomenal visual experience, for example they may be having auditory and tactile experiences. Anton's subjects typically conform to a non-simple bad case template: they judge that they are having an additional phenomenal state over and above those that they are actually having. These non-simple bad cases also raise Shoemaker's skeptical worry.

Thus, we have some reason to reject the conclusions of Shoemaker's zombie argument, namely, that zombies and that ersatz states are not possible. We have some reason to believe that states with the problematic feature of ersatz states are possible and, thus, we should be concerned to address the skeptical worry that such cases raise.

3. A Disjunctive Theory of Introspection

The key to responding to the skeptical worry, I believe, is to deny that it is possible for someone to be in a state with no phenomenal character and yet to judge that they are, or for someone to be in certain phenomenal states (such as non-visual states) and to judge that they are in an additional phenomenal state (such as a visual state). I will deny these possibilities, yet at the same time, I will maintain that Anton's subjects are not having visual experiences. How is it possible to do both of these things at once? The way forward is to follow the example of disjunctivism in the philosophy of perception, but to apply it, not to perceptual experiences, but to introspective states.

For purposes of comparison and elucidation, I will very briefly outline one form of disjunctivism about perceptual experiences. A common disjunctive theory of perceptual experiences would be that, even though when someone perceives and when they merely hallucinate they have perceptual experiences that seem the same to them, these experiences are actually very different kinds of mental state. In the 'good case', when perceiving, the person is undergoing a visual experience that has what is seen as a constituent of the experience. In doing so, they are directly aware of what they see. In the 'bad case' where the person is hallucinating, they are not having that type of visual experience. The thing that is seen in the good case is not a constituent of the experience in the bad case. The person is in a state that is indiscriminable from the visual experience in the good case but, metaphysically, the states are very different. This metaphysical disjunctivism could be supplemented by an epistemological disjunctivism. This view would say that the experience in the good case and that in the bad have different epistemological significance. The experience in the good case can justify the belief of, and yield knowledge in,

the subject of the experience concerning what is seen. The experience in the bad case cannot justify belief and does not yield knowledge.¹⁸

I do not advocate disjunctivism for perceptual experiences, but I want to advocate a particular form of disjunctivism for introspective states of the kind that amount to putative introspections of states with phenomenal character.

The theory is this. We distinguish a good case and a bad case. In the good case, one is in a state with phenomenal character, say a visual experience (of course it does not matter whether the experience is one had whilst perceiving or when hallucinating). One then introspects this state and comes to be in a certain introspective state which has a content, namely, something to the effect, “I am in a state with phenomenal character”. I will call this introspective state a judgment. In fact we will see below that the introspective state has both features like judgments and features traditionally associated with an inner perceptual state.

In the simplest bad case, one is not in a state with phenomenal character, such as a visual experience. Nonetheless, one then goes into a state of a certain kind. This is a state that is, for the subject, indiscriminable from the state of judging that one is in a state with phenomenal character. The key thought is that the state one goes into is not an inner judgment. For want of a better term, we might call it a pseudo-judgment.

What indiscriminability means here has to be carefully spelled out. To do so, I will elaborate on the good case and the bad case again, in turn. In the good case, when one forms a judgment that one is in a state with phenomenal character, I claim that that judgment is partly constituted by the phenomenal character of the state that it is about. This is why I think it is correct to say that in making the judgment one comes to be directly aware of the phenomenal character of one’s visual experience – because that phenomenal character is literally a part of the judgment. This is to say that one’s judgment does not involve a representation of the phenomenal character, if that idea is cashed out as follows: that, were the same type of judgment made on another occasion, that judgment might be capable of misrepresenting that a state with phenomenal character was present in one. If there is representation of

¹⁸ More detail of the nature of disjunctivism and its various forms can be found in Haddock and Macpherson (2008).

phenomenal character by the judgment state, it is such that it is guaranteed to be accurate, for the existence of the judgment necessarily involves the existence of the phenomenal state, which is a part of it. If one thought that the nature of representation is such that it can occur only if there is the possibility of misrepresentation, as some but not all people do, then the most accurate description of the case at hand would not be that the judgment represented the state with phenomenal character but, rather, *presented* it to the subject of the judgment. Whether one chooses to say that the judgment represents or not seems to me to be a terminological matter of how one should define ‘representation’.

Thus, the inner judgmental states are like judgments in that they involve an affirmation of a content such as: “I am in a state with phenomenal character”. But they are like perceptual states in that having them essentially involves being in a state with a certain phenomenal character – the phenomenal character of the state of which they are an introspection. Moreover, the state provides one with an awareness of the phenomenal character of the state being introspected in a way that is direct and unmediated, because the state is literally composed of that phenomenal character. Thus the similarity between the nature of my introspective states and the nature of perceptual experiences, as they are conceived of by the perceptual disjunctivists, as providing direct and unmediated access to the world and being partly constituted by the world, is clear. Thus, my view of introspection shares some similarities with a view of introspection that that treats it as unmediated direct observation.¹⁹

One might ask: is introspection going on in the bad case? The answer is, in part, a terminological matter. But before explaining why this is the case, let me first articulate one confusion that might be motivating this question. One might think the following: what is being given is a disjunctive theory of introspection, so there must be two kinds of introspection – a good and a bad case. So surely a proponent of my theory must think that introspection is going on in the bad case. But there doesn’t look to be introspection in the bad case – for there is no mental state to introspect.

¹⁹ See Gertler (2008) for an excellent taxonomy of views of introspection and a detailed description of standard unmediated observation views of introspection. Other recent accounts of introspection in the literature, different to my own, that nonetheless involve the claim that introspective states are partly constituted by the states that they are introspects include Papineau (2002) and Chalmers (2003).

In response, I would urge comparison with the disjunctive theory of perception. That does not say that there are two types of perception, but rather that there are good cases in which perception takes place, and bad cases in which perception does not take place, merely hallucination. The theory is disjunctivist because it says that the bad hallucinatory cases are cases in which what is going on is to be analysed in terms of some form of indiscriminability from perception. Similarly, a disjunctivist about introspection needn't be forced into saying that introspection is taking place in the bad case, merely something is going on that should be analysed in terms of some form of indiscriminability from introspection.

With that in mind, I think that whether one says introspection is going on in the bad case, will depend on whether one takes introspection to be a success term or a term for some sort of process. On one hand, if one takes "introspection" to be a success term then one takes it that it can only go on if the process delivers some accurate verdict on what is going on inside one's mind. If that is how one understands introspection then it will be right to say that there is no introspection going on in the bad case. On the other hand, if one takes introspection to be some kind of process then one might think that in the bad case a process goes on which bears enough resemblance to the introspective process in the good case, to count as a process of introspection. If this is one's view of introspection then it would be correct to say that introspection is taking place in the bad case. As I said above, which option one chooses is a mere terminological matter.

