

5,323 ww

Lester Embree, Department of Philosophy, Florida Atlantic University,  
Boca Raton, FL 33444 U.S.A. [Embree@fau.edu](mailto:Embree@fau.edu)

## The Reflective Analysis of Appearances in Dorion Cairns

**ABSTRACT:** It is shown from Cairns's Nachlass how the intending to sensuous appearances differs from the sensing of *sensa* and the perceiving of things, that appearances are neither parts of mental life nor of things in real space and time, that they have functional but not causal relations with the organism and other spatiotemporal things, media, and illumination, that they are necessarily believed in with certainty, and, finally, that they have a role in illusions.

We have seen that automatic or passive intending constitutes more than just *sensa* and objects of sensuous perceiving. Lying as it were between the former and the latter, perspective appearances of physical things are constituted. These too may be liked or disliked and "willed" for and against—at the automatic level and at the spontaneous levels. (Cairns Nachlass, p. 013,663)

### INTRODUCTION

*This study is based on references to what are called "appearances" in the Nachlass of Dorion Cairns (1901-1973), especially in the lecture scripts from his decade on the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science of the New School for Social Research. He knew Husserl's lifetime publications and some manuscripts especially from his second visit to Freiburg in 1931-32, but for his teaching he sought to present not only what he had been able to verify but also what he had corrected and extended phenomenologically. In addition, he constantly sought better technical terminology for phenomenology in English. The question of the degree to which Cairns's account here matches that of Husserl has not been asked, but of course it can be. What is presented now is then a phenomenological description, which can also be called a reflective analysis.<sup>1</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lester Embree, *Análisis reflexivo. Una primera introducción a la Fenomenología / Reflective Analysis. A First Introduction to Phenomenology*, trans. into Castilian by Luis

*The theme of this analysis is appearance (Erscheinung). Some interpreters think that phenomenology is entirely about appearances and is thus a type of phenomenalism. This is an error because phenomenology is actually not even chiefly about appearances but about things that appear in the broad signification whereby anything is a thing. And it is then centrally about Erlebnisse, which Cairns came ultimately to render as “intentional processes” and which, by virtue of the wonder of intentionality, bring in physical and psychic realities, ideal objects, and much else, the appearances of things included, as things intended to.*

*Since it entails greater clarity and persuasiveness and despite some repetitions, nearly all of the following exposition is by quotation. Regardless of how long, quotations are neither reduced nor placed between quotation marks, but they are chiefly in Roman typeface and followed immediately by the six digit Nachlass page numbers. Some spelling has been standardized, but the punctuation is by Cairns, italics within quotations included.*

*Interstitial comments by the present writer are given in italics. Professor Richard M. Zaner, Cairns’s literary executor, is once again thanked for permission to quote from our teacher’s Nachlass.*

*Cairns’s critiques of the thought of others, e.g., the British Empiricists, are not drawn on because it would require too much space, and his Harvard dissertation of 1933, which should be published soon, is also not drawn on. The account is tacitly eidetic, but for his analysis of appearances he seems to have felt no need to leave the natural attitude and most of the investigation is in the specifically egological attitude. Finally, this study is not entirely uncritical since, while Cairns’s description, as far*

*as it goes, has been verified by the present writer and some gaps have not only been noted, but attempts have been begun to fill some of them.*

#### THE ANALYSIS

(1) *It seems best to begin with the richest passage in the Cairns Nachlass about appearances:* Let us take as our example a sensuous perceiving of a concrete physical thing, say a tree, as at rest and unchanging. Speaking purely descriptively, the perceiving is a consciousness of the tree itself as now itself presented. Nevertheless, it is observable that the tree may be perceived as *one*, and as at rest and unchanging, throughout a multiplicity of observably changing appearances. It may be seen as far or near; from this side and that; and the visual appearances vary accordingly. Then too, it may be touched. Descriptively, the seeing is a seeing of the same thing that is touched; but the visual and tactual appearances are heterogeneous.

