

Many Molyneux Questions

Abstract: Molyneux's Question (MQ) concerns whether a newly sighted man would recognize/distinguish a sphere and a cube by vision, assuming he could previously do this by touch.

We argue that (MQ) splits into questions about (a) shared representations of space in different perceptual systems, and about (b) shared ways of constructing higher dimensional spatiotemporal features from information about lower dimensional ones, most of the technical difficulty centring on (b). So understood, MQ resists any monolithic answer: everything depends on the constraints faced by particular perceptual systems in extracting features of higher dimensionality from those of lower. Each individual question of this type is empirical and must be investigated separately.

We present several variations on MQ based on different levels of dimensional integration—some of these are familiar, some novel adaptations of problems known elsewhere, and some completely novel. Organizing these cases in this way is useful because it unifies a set of disparate questions about intermodal transfer that have held philosophical and psychological interest, suggests a new range of questions of the same type, sheds light on similarities and differences between members of the family, and allows us to formulate a much-augmented set of principles and questions concerning the intermodal transfer of spatiotemporal organization.

I. Molyneux's problem regarding spheres and cubes

If you find something out by touch alone, can you confirm it by vision alone? William Molyneux famously posed this question to John Locke in letters of July 7th, 1688 and March 2nd, 1693. Here is the 1693 version:

Suppose a blind man can tell by touch the difference between a sphere and a cube: Suppose then the cube and sphere placed on a table, and the blind man to be made to see. Quaere, whether by his sight, before he touched them, he could now distinguish, and tell, which is the globe, which the cube.

Since Locke's initial report (*Essay* II. ix. 8) of what has come to be called Molyneux's Question (MQ), commentators have seen within it (and within its answers) a range of philosophical and psychological issues about perception.¹

Locke seems to think of MQ as a problem about ideas of shape. We have ideas of a sphere and of a cube. Molyneux prompted him to ask, in effect, whether these ideas were modality specific. That is, he asked whether there is a single idea of a sphere that spans

¹ For a summary of philosophical approaches to the question, see Degenaar and Lokhorst (2017).

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

both vision and touch, or two distinct ideas, one for each modality. Similarly for the cube. Locke believed that ideas of shape (and, indeed, all ideas) are modality specific, and that the blind man has not yet formed the visual counterpart. Consequently, he gave MQ a negative answer: according to him, the tactual ideas give the newly-sighted man no help with the visual ones. (This interpretation does not do full justice to Locke's view; we qualify it in section III.)

Many subsequent treatments of MQ take a rather different view of the problem Molyneux raised. Gareth Evans's (1985) influential treatment is a key example. Following a well-established tradition in the literature that traces to Diderot's 'Letter on the Blind,' (1749), Evans suggests that MQ raises a problem about the perceptual representation of *space*, rather than about shape as such.² Specifically, he thinks that the most pressing version of the Question (and the one that he takes Diderot, Condillac, Berkeley, and Leibniz to be disputing) is about "the relation between the perceptual representation of space attributable to the blind, and the perceptual representation of space available in visual perception" (370). Evans contends that distinct modalities within a single organism must share a single, inter- or a-modal, "behavioural" representation of space, in which there is a greater possibility of intermodal transfer of shape (inter alia), and hence for a positive answer to (a generalized version of) Molyneux's Question than Locke supposed.

According to Evans, Diderot doesn't share Locke's assumption that ideas of shape are the unanalysable ground floor of the problem. His idea, in effect, is that shapes and solids are not just given, but rest on an analytically prior representation of space. According to Diderot, space is not presented 'simultaneously' to the blind—touch does not have, as vision does, a sensory field in which spatial points are given as co-present side-by-side, stretching out to infinity. Touch relies on bodily movement to locate points in external space, Diderot says, and tactual representations of relative position—and hence of shape—are, for this reason, inextricably bound up with temporal succession. *This* is the notion that Evans rejects; he finds it nonsensical to suppose that the representation of external space could be modality-specific. He thinks that there is a shared representation of space on which to construct modally non-specific 'spatial concepts,' such as those of a sphere and a cube. Unfortunately, though, he doesn't tell us how this construction is

² For a discussion of the difference between shape and space in this context, see Schwenkler (2012a).

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

supposed to work. One of our main points is that as far as perception goes, it need not. The modal non-specificity of our representation of space doesn't, by itself, get us any closer to an answer to Molyneux's question about shape. Ultimately Evans's insistence that shapes are modally non-specific is just as uninformative as Locke's or Berkeley's insistence that they are modally specific.³

For these reasons, Evans doesn't advance the discussion of MQ proper; nevertheless, he breaks new ground because Diderot's reversion to space offers a great deal more scope for an interesting resolution than one based on the modal specificity of simple ideas. We take it as our starting point here. Space is three-dimensional and time adds an additional dimension. Though we'll have something to say about MQs that problematize shared spatial representations (section V), the bulk of our discussion revolves around the perception of n -dimensional spatiotemporal features, for n greater than zero. Perceptual systems construct these higher dimensional features from information about lower-dimensional ones—lines are detected by integrating information about points; information about surfaces from information about points and lines, and so on. Starting from an insightful point first made by John Mackie, we'll organize our discussion of MQ around such *dimensional integration*. The question here is: given a feature F that is integrated from lower dimensional information in one modality, and given equivalent lower-dimensional information in another modality, does the perception of F follow automatically in the second modality?

Here is MQ, reformulated from this perspective and generalized:

Intermodal Transfer of Dimensionally Integrated Features Suppose that you can reliably identify objects as instances of a spatiotemporally complex feature F by means of one sense modality alone. Can you, in virtue of this ability alone, reliably identify objects as instances of F by means of another modality alone? (Assume, for the sake of vividness, that you have newly acquired the second modality. Are you able to identify instances of F by means of the newly acquired modality?)

³ Of course, Evans's main concern was with space, not shape; see his (1980). However this might be, Molyneux's question is about shape, and this was Evans's advertised topic, as well as our concern here.