Now, to further elucidate my theory: in the good case, if one introspects one's introspective judgment that one is in a state with phenomenal character, it yields a higher-order judgment to the effect that one is judging that one is judging that one is in a state with phenomenal character.²⁰ I claim that that higher-order introspective judgment, and any further higher-order introspective judgments (judgments that one is judging that one is judging that one is in a state with phenomenal character, and so on), are also partly constituted by the phenomenal character of the original phenomenal state that one first introspects. Thus, to speak slightly metaphorically, one can think of the phenomenal character of the original state passing on up the line of

²⁰ In this sentence, I am stipulating what happens in the perfectly good case. I am not claiming that this is the only thing that can happen if one has accurately introspected and judged that one is in a state with phenomenal character.

increasingly higher-order introspective judgments, partly constituting each in turn, in just the way that it constituted the original introspective judgment. Thus, the phenomenal character that is present in the original experience and that is present in the original introspective judgment is also present in all the higher-order judgments.

Compare this with what happens in the bad case. One is in a state that lacks phenomenal character. One then goes into a state that is indiscriminable to one from making a judgment that one is in a state with phenomenal character. The state is indiscriminable from a judgment in this sense: when one is in it one cannot tell that one is in such a state, rather than the relevant judgment state, by reflection alone. Crucially, this does not mean that were one to introspect this pseudo-judgment that one would go into the same judgment state that one would go into were one to introspect the counterpart to the pseudo-judgment that exists in the good case. Rather, one would go into a state that was indiscriminable from a higher-order judgment. Thus, one would not judge that one was judging that one was in a state with phenomenal character. One would go into a state that was indiscriminable to one from such a judgment, in the sense outlined above. Thus, again to speak slightly metaphorically, one can think of the absence of phenomenal character being passed on up the line, thus affecting every higher-order introspective pseudo-judgment in the bad case, thus yielding states that are indiscriminable from the counterparts to these states that exist in the good case – not yielding genuine judgments.²¹

Consequently, note that I do not spell out what it is for two states to be indiscriminable by saying that they are so if and only if they have all the same effects in a subject, as Fish (2008) does when elucidating his version of (perceptual) disjunctivism. Indeed, Fish becomes more specific, following Sturgeon (2000), claiming that:

²¹ To clarify my terminology here, the state with phenomenal character that gets introspected in the good case has as its *counterpart* the state that lacks phenomenal character in the bad case. The *counterpart* of the judgment that one is in a state with phenomenal character that exists in the good case is the pseudo-judgment in the bad case that is indiscriminable from this judgment. Similarly the higher-order judgment that one is judging that one is judging that one is in a state with phenomenal character, which exists in the good case, has a *counterpart*, namely, the pseudo-judgment that is indiscriminable from it – and so on for all further higher-order judgments and pseudo-judgments.

On this account, to say that two mental states are indistinguishable would be to say that they register equivalently in introspection, where this is understood as requiring the two states to generate equivalent introspective beliefs. (2008: 151)

Indeed, no theory could be at further remove from mine for, according to my (introspective) disjunctivist theory, the states in the good case and in the bad case never yield the same higher-order introspective states.

A further point to note is that although the bad case is indiscriminable from the good case, *what it is like* to be in any of the states in the bad case is not *what it is like* to be in any of the counterpart states in the good case. On the contrary, in the good case, the phenomenal character of the state that is introspected is part of the phenomenal character of the introspecting state and each subsequent higher-order introspecting state. In the bad case that phenomenal character does not exist, for the counterpart to the state that is introspected in the good case lacks phenomenal character. Of course this does not mean that there must be no phenomenal character at all to making a pseudo-judgment in the bad case (unless one is considering a zombie that by definition has no states with phenomenal character). In non-zombie creatures, there may be something it is like to make pseudo-judgments. You might think this if you think that there is something that it is like to make ordinary conscious judgments and to have conscious occurrent beliefs – it is just that such pseudo-judgments will not have exactly the same phenomenal character as their counterpart judgments which exist in the good case. It might even be the case that a pseudo-judgment and its counterpart in the good case have some phenomenal character in common. However, there will always be an element of phenomenal character that is present in the good case that is absent in the bad, namely, the phenomenal character of the experience that the judgment in the good case is about.

I have said that the bad case is indiscriminable from the good case in the following sense: when you are in it you cannot tell that you are in the bad case rather than the good case, by reflection alone. That is to say, you cannot *know* that you are in the bad case and not in the good case by reflection alone.²²

²² This formulation clearly draws on Siegel (2004) and (2008), and Martin (2004), which in turn draw on Williamson (1990). Williamson claims, “*a* is indiscriminable from *b* for a subject at a time if and only if at that time the subject is not able to discriminate between *a* and *b*, that is, if and only

However, I hold that the good case is not indiscriminable from the bad case in this sense: when you are in it you can tell that you are in the good case and not in the bad case, by reflection alone. Thus, you can *know* that you are in the good case by reflection alone. Indiscriminability, in this sense, is not a symmetric relation. X can be indiscriminable from Y, but Y need not be indiscriminable from X.

Some might wonder whether indiscriminability really can be a relation that is not symmetric. For example, if one focuses on cases where one is comparing two things, X and Y, simultaneously, say things that are observable in front of one, and one thinks of indiscriminability as being a matter of not being able to tell things apart, then one is apt to think that indiscriminability must be symmetric. After all, if one can tell that one of the things on the bench is distinct from the other (is X and not Y), then this gives one a way of identifying the other object – it is not the first object X (and therefore must be Y).²³

However, not all cases are like this. Specifically, many cases in which one is presented with only one of the items at a time are different. This is because, in some cases, one's ability to tell which item is before one will be altered by the nature of the item that one is presented with. This will often happen when these items are states of one's self.

if at that time the subject is not able to activate (acquire or employ) the relevant kind of knowledge that *a* and *b* are distinct" (1990: 8) Siegel modifies this notion in order to yield an account of indiscriminability that accounts for cases in which what we are interested in is the indiscriminability of mental states that are had at different times: "X is indiscriminable from Y by a subject S at time t iff S cannot know at time t by introspection alone that X is not Y" (2008: 209). Note that one problem that Siegel (2008) raises for perceptual disjunctivists who employ this type of notion of phenomenal character, namely, that they cannot account for the hallucinations of cognitively unsophisticated creatures, such as dogs, who can hallucinate yet are not able to form the relevant judgments does not apply to my account. This is because I use the notion of indiscriminability not to define hallucinations, but pseudo-judgments, which are not obviously such that cognitively unsophisticated creatures can have them. In fact, if there is a problem in this vicinity for my account it will be to say what, in addition to the lack of indiscriminability from the good case, makes a pseudo-judgment a pseudo-judgment and not some other state. While I don't provide an answer to this in this paper, I can do two things. First, I can claim that the indiscriminability condition is merely a necessary condition on being a pseudo-judgment. Therefore, note that in no way am I restricted to saying that indiscriminability from the good case is all that there is to being in the pseudo-judgment in the bad case. (Some disjunctivists in the case of perception take themselves to be restricted in a parallel way. They claim that all there is to having a perceptual experience is to be in a state indiscriminable from the good case.) Thus, there is no bar to my providing additional necessary or sufficient conditions for being a pseudo-judgment. Second, I can gesture, even if only exceptionally roughly, towards the kind of condition that might be given. One might think that a necessary condition for having a pseudo-judgment is that one must have a disposition at that time to utter the words, "I am having an experience", or words with a similar meaning..

