EXPLAINING
imagination

PETER LANGLAND-HASSAN

Explaining Imagination

PETER LANGLAND-HASSAN

10

Consuming Fictions Part II

The Operator Claim

10.1 Introduction

Last chapter I offered an account of how fictional content, both implied and explicit, is recovered without use of *sui generis* imaginative states. This and the next chapter shift focus to our immersion in fictions—to the fact that we become emotionally involved, concerned with, "lost in," moved by, and, well, *immersed* in compelling fictions. Explaining our immersion amounts, first and foremost, to explaining how and why we become emotionally involved in the fictions we enjoy. (At the beginning of Chapter 9, I considered the objection that immersion is something distinct from emotional involvement—that it involves "losing oneself" in the fiction in some other, more cognitive sense.) Many have thought that our being moved by fictions is due in part to our entering into *sui generis* imaginative states through which the fictional events are represented. Some then add to this picture that *sui generis* (belief-like) imaginative states combine with a second, desire-like form of imaginative state—what we can call "i-desires"—to generate fiction-related emotions. Over the next two chapters, I will argue that neither sort of imaginative state should form part of our account of immersion in fiction. We can better explain immersion by appeal to ordinary beliefs and desires about the fictions. Further, quite apart from its being *possible* that fiction consumption draws only on beliefs and desires, there are serious independent difficulties with the idea that *sui generis* imaginative states underwrite our immersion in fictions. These difficulties—which are the main topic of this chapter—disappear when we adopt a reductive approach to imagination, where the imaginings we experience in response to fiction amount to certain kinds of ordinary perceptions, judgements and desires.

10.2 The Operator Claim

In the Batman fictions, Gotham is a dangerous city, riddled with crime. Do I, myself, *believe* that Gotham is dangerous? Not exactly. Asked to name some dangerous cities, I don't list Gotham among them. What I believe is that, in the Batman fictions, Gotham is a dangerous city. If in casual conversation I leave out

the 'in the fiction' operator—asking, "What if Batman lived in Woodstock instead of Gotham?"—it is always there *sotto voce*. A formal account of my beliefs must make it explicit, in order to distinguish me from the person who truly believes that Gotham is a dangerous city and, for that reason, plans to avoid it on his next cross-country trip. Likewise David Lewis, in his influential account of truth in fiction, advises that we "not take our descriptions of fictional characters at face value," but instead "regard them as abbreviations for longer sentences beginning with an operator 'In such-and-such fiction…'" (1978, p. 37). In his example: "if I say that [Sherlock] Holmes liked to show off"—and thereby express my *belief* about Holmes—"you will take it that I have asserted an abbreviated version of the true sentence 'In the Sherlock Holmes stories, Holmes liked to show off'" (p. 38). It is the latter "true sentence" that is actually believed. I will be arguing that the same kind of disambiguation-by-operator is required in the case of fiction-directed imaginings as well. Call this the *Operator Claim* (OC):

OC: when recovering fictional content from a fiction F in which p is the case, we do not simply imagine that p; rather, we imagine that, in the fiction F, p.

Just as we need to include an 'in the fiction' operator within properly character-ized beliefs about fictional entities, so too must we include such an operator when properly characterizing our imaginings concerning fictions. If correct, the Operator Claim undermines the main rationale for positing *sui generis* imagina-tive states in the explanation of immersion—and indeed in explaining our enjoy-ment of fiction more generally. Or so I will argue.

To appreciate the OC's importance, it will help to first map the landscape of popular positions on imaginative immersion as it now stands.

10.3 Mapping the Territory: Three Views

Not everyone who discovers that q is happy about it. Typically, only those who desired that q are glad at the discovery, and not those who desired that not-q, or who couldn't care less whether q. Likewise, judging that p will not usually, by itself, make someone anxious; negative affect only sets in if one also desires that not-p. So say the platitudes of folk psychology, and so I agree. A concrete case: Doggett & Egan are thrilled as the Red Sox batter circles the bases following his grand slam, while I watch the same events with sorrow. Why this difference in our emotions? Doggett & Egan desire that the Red Sox win, while I want their opponent, the Chicago Cubs, to prevail. Our desires themselves were not sufficient for the emo-tions we experienced; nor, for that matter, is belief that the Red Sox have hit a grand slam sufficient to arouse emotion in those who lack desires on the matter either way. The *pairing* of a cognitive with a suitably related conative state is essential.

True, not *all* emotional responses result from this recipe (Prinz, 2004; Robinson, 2005b). Some emotions are reflexive or "pre-cognitive" in nature. A door slammed shut by the wind may trigger fear and anxiety, without a belief/desire pair featuring in the explanation. But I don't think that is the case, in general, with respect to our emotional immersion in fiction. The best account of that immersion, I will argue, makes much the same appeal to suitable cognitive/conative state pairs as do explanations of our immersion in ordinary (non-fictional, non-pretend) events we enjoy, such as baseball games. I am joined in this thought by many others working on fiction and immersion, including Doggett & Egan (2012), Currie & Ravenscroft (2002), Kind (2011), and Spaulding (2015). A competitor to this approach holds that our (*sui generis*) imaginings generate emotional responses *directly*, irrespective of any conative states we may or may not have with respect to the fiction. Nichols (2004b, 2006b) and Van Leeuwen (2016) defend versions of that view. I have discussed Nichols' view elsewhere (Langland-Hassan, 2017) and will delay discussion of Van Leeuwen's until Chapter 11.

Provided that we are committed to the idea that cognitive and conative state pairs generate emotional response to fictions (in the normal case), there remain two controversial questions with respect to the nature of such pairs. The questions, and their most common answers, can be elucidated though an example. In the HBO mini-series *The Wire*, Wallace is a sixteen-year-old caregiver to his younger siblings and cousins, and occasional drug dealer. At the end of Season One, he is murdered by his peers on the off chance that he'll become a police informant. I felt anxiety and distress as the scene unfolded, having grown attached to Wallace. A first question we can ask about this case is: what are the specific cognitive and conative "attitudes" involved in generating the response? Are they imaginings, beliefs, desires, "i-desires" (Currie, 2010; Doggett & Egan, 2007, 2012), or something else? A second question is: what are the contents of those states? In particular, we will want to know whether the contents involve 'in the fiction' operators. Here are three popular approaches to answering these questions.

The Simple View: One set of responses, defended by both Kind (2011) and Spaulding (2015), is that the cognitive state is an *imagining* and the conative state is a *desire*, and that neither of those states involves an 'in the fiction' operator. So, in the example given, it might be an imagining that Wallace is dying that combines with a desire that Wallace survives that, together, serve to generate negative affect. I will call this the *Simple View*, following Currie (2010).[1] The Simple View is simple insofar as it meshes with our pre-theoretical tendency to describe ourselves as wanting Wallace to survive, and as imagining that he is dying.

---

[1] It bears noting that, on Currie's use of "the Simple View," the view is limited to making a claim about other conative states involved in fiction appreciation, and not on the nature of the cognitive state. Those who defend the Simple View will, however, typically agree that the cognitive state is an imagining of some sort, and not a belief.

The Change of Attitude View: A second style of view, defended by Currie (2010), Currie & Ravenscroft (2002), and Doggett & Egan (2007, 2012), gives a different answer concerning the nature of the conative state involved. Instead of holding that a desire that Wallace survives pairs with an imagining to generate negative affect, it proposes that we should posit an imaginative analog to desires—"i-desires"—to serve as the relevant conative state. It is my i-desiring that Wallace survives, while imagining that Wallace is being shot, that generates negative affect, with i-desires and imaginings combining to generate affect in roughly the same way that ordinary beliefs and desires do. I will—again following Currie (2010)—call this the *Change of Attitude View*. It is so named because it proposes a change to the conative attitude we might ascribe, pre-theoretically, when considering the case. It turns out we don't actually desire that Wallace survives; instead, we i-desire that he survives.