Normally, in attentive perceiving, one pays attention, not to the actually or possibly changing appearances of the tree, but to the *tree*, its parts, qualities, or relations. The appearances are not parts of the tree, and are usually ignored. But sometimes one does pay attention to, e.g., how the tree *looks* from here. And, of course, the phenomenologist must describe the perceiving even with respect to those structures that are not objects of attention in the perceiving itself.

Now such changes in appearances as I have mentioned are observably correlated with changes in the perceiver's co-perceived organism, either in its co-intended intrinsic states, or in its co-perceived real relations to the tree. These correlations between organism and *tree-appearances* must not be confused with co-perceived relations between organism and *tree*—even though some of the former depend on some of the latter. And, having

described the manner in which the tree is perceivable as *one* and the same, and unchanging, through many different appearances, the phenomenologist must describe the typical functional correlations between such appearances and perceived states of the organism. Obviously, the description becomes more complicated when we take into account the circumstance that one's organism itself is perceived through organism appearances. And it becomes still more complicated, when we turn from sensuous perceiving of physical things as unchanging, to sensuous perceivings of things as moving or swelling, or shrinking, or melting, or fading, or otherwise changing, in themselves. Here we find both the perceiving of a changing but the identical thing and a plurality of actual and possible appearances.

I should add that there are other possible changes in appearances, which are correlated with perceived or at least intended real changes in things other than the perceiver's organism. E.g., change in illumination [and] change in medium (glasses, gloves).

And, obviously, the phenomenologist must analyze other modes of sensuous perceiving besides seeing and what we may, for short, call tactual perceiving. Here, too, we shall find distinctions between unchanging things or qualities and their many, possibly changing appearances. The siren sounds louder, the skunk smells stronger, when one is near it. But one distinguishes between a sound or smell that is itself more intense, and a more intense appearance. I do not believe that I deodorize the skunk by holding my nose. It is the *appearance* that is modified, not the skunk, by this co-perceived change in my olfactory organ. (011317-011319)

(2) *One needs to be clear that appearances are different from the things believed in on the basis of intending to them:*

And consideration of even the examples already given makes it plain that the sensuously perceived public thing, as perceived, is not an association of sense data, or of sensuously perceived perspective appearances. The thing as perceived is numerically distinct from its perceptual appearances, and each of the perceived qualities of the thing is numerically distinct from *its* perceptual appearances. The appearances (and, a fortiori, any eventually discovered sense-data) do not enter into the perceived everyday thing as components. Having the manifold of appearances is the epistemic condition for having the thing, as an object “beyond” them. (010395)

(3) *Where media are concerned, Cairns does not refer to the telescope but he does refer not only to eyeglasses but also the microscope:*

Without the microscope we are all far sighted,<sup>2</sup> and have no means of making objects more distinct. We see smooth surfaces and straight edges where microscopic vision presents rough surfaces and jagged edges. But we do not wear microscopes as the near-sighted do glasses[;] neither do we discriminate tactually with microscopic fineness. Consequently, the superior clarity of the microscopic aspect never establishes a habit which would lead us to *perceive* the microscopic distinctions in such a way as to cancel the normal perceptual belief in smoothness. It is not then illusory, but normal. (028512)

(4) *How can one thematize appearances?*

We may make the *appearance* itself an object—as when, e.g., we want to paint the *appearance* of a thing, “through which” the thing itself appears. But this “appearance” is a new object, with *its* way of givenness. It is not in “real” space but in “apparent” space (& time). It is absurd to ask

---

<sup>2</sup> Cairns wrote “far?” above “near-sighted” here.

whether the “*appearance*” is simultaneous with [or] larger or smaller than the real object. [A]ppearances can be compared only in apparent space and time. So *the* perceived shape is not identical with any one of the appearance shapes. (037191)