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

Despite their differences, it is striking in retrospect that Locke's and Evans's responses to Molyneux are both rooted in extremely general views that would apply uniformly to a wide range of questions that take the above form. One main point of our discussion is that any monolithic approach to MQ and the puzzles it raises is not only over-simple but, more importantly, a significant misunderstanding of the nature of perceptual processing. The scientific literature contains investigations of many questions that we will recast in the above form. Some of these questions are about location in space and time, and others—the majority—about the transfer of dimensional integration. And, as we'll see, some of these questions are answered positively, others (including some that are about location, not integration) negatively; it all depends on the constraints faced by the perceptual system when it extracts the feature in question from proximal data; it does *not* depend solely on whether the underlying representation of space (or of spatial location) is shared by different modalities. The answer to each individual question of this type is empirical, and each has to be investigated separately.

The bulk of our discussion is directed at issues that arise with regard to higher-dimensional integration. In sections II and III, we present some variations on MQ, some of which are familiar in the literature, and in subsequent sections, we suggest new versions, some completely novel, as in section V, and others that are novel adaptations of problems that are known in other contexts. Construing these cases as MQs is useful in so far as it organizes systematically a set of otherwise disparate questions about intermodal transfer that have held philosophical and psychological interest on their own, suggests a new range of questions of the same type, sheds light on similarities and differences between members of the family, and allows us to formulate a much-augmented set of principles and questions concerning the intermodal transfer of spatiotemporal organization. We anticipate that these questions will be significant in the context of the on-going discussion of cross-modal perception.

II. On the perception of wholes and parts

Return to Evans's shift of focus from shape to space. One way of understanding this shift comes from a thought like the following:

Assume that the content provided by vision and touch consists in features at point-locations in a two-dimensional space. What we *directly* see is an array

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

of point-colors; what we directly feel is pressure, heat, and pain at various point-locations on or in our bodies. Following David Lewis (1966),⁴ call this the ‘mosaic’ view. Now, spatiotemporally extended qualities such as shape and motion reduce to aggregates of these point-located qualities. The mosaic view implies that you *see* or *feel* such an aggregate simply in virtue of seeing or touching each minimal part of it—there is nothing else that vision or touch contributes.

Suppose then that a newly sighted person was able, by vision alone, to identify point-locations that she previously knew by touch. The mosaic view would hold that since the operations she previously employed to identify shapes were applied to point-locations not specific to touch, they are available for redeployment to visual locations. Conversely, if she was unable visually to locate those point-qualities, then these aggregative operations could not gain any purchase. Thus, Molyneux’s Question reduces to a problem of inter-comparability of point-located qualities, and thus to space.

This kind of argument might be used to motivate Evans’s reduction of MQ to a question about the inter-modality of the representation of space. Underlying every idea of shape is a more fundamental idea of space or of spatial position. The former is modality specific, one might think, just in case the latter is.⁵

This reductive move is a mistake. True, there is a mathematical analysis of shape properties in terms of point-locations. For example, in Cartesian geometry, the surface of a sphere is definable as the set of points in space satisfying the equation

$$(x - x_0)^2 + (y - y_0)^2 + (z - z_0)^2 = r^2$$

(where the center of the sphere is $\langle x_0, y_0, z_0 \rangle$ and the radius is r).

⁴ Lewis contrasts the color mosaic view with one in which visual perception is of ‘ostensible constituents of the external world.’ This is not the contrast we focus on. We do not assume that color mosaics are arrays of ‘sense data’ and we are not primarily concerned with how external objects are constructed from these. Our interest is in how point-data yield higher-dimensional data, and not in the separate question of whether the former are constituents of conscious states.

⁵ To be clear, we have no definite view about whether Evans himself would have endorsed this line of thought, and if so, in what form. (His paper is a late draft that he could not revise before he died.) However, his critical remarks (following his reading of Pierre Villey, see below) about the blind man’s integration of tactile information strongly suggests some such transition.

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

However, the availability of a geometric analysis of shape in spatial terms tells us little about the nature of perceptual representations/ideas of shape, which may or may not be similarly constructed. According to the mosaic view, perception of extended shapes is built up by combining perceptions of the points that constitute the shape. In other words, ideas of extended shapes are Lockean complex ideas, built up by combining simples. Nothing more is required of your senses for you to be able to *see/feel* the complex idea *A and B* than for you to be able to *see/feel A* and to *see/feel B*. So also with shapes and the points that constitute them.

But this is problematic. To appreciate why, consider the following case:

Cookie Cutter Imagine a circular cookie cutter impressed motionless upon your back. This creates a set of contact points that jointly constitute a circle. You have a distinct tactual impression of each of these points individually (or at least of a multiplicity of short line segments constituted by them).

Cookie Cutter undermines the mosaic view. Mosaicists want to say that *feeling* a circle is nothing different from feeling a collection of points that together form a circle. Clearly, however, this is not analytically sufficient to ensure that you can tactually “distinguish, and tell” that it is a circle. For nothing we have said so far guarantees that the feature of circularity is, as such, within the representational repertoire of tactual perception (i.e., that tactual perception has a representational capacity for circularity).⁶ After all, every shape is reducible to a set of spatial positions. Yet even given a sufficient ability to distinguish the constituent spatial positions, one does not have the ability in either vision or touch to discern every shape, or to differentiate each from all others.

As it happens, it is empirically implausible to suppose that we *are* able to discern the circularity of a cookie cutter impressed on our backs. Nor does this have anything to do with the inability to discern points of contact by touch—touch is less spatially acute than vision but enlarging the circle does not help. The perception of lines and shapes by touch is, in fact, extremely spotty—we can often detect collinearity, but this is easily disrupted and doesn’t work as well across different body parts (e.g., when one of the

⁶ [AUTHOR'S WORK] emphasizes problems of such intermodal differences in both representational scope and structure, and their implications for the operation of sensory substitution devices. These questions must be taken case by case, and on an empirical basis.

