

## The Dustbin Theory of Mind: A Cartesian Legacy?

LAWRENCE NOLAN AND JOHN WHIPPLE

### I. INTRODUCTION

It is part of the lore of Descartes's philosophy that he subscribed to what might be termed the 'Dustbin Theory of Mind'. According to this traditional picture, Descartes's conception of the mental was determined by his prior conception of matter as pure extension, shorn of the various sensible qualities familiar from our ordinary experience of the physical world. Having banished these qualities from nature, and finding no other place to locate them, Descartes swept them into the dustbin of the mind. The mind thus became a repository of heterogeneous items—colours, sounds, odours, heat and cold, pains, beliefs, intellections, etc.<sup>1</sup>

This interpretation of Descartes's theory of the mental has given birth to several criticisms. One in particular has a long history, dating back to Descartes's unorthodox disciple Nicolas Malebranche. Descartes and his more orthodox followers purport to have a clear and distinct idea of the mind, but Malebranche argues that this

<sup>1</sup> Without using the term 'Dustbin Theory' as such, Ryle's *Concept of Mind* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949), esp. 20 and 199, contains the seminal statement of this interpretation within analytic philosophy, though as we indicate below the general view can be traced to Malebranche, Descartes's successor. Nicholas Jolley was perhaps the first to discern this interpretation of Descartes in Malebranche, *The Light of the Soul* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), and concurs in this interpretation himself: 'Descartes subscribed to what might be called a dustbin or grab bag conception of the mind. The items that fall under the umbrella of the mental, for Descartes, are whatever is left over from the picture of the world once matter is defined in purely geometrical terms' ('Malebranche on the Soul', in Steven Nadler (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Malebranche* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 57). Also see Monte Cook, 'Descartes and the Dustbin of the Mind' ['Descartes and the Dustbin'], *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 13 (1996), 17–33, and Richard Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979).

claim is belied by their practice. To determine whether colours and other sensible qualities<sup>2</sup> are modifications of the mind, they do not consult their idea of mind; rather they consult the idea of body as pure extension and reason as follows: ‘Heat, pain, and color cannot be modifications of extension, for extension can have only various figures and motion. Now there are only two kinds of beings, minds and bodies. Therefore, pain, heat, color, and all other sensible qualities belong to the mind’ (Elucidation XI, OC iii. 165; LO 634).<sup>3</sup> Malebranche concludes that the Cartesians themselves lack a distinct idea of the mind, for if they had such an idea, they would not need such a circuitous route to establish that sensible qualities are mental items. We shall refer to this circuitous way of arguing, which Malebranche attributes to the Cartesians, as the ‘Indirect Argument’.<sup>4</sup>

Despite Malebranche’s claims, Descartes never explicitly articulates a version of the Indirect Argument.<sup>5</sup> The important question to consider, however, is whether there are any features of Descartes’s philosophical system that commit him to it. Tad Schmaltz has argued that Descartes’s account of material falsity, which stresses the obscurity and confusion that attends our sensations, should have led him to embrace the Indirect Argument, on the ground that our confused perception of the qualities of sense conceals their ontological status from us. We can know that sensible qualities are modes of the mind only indirectly, by first examining our distinct idea of body.<sup>6</sup> One

<sup>2</sup> Malebranche uses the term ‘sensible qualities’ (*qualitez sensibles*) to refer exclusively to colours, sounds, heat and cold, odours, etc. We follow his usage in this chapter.

<sup>3</sup> This chapter uses the following abbreviations: LO: T. M. Lennon and P. J. Olscamp (tr.), *The Search after Truth and Elucidations of The Search after Truth* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1980). *TFI: On True and False Ideas: New Objections to Descartes’s Replies*, tr. E. J. Kremer (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990). We sometimes diverge from the translations in CSM(K) and LO.

<sup>4</sup> Malebranche’s objection here is part of a larger critique of Descartes’s account of knowledge of the mind. We defend Descartes against this critique in ‘Self-Knowledge in Descartes and Malebranche’, *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 43 (2005), 55–81. Here we are concerned with Malebranche’s Indirect Argument more narrowly, as it bears on the question of whether Descartes holds a Dustbin Theory of Mind. For recent discussions of the Indirect Argument, see Cook, ‘Descartes and the Dustbin’; Jolley, ‘Malebranche on the Soul’; Andrew Pyle, *Malebranche* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 186–208; and Tad Schmaltz, *Malebranche’s Theory of the Soul: A Cartesian Interpretation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

<sup>5</sup> Ferdinand Alquié and Geneviève Rodis-Lewis claim to detect an indirect argument in the *Passions of the Soul*. We consider and reject this claim in n. 29.

<sup>6</sup> Schmaltz, *Malebranche’s Theory of the Soul*, 81–2.

might also argue that if Descartes were a dustbin theorist, then he ought to have been committed to the Indirect Argument. For again, according to this traditional interpretation, Descartes the scientist started with a positive conception of matter and then conceived of the mind in negative terms as whatever body is *not*. If this interpretation were correct, then the argument for the mental status of sensible qualities would simply be an instance of this general strategy. Malebranche's claim that the Cartesians themselves lack a clear idea of mind would thus be vindicated.

But contrary to Malebranche and to more recent critics,<sup>7</sup> Descartes has principled reasons for rejecting both the Indirect Argument and the Dustbin Theory of Mind, as we shall argue. There are two general considerations, stemming from his philosophical system, which will help us to uncover these reasons: first, his diagnosis of why our ideas of mind and body, and our sensations,<sup>8</sup> are confused prior to philosophizing, and, second, his primary strategy for clarifying these ideas. Sections 2 and 3 take up each of these points respectively. These considerations will reveal three distinct (albeit related) reasons why Descartes would reject the Indirect Argument and the Dustbin Theory.