Usually, when I am engaged in such a mental process, I am busied with and attentive to what we may call its “terminal” object—in our example: the one unchanging chair. Sometimes, however, I shorten the ray of my attention and focus it on this or that phase of the continuum of *changing appearances* through and throughout which the one unchanging chair is intended as one and unchanging. None of these many variable chair-*appearances* is intended as a part or phase of the chair itself; they are not terminal but transitional objects, objects *through which* the terminal object and its own parts and phases are intended. Accordingly, I called them “*quasi-objects*,” reserving the unqualified name “objects” for the end-result of the intensive synthesis, the intended chair. (013119)

(5) *It deserves further emphasis that there are appearances other than the visual:*

Let us assume we are listening to an outdoor concert. We shall abstract, in the first case, from the “cultural sense” of the sounds we hear, as embodiment of an individual piece of music, also from the “value” of the sheer sounds as pleasant or unpleasant.

We perceive, let us say, a prolonged tone from a trumpet. The tone has the sense for us of issuing from the trumpet, of being a “natural” sound with a certain source located in natural space. It has its way of givenness. It is “perceived,” or specifically, aurally perceived. We distinguish, furthermore, between the tone itself and its “appearance.”

If I cover my ears, or walk away, the tone *appears* to be less intense and to differ in quality, but I nevertheless may intend it as objectively unchanged through these apparent changes.

These changes in the appearance are given, moreover, as functionally determined by the state of my organism, as far or near, as with open or shut ears. And these changes in my organism are functionally related to certain kinaesthetic systems belonging to the sphere of the “I can.”<sup>3</sup>

*It may further be observed reflectively that sonorous appearances are affected by media including wind and fog and are also different under water. Curiously, Cairns does not analyze the role of visual images in the seeing of reflections in mirrors or sonorous images in the hearing of sound from radios and audio-recorders, where of course the listener can draw closer and withdraw from the device reproducing the sound. And with a television set auditory and visual appearance change with one’s organism’s distance from it.*

(6) *What is the place, phenomenologically speaking, of appearances in the encountering of things? There are two connections here.*

But *how* does seeing the objective chair “involve” seeing the quasi-objective appearances? Using our new concepts, we can now say: seeing the objective chair is a noetic-noematic superstratum founded on and presupposing, as a noetic-noematic substratum, seeing the quasi-objective appearances. Or, more generally: intending the terminal object is founded on intending the transitional objects. These are intentional objects “in their own right” (so to speak); and, over and above that, they *function* in the concrete

---

<sup>3</sup> For some reason this page was not numbered in the Nachlass, but it is p. 1,963 in the electronic file.

sensuous perceiving *as* presentive appearances or the terminal object of the intention.

An analogous structure is present and observable in the other modes of sensuous perceiving: tactual, auditory, gustatory, and so forth. But it is also present in the memorial and fictive analogues of sensuous perceivings.” (013120) (*Although Cairns does not emphasize it, the intending to appearances is also involved in fictive perceiving, fictive remembering, and fictive expecting.*)

However that may be, sensuous appearances belong neither to the realm of physical reality nor to the realm of psychic reality. So far as they *are*, they are relative to a limited spatio-temporal “point” of view. A real entity, on the other hand, is what it *is* from any “point” of view. Sensible appearances belong in the world along with the things apparent through them and the minds through which things and ‘their’ appearances are apparent. But sensible appearances occupy as it were, an existential limbo between these two realms of real existence. (010420)

(7) *But while what is, so to speak, “above” the intending to appearances has now been somewhat addressed, sensations or, preferably for Cairns, the sensings of sensa are “below” them:*<sup>4</sup>

The tactual perceiving of the shapes of things, and the perceiving of thing-qualities such as heaviness, smoothness, stickiness, [and] warmth, involve awareness of “sensations,” i.e., sensa, as located on or in the sensuously perceived organism. Accordingly, in describing some kinds of sensuous perceiving, the co-perceived organism must be described, not only

---

<sup>4</sup>*Cairns of course revised Husserl’s account of hyletic data into a description of sensings and sensa in* Dorion Cairns, “The Many Senses and Denotations of the Word *Bewusstsein* (“Consciousness”) in Edmund Husserl’s Writings, in *Life-World and Consciousness: Essays for Aron Gurwitsch*, ed. Lester Embree (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1972).



as co-perceived, like other things, but also as the presented seat of certain fields of sensa. (011113-011114)

Among the most obvious *sensations* are pains perceived as located here or there in the body, touch-sensations normally felt if the skin is distorted, a vaguely located sense of repletion of one has recently eaten as much as one wants, sensations felt when the bladder is full, etc. Also coolness or warmth from contact with a thing-surface.

