



6

Raum and 'Room': Comments on Anton Marty on Space Perception

Clare Mac Cumhaill

1 Space and Place

At the very outset of his discussion of space, in the first part of *Raum und Zeit*, a work composed in haste at the end of his life and published posthumously by his students—the 'feather' fell from the author's hand mid-composition (RZ: iv),¹ we are told—Anton Marty introduces a number of ways in which 'Raum' (space), and the related term 'Ort' (place) can be used. At least some of these uses are centrally relevant to his exploration. More than that, they set the data for his treatise in a way to be made clear.

Marty at once dispenses with two uses; a 'social' use which he concedes may even be primary, whereby 'place' is understood to be an 'inhabited space'; and one which might be expressed in English as 'terminus'—the end of some process or thing (for instance, the ground may be the 'place' for fallen things). He observes that sometimes 'Ort'

A1 C. Mac Cumhaill (✉)
A2 Durham University, Durham, UK
A3 e-mail: clare.maccumhaill@dur.ac.uk



2 C. Mac Cumhaill

19 and ‘Raum’ are used interchangeably, sometimes synonymously. The
20 example he gives is striking:

21 Der Körper ist an dem Orte” heißt ganz dasselbe wie “er ist in dem
22 Raume. (RZ, §1: 3)

AQ1

23 There is a like parallel in English. ‘an dem Orte’ is naturally translated
24 in English as ‘at the place’. But while ‘at’ may be distinguished from ‘in’
25 insofar as the former refers to a place idealised as a zero-dimensional
26 topological point and the latter a place idealised as two-dimensional
27 area or a three-dimensional volume (Wesche 1985: 385), we typically
28 tend to think, and say, that things ‘in’ space, in being in space, are ‘at’
29 places. On this intuitive conception, a place is understood to be a spa-
30 tial region of limited extent, a use of ‘place’ that Marty also catalogues
31 and which goes hand in hand with the conception of space that I note
32 in closing. For now, I can be brief.

AQ2

33 Places are countable and ‘spaces’ may be too. ‘Space’, however, is
34 often used as a *mass* noun like sugar or rain; we may speak of there
35 being more or less ‘space’ (notice, it is less felicitous to say more or less
36 ‘place’). In everyday English, we also sometimes speak of there being
37 more or less ‘room’, a term cognate with the German term ‘Raum’.
38 Marty’s exploration evidences that *his* ‘Raum’ encompasses what *we*
39 call ‘room’—a space for a purpose or a person, a space which is often
40 enclosed. But the English word ‘space’, and certainly in recent analytic
41 philosophical use, is less embrative.

42 Finally, Marty introduces two analogous uses where ‘place’ and ‘space’
43 overlap. *Empty* places are those that can be easily passed through and
44 filled, while ‘the space of a body’ refers to its cubic content or three-
45 dimensional extent. Critically, Marty writes that the latter concept
46 presupposes a local positivity that is not identical with it [the body]’
47 (RZ, §1: 4). Let us call this the *Naive Presupposition*—‘naïve’ since it
48 tallies, I think, with our pre-theoretic ontology of perceptual space. Or
49 so I shall assume.

50 Marty takes it that *what exists* is the subject of true affirmative
51 judgement—*viz.* a judgement with the content that ‘*x* is’ or, in this
52 case, ‘space exists’. Such pronouncements are hardly every day. Less



6 Raum and 'Room': Comments on Anton Marty ...

3

53 mysteriously, it seems we can truly judge of things that they are 'in
54 space' or 'at a place'—that an acrobat is suspended in mid-air 'over
55 there', say. Marty's project is to uncover the nature of this 'what is'—
56 *space*—and the spatial relations that, as he argues, it grounds, and he
57 does so by arguing against a series of philosophical fathers, among them
58 Descartes, Berkeley, Kant and his former teacher Brentano, a dialectical
59 strategy that, as Simons (1990: 157) notes is by no means advantageous.
60 In particular, Marty's positive view, which is interpolated with polemic,
61 is motivated mostly negatively. By sifting a number of positive claims
62 from the earlier sections of *Raum und Zeit*—the section entitled 'vom
63 Raume'—I have a go at setting a Martyan picture of space perception
64 against the backdrop of contemporary philosophy of perception.

65 The paper unfolds as follows. In Sect. 2, I sketch two charges that
66 Marty raises against Kant and Brentano. Both charges are descriptive
67 and conceptual. Kant's descriptive phenomenology is inadequate, Marty
68 urges. 'Form' is in no sense prior to 'matter'. But it follows from this
69 exploration, in ways I will explain, that Brentano's empirical psychology
70 is also inadequate, and this despite its anti-Kantian flavour. From there,
71 I outline Marty's unusual ontology of space (Sect. 3). Marty has it that
72 spatial relations are non-real but existent, causally inert relations that are
73 grounded in space, which is itself non-real but existent. Objects do not
74 inhere in space in the way properties inhere in substances. Rather, there
75 is a primitive non-real relation of 'fulfillment' (Erfüllung) that holds
76 between objects and places in space, which itself subsists.²

77 In Sect. 4, I consider whether any contemporary philosophy of percep-
78 tion is equipped to make sense of Martyan space perception, and I
79 suggest that the most promising conception is Naïve Realism. I support
80 my proposal by drawing on some limited remarks that Marty makes in
81 a short correspondence with Husserl.³ I then outline a difficulty for this
82 theoretical translation.

83 Naïve Realism is a direct theory of perception which is often cast
84 as *relationalist*: Perceptions are fundamentally conscious experiences
85 in which the perceiver is directly acquainted with mind-independent
86 worldly objects, events, and, for some, regions of space and intervals
87 of time. Thus, S perceives O, just in case S stands in such a psycho-
88 logical relation of acquaintance. This relation is non-representational,



4 C. Mac Cumhaill

89 primitive, and, typically, is conceived as a relation of *perceptual aware-*
90 *ness*. As we shall see, the worldly objects of one's acquaintance partly,
91 though constitutively, determine conscious character.⁴

92 For Marty, however, *all* relations are non-real. Further, insofar as they
93 are grounded, they are not fundamental. But in this sense, it might
94 be supposed that they ought not to be construed as brute or primitive
95 either. With this in mind, we might wonder in what sense, if any, the
96 perceptual relation that the Naïve Realist envisages might be conceived
97 as non-real and what its real grounds could thereby be. I explore these
98 matters in Sect. 5, before going on to describe a distinctively Martyan
99 form of Naïve Realism, one which preserves the central theoretical tenet
100 that phenomenal character is fundamentally constituted by worldly
101 objects—Call this the *Assimilation Thesis*—but which regards the
102 apparent relational structure of *awareness* as derived, for reasons to be
103 made plain. There are two routes to explain the derivation of the struc-
104 ture that the standard Naïve Realist invokes in her talk of a relation of
105 awareness: one is psychological and necessary, the other is artefactual. I
106 make headway in spelling out the latter by bringing Marty into fleeting
107 conversation with another Thomist—G.E.M. Anscombe (Sect. 6).

108 2 Kant and Brentano—Dimensions of a 109 Critique

110 Marty's *Raum und Zeit* has two parts; the first dealing with space, of
111 which there are 33 numbered sections, the latter with time. My recon-
112 struction considers only the first part. Of those 33 sections, a substan-
113 tial number deal with the shortcomings, as Marty sees them, of central
114 canonical figures—most notably, for my purposes, Kant and Brentano.
115 Both of the charges that I see as relevant to my exploration (there are
116 many others), Marty erects primarily on descriptive phenomenological
117 grounds. Let's start with the first objection.⁵

118 Kant is correct, says Marty, in maintaining that if *anything* sen-
119 sory is given than so is space. For Kant, notoriously, this is since the
120 form of the receptive faculty is such that, necessarily, anything that



6 Raum and 'Room': Comments on Anton Marty ...

5

121 is phenomenally given is given in space. But Marty wonders whether
 122 from this descriptively true claim, Kant's treatment of space as a sub-
 123 jective form of intuition is invited. Marty reads Kant's transformation
 124 of Newtonian space into a subjective form of intuition as preserving
 125 Newton's insistence on the unity, infinity and independence of space
 126 from that which fills it. In Kant's case however, the independence cri-
 127 terion is reconceived in the following way: the form of intuition is
 128 'pure'—a priori and not dependent on quality. Marty questions this
 129 from a descriptive phenomenological perspective.

