Does the physicalist have to fold his hand in admitting that Mary gains new knowledge, or can he accommodate this intuition and still maintain that all facts are physical facts?

Hsueh Qu[1]
Department of Philosophy
University of Oxford

A few common moves in response to the Knowledge Argument are as follows:

- Mary did not have all the facts in her black and white room: Not all physical facts can be expressed by the languages of the sciences (Flanagan, 1992). Some proponents of this line go on to claim that "qualia" facts are basic, irreducible, and "brute" physical facts.

- An account of why a certain physical fact cannot be expressed by the language of the sciences (or any language, in fact) needs to be given, otherwise this account merely begs the question against the Knowledge Argument. Whether a satisfactory account can be given seems dubious.

- Mary gains new "know-how" but not new "know-that." She does not gain any new propositional knowledge, merely a set of abilities of recognizing, distinguishing, imagining, and so forth, with regard to color (Lewis, 1990).

- One could imagine a person (call her Marie), however, who had the set of abilities listed above but yet did not know what the qualia of red was like. The set of abilities, therefore, cannot be constitutive of knowledge of color qualia. Besides, propositional knowledge follows from knowledge of color qualia: Mary would gain knowledge of the proposition "Red corresponds to this experience."

- Mary gains new knowledge when she sees the color red, but of an old fact, which she already knew (Tye, 1995).

It is with the last strategy (the Old Fact/ New Knowledge line) that this essay is primarily concerned, as I believe that it is the most plausible line of the three (a fuller treatment of the other options is unavailable due to space considerations).

Tye argues that although Mary does, in fact, gain new knowledge when she leaves her room, this is merely new knowledge of an old fact. He distinguishes between "fine-grained" and "course-grained" facts. Fine-grained facts are intensionally individuated, while course-grained facts are extensionally individuated, and are "states of affairs that obtain in the objective world, regardless of how those states of affairs are conceived" (Tye, 1995, p. 173). Fine-grained facts supervene on

[1] hsueh.qu@hertford.ox.ac.uk

course-grained facts, and are modes of presentations[1] or conceptions of coarse-grained facts.

Thus, according to Tye, Mary does gain new knowledge upon seeing the color red, but only of a new fine-grained fact supervening on a course-grained fact she already had access to. Tye is a coarse-grained physicalist: He holds that all coarse-grained facts are physical facts. On his line, Mary did not learn a new coarse-grained fact when she left the room, but rather she gained a new mode of presentation of an old coarse-grained fact she already knew. One can only gain this phenomenal concept through phenomenal experience.

Lockwood (1989) and Chalmers (1996) raise the worry that Mary, in gaining a new outlook on an old fact, also learns a new fact: New knowledge of an old fact requires new knowledge of a new fact. In order to make epistemic progress, Mary would have to gain knowledge of a new fact connecting the two modes of presentation. For example, my ignorance of the relationship between the Morning Star and the Evening Star would have been eliminated through further factual knowledge that Venus was visible from Earth both in the morning and the evening. Indeed, the relationship "the morning star is the evening star" is a fact itself: The fact in question being that X and Y are modes of presentation of the same coarse-grained fact.

Tye responds by arguing that although Mary does learn other new facts in learning the fine-grained phenomenal fact of what red is like, these facts are also fine-grained. Therefore, Mary does not gain any knowledge of new coarse-grained facts. Tye's response is best illustrated by means of his thought experiment, where Tye seems to see a person across the room wearing his old school tie. In fact, Tye is looking into a mirror and is seeing himself wearing his old school tie. He hadn't realized that he was wearing his old school tie in his haste to get to the event. The reason Tye does not realize he is wearing his old school tie, even though he knows the person he is seeing is wearing his old school tie, seems to be the fine-grained fact that Tye does not realize he is the person he is seeing. Nonetheless, Tye knows the coarse-grained fact that this fine-grained fact supervenes on, that is the fact that he is himself. So although Tye learns a new fact, it is merely a fine-grained fact, which supervenes on a coarse-grained fact, which he already knew. Similarly, in leaving the room, all Mary learns are new fine-grained facts, which supervene on coarse-grained facts, which she already knew.