A motivation for the Change of Attitude View is that we are sometimes upset by what occurs in a fiction (as in a tragedy), even if we do not want to change the fiction to remove the upsetting feature (because we think the fiction is excellent as it is). Instead of describing us as somehow conflicted about how we want the fiction to be—both wanting Wallace to survive (because we like him) and wanting him to die (so that the fiction retains its dramatic integrity)—the Change of Attitude View proposes that we are in distinct states of desiring that the fiction remains as it is, while i-desiring that some event in the fiction does not occur. I will say more about this view and the argument just sketched in its favor below (section 10.5).

The Change of Content View: A third style of view—my own—is the *Change of Content View*. I again take the term from Currie.[2] The Change of Content view, as I will understand it, bears two important differences with both the Simple View and the Change of Attitude View. First, on the Change of Content View, the conative/cognitive state pair responsible for fiction-directed affect is a belief and a desire. This contrasts with the Simple View's claim that an imagining is (at least often) involved, and with the Change of Attitude's thesis that an imagining and an i-desire pair are (at least often) involved. Second, on the Change of Content View, both the belief and the desire include 'in the fiction' operators. This again contrasts with both the Simple View and the Change of Attitude View, insofar as neither hold that 'in the fiction' operators typically occur within the contents of the relevant emotion-generating states. Returning to the example from *The Wire*, on my view—the Change of Content View—it is my belief that, in the fiction, Wallace is being shot that combines with a desire that, in the fiction, Wallace survives, that generates negative affect. The Change of Content View is so named because,

---

[2] On Currie's version of the Change of Content View, the view only makes a claim about the conative state at work in generating fiction-directed affect (viz., that it is a desire with an 'in the fiction' operator within its content). On my version of the Change of Content View, I add that the relevant cognitive state is a belief (and not an imagining), where the belief *also* has an 'in the fiction' operator.

pre-theoretically, we may not include 'in the fiction' operators within the content of the attitudes we describe ourselves as taking toward fictions (even if they are always there *sotto voce*, as noted above). The Change of Content View is, however, consistent with a view where the states responsible for triggering our emotional responses to fiction are ordinary beliefs and desires.

I will now mount an argument for the Operator Claim that, if correct, favors the Change of Content View over both the Simple View and the Change of Attitude View. Like it or not, the operator-involving Change of Content View is the only coherent alternative for providing an explanation of fiction-directed affect, so long as we are committed to those explanations invoking suitable cognitive/conative state pairs.

10.4 To Which Fiction Do Your Desires Refer? Troubles for the Simple View

I begin by recounting an ingenious argument developed by Currie (2010)—with help from Tyler Doggett and Stacie Friend[3]—against the Simple View, as a means to promoting his own Change of Attitude (i.e., "i-desire") View. I will then argue that, with minor modifications, it poses an equally serious challenge to his own Change of Attitude View.

Currie imagines a fictional *BBC* drama—*Death of a Prime Minister*—the plot of which involves Margaret Thatcher being pursued by an assassin. While he does not, in reality, wish for Thatcher to be assassinated, he is, in the context of the fiction, hoping that she is assassinated. As he puts it, he is "on the side" of the film's clever villain. As he cheers for the assassin, the Simple View would characterize him as having the desire that Thatcher dies. But, if that were really his desire, Currie observes, "it should be satisfied by her [actual] death." And yet:

> It wouldn't be. Suppose that, while I am cheering for the play's assassin, Mrs. Thatcher runs in pursued by someone who proceeds to murder her. That would seem to me a wholly bad thing…this state, which we ignorantly call a desire, is not satisfied by the death of Mrs. Thatcher, but by her death *according to the fiction*.   (2010, p. 635)

Currie concludes that the Simple View provides a wrong account of his fiction-directed conative state, insofar as it suggests that the state should be satisfied by events that would not satisfy it.

---

[3] Currie thanks both Doggett and Friend in the article for suggesting aspects of the argumentative strategy.

Currie's example exploits the fact that we sometimes desire events to occur in a fiction that we do not wish to occur in reality. He would be aghast if Thatcher were actually murdered; yet he wishes the assassin to succeed in the fiction. This helps us to see that Thatcher's actual assassination is not among the satisfaction conditions for the fiction-directed desire. This suggests that the Simple View has given the wrong account of the conative state at work. We can also create problems for the Simple View using examples where one's fiction and reality-directed desires appear to align. Suppose that I am watching a film where terrorists storm Buckingham Palace. The film's hero hatches a plan to drive the terrorists out. I feel anxiety as I follow along, imagining (let us suppose) that the terrorists haven't yet been driven out of the palace. Which desire of mine pairs with this imagining to generate anxiety? On the Simple View, it should be a desire that Buckingham Palace is free of terrorists. Yet if the desire that Buckingham Palace is free of terrorists were really contributing to my anxiety, I should be able to dispel that anxiety by turning on the news and confirming that there are not, in fact, any terrorists laying siege to Buckingham Palace. But, obviously, news reports about the peaceable state of Buckingham Palace are irrelevant to my concerns. For the unsatisfied desire in question does not concern the state of Buckingham Palace itself, but, rather, the events of the fiction I am watching. I desire that, *in the fiction*, Buckingham Palace is free of terrorists. This is why simply assuring myself that Buckingham Palace is in fact safe does nothing to ease my mind. And it is why my negative affect subsides the very moment I judge that, in the fiction, terrorists have been driven out of Buckingham Palace. At least, so says the Change of Content View.

This is not Currie's conclusion, however. He favors the Change of Attitude solution, which we will consider in a moment. First, a comment on the structure of these cases. One might find it suspicious that both examples make use of people and places that have counterparts in reality. It might give the appearance that the problem lies in characterizing desires when there is a real-world counterpart to some entity in a fiction, and not with the Simple View's general claim that we needn't include 'in the fiction' operators within fiction-related desires. However, the real-world counterparts merely serve to highlight a general need to disambiguate the object of one's desires when making claims about their ability to generate affect. The need to distinguish such desires at the level of content is thrown into relief by any situation where two entities—fictional *or* non-fictional—share the same name.[4]

For example, suppose that I want Mike Mulligan to win an election where the only other candidate is Mike Jones. You find me dejected after Mike Mulligan's

---

[4] By "share the same name" I mean the sense in which two people named 'John Smith' share the same name. More neutrally we could describe the situation as one where the names for two people or places are homonyms and homographs (i.e., the linguistic labels look and sound the same). This leaves open whether names, as such, are partly individuated by their referents.

loss. But why? I wanted Mike to win, and Mike *did* win. Well, the obvious answer is that the two instances of 'Mike' have different referents. A more thorough description of the desire and belief—that I wanted Mike *Mulligan* to win, and believe that Mike *Jones* won—instantly removes any appearance of a puzzle. What the Margaret Thatcher and Buckingham Palace examples highlight—though it is not obvious Currie himself recognizes it[5]—is that there are contexts where, in order to properly disambiguate the ascription of a desire that is elicited by a fiction, the fiction itself will need to be referenced in the content of the desire (as opposed to, say, a person's last name). But this reveals that we were only *abbreviating* our ascription of the state when we initially omitted mention of the fiction from its content. Where conversational context removes ambiguity in the intended object of reference—as it so often does, both within and outside of our engagement with fictions—we feel comfortable leaving out from our descriptions details like last names and titles of the fictions that feature the named characters. The resulting habitual omission of relevant 'in the fiction' operators, in the case of fiction-directed desires, can make them appear altogether unnecessary and even non-existent within the desires themselves; but that is *only* an appearance. Change the context—by highlighting fictional and real-life individuals with the same name, or (as we'll see below) fictional characters with the same name from different fictions—and the need for the operator is instantly felt.

I'll now build on these points to argue that 'in the fiction' operators are needed whether it is desires or i-desires that are active in fiction-appreciation, and so extend Currie's argument to the Change of Attitude View as well.