130 It is 'undeniable', he says, that we can only abstract spatiality from
 131 quality; when we see colour we see extent, and it is only by abstraction
 132 that we can 'abstract' away from the peculiarities of colour and conceive
 133 of spatiality as distinct from quality. Further:

134 Immediately and vividly we are only given the presentation of a space
 135 filled with quality. (RZ, §4: 8)

136 But, this being so, it is 'factually above all doubt', says Marty, that our
 137 intuition of space is not quality-less, or 'pure' in the sense specified
 138 above, and nor are we given an infinite space—Marty takes it as just
 139 obvious that our spatial vision is finite, and even very limited.⁶ Again,
 140 his point is descriptive, but he augments it with a genetic or causal
 141 claim: no purely empty space could affect our senses. This does not
 142 show that space is a subjective form of intuition however. It only shows
 143 that just as colour cannot be sensed without extent, *the converse also*
 144 *holds*. Space cannot be intuited without localised quality.⁷ Prima facie,
 145 this might be thought to suggest that Marty must deny that intuited
 146 space retains aspects of the Newtonian conception—most modestly,
 147 the thought that space is something over and above its contents, or
 148 that which fills it. As we will see however, though Marty agrees with
 149 Kant that whenever something sensible is given so is space, and while
 150 he argues that space cannot be given without quality—deriding, as his
 151 friend Carl Stumpf also does, Kant's imaginative 'subtraction argument',
 152 something which I leave aside⁸—he rejects a relationist conception of
 153 space, and not only on descriptive phenomenological grounds, but also,



6 C. Mac Cumhaill

154 it seems, on conceptual grounds too. Thus, we find Marty writing in an
155 intriguing footnote:

156 Kant considers the presentation of an ‘empty space’ as a posteriori. If one
157 understands by this the presentation of an empty space outside the world,
158 this only follows. For the presentation of a world is certainly empirical,
159 and so also is the [presentation] of adjacent space, not filled with bodies,
160 that would have common boundaries with that world, since the adjacent,
161 as such, cannot be presented without *what* borders it. (RZ, §6: 17, fn. 1)⁹

162 It is notable that Marty refers here to the presentation of *an* empty
163 space, the singularity of which must, in Kantian terms, be a posteriori.
164 This claim is difficult to make sense of, but one suggestion is the
165 following: such a presentation must be a posteriori since an empty space
166 is *one that is not filled with body*. It is hence not ‘empty’ in the sense that
167 a mere form of intuition is, viz. contentless, or without sensible mat-
168 ter. If correct, this suggests a further tempting line of thought. C. B.
169 Martin holds that the provision of the limits of the being of presences
170 (things like pens and bicycles) requires the presence of *absence* outwith
171 those limits—the presence of absence *at places* where those things are
172 not or *empty* regions.¹⁰ But if so, and if part of the concept of a body is
173 that of a *limited* whole, then the concept of an empty space in the first
174 sense (viz. not in the sense of a form of intuition) attends, or is part of
175 the structure of, our concept of a body. More explicit is Marty’s critique
176 of Brentano, also on conceptual grounds—and here, as Smith puts it,
177 ‘Marty seeks a position more commonsensical than that of his master,
178 even at the price of a certain sort of theoretical inelegance’ (1990: 129).
179 I detail Marty’s ‘inelegant’ theory in Sect. 3. First, some comments on
180 his divergence from Brentano.

181 Like Marty, Brentano also maintains a form of spatial *nativism*—
182 namely, the thought that space is given as part of the originary content
183 of experience: it is not a form of intuition, as Kant thought, and nor is
184 form (typically the form of objects) constructed from bundles of sensa-
185 tion, as an empiricist might hold. Rather, colour continua are *founded*
186 on spatial continua, the spatial extents they ‘colour’. Here ‘founded’ is a
187 technical term that we can gloss simply, for the purposes of this paper,



6 Raum and 'Room': Comments on Anton Marty ...

7

188 as one-sided dependence.¹¹ Since colour is founded on spatial continua,
189 we cannot see colour without seeing extent.

190 For most of his life, Brentano maintained that spatial continua are in
191 turn secondary to, or founded on, temporal continua, where this entails
192 a concomitant rejection of spatial absolutism; what is spatial coincides
193 with what is *corporeal* and only insofar as bodies persist through time
194 can we say that the three-dimensional spatial continuum that they con-
195 stitute persists also.¹² In later writing on space, however, specifically
196 in the *Categories*, Brentano appears to grant that places are substances
197 which may or may not be filled. For Smith (1990: 128), Brentano
198 makes this shift so as to be able to give an account of what individuates
199 otherwise qualitatively identical things. Thus, '[t]wo dots of identically
200 the same red are individually different only because one is here, and the
201 other there' (*Kat*, 247, Eng tran., p. 177). But, unsurprisingly, such an
202 individuation condition makes movement impossibly rare; if things are
203 individuated by the places at which they are, no *thing* can move place
204 and yet be the same.¹³

205 Marty rejects both these Brentanian theses, the earlier and the later.
206 Philosophy, he says, has to 'exercise its office by stubbornly and repeat-
207 edly, pointing out the questionable, even the impossibility and absurdity
208 of certain conditions' (RZ, §1: 72), words he borrows from Hermann
209 von Lotze, his former dissertation supervisor (an appeal that is strik-
210 ing in the context of his dispute with his other mentor, Brentano).
211 For Marty, that space is nothing but the ordering of bodies is one such
212 absurdity. But so is the thought that movement is something merely,
213 and only relative or, worse, a fiction. I will assume that this rejection
214 is something that Marty thinks follows from the very *concept* of move-
215 ment. But this is not all. Recall the *Naïve Presupposition* has it that we
216 take bodies to be *at* places of three-dimensional extent, where such
217 places are *positivities* that we may say are *filled*—indeed, as we shall see,
218 Marty takes the relation of 'fulfilment' as basic. The relationist about
219 space can only reductively identify such places with respect to *other*
220 bodies in the web of corporeal bodies that constitute the spatial contin-
221 uum. But, as such, the place at which an object is, for the spatial rela-
222 tionist, somehow 'external to it'; it is individuated with respect to *other*
223 bodies in the nexus, something that, for Marty, seems to run counter

**8 C. Mac Cumhaill**

224 to how things strike us. How so? For if this were the case, he seems to
 225 ask, what could be the meaning or essence of what might be called the
 226 *in-dwelling*, or in-space being of a body (Innewohnen oder Im-Raum-
 227 Sein der Körper [RZ, §15: 76])—the very space or place which the
 228 *Naïve Presupposition* presupposes that things in space occupy or fill?
 229 Marty characterises the alternative, reductive strategy of his opponent as
 230 follows:

231 To say that between this and another body (atom) is an *empty space* is
 232 only a pictorial way of speaking which, by a fiction of inner form of lan-
 233 guage, puts something positive in the place of something negative. The
 234 correct negative form of expression would be that *no other body* is between
 235 bodies X and Y at any distance from them. Similarly, instead of: from a
 236 certain place, empty space expands (in the infinite), the facts can be stated
 237 more reasonably as: beyond a certain distance, no body is found anymore.
 238 (RZ, §18: 88)

239 Marty does not accept this negative thesis. I sketch his positive proposal
 240 below. For now, it is worth noting that Brentano appears, if not to
 241 revert to his former position at the end of his life, then to equivocate.
 242 Only weeks before his death, on 23 February 1917, a year after the
 243 publication of *Raum und Zeit*, Brentano dictated the essay ‘What we
 244 can learn about space and time from the conflicting errors of philoso-
 245 phers’. Brentano, it seems, wants to reclaim the thesis that empty space
 246 is a fiction:

247 It has been said that if a body is to move then there must exist an empty
 248 space into which it moves. This is just as compelling as if someone were
 249 to say that, if something to change colour, there must already exist a col-
 250 our which it then takes on. (quoted in Smith 1990: 169)

AQ4

251 Adding in a footnote:

252 And indeed why not also: if someone is to enter into marriage, then this
 253 marriage must already exist beforehand? (ibid.: fn. 3)

254 Marty’s name is mentioned six times in this discussion.



255 3 Marty's Radical Conception

256 We have seen that for Marty space is not a subjective form of intui-
 257 tion. Mind-independent space would exist in the absence of anyone
 258 perceiving it (see Johansson, this volume). Nonetheless, *when* space is
 259 perceived, it is given *with* the sensible. Further, just as one cannot see
 260 colour without seeing extent, one cannot see space without seeing sen-
 261 sible bodies. Importantly, however, this does not entail, *pace* the early
 262 Brentano, that space is to be *identified* with sensible bodies and the rela-
 263 tions in which they stand to one another—it does not mean that 'empty
 264 space' is a fiction. So, what, then, is Marty's radical alternative?

265 For Marty, empty space, at least on one understanding, is *space* that
 266 is not filled, where space is a positivity, or, more precisely, as I explain
 267 below, non-real existent (see also Johansson, this volume). *Prima facie*
 268 this might seem to align with Brentano's later position, but this is not
 269 so. For Marty, whatever can be the subject of a true affirmative judge-
 270 ment exists, where what is non-real in addition is non-real insofar as it
 271 cannot enter into causal relations. After Smith, let us call those objects
 272 that *can* enter into causal relations, and which Marty designates as 'real',
 273 *energetic* objects. Non-real entities are, by contrast, *anergetic* objects,
 274 among which are included collectives, states of affairs, values and, as we
 275 shall see, relations and space.