## 2. DESCARTES'S DIAGNOSIS OF CONFUSED THOUGHT

### 2.1. *Embodiment and false judgements as the source of confusion*

Descartes's account of how our sensations become confused presupposes an account of how confusion infects the ideas of mind and body. So we begin our discussion with the latter. Descartes maintains that our ideas of mind and body are given to us as confused, largely as a result of our 'embodiment'. This is one of the watchwords of recent Cartesian studies. Commentators are beginning to concur that the doctrine of mind-body union constitutes one of the keys to Descartes's philosophy. Although the mind is a substance really

<sup>7</sup> See n. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Descartes often uses the terms 'sensation' and 'sensory idea' interchangeably. In this chapter, we shall use the term 'sensation' exclusively. Descartes distinguishes these mental effects from (1) the motions in our sense organs that occasion them and from (2) the judgements about things outside us that often accompany our sensations (see AT vii. 436–7; CSM ii. 294–5). As we shall see below, the latter play a crucial role in his account of how our sensations become confused.

distinct from the body, and thus can exist apart from it, the body strongly influences the mind and the two are so intimately related in this life that it is difficult to understand one without the other. As is to be expected then, mind–body union figures prominently in Descartes’s account of confused thought. One of the most immediate consequences of mind–body union, familiar to readers of the *Meditations*, is that from its infancy the mind is immersed in the senses and the ways in which the body is being affected by things outside it: ‘In its first state (*primā aetate*) the mind was so closely tied to the body that it had no leisure for any thoughts except those by means of which it had sensory awareness of what was happening to the body’ (AT viiia. 35; CSM i. 218).<sup>9</sup> At this point, we had no purely intellectual thoughts—no thoughts of the mind as a purely thinking thing and no understanding of body as pure extension. All we had was a confused perception of ourselves as a union of mind and body.

This sensory, pre–philosophical perception of union is not something we can improve upon through meditation or intellectual endeavour. In an oft–cited passage from a letter to Elisabeth, Descartes asserts that the union of mind and body is ‘known very clearly’ through the senses but ‘known only obscurely by the intellect’. Whereas the mind is known best by the intellect, and body by the intellect aided by the imagination, one is best able to perceive how the soul acts on the body, and vice versa, through ‘the ordinary course of life and conversation’ (AT iii. 691–2; CSM iii. 227). According to Descartes’s technical definitions of clarity and distinctness (and their correlatives), if something is obscure to the intellect, then it is also confused or indistinct.<sup>10</sup> This implies that, in addition to being obscure, the union of mind and body is conceived of only confusedly by the intellect. As Descartes asserts in the Sixth Replies: ‘I had from my earliest years conceived of my mind and body as a unity of some sort (for I had a confused awareness that I was composed of mind and body)’ (AT vii. 445; CSM ii. 300). This confused conception makes it extremely difficult to conceive of the real distinction between mind and body, and ‘many more people make the mistake of thinking that the soul is

<sup>9</sup> CSM translates *primā aetate* here as ‘early childhood’, but we think the more literal translation is appropriate, for we take it that on Descartes’s view the ideas of mind and body are given to us as confused at birth (or even in the womb) as a result of the union.

<sup>10</sup> See *Principles of Philosophy*, I. 45, AT viii. 22; CSM i. 207–8.

not really distinct from the body than make the opposite mistake of admitting their distinction and denying their union' (letter to Regius, January 1642, AT iii. 508; CSMK 209).<sup>11</sup> Descartes's view then is that our ideas of mind and body are confused as a result of our ordinary, pre-philosophical awareness of ourselves as a union. This point is highly significant for it suggests that the confusion attending these ideas consists in their being confounded *together*. We draw out several consequences of Descartes's analysis below, after discussing the source of confused *sensory* thought.

It is standardly held that the obscurity and confusion attending Cartesian sensations is intrinsic and thus incapable of being remedied. This standard reading is based on Descartes's remarks about materially false ideas in the Third Meditation. There Descartes proffers as examples of material falsity the sensations of heat and cold, and says that such ideas 'contain so little clarity and distinctness' that one cannot tell whether 'cold is merely the absence of heat or vice versa, or whether both of them are real qualities, or neither is' (AT vii. 43–4; CSM ii. 30). Some influential commentators have taken such remarks to imply that sensations have a deceptive presentational character that inclines us to make false judgements about the properties of external objects. Although we can guard against making such judgements, we cannot ameliorate the obscurity and confusion that naturally attends our sensations.<sup>12</sup>

The received view of material falsity has recently come under fire. At least two commentators have argued convincingly that our sensations are not inherently deceptive and that the obscurity and confusion attending our sensations, prior to philosophizing, is the result of habits of judgement formed in childhood and reinforced by scholastic science.<sup>13</sup> On this view, the sensory perception of a red apple is confused not because the idea itself has a misleading

<sup>11</sup> Also see *Fourth Replies*, AT vii. 228–9; CSM ii. 160.

<sup>12</sup> The classic formulation of this interpretation can be found in Margaret Wilson, *Descartes* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), 101–19. Schmaltz presupposes an interpretation of material falsity along these lines when he suggests that this feature of Descartes's system should have led him to endorse the Indirect Argument. See n. 6.

<sup>13</sup> See Lilli Alanen, 'Sensory Ideas, Objective Reality, and Material Falsity', in John Cottingham (ed.), *Reason, Will, and Sensation* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1994), 229–50, and especially Alan Nelson, 'The Falsity in Sensory Ideas: Descartes and Arnauld', in Elmar Kremer (ed.), *Interpreting Arnauld* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1996), 13–32.

presentational character, but because the perception is compounded with the false judgement that redness is a quality in the apple. Such judgements are so habituated that we fail to realize that we are making them. Nevertheless, these judgements are voluntary and therefore fully correctable.

This revisionist interpretation of material falsity has several attractive features as an account of material falsity and it is one that we accept.<sup>14</sup> It is also attractive for at least one external reason, more directly relevant to the concerns of this chapter. The revisionist interpretation explains Descartes's remarks in the *Principles of Philosophy*, I, 68, that our sensations of pain and colour are clear and distinct when they are regarded merely as thoughts, and not judged to resemble anything in bodies:

In order to distinguish what is clear in this connection from what is obscure, we must be very careful to note that pain and color and so on are clearly and distinctly perceived when they are regarded merely as sensations or thoughts. But when they are judged to be certain things existing outside our mind, there is no way of understanding what sort of things they are ... (AT viiia. 33; CSM i. 217)

Proponents of the standard view of material falsity are forced to maintain that Descartes is not entitled to say that sensations can be clearly and distinctly perceived, or that what he says here is inconsistent with his remarks in the *Meditations*, for on their view sensations are intrinsically confused and this confusion cannot be remedied.