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

points is on the forearm and the other two on the palm).⁷ When you look at two red spots on the back of your left hand and two on the back of your right hand, it's easy to adjust your hands so that they line up straight. The same is not true for vibrotactors felt by touch.

Cookie Cutter gives us reason to doubt that the *perceptual representation* of circularity, or by extension sphericity, is composed of ideas of position. The point is reinforced by reflection on certain kinds of pathology known as “visual form agnosias,” in which “patients with normal acuity cannot recognize something as simple as a square or circle” (Farah 1990, 1). For example, Goodale et al (1991) reported that after brain damage due to carbon monoxide induced hypoxia, their patient DF was unable visually to identify whole objects such as her mother's forearm though she retained the visual ability to discern the fine visual details, such as hairs on the forearm. DF's brain had, in short, lost the ability to integrate visual parts into a whole. Conversely, some patients with Balint's syndrome successfully report visually perceived whole shapes and yet are unable to report on or reach toward the points in space where these whole shapes are located, which some have taken to indicate that they have at best a limited visual representation of spatial location.⁸ These findings show that perception of spatial points and perception of shape come apart in at least one direction, and possibly two.

These cases invite us to consider a within-modality version of MQ:

Suppose that a mature woman who has been sighted since birth is plainly shown a circle (or a sphere). Suppose further that she is able to see every part (or facing part) of it. Would she be able to identify the whole object as a circle/sphere by sight alone?

The case of DF shows that the answer to this question varies from person to person. Independently of any tactual knowledge that she might employ, this mature woman was consistently unable to perform the identification task. This puts *Cookie Cutter* into perspective. In *Cookie Cutter, unimpaired* perceivers lack the ability to integrate shape information in one modality, though they possess it in another. We might call this a *normal*

⁷ The question has been investigated by Patrick Haggard and a number of co-workers. See, for example, Haggard and Giovagnoli (2011). It is worth noting that Haggard's theoretical stance distinguishes the questions of tactile localization and those of tactile pattern recognition. The former set of questions has been investigated ever since the dawn of psychophysics, the latter only very recently.

⁸ This interpretation is controversial; see, for example, Robertson et. al (1997), Kim, M.-S. and Robertson, L. C. (2001), and Robertson, L. C. (2004).

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

form agnosia of the deprived modality (i.e. of touch) in normal perceivers. You may have sensory awareness of points satisfying the geometric analysis of circularity and yet not have a perceptually given idea of circularity.

These clarifications concerning dimensional integration point to a version of MQ that is about the perceptual representation of shape per se, as opposed to space. So conceived, Molyneux's original question generalizes to this:

if a congenitally blind person tactually reliably represents/ discriminates/ reidentifies a range of shape features, will she (immediately, with certainty, etc.) visually represent members of that same range of shape features once her sight is restored?

This question is independent of assumptions about ideas of space. We can ask whether the dimensional integration of particular shapes transfers across modalities both on the assumption that the idea of space transfers across modalities, and on the contrary assumption that it does not transfer.

In confronting the implications of this version of MQ, we should bear in mind a further complication raised by Reid's observation that there are significant structural differences between the representational resources distinct modalities bring to the task of representing any shape feature *F*. Reid contends that touch and vision use different geometries: according to him, touch does, while vision does not, represent space and shape as Euclidean.⁹ Simply put, Reid's point is that since the corneal lens projects onto a spherical surface, visual geometry is non-Euclidean. Touch, on the other hand, takes its geometry from direct contact with Euclidean external space. Reid's argument is contentious, but whether or not we ultimately endorse his substantive views about touch and vision, we should surely accept his underlying methodological assumption—namely that the structure of the world leaves different options open to individual perceptual modalities (which, therefore, needn't coincide in the options they select) for how their representation of the world is put together. There's no direct match required between the structure of the worldly feature, *F*, and the structure of a modality's representation of *F*,

⁹ *An Inquiry Into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense*, ch. 6-7.

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

or, a fortiori, between the structures selected by different modalities for the representation of *F*.

This leads us to a version of *Cookie Cutter* that highlights the question of inter-modal transfer in adults unimpaired since birth:

Suppose that a cookie cutter is impressed on the back of a mature, perceptually unimpaired subject, and that another cookie cutter is plainly shown to her in such a way that she can see every part of the impressed edge that she can feel and vice versa. (That is, the displays are controlled in size so that the greater spatial acuity of vision is not a factor.) Can she say whether the cookie cutter she sees has the same shape as the one she feels?

How widely can MQ, and the issues it highlights, be generalized? On their broadest construal, MQs ask whether there is intermodal transfer between representations of some feature *F* in two distinct modalities. Of course, such questions will be gripping only for features that can be represented in multiple modalities. MQ is posed about spatial concepts in order to dispute whether space is a common sensible. The oft-neglected question that we want to bring to the fore is that of dimensional integration.

One way to answer MQ, then, is to go through a list of common sensibles, experimentally checking for (automatic, immediate, etc.) intermodal transfer of each feature. But as we said earlier, there's another wrinkle that is of interest here. One general problem suggested by MQ is that of the integration of lower-dimensional information over regions of space, time, and space-time. In what follows, we show that different sense-modalities face different problems of integration in different spatial and temporal dimensionalities. As a consequence, inter-modal transfer of feature-recognition faces different obstacles in these different dimensions. This leads us to consider variations of MQs organized around these dimensional variations. This will be our focus in what follows.

III. The two- and one-dimensional questions

In his recounting of MQ, Locke says that vision acquaints us only with a "plane variously coloured." In other words, he thinks that, contrary to the simplified account offered above,

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

there is no simple idea of a sphere. Rather, he believes, vision gives us something like Figure 1.

Figure 1 about here

Figure 1: Do we have visual awareness as of a sphere in the scene depicted above, or only of a circular 'plane variously coloured'?