276 Now, that space is anergetic might tempt one into supposing that
 277 it is ideal and subjective. But Marty holds that it cannot be subjective
 278 for the nativist reasons he offers in critique of Kant. Yet nor can it be
 279 objective only through being identified with real bodies, as the earlier
 280 Brentano proposes. This not only runs counter to what I am calling
 281 the *Naïve Presupposition*, but leads too to an unacceptable scepticism,
 282 or at least reductionism, about movement. And once space is admit-
 283 ted instead as a substance that individuates property instances, this
 284 scepticism only grows. It is this latter Brentanian proposal that Marty's
 285 proposal definitively wants to avert.

286 Substances are real for Marty, and they individuate property
 287 instances. Since movement is possible however—and here is Marty's
 288 common sense in action—space cannot be said to individuate otherwise



10 C. Mac Cumhaill

289 identical things. Space then is not a substance, so defined. Rather it is,
 290 says Marty, a *subsistent*. Subsistents are like substances insofar as they do
 291 not ‘inhere’ in anything, but unlike substances *subsistents* are non-real.
 292 Thus, while property instances (accidents) inhere in substances, objects
 293 cannot be said to ‘inhere’ in space. Rather, Marty takes the relation
 294 of objects to space as brute and basic—they are said, again in the line
 295 with common parlance, to ‘fill’ it (we have called this relation ‘fulfil-
 296 ment’; Johansson, this volume calls it ‘space-filling’; the German term is
 297 ‘Raumerfüllung’).

298 With this much spelt out, we can finally detail out the nature of spa-
 299 tial relations for Marty. Spatial relations hold *between positions in space*:

300 As far as location [*Ortlichkeit*] by itself is concerned it is uncontroversial
 301 that the relations of being outside and of being side by side are grounded
 302 local relations that presuppose absolute places as their grounding funda-
 303 menta. (RZ, §7: 24)¹⁴

304 Like all relations, spatial relations are themselves non-real. Nonetheless,
 305 they are grounded in space, itself an objective non-real existent (see
 306 Johansson 1990 for discussion).

307 4 Marty, Husserl and a Contemporary 308 Translation

309 Let us gather together some claims that have been sketched, and
 310 grant that, from the contemporary perspective, a rather exotic picture
 311 emerges.

- 312 – Space is existent; it is the subject of true affirmative judgement.
- 313 – Its manner of existence is that it subsists; nothing inheres in it.
- 314 – Space is a positivity.
- 315 – Space is anergetic.
- 316 – Space is non-real.
- 317 – Space is not a quality-less form of intuition.
- 318 – When something sensible is given so, necessarily, is form.¹⁵



- 319 – Objects fill space, where the relation of objects to space is *sui*
 320 *generis*—it is one of fulfilment.
 321 – Space cannot be intuited without the presentation of something
 322 sensible.

323 To make this latter point a little clearer, let us distinguish *subsistent*
 324 *space* from *substantial form*. Unlike Brentano and Stumpf, Marty *doesn't*
 325 think that we only perceive substantial form. The relation of substantial
 326 form to subsistent space is, recall, one of fulfilment (space-filling),
 327 where empty space is subsistent space that is unfilled. Can we assume,
 328 therefore and further, that Marty supposes that empty space can be
 329 perceived?

330 Two considerations might be offered here. First, Marty's opening
 331 exploration appeals directly to empty space. The concept of an empty
 332 space is of a region that can be passed through. Such spaces can be sub-
 333 jects of true affirmative judgement. Second, the concept of an empty
 334 space is not the concept of a pure form of intuition, but, arguably, the
 335 concept of a region that is empty of body. Since, however, Marty denies
 336 that space is to be identified with sensible bodies and the relations in
 337 which they stand to one another, even while he holds that we cannot
 338 perceive space without also perceiving something sensible, it is argua-
 339 ble that he ought to be prepared to grant that we perceive empty space.
 340 Why? Since he allows that we perceive space *tout court*; both filled and
 341 unfilled (to wit: empty) spatial regions.

342 I consider this line of thinking attractive, and it guides what fol-
 343 lows.¹⁶ However, further work is needed to establish Marty's final view
 344 on the possibility of our perceiving empty space—a question over which
 345 Brentano, Stumpf and Husserl all waver. To this extent while the explo-
 346 rations that follow are *Martyan* insofar as they are in the spirit of Marty,
 347 they might not be wholly to the letter. My task in the remainder of the
 348 paper is to consider *Martyan* space perception, thus understood, in
 349 the light of contemporary philosophy of perception. I take this to be
 350 a useful exercise since Marty, as I read him, offers a host of conceptual
 351 resources that suggest ways of reframing questions about space percep-
 352 tion and perceptual experience more generally, in ways I hope to show-
 353 case, if only in a schematic way.



12 C. Mac Cumhaill

354 The explorations that follow then are rough. Even so, it strikes me
355 that two lessons already follow from what I have drawn out so far.
356 Setting these out helps frame the course of the rest of the paper.

357 First, for Marty, space is a non-real existent, not a subjective form
358 of intuition. This being so, it might be thought that any philosophy
359 of perception that endorses the thought that space *itself* is a subjective
360 form of intuition—rather than something that can be presented under a
361 subjective or ideal mode of presentation say—is non-Martyan.¹⁷

362 Second, since space is non-real on this Martyan picture, it is anergetic.
363 Hence any philosophy of perception which necessitates a causal
364 theory of perception, even where this is treated counterfactually, or one
365 whereby our receptivity extends only to sensible matter, is also at odds
366 with Marty.

367 These two lessons touch on Marty's anti-*Kantian* misgivings on the
368 one hand, and his anti-*Brentanian* considerations on the other. Space
369 is not ideal (anti-Kantian), and nor can it be identified with corporeal,
370 substantial bodies (anti-Brentanian). On the assumption that space can
371 be an object of experience, however, rather than a subjective form of
372 intuition, *and* on the assumption that space is something anergetic that
373 exists in addition to the objects it fills, a question is suggested. What
374 philosophical theory of perception could embrace a Martyan space
375 perception, this much assumed?

376 Begin with orthodoxy. Many forms of standard representationalism,
377 where this is taken to be a thesis concerning the fundamental nature of
378 experience, should run into difficulty on the second count—viz. where
379 the anergetic nature of space is acknowledged. This is since veridical
380 experience is typically taken to be experience that has been caused in
381 the right way, where here the appeal is to experiential states and their
382 causes. In addition, externalists emphasise a history of causal interac-
383 tion with properties or kinds represented. But this being so, the ineffica-
384 ciousness of space should make problematic the individuation of certain
385 aspects of spatial content.¹⁸

386 These twin difficulties suggest to me that we should leave representa-
387 tionalism aside, and I do so for the most part of the remainder paper.
388 But the standard palette of philosophical theories of perception is more
389 colourful—it includes forms of relationism, as well as adverbialism. In



390 what follows, I will suggest that it is plausible to think that Martyan
391 perception embraces some form of Naïve Realist relational theory; how
392 we should characterise this is something I turn to in the next section.
393 Before that however, it is worth querying whether the kind of structure
394 of experience that the sense-datum theorist envisages, also a relationist
395 of sorts, could plausibly apply to experience of space, including, criti-
396 cally, experience of empty regions.

397 For the purposes of this paper, I will treat the philosophical con-
398 cept of a sense-datum *functionally*. Call a sense-datum *whatever it is*
399 that we are immediately aware of in experience, in virtue of which, in
400 non-hallucinatory perception, we are mediately aware of worldly objects
401 and their properties.¹⁹ Assume, here, that experience has an act/object
402 structure and, further, that demonstrative reference to worldly objects
403 is secured in virtue of the experience of or sensing of sense data. After
404 H. H. Price, call the relation between the sense-datum and that which
405 is indirectly or mediately perceived in virtue of the sensing of the
406 sense-datum '*belonging*'. Take it that belonging is a non-causal relation.²⁰

407 Now, supposing that sense-datum 'belongs to' the worldly object
408 sensed in virtue of the sensing of it (the sense-datum), we might ask:
409 Could there be a space-presenting sense-datum in virtue of which non-
410 real objective space is perceived and could be demonstrated?

411 If my reading of Marty is on the right track, the relevant sense-datum
412 could not be ideal or subjective, though it could plausibly be private (cf.
413 Johansson 2018). Importantly, however, it cannot be entirely insensible.
414 The notion of an insensible sense-datum is hardly a happy one, but,
415 as we have seen, Marty anyway insists that space cannot be perceived
416 in the absence of the perception of *some* local quality. Yet even if this
417 much is granted we might wonder: How could a space-presenting sense-
418 datum *belong* to its object?

419 Belonging is perhaps no more mysterious in the case of space per-
420 ception than it is in the case of objects. Still, from the functional per-
421 spective we have adopted above, belonging, whatever its nature, must
422 allow for the kind of cleavage on which arguments from conflicting
423 appearances to the existence of sense-data spin. That is, belonging ought
424 to be consistent with the putative immediate objects of experience hav-
425 ing properties that, as we may say, 'conflict' with the properties of the



14 C. Mac Cumhaill

426 worldly items mediately perceived in virtue of the sensing of sense data.
 427 Thus, we want to allow that an elliptical sense-datum can ‘belong’ to a
 428 circular coin.