But to suppose that Descartes is inconsistent here would also require one to suppose that he is inconsistent in the *Meditations* itself. For in the Sixth Meditation he says that although certain things appear to have been taught to us by nature or by the senses themselves—such as that heat or colour is in body—such beliefs are in fact the result of ‘a habit of making ill-considered judgments’ (AT vii. 82; CSM ii. 56). Descartes appeals here to the very same account of sensory confusion that one finds in the *Principles*, in terms of habits of judgements formed in early childhood. Indeed, while considering another example in the same context, he notes that

although a star has no greater effect on my eye than the flame of a small light, that does not mean that there is any real or positive inclination in me

<sup>14</sup> See Nelson, ‘The Falsity in Sensory Ideas’, for an enumeration of these attractions.

to believe that the star is no bigger than the light; I have simply made this judgment from childhood onwards without any rational basis. (AT vii. 83; CSM ii. 57)

Descartes is quite explicit that the source of the confusion is not something ‘real or positive’ in the sensation itself, which inclines me to judge falsely. Rather I make this judgement because of a habit of doing so that was developed in childhood and that has become ingrained. In the articles surrounding *Principles* 1. 68 (especially article 71), we get a more detailed account of how these habits of judgement are formed and thus of how our sensations become confused. We turn now to that discussion.

As with his diagnosis of how our ideas of mind and body become confused, Descartes’s account of the genesis of confused sensory thought relies on the doctrine of mind–body union. Descartes explains that, in our infancy, when immersed in the senses and the ways our body was being affected, we did not ‘refer’ our sensations of pain, colour, smell, etc. to anything outside ourselves. However, this is not to say that we attributed them exclusively to the mind. Because our ideas of mind and body were confounded together we regarded ‘ourselves’ not as minds, but as mind–body unions. We thereby falsely attributed our sensations to the union, rather than to the mind alone.<sup>15</sup>

At this very early stage, the mind also perceived shapes, sizes, and motions, etc. that were presented to it ‘not as sensations but as things, or modes of things, existing (or capable of existing) outside thought’ (AT viiia. 35; CSM i. 219). However, at this point, we did

<sup>15</sup> Some commentators have argued that Cartesian sensations are, in fact, modes of the union rather than of the mind. For a range of positions like this, see John Cottingham, ‘Cartesian Trialism’, *Mind*, 94 (1985), 218–30; Paul Hoffman, ‘Cartesian Passions and Cartesian Dualism’, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly*, 71 (1990), 310–33; R. C. Richardson, ‘The “Scandal” of Cartesian Interactionism’, *Mind*, 91 (1982), 20–37; and Tad Schmaltz, ‘Descartes and Malebranche on Mind and Mind–Body Union’, *Philosophical Review*, 101 (1992), 281–325. The purported texts in favour of such ‘trialist’ interpretations, however, all admit of alternative readings consistent with Descartes’s official dualism; for example, in places where some of these commentators read Descartes as saying that sensations are modes of the union, he can be taken to mean that they are modes of mind *caused by* the mind’s union with the body or, more precisely, *caused by* the body and produced in the mind as a result of the union (see e.g. AT viiia. 23; CSM i. 209). As Marleen Rozemond has shown, trialist interpretations also suffer from philosophical problems and saddle Descartes with serious inconsistencies. See *Descartes’s Dualism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 191–2.

not fully understand the difference between sensations and external things. As the body began to develop such that it could pursue what was beneficial and avoid what was harmful to the union, the mind ‘began to notice that the objects of this pursuit or avoidance had an existence outside itself (ibid.). It then attributed to these objects ‘not only sizes, shapes, motions, and the like, which it perceived as things, or modes of things, but also tastes, smells and so on, the sensations of which were, it realized, produced by the objects in question’ (AT viiia. 36; CSM i. 219). We thus came to form many false judgements concerning the things causing our sensations. In particular, we judged that there were things in bodies—which we *called* ‘colours’, ‘sounds’, ‘odours’, etc.—that resemble our sensations.<sup>16</sup> Our sensations became further confused as a result of such false judgements, and our ideas of mind and body became further confused together.

Descartes calls these false judgements—by which we attribute colours, sounds, and odours to external things—‘prejudices’, where the Latin *praejudicia* literally means to ‘prejudge’. In general, the prejudices of childhood are the ‘chief cause of error’. They are formed when we are not in full command of our reason, but are difficult to relinquish later when we reach intellectual maturity because they become habituated.<sup>17</sup> ‘Forgetting that they were adopted without sufficient examination’, we regard them ‘as known by the senses or implanted by nature’, accepting them ‘as utterly true and evident’ (AT viiia. 36; CSM i. 218–19). As a result of these prejudices, and our preoccupation with the senses and the imagination, ‘most people have nothing but confused perceptions [of all their ideas] throughout their entire lives’ (AT viiia. 36; CSM i. 220).

This discussion has important consequences for the issue of whether Descartes holds a Dustbin Theory of Mind and for whether he is committed to Malebranche’s Indirect Argument. First, it shows that Descartes and Malebranche have very different diagnoses of the source

<sup>16</sup> AT viiia. 216; CSM i. 216. Also see AT viiia. 318, 322; CSM i. 282, 285, for Descartes’s account of how we come to apply the terms ‘colour’, ‘smell’, ‘taste’, ‘sound’, etc. to the properties of bodies.

<sup>17</sup> ‘... we are therefore in the habit of judging of these things not on the basis of present perception but from preconceived opinion’ (AT viiia. 37; CSM i. 220). For a more complete treatment of the role of habits in confused thought, see Lawrence Nolan, ‘The Ontological Argument as an Exercise in Cartesian Therapy’, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* (forthcoming).

of our confusion. Malebranche attributes our sensory confusion to the fact that we lack a clear and distinct idea of the mind.<sup>18</sup> But Descartes will not accept that verdict. On the contrary, he has his own highly sophisticated account of our confusion that attempts to explain how it infects all of our ideas, prior to philosophizing, and that depends on theses about mind–body union that he shares with Malebranche. If anything, one wonders why Malebranche rejected his account in favour of a verdict that appears, from a strictly Cartesian perspective, rather hasty.

Second, Descartes thinks that the confusion attending our pre-philosophical idea of mind and our sensations is a contingent matter, resulting in the first case from our embodiment and in the second from habitual false judgements, and not from something intrinsic to these ideas. Although it requires great effort and training, and most people never succeed, the dedicated meditator is capable of dispelling the confusion infecting all of these ideas. Malebranche, by contrast, assumes that our confusion about the nature of the mind is inevitable and incurable.