According to him, we are directly aware of a two-dimensional projection, a pattern of colored patches within a circular outline without any depth information about any of the patches. There is some feature of this pattern that we learn by experience to associate with the tactile idea of depth, thereby allowing us to infer that what we see has depth. Thus, the visual idea of a sphere is, in Locke's view, complex and multimodal. It has, as its components, a visual idea of colored patches constituting a circle, each added by association to a tactile idea of depth.

Acknowledging this complication in Locke's thinking, John Mackie (1976, ch. 2) argued that Locke's negative answer to Molyneux might be based on what he takes to be the role of association in the extraction of depth information, not on the modal specificity of visual ideas.¹⁰ The newly sighted man looks at the globe and the cube. He is directly aware only of two-dimensional planes variously coloured. He has no visually activated complex idea of two distinct three-dimensional shapes because he lacks the association between the visual ideas and the tactile idea of depth in the two cases.

Mackie suggests a two-dimensional version of MQ, which we formulate as follows:

Suppose then the cube and sphere placed on a table, and the blind man to be made to see. Quaere, whether by his sight, before he touched them, he could now distinguish, and tell, which appears as a circle variously coloured, which as a rectilinear figure.

¹⁰ Is the newly-sighted man aware right away of coherent two-dimensional displays of colour similar to those available to those sighted since birth? This is what Locke thought, but the assumption is dubious, and infects some treatments of the problem up until the present time. (See Schwenker 2012b for discussion.)

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

Mackie says that though Locke had answered the original, three-dimensional Question negatively, he might have given a positive answer to the two-dimensional Question. For Locke held that simple ideas of primary qualities resemble the qualities themselves. Since shape is a primary quality, it follows that both the visual and the tactual idea of a circle resemble a circle. Depending on how exactly this similarity works in the two modalities, and on whether we possess the ability to recognize similarity/difference between ideas that both stand in resemblance relations to the very same primary quality, it is possible that it would be sufficient to secure immediate recognition (29).¹¹ Mackie is, in effect, raising an interesting complication in the question of inter-modal transfer—the possibility of an external reference point, in this case, the quality itself.

It is worth observing, first of all, that Mackie relies on a higher-dimensional version of mosaic theory. The mosaicist ascribes the failure to perceive higher-dimensional wholes—lines and shapes—to the failure to perceive some punctate part. Mackie does not depart from this. Why would the newly sighted man recognize flat circles? Because he is able to see their constituent points laid out in two-dimensional space. Why does he fail to discern a three-dimensional solid? Because vision provides him only indirect indications of distance that he has yet to learn. Note in particular that the capacity that this man lacks is supposedly not visual; rather, it is the learned capacity to associate distance with various visual cues that are implicit in the “color mosaic.” This way of putting the problem overlooks an additional difficulty—suppose that vision *did* give us the distance of each part. Would it follow that the newly sighted man could then recognize a sphere? No, because vision might not be able to integrate the totality of location-distance pairs into a form where it matches the pre-existing idea of a sphere—and the same goes for recognizing a circle.

In any case, Mackie is right to notice the consistency of different answers to versions of MQ in different dimensionalities, in this case a difference between the 3D and

¹¹ For a candidate Lockean understanding of how this immediate recognition might proceed, see Bennett (1965). In the opposite direction, one should note that the sense of touch is unlike vision in that its input is not a flat Euclidean two-dimensional array, but rather an array of contact points on the skin together with (possibly incomplete) proprioceptive information about the three-dimensional disposition of these contact points. This brings to the fore the Reidian point about possible differences between the kinds of information that are available to the two modalities. How does translation from one to the other work, and how does this affect inter-modal transfer? The answers to these questions, which bridge the two- and three-dimensional versions of MQ, are not a priori obvious.

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

the 2D MQs. But his line of thought about the two-dimensional MQ is not in fact supported by experiments reported by Ostrovsky et al (2009) and Held et al. (2011). Project Prakash was a surgical clinic that removed cataracts from Indian children and adolescents and replaced them with intraocular lens implants. When sight was thus surgically restored to congenitally blind patients, it was found that they could not immediately visually identify two-dimensional shapes (displayed on a computer screen) that they could identify by touch. The newly sighted subjects did not exhibit an immediate transfer of their tactile shape knowledge to the visual domain, these experimenters write. This supports a negative answer to two-dimensional MQ (and presumably the three-dimensional version as well).^{12,13}

Mackie's two-dimensional version of MQ is illuminating. We note that it is easy to construct a one-dimensional version.

Suppose that the newly sighted man was shown a rope stretched tight and one that droops in a catenary curve. Could he distinguish and tell by sight alone which was which?

Diderot uses an example of this sort to argue that the blind lack a "simultaneous" representation of space, as Evans calls it. A blind person has to run her finger over such ropes, and Diderot argues that her concept of shape therefore integrated spatial information gathered over an extended interval of time. But, he continues, sighted persons are capable of seeing the straight and the curved in a single instant. Thus, blind people have a different kind of representation of the straight and the curved.

There is a formal similarity between Diderot's formulation and the argument from Reid mentioned earlier. Reid argues that tactile and visual representations of shape are structurally different, which allows one to construct a model for a negative answer to shape-MQ. Diderot does the same for what he supposes to be the concept of shape that blind people have; it includes a temporal element while that of the sighted person does

¹² Similar negative results were reported much earlier, e.g., in the celebrated "Cheselden case" of a congenitally blind Molyneux subject restored to vision by the removal of cataracts (Cheselden, 1728). For more on the history of Molyneux cases, see von Senden(1932).

¹³ Of course, these results do not, all by themselves, confirm Locke's treatment of the matter. As we have noted, there is also the possibility that the newly sighted find it difficult to form a coherent two-dimensional visual expanse, and that there are difficulties in transitioning between the way three-dimensionality is presented in the two modalities.

not.¹⁴ (Note the extrapolation from shapes to space here. Note also the mosaicist assumption: failure to discern shape traces to the failure to locate segments in an inclusive space.)