429 It is not clear that Marty would be willing to admit such disparity or
 430 conflict between entities that can be said to putatively ‘belong’ together.
 431 Why so? As Smith (1990: 137) explains ‘consciousness, for Marty, is
 432 itself just a variety of *assimilation* of mental processes to (real or non-
 433 real) objects in the world’. He likens Marty’s position to that given by
 434 Aristotle in *De anima*, quoting the following passages:

435 What has the power of sensation is potentially like what the perceived
 436 object is actually; that is, while at the beginning of the process of its
 437 being acted upon the two interacting factors are dissimilar, at the end
 438 of the process the one acted upon has become assimilated to the other.
 439 (*De anima*, 418 a 2ff.)

440 Within the soul the faculties of cognition and sensation are *potentially*
 441 these objects, the one what is knowable, the other what is sensible. These
 442 faculties, then, must be identical either with the things themselves, or
 443 with their forms. Now they are not identical with the objects; for the
 444 stone does not exist in the soul, but only the form of the stone. (*De*
 445 *anima*, 431 b 26ff.)

446 Commenting on the parity, Smith writes:

447 Similarly, now, for Marty, all psychic activity is a process which has as its
 448 consequence that the psychic activity comes into a certain *sui generis* sort
 449 of conformity with something other than itself. (Ibid.)

450 Smith’s exegesis makes it plausible to suggest that the metaphors of ‘con-
 451 formity’ and ‘assimilation’ are more aptly applied to Martyan percep-
 452 tion than the metaphor of ‘belonging’, where conflict or *non-conformity*
 453 is even implied or permitted. But, if so, then this suggests that Marty’s
 454 position is quite different from those versions of sense-datum theory
 455 that lend themselves to being characterised functionally in the way I
 456 have above. Instead, it seems closer to a distinct form of relationism:
 457 Naïve Realism. This is (in part) the view that:



458 [T]he objects we are consciously acquainted with in perceptual experi-
 459 ence are constitutive of conscious character: the aspects of the world that
 460 we are acquainted with in perceptual experience constitutively 'shape
 461 the contours of the subject's conscious experience' (Martin 2004: 64).
 462 Perceptual experiences have the characters they have because of, or in
 463 virtue of, the nature and character of the mind-independent objects they
 464 involve. (French, forthcoming)

465 Beck (2018) notes a list of adherents:

466 Brewer (2011: 100), Campbell (2002: 116), Fish (2009: 49–50), French
 467 (2014: 395–396), Logue (2012, p. 212), Martin (1998, pp. 173–175)
 468 and other naïve realists all hold that the items a subject perceives in hav-
 469 ing a perception constitutively shape the perception's phenomenology.

470 There are, I propose, two features of this understanding of Naïve
 471 Realism as a thesis about perceptual phenomenology that bring us
 472 closer to a Martyan space perception (for further discussion see Beck
 473 [2018]).

474 First, on Naïve Realism conceptual space may be made for *aner-*
 475 *getic* objects. This is since there is no requirement that the aspects of
 476 the world that shape the contours of consciousness be real or energetic.
 477 Thus, arguably shadows can shape the contours of consciousness.

478 Second, it appears that insofar as worldly objects 'shape the con-
 479 tours of the subject's conscious experience', conscious experience can
 480 be understood to 'assimilate' its objects, where here assimilation means
 481 the 'taking in', or 'picking up', or as Naïve Realists sometimes put it,
 482 the *involvement* of objects in experience. Call the *Assimilation Thesis* the
 483 central theoretical Naïve Realist tenet that the aspects of the world that
 484 we are acquainted with in perceptual experience constitutively *shape*
 485 *the contours* of the subject's conscious experience. Strictly speaking, we
 486 can make sense of involvement without *Assimilation* and a theorist may
 487 be committed to the former but not the latter; the metaphysical struc-
 488 ture of experience is such that it just ensures that objects are involved.
 489 Nonetheless, if we read Naïve Realism as a thesis about not only the
 490 nature of experience but the nature of conscious character too, and if it



16 C. Mac Cumhaill

491 is granted that *Assimilation* entails involvement, then it is fair to pit the
492 *Assimilation Thesis* as a central tenet.

493 Now, there is reason to think that the theoretical puzzle that I used
494 to partly frame this chapter can be dissolved on such a Naïve Realism.
495 I asked: If space can be an object of experience rather than a subjective
496 form of intuition, and if it is something anenergetic that exists in addition
497 to the objects it fills, what philosophical theory of perception could
498 embrace a Martyan space perception? Naïve Realism is a contender since
499 on Naïve Realism it can be granted that non-efficacious entities, including
500 empty regions, can shape the contours of consciousness, such that the
501 phenomenal character of experience is fundamentally constituted by those
502 entities and regions, recognising, as Marty does, that we cannot perceive
503 space in the absence of the perception of local quality. Necessarily, when
504 we see empty regions we see sensible objects. Both are, to borrow a term
505 from Husserl, co-seen.²¹ This congruence notwithstanding, however, the
506 theoretical translation is not seamless. Let us explore why.

507 For most Naïve Realists, the *Assimilation Thesis* goes hand in hand
508 with a further doctrine. Cast neutrally, this is the idea that perceiving
509 involves the obtaining of a perceptual relation whereby the perceiving
510 subject ‘stands’ in a perceptual relation to mind-independent worldly
511 objects. For most Naïve Realists, it is in virtue of the perceiver standing
512 in a perceptual relation to mind-independent worldly objects that
513 those objects can play their character constituting role—to wit, by
514 shaping the contours of consciousness. Different theorists have different
515 ways of articulating this idea. Some speak of a relation of ‘conscious
516 acquaintance’; others refer to the obtaining of a ‘psychological relation
517 of acquaintance’—both technical notions. Sometimes ‘conscious attention’
518 is appealed to, but very often the perceptual relation is spelt out as
519 a *relation of awareness*. For instance, Soteriou (2013) writes (commenting
520 on a passage from Moore’s ‘Refutation of Idealism’):

521 Sensory experience somehow involves some kind of *psychological relation*
522 *of awareness*, and not simply some psychological event, process, state,
523 or property. In this context, to say that the relation of awareness is a psychological one isn’t simply to say that one of the relata of the relation is a psychological subject—a bearer of psychological properties—for there are



526 also non-psychological relations that psychological subjects can stand in to
527 things. The suggestion appears to be that when one has a sensory experience
528 there obtains a distinctive psychological relation that one stands in to some
529 sensory quality, where that sensory quality is not a quality of the psychologi-
530 cal relation. The awareness of blue is not itself blue. (Soteriou 2013: 13)

531 Importantly, for many theorists, this relation is primitive.

532 Now, there is reason to think that Marty would partly concur with
533 this picture. In a letter to Husserl, written in 1901 from a 'well-wooded
534 and charming area of the Bohemian Mittelgebirge', he iterates the fol-
535 lowing two points, responding to objections from Husserl²²:

- 536 1. You [Husserl] argue: if an act is a relation to an object and if the
537 object, as is normally the case, is transcendent, then on my view it
538 would follow that the transcendent object exists necessarily. Thus,
539 this view (that if a presenting exists then a presented something exists
540 too) cannot be correct. But what does transcendent object mean?
541 Doubtless an object that does not exist merely in consciousness. But
542 a presented something exists. Whether this something exists *outside*
543 *consciousness* has nothing to do with the presentation as such [...]
- 544 2. Now another of your objections seems to be: according to me the
545 object of a presentation of blue would not be 'blue' but 'presented
546 blue'. But the object presented in a presentation is in fact 'the same
547 object that is judged about in the corresponding judgment and loved
548 in the corresponding state of love'. This object is just blue not the
549 presented blue. I entirely agree with this assertion of yours. The
550 object of the presentation of blue is: blue, not: presented blue".

551 I suggest that 2 might be recruited *against* reading Marty's position
552 along sense-datum lines—after all, it is 'the same object that is judged
553 about in the corresponding judgement and loved in the corresponding
554 state of love'. While 1 can be read as gesturing at the *Assimilation Thesis*
555 and an associated relationism. This is so at least in the following sense.
556 For the Naïve Realist, in order that worldly objects can play a character
557 constituting, consciousness-shaping role, the perceptual relation must
558 obtain. In such cases, the perceptual relation obtaining entails that those



18 C. Mac Cumhaill

559 objects that partly shape phenomenal character exist, but *not* that they
560 exist necessarily. I pick up the further matter of ‘presenting’ below.

561 For all that, however, there are significant differences between Marty’s
562 position and the Naïve Realism I have articulated above. These can
563 be brought into view by sketching a challenge for the Naïve Realist
564 attracted by Marty’s unusual take on space. For the Naïve Realist, per-
565 ception involves a primitive perceptual relation. But for Marty *all*
566 relations, and not only spatial relations, are unreal. If there is such a
567 perceptual relation then, it is a *non-real* relation. What kind of Naïve
568 Realism can be developed, starting from this assumption? I make some
569 tentative suggestions in the next section.