Third, although Descartes and Malebranche agree that the ordinary person and the scholastic falsely attribute colours, sounds, odours, etc. to external things, they have different accounts of the content of such judgements. According to Malebranche, the common person supposes that the very qualities she senses are in external objects: it is a ‘prejudice common to all men, *that their sensations are in the objects they sense*’ (*Recherche*, i. 16, OC i. 169; LO 75). Descartes, by contrast, holds that the common person makes two other mistakes: first, rather than (properly) attributing sensations to the mind, she attributes them to the union. Second, she supposes there are things (that she calls ‘colours’, ‘sounds’, ‘tastes’, etc.) in external objects that resemble her sensations.

It is highly significant that Descartes thinks the common person makes this second mistake, for it shows that he does *not* identify colour or sound sensations with the ‘colours’, ‘sounds’, etc. that the common person attributes to external things. The latter are *not* sensations, but things the confused person takes to *resemble* her sensations. This

<sup>18</sup> ‘Now the reason why all men do not immediately see that colors, odors, tastes, and all other sensations are modifications of their soul is that we have no clear idea of our soul’ (*Recherche*, i. 12, OC i. 139; LO 58).

reveals the first of three main reasons that Descartes would reject both the Indirect Argument and the Dustbin Theory. The Dustbin Theory presupposes, and the Indirect Argument seeks to prove, that the sensible qualities that we pre-philosophically attribute to external bodies are really just modes of mind. But if Descartes does not identify those qualities with sensations, as we have suggested, then he would regard the Indirect Argument as unsound. Quite simply, these so-called ‘qualities’ are not modes of body *or* mind; they are merely the products of confused judgement.<sup>19</sup>

From Descartes’s perspective, another problem with Malebranche’s Indirect Argument is that it presupposes a distinct idea of body that is ready to hand and to which even the philosophically benighted person can appeal to establish the mental status of sensible qualities. But, according to Descartes’s diagnosis, prior to philosophizing the ordinary person’s ideas of mind and body are both highly confused, and this confusion consists in their being literally confounded together. Thus, there is no prior idea of body that is given to us as distinct. In Section 3, we attempt to explain Descartes’s positive strategy for clarifying our ideas. As we shall see, to achieve distinct ideas of both mind and body, one must carefully and methodically tease them apart. This means that clarifying these ideas is a single process, and one does not achieve a *fully* clear and distinct idea of the one without also achieving such an idea of the other. But once one has a fully clear and distinct idea of the mind, then one can determine the ontological status of any mode of mind *directly*. Before turning to that discussion, however, in the next subsection we address the question of why Malebranche assumes that the ordinary person has a distinct idea of extension, prior to philosophizing. This will further expose the philosophical divide that separates him from Descartes.

## 2.2. *Malebranche’s distinction between the idea of body and the idea of extension*

It is puzzling that Malebranche singles out the lack of a distinct idea of the mind as the primary reason we mistakenly attribute sensible

<sup>19</sup> For an account of the ontological status of Cartesian sensible qualities that complements the claims of this chapter, see our ‘The Bogey of Cartesian Qualia’ (unpub.).

qualities to bodies. On Descartes's view, this mistake results in part from having confused ideas of both mind and body. Short of taking that position, it seems more plausible to locate the source of our error in the idea of body. In his defence of Descartes, Arnauld rightly observes that people who think that sensible qualities are in corporeal objects do not have a clear and distinct idea of body.<sup>20</sup> In Elucidation XI Malebranche attempts to address this objection by drawing a distinction between the idea of body and the idea of extension: some people 'might have doubts as to whether or not body is capable of sensations, or of receiving some sensible quality; but this is because they understand body as something other than extension' (OC iii. 167; LO 635). However, even if they conceive of body in this confused manner, the idea of extension 'is so clear that everyone agrees on what it contains and what it excludes' (ibid.). Arnauld dismisses Malebranche's response here as a pure equivocation. Those who distinguish body from extension do not 'have a clear idea of extension, since they do not know that body and extension are the same thing' (TFI 130). In other words, if one does not recognize that extension just is the essence of body, then one does not have a clear idea of extension.

Arnauld plainly gets the better of Malebranche on this point. But what is motivating Malebranche's tenuous distinction between the idea of body and the idea of extension? Consider the following passage from Elucidation XI:

If the nature of the soul is better known than the nature of any other thing, if the idea we have of it is as clear as the idea we have of the body, then I ask only this: how is it that there are so many people who confuse the two? Is it possible to confuse two entirely different clear ideas? Those who are not of our opinion are as reasonable as we, they have the same ideas of things, they participate in the same reason. Why, then, do they confuse what we distinguish? Have they ever confused two different numbers? Have they ever taken a square for a circle? Yet the soul is more different from the body than a square is from a circle, for they are substances that agree in nothing, and yet these people confuse them. There is, then, some difficulty in recognizing

<sup>20</sup> '... those who think that the sensible qualities do not belong to the soul believe that they belong to the body. Therefore they do not have a clear idea of the body, since according to him [i.e. Malebranche], in order for an idea to be clear, we must be able to perceive, by a simple vision, *what it contains and what it excludes*' (TFI 134–5).

their difference. . . . The idea of extension must be carefully consulted, and it must be seen that extension is not a mode of bodies but body itself . . . and thus, since the modes of which a body is capable are in no way related to sense qualities, the subject of these qualities . . . must be very different from body. Such arguments must be produced in order to avoid confusing the soul with the body. But if we had a clear idea of the soul, as we do of the body, we certainly would not have to take such a roundabout way to distinguish it from the body. We could do so at a single glance, as easily as we see that a square is not a circle. (OC iii. 170–1; LO 637–8)

This passage is quite striking given our earlier discussion of Descartes’s account of how the ideas of mind and body are confused. Malebranche begins by acknowledging Descartes’s point that people often confound these ideas together, but rather than attributing this confusion to our pre-philosophical conception of union, he insists that this too is due to our lack of a clear (and distinct) idea of mind. He also claims that the idea of extension remains perfectly clear. This strains credulity, for we are told here that extension just is body (‘extension is not a mode of bodies but body itself’). To press Arnauld’s point, how could one have a distinct idea of extension if she did not know that body just is extension? Once more, the idea of extension *is* the idea of body, and if this idea were distinct, one would not confuse the idea of the mind with it.