While Diderot's reasoning is eye-opening, there is evidence that complicates his negative answer. Evans (369) quotes a memoir of a blind author, Pierre Villey, who reports that his memory of three-dimensional objects "appears immediately, and as a whole." This report, if credible, shows that the ideas he forms do not in fact have the temporal structure Diderot assumes they would have. They also raise the possibility of a shared representation of space that forms a template for temporally sequential haptic exploration. It is worth noting in this context that we engage in temporally extended visual exploration of three-dimensional objects¹⁵—for example, we walk around large objects, taking in their three-dimensional shape. Matches between visual and haptic exploration remain empirically obscure.

IV. Learning and MQ: Graded transfer

Project Prakash experimenters also studied how visual parsing is learned—i.e., how newly sighted people learn to segregate the visual scene into distinct objects (Ostrovsky et al 2006). They note, in an echo of Locke's "plane variously coloured" remark, that "Real-world images typically comprise many regions of different colors and luminances" (*ibid.*, 1484). They tried to find out how newly sighted patients learn to resolve such scenes variously colored into discrete objects. Figure 2 shows some of their results. They write that in these patients, "prominent figural cues of grouping, such as good continuation and junction structure, were largely ineffective for image parsing."

By contrast with these "Gestalt cues" (as they might be called), motion cues were almost immediately significant. When one shape, such as a sphere, moves in front of and across another shape, such as a cube, it creates a constantly changing joint boundary. Sighted people immediately see the three-dimensional scene for what it is. As it turns out, newly sighted people learn this very quickly. In other words, they are quick to learn

¹⁴ However, Diderot is wrong to treat a difference in the spatiotemporal range of vision and touch as marking, by itself, a genuine structural difference between the two. After all, there are ways of controlling for the former sort of difference — e.g., in this case, either by restricting visual range (by the use of blinders) or increasing tactile range (presenting the entire straight or curved shape all at once on the subject's back).

¹⁵ [AUTHOR'S WORK]

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

motion cues of three-dimensional arrangement, but much slower to learn Gestalt cues. (But, of course, they had a pre-existing tactual idea of three-dimensional layout.)

Figure 2 about here

Figure 2: Support for Mackie's interpretation of Locke. Newly sighted patients have difficulty recognizing occlusion in displays B to E. Some had difficulty identifying the longest curve in F, and none were able to resolve display G into faces of a cube. (c) indicates how a simple display resolves into three distinct shapes. The patients were unable to parse the displays on the top row of (e); the bottom row shows how a simple luminance-contrast algorithm performed. (From Ostrovsky et al 2009; used by permission.)

Different visual cues (Gestalt cues, motion-based cues) are associated with different shape- and space-related properties, but these associations are learned at different rates. This shows that, contrary to Locke, learning by association (or simple classical conditioning) is not by itself sufficient to explain how newly sighted persons learn visually to recognize three-dimensional shapes and spatial distributions. If it were, then the associations between Gestalt cues and depth should be no more difficult to learn than those between motion cues and depth. The associations exploited here are domain-specific. So the learning must involve something more than mere association. Specifically, associations between visual representations of motion and tactual ideas of depth are not created equal. As Held et al (2011, note 10) write: "The rapidity of acquisition suggests that the neuronal substrates responsible for cross-modal interaction might already be in place before they become behaviorally manifest."

Here, then, is another version of Molyneux's Question:

Suppose that a cube and a sphere are placed on a table, one in front of and partially obscuring the other. How long after restoration of sight would a previously blind man be able to distinguish the two objects? Would he be quicker to distinguish the two objects if one of them were moved?

On the classical idea that all learning is associative and all associative pairings between two simple features are made at the same rate, the answer to the second question should be no. But this is not experimentally supported. Just as there are differences among

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

modalities with regard to how they process the different forms of information their receptors provide, so also there is a difference in learning mechanisms regarding the significance of various available cues of environmental variables.

This variation in learning rates has an important cautionary significance for the mosaicist. The processes by which dimensional and other forms of integration are achieved are not trivial or analytic. They demand significant computational resources. To put the point in its simplest terms: it requires new resources for representing conjunction to go from *red* and *round* to *red **and** round*. And in the absence of the requisite “neuronal substrate,” this transition would have painstakingly to be learned.

V. Zero-dimensional versions of MQ

As we saw above, Evans framed MQ as a problem about the perceptual representation of space (as opposed to shape). Though we disagree with Evans's view that the MQs posed above should always reduce to such questions, it is possible to ask versions of MQ closely related to the above that take spatial position and spatial relations as their targets. In other words, it makes sense to ask whether the raw unintegrated positional information given by one modality transfers to a second modality. For instance, we can ask zero-dimensional versions of MQ about the possibility of intermodal transfer for representations of such spatial features exemplified at single points:

Suppose we have two vibrators each fitted with a light that can be turned on independently of the vibrator. Both are placed on the newly sighted man's body, one on the palm of the hand and the other on the forearm. Now the room lights are switched off so that the man is sitting in the dark. One (and only one) of the vibrators and one (and only one) of the lights is turned on. He feels one vibrator and sees one light. Can he tell whether the active vibrator is lit up?

This version of the Molyneux problem requires the newly sighted man to identify the position of a tactual feature with the position of a feature identified by sight. Suppose he feels a vibration on the palm of the hand. His problem is to say whether a light is shining from the place where his hand is.

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

Similar zero-dimensional questions can be posed regarding the motor system's representation of space. Motor (and associated proprioceptive and tactual) representations of position are body-centered. So, if a foreign object (say a grain of sand on the inside of your glove) pushes against your finger-tip, it will tactually seem to be stationary, even if your hand and finger should move (either by your own agency or passively). Presumably this is because your tactile sense is linked to the motor system; it tracks the part of your body that you are able to move. Now, let Dr Molyneux ask:

Suppose that a rubber hand is placed alongside a newly sighted man's hand. Let a flashing light be placed next to one of these. Now, suppose that both hands are stroked with a brush. Can the man tell by sight alone whether the light is next to his own hand, i.e., the one in which he feels the brushing?