570 5 Space for Naïve Realism?

571 To begin, on a Martyan Naïve Realism, the perceptual relation ought
572 not to be conceived as primitive in the sense of brute or unanalysable.
573 The relation is non-real, as all relations are. Further, it is grounded.
574 In *Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung der allgemeinen Grammatik und*
575 *Sprachphilosophie*, Marty writes that ‘the peculiar relationship of con-
576 sciousness to its object’ is a special kind of grounded relation (quoted
577 in Johansson 1990: 191). Johansson reads Marty as supposing that non-
578 real relations can be grounded in non-real entities like space and time,
579 as well as in real entities. Start by considering only *real* worldly relata of
580 the putative perceptual relation—for instance, a cherry tree.

581 All Naïve Realists teach that when a perceiver sees something, a par-
582 ticular cherry tree say, she stands in a perceptual relation to that thing,
583 where standing in this relation explains why the cherry tree, in this
584 case, can play a consciousness-shaping role. It should be plain by now,
585 I hope, that merely being a psychological subject isn’t sufficient to field
586 the subject-end of the relation since such a subject can stand in man-
587 ifold non-psychological relations to things—as when asleep and the
588 cheery tree is outside the window. Rather, the relevant relatum must be
589 a psychological subject in a certain conscious state or in whom certain
590 conscious occurrences are unfolding.²³ I suggest that Marty assumes this
591 much with the concept of ‘presenting’:



6 Raum and 'Room': Comments on Anton Marty ... 19

592 Presenting [...] is a real process in the mind. *In case there exists that which*
 593 *one calls the presented*, then as a non-real consequence of the process it fol-
 594 lows that the presenting mind stands to this thing in a peculiar relation,
 595 which might be described as an ideal similarity or adequacy. (U: 406,
 596 quoted in Smith 1990: 125)

597 And when 'presenting' occurs Marty writes:

598 What really exists within us is not a peculiar, modified double of the real
 599 object, but only the real psychic process to which in certain circumstances
 600 there becomes attached as consequence an ideal similarity with some-
 601 thing other, existing independently of this process. (ibid.: 415f., quoted
 602 in Smith, ibid.)

603 Importantly, on this view then, to say that the experience 'has an
 604 object'—the presented—is not to suppose that the presented is a
 605 'double', some kind of sensory image of the real object say. For in cir-
 606 cumstances where '*there exists that which one calls the presented*', the
 607 object that the experience *has*, *is* the object that exists independently of
 608 the presenting—to wit, the worldly object. Accordingly, the experience
 609 'has an object' necessarily in the sense that the present *existence* of the
 610 object is a requirement on the existence of process that is *the presenting*
 611 *of an existing object*.²⁴

612 Support for this reading comes, I think, from a distinction that
 613 Marty makes between the relations of *correlation* and *relative determi-*
 614 *nation*. The relation of correlation entails the coexistence of its *relata*
 615 (Mulligan 1990: 19)—though, as we have seen, in the perceptual case, **AQ5**
 616 the subject-end of the relatum cannot simply be a psychological subject,
 617 but one for whom there is a presenting of an existing object, a present-
 618 ing which thus has an existent object necessarily but which does not in
 619 turn necessitate the existence of its object.

620 But experiences can also 'have an object' in a different sense (see
 621 Egidi 1990 for discussion). Experiences are often said to 'have an object'
 622 insofar as they are typically taken to be *intentional*. Insofar as experi-
 623 ences are taken to be intentional however, they may also seem to involve
 624 a relational structure, at least insofar as they are said to be objects of



20 C. Mac Cumhaill

625 mental states of various sorts. It is notable that for Brentano this appar-
 626 ent relational structure is only apparently relational; in fact, it involves
 627 a ‘complex of presentations’ which involves instead ‘relative determina-
 628 tions’ (Smith 1990: 126), where the complexity of the relevant presenta-
 629 tions is relative in the following sense. Brentano supposes that where
 630 one thing is thought of (or experienced) relative to another, that which
 631 is thought of or experienced directly is said to be thought of or experi-
 632 enced ‘*in modo recto*’, while that which is thought of or experienced
 633 relative to what is thought of or experienced directly, is thought of or
 634 experienced ‘*in modo obliquo*’—viz. relative to that which is thought
 635 of in the direct mode. Importantly, in cases of relative determination
 636 that which is thought of or experienced *in modo recto* must exist, *if that*
 637 *which is relative is to exist*. But that which is presented *in modo obliquo*
 638 need not exist (except in certain cases). But as such, on this understand-
 639 ing, an experience can have an object in the *second* sense (the intentional
 640 sense), while not having an object in the *first* sense (the transcendent
 641 sense). Chisholm (1990: 2) details Brentano’s application of this distinc-
 642 tion to sensation in a 1914 manuscript:

643 [Brentano] makes two remarkable statements. The first is: ‘In sensing
 644 I am the sole object that is presented in recto [*das einzige in recto vorg-*
 645 *estellte Objekt*]’. The second is: ‘The thing that we have as external object
 646 is sensed only *in obliquo*.... It is sensed as sensed by us’.

647 As we have seen however, Marty appears to insist that presenting of
 648 an existent object involves *correlation*—the necessary coexistence of its
 649 *relata*. As such, this demands the existence of the object of experience in
 650 the *first*, transcendent sense, and not merely as a relative determination
 651 within a complex presentation.

652 Now, it might be objected that the obtaining of a relation of correla-
 653 tion is consistent with contemporary forms of representationalism that
 654 likewise deny the existence of an internal ‘double’ of the real object—
 655 I am thinking here of what Fish designates as ‘strong’ versions of rep-
 656 resentationalism (2010: 67)—and insofar as Marty often speaks of cor-
 657 relation in terms of ‘adequation’ or ‘correctness’ this reading might seem
 658 supported. Once it is recalled, however, that Marty seems to hold that



659 space, as a non-real objective entity, is a possible object of experience in
 660 the first sense, it is, I think, possible to resist this interpretation. Why?
 661 Space is anenergetic. There is then a question for the representationalist
 662 as to how space can 'get into experience'—viz. be represented—without
 663 itself having any causal impact on the subject.²⁵ One promising strategy,
 664 surely, is to appeal, simply, to relations between *things* and to *rep-*
 665 *resent* those relations. But it not clear that Marty would find the mere
 666 representation of spatial relations between things satisfactory. This is
 667 because he seems to think that the spatial relations are themselves also
 668 presented to us in experience (bearing in mind, recall, that these are
 669 grounded in space). He writes:

670 We find them [spatial relations] there before us, and if this were not so, if
 671 they were a product of our psychic activity, then how would things stand
 672 with regard to the objectivity of our entire knowledge of nature [...]? (U:
 673 468, quoted in Smith 1990: 126)

674 However, it is plausible to think that, for the representationalist, spa-
 675 tial relations are precisely *not* 'there before us' but are only *represented* as
 676 ways things are arrayed or stand relative to each other and the perceiver.
 677 But, as such, spatial relations cannot be presented in experience directly
 678 and nor is there any possibility of their playing a character-shaping role.
 679 This former point is in essence the criticism that Marty wages against
 680 Brentano's reduction of non-real spatial relations to relative determina-
 681 tions in complex (intentional) presentations (see Egidi 1990 for discus-
 682 sion). Johansson (2014) suggests a way of transposing this objection to
 683 the contemporary scene, formulating Naïve Realism as the conjunction
 684 of the following four broad theses:

- 685 (a) the perceiving subject and the perceived object are two distinct
 686 entities where none is part of the other²⁶;
- 687 (b) there is a distance between the subject and the object, but the sub-
 688 ject and the object are nonetheless in some sense connected;
- 689 (c) the distance between the subject and the object is empty;
- 690 (d) there is a relation of directedness (the arrow) from the subject to
 691 the object.



22 C. Mac Cumhaill

692 He notes:

693 The term ‘distance’ adds something important to the view that, necessar-
694 ily, consciousness is consciousness *of* something. The conjunction of the
695 statements (a) and (d) says that perception is always perception *of* some-
696 thing, but it does not bring in any notion of distance; this is done in (b)
697 and (c). (RZ, 3)

698 But, for a Brentanian, arguably, (b) and (c) are subsumed into (a) and
699 (d) inasmuch as the ofness (a) and directedness (d) of intentional expe-
700 rience might be supposed sufficient to capture the phenomenology that
701 (b) and (c) articulates. For the contemporary representationalist in addi-
702 tion, experience might be said to be ‘of’ or about distance—the empty
703 distance between the subject and object say. Such regions must be rep-
704 resented. But for Marty, who resists the ideality or subjectivity of space
705 as a form of intuition, insisting too that space is anenergetic, such regions
706 are, and are *presented* as being, there, before us.²⁷

707 Now, so far, I have suggested reasons for thinking that the Martyan
708 position I am constructing should be found sympathetic to contem-
709 porary Naïve Realism, specifically insofar as it seems to endorse a cor-
710 relational account of the relation which requires the existence of, and
711 is dependent on, the worldly consciousness-shaping objects that such
712 experiences *thereby have*. On this understanding, perceptual correla-
713 tion involves *Assimilation*. As noted, correlation is a non-real relation.
714 Earlier, however, I noted that most Naïve Realists characterise the per-
715 ceptual relation as one of *awareness*. I now want to suggest that this
716 spells trouble for the attempt at a theoretical transposition.