²³ See Williamson (1990: 10-11) who makes this case for the notion of indiscriminability that I attribute to him in the previous footnote.

There are several examples of this kind. At one end of the spectrum is the case of sobriety and drunkenness. It seems plausible that on many occasions when I am sober I can know that I am sober. I can tell that I am not drunk. However, there are some (admittedly not all) states of drunkenness that are such that when I am in them I am unable to know whether or not I am sober or drunk.²⁴ My ability to tell whether I am sober or drunk is affected by the very state of sobriety or drunkenness that I am in.

Further along the spectrum is a case discussed by Bernard Williams (1978: Appendix III). Set aside cases of dreaming used to motivate skepticism: cases of dreaming that are supposed to be subjectively exactly like being awake in all respects. Restrict your attention to the kind of dreams that we typically have, which are not like this. Williams claims that there are some instances of being awake such that when one is awake one can know that one is awake and not dreaming (dreaming skepticism aside). But there are some cases of dreaming such that one cannot tell whether one is awake or dreaming. This is because one's ability to tell whether one is dreaming or not is affected by whether one is doing so. Often, of course, when one wakes, one regains one's ability to tell dreams apart from wakefulness, and one can use this ability, plus one's memory of one's dream, and come to know, after the fact, that one was dreaming. I take it that this is a fairly common occurrence.

At the far end of the spectrum are the following cases: being conscious and being unconscious, and being alive and being dead. It is often possible to tell and to know that one is conscious or alive and impossible to tell or to know that one is unconscious or dead (unless of course there is an afterlife).

In the case of introspection, the fact that you can know by reflection alone that you are in a state with phenomenal character, despite the fact that there is a corresponding bad case which is such that when you are in it you cannot know by reflection that you are not in the good case and are in the bad case, is the key to understanding how the view will overcome the skeptical challenge raised by Shoemaker's zombie argument. I will explicate exactly how this should be done in section five.

²⁴ The relevant states in which I cannot tell are, I think, those in which I am barely drunk and those in which I am completely plastered.

That is the disjunctive theory of introspection that I endorse. In the next section, I will do three things. First, I will explain how one who holds this theory, and who holds that Anton's subjects do not have visual experiences, should construe what is happening in the minds of Anton's subjects. Second, I will defend the view that pseudo-judgments are not judgments from a variety of criticisms and say more about precisely which mental states it is possible for people in the bad case to have. Third, I will compare and contrast my disjunctive theory of introspection with another form of disjunctive theory about introspection that one might adopt. Fourth, I will discuss an extension of my account that would cover other types of introspective judgment about experience.

4. Elaborating and Defending the Theory

So, what should one say of Anton's subjects if you accept that they are not having visual experiences and you accept my disjunctive theory of introspection? Anton's subjects appear to make judgments, which they seemingly express by saying that they are having a visual experience. But they are not really making such judgments. For, on the disjunctive view of introspection, you need to have the requisite experience in order to make the judgment – and I have argued that the Anton's subjects are not having such experiences. Anton's subjects do not make judgments that they are in states with phenomenal character; they merely go into states that for them are indiscriminable, by reflection, from making such judgments. Thus, the way I spoke of the Anton's subjects in section two was deliberately imprecise. On my view, the subjects lack visual experiences and they make pseudo-judgments that they are having visual experiences.

One might object here that there are lots of reasons to think that the Anton's subjects are making false judgments in the bad case and not pseudo-judgments, for example, the behaviour of the subjects and what they say. Can I really maintain that they are not? My answer comes in four parts. First, there are other theories of belief or thought which hold that in some cases there is not a belief or thought present when many, including the man on the Clapham Omnibus, would think otherwise. One example is the singular thought theory. Proponents of this view would say that an apparent demonstrative thought like "that is a banana" is not a thought at all if there is nothing answering to the

“that”. One tries to essay a thought, and perhaps even thinks that one has, but yet one fails – the phenomenology of the situation notwithstanding.

The second part of my answer is that I have a reason to explain why the subject can't make the relevant judgment. On my theory, the judgment partly consists in a certain phenomenal character and, in the cases we are concerned with – the bad cases – that phenomenal character is not present. This mirrors the answer that a singular thought theorist will give about why an apparent demonstrative thought has failed: because a certain object – one that the “that” should refer to – is not present.

Thus, on my view of introspection, a certain sort of error becomes impossible: judging that one is in a state with phenomenal character when one is not. However, one is not thereby rendered infallible in all one's judgments about whether one is in a state with phenomenal character, nor are one's phenomenal states self-intimating. For all I have said, there is nothing to guarantee that if one is in a state with a certain phenomenal character one will either judge that one is, or not judge that one is not.

The third part of my answer to the question about whether I can maintain pseudo-judgments are not really judgments comes from considering exactly what mental states I think it is possible for subjects in the bad case to have. According to my theory of introspection, subjects in the bad case cannot judge that they are in a state with phenomenal character, although they go into a state that is for them indiscriminable from making such a judgment. One might ask whether such subjects can go into related mental states. For example, can such subjects entertain the thought that they are in a state with phenomenal character?

To answer this question, one should distinguish between different types of concepts. There is a fine-grained view of concepts of phenomenal character that holds that there are in fact two concepts of phenomenal character. One concept of phenomenal character, PC_1 , is such that you cannot have it unless you have been in states with phenomenal character.²⁵ Another concept of phenomenal character, PC_2 , is such that you can have it without actually having been in a state with phenomenal character. Thus, a zombie that has never had states with phenomenal character can have the latter, but not the former, concept. Corresponding to each of these overarching concepts of

²⁵ Among those who hold this view are Chalmers (2003) and Tye (2003).

phenomenal character, are more specific phenomenal concepts. For example, there is a phenomenal concept of colour, PC-COLOUR₁, that you cannot have unless you have had an experience of colour. It is a concept of what it is like to experience colour that draws on one's knowledge of what it is like. There is another phenomenal concept of colour, PC-COLOUR₂, that you can have if you have never experienced colour. It is a concept of what it is like to experience colour that does not draw on the knowledge of what it is like to experience colour. People who are congenitally blind can have the latter but not the former concept of colour. Thus they can entertain the thought that they are in a state with PC-COLOUR₂ but they cannot entertain the thought that they are in a state with PC-COLOUR₁. Likewise, there could be two such different concepts for each particular shade of colour.²⁶