10.5 Troubles with I-desires

First, a few words on the nature of i-desires. I-desires are said to correspond to actual desires in roughly the way that *sui generis* "belief-like" imaginings are thought to correspond to ordinary beliefs. Currie & Ravenscroft (2002) and Doggett & Egan (2012) motivate i-desires—and their place within the Change of Attitude View—over both the Simple View and Change of Content View in part by appeal to their ability to solve a puzzle concerning the enjoyment of tragedies. Watching *Romeo and Juliet*, it seems we really want the couple to survive and are upset by their tragic suicides; on the other hand, most of us don't wish for *Romeo and Juliet* to be any different than it is—in particular, we don't wish for it to be rewritten so that it is no longer a tragedy. But this seems to suggest that we are

---

[5] Currie grants that his example is unusual in its appeal to characters based on actual people, but says, "I don't believe this affects the arguments' generality." "It would be odd to claim," he explains, "that, when fictions concern real things it is i-desires which are in play, but that in the case of fictions involving non-existents, real desires take over." However, my argument will be that the right conclusion is that it is *both* when fictions concern real things *and* when they involve non-existents that 'in the fiction' operators are needed—and that i-desires are not in play in either case.

somehow conflicted about how we want the fiction to be. Arguably, if we really want Romeo and Juliet to survive, then we should *also* want the fiction to be rewritten accordingly. And yet, few among us will advocate amending Shakespeare's work. (Much the same sort of example, keyed to *The Sopranos*, occurs in Doggett & Egan (2012).) Currie and Doggett & Egan's proposed exit from this impasse is to hold that we don't really desire that Romeo and Juliet survive; instead, we bear a desire-*like* imaginative attitude of *i-desire* to the proposition that they survive. And just as there is no conflict between imagining that p and believing that not-p, so too, they propose, is there no conflict between desiring that Romeo and Juliet perish (in line with the trajedy as it is) while i-desiring that they survive. We no longer have to say—implausibly, by their lights—that we have conflicting desires about how the fiction ought to unfold.[6]

What, exactly, is the difference between regular desires and *i*-desires, such that an i-desire that p and a desire that not-p will not conflict with each other? Currie gives us the following "test" for distinguishing the two:

(SC)   A putative desire, A, is an i-desire and not really a desire if A has satisfaction conditions, a canonical statement of which makes reference to a fiction which is not also the object of A.   (2010, p. 635)

The key idea here is that, while an i-desire has satisfaction conditions related to what happens in *Romeo and Juliet*, the fiction itself "is not also the object of" the i-desire. Essentially, Currie seeks to split the difference between the Simple View and the add-an-operator ("Change of Content") approach by stipulating that the

---

[6] Granting Currie & Ravenscroft and Doggett & Egan's points that we would not change the fictions in question even if we could, there is still a strong case to be made that we are nevertheless conflicted about how the fictions proceed. This is indeed the view I take on the matter. We want *Romeo and Juliet* to continue in existence as the excellent tragedy that it is, sure; but part of us also wants it to be different—we really do desire that, in the fiction, Romeo and Juliet live happily ever after. It is this conflict in desires that characterizes the experience of tragedy in fiction—as proposed by Nichols (2004b) and Weinberg & Meskin (2006a).

Obviously, this reply will be unsatisfactory to Doggett & Egan and Currie & Ravenscroft, who are adamant that we experience no such conflict about the course of tragedies. In light of this standoff, the best we can do, I suggest, is to reflect on how common it is to have desires that are at odds with one's strongest, most settled preferences. Amy Kind offers a vivid example:

> Consider a mother whose only child is a senior in high school. She wants her son to go away to university and she firmly believes that certain experiences can be achieved only if he does. Simultaneously, she fears having an empty nest, and thus she also wants her son to stay home and attend a local institution. Does this make her irrational? Surely not. Rather, it seems like a perfectly ordinary case of conflicting desires.   (Kind, 2011, p. 429)

Questions of rationality aside, this mother quite plausibly has conflicting desires, despite being settled on the view that her son should go away to university. Given the opportunity to change his enrollment back to a local institution, she would not act on it any more than she would recommend rewriting *Romeo and Juliet*. And yet, as she looks around his room—at the old soccer trophies, the photos, the vacation souvenirs—she has a powerful desire that she knows she will not, and cannot act upon: to have him at home; to see him as a little boy again; to keep him from growing up. And why shouldn't she? Growing up is a kind of tragedy. She is conflicted, resigned as she may be to the proper course of events. A good fiction can generate much the same kind of conflict within our desires.

satisfaction conditions of i-desires pertain to what occurs in the fiction (in line with the operator approach), while holding that the content of the state makes no mention of the fiction (in accordance with the Simple View). So, for instance, the state that contributes to feelings of despair when Romeo dies is an *i-desire*, the content of which is that Romeo survives. This (putatively) makes "Romeo himself" the object of the desire, and not the fiction *Romeo and Juliet.* Just as regular desires pair with regular beliefs to generate affect, defenders of i-desires hold that i-desires pair with belief-like imaginings to generate fiction-directed affect. In the present case, the i-desire that *Romeo survives* combines with a (belief-like) imagining that *Romeo is committing suicide* to generate negative affect. While neither state includes reference to a specific fiction within its content, Currie proposes, a canonical statement of the i-desire's satisfaction conditions *will* make explicit reference to some fiction. The i-desire is satisfied if and only if, in the fiction, Romeo survives. (Similarly, the imagining that Romeo is committing suicide is "correct" or "appropriate" only if it is true, in the fiction, that Romeo is committing suicide.) Importantly, this picture avoids the problem that Currie's *Death of a Prime Minister* creates for the Simple View. The reason that Currie's fiction-directed desire that Margaret Thatcher is assassinated is not satisfied by an actual assassin's killing Thatcher in the theater is that Currie's (supposed) desire for her to be assassinated was really an *i-desire*. I-desires are satisfied by what is true in a particular fiction and not by what is true in reality.

Currie admits that this leaves i-desires with "odd satisfaction conditions" (p. 635). For such states can putatively be about an actual person (e.g., Margaret Thatcher)—in the sense of taking that person as their object—yet be satisfied (or not) according to how things turn out with respect to a mere fiction. Ordinarily, how things stand with the object of a conative state (viz., Margaret Thatcher herself) is the only matter relevant to judging whether that state is satisfied. We can reasonably ask: if my i-desire is really *about* Margaret Thatcher herself, why should what happens to a fictional character have any bearing on its satisfaction? The fate of the Thatcher character in *Death of a Prime Minister* has no causal influence over Margaret Thatcher *herself*, who, we are told, is the object of the desire. To simply say that this is how it is with i-desires—that they are about one thing, but satisfied by something causally unrelated to that thing—does little to diminish the puzzle.

A more decisive form of objection is available, however. For the same argument Currie runs against the Simple View can, with a few amendments, be applied to the i-desire view as well. Suppose that the BBC made multiple Margaret Thatcher-inspired fictions. *Death of a Prime Minister* is one, but there is also *A Dangerous Pearl.* Thatcher is pursued by an assassin in both. And let us suppose that I watch the first half of each film one afternoon, delaying their conclusions until the next day. When it comes to *Death of a Prime Minister*, I am rooting, with Currie, for the assassin. Yet, in *A Dangerous Pearl*, I want the Prime Minister to survive.

(In that film, the assassin's motivations are less compelling.) What is the proper characterization of these putative i-desires? Working with the tools Currie allows himself, neither i-desire can make reference to the particular fiction that elicited it. So it appears I am conflicted: I i-desire that Thatcher die; and I i-desire that Thatcher not die. Both i-desires take, as their object, Thatcher herself. But, of course, it seems wrong to say that I am conflicted. This is not a case of mixed emotions, after all. I am not "of two minds" in this sort of case. (Contrast my account of tragedy, in fn. 6.) I want one thing to happen to the Thatcher character in *Death of a Prime Minister*; and, as a separate matter, I want something different to happen to the Thatcher character in *A Dangerous Pearl*.[7] Something has gone wrong with the i-desire approach if it suggests I am in fact conflicted. For all my desires can be satisfied simultaneously, if things turn out the right way in each fiction.