But it is at least difficult to discover visual or auditory sensations.

Colors are found most obviously as qualities of seen things, as surface colors and, in transparent things, depth colors, as colors of perceived light also. Then as colors of unreal appearances, or color-appearances, and as colors of after-images. But none of these are seen as located in or on the eyes. Rather they are seen as located in space outside the body, unless they are seen as surface colors of the body itself. (Appearances of colors or concrete visual appearances.)<sup>5</sup>

As already said, the perceiving of something physical is founded on a sensing of sensa. It is also true that anything physical is perceived through an appearance or through appearances—tactual, visual, auditory, or the like. Furthermore, just as an ego may busy himself with a sensum and become aware of it as itself given and as simultaneous with the sensing of it, so he may busy himself with a sensuous appearance and become aware of *it* as itself given and as simultaneous with his actional intending to it. Accordingly one might say that, when an ego does that, he is perceiving and, more specifically, perceiving *sensuously* an appearance of something physical. **But, as in the case of sensings of sensa, it is best not to call**

---

<sup>5</sup>(010386) *The last two sentences in this passage were crossed out by Cairns.*

awarenesses of appearances as themselves given and simultaneous with the awarenesses of these “perceivings.” (013034) THE POINT IS THAT THE AWARENESSES OF APPEARANCES ARE NOT TO BE CALLED PERCEIVINGS.

(8) *Besides perception, appearances are involved in recollection:*

Though the object of a primary memorial intending presents *itself* continuously through the intending, it presents itself through a continuously changing *appearance*. The increase in the temporal distance of the thing still grasped from the current extent of the grasping is correlated with a decrease in the clarity and distinctness of the appearance and with a shrinking of its temporal extent. This change in the appearance of something receding into the temporal distance from Now is like the change in appearance of something receding into the spatial distance from Here. In this connexion Husserl speaks, accordingly, of temporal recession phenomena (*Ablaufsphänomene*) and temporal perspective [appearances].” (013055-013056)

*How the appearance of an expected intensive process and the things as intended to in it changes as it comes closer and closer to being impressional is not emphasized in Cairns’s Nachlass, but the role of expectation in illusions will be described below.*

(9) *Cairns does hold that ideal objects also have appearances:*

Like any other intended object, the essence or eidos is intended through a multiplicity of appearances. This must be the case since the intending of it is a process in immanent time. But this does not, of course, mean that the temporal way of givenness represents a temporality intrinsic to the eidos itself. (010885)

(10) *Besides not being intended to alone, appearances are furthermore objects of intentional or intensive syntheses:*

In the visual perceiving, what is perceived through the ash-tray's *appearances* as "something far from this organism" is identified with what was or will be perceived through its appearances as "something near this organism." [T]he thing presented through sharp and clear appearances when "these eyes" are protodoxically posited as "wide open" is identified with the thing presented through vague and dim appearances when "these eyes" are protodoxically posited as "almost shut."

"The *ashtray*" is protodoxically posited as "enduring"; and each extent of *its* duration is identified and distinguished throughout each extent of the perceiving of it. It is continuously distinguished from its co-posed and partly co-perceived physical surroundings. All this is true of any part it is believed to have: the presented side, the non-presented other sides and [the] inside; the color of the ash-tray, the color of this side, of the inside. The brightness or saturation or hue of the color. Or the co-intended hardness or smoothness. Each is identified and distinguished throughout each extent of the perceiving. I can shorten the focus of my attention and note the visual (or non-visual) appearances. I find each of them too to be continuously identified and distinguished. [There is the] same identificational structure. [And there is] [i]dentifying and differentiating of things intended as non-temporal: "Seven is greater than five and (the same seven) is less than ten." Each of these syntheses is continuous throughout the process and is founded on retrotending in each partial extent, to the earlier extents as intensive to their respective objects.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>(012630-012631) Concerning synthesis, which Husserl held alone could make Brentano's discovery of intentionality fruitful, cf. Dorion Cairns, ed. Lester Embree, Fred