Malebranche thinks he is entitled to say that we have a clear and distinct idea of extension—even while confusing the ideas of body and mind—because the primary notions in geometry and arithmetic are immediately distinct and readily agreed upon by everyone. He is treating mathematical knowledge as the paradigm of knowledge through clear and distinct ideas and emphasizing what he takes to be a revealing asymmetry with knowledge of mind. People do not (generally) confuse geometrical figures or numbers, but (almost) everyone confuses the mind with the body. If we had a clear and distinct idea of the mind then we would be able to see immediately that sensible qualities are modes of the mind and that the mind is really distinct from the body—just as we see that a square is not a circle.

The appeal to mathematical knowledge fails to validate Malebranche’s distinction between the idea of body and the idea of extension, for the reasons already given. In particular, it does not address Arnauld’s point that people who attribute sensible qualities

*The Dustbin Theory of Mind*

45

to body do not have a clear idea of extension. Malebranche insists on making the idea of mind (or the lack thereof) the culprit, but this is implausible. Following Descartes, it is more reasonable to say that such people lack clear and distinct ideas of both mind and body (extension). Malebranche thus fails to locate an asymmetry between our knowledge of body and our knowledge of mind. At most, he identifies an interesting asymmetry between knowledge of mind and body on the one hand and mathematical knowledge on the other. Generally speaking, only knowledge of the latter sort is immediately clear and distinct (or so it seems). One might well wonder why this is.

In the *Sixth Replies*, Descartes offers an interesting explanation of this epistemic disparity that again relies (implicitly) on our status as embodied creatures.

It is true that, before freeing myself from prejudices acquired from the senses, I did perceive correctly that two and three make five ... and many things of this kind; and yet I did not think that the soul of man is distinct from his body. But I do not find this surprising. For I can easily see why it happened that, when still an infant, I never made any false judgments about propositions of this sort, which everyone accepts; the reason was that I had no occasion to employ these propositions, since children do not learn to count two and three until they are capable of judging whether they make five. (AT vii. 445; CSM ii. 299–300)

If we juxtapose this passage with the ones considered earlier from the *Principles* and elsewhere, we begin to get a very full and nuanced account of the genesis of confused thought and of the sense in which mathematical knowledge is privileged for Descartes, if it is privileged at all. In our earliest years, when immersed in the senses and the ways in which our body was being affected by external things, we formed many false judgements about the nature of the mind and the nature of corporeal objects. However, at that stage we were so concerned with preserving our union and pursuing what was beneficial to it that we never had occasion to make judgements about mathematical propositions; a fortiori we had no occasion to make *false* judgements that would later become habituated. As a result, we never formed prejudices about the primary notions in mathematics. We only began making judgements in mathematics after we were already in full command of our reason. Once we have an idea of

a simple mathematical truth, it is immediately clear and distinct. It turns out that on Descartes's view, the disparity between our mathematical knowledge and other types of knowledge is completely innocuous, and even complements his treatment of why the ideas of mind and body are confused. By failing to consider this account or to provide adequate responses to Arnauld's objections, Malebranche's own conclusions appear rash and forced.

### 3. HOW OUR CONFUSED IDEAS BECOME CLEAR AND DISTINCT

We now turn to Descartes's primary strategy for clarifying our pre-philosophically confused sensations and ideas of mind and body. This strategy follows naturally from his account of how these ideas are confused, as explained in Section 2.1. Since the ideas of mind and body are given to us as confused, *and* this confusion consists in their literally being confounded together, the primary strategy for dispelling this confusion is to tease these ideas apart very carefully and methodically: 'it happens in almost every case of imperfect knowledge that many things are apprehended together as a unity, though they will later have to be distinguished by a more careful examination' (AT vii. 445; CSM ii. 300). Simply put, the ideas of mind and body become distinct (in Descartes's technical sense of 'distinctness') by being distinguished from each other.<sup>21</sup> It is precisely because these ideas are confused together that the only way to make them distinct is by teasing them apart. This is a single process and a gradual one: these ideas become distinguished by degrees, and one does not achieve fully clear and distinct ideas of mind and body until one has completely distinguished them from each other.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> In the *Principles* Descartes explains that 'a perception is "distinct" if, as well as being clear, it is so sharply separated from all other perceptions that it contains within itself only what is clear' (AT viii. 22; CSM i. 207–8).

<sup>22</sup> One might object that this assertion contravenes Descartes's boast in the Second Meditation that mind is better known than body. If our ideas in this case become clear and distinct by means of a single process, then at most Descartes should claim that mind and body are known equally well. To blunt this objection, it helps to recall that by the end of the *Meditations* Descartes does think that our knowledge of mind and our knowledge of body are on a par, in the sense that we have metaphysical certainty about the existence and nature of both substances. In keeping with this point, Descartes's stronger thesis is

In fact, one could read the *Meditations* as a whole as aiming towards this goal. The meditator begins this process in the Second Meditation, but does not complete it until the Sixth Meditation, where she excludes the ideas of mind and body from each other in thought. This final step of the process plays a central role in Descartes's proof of the real distinction between mind and body.

If this reading is correct, it highlights the second main reason that Descartes would reject both the Indirect Argument and the Dustbin Theory. As we have seen, the latter presuppose that the idea of body (or extension) is given to us as distinct and is prior to any idea of mind. But Descartes maintains that both ideas are highly confused prior to philosophizing and, moreover, that one cannot achieve a *fully* clear and distinct idea of the one without also achieving such an idea of the other.

In this section we shall develop and defend our interpretative hypothesis concerning the way in which clear and distinct ideas of mind and body are achieved. This discussion will also reveal the third main reason that Descartes would reject the Indirect Argument. He maintains that the ontological status of any mode can only be known *directly*, and prescribes a method for accomplishing this that consists in perceiving a given mode through a substance's 'principal' attribute.

We have suggested that a central aim of the *Meditations* is to help the sympathetic reader tease her ideas of mind and body apart from each other. Many of the moves Descartes deploys to help the meditator attain this end are quite familiar. Using the method of universal doubt, he teaches the meditator to withdraw from the senses and to meditate carefully on the ideas of mind and body individually. In the Second Meditation, the meditator discovers that she can conceive of her mind as a thinking thing and the wax as an extended thing. The nuances of the *cogito*, the *res cogitans*, and the wax passage have been discussed at great length in the secondary literature. Such details need not be discussed here, for our perspective is much broader. We shall focus on the *function* of the various cognitive exercises prescribed for the meditator in the Second Meditation.

often interpreted to mean either (1) that body is known through the mind or (2) that in the context of the Second Meditation, the existence and nature of mind is certain while that of body remains dubitable. But both of these interpretations are compatible with the claim that the ideas of mind and body are not fully clear and distinct until they have been completely teased apart.