We can further put pressure on the Change of Attitude View by showing how it wrongly predicts the situations in which an i-desire will be satisfied. Suppose that I have a single i-desire that Thatcher is assassinated, elicited by my viewing of *Death of a Prime Minister* (*DPM*). I have not yet viewed *A Dangerous Pearl* (*ADP*). Pausing *DPM* momentarily to make more popcorn, I stream, on my phone, the opening of *ADP*, in which she *is* assassinated—in the first minute, no less! (Here I mirror the feature of Currie's example where Thatcher herself is chased into the very theater where he is enjoying *DPM* and assassinated; one remains in the context where the initial i-desire is active, while being confronted by another Thatcher-iteration.) Yet I don't experience any sense of satisfaction, as I wasn't rooting for *that* assassin. But why shouldn't I be at least somewhat pleased, given that I (still) have an i-desire, elicited by *DPM*, that Thatcher is assassinated and, in watching the opening of ADM, imagine *that Thatcher is assassinated*?[8] The answer is plain: the content of the relevant desire (or i-desire) was more specific than that Thatcher is assassinated—or even that she is assassinated *in some fiction or other*. It was a quite specific desire (or i-desire) that, in *Death of a Prime Minister*, Thatcher is assassinated.

Currie might respond by reminding us that i-desires have satisfaction conditions relating to the different fictions that elicit them, which are not tracked by their contents. In that case, a person might i-desire that *p* while i-desiring that

---

[7] For reasons explained at the end of the previous section, this case does not require there to be a real-world counterpart to the fictional character(s). A similar example is easy to generate with different iterations of James Bond in different 007 films—as explained below.

[8] The dueling BBC dramas example can be levied against the Simple View as well. In that case, the problem is one's having a desire that Thatcher is assassinated (elicited by *Death of a Prime Minister*) and a desire that Thatcher is not assassinated (elicited by *A Dangerous Pearl*). Again one is wrongly characterized as being conflicted; and again one is left without explanation for why one's desire for Thatcher to be assassinated (elicted by *Death of a Prime* Minister) continues to generate negative affect, or feelings of suspense, even after one has imagined that Thatcher is assassinated (while watching *A Dangerous Pearl*). The clear solution to our problems here is to simply grant that the respective fictions make it into the content of our two desires. As they are desires about two different fictions, there is no cognitive conflict in having them.

not-*p* without being at all conflicted, just because the satisfaction conditions of each i-desire pertain to different fictions. However, one might wonder why the defender of the Simple View could not have made a similar move, appealing to differences in satisfaction conditions for regular desires with conflicting contents (e.g., the desire that Thatcher lives, and the desire that she is assassinated) to explain why Currie isn't thrilled when Thatcher is murdered before him in the theater. More troublingly, for both the Change of Attitude and Simple Views, such differences in satisfaction conditions could make no difference to the causes and effects of the states within a person's mind, which, we must assume, are determined entirely by a state's content and attitude. If we cast aside that assumption and claim, to the contrary, that different satisfaction conditions *can* make a psychological difference, even when the difference in satisfaction conditions is not reflected in a state's content or attitude, the explanatory value of the notions of attitude and content is undermined. A state's content and attitude would not suffice to determine its state's satisfaction conditions *or* its psychological role. A person could then potentially have two or more i-desires with the *same* content simultaneously, each of which played different cognitive roles. What theoretical role would the notions of content and attitude—the main explanatory posits in this debate—be playing on such a picture? Surely we will have taken a wrong turn.

A related response worth considering is that an i-desire will typically be cordoned off to, or "quarantined" within, just one imaginative project—occurring only "in the scope of" that project—while another i-desire with the same (or a conflicting) content may similarly interact only with cognitive states relating to the distinct fiction that elicited *it* (cf. Friend, 2003; see fn. 9). But this just leaves us with the question of how this quarantining-to-a-specific-project is accomplished. As we've seen in earlier chapters, the notion of a distinct cognitive (or conative) attitude is typically brought into play precisely to serve this kind of function. It is said that our imagining that *p* is quarantined from our belief that *p* precisely in virtue of the fact that we take a different attitude toward the propositions in each case (Nichols & Stich, 2000). The difference in attitude is supposed to account for the difference in functional role between the two states which nevertheless have the same content. This explanation of quarantining must be superfluous, or just mistaken, if it turns out that some i-desires are quarantined from imaginings that other i-desires are not quarantined from (The same point extends to regular desires as well, insofar as a defender of the Simple View may wish to appeal to distinct regular desires occurring only "in the scope of" different imaginative projects, in responding to the above objections.)

In any case, if one i-desire (or desire) is quarantined from a cognitive state while another i-desire (or desire) with the same content is not, the two conative states will *ipso facto* have different functional roles, despite having the same content. This will imply that we are indeed taking distinct attitudes toward the two propositions after all, insofar as attitudes are understood functionally. The price

of maintaining an operator-free account of the content of the states is that we need to posit a distinct cognitive attitude for each new fiction we enjoy. Again something has clearly gone wrong.⁹

In a blog response to a short version of this criticism I raised elsewhere (Langland-Hassan, 2018b), Currie (2018) proposes that Bratman's (1992) notion of context-relative *acceptance* may help to dissolve the problem (where, again, the problem is our seeming to have conflicting i-desires elicited by distinct fictions in cases where, intuitively, we lack any conflicting conative states). While I don't want to pin the view on Currie—it was an informal blog post, after all—it is an interesting idea worth exploring, as others may find it attractive. He offers the example of a ship's captain who accepts that her ship is in a certain sort of danger with respect to one context, but not another. This person, he writes, "accepts P relative to one context and accepts not-P relative to another and that there is no contradiction in doing so." This is different than cases of "irrational acceptance" where "the captain becomes so confused that she accepts P and not-P in the same context." Currie's idea here is that i-desires (and perhaps "ordinary" imaginings as well) may be context-relative in the manner of acceptances, and that this would dissolve the apparent conflict in imagining that *p* (with respect to one fiction) while simultaneously imagining that not-*p* with respect to another.

However, the context-relativity of any acceptance (or imagining) must find its way into the agent's mind in some way or other. That is, there must be some psychological difference between the person who accepts P relative to context R and the person who only accepts P relative to context Q (where contexts R and Q are different)—even if both people otherwise have the same beliefs. That difference cannot be captured by appeal to the content or attitude of the state, as both accept that P. One might respond, "Well, the different contexts will reveal themselves in the different ways the acceptance that P functions in their broader cognitive economies." However, I take it as shared ground that such functional differences are to be understood in terms of different attitudes taken toward type-identical contents—that different attitudes essentially serve to mark different characteristic functions a certain type of contentful state may have. The proposal thus suggests that the same attitude is not taken toward the content P in each case, after all. So it

---

⁹ Stacie Friend (2003) also discusses cases where a single character is portrayed in different ways in different fictions, giving rise to correspondingly different emotional responses. She explains away the apparent conflict in the responses by holding that they "occur within the scope of different imaginings." The question is: what determines the "scope" of an imagining, given that there can be dispositional imaginings, which Friend rightly allows ("We can say that my imaginings and feelings about Tess are dispositional: even if I am thinking about something else entirely, it would be accurate to say that I pity Tess"). Friend simply proposes that the contents of imaginings "remain attached to their sources and thus compartmentalized." But *how* do imaginings remain "attached" to a specific source, if not by their contents? It cannot be the mere fact that they are imagined. This is where we need an operator relativizing the contents to a specific fiction.

appears we either have to proliferate attitudes, or adjust the contents. Turning back to the case of consuming fictions, if we go the route of proliferating attitudes, we seem headed toward holding that we adopt a different attitude toward the propositions relevant to each different fiction we enjoy. If we adjust the content, then we are returning to the solution I initially proposed of invoking distinct "in the fiction *F*" operators.