717 6 Awareness Versus Correlation

718 To begin, we ought to grant that perceptual awareness requires more
719 than perceptual correlation. It requires relative determination insofar as
720 it requires that the experience or episode of perceptual awareness have
721 an object in *both* senses detailed above. Second, perceptual *awareness* is
722 typically understood as reflexive in the sense best characterised by quot-
723 ing directly from Moore’s ‘Refutation of Idealism’:



6 Raum and 'Room': Comments on Anton Marty ... 23

724 To be aware of the sensation of blue is not to be aware of a mental image -
725 of a 'thing', of which 'blue' and some other element are constituent parts
726 in the same sense in which blue and glass are constituents of a blue bead.
727 It is to be aware of an awareness of blue; awareness being used, in both
728 cases, in exactly the same sense. (Moore 1903: 25)

AQ6

729 That perceptual awareness involves awareness *of awareness* explains why
730 sensory experience, so understood, can be meaningfully cast as a kind of
731 knowing, as the Naïve Realist often insists—this follows from the claim
732 that experience is direct acquaintance with mind-independent worldly
733 things and events, etc. But that awareness *could* be a kind of knowing
734 is also, one would think, explained by the fact that genuine perception
735 involves what Marty calls correlation: it involves the presentation of an
736 existent object.²⁸

737 Now, although perceptual awareness requires more than perceptual
738 correlation insofar as the former but not the latter is conceived to have
739 an object in the second sense as well as the first, and insofar as the latter,
740 but not necessarily the former, involves reflexive awareness, it is also the
741 case that many Naïve Realists deny that we are *aware* of anything in
742 hallucination. This might seem to tally with Marty since although per-
743 ceptual awareness requires more than correlation, correlation demands
744 the coexistence of its relata. If this requirement were 'inherited' by
745 awareness then, it would follow that in the absence of the existence of
746 the object apparently presented, as in hallucination, there could be no
747 awareness. Marty, I suspect, would say differently.

748 On the Martyan picture I am sketching, in hallucination, there may
749 be relative determination *without correlation*. Cast differently, the hallu-
750 cinatory experience does not 'have an object' in the first, transcendent
751 sense, but it does in the second, intentional sense. It is worth harnessing
752 G. E. M. Anscombe's criticism of the Ordinary Language philosopher
753 in her difficult paper 'The Intentionality of Sensation: A Grammatical
754 Feature' to make sense of this.

755 In saying that Marty seems to allow that hallucination involves the
756 presenting of a non-existent object, it might be thought that the use of
757 'object' deployed here is that which is also admitted by the sense-datum
758 theorist or Meinongian when they wish to preserve the intuition that in



24 C. Mac Cumhaill

759 such cases (or in thinking of entities like unicorns say) we *are* aware of,
760 in experience (or in our thinking of), some *thing*. But Marty does not
761 seem to have this particular understanding of ‘object’ in mind, at least
762 in the case of hallucination. This is because he seems to think that in
763 these cases the meaning of ‘object’ is transferred from cases where pred-
764 icates are applied to real objects; there is a kind of linguistic *Bild*, or fic-
765 tion of inner linguistic form, as though:

766 one were to allow the person portrayed to inhabit the portrait because of
767 the similarity between the contours and colours of the painted bit of can-
768 vas and those of the portrayed body or face. (RZ, §12: 58)

769 This recalls G. E. M. Anscombe’s critique of both the Ordinary
770 Language philosopher and the sense-datum theorist. Both theorists
771 offer an *ontological* response to the question ‘what do you see?’ That is,
772 they respond by giving the name of *entities*, things—everyday objects
773 or, alternatively, sense data—as *things* seen. But while the Ordinary
774 Language theorist denies that we see anything in hallucination—since
775 what we *see* are ordinary things—the sense data insists that we see some
776 thing, some data of sense! In contrast, Anscombe recommends a *gram-*
777 *matical* approach. The objects of sensation are not things, in the weighty
778 ontological sense but *direct objects* of the sensation verb. Thus, we can
779 intelligibly say that we see things even in cases where it is evident to all,
780 including the speaker, that no such thing exists in the perceiver’s vicin-
781 ity. How does this shift from ontology to grammar help the Martyan
782 theorist, who is nonetheless tempted by Naïve Realism with respect to
783 the nature of phenomenal character?

784 Notice that when the Naïve Realist denies, as she typically does, that
785 in hallucinatory experience we are aware of anything, in doing so, she
786 *preserves* the sense of ‘thing’ that applies in the good, non-hallucinatory
787 case—this is precisely why she denies that we are aware of anything in
788 the hallucinatory case. It strikes me, however, that a Martyan Naïve
789 Realist should want to urge that genuine perception involves correla-
790 tion and that this is what grounds phenomenal character, but without
791 deploying what is ostensibly a linguistic picture to articulate the met-
792 aphysical structure of experience (and which may in turn lead one to



793 insist that in hallucinatory experience we cannot *say* that something
794 is seen). To clarify: sensation verbs take direct objects. The verb 'to be
795 aware' though not a sensation verb strictly speaking also takes a *gram-*
796 *matical* object. The Naïve Realist, in noting that in hallucination,
797 by definition, there is nothing in the world that answers the subject's
798 description of what they 'see', and in supposing that phenomenal char-
799 acter is partly constituted by the worldly objects of which the perceiver
800 is putatively aware, may be tempted to suppose both that nothing is
801 seen—i.e. the subject is mistaken in her use of that term, that she is not
802 thereby aware of anything—and, further, that the experience thereby
803 lacks phenomenal character.

804 The Martyan picture is more circumspect. It says only that hallucina-
805 tion involves the presenting of a non-existent object. But, if I am right,
806 Marty does not want to read the notion of object here—an intentional
807 notion—*ontologically*. Scholarly work is required to establish the scope
808 and correctness of this claim.

809 7 'Raum' and Room

810 To conclude, I want to sketch briefly two positive lessons that fall out of
811 my attempt to provide for a Martyan Naïve Realism.

812 At the outset I noted what I called the *Naïve Presupposition*, which
813 is just the perceptual datum that we do not take the spaces that bodies
814 fill to be identical with them; and this is partly why it makes sense to
815 say that things appear to be located at places. The *Assimilation Thesis*,
816 recall, is the idea that perceptual conscious is fundamentally shaped by
817 (or constituted by) worldly objects. We might not ask: Are these two
818 conceptually or theoretically related?

819 I think it is plain that they are not *conceptually* related. Nonetheless,
820 if the generic characterisation I have given of Naïve Realism above is
821 accurate, they are, at least, theoretically related. How so?

822 For those theorists who think the perceptual relation is a relation
823 of awareness, and where the possibility of *Assimilation* is explained by
824 the subject's standing in such a relation of awareness to the objects



26 C. Mac Cumhaill

825 of her experience, there may be a tendency to think that the *Naïve*
826 *Presupposition* is likewise assured. Why so?

827 Awareness is a non-solipsistic relation. P. F. Strawson famously pro-
828 posed that a requirement on non-solipsistic consciousness is that a
829 subject be able to conceive of things existing in the absence of her expe-
830 rience of them where this requires a conception of space. If having a
831 conception of space is partially what grounds the phenomenology that
832 the *Naïve Presupposition* is supposed to capture however, and where
833 the possibility of awareness is secured when there is such a conception,
834 awareness being non-solipsistic, then the *Assimilation Thesis* and the
835 *Naïve Presupposition* should go hand in hand.

836 If we take Naïve Realism to be a thesis, *only*, about the fundamen-
837 tal *nature* of phenomenal character however, a weaker form of rela-
838 tionism may suffice. What form this may take, I leave for some other
839 occasion, suffice to say that unyoking the *Naïve Presupposition* from the
840 *Assimilation Thesis* opens up explanatory paths not much explored in
841 contemporary analytic philosophy of perception. This is one reason for
842 taking seriously Marty's peculiar take on space—one which, as I under-
843 stand it, is nonetheless supposed to honour perceptual and linguistic
844 data. Another is the following:

845 I began this paper by detailing a variety of ways in which the words
846 'place' and 'space' can be used. I noted Marty's inclusion in this list of
847 the English word 'room', completely untheorised in contemporary
848 analytic philosophy of perception—for various reasons, not uncon-
849 nected with the point above, 'room' just vanishes from contemporary
850 analytic theorising (the Brentanian school is thereby an informative
851 counterpoint).