Now to return to the question: can subjects who are in the bad case entertain the thought that they are in a state with phenomenal character? The answer to this question depends on the nature of the subjects in question. If the subject is a zombie then they could not entertain the thought, "I am in a state with PC₁", on the ground that they lack the concept PC₁. But they could entertain the thought, "I am in a state with PC₂". However, not all subjects who can be in the bad case are zombies. A subject with Anton's syndrome could entertain the thought, "I am in a state with PC₁", because they can have this concept if they have, or have had, some states with phenomenal character (which, of course, typically, they will).²⁷ One can have a thought – even a thought that involves some PC₁ concept – without actually being in the state that has that phenomenal character, simply by drawing on, through memory, one's knowledge of what it is like to be in that state. For example, one can entertain the thought that one might be in terrible pain right now had the hammer hit one's thumb – a thought that employs a PC-PAIN₁ concept – without being in terrible pain. Indeed, most thoughts are such that one can think them in the absence of the presence of that which is thought about – as fantasy attests.

²⁶ In fact there may be particular shades of colour, such as Hume's missing shade of blue, which are such that if one has seen the shades of colour on either side of the spectrum of the missing shade of blue then one could come to have the first type of phenomenal concept of that shade without actually having experienced that shade. Such cases do not detract from the general point though.

²⁷ There are no cases reported in the literature of congenitally blind subjects with Anton's syndrome. But even if there were, such subjects would have had non-visual states with phenomenal character.

Therefore, on my disjunctive view of introspection, there could be subjects that can entertain the thought that they are in a state with phenomenal character but, at the same time, are unable to judge (judge falsely) that they are in a state with phenomenal character, and the concept of phenomenal character in question can be either of the PC₁ or the PC₂ kind. One consequence of my view then is that the conditions in which one can entertain some proposition are not the same as the conditions in which one can judge that proposition to be true.

But now the question arises, is it plausible to think that one can entertain a thought – and thus, as one might say, have access to the relevant content – without being able to make a judgment with the very same content? One might wonder why, if one can entertain the thought, one can't make the corresponding judgment in the bad case. Indeed, one might be tempted to think that if a view has the consequence that one can entertain a proposition but not judge it to be true, then the view is advocating something so implausible that it should be rejected.

I think not, however. One reason comes from noting that this consequence of my theory is not particularly odd. There are many cases where people think that we can take one propositional attitude to a content but not another. Here are four:

- 1 Those who think conceivability implies possibility think one can entertain some impossible scenario, but not conceive of it.
- 2 Many people think that one can entertain or suppose an explicit contradiction but one cannot consciously believe it (or judge it to be true).
- 3 Some people think that one can entertain the thought, “I do not exist”, but one cannot believe it (or judge it to be true).
- 4 Some people think that one can entertain or suppose that, “I do not exist”, but one cannot have a true belief that (or judge truly), “I do not exist, or have a false belief (or judge falsely), “I do exist”.

If you are inclined to think that any of these cases are plausible then I suggest you should not be dismissive of a view that has similar consequences.

The second reason comes from making clear that my theory explains why one cannot make the introspective judgment at a certain time, despite one being able to entertain the content. The reason is that the introspective judgment has the phenomenal character of the state being introspected as a constituent. And in the bad case, there is no relevant phenomenal character present to form part of the state. Thus the introspective judgment can't come into existence. On my view the process by which one forms the introspective judgment is very different from that by which one comes to have the introspective thought. The introspective judgment involves direct access to the phenomenal character that one is judging to be present. That the introspective process cannot take place should not affect the existence of a very different process that leads to the entertaining of a thought.

The fourth and final part of my answer to the question about whether I can maintain that pseudo-judgments are not judgments, urges someone who thinks I cannot to consider a slightly less radical-sounding variant of my view which would say that pseudo-judgments are judgments, only that they are radically different from non-pseudo introspective judgments in all the ways that I have claimed above. (Call these latter judgments, introspective “full-blown-judgments”.) This would still be a disjunctive view that advocates the existence of two different kinds of introspective judgment.

I suspect that I could make all the essential points of this paper whilst giving up the claim that pseudo-judgments are not judgments. According to the less radical-sounding variant, full-blown-judgments and pseudo-judgments differ in phenomenal character. Zombies can't have introspective full-blown-judgments but we (non-zombies) do, and because we can know that we do skepticism does not arise.

I suspect that this variant of the theory is little different from the more radical-sounding alternative. On both versions, pseudo-judgments are like ordinary non-introspective judgments in many respects, nonetheless, their nature is quite unlike that of introspective full-blown-judgments. Whether one thinks the epithet “judgment” should apply to pseudo-judgments, I suspect, might lie in one's willingness to flag up what seem to me to be the crucial and vitally important differences that exist between them and the full-blown-judgments, perhaps at the expense of advocating a radical-sounding view.

I will now compare and contrast my disjunctive theory of introspection with another form of disjunctive theory about introspection that one might adopt. One feature of my view, that in the bad case a subject cannot judge that they are in a state with phenomenal character although they go into a state that is for them indiscriminable from making such a judgment, is similar to a feature of the singular thought theory outlined above. According to the singular thought view, one cannot form a demonstrative thought, belief or judgment to the effect that “that is a banana” if there is no appropriate object around – in this case something answering to the “that”. One can imagine a disjunctive theory of introspection somewhat different to my own that explained the differing natures of judgment and pseudo-judgment by saying that in the good case, the judgment, “I am in a state with phenomenal character” contains a hidden demonstrative. It is really a judgment to the effect, “*That* is a state with phenomenal character”. In the good case, one can have this thought as there is a phenomenal state answering to the “that”. In the bad case there is nothing answering to the “that” and thus whilst one is trying to essay the judgment “That is a state with phenomenal character”, one fails to do so.

A version of this singular thought introspective disjunctivism might employ the notion of a quotational concept of phenomenal character. A quotational concept is one that has its referent as a constituent of the concept. A quotational concept of phenomenal character is one that has the phenomenal character as a constituent. It represents its referent as “That state: ____”, where the blank is completed by the phenomenal character of the relevant state.²⁸ Quotational concepts are clearly different from PC₁ or PC₂ concepts of phenomenal character. The latter two do not have phenomenal characters as constituents and one can be in them without having to be in a state that has a particular phenomenal character. On the singular thought view, in the good case, one would judge, “I am in a state with phenomenal character”, employing a quotational concept of phenomenal character. In the bad case, one couldn’t make that judgment, although one could make a similar judgment employing a different concept of phenomenal character, such as PC₁ or PC₂.

²⁸ The existence of such concepts is advocated by Chalmers (2003) and Papineau (2002).