Stepping back, all of these problems were lurking the moment Currie drew a distinction between the content and the satisfaction conditions of a conative state. When he first introduced the idea of i-desires having distinct satisfaction conditions from desires with the same content, the implicit suggestion was that this functional difference was to be accounted for by the nature of the distinct attitudes taken toward the content. It was in the nature of i-desire *as an attitude*, one might have supposed, that i-desires have fiction-related satisfaction conditions even when their contents make no mention of a fiction. Yet, as soon as there are multiple fictions afoot, it becomes clear that a single attitude of i-desire will be too blunt an instrument to determine *which* fiction's events are relevant to the satisfaction of any given i-desire.

10.6 The Life-expectancy of Fiction-directed Desires

There nevertheless remains a last response to consider on behalf of i-desires. With slight modifications, it can also be adopted by defenders of the Simple View. It could be argued that the i-desires (or, alternatively, ordinary desires) elicited by fictions are highly *condition-dependent*, in that we no longer harbor them when we are not actively attending to the fiction they concern. In that case, I would not retain i-desires (or desires) about the Thatcher of *DPM* when I am engaging with *ADP*, and so would not end up with conflicting i-desires (or desires) in the case I described above.

Currie himself considers and rejects this response when assessing whether a defender of the Simple View could use it in response to his own argument. The Simple View theorist, he notes, might say of the *Death of a Prime Minister* case that he has a long-term, stable desire that Thatcher lives, and a condition-dependent desire (while watching *DPM*) that she is assassinated. This could explain why his eagerness for Thatcher's assassination while watching *DPM* does not conflict with his general support of her outside of the fiction. Currie's example of the assassin running into the very theater where he is watching *DPM* and murdering her there aims to undermine this response. For in that case, he (arguably) remains in the very context where his condition-dependent desire (or i-desire) that she is assassinated (in *DPM*) is active; and yet, her actual assassination *still* does not satisfy any desire of his. This, Currie suggests, shows that *even if* the fiction-directed desire is condition-dependent, it is not a desire

that Thatcher is assassinated. My response can piggyback on Currie's: instead of Thatcher being chased into the theater, suppose that we simply bring an iPad into the theater where Currie is enjoying *DPM* and show him a snippet of *ADP* where Thatcher is assassinated. No desire (or i-desire) of his is thereby satisfied; and yet he is imagining that Thatcher is assassinated (in response to *ADP*) and remains in the context where he (purportedly) i-desires that she is assassinated. Moreover, there is nothing to stand in the way of one's watching both films simultaneously, on two screens. It would be far-fetched to propose that one's i-desires (or regular desires) with respect to each fiction pop in and out of existence as one looks from screen to screen. Turning momentarily to *ADP*, I may still feel anxiety, or suspense, with respect to what is occurring in *DPM*. So the relevant desires persist. Yet neither could one say that I am in some sense conflicted about what I want, just in virtue of wanting the Thatcher character to perish in one, but not the other fiction.

In any case, I see no good reason to think that our fiction-directed conative states are, in general, highly condition-dependent. There are clear cases of stable, long-lasting fiction-directed desires. Whenever I return to a mini-series I've been watching, they are there at the ready, assuring that I'm instantly engaged. We can easily generate the same sort of puzzle we have been considering with respect to such stable desires. When James Bond is played by Sean Connery, for instance, I want him to succeed in saving the world; when he is played by Timothy Dalton, I am indifferent. These are stable dispositions. I retain them in my sleep. With my Connery-related desires in mind, we can say that, right now, I want James Bond to defeat the evil masterminds. But, then, why am I indifferent as I watch the Dalton-acted *License to Kill*? Well, the desire (or i-desire) in question was not directed at *that* James Bond. Properly characterized, my stable desire is that the James Bond of *Goldfinger*, and other Sean-Connery-acted-installments, saves the world. Again the notion of fictionality—and even of a particular fiction—must enter into the content of the state.

My arguments in favor of the Change of Content View have, up to this point, focused on fiction-directed conative states: desires and i-desires. I will now move toward a broader defense of the Operator Claim (OC), by arguing that the same points extend to our fiction-related ("belief-like") imaginings as well.

10.7 Imagining that, in the Fiction, *p*, and the Problem of Thatcher's Pearls

At the beginning of this chapter, I advertised a surprising conclusion I would endeavor to reach, dubbed the *Operator Claim*:

OC: when recovering fictional content from a fiction *F* in which *p* is the case, we do not simply imagine that *p*; rather, we imagine that, in the fiction *F*, *p*.

We will need to include 'in the fiction' operators within proper ascriptions of imaginings for much the same reason they are required within ascriptions of fiction-related desires (or i-desires).

First, we can find cases where doing without such operators commits one to ascribing contradictory imaginings where there are none. These mirror the dual BBC drama cases where the Simple View and Change of Attitude View wrongly ascribe conflicted desires (or i-desires) about Thatcher's assassination. Suppose again that I am watching the two Margaret Thatcher dramas on dual screens, shifting my attention from one to the other now and then. (It is not necessary to the example that I am watching the fictions at roughly the same time, provided, as earlier argued, that fiction-related desires and imaginings are not highly condition-dependent; the present version of the argument avoids depending upon that point, however.) In *A Dangerous Pearl*, Thatcher is always wearing a pearl neck-lace; in *Death of a Prime Minister*, she is never wearing one. On the ordinary account of things—making no use of 'in the fiction' operators—we have to say that I am simultaneously imagining that Margaret Thatcher is wearing a pearl necklace (as a result of taking in *ADP*) and imagining that Margaret Thatcher is not wearing a pearl necklace (as a result of taking in *DPM*). Is this a plausible account of things?

Set aside the BBC fictions for a moment. Can I, right now, imagine that Margaret Thatcher is wearing a pearl necklace *and* that Margaret Thatcher is not wearing a pearl necklace? I can certainly imagine one proposition *after* the other: I imagine that she is wearing a necklace; then I imagine that she takes it off. The question is: can I imagine one proposition while I am still imagining the other? This may be possible. Perhaps I can imagine a kind of macro-scale quantum non-locality, wherein Thatcher's necklace both is and is not around her neck. I will, in any case, place no barrier on imagining apparent contradictions of this sort. Yet this clearly isn't the imaginative project I am engaged in as I watch the two BBC drams. They are not forcing me to imagine a violation of folk physics. The more natural thing to say is that the imaginings take two different objects: *DPM*, with its events and characters; and *ADP*, with its own events and characters. I imagine that, in *A Dangerous Pearl*, Margaret Thatcher is wearing a pearl necklace; and I imagine that, in the *Death of a Prime Minister*, Margaret Thatcher is not wearing pearls. This instantly resolves the ambiguity and removes any suggestion that I am contemplating bizarre quantum phenomena. Yet this response is only possible if fiction-directed imaginings involve 'in the fiction' operators, just as fiction-directed beliefs and desires must.

Again one might respond that my simultaneous imaginative projects somehow remain quarantined from each other, as a means to omitting 'in the fiction' oper-ators from our imaginings. One way to develop this response is to suggest that we have different imaginative dispositions with respect to each distinct fiction we enjoy. But this again recreates, within imagination itself, the need to quarantine

contents from each other that the distinct cognitive attitude of imagination was originally introduced to explain (as in Nichols & Stich (2000), and Currie & Ravenscroft (2002)). In proposing distinct sets of dispositions relevant to each fiction we enjoy, we have, in effect, posited distinct *boxes* corresponding to each fiction. After all, the heavy-duty theorist's cognitive "box" is just a cognitive reification-cum-explanation of the fact that we ascribe different cognitive and behavioral dispositions with ascriptions of "imagines that *p*" than we do with ascriptions of "desires that *p*" or "believes that *p*." Now we are likewise forced into positing distinct boxes as an explanation for the different dispositions we ascribe with "imagining that *p* with respect to *Death of a Prime Minister*," as opposed to "imagining that *p* with respect to *A Dangerous Pearl*." We have simply multiplied the stock of primitive attitudes, each of which will have a somewhat different associated functional role. Where will it end? A person can be reading several different novels over the course of a week, keeping each well enough in mind to pick it up and follow along at a moment's notice. Such a reader has distinct "imaginative dispositions" relating to each novel. Is she exploiting a distinct cognitive box for each novel, each corresponding to a primitive, fiction-specific set of dispositions? Of course not. She simply has beliefs about what is happening in each novel that are accessed and *used* when engaging with each.