This is a problem concerning the coordination of visual representation of *external* position and movement (of the brush) and tactile representation of bodily position and movement (of the stroking). We know that when this experiment is conducted with normally sighted patients, but with their own hand hidden from view, these subjects report that they feel the rubber hand being stroked (Botvinik and Cohen 1998). In other words, these normal subjects would wrongly report the flashing light above as being adjacent to the hand being stroked. This is an error of visuotactile coordination. So, it is at least possible that in the rubber-hand MQ, the newly sighted man will lack the necessary visuotactile coordination, and therefore be unable to identify where the stroking is happening in the visual world.

Along the same lines, but with the opposite effect, consider this: If a spotlight suddenly appeared from some direction, would the newly sighted man immediately turn towards it? There is no evidence that this zero-dimensional MQ has a negative answer—for all that we know, this visuomotor coordination task is successfully performed. (Project Prakash workers report on no failure.) This seems to indicate that even the cross-modal locational task might not admit of a single uniform answer. It could very well be that cognitive systems work with multiple representations of space, and that coordination among these is piecemeal, not solved across the board. Visuotactile coordination may be subject to different parameters than visuomotor.

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

We can pose similar questions about relations in one spatial dimension obtaining between zero-dimensional points.

Two vibrators are placed on the newly sighted man's skin. A light (without vibrator attached) is also placed on his skin. All three are switched on. Can he tell by vision alone whether the light is in between the vibrators?

The newly sighted man is able to estimate distances by haptic touch. He is shown three non-collinear lights, A, B, and C. Length AB is shorter than length ACB. Can he tell by vision alone that AB is a shorter length than ACB?

These lower-dimensional problems are about the intermodal transfer of position information and basic geometrical relations such as the triangle equality. As such, these versions of MQ are plausibly understood as concerning the intermodality of perceptual representation of space but not about perceptual representation of shape.¹⁶

VI. A temporal version of MQ

Moving away from space-related versions of MQ, we now ask a version of MQ about time. A blind person is aware of the time it takes for things to happen. For instance, if two people speak, she is able to say who started and ended first. If she hears a rhythmic pattern, she can beat out the time with her finger. Now she is made to see. She sees two people speaking behind a sound-blocking window — their lip movements coincide with their speech sounds. Or she sees a rhythmic stream of light flashes.

Question: can she tell by sight alone which of the individuals spoke for longer or began/ended first? Can she beat time to the stream of light flashes?¹⁷

Again, it is possible to think about the question here in terms of a comparison between the resources available in different modalities for the integration of lower dimensional information (auditory qualities at zero-dimensional instants) into a higher dimensional

¹⁶ John O'Keefe and Steven Nadel (1978) argue that the representation of space used in memories of spatial layout derives not from information received through the senses, but in innate structures in the hippocampal formation. This might be taken to suggest that the perceptual representation of space is not modal at all, or that it is amodal/"premodal" ([AUTHOR'S WORK]) and that these zero-d MQs would get a 'yes' answer for reasons that have nothing to do with intermodal transfer.

¹⁷ Evans alludes to temporal MQ, though according to his wife and posthumous editor, Antonia Phillips, he was apparently of two minds about how to approach it (372).

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

(temporally ordered) representation. (Note that these MQs are audiovisual and visuomotor, rather than visuotactile as in the original.)

There are certain ways of thinking about the experience of time that suggest (given natural assumptions) that such temporal versions of MQ should receive positive answers either a priori or on the basis of some general principle that applies equally to all the cases being discussed.¹⁸ The principles that have been proposed here are mosaicist in spirit; if you have access to information about every relevant instant of time, then you have access to higher-dimensional temporal patterns.

Some think that the temporal structure of our experience is inherited from the temporal structure of the events we experience.¹⁹ This implies that a flash seems to be before a bang just in case the flash precedes the bang.²⁰ So, the events will always seem to occur in the order they actually occur—illusions of temporal order are impossible. As long as the temporal structure of the extended events mentioned above matches, as it is stipulated to do, there is no special problem of intermodal transfer over and above that of within-modality matching. On this reading, MQ must be answered positively if there is within modality recognition of a temporal relation.

Another route to a positive answer to temporal MQ goes through the Kantian idea that time is "nothing other than the form of inner sense" (A33/B49). According to this way of thinking, temporal experience is itself not proprietary to any single, externally directed perceptual modality—on the contrary, it is always discerned, introspectively, by self-awareness of experience itself.²¹ Some extend this view to the experience of temporal relations, holding that experience of simultaneity/succession of two events just amounts to the simultaneity/succession of the experiences of those two events. This would imply an Introspective Reflection Principle (IRP) for the perception of time, according to which two events are experienced as standing in temporal relation R if and only if the

¹⁸ For example, Louise Richardson (2014) takes it as a datum that temporal MQs are unlike spatial MQs in meriting obvious positive answers, and attempts to explain why this should be so. What we say below suggests that the alleged datum is false.

¹⁹ See Ian Phillips (2008), (2011), and (2014).

²⁰ More precisely, the claim should be that the timing of the sensory experiences matches the times that information about the flash and the bang are received. We see a distant flash of lightning before we hear the thunder that accompanies it because the sound arrives after the flash.

²¹ Barry Dainton (2014) ascribes something like this view to Locke, Berkeley, and (more tentatively) to Hume, as well as to Kant and Brentano; it is also endorsed by Richardson (2014).

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

experiences of the two events stand in the temporal relation R. For example, IRP would predict that a flash of light is experienced as occurring simultaneously with/one second before a drum beat if and only if the experience of the flash occurs simultaneously with/one second before the experience of the drum beat.²²

There is a wide range of evidence that threatens both these approaches, especially over periods so brief that experience of temporal relations must be extracted, some say “constructed,” by automatic or sub-personal processes. One simple illustration of the threat comes from the finding that subjects are unable to detect onset asynchronies between visual and auditory stimuli within roughly 250ms:²³ within this window (whose breadth varies interpersonally), subjective simultaneity is susceptible to adaptation, and differs for different cross-modal combinations. Thus, subjects will experience two events as occurring simultaneously even though sensory information regarding them is received at different times.²⁴ Theoretical explanations of how experience of temporal order arises in these cases often appeal to processes that construct or reconstruct temporal order and could be prone to error. These explanations invoke a wide range of parameters and faculties, and there is no reason to expect that they would all operate the same way across modalities and domains.