Descartes makes some revealing remarks about this function in the following passages from the Second Replies and the Synopsis of the *Meditations*:

*All our ideas of what belongs to the mind have up till now been very confused and mixed up with the ideas of things that can be perceived by the senses. This is the first and most important reason for our inability to understand with sufficient clarity the customary assertions about the soul and God. So I thought I would be doing something worthwhile if I explained how the properties or qualities of the mind are to be distinguished from the qualities of the body. Admittedly, many people had previously said that in order to understand metaphysical matters the mind must be drawn away from the senses; but no one, so far as I know, had shown how this could be done. The correct, and in my view unique, method of achieving this is contained in my Second Meditation. But the nature of the method is such that scrutinizing it just once is not enough. Protracted and repeated study is required to eradicate the lifelong habit of confusing things related to the intellect with corporeal things, and to replace it with the opposite habit of distinguishing the two. (AT vii. 131; CSM ii. 94; our emphasis)*

In the Second Meditation, the mind uses its own freedom and supposes the non-existence of all the things about whose existence it can have even the slightest doubt; and in so doing the mind notices that it is impossible that it should not itself exist during this time. *This exercise is also of the greatest benefit, since it enables the mind to distinguish without difficulty what belongs to itself, i.e. to an intellectual nature, from what belongs to the body. (AT vii. 12; CSM ii. 9; our emphasis)*

These texts cohere nicely with the thesis argued for in Section 2.1, namely that prior to meditation the ideas of mind and body are confused by their having been naturally confounded together. This is most explicit in the first passage where Descartes speaks of the ‘lifelong habit of confusing things related to the intellect with corporeal things’. Descartes wants to help the meditator replace this habit ‘with the opposite habit of distinguishing the two’. Similarly, in the second passage Descartes describes the application of the method of doubt as being ‘of the greatest benefit’ because it allows the meditator to distinguish what belongs ‘to an intellectual nature, from what belongs to the body’.

We want to underscore the fact that in each of these texts Descartes presents his Second Meditation strategies as directly combating the confusion that infects the ideas of mind and body. One virtue of

applying the method of doubt as directed in the Second Meditation is that it allows the meditator to tease her ideas of mind and body apart. Indeed, the texts cited above, taken in conjunction with Descartes's previously discussed remarks on how the ideas of mind and body are given to us as confused, strongly suggest that the Second Meditation is carefully crafted with precisely this end in mind.

We now turn our attention to the real distinction argument of the Sixth Meditation. As mentioned above, this is where the final step in the process of distinguishing the ideas of mind and body takes place. Needless to say, a complete discussion of Descartes's real distinction proof exceeds the scope of this chapter. For our present purposes, we need focus only on how to understand Descartes's claim that mind can be clearly and distinctly understood apart from body. This assertion constitutes an important part of the real distinction proof. It is a particular instance of a general principle that Descartes sets forth at the beginning of his proof: 'the fact that I can clearly and distinctly understand one thing apart from another is enough to make me certain that the two things are distinct' (AT vii. 78; CSM ii. 54). At first glance, the phrase 'clearly and distinctly understanding one thing apart from another' seems ambiguous. To use the case of mind and body, it is not clear whether considering mind apart from body requires attending to the idea of the mind alone, or attending to the ideas of both mind and body.

Arnauld, in his well-known objection to the real distinction argument in the *Fourth Set of Objections*, assumed that Descartes was claiming the former. He thought that to perceive mind apart from body was just to think of the mind without thinking of body. Arnauld suggested that one could clearly and distinctly perceive a right-angled triangle without knowing that the Pythagorean theorem is one of its properties. This would seem to be a case of clearly and distinctly understanding one thing—a right-angled triangle—apart from another, namely the Pythagorean property. But of course the Pythagorean theorem is a property of a right-angled triangle. Thus, in this case perceiving one thing apart from another does not seem to be sufficient for demonstrating distinctness. But if this is so, why should our perception of the mind apart from body have to entail that mind and body are really distinct substances?

Although I clearly and distinctly know my nature to be something that thinks, may I, too, not perhaps be wrong in thinking that nothing else belongs to my nature apart from the fact that I am a thinking thing? Perhaps the fact that I am an extended thing may also belong to my nature. (AT vii. 203; CSM ii. 142–3)

Descartes provides a two-part rejoinder to Arnauld's objection. In each part he attempts to establish a disanalogy between the right-angled triangle and the Pythagorean theorem, on the one hand, and the distinction between mind and body, on the other. Here we shall focus only on Descartes's second response.<sup>23</sup> However, in order to understand it we must briefly sketch a distinction Descartes draws between two kinds of mental operation—abstraction and exclusion. Although this important distinction is at work in Descartes's real distinction argument, he does not formally expound it in the *Meditations*. The only place the distinction is explicitly set forth is in a letter to Gibieuf. He tells Gibieuf that abstraction is an intellectual operation which consists in concentrating one's attention on one aspect of some rich idea while ignoring or turning one's thought away from its other aspects. For example, if one were to 'consider a shape without thinking of the substance or the extension whose shape it is', one would be performing an abstraction (19 January 1642, AT iii. 475; CSMK 202). By contrast to abstraction, exclusion is a matter not simply of ignoring certain aspects of an idea, but of actively denying them. For example, one could exclude from a circle the properties of a square. Exclusion thus requires that one attend to what is being excluded. When one performs such an exclusion clearly and distinctly, one establishes that what has been excluded is not contained in the idea in question. If it were so contained, then it would not be possible to perform the exclusion (clearly and distinctly). For example, although one can attend to the particular shape of a corporeal substance without attending to the substance itself (as mentioned above), it is impossible to understand the shape if one excludes the substance. Abstraction

<sup>23</sup> Descartes's first point is that mind and body can be conceived as complete things, while neither a right-angled triangle nor the Pythagorean theorem can be conceived as complete things (AT vii. 224; CSM ii. 158). To conceive the mind as a complete thing is just to conceive mind as a substance, that is, as something capable of existing independently (of any other *finite* substance). In contrast, Descartes does not think that a right-angled triangle or the Pythagorean theorem can be conceived as capable of independent existence.