According to such a singular thought view, in the good case, the introspective judgment is a demonstrative judgment that can't be made in the bad case, and the content of the judgment can't be *entertained* in the bad case either. The lack of the relevant state with phenomenal character precludes the employment of the relevant demonstrative concept required to judge *or to entertain* the content in the bad case. This is one crucial respect in which my view is different from this view. Recall that on my view, in the bad case, the subject can't make a judgment with a certain content but they *can* entertain the content. The content can be entertained as it is not a singular content. It can't be judged because the introspective judgment doesn't consist solely in what one might call a "brute affirmation" of a content. Rather, the introspective judgment consists of an affirmation of a content that involves a direct awareness of the phenomenal character of the state that one is introspecting.

I think that my disjunctivist theory of introspection view is preferable to a singular thought disjunctivist theory of introspection. For the reasons already given, I don't see it as a negative that on my view in the bad case one can entertain the content even if one can't make an introspective judgment with that content. In fact it seems a positive for, in the absence of a visual experience, it certainly seems to me that I can entertain the thought that I am having a visual experience. And it seems that this thought has the same content as the content of the judgment that I make when I do have a visual experience and introspect.

On the singular thought view, in the absence of visual experience, when I seem to be entertaining the thought that I am having a visual experience, two things might be taking place. On the one hand, I could be having no thought at all and be merely trying, but failing, to entertain a thought with a hidden demonstrative – thus being seriously deluded about whether I am even thinking. On the other hand, if I am entertaining a thought that I am having a visual experience, then it must be a thought that involves a PC₁ or PC₂ concept of phenomenal character – not one with a hidden demonstrative. This means that I am not entertaining the thought with a content that is the same as the content of the judgment I make when introspecting and which the singular thought theorist thinks involves a hidden demonstrative. But it certainly *seems* to me as if I do entertain the very same content, when lacking a visual experience, that I judge, when having a visual experience – and the

singular thought theorist should agree with this as their theory claims that the demonstrative is “hidden”. If this is the case, then I am wrong as to which thought and/or judgment I am having.

On either hand, I am wrong about my thoughts or judgments. Positing such massive error in normal subjects is an unattractive feature of this view. (The error that my view posits only occurs when subjects seem to falsely judge that they are in states with phenomenal character when they do not judge at all. But every view has to think that such subjects are in error – if you don’t posit the sort of error that I do then you have to claim that the subjects falsely judge that they are in a state with phenomenal character when they are not. But the subjects that the singular thought theorist claims are in error needn’t be in error at all on my view. Thus, the singular thought theorist has to posit more error on the part of subjects.)

Moreover, the singular thought theory allows that one might judge falsely that one is in a state with phenomenal character if that judgment involves a PC₁ or PC₂ concept. But then it seems Shoemaker’s skeptical worries can arise again concerning these types of judgments. Combine this thought with the thought that subjects often may not know whether they are making the sort of judgment that involves a demonstrative concept or not (because the demonstratives in question are “hidden”) and one can see that the singular thought theory allows skeptical worries to re-emerge involving introspective judgments.

Finally in this section, I will discuss an extension of my disjunctive account of introspection that is not only disjunctive about introspecting and judging whether a state has phenomenal character, but also disjunctivist about introspecting and judging whether a state has a *particular* phenomenal character, such as that had when I perceive red things. (Call that phenomenal character red'.) The extended account would be that one can only judge that one is in a state with a particular phenomenal character, say red', if one is in a state with red' phenomenal character. If one is not in a state with red' phenomenal character then one might go into a state which is indiscriminable from judging that one is in a state with red' phenomenal character – a pseudo-judgment to the effect that one is in a state with red' – but one would not really be making the judgment. Much more could be said to elaborate on such an extended

account. I merely record the existence in logical space for such an extended account here. I neither commit myself to it nor reject it.

5. Responding to Shoemaker's Zombie Argument

In the previous two sections, I outlined my disjunctive theory of introspection. In this section, I will explain how one can use this theory to respond to Shoemaker's zombie argument.

The theory I've outlined supposes that there cannot be states lacking phenomenal character that give rise to judgments that one is in a state with phenomenal character. This gives no reason to reject the third premise of Shoemaker's argument:

P3 It is not the case that we do not know whether we have states with phenomenal character

We should instead either accept Shoemaker's conclusion that zombies are not possible or reject one or both of premises one or two:

P1 If zombies are possible then ersatz states are possible

P2 If ersatz states are possible we do not know whether we have states with phenomenal character

When considering these options we should remember that there are more or less fine-grained, and more or less abstract, specifications of a functional system that we can give. For example, simplifying for the sake of argument as we did in section one, suppose that it is true that the functional role of genuine pain states is as follows: they are caused by bodily damage and they cause observable behaviour such as crying and running away, and they cause the formation of a judgment by the subject of the state that they are in pain, which in turn causes the subject to produce the words "I'm in pain". It might be possible to give a more fine-grained, and yet compatible and true, functional specification of genuine pain. For example, pains might be states caused by c-fibre firing that is caused by bodily damage and states which cause

activation of motor neurons which cause crying and running away, and states that cause the subject of the state to judge that they are in pain, which in turn, causes the subject to utter the words, “I’m in pain”. Likewise, a more abstract, yet compatible and true, specification of the functional role may be possible: pain is caused by bodily damage and itself causes crying and running away and causes the subject of the pain to go into some intermediate mental state, which causes the subject to produce the words, “I’m in pain”.

With this point in mind, I suggest that zombies are possible, so long as the functional roles that their mental states instantiate, and share with the mental states of normal humans that have phenomenal character, do not specify that the effects of those states involve introspective judgments about phenomenal character.²⁹ For example, one effect of the genuine pain states of normal humans that the pain-like states of zombies can share is that they cause the subject to go into some intermediate mental state (a judgment in the case of normal humans; a pseudo-judgment in the case of zombies), which in turn causes the subject to utter the words, “I’m in pain”. But if we give a more detailed specification of the effect of genuine pain states, stating that their effect is that they cause the subject to judge that they are in pain, then we mention an effect that the states of zombie pain-like states cannot have. Thus, when someone claims that they can conceive of zombies, I would argue that they are conceiving of creatures that have a functional specification identical to that of a normal human, but a functional specification that does not involve introspective judgments about phenomenal character. The functional specification is less specific and more abstract, merely involving some mental state that is (a) either a judgment or is indiscriminable from a judgment by reflection by the subject of the state and (b) has some of the effects of a judgment.