IRP is threatened even more directly by a class of “postdictive” temporal illusions, in which the experienced simultaneity/succession of two experienced events is mediated by the later experience. One such case is the flash-lag effect: when a moving object and a flash are visually presented simultaneously and in the same location, subjects report the flash as occurring later than the moving object.²⁵ David Eagleman reports an analogous cross-modal postdictive illusion.²⁶ He began by adapting his subjects to a 200ms delay between a keypress and a subsequent flash, so that they experienced the two as simultaneous. When he then removed the delay in the next trial after adaptation, his subjects experienced the flash as preceding (hence, not simultaneous with) the keypress.

²² Views in the vicinity of our Reflection Principle have been endorsed by Evans (1985, 373, n18), Mellor (1985, 144), Phillips (see note 18), and Dainton (2000) and (2014). Detractors include Daniel Dennett (1991), Dennett & Marcel Kinsbourne (1992), Rick Grush (2008), Geoffrey Lee (2014), and [AUTHOR'S WORK].

²³ Dixon and Spitz (1980).

²⁴ Cf. Scheier, Nijhawan, and Shimojo, (1999); Morein-Zamir, Soto-Faraco, and Kingstone (2003), and Spence and Squire (2003).

²⁵ Nijhawan (1994).

²⁶ Eagleman (2009).

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

Prima facie, these are cases in which the subject undergoes two experiences that are simultaneous, but, contrary to IRP, she does not experience them that way.

There are, to be sure, strategies for reconciling these effects with IRP. (See, for example, the "Stalinesque" interpretation of Dennett and Kinsbourne, or the temporal smudge view of Phillips 2014). Without taking any stand on the plausibility or success of these proposals, we want to make the more general point that answering the temporal MQ will depend on the particular, and potentially modality-specific, psychological mechanisms responsible for temporal integration.²⁷

These considerations about the temporal version of MQ offer lessons for the spatial MQs as well. Just as there is a non-trivial window of subjective simultaneity such that events picked out in same/different modalities and falling in that temporal region are experienced as temporally simultaneous, we can by analogy ask whether there is a non-trivial spatial window of subjective co-location such that events discerned by same/different modalities and falling in that spatial region are experienced as co-located (cf. the ventriloquist effect, in which subjects perceive a ventriloquist's voice as originating from the location of the visually perceived dummy rather than that of the auditorily perceived ventriloquist).²⁸ This invites us to ask, further, whether visual domination over audition is relevant to MQs (in various spatial and temporal settings).

VII. A space+time, or four-dimensional, version of MQ

We said earlier that MQ raises general issues about integrating information over space and time together. And we have gone through various spatial dimensionalities in which these features are arrayed, as well as a temporal version and a version that probes how these features are learned. We conclude with a question about a feature exemplified by individuals at their location at different times. Motion is such a feature, and therefore is of special interest. Here is a version of MQ concerning motion.

²⁷ Of course, there is much more to say about these and many related results, the psychological processes of temporal integration that underpin them, and their significance for the philosophy of perception and the philosophy of time. For further examples and wide-ranging discussion, see Lee (2014) and Craig Callender (2017 ch 9).

²⁸ See Pick, Warren, and Hay, (1969); Bertelson (1999); Vroomen and de Gelder (2000) and (2004).

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

Suppose that two objects were shown to a man newly made to see, both moving from left to right, one continuously and the other in jumps. Could he tell by sight alone which is which?

We know that cortical motion blindness is an agnosia. Patients with lesions in the medio-temporal occipital cortex (MT) no longer see motion as continuous, but rather see it as a succession of discontinuous positions.²⁹ We don't know how soon after restoration of vision this visual area of the brain, which subserves the perception of motion as continuous, kicks in. We also do not know whether and how learning plays a role in the activation of MT. Consequently, the answer to this 4D MQ is unobvious, and certainly not a priori.

VIII. Conclusion

We take the foregoing to show that there is a variety of fruitful MQs, cast in a number of spatial and temporal regimes, that are about the transferability across modalities of information about spatiotemporal common sensibles, including spatial position, shape, temporal order, and change. We have argued, pace Evans, that these cannot all be reduced to questions about the existence and character of an inter-modally shared representation of space. We have also argued that it is wrong to assume that negative answers to MQ always trace back to negative answers to zero-dimensional percepts. Consequently, these questions cannot be answered a priori or by appeal to a single principle. Different MQs have different answers, within different sets of perceptual conditions. We have, however, outlined some organizing principles, based on similarities and differences among the modalities with regard to how they process information in various spatiotemporal dimensions. These organizing principles correspond to different types of obstacles that arise when the perceptual brain transfers information about features it represents in one modality to another modality.³⁰

²⁹ Zihl, Von Cramon, and Mai (1983).

³⁰ [ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS SUPPRESSED]