is thus a weaker intellectual operation than exclusion—it does not follow from the fact that A can be clearly and distinctly abstracted from B that A can be clearly and distinctly excluded from B.<sup>24</sup>

We are now well placed to understand the second part of Descartes’s response to Arnauld. Descartes concedes to Arnauld that one can clearly and distinctly understand a right-angled triangle without recognizing that the Pythagorean theorem is one of its properties. In the technical terminology set forth above, one is merely considering the idea of a right-angled triangle in abstraction from the Pythagorean theorem. Performing such an abstraction does not prove that the Pythagorean theorem is not a property of a right-angled triangle. In order to establish that conclusion one would have to clearly and distinctly *exclude* the Pythagorean theorem from the idea of a right-angled triangle. But this, of course, cannot be done: ‘it is not intelligible that this ratio should be denied of the triangle’ (AT vii. 227; CSM ii. 159).

In contrast, Descartes explains that clearly and distinctly understanding mind apart from the body involves more than just thinking of the mind in abstraction from the body: ‘not only do we understand it [the mind] to exist without the body, but, what is more, all the attributes which belong to a body can be denied of it. For it is of the nature of substances that they should mutually exclude one another’ (AT vii. 227; CSM ii. 159). Contrary to Arnauld’s assumption, clearly and distinctly understanding mind apart from body involves attending to the ideas of both mind and body. More precisely, it involves excluding the ideas of mind and body from each other in thought.<sup>25</sup> It is by performing this exclusion operation that

<sup>24</sup> For more on this distinction, see Dugald Murdoch, ‘Exclusion and Abstraction in Descartes’s Metaphysics’, *Philosophical Quarterly*, 43 (1993), 38–57.

<sup>25</sup> That exclusion is an essential feature of this proof is further confirmed by Descartes’s brief discussion of real distinction in the *Principles*. There he states that ‘from the mere fact that each of us understands himself to be a thinking thing and is capable, in thought, of excluding (*excludere*) from himself every other substance, whether thinking or extended, it is certain that each of us, regarded in this way, is really distinct from every other thinking substance and from every corporeal substance’ (AT viiia. 29; CSM i. 213). Furthermore, although the real distinction passage in the Sixth Meditation makes no explicit mention of exclusion, a careful reading shows it to be implicit in this text as well: ‘On the one hand I have a clear and distinct idea of myself, in so far as I am simply a thinking, non-extended thing; and on the other hand I have a distinct idea of body, in so far as this is simply an extended, non-thinking thing. And accordingly, it is certain that I am really distinct from my body, and can exist without it’ (AT vii. 78; CSM ii. 54). We must be careful not to

one completes the process of distinguishing the ideas of mind and body from each other—thereby achieving fully clear and distinct ideas of these substances simultaneously.<sup>26</sup>

To perform this exclusion operation, it suffices to exclude the essences of mind and body from each other, for in excluding the essences one also excludes the modes of each substance. This result follows from Descartes's conception of the metaphysical relation between the modes of a substance and its essence. Cartesian created substances are simple in an important way: minds are purely thinking things and bodies are purely extended things. But they are simple in another sense too: the 'modes' or affections of a substance are merely determinations of its essence. For example, modes of body such as size, shape, position, etc. are determinations of extension. Clearly, Descartes chose the term 'mode' (*modus*), which literally means 'way', to indicate this relation. Modes are *ways* of being an extended or thinking thing. As Daniel Garber has observed, Descartes's view that there must be a very intimate relation between the modes of a

misread this passage. When Descartes claims to have an idea of the mind as 'a thinking, non-extended thing', and of body as 'an extended, non-thinking thing', he is not attributing negative properties to the ideas of mind and body. He is not saying that it is part of the idea of mind that it is non-extended, or that it is part of the idea of body that it is non-thinking. Rather, he is claiming that these two ideas can be mutually excluded from each other in thought.

<sup>26</sup> It is natural to ask whether this exclusion can be performed earlier in the *Meditations*—perhaps by the end of the Second Meditation. To be sure, the meditator achieves clear and distinct ideas of mind and body in the Second Meditation, but it is not clear whether *fully* clear and distinct ideas of mind and body can be achieved at this point. On the one hand, Descartes does not speak of mutual exclusion in the Second Meditation or in any of his replies to objections concerning it. Nevertheless, he does occasionally use language that is suggestive of mutual exclusion prior to the Sixth Meditation (see e.g. AT vii. 44; CSM ii. 30). If a meditator were to perform the relevant exclusion operation prior to the Sixth Meditation, she would achieve fully clear and distinct ideas of mind and body. We see no reason for Descartes to deny that *some* meditators might do this. But the important issue here is not whether mutual exclusion is first performed in the Second or Sixth Meditations. Descartes emphasizes mutual exclusion in the Sixth Meditation because it is only at this point that the attainment of fully clear and distinct ideas of mind and body will have ontological implications. Descartes is seeking *scientia* of the respective natures of mind and body, and this is not possible until one has secured a divine guarantee and the rule for truth, for without these things we cannot be sure 'whether things do in reality correspond to our perception of them' (AT vii. 226; CSM ii. 159). Fully clear and distinct ideas of mind and body must be attained in order to prove that mind and body are really distinct substances, but this conclusion cannot be established until the sceptical doubts raised in the First Meditation have been defeated.

substance and its essence contrasts sharply with the scholastic account of substance, which it is likely targeting. The scholastics countenanced a very loose connection between the essence of a substance and its non-essential or accidental properties, such that the latter are merely ‘tacked on’ to an underlying substratum, but this is something that Descartes could not abide. The only properties of a Cartesian substance are its essence and the modes, or ways, of being that essence.<sup>27</sup>

The metaphysical priority of essences to modes grounds a corresponding conceptual or epistemic priority. In fact, as a consequence of his understanding of the relation between a substance and its properties, Descartes is committed to an important epistemic principle, namely that the modes of a substance can be clearly and distinctly understood *only* through the essence or what he calls the ‘principal attribute’ of that substance.