852 Johansson, this volume, explains in what sense the concept of 'a room'
853 helps isolate Marty's conception of '*Raum*', with which it overlaps:

854 A room is regarded neither as some kind of relations between the things
855 in it, nor as a contingent structure inhering in the properties of the things
856 there. Also, rooms can always easily be thought of as being completely
857 empty, as three-dimensional holes so to speak; and some of them are also
858 so perceived. Such a room is homogenous in the sense that all its different
859 parts are regarded as exactly similar in their emptiness. (This volume, p. x)



860 This gloss is illuminating. Empty rooms can be perceived—the empty
861 space they enclose is co-seen with the walls which 'line' the room (recall,
862 for Marty, we cannot see space without seeing localised quality). But
863 there are a host of other uses that are relevant to the concept of space
864 that contemporary analytic philosophers have almost wholly ignored. In
865 English, 'room' can sometimes mean dimensional extent—the amount
866 of space that is or may be taken up by a thing, event or process. In such
867 cases, there may be 'more' or less 'room'. Sometimes 'room' refers not to
868 some dimensional extent but the capacity to accommodate a person or
869 thing or to allow a particular kind of action; 'room' in this sense appears
870 with modifying words such as 'ample', 'enough', 'plenty of'; sometimes
871 there can be 'no room'.

872 Marty takes it that spatial relations are *there*: 'We find them there
873 before us'. Space is not a nexus of spatial relations between real things
874 on this view, a conception of which is a condition on the possibility
875 of awareness and so, on certain views, experience. Nor are experienced
876 spatial relations determined relative to ourselves, where we are experi-
877 enced in *modo recto*, and everything else in the oblique mode. Rather,
878 on a Martyan understanding, as I have been telling it, there are exist-
879 ent ways in which our world is shaped, ways which in turn shape our
880 consciousness.

881 Anscombe famously thought that no action could fail to have moral
882 significance—even the plucking of a single flower. Assuming perceiving
883 involves perceptual activity, it is hardly plausible that this demanding
884 and austere thought could apply to *Raum* qua 'space'. Yet although, as
885 Johansson urges, *Raum* is homogeneous *in its emptiness*, 'room' in some
886 of the above senses, *which is also there*—room for a person, or for an
887 event—is not. And this suggests, at least to me, an unexplored place for
888 the theorist of perception to retreat to, and 'dwell in' with her theories.

889 Notes

- 890 1. Page numbers refer to the original edition text.
891 2. For discussion, see Johansson, this volume, as well as Johansson (1990),
892 Rosaria Egidi (1990), and Barry Smith (1990).



28 C. Mac Cumhaill

- 893 3. Trans. Mulligan and Schuhmann, K. in Mulligan (1990: 225–236).
894 4. Though intentional theories are sometimes presented as relational—
895 experience involves an intentional relation to sensible properties (that
896 may or may not be instantiated)—I leave explicit consideration of this
897 construal aside. See, for example, Pautz (2010).
898 5. Marty’s work is untranslated. The exposition that follows is far from
899 scholarly. I have been helped in my comprehension by the work of
900 Chisholm, Johansson, Mulligan, Simons, Smith, and, particularly,
901 Egidi in the 1990 volume ‘Mind, Meaning and Metaphysics’, edited by
902 Kevin Mulligan. H el ene Leblanc and Mark Textor helped me with the
903 translation of some puzzling passages. Special thanks to Craig French
904 and Ingvar Johansson for insightful comments on an earlier draft.
905 6. He supplements this point with an interesting and early discussion of
906 modality-specific spatial fields, which I leave aside.
907 7. Husserl is more explicit on this point in his 1907 *Thing and Space* lec-
908 tures: ‘It must be noted, however, that a given empty space is neces-
909 sarily an empty space between given things or phantom of things. If
910 nothing spatial at all is given, then neither is any space’ (Husserl
911 1997/1973: 323, fn. 1).
912 8. See instead Mac Cumhaill (in preparation).
913 9. Thanks to Mark Textor and H el ene Leblanc for suggestions as to how
914 to translate this passage.
915 10. See C. B. Martin (2006).
916 11. See O. Massin (forthcoming) for a discussion of the conception of
917 ‘founded’ relations.
918 12. See Barry Smith (1988) for discussion of Brentano’s notion of a contin-
919 uum, and the distinction, and relations, between spatial and temporal
920 continua.
921 13. Ingvar Johansson rightly points that if things are *partly* individuated
922 with respect to places, there is no problem with movement.
923 14. This translation appears in Johansson (1990: 153). Johansson notes
924 that this characterisation leads to a peculiar consequence: there must be
925 at least two different kinds of grounded relations—those grounded in
926 something real (e.g. colour resemblance and difference of weight) and
927 those grounded in something non-real (e.g. spatial relations).
928 15. We can now see perhaps why Marty mostly favours the term ‘ausgebret-
929 itet’ (spread out) to characterise the relation of sensible matter to form,
930 over ‘durchdringend’ (interpenetrated), used by Stumpf.



- 931 16. See, however discussion at §§17–18.
- 932 17. Johansson (2018) argues that space is objective in Marty's sense, but
- 933 that the space of perceptual experience is nonetheless subjective. Since
- 934 a careful elaboration of Johansson's subtle and distinctive position
- 935 requires the introduction of a number of concepts that are peculiar
- 936 to Johansson (for instance the notion of intentional-logical distance),
- 937 I treat his view directly and in detail elsewhere.
- 938 18. Prima facie, Chalmers recent development of spatial functionalism
- 939 (Chalmers 2006, 2012, forthcoming), a species of phenomenology-first
- 940 representationalism where veridical space perception involves a Fregean
- 941 manner of presentation, might seem to escape this difficulty. I leave the
- 942 reader to follow this position up. I would suggest however that Fregean
- 943 representationalism is also at odds with Marty's picture, albeit for
- 944 another reason: it makes visible space essentially ideal.
- 945 19. I recognise that this functional treatment may be viewed as inadequate
- 946 in a number of respects. It defines sense-data in terms of non-hallu-
- 947 cinatory experience rather than, as is more common, by appealing to
- 948 historical responses to the argument for hallucination and illusion (see
- 949 Fish 2010 for discussion). I do this for dialectical reasons. Second, my
- 950 formulation may prompt epistemic worries—for instance, it might
- 951 be thought that whether or not an entity is a sense datum cannot be
- 952 determined until it is known whether experience is non-hallucinatory.
- 953 I don't think this is a difficulty for a functional treatment for the
- 954 kinds of reasons spelt out in Martin (2004). Further, it does not
- 955 strike me that saying that a sense-datum is *whatever* one is aware of in
- 956 non-hallucinatory perception *in virtue of which* objects (say) are indi-
- 957 rectly sensed, does not preclude the further claim that hallucination
- 958 involves entities of the same kind but in virtue of which nothing is
- 959 sensed. Thanks to Ingvar Johansson for raising these worries.
- 960 20. For discussion, H. H. Price (1932).
- 961 21. See fn. 7.
- 962 22. Translated by K. Mulligan and K. Schuhmann (1990).
- 963 23. It is plausible to think that, for the world to play a consciousness-shap-
- 964 ing rôle, the subject must be awake. Merely being awake isn't sufficient
- 965 for perception however—one could be awake in a sensory-deprivation
- 966 tank.
- 967 24. To be clear: both according to Marty and Brentano, a presenting may
- 968 be a presenting of an existing or non-existing object. But according to



30 C. Mac Cumhaill

- 969 Marty, only the presenting of an existing object really has an object.
 970 This constitutes a difference between Brentano and the late Marty:
 971 Brentano maintained that even the presenting of a non-existing object
 972 has in a sense an object. Thanks to Giuliano Bacigalupo for emphasising
 973 this point.
- 974 25. I leave aside the question as to how space could be *phenomenally*
 975 represented.
 - 976 26. An important though not unproblematic exception is of course when
 977 we perceive ‘ourselves’.
 - 978 27. Johansson distinguishes between material-logical and intentional-
 979 logical distance, an important and productive distinction that I discuss
 980 in Mac Cumhaill (in progress).
 - 981 28. Cf. Johansson (2014, Section 4).

982 References

- 983 Beck, O. 2018. Rethinking Naïve Realism. *Philosophical Studies* (Online First).
 984 Brentano, F. 1988. *Philosophical Investigations on Space, Time and the*
 985 *Continuum*, trans. B. Smith. Oxford: Routledge.
- 986 Brewer, B. 2011. *Perception and Its Objects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 987 Campbell, J. 2002. *Reference and Consciousness*. Oxford: Oxford University
 988 Press.
- 989 Chalmers, D. 2006. Perception and the Fall from Eden. In *Perceptual*
 990 *Experience*, ed. T. Gendler and J. Hawthorne, 49–125. Oxford: Oxford
 991 University Press.
- 992 Chalmers, D. 2012. *Constructing the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 993 Chalmers, D. Forthcoming. Three Puzzles About Spatial Experience. In *Themes*
 994 *from Ned Block*, ed. A. Pautz and D. Stoljar. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- 995 Chisholm, R. 1990. *Brentano and Marty on Content: A Synthesis Suggested by*
 996 *Brentano*. Ed. K. Mulligan, 1–11. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota
 997 Press.
- 998 Egidi, R. 1990. *Marty's Theory Space*. Ed. K. Mulligan, 171–179. Dordrecht:
 999 Kluwer. AQ8
- 1000 Fish, W. 2009. *Perception, Hallucination, and Illusion*. Oxford: Oxford
 1001 University Press. AQ9
- 1002 Fish, W. 2010. *Introduction to Philosophy of Perception*. London: Routledge.