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

REFERENCES

- Bennett, Jonathan (1965). "Substance, Reality, and Primary Qualities," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 2: 1-17.
- Bertelson, P. (1999). "Ventriloquism: A Case of Crossmodal Perceptual Grouping," *Advances in Psychology* 129: 347-362
- Botvinik, Matthew and Cohen, Jonathan (1998). "Rubber hands 'feel' touch that eyes see," *Nature* 391 (6669): 756.
- Callender, Craig (2017). *What Makes Time Special?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cheselden, William (1728). "An Account of some Observations made by a young Gentleman, who was born blind, or lost his Sight so early, that he had no Remembrance of ever having seen, and was couch'd between 13 and 14 Years of Age", *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 402: 447-450.
- Degenaar, Marjolein and Lokhorst, Gert-Jan (2017). "Molyneux's Problem", in Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2017 Edition), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2017/entries/molyneux-problem/>.
- Dainton, Barry (2000) *Stream of consciousness: Unity and Continuity in Conscious Experience* (London: Routledge)
- Dainton, Barry (2014) "Temporal Consciousness", in Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2014 Edition), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/consciousness-temporal/>.
- Dennett Daniel (1991) *Consciousness Explained* London: Allen Lane.
- Dennett, Daniel & Marcel Kinsbourne (1992) "Time and the observer: The where and when of consciousness in the brain," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 15 (2):183-201.
- Diderot, D. 1749. *Lettre sur les aveugles, à l'usage de ceux qui voient*, edition critique par Robert Niklaus, Genève: Librairie Droz, 1951.
- Dixon, N. F. and Spitz, L. (1980). "The detection of auditory visual desynchrony," *Perception* 9(6): 719-21.
- Eagleman, David (2009). "Brain Time," in M. Brockman (ed.) *What's Next? Dispatches on the Future of Science* New York: Vintage.
- Evans, Gareth (1980). 'Things Without the Mind: A Commentary on Chapter 2 of Strawson's *Individuals*,' in Z. von Strasten (ed.) *Philosophical Subjects: Essays Presented to P. F. Strawson*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

- Evans, Gareth (1985). "Molyneux's Question." In his *Collected Papers*, Oxford: Clarendon Press: 364-399.
- Farah, Martha J. (1990). *Visual Agnosia*, Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Goodale, M. A., Milner, A. D., Jakobson, L. S. and Carey, D. P. (1991). "A neurological dissociation between perceiving objects and grasping them," *Nature* 349: 154-156.
- Grush Rick (2008). "Temporal representation and dynamics," *New Ideas in Psychology* 26: 146-157.
- Haggard, Patrick and Giavagnoli, Guilia (2011). "Spatial patterns in tactile perception: Is there a tactile field," *Acta Psychologica* 137: 65-75.
- Held, R., Ostrovsky, Y., Gandhi, T., Ganesh, S., Mathur, U., and Sinha, P. (2011) "The newly sighted fail to match seen with felt," *Nature Neuroscience* 14 (5): 551-553.
- Kim, M.-S. and Robertson, L. C. (2001). "Implicit representations of space after bilateral parietal lobe damage," *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 13(8):1080-1087.
- Lee, Geoffrey (2014). "Temporal Experience and the Temporal Structure of Experience," *Philosophers' Imprint* 14 (3).
- Lewis, David (1966). "Percepts and Color Mosaics in Visual Experience," *Philosophical Review* 75: 357-368.
- Mackie, John (1976). *Problems From Locke* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mellor, Hugh (1985) *Real Time* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morein-Zamir, S., Soto-Faraco, S., and Kingstone, A. (2003) "Auditory capture of vision: Examining temporal ventriloquism," *Cognitive Brain Research* 17(1):154-163.
- Nijhawan, R. (1994). "Motion extrapolation in catching," *Nature* 370: 256-257.
- O'Keefe, John and Nadel, Steven (1978) *The Hippocampus as Cognitive Map* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ostrovsky, Y., Andalman, A., and Sinha, P. (2006). "Vision After Congenital Blindness," *Psychological Science* 17: 1009-1014.
- Ostrovsky, Y., Meyers, E., Ganesh, S., Mathur, U., and Sinha, P. (2009). "Visual Parsing After Recovery From Blindness," *Psychological Science* 20 (12): 1484-1491.
- Phillips, Ian (2008). "Perceiving temporal properties," *European Journal of Philosophy* 18(2): 176- 202.
- Phillips, Ian (2011). "Indiscriminability and experience of change," *Philosophical Quarterly* 61: 808-827.

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

- Phillips, Ian (2014). "The Temporal Structure of Experience," in D. Lloyd and V. Arstila (eds.) *Subjective Time: the Philosophy, Psychology, and Neuroscience of Temporality* Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Pick, H. L. Jr., Warren David H., and Hay, John C. (1969). "Sensory conflict in judgements of spatial direction," *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* 6(4): 203-205
- Richardson, Louise (2014). "Space, Time and Molyneux's Question," *Ratio* 27 (4): 483-505.
- Robertson, L. C., Treisman, A. M., Friedman-Hill, S. R., and Grabowecky, M. (1997). "The interaction of spatial and object pathways: Evidence from Balint's syndrome," *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 9: 691-700.
- Robertson, L. C. (2004). *Space, Objects, Minds and Brains*. Psychology Press, New York.
- Scheier, C. R., Nijhawan, R. and Shimojo, S. (1999). "Sound alters visual temporal resolution," *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, 40(4):4169
- Schwenkler, John (2012a). "Does Visual Spatial Awareness Require the Visual Awareness of Space?" *Mind and Language* 27:308-329.
- Schwenkler, John (2012b). "On the matching of seen and felt shape by newly sighted subjects," *i-Perception* 3.3 : 186-188.
- von Senden, M. (1932). *Raum- und Gestaltauffassung bei operierten Blindgeborenen* Leipzig: Barth, 1932, translated by P. Heath: *Space and Sight: The Perception of Space and Shape in the Congenitally Blind Before and After Operation* London: Methuen, 1960.
- Spence C. and Squire, S. (2003). "Multisensory integration: Maintaining the perception of synchrony," *Current Biology* 13(13): R519-21.
- Vroomen, Jean and de Gelder, Beatrice (2000). "Sound enhances visual perception: crossmodal effects of auditory organization on vision," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 26(5): 1583-1590.
- Vroomen, Jean and de Gelder, Beatrice (2004). "Ventriloquism and the freezing phenomenon," in G. A. Calvert, C. Spence, and B. E. Stein (eds.), *The Handbook of Multisensory Processes* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press: 141-150.
- Zihl, J., von Cramon, D. and Mai, N. (1983). "Selective disturbance of movement vision after bilateral brain damage," *Brain*, 106: 313-340.

MANY MOLYNEUX QUESTIONS

Figure 1



Figure 2