However, this solution does not solve the problem, but merely transposes it. If Tye explains Mary's ignorance of the new phenomenal fine-grained fact through her ignorance of another phenomenal fine-grained fact, then her ignorance of that further phenomenal fine-grained fact must be accounted for. If this is yet again explained

[1] Here Tye is gesturing towards a broadly Fregean conception of modes of presentation. Frege believed that we could conceive of the same object with different senses: for example, the way Hepserus and Phosphorus are viewed differently, though they are identical. These senses are usually (but not always) read as "modes of presentations" or manners of conception.

through her ignorance of yet another phenomenal fine-grained fact, we find ourselves on an infinite regress. To halt the regress, Tye would have to argue that at some point, Mary learns a new fine-grained phenomenal fact without this new knowledge being explained by knowledge of another fact. This is simply to beg the question against Lockwood and Chalmers.

One might object that the regress would equally apply to a non-physicalist position: It is not immediately clear how dualism would solve the issue. Say Mary learnt a new non-physical fact upon seeing the color red. Wouldn't this new knowledge have to be explained by new knowledge of another fact as well, and so forth, in which case a regress occurs regardless? This objection, however, is unfounded. If the new non-physical fact that Mary learnt was a coarse-grained one, then her new knowledge does not need to be explained by a further fact. It is only new knowledge of fine-grained facts that need to be explained by knowledge of other facts, because fine-grained facts supervene upon coarse-grained facts. Since coarse-grained facts are not supervenient on other facts but are simply states of affairs (as Tye defines them), knowledge of them does not require knowledge of further facts. This is not the case for fine-grained facts. One can only stop the regress by pointing to new knowledge of a coarse-grained fact at some point in the chain. Since, however, Mary knew all the physical facts prior to leaving the room, this would be to abandon physicalism.

Alternatively, one sympathetic to Tye's position might simply embrace the regress: Mary is ignorant of an infinite number of phenomenal fine-grained facts, but, crucially, she has full knowledge of the coarse-grained facts. The regress, however, seems to entail that knowledge of phenomenal facts is an "all or nothing" affair: Knowledge of just one phenomenal fact would entail knowledge of an infinite number of phenomenal facts. Given that an infinite number of phenomenal facts is exhaustive of the phenomenal facts, one either has no knowledge of phenomenal facts, or one has all knowledge of phenomenal facts. This seems clearly false; a color-blind person could know what yellow and blue look like but not red or green, for example. This conclusion could be avoided by appealing to larger and smaller infinities, with the infinity of all phenomenal facts being larger than the infinity of the phenomenal facts of which one is ignorant. That discussion, however, would take us too far afield from the scope of this paper, and besides, the position begins to look quite implausible regardless.

Thus, the New Fact/ Old Knowledge line fails to defend physicalism from Mary, and the other lines are problematic and implausible. Therefore, it seems that if we accept that Mary gains new knowledge when she sees the color red for the first time, we must reject physicalism. This is not to give up the physicalist ghost against the Knowledge Argument: We could, like Dennett, argue that if Mary truly had access to all the physical facts, then she would not gain new knowledge upon leaving the room (for example, she would not be fooled by a blue banana as she could recognize the relevant brain patterns). If we concede that Mary gains new knowledge upon seeing the color red, however, then we seem to be led to a non-physicalist theory of

consciousness.

References

Alter, T. (2006). The knowledge argument against physicalism. In *The internet encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved June 21, 2008, from http://www.iep.utm.edu/k/know-arg.htm.

Chalmers, D.J. (1996). *The conscious mind: In search of a fundamental theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chalmers, D.J. (2004). Phenomenal concepts and the knowledge argument. In P. Ludlow, Y. Nagasawa, & D. Stoljar (Eds), *There's something about Mary.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dennett, D. (1991). *Consciousness explained*. Boston, MA: Little Brown and Company.

Flanagan, O. (1992). *Consciousness reconsidered*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Jackson, F. (1982). Epiphenomenal Qualia. *The Philosophical Quarterly, 32*(127), 127-136 .

Jackson, F. (1986). What Mary Didn't Know. *Journal of Philosophy, 83*, 291-295.

Lewis, D. (1990) What Experience Teaches. In W.G. Lycan (Ed.), *Mind and Cognition* (pp. 499-518). Oxford: Blackwell. (Reprinted from *Proceedings of the Russellian Society*, 1988, Sydney: University of Sydney.

Lockwood, M. (1989). *Mind, brain, and the quantum*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nida-Rümelin, M. (2002). The Knowledge Argument. In The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. Retrieved June 21, 2008, from http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qualia-knowledge/.

Tye, M. (1995). *Ten problems of consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Tye, M. (1999). Phenomenal consciousness: The explanatory gap as a cognitive illusion. *Mind, 108*, 705-725.