(11) *While it is mentioned in the epigraph of this essay that appearances can be objects of willing, valuing, and believing, elaboration is offered only with respect to the last mentioned.*

Both the sensings of *sensa* and perceptual intendings to appearances of physical things are doxic mental processes. In this respect, then, they are like perceptual intendings to physical things. But, whereas some of these perceptual intendings are more or less uncertain believings, or even disbelievings, in the physical things presented in them, all clear sensings of *sensa* and all clear perceptual intendings to appearances are *simply certain believings* in their objects, as having the determinations they are presented as having, purely *qua sensa* or *qua* appearances. (023166)

No other intending to its object could motivate a doubting of its object, let alone a disbelieving in its object. Because: Firstly: A *sensum* or an appearance can be presented in only one mental life. Secondly: Even in that life it can be perceptually presented only once, since it unlike a physical thing, it is not believed to exist unperceived. (023168-023169)

(12) *What of the body or, as Cairns prefers to say, the organism?*

In the first place, the movements of the body have the sense of being, within certain limits, under the control of the will. In the second place, certain parts and certain changes in those parts of the organism, have the sense of being functionally related to the appearance and change in appearance of material objects as perceived. These changes in appearance

---

Kersten, and Richard M. Zaner, "The Theory of Intentionality in Husserl," *The Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, 32 (1999). Reprinted in Dermot Moran and Lester Embree, eds., *Phenomenology: Critical Concepts in Philosophy*, vol. I, London: Routledge, 2004.

are indirectly controlled to the extent that the organism as psycho-physical has the sense of being organon of volition and sense perception. (037053)

We call appearances “subjective”—thereby indicating, not that they are part of the flux of consciousness, but that there are to a certain extent *dependent* upon perceivable real states of our organisms. (037192)

[T]he perceiver’s own organism is itself sensuously perceived whenever anything else is sensuously perceived. Now physical things (among them, the perceiver’s organism) and their determinations are perceived as unities “through” multiplicities of quasi-objective appearances. We say, moreover, that the typical nature of the variable appearances, through which a physical thing is perceived, is given as functionally dependent on—among other conditions—co-positing (and often co-perceived) typical states of motion or rest of the perceiver’s organism and particular organs of perception. (For example, the typical nature of the quasi-objective appearances through which I *see* physical things is given as functionally dependent on the co-positing typical states of rest and motion of my whole body, of my head relative to my body, and of my eyes in their sockets.) (013278-013279)

*Cairns mentioned earlier that there are “organism appearances,” but unfortunately does not elaborate. Nevertheless, there is certainly variation of such appearances when one looks at and/or touches various parts of one’s body and also when one hears and feels it slapped, for example. Furthermore, the organism appears variously from within during movements and in different postures. And can one not also find appearances when tasting and especially from changing distances smelling parts of one’s organism, perfumed or not?*

(13) *There are if-then or causal-functional relations between appearances and other things, especially the perceiver's organism and also her psyche:*

Not only the material world, but all the world of individual objects is experienced, and believed in, as *having* a causal style, more or less familiar. If I cut my finger I ordinarily feel pain; so I assume does anyone else who cuts his finger under ordinary circumstances. If I will to close my hand, it **closes--unless**. DIDN'T I SEND YOU A REVISED EDITING OF THIS SENTENCE? If I walk towards a mountain, the far aspect changes gradually in a familiar way and at a familiar rate, into nearer appearances of the same mountain.—This if-then style of the states things relative to each other, and of their appearances relative to the state of my organism, is familiar, taken for granted, believed in, and acted on, by all persons everywhere before ever they start *thinking* about cause and effect. (037560)

But when I sensuously perceive a thing, I am also believing in another reality, besides the perceived thing, namely, my *psychic act of perceiving* the thing. And this psychic reality is believed-in as *standing in if-then relations with physical realities or things*. E.g., that I am seeing this thing, and seeing it through such-and-such appearances, depends on the state of my body, the distance between my body and the thing, the illumination, the medium (glasses), and possibly other conditions.