A second problem that results when we omit 'in the fiction' operators from our fiction-related imaginings is that we run into cases where we fail to experience the kind of affect we ought to, given our imaginings. Suppose that I am deeply engrossed in *Death of a Prime Minister* and form a strong desire that, in *DPM*, Thatcher is assassinated. (I am taking it as established, by earlier arguments, that such fiction-directed desires involve 'in the fiction' operators.) Pausing *DPM* momentarily, I watch the first few minutes of *A Dangerous Pearl*, where she is assassinated in the opening scene. On the standard view of fiction-consumption, I am now imagining that Thatcher is assassinated (in response to *ADP*). Yet this imagining does not generate positive affect in combination with my desire that, in *Death of a Prime Minister*, Thatcher is assassinated. Why not?

Well, intuitively, the imagining is not *about* the right fiction. What would it take for the imagining to *be* about the right fiction? The answer is clear: the specific fiction would need to feature in the content of the imagining. That is the only plausible way to render the imagining relevant to my desires about one, as opposed to the other, fiction—or, indeed, to any existing *fiction* at all. If I imagine that, in *DPM*, Thatcher is assassinated, this state can potentially combine with my desire that, in *DPM*, Thatcher is assassinated, to generate positive affect. But simply imagining that Thatcher is assassinated will not do the trick.[10]

---

[10] A last response to the OC worth considering mirrors the claim that our fiction-related desires are highly condition-dependent and therefore only temporary. Suppose that it is a general constraint on *sui generis* imaginings that we can only imagine *one proposition at a time*. In that case, there would

Conclusion: if our imaginings are to play a role in generating fiction-related affect, and if we are to avoid attributing contradictory imaginings where there are none, we need 'in the fiction' operators within our propositional, fiction-directed imaginings. Indeed, for our imaginings simply to *concern* one fiction, as opposed to another, relevant 'in the fiction' operators are required within the imaginings. This level of detail is always present in our mental states themselves, even if our ordinary verbal ascriptions of beliefs, desires, and imaginings often rely on context to provide it. Just as we might say, "The Dude hates the Eagles" in casually expressing our belief that, in *The Big Lebowski*, The Dude hates the Eagles, we may also say that we are imagining that The Dude hates the Eagles when, strictly speaking, we are imagining that, in *The Big Lebowski*, The Dude hates the Eagles. Focusing on the fact that emotional immersion requires appropriately matched cognitive and conative state pairs is simply a means for highlighting the fact that our ordinary, operator-less, ascriptions of imaginings are always elliptical for certain fuller, operator-involving contents that characterize our psychological states.

We shouldn't be *too* surprised by this. After all, why would things be any different for (supposedly) *belief-like* and *desire-like* imaginings than for beliefs and desires themselves? There is a difference between believing (falsely) that Gotham is a dangerous city and believing (correctly) that, in the Batman fictions, Gotham is a dangerous city. So too there is a difference between imagining that Gotham is a dangerous city and imagining that, in the Batman fictions, Gotham is a dangerous city.

---

be no threat of imagining contradictory propositions in the example involving Thatcher's pearls. For no two imaginings could remain on stage at the same time, as it were. In support of this view, it could be remarked that imaginings (unlike desires) are *occurrent states*, not dispositional or stored ones. When we think of other occurrent states—just as judgments, decisions, and *thinkings* more generally—the (roughly) one-proposition-at-a-time limit might seem to make sense. If we cannot *judge* or *decide* multiple propositions simultaneously, why think that we can imagine them?

The most significant problem with the "one-proposition-at-a-time" response is that it undermines the main rationale for invoking imagination in the primary contexts where it is thought to be required, including fiction appreciation, pretense, and conditional reasoning. Imagination is said to be the means by which we draw out inferences about what is true in a fictional world based on what is made explicit by the fiction itself. When, in *Pride and Prejudice*, Elizabeth reads that Lydia has gone to London with Wyckham, we imagine that she is devastated and concerned for her family's future. We imagine this just because we are *also* imagining that Elizabeth is in Victorian England, that Lydia is unmarried, that an unmarried woman eloping can undermine an entire family's reputation, that Elizabeth herself is unwed and hopes to find a husband, and so on. In general, what we imagine, based on our uptake of some new proposition expressed in a fiction, is determined by what else we are imagining *at the same time*, with respect to that fiction. Holding that we can only imagine one proposition at a time would prevent any inferential interaction among multiple imagined premises. This would render imaginings useless to the recovery of inexplicit fictional content. (Walton (1990, pp. 16–18) is one who, early on, saw clearly the need for dispositional imaginings that could account for the apparent inferential interplay among imagined propositions; see also Friend (2003)).

10.8 The OC's Implications

It is not due to a small oversight, or an easily corrected infelicity, that views positing i-desires and *sui generis* imaginings run into the problems discussed in this chapter. In separating the satisfaction conditions of i-desires from their content, Currie must rely on the attitude component of the state to account for why it has the specific satisfaction conditions it does, relating to what is true in one fiction and not another. Likewise, in omitting 'in the fiction' operators from "ordinary" imaginings, others implicitly push the burden of achieving reference to a specific fiction onto the notion of an *attitude*. Normally, the work of achieving reference to one entity, as opposed to another, is reserved for the notion of *content*. Content is the right tool for the job, as we are not limited to a single content in characterizing our dealings with all different entities. We are able to reorder and recombine our many concepts so as to generate thoughts with innumerable distinct complex contents—and correspondingly distinct satisfaction or correctness conditions. The notion of an attitude, by contrast, paints in broad strokes and, ordinarily, is used to account for quite general cognitive differences, such as the distinction between a state that *guides* and one that *motivates*. Relying on the notion of an attitude—be it an imagining or i-desiring—to direct our thoughts at one versus another fiction dissolves the distinction between content and attitude itself.

The curious upshot of all this is that we have rendered *sui generis* imaginings cognitively superfluous, to the extent that we expected them to do special work either in quarantining our cognitive representation of a fictional world from our beliefs, or in making our appreciation of a fiction somehow more cognitively direct than it would be if we had to rely upon beliefs about what is true in a fiction. We now see that *sui generis* imaginings (were there such) would serve their quarantining function in just the same way as ordinary beliefs—i.e., via operators. Further, if our immersion in a fiction really were threatened by the presence of 'in the fiction' operators within our beliefs, drawing on imagination would stand us no better. For the same operators must be present there as well. Given that all sides should, in any case, allow that we *have* beliefs of the form "In fiction *F*, *p*," for any fiction we can recall, we may as well let those beliefs—and the judgments in which they were formed—do the needed work in explaining our emotional responses to fiction (when paired with the relevant desires). There is no reason to call upon an additional state of imagining that, in fiction *F*, *p*, to do the same work in the same way. This point is bolstered by the fact that we already saw, in Chapter 9, that ordinary beliefs are sufficient to explain how we recover both implied and explicit content from fictions.

In the balance of this chapter I want to put this conclusion on firmer footing by addressing three independent worries one might have about the claim that beliefs and desires with 'in the fiction' operators serve to explain immersion. My full

positive account of immersion won't be complete until Chapter 11, however, where I address the paradox of fiction.