This ‘limited’ type of zombie is possible and their existence does not raise the skeptical worry concerning knowledge of our own mental states. This is because, as I argued in section three, the existence of states indiscriminable from judgments to the effect that the subject is in a state with phenomenal character (by reflection by the subject of those states) does not mean that someone who is really judging that they are in a state with phenomenal

²⁹ In a later article, Shoemaker (1981) makes a version of this response, distinguishing functional roles that include introspective beliefs and those that don’t.

character cannot know that they are in the state with phenomenal character and know that they are really judging that they are. Thus, Shoemaker's conclusion that zombies are not possible should be rejected in the case of these limited zombies. When considering this type of zombie then we should either reject either premise one or two:

P1 If zombies are possible then ersatz states are possible

P2 If ersatz states are possible we do not know whether we have states with phenomenal character

Which we should reject will turn on how exactly we define ersatz states. For now we can see that there are actually two different ways of making more precise the definition of ersatz states:

- (i) Ersatz states are states that lack phenomenal character but that have the functional role of mental states that have phenomenal character, where it is specified that such roles involve the subject of the state introspectively judging that they are in a state with phenomenal character.
- (ii) Ersatz states are states that lack phenomenal character but that have the functional role of mental states that have phenomenal character, where it is not specified that such roles must involve the subject of the state introspectively judging that they are in a state with phenomenal character.

If we adopt (i) then we should reject premise one for there can be limited zombies that do not have ersatz states in this sense. And we should accept premise two, for the ersatz states specified in (i) raise the skeptical challenge to our knowledge. However, if we adopt (ii) then we should reject premise two. It does not follow that the existence of ersatz states as specified in (ii) raise the skeptical challenge. And if we adopt (ii), we should accept premise one: the existence of limited zombies does entail the existence of ersatz states as specified in (ii). The difference between these positions is merely terminological.

I have claimed that ‘limited’ zombies are possible, but I also claim that not all types of zombie are possible. There cannot be zombies of the sort that instantiate the functional role identical to that of phenomenal states, where the role is specified to involve an introspective judgment by the subject of the state to the effect that they are in a state with phenomenal character. We should accept Shoemaker’s conclusion concerning such ‘unlimited’ zombies: they are not possible. Thus a restricted version of Shoemaker’s conclusion can stand.

Accepting this restricted form of the conclusion means that we do not face the skeptical worry that we, ordinary subjects of conscious experience, lack knowledge about our experiences and their phenomenal character. For we, and only we, will introspectively judge that we are in states with phenomenal character and, when we do so, we can know that we are in states with phenomenal character and know that we so judge. Moreover, the existence of the unlimited type of zombie is not supported by my interpretation of what is going on in the minds of Anton’s subjects. Further, there is a story to be told to explain away the claims of those who might hold that they can conceive of unlimited zombies: they are merely conceiving of limited zombies. Therefore, the reasons that I adduced to resist Shoemaker’s conclusion that zombies are not possible does not exist in the case of unlimited zombies.

My disjunctive theory of introspection makes a sharp distinction between judgments and pseudo-judgments. In turn, this allows us to distinguish between two types of zombie: limited and unlimited. The possibility of the existence of limited zombies is supported by what we can conceive and by my account of Anton’s syndrome. My disjunctive theory of introspection shows that the possibility of limited zombies and of people with Anton’s syndrome who conformed to my theory of it would not raise an intolerable skepticism concerning knowledge of states with phenomenal character. People who have conscious states with phenomenal character can know that they do.

It is the possibility of unlimited zombies that raises the more worrying skeptical challenge. I have shown how one might resist concluding that such zombies are possible. If some people hold, contrary to what I have claimed, that such zombies are possible, then the skeptical challenge remains to be addressed by them and will have to be tackled by them in an alternative way.

6. Disjunctive Theories of Introspection and of Perception

I have advocated a disjunctivist theory of introspection but, as I have already mentioned, I do not advocate a disjunctive theory of perception. I wish to say a few words about why one might endorse the former but not the latter. First, I will say a little about the compatibility of my introspective disjunctivism and perceptual disjunctivism in its metaphysical form. Then I will discuss the metaphysical and epistemic benefits of introspective and perceptual disjunctivism.

Perceptual disjunctivism comes in many forms.³⁰ As outlined in section three, there are metaphysical and epistemological versions of perceptual disjunctivism (often held together). The core thesis of metaphysical disjunctivism is that the experience in the good case (when veridically perceiving) and the bad case (a hallucination that seems the same to the subject as the experience had when veridically perceiving) are not of the same fundamental mental kind. In the good case, the relevant part of the world partly constitutes the experience; the bad case does not have this constituent. This claim seems compatible with the introspective disjunctivism I have outlined above. However, a stronger form of metaphysical disjunctivism is often held, in which in addition to the above claim, it is held that it is a sufficient condition for a state to be a perceptual experience (either one involved in perceiving or one involved in hallucination) that it is indiscriminable from a veridical perceptual experience.³¹ This claim is often articulated further by saying that what it is for a state to have perceptual phenomenal character is just for it to be indiscriminable from an experience had in the good case.

Prima facie, my disjunctive theory of introspection is incompatible with this strong form of perceptual disjunctivism. This is because my theory suggests that there can be a subject that is in a state that is indiscriminable from having a veridical perceptual experience but who is not having a perceptual experience. This is because a subject might be in a state that lacked phenomenal character altogether, but they would be in a state that was indiscriminable from an experience had in the good case. So on my account, a

³⁰ See Haddock and Macpherson (2008).

³¹ See Martin (2004) and (2006), Fish (2008) and Sturgeon (2008).

subject can lack a perceptual experience with phenomenal character yet they can satisfy the strong perceptual disjunctivist analysis sufficient for being in such a state. (Recall that I suggested that this was what was happening in the case of Anton's syndrome and of zombies.) Other quite different examples of this type – where intuitively a subject is not in a state with perceptual phenomenal character yet satisfies the indiscriminability condition – have been concocted by A. D. Smith (2008) as problem cases for this strong disjunctivism.

However, some people might resist the thought that these positions are incompatible. Fish (2008), for example, is happy to endorse the idea that hallucinations lack phenomenal character, although he claims they will seem to have it.³² Thus, he could say that the Anton's subjects, as I conceive of them, are having hallucinations and are having perceptual experiences, it is just that such states lack phenomenal character, therefore that it is unproblematic if those states satisfy the indiscriminability condition. However, this view only gains compatibility between the views by stretching the notion of hallucination and perceptual experience to include states that lack phenomenal character. This is certainly stretching the term beyond its usual usage, and in a way that I would resist. I believe that we should take it as a given that perceptual experiences are states with phenomenal character. So the moral is that if one thinks that one can have hallucinations and perceptual experiences without being in a state with phenomenal character then one can think that my disjunctive view of introspection and strong metaphysical disjunctivism about experiences are compatible, but if one wishes to uphold the more traditional philosophical terminology where hallucinations and perceptual experiences must be states with phenomenal character then the views are incompatible.