Thus the sensuous perceiving of a thing is co-perceived as standing in the causal nexus along with the thing perceived.

Prior to all theorizing, no difficulty is found in this positing of *psychic acts as causally-functionally interwoven with physical processes*.

Difficulties are felt only when, in thinking, I abstract the world of things

from its pre-theoretically co-positing and co-experienced concomitants, and take the thing-world as a closed system. (010384)

I have already referred to another if-then nexus that is also simply believed in, prior to all theorizing: a nexus made up of *if-then relations between objective states of my body and appearances to things*, including my body. E.g., if my eyes are open and directed on my hand, the latter appears visually. If my body approaches a distant thing, [the] visual appearance changes, while the thing is perceived as itself unchanging throughout its varied visual appearances. But the appearance of a thing-determination, perceived as unchanging, is believed to change in *functional dependence not only on changes in my body, but also on changes in surrounding thing-determinations*. E.g., a surface-color is perceived as unchanging but appearing variously under various illuminations.

It is a matter of convention whether these if-then relations between appearances on the one hand and thing determinations (of my body and of other things) be called “causal” and their style a “causal” style. It is important, however, to distinguish between these and the if-then relations among thing-determinations. The former are relations between appearances and realities; the latter are relations among realities. (010383)

(14) *Cairns writes*: So far, I have said nothing of *minds other than my own*.

To the extent that I experience other things as resembling my body in appearances and physical behavior, I experience them as *the bodies of other persons*, who perceive some of the things that I perceive, notably their own bodies, and in perceiving them, believe in them. And I believe in their acts of sensuous perceiving as conditioned by physical circumstances even as mine are, and in their acts of willing **as conditionally** their voluntary

movements even as mine do. HE COULD HAVE BEEN CLEARER BY PUTTING “AS CONDITIONALLY” AT THE END OF THE SENTENCE. THE POINT IS THAT THE ACTS OF OTHERS ARE CONDITIONED BY PHYSICAL CIRCUMSTANCED EVEN AS MINE ARE. I believe that another person and my self sometimes do experience not only the same physical things but also the same thing-qualities—the same thing-shapes, thing-hardness, thing-color—that we hear the same sounds and smell the same odors. These objects are believed to be presented as identical to both of us.

On the other hand, the other’s psychical acts are not believed to be presented to me nor are mine believed to be presented to him. Though we both see the same color of my skin, the other does not feel the pains and touch sensations, etc. that to me are presented as located in my body. And the varied appearances throughout which I perceive the same unchanging thing are presented to me alone, just as those through which he perceives identically the same unchanging thing are presented to him alone. (010388)

This, however, is not yet to say that any particular sensuous appearance, like any particular psychic reality, is essentially presentable to only one subject. It is only to say that such an appearance can be presented to only one [subject] at a time. There is a legitimate sense in which one says, “If my eye occupies the same point of view that his eye occupied a moment before, and if the thing he saw, etc. remained unchanged, I can see the same appearance that he saw—not merely an appearance precisely like the one he saw.” Thus there is a sense in which sensible appearances, like sensible things, may be presentationally common to objects of experiences belonging to several minds. As a matter of fact in the actual world, no sensible appearance can be presentationally common at one time to two minds, since



no two minds are combined with one organism—no two subjects see with a common eye or tactually perceive with a common skin. (That may even be an essential necessity.) Moreover, to say that I can see the appearance he saw is to presuppose that the “appearances” (in this sense) endure even when there is no impressional perceiving relative to which they are apparent. (010418-010419) (*Cairns seems to equivocate here on “appearance” in relation to what was said elsewhere in this text.*)

It was said above that what is psychic can be presented to only one psychophysical entity, namely the one of which it is itself a real part. Whatever one man or beast lives through psychically is alone *presented* to him. His perceiving of the psychic processes of others is *appresentational*. Nevertheless, a psychic reality is indeed *appresentationally* experienced by many psychophysical entities. And, just as the psychic is really concretely *one* with the somatic, so they are experienced as concretely one.