6 Raum and 'Room': Comments on Anton Marty ... 31

- 1003 French, C. 2014. Naive Realist Perspectives on Seeing Blurrily. *Ratio* 27:
1004 393–413.
- 1005 French, C. Forthcoming. Naïve Realism and Diaphaneity. *Proceedings of the*
1006 *Aristotelian Society* 118 (2): 149–175.
- 1007 Husserl, E. 1997/1973. *Thing and Space: Lectures of 1907*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- 1008 Johansson, I. 1990. *Marty on Grounded Relations*. Ed. K. Mulligan, 151–157.
1009 Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- 1010 Johansson, I. 2014. Triple Disjunctivism, Naive Realism, and Anti-
1011 Representationalism. *Metaphysica* 15: 239–265.
- 1012 Johansson, I. 2018. Perceptual Spaces Are Sense-Modality-Neutral. *Open*
1013 *Philosophy* 2 (1): 14–39.
- 1014 Logue, H. 2012. Why Naive Realism? *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*
1015 112: 211–237.
- 1016 Mac Cumhaill, C. In Progress. Co-Seeing and Seeing-Through.
- 1017 Martin, C.B. 2006. How It Is: Entities, Absences and Voids. *Australasian*
1018 *Journal of Philosophy* 74 (1): 57–65.
- 1019 Martin, M.G.F. 1998. Setting Things Before the Mind. *Royal Institute of*
1020 *Philosophy Supplement* 43: 157–179.
- 1021 Martin, M.G.F. 2004. The Limits of Self-Awareness. *Philosophical Studies* 120:
1022 37–89.
- 1023 Marty, A. 1908. *Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung der allgemeinen Grammatik*
1024 *und Sprachphilosophie*, Bd. 1. Halle: Niemeyer (Referred to in the text as U). **AQ10**
- 1025 Marty, A. 1916. *Raum und Zeit*. Aus dem Nachlass des Verfassers herausgege-
1026 ben von J. Eisenmeier, A. Kastil und O. Kraus. Halle: Niemeyer (Referred
1027 to in the text as RZ). **AQ11**
- 1028 Massin, O. Forthcoming. 'Brentanian Continua'. *Brentano Studien*.
- 1029 Moore, G.E. 1903. The Refutation of Idealism. In *Philosophical Papers*, 1–30.
1030 New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co Inc.
- 1031 Mulligan, K. 1990a. *Mind, Meaning and Metaphysics: The Philosophy and*
1032 *Theory of Language of Anton Marty*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- 1033 Mulligan, K. (ed.). 1990b. *Marty's Philosophical Grammar*, 11–29. Dordrecht:
1034 Kluwer.
- 1035 Mulligan, K., and K. Schuhmann. 1990. *Two Letters from Marty to Husserl*
1036 *by Kevin Mulligan and Karl Schuhmann*. Ed. K. Mulligan, 225–237.
1037 Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- 1038 Pautz, A. 2010. A Simple View of Consciousness. In *The Waning of*
1039 *Materialism*, ed. G. Bealer and R. Koons, 25–67. Oxford: Oxford
1040 University Press.

**32 C. Mac Cumhaill**

- 1041 Price, H.H. 1932. *Perception*. London: Methuen & Co.
- 1042 Simons, P. 1990. *Marty on Time*. Ed. K. Mulligan, 157–169. Dordrecht:
1043 Kluwer.
- 1044 Smith, B. 1990. *Brentano and Marty: An Inquiry into Being and Truth*. Ed. K.
1045 Mulligan, 111–143. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- 1046 Soteriou, M. 2013. *The Mind's Construction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1047 Strawson, P.F. 1959/1961. *Individuals: An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics*.
1048 London: Methuen & Co. **AQ12**
- 1049 Stumpf, C. 1891/2017. Psychology and Epistemology. Trans. J. Leech
1050 and M. Textor. Manuscript. Originally Published as 'Psychologie und
1051 Erkenntnistheorie' in *Abhandlungen der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der
1052 Wissenschaften* 19(2): 465–516. **AQ13**
- 1053 Wesche, B. 1985. At Ease with 'At'. *Journal of Semantics* 5: 385–398.

Author Query Form

Book ID: **461216_1_En**

Chapter No: **6**

Please ensure you fill out your response to the queries raised below and return this form along with your corrections.

Dear Author,

During the process of typesetting your chapter, the following queries have arisen. Please check your typeset proof carefully against the queries listed below and mark the necessary changes either directly on the proof/online grid or in the 'Author's response' area provided

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's Response
AQ1	Please check the quote usage in the sentence 'Der Körper ist an dem ...'.	done
AQ2	The citation 'Wesche (1986)' has been changed to 'Wesche (1985)' to match the author name in the reference list. Please check here and in subsequent occurrences, and correct if necessary.	It should be 1986
AQ3	Reference 'Marty (1990)' is cited in the text but not provided in the reference list. Please provide the respective reference in the list or delete this citation.	it is Smith (1990) - this is referred to in te
AQ4	The citation 'Smith (1998)' has been changed to 'Smith (1990)' to match the author name in the reference list. Please check here and in subsequent occurrences, and correct if necessary.	thanks
AQ5	Please check and update the citation 'Mulligan (1990)' refers to either 'Mulligan (1990a) or Mulligan (1990b)'.	there is a mistake with these references. Mulligan 1990b is a chapter in Mulligan 1990, the edited volume
AQ6	The citation 'Moore (1922)' has been changed to 'Moore (1903)' to match the author name in the reference list. Please check here and in subsequent occurrences, and correct if necessary.	thanks
AQ7	The citation 'Chalmers (2010)' has been changed to 'Chalmers (2006)' to match the author name in the reference list. Please check here and in subsequent occurrences, and correct if necessary.	thanks
AQ8	Please check and confirm if the inserted publisher name and location are correct in reference 'Chisholm (1990)'.	this is a chapter in Mulligan 1990
AQ9	Please check and confirm if the inserted publisher name and location are correct in reference 'Egidi (1990)'.	this is also a chapter in Mulligan 1990

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's Response
AQ10	Reference 'Marty (1908)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite in text or delete from the list.	The german text is given so that is fine
AQ11	Reference 'Marty (1916)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite in text or delete from the list.	the german text is given
AQ12	Reference 'Strawson (1959/1961)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite in text or delete from the list.	please could you delete for me.
AQ13	Reference 'Stumpf (1891/2017)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite in text or delete from the list.	please keep this in

MARKED PROOF

Please correct and return this set

Please use the proof correction marks shown below for all alterations and corrections. If you wish to return your proof by fax you should ensure that all amendments are written clearly in dark ink and are made well within the page margins.

<i>Instruction to printer</i>	<i>Textual mark</i>	<i>Marginal mark</i>
Leave unchanged	... under matter to remain	Ⓟ
Insert in text the matter indicated in the margin	∧	New matter followed by ∧ or ∧ [Ⓢ]
Delete	/ through single character, rule or underline or ┌───┐ through all characters to be deleted	Ⓞ or Ⓞ [Ⓢ]
Substitute character or substitute part of one or more word(s)	/ through letter or ┌───┐ through characters	new character / or new characters /
Change to italics	— under matter to be changed	↙
Change to capitals	≡ under matter to be changed	≡
Change to small capitals	≡ under matter to be changed	≡
Change to bold type	~ under matter to be changed	~
Change to bold italic	≈ under matter to be changed	≈
Change to lower case	Encircle matter to be changed	≡
Change italic to upright type	(As above)	⊕
Change bold to non-bold type	(As above)	⊖
Insert 'superior' character	/ through character or ∧ where required	Υ or Υ under character e.g. Υ or Υ
Insert 'inferior' character	(As above)	∧ over character e.g. ∧
Insert full stop	(As above)	⊙
Insert comma	(As above)	,
Insert single quotation marks	(As above)	ʹ or ʸ and/or ʹ or ʸ
Insert double quotation marks	(As above)	“ or ” and/or ” or ”
Insert hyphen	(As above)	⊥
Start new paragraph	┌	┌
No new paragraph	┐	┐
Transpose	└┐	└┐
Close up	linking ○ characters	Ⓞ
Insert or substitute space between characters or words	/ through character or ∧ where required	Υ
Reduce space between characters or words		↑