Turning now to metaphysical considerations for favouring introspective disjunctivism over perceptual disjunctivism, one feature of perceptual disjunctivism, of the sort I outlined above, that some people do not

³² M. G. F. Martin (2006) also claims that hallucinations can lack phenomenal character. However, he claims that one can distinguish between states that are hallucinations that have phenomenal character and states that lack it, when both are indiscriminable by reflection by the subject of those states from veridical perceptual experiences, by introducing a notion of impersonal discriminability. This notion is such that we consider not just what the subject of the state can discriminate but what an ideal subject could discriminate and thus what is discriminable *simpliciter*. The idea is that only states that have perceptual phenomenal character will be impersonally indiscriminable from veridical perceptual experiences. States that lack such phenomenal character could be impersonally discriminated, even if the subject of the state can't actually discriminate it. However, Martin's notion of impersonal indiscriminability has been strongly criticised by Siegel (2004) and (2008) and Smith (2008).

like is its commitment to the idea that what one sees, say a table or a dog, is literally a part of one's mental state. Some people worry about whether physical objects at a remove from one's body can be part of one's mental states. Such people may be conservative in their mereological principles or perhaps they think that mental states are not physical states and so are concerned about how such states can have physical components. I won't argue that these worries are legitimate or justified. But if one held them then this would give one a reason to reject perceptual disjunctivism. However, one wouldn't have reason to reject my disjunctive view of introspection. This is because my view only holds that mental states, or the phenomenal characters of mental states, can be parts of other mental states.

Finally, are there any epistemological reasons to endorse introspective disjunctivism but reject perceptual disjunctivism? I think that introspective disjunctivism overcomes skepticism concerning knowledge of our own minds but it is not so clear that epistemological disjunctivism about perception is as successful at dealing with external world skepticism. Epistemological perceptual disjunctivism says that the veridical experience had whilst perceiving in the good case has a different epistemic status from the visual experience in the bad, hallucinatory case. The former can yield knowledge of the external world, the latter cannot.

Recall that I claimed that when introspecting one's state with phenomenal character one can know that one is in a state with phenomenal character and one can further introspect and, all being well, one can come to know that one knows. One reason in favour of the thought that one can really know, and know that one knows, in the introspective case is that how things are in the good case and the counterpart bad case are radically different phenomenally for one in the two cases. The phenomenal character that exists in the good case, not only the phenomenal character of the experience but also the phenomenal character of the judgments, does not exist in the counterpart states in the bad case.

Now consider what McDowell says when considering perception and hallucination and what he claims is their distinctive epistemic status when he is promoting his epistemic perceptual disjunctivism:

The root idea is that one's epistemic standing on some question cannot

intelligibly be constituted, even in part, by matters blankly external to how it is with one subjectively. For how could such matters be other than beyond one's ken? And how could matters beyond one's ken make any difference to one's epistemic standing?" (1982: 215)

McDowell is *not* here promoting the attractive idea of the last paragraph that the phenomenal character of one's experience in the bad case and the good case must be different if they are to have a different epistemic status, as he might seem, at first blush, to be doing. For McDowell also claims that how things appear to one will be the same in both hallucination and perception, despite their distinctive epistemic status. Rather McDowell claims that, in the good case, one sees that *p* and he holds that this factive state is a state of one's subjectivity and that, when one sees, that is the fact being made manifest to one's subjectivity. One might think of McDowell's epistemological disjunctivism as trying to do justice at the same time to the fact that the states in the good and bad cases seem the same to one and the fact that one's mind must, in some sense, be different in the two cases if the states are to differ epistemically.

Does McDowell do enough to persuade us that the mind of a subject is sufficiently different in hallucination and perception to warrant attribution of different epistemic status? One might think not. One might hold that a difference in phenomenal character is precisely what *is* required in order to warrant attribution of a different epistemic status to the states. (At least if one has internalist sympathies one will.) If one thinks that then one will think that my theory of introspective disjunctivism does what McDowell's theory of perceptual disjunctivism does not: it guarantees that the minds of subjects are sufficiently different when they introspect and gain knowledge of their mind compared to when they merely seem to do this. According to my theory there is no doubt that the minds of the subjects *are* sufficiently different when introspecting accurately and when pseudo-judging. The ground for making an introspective judgment about experience is the very experience and its phenomenal character that one is judging. And one has the ground literally in one's mind when one accurately judges that one has an experience. Of course one does not have this ground when one lacks an experience but pseudo-judges that one is experiencing. The having or lacking of this ground clearly makes a phenomenal difference to one's mind.

Most people hold that, in the case of perception, the ground for making a judgment about the external world is an experience of the world not the external world itself. If one is not a disjunctivist about perception, one will think that this experience can exist in both the good and the bad case and thus that one has the same grounds in both cases. McDowell and other disjunctivists resist this thought, holding that the experience in the good case is partly constituted by the external world, therefore claiming that one's grounds in the two cases are not the same. But, as we have just seen, McDowell does not think that when the fact partly constitutes one's experience in the good case it manifests itself by presenting a different phenomenal character to one's mind compared with the bad case. Thus, one might think that the fact is not really "made manifest" to the subject in the crucial way to guarantee a distinctive epistemic status.

Of course, some disjunctivists might insist that in the good perceptual case one's phenomenal character is literally constituted by the external world and its properties and, as this is not so in the bad case, the phenomenal character in the two cases is different after all. However, it would not be unreasonable, in my opinion, to think that this is gross *terminological hoodwinking*. The experience in the good case and the bad case are such that *in principle* one could not tell them apart just by reflection on those experiences – nor could any expert tell them apart in principle just by reflection. *What it is like* for the subject in each case is *in principle* the same. Therefore, if one labels any differences between the good case and bad case experiences as being differences of phenomenal character one is certainly not using that term with its standard usage.

In opposition to the picture presented by perceptual disjunctivists, the mental states of the subjects in the good and bad introspective states are truly very different in phenomenal character according to my theory. The good case is discriminable from the bad case. There is a phenomenal difference between the good and bad introspective cases and it is this difference in phenomenal character that underpins the claim that one has knowledge in the good introspective case. As stated in the previous paragraph, however, I believe that there is not a difference in phenomenal character between the good and the bad perceptual cases and this shows that attribution of knowledge in the good perceptual case cannot be done for the same reason as

it is in the good introspective case. Whether it can be done for any good reason in the perceptual case remains an unanswered question.

7. Conclusion

I have claimed that in response to Shoemaker's argument we either need to explain away the seeming possibility of zombies or show that one of the premises concerning introspective knowledge about our experiences is false. *Prima facie*, the conceivability of zombies and the confabulation theory of Anton's syndrome seem to imply that Shoemaker is wrong about introspective knowledge. I have proposed a view of introspective knowledge about phenomenal character of a disjunctive sort in which if a subject has no state with phenomenal character then they can't form a judgment that they are in a state with phenomenal character. This view is interesting as it uses a disjunctivist style of consideration usually favoured by non-Cartesians about the mind to argue for what is in many respects a fairly traditional, Cartesian view of the mind. This view allows one to accept the confabulation theory of Anton's syndrome, it partially vindicates the conclusion of Shoemaker's argument, and makes clear which kind of zombies are possible and which are not.³³

References

- Brueckner, A. and Fiocco, M. O. (2002) "Williamson's Anti-Luminosity Argument", *Philosophical Studies*, 110: 285-93.
- Chalmers, D. (2003) "The Content and Epistemology of Phenomenal Belief", in Q. Smith and A. Jokic (eds.) *Consciousness: New Philosophical Perspectives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Davies, M., Coltheart, M., Langdon, R. and Breen, N. (2001) "Monothematic Delusions: Towards a Two-Factor Account" *Philosophy, Psychiatry and Psychology*, 8: 133-58.
- Davies, M., Davies A. A. and Coltheart, M. (2005) "Anosognosia and the Two-Factor Theory of Delusions", *Mind and Language*, 20: 209-36.