10.9 Immersion in the Fiction as Such?

To be immersed in a fiction, as I have understood it, is to be deeply emotionally involved in the fiction and concerned for its characters. In earlier work, Currie (1990) finds fault with the sort of operator-laden view I propose, on the grounds that beliefs and desires with 'in the fiction' operators put us at too great a distance from the events of a fiction to render it compelling. He raises this objection in response to a view of Walton's:

> If we adopt Walton's proposal, we shall have to say that the reader does not take any attitude toward the propositions of the story, but instead takes the attitude of belief toward the propositions in which the propositions of the story are embedded. And if we do say this, it will remain a puzzle as to how our engagement with the story can generate strong feeling. We tend to distance ourselves from disturbing tales by reminding ourselves that they are only make-believe; if the content of the reader's thought is that it is make-believe that the governess is in danger, his feelings are likely to be inhibited. What makes me anxious is the thought that the governess is in danger: a thought I do not believe, but which I do make believe.   (1990, p. 210)

Currie might extend this worry to my view in the following way. Returning to my earlier example from *The Wire*, in judging that, *in the fiction*, Wallace is murdered, I have reminded myself of the fictionality of the event. This judgment should cause emotional distance—not concern—as I am, in making it, reaffirming my awareness of the event's fictionality.

There is indeed a sense in which reminding ourselves that a fiction is a mere fiction can help to diminish its emotional impact. But reminding ourselves that a fiction is "only a fiction," in that sense, is not *simply* a matter of having a thought that the events it describes are fictional; it is a matter of putting the fiction into context with other, weightier matters. Suppose, by comparison, that I am immersed in a game of baseball: the Chicago Cubs are on the brink of a World Series victory. We can correctly characterize me as having thoughts involving an "in this baseball game" operator. I believe that, in this baseball game, the Cubs are only two outs away from winning; I believe that, in this baseball game, the Cubs are clinging to a one-run lead. These beliefs are partly responsible for my heightened affect. Should the Cubs end up blowing the lead and losing the series, I might try to console myself by meditating on the fact that it is "only a baseball game." I might, for instance, turn on the news, see evidence of real tragedy, and,

putting the game in context, no longer feel so bad about the Cubs' latest misadventure. In one sense, I was always aware that the event was "only" a baseball game. The fact that it was a baseball game explains why I was interested in it in the first place; I *like* baseball. But, in another sense, I can remind myself that it is *only* a game—I can put the game in broader context—as a way of emotionally distancing myself from it.[11] This will involve more than simply judging that it is a game. It will involve actively comparing the significance of baseball games to other matters.

The same points apply to our appreciation of fictions. We generate beliefs about what is happening *in the fiction*, which combine with our desires about what is true in the fiction to generate affect. In the case of my watching Wallace being murdered in *The Wire*, my awareness that the fiction is indeed a fiction is essential to the emotions being bearable at all. As immersed as I was in *The Wire*, I had clearly in mind that it was only a fiction; this is why I was not *completely* horrified. (For a stark class of examples, consider dark comedy in the vein of *Dr. Strangelove*. Our awareness that the fiction is a fiction is obviously essential to explaining the resulting affect.) That said, if the affect becomes too intense or unpleasant during our engagement with a fiction, we may try to put it into broader context, comparing it to weightier matters, as a way of distancing ourselves from it, reminding ourselves that it is "only a fiction." Doing so will involve more than simply judging that such and such is a fiction (as though we had forgotten!). It will take an active attempt to compare the fiction's significance to other matters.

10.10 Does Immersion Involve an Imaginative "Spectrum"?

Susana Schellenberg makes a somewhat different appeal to *sui generis* imaginings in the explanation of immersion. She argues that when we become immersed in a pretense or fiction, it is because we are entering into mental states that are more belief-like than they are imagination-like (2013, pp. 508–11). For Schellenberg, these belief-like states do not involve 'in the fiction' operators; instead, they have the same content as the imaginings one has when not immersed in a fiction. As she sees it, we only become deeply immersed in a fiction when we move from imagining its content to doing something more like believing it:

> When a good actor plays a villain, she does not simply imagine that she is a villain. She immerses herself in her role. In doing so, she arguably adopts mental representations that are to some extent imagination-like and to some extent belief-like.   (2013, p. 510)

---

[11] I owe this point to Maxwell Gatyas, who proposed it in conversation.

Schellenberg conceives of the situation in terms of a spectrum of cognitive boxes, with "pure" imagination on one end, pure belief on the other, and intermediate boxes between. "In nonimmersive cases of imagination," she explains, "propositions in the pure-imagination box are in play," whereas:

> In the case of imaginative immersion, propositions from the intermediate boxes are in play. Depending on how immersed one is, propositions from boxes closer to or farther from the pure-belief box are in play.   (pp. 510–11)

So, according to Schellenberg—and in contrast to theorists such as Weinberg & Meskin (2006b) and Nichols (2006b)—"pure" imagination does not trigger emotion. However, there are many intermediate states between pure imagination and pure belief that do elicit related emotions. The difference between an adult who makes a lame show of pretending to be a lion and the child who gives full-throated performance is due to a difference in the types of mental states—almost-beliefs or pure imaginative states—underlying the acts. The existence of intermediate states also serves to explain the different *degrees* of emotional involvement one might have with a fiction or pretense: we become more emotionally involved the more we move from merely imagining a scenario to believing it is the case. On Schellenberg's view, these intermediate states will be *sui generis* semi-imaginings—cognitive states between pure imagination and pure belief. If we need intermediate cognitive states of this sort to explain immersion, we will have to give up on explaining A-imagining in more basic folk psychological terms. For not only does imagination remain *sui generis* on this view; there are a great many intermediate *sui generis* states besides.

   However, the spectrum of emotional involvement and immersion that people experience when taking part in pretense and consuming fictions gives us no reason to think that ordinary beliefs and desires are not responsible at all times. The general phenomenon—being either more or less emotionally involved in a game or narrative—is common to contexts outside of pretense and fiction consumption and requires no special explanation. Consider a game of kickball. As with most sports, there is no *pretending* involved in playing kickball. It is just a game people play, with different levels of "immersion." Some people get *really into* kickball. Others, not so much. There is a psychological difference here. But it is not one that suggests that only one group is acting from beliefs about the game, while the other is simply imagining the game. The contrast between imagining and believing is not to the point. Those immersed in kickball, and those who couldn't care less, may indeed have more or less *the same* beliefs about the game. It is the nature and strength of their desires and interests with respect to kickball that makes for the difference. Similarly, Professor A and Professor B might experience quite different levels of immersion in the talk they are both attending, despite having much the same beliefs about what is being said. The reason is that the talk

contradicts the published views of Professor A, while having nothing to do with Professor B's research program. Their different desires and interests explain their different levels of immersion.

The same points apply to games of pretense and our consumption of fictions. Some people really get into their pretense games and experience related emotions. Others are just going through the motions, perhaps at their children's behest. As with other kinds of games, it is a person's larger interests and motivations that will explain whether and to what degree they become immersed in the pretense (or fiction). Someone might become immersed in a pretense simply because they enjoy games of pretense, want to bring joy to their children, or (as in the case of professional actors) because they are being paid to do so. These explanations, which appeal to a person's more general interests and motivations, are the right *sort* of explanations for immersion within a pretense. Similarly, there are reasons that children will care more about the events in a fiction designed for children than adults; for the events—involving, say, an orphaned child forced to navigate the world alone—will speak more to the interests and desires of a child than an adult. There is no need to bring intermediate "boxes" into the picture.

10.11 Being Upset at the Fiction Itself, or Its Events?

An anonymous reviewer—the aptly-named "Reader Y"—raises an interesting objection. We can distinguish two ways of being upset by a fiction. The first is the ordinary way: something bad happens to a beloved character; we hold out hope that things will get better for him. The second is less common: we feel upset and betrayed by the fiction because something has happened that, aesthetically, is just *off*. We'd put our trust in the fiction—we'd invested hours of our lives in it—and now, either through bad judgment, or laziness, the writers have made the characters do something that is just, well, *out of character*; or they have inserted a hackneyed plot device where we thought none would occur. Again we are upset by the fiction, but it is different than the kind of upset we feel at a beloved character's unfortunate fate.