However the *common* experienceability of all psychic realities by many is only their common *appresentative* experienceability. (A psychophysical entity experiences its *own* psyche appresentatively as well as presentatively.)

An appresentative experiencing of another’s sensuous-presentative experiencing is implicitly an *appresentative* experiencing of the appearances through which the real thing is sensuously being experienced by him. (010421)

(15) *Finally, it is not unusual to hear appearances said to be illusory, but is it actually usual for them to be illusory? The extensive role in veridical encountering documented above argues that they are not. Nevertheless, how can appearances be involved in illusions?*

Sometimes when I attempt to realize these possibilities, I perceive something incompatible with what was expected. When that is the case, I speak of illusion. Thus, e.g., when I see a shape like this I expect that, by going through motions of a familiar kind, I will feel a shape like this. But sometimes I am disappointed. I then call the visual appearance illusory. Under other conditions, I might conceivably call the tactual appearances illusory. The non-illusory appearance is whichever one indicates a system of other appearances THAT is realized consistently. THIS HELP?

The same is true with other modes of sensuous perceiving. If I hear a sound to my right, that indicates that I would see or touch its source to my right. But I may be disappointed. *Either appearance* may be illusory in that case. (028501-028502)

Let us now consider, for a moment, color perception. Let us imagine that we are seeing a uniformly colored red carpet. If we attend to the appearance of the color, rather than to the color, we observe that it is not uniform: the color of the further surfaces appears, e.g., less saturated. But, as in the case of shape, we do not normally perceive the varied appearance. We see “through” the varied color-appearance the uniform color. Illusion is present only when the wider context of perception would motivate a cancellation of some perceptual belief about the thing-color. Suppose I see the carpet as having a dark stain on it, which further experience would show to be a shadow. Then that is an illusion. But normally we do not even see such variety in appearance and much less do we take them for objective differences.

The illusoriness of an illusion lies not in what is *presented*, but in what is tacitly *expected* to be presented. If I expect that a coin will present an oval aspect when seen from a point on a line to its center, then that is an illusion, provided the expectation is cancelled. If I expect that the carpet will

look darker under all lights, but it does not, then that is an illusion. If I tacitly expect the tree to *feel* woolly that is an illusion. Etc. (028513-028514)

Normally we do not grasp the shape-aspect, e.g., the rhomboid shape of a table-top; we see *the* table-shape “through” the aspects, and it is often very difficult, without practice, to see the aspect at all.<sup>7</sup> This is evident when one tries to draw a two-dimensional picture of a thing. It is evident, then, that normally we do not confuse the varying appearances of the seen shape with the unchanging seen shape itself and that consequently these appearances are not illusions.

Illusion comes in when, e.g., we “see” a thing as changed in shape, despite the fact that other perceptions would present the thing as unchanged. I do not see a spoon as shorter when it is pointing away from me, although its appearance changes. But I may *see* it as “really” bent when half-immersed in water. The latter experience involves a belief that is cancelled when I *feel* the spoon is still straight.

In the same way, the blurring of the visual appearance of distant things in the experience of a near-sighted person is not an illusion unless there is a belief that the things run together objectively. Normally, the familiar potentiality of bringing objects near and making them *look* distinct, prevents a belief in the confusion as an objective change. But I know of one case where such an extension of the possibly near field had not been made and the child perceived trees as big woolly things, until his near-sightedness was corrected. (028510)

//5,244 words//

---

<sup>7</sup> “Aspect” here is synonymous with “appearance.”