A substance may . . . be known through any attribute at all; but each substance has one principal property which constitutes its nature and essence, and to which all its other properties are referred. Thus extension . . . constitutes the nature of corporeal substance; and thought constitutes the nature of thinking substance. Everything else which can be attributed to body presupposes extension, and is merely a mode of an extended thing; and similarly, whatever we find in the mind is simply one of the various modes of thinking. (AT viiia. 25; CSM i. 210)

In his subsequent discussion, Descartes makes clear that what it means to say that the modes of a substance are ‘referred’ to its principal attribute is that they are *understood or conceived of through* that attribute. For example, ‘shape is unintelligible except in an extended thing . . . [and] imagination, sensation, and will are intelligible only in a thinking thing’ (AT viiia. 25; CSM i. 210–11). Despite the centrality of this epistemic principle to Descartes’s philosophy, and his explicit statement of it in pivotal texts, it is widely under-appreciated.<sup>28</sup> Indeed, Malebranche failed to grasp its centrality, for it provides Descartes with a direct method for determining the ontological status of any mode

<sup>27</sup> This paragraph has greatly benefited from Garber’s discussion of this issue. See *Descartes’s Metaphysical Physics* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992), 68–9.

<sup>28</sup> Descartes’s most careful presentation of this epistemological principle is in the *Principles* (AT viiia. 25; CSM ii. 210). Less formal statements of the principle can be found in the *Sixth Replies* (AT vii. 444; CSM ii. 299), and in *Comments on a Certain Broadsheet* (AT viiib. 350; CSM i. 298).

whatsoever: if a mode can be conceived of through the attribute of thought, then it is a mode of mind; if it can be conceived of through the attribute of extension, then it is a mode of body. However, this method cannot be applied unless one has a clear and distinct idea of the substance in question. An indirect argument purporting to establish that sensations (or any other modes) are modes of mind *in the absence of a clear and distinct idea of the mind* is thus impossible in principle.<sup>29</sup> This is the third and final reason that Descartes would reject both the Indirect Argument and the Dustbin Theory.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

We have argued, contrary to a long-standing myth, that Descartes is not committed to the Dustbin Theory of Mind and, correlatively, that he would reject Malebranche's Indirect Argument. If this were a

<sup>29</sup> Geneviève Rodis-Lewis and Ferdinand Alquié claim to detect an indirect argument in the following passage from the *Passions of the Soul*: 'Thus, because we have no conception of the body as thinking in any way at all, we have reason to believe that every thought present in us belongs to the soul' (AT xi. 329; CSM i. 329). We find this suggestion implausible, especially given the larger context in which this passage appears. Descartes is attempting to distinguish the functions of the soul from the functions of the human body (AT xi. 328; CSM i. 328). In article 3, just before the passage at issue, he presents a 'rule' that will enable us to accomplish this task: 'anything we experience as being in us, and which we see can also exist in wholly inanimate bodies, must be attributed only to our body. On the other hand, anything in us which we cannot conceive in any way as capable of belonging to a body must be attributed to our soul' (AT xi. 329; CSM i. 329). Descartes maintains that an application of this rule will disabuse the scholastically trained reader of the 'serious error' of thinking that 'the soul gives movement and heat to the body', which he takes to be the primary reason previous philosophers failed to give a satisfactory explanation of the passions: 'we must believe that all the heat and all the movements present in us, insofar as they do not depend on thought, belong solely to the body' (here the 'us' refers to the union of mind and body, and 'heat' to the cause of the sensation) (AT xi. 329–30; CSM i. 329). One cannot help noticing that this application of the rule runs in the other direction than the Indirect Argument—from mind to body! If Descartes were articulating an indirect argument in these passages it would have to operate in both directions, given his statement of the rule. But what would this mean by Malebranche's reasoning, *that we lack distinct ideas of both mind and body*? Fortunately, there is a better explanation of this text. Descartes does not say here what grounds the rule for distinguishing the functions of mind and body, but it is natural to suppose that he sees himself as relying on the results of his mature philosophy, especially the proof of real distinction. Indeed, in applying the rule one is, in effect, rehearsing one of the main steps of that proof, namely the mutual exclusion of mind and body in thought. See Ferdinand Alquié, *Le Cartésianisme de Malebranche* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1974), 99, and Rodis-Lewis's editorial remarks on the *Recherche*, OC iii. 367 n. 91. Also see Schmaltz, *Malebranche's Theory of the Soul*, 256 n. 125, who agrees with us that Descartes does not intend to articulate an indirect argument in this passage.

Cartesian legacy, then Descartes would have to concede Malebranche's contention that he lacks a clear and distinct idea of mind. Our interpretation spares him from having to concede anything here.

The strategy of our argument has been to develop two general considerations stemming from Descartes's philosophical system: first, his diagnosis of the confusion infecting our ideas of mind and body, and our sensations, and, second, his method for dispelling this confusion. These considerations reveal three independent reasons that Descartes would reject the Dustbin Theory and the Indirect Argument.

First, the Dustbin Theory and the Indirect Argument presuppose that the qualities we pre-philosophically attribute to external things just are modes of mind. Descartes rejects this presupposition. According to his diagnosis, these purported qualities are not modes of body *or* mind, but the products of confused judgement that result from the ordinary person's tendency to posit things in bodies that resemble his sensations. Thus, rather than reducing these so-called 'things' or 'qualities' to modes of mind, Descartes eliminates them from his ontology entirely.

Second, it is a presupposition of the Dustbin Theory and the Indirect Argument that the idea of body is epistemically prior to the idea of mind. But for Descartes the ideas of mind and body are confused together, prior to meditating, and one cannot achieve a fully clear and distinct idea of body until one also has a clear and distinct idea of mind and vice versa.

Third, Descartes holds that the *only* way to establish the ontological status of any mode is by conceiving of it through the principal attribute of the substance that it modifies. In the case of mind, this requires that one conceive of the mode in question through the attribute of thought. This procedure is *direct*, and can only be performed if one has a clear and distinct idea of the mind as a purely thinking substance. This means that an indirect argument for the claim that sensible qualities are modes of mind is impossible in principle.<sup>30</sup>

*California State University, Long Beach  
University of California, Irvine*

<sup>30</sup> We would like to thank Paul Hoffman, Nicholas Jolley, Thomas Lennon, Steven Nadler, Alan Nelson, Tad Schmaltz, Russell Wahl, June Yang, and referees for this volume for comments on earlier drafts of this chapter. We are also indebted to audiences at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (Nov. 2002) and at the American Philosophical Association meeting in San Francisco (Mar. 2003).

