

Daniel Immerman
Phil Mind

Reading Questions for April 4

These questions cover Andrew's presentation and the first part of a chapter by Alex Byrne and Heather Logue called "Introduction" from a book titled *Disjunctivism: Contemporary Readings*. The answers do not have to be turned in. You will probably have to read more than once to get the answers.

Background:

We'll start with Andrew's Q and A. Next we'll start our discussion of the question: Are cases of normal perception and hallucination/misperception radically different? In answering this question, we'll spend this week looking at the chapter from Byrne and Logue, which summarizes key positions and arguments from various philosophers taking part in this debate. Today we're going to spend most of the time getting clear on terms and on connecting this debate with one we've seen earlier regarding the problem of other minds. Then next Monday we'll look at a chapter from another book that examines what psychologists can add to this debate.

Questions:

1. (*) What questions do you have for Andrew? (Note: I've posted a small handout about what sorts of questions to ask during a philosophy Q and A in the section of the calendar page of the class website devoted to today's class.)
2. In their first section, "What is Disjunctivism" (pages vii to xi), Byrne and Logue introduce three views, "disjunctivism", "The Cartesian view" and "the moderate view". What are these three views?
3. In their second section, "Distinctions between Disjunctivisms" (pages xi to xiv), Byrne and Logue introduce several distinctions. One is a distinction between a " $V \vee I/H$ disjunctivism" and a " $VI \vee H$ disjunctivism." Another is between "positive disjunctivism" and "negative disjunctivism." What are the distinctions?

4. (*) On pages xiv-xvi, Byrne and Logue discuss John McDowell's views. McDowell endorses a view called epistemic disjunctivism. What is this view, what are his reasons for endorsing it, and are they plausible? How do you think epistemic disjunctivism is related to disjunctivism as it was defined earlier in this chapter; does endorsing one give you reasons to endorse the other? Why?