³³ I would like to thank Michael Brady, David Chalmers, Max Coltheart, Stuart Crutchfield, Duncan Pritchard and Nicholas Silins for helpful discussion. I would particularly like to thank William Fish who helped me work out the case for my theory of Anton's syndrome in detail.

- DSM-IV (1994) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition*, Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association).
- Evans, G. (1982) *The Varieties of Reference*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fish, W (2008) "Disjunctivism, Indistinguishability and the Nature of Hallucination", in A. Haddock and F. Macpherson (eds.) *Disjunctivism: Perception, Action, Knowledge*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gazzaniga, M. S. and LeDoux, J. E. (1978) *The Integrated Mind*, New York: Plenum Press.
- Gazzaniga, M. S. (1998) *The Mind's Past*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gertler, B. (2008) "Self-Knowledge", in E. N. Zalta (ed.) The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2008 Edition), <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2008/entries/self-knowledge/>.
- Goldenberg, G., Müllbacher, W. and Nowak, A. (1995) "Imagery Without Perception – A Case Study of Anosognosia for Cortical Blindness", *Neuropsychologia*, 33: 1373-82.
- Goldman, A. (1979) "What is Justified True Belief", in G. Pappas (ed.) *Justification and Knowledge: New Studies in Epistemology*, Dordrecht: D. Riedel.
- Haddock, A. and Macpherson, F. (2008) "Varieties of Disjunctivism", in their *Disjunctivism: Perception, Action, Knowledge*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hirstein, W. (2005) *Brain Fiction: Self-Deception and the Riddle of Confabulation*, Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Joseph, R. (1986) "Confabulation and Delusional Denial: Frontal Lobe and Lateralized Influences", *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 42: 507-20.
- Klein, P. (2009) "Skepticism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (Spring 2009 Edition), E. N. Zalta (ed.), <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2009/entries/skepticism/>.
- Kripke, S. (1970) *Naming and Necessity*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Martin, M. G. F. (2004) "The Limits of Self-Awareness", *Philosophical Studies*, 120: 37-89.

- (2006) “On Being Alienated”, in T. S. Gendler and J. Hawthorne (eds.) *Perceptual Experience*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McDaniel, K. D. and McDaniel, L. D. (1991) “Anton’s Syndrome in a Patient with Posttraumatic Optic Neuropathy and Bifrontal Contusions”, *Archives of Neurology*, 48: 101-5.
- McDowell, J. (1982) “Criteria, Defeasibility, and Knowledge”, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 68: 455-79. [Reprinted in J. Dancy (ed.) *Perceptual Knowledge*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, page numbers refer to this reprint.]
- Nagel, T. (1974) “What Is It Like to Be a Bat?”, *The Philosophical Review*, 83 (4): 435-50.
- Neta, R. and Rohrbaugh, G. (2004) "Luminosity and the Safety of Knowledge", *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly*, 85: 396-406.
- Noe, A. (2002) “Is the Visual World a Grand Illusion?” *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 9(5-6): 1-12.
- Papineau, D. (2002) *Thinking About Consciousness*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pritchard, D. (2005) *Epistemic Luck*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Putnam, H. (1973) “Meaning and Reference”, *Journal of Philosophy*, 70: 699-711.
- Raney, A. A. and Nielsen, J. M. (1942) “Denial of Blindness (Anton’s Symptom): Two Clinical Cases”, *Bulletin of the Los Angeles Neurological Society*, 7: 150-1.
- Redlich, F. C. and Dorsey, J. F. (1945) “Denial of Blindness by Patients with Cerebral Disease”, *Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry*, 53: 407-17.
- Schaffer, J. (unpublished manuscript) “The Debasing Demon”.
- Schwitzgebel, E. (2002) “How Well Do We Know Our Own Conscious Experience? The Case of Visual Imagery” (2002), *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 9(5-6): 35-53.
- (forthcoming) “The Unreliability of Naïve Introspection”, *Philosophical Review*.
- Shoemaker, S. (1975) “Functionalism and Qualia”, *Philosophical Studies*, 27: 291-315.
- (1981) “Absent Qualia are Impossible”, *Philosophical Review*, 90: 581-599.
- Siegel, S. (2004) “Indiscriminability and the Phenomenal”, *Philosophical Studies*, 120: 91-112

- (2008) “The Epistemic Conception of Hallucination”, in A. Haddock and F. Macpherson (eds.) *Disjunctivism: Perception, Action, Knowledge*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, A. D. (2008) “Disjunctivism and Discriminability”, in A. Haddock and F. Macpherson (eds.) *Disjunctivism: Perception, Action, Knowledge*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sosa, E. (1999) “How to Defeat Opposition to Moore”, *Philosophical Perspectives*, 13: 141-53.
- Sturgeon, S. (2000) *Matters of Mind: Consciousness, Reason and Nature*, London: Routledge.
- (2008) “Disjunctivism about Visual Experience”, in A. Haddock and F. Macpherson (eds.) *Disjunctivism: Perception, Action, Knowledge*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stuss, D. T. and Benson, D. F. (1986) *The Frontal Lobes*, New York: Raven.
- Swartz, B. E. and Brust, J. C. M. (1984) “Anton’s Syndrome Accompanying Withdrawal Hallucinosis in a Blind Alcoholic”, *Neurology*, 34: 969-73.
- Teunisse, R. J., Cruysberg, J. R., Hoefnagels, W. H., Verbeek, A. L. and Zitman, F. G. (1996) “Visual Hallucinations in Psychologically Normal People: Charles Bonnet’s Syndrome”, *The Lancet*, 347: 794-97.
- Tye, M. (2003) “A Theory of Phenomenal Concepts”, in A. O’Hear (ed.) *Minds and Persons*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, B. (1978) *Descartes: The Project of Pure Inquiry*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Press.
- Williamson, T. (1990) *Identity and Discrimination*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- (2000) *Knowledge and Its Limits*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, C. (2008) “Comment on John McDowell’s ‘The Disjunctive Conception of Experience as Material for a Transcendental Argument’”, in A. Haddock and F. Macpherson (eds.) *Disjunctivism: Perception, Action, Knowledge*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.