Granting the distinction in ways of being upset, it might seem that the latter cases are those where beliefs and desires about what happens *in the fiction* are especially relevant; they may seem more squarely directed at the fiction *qua* aesthetic product. This would suggest that ordinary cases of immersion—the ones I've taken as my explanandum—require some other treatment.

In response, we can make sense of the distinction here even if the negative emotions in each kind of case are triggered by beliefs and desires with 'in the fiction' operators. In each case, we have a desire that, in the fiction, *p*; and we are upset when we discover that, in the fiction, not-*p*. However, in the case where we are miffed by the narrative (or its writer's decisions), we also experience an

erosion of trust in the narrative. *Not only* are we upset by what has happened in the fiction; we have now lost some of our faith that the authors of the fiction will meet aesthetic standards we thought were in place. This is disappointing and irksome in its own right, in proportion to how much time and energy we've already invested in the fiction. We wanted to continue investing in the fiction so as to enjoy its rewards; yet now we see that the desire to enjoy its rewards will never be satisfied. In addition to our trust being violated, something we found beautiful has been corrupted. We wanted the fiction to remain of high aesthetic quality and, now, it has not. In ordinary cases of immersion, where we are upset by fictional events, there are not these extra layers of discontent.

Compare the experience of tragedy (also discussed in fn. 6). There, too, we have desires that things go differently in the fiction; yet they are counter-balanced by stronger desires that the fiction remain as it is. Where the desires for the fiction to be different strongly outweigh our desires that the fiction remain as it is— where we really *do* want to rewrite the fiction—we start to lose faith in the fiction's value. We experience the added dimensions of resenting our prior attention to it, of being disappointed that future investment won't be worthwhile, and of being saddened that something beautiful has been dented or defiled.

10.12 Summary

It is a combination of our beliefs and desires about what is happening in a fiction that accounts for the emotions we experience in response to fictions. We need not bring a *sui generis* notion of imagination—or of i-desire—into the picture. It remains true, at a platitudinous level, that we imagine the events of the fictions we enjoy and that our doing so is in part responsible for our immersion in the fictions. However, there are ways of understanding what those A-imaginings consist in that are compatible with reducing them to a more basic collection of mental states—beliefs and desires, in particular.

These claims find support from the Operator Claim. Even if *sui generis* imaginative states and i-desires were deployed in fiction-appreciation, they, too, would need to feature 'in the fiction' operators. At that point, such states offer no explanatory benefit to explaining immersion that aren't also offered by beliefs and desires. Nor, as I argued in Chapter 9, need we posit *sui generis* imaginative states in order to explain how we recover implicit or explicit content from a fiction. If all this is correct, then beliefs and desires—and, at times, decisions—are sufficient to explain how we comprehend, cognitively develop, and emotionally respond to fiction.

There is, however, a last puzzle I still need to address. Even if you were convinced that beliefs and desires with 'in the fiction' operators were sufficient, in principle, to generate fiction-directed affect, you might still wonder where the

desires come from. Why bother to have full-fledged desires about what is happening *in a fiction*? After all, it's only a fiction! The door seems to swing open again for imagination to provide an answer. It may seem that it is only in *vividly imagining* the events of a fiction that we come to have the desires that, in turn, pair with certain beliefs (or the imaginings themselves) to generate related affect.

It will require another chapter—the next—to untangle the many knots in this tempting line of thought.

References

Ackermann, W., & Hilbert, D. (1928). *Grundzüge der theoretischen Logik*. Berlin: Springer.

Adams, Ernest W. (1970). Subjunctive and Indicative Conditionals. *Foundations of Language*, *6*(1), 89–94.

Addis, D. R., Pan, L., Vu, M., Laiser, N., & Schacter, D. L. (2009). Constructive Episodic Simulation of the Future and the Past: Distinct Subsystems of a Core Brain Network Mediate Imagining and Remembering. *Neuropsychologia*, *47*, 2222–38.

Arcangeli, M. (2014). Against Cognitivism about Supposition. *Philosophia*, *42*(3), 607–24.

Arcangeli, M. (2018). *Supposition and the Imaginative Realm: A Philosophical Inquiry*. New York: Routledge.

Arcangeli, M. (2019). The Two Faces of Mental Imagery. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. doi:10.1111/phpr.12589

Arp, R. (2008). *Scenario Visualization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Austin, J. L. (1958). Pretending. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volumes*, *32*, 261–78.

Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to Do Things with Words* (Vol. 75). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Austin, J. L. (1979). Pretending. In J. O. Urmson & G. J. Warnock (Eds.), *Philosophical Papers* (pp. 253–71). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aydede, M. (2015). The Language of Thought Hypothesis. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2015 ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Balcerak Jackson, M. (2016). On the Epistemic Value of Imagining, Supposing, and Conceiving. In A. Kind & P. Kung (Eds.), *Knowledge through Imagination* (pp. 41–60). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baron-Cohen, S. (1989). The Autistic Child's Theory of Mind: A Case of Specific Developmental Delay. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines*, *30*(2), 285–97.

Baron-Cohen, S. (1995). *Mindblindness*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Baron-Cohen, S., Leslie, A., & Frith, U. (1986). Mechanical, Behavioral and Intentional Understanding of Picture Stories in Autistic Children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *4*, 113–25.

Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Stone, V., & Rutherford, M. (1999). A Mathematician, a Physicist and a Computer Scientist with Asperger's Syndrome: Performance on Folk Psychology and Folk Physics Tests. *Neurocase*, *5*, 475–83.

Barrouillet, P., Gauffroy, C., & Lecas, J.-F. (2008). Mental Models and the Suppositional Account of Conditionals. *Psychological Review*, *115*(3), 760.

Bartlett, G. (2018). Occurrent States. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, *48*(1), 1–17.

Bechtel, W., & Richardson, R. C. (2010). *Discovering Complexity: Decomposition and Localization as Strategies in Scientific Research*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Beck, J. (2018). Marking the Perception–Cognition Boundary: The Criterion of Stimulus-Dependence. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, *96*(2), 319–34. doi:10.1080/0004840 2.2017.1329329

Begeer, S., De Rosnay, M., Lunenburg, P., Stegge, H., & Terwogt, M. M. (2014). Understanding of Emotions Based on Counterfactual Reasoning in Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Autism*, *18*(3), 301–10. doi:10.1177/1362361312468798

Bennett, J. (2003). *A Philosophical Guide to Conditionals*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Block, N. (1981). *Imagery*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Boden, M. A. (1998). Creativity and Artificial Intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence*, *103*(1), 347–56. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702(98)00055-1

Boden, M. A. (2004). *The Creative Mind: Myths and Mechanisms*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Bratman, M. E. (1992). Practical Reasoning and Acceptance in a Context. *Mind*, *101*(401), 1–16.

Brogaard, B., & Gatzia, D. E. (2017). Unconscious Imagination and the Mental Imagery Debate. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*(799). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00799

Buttelmann, D., Carpenter, M., & Tomasello, M. (2009). Eighteen-month-old Infants Show False Belief Understanding in an Active Helping Paradigm. *Cognition*, *112*(2), 337–42.

Byrne, A. (1993). Truth in Fiction: The Story Continued. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, *71*(1), 24–35.

Byrne, A. (2007). Possibility and Imagination. *Philosophical Perspectives*, *21*(1), 125–44.

Byrne, R. (2005). *The Rational Imagination: How People Create Alternatives to Reality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Calhoun, M., Longworth, M., & Chester, V. L. (2011). Gait Patterns in Children with Autism. *Clinical Biomechanics*, *26*(2), 200–6. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2010.09.013

Carroll, N. (2003). Art and Mood: Preliminary Notes and Conjectures. *The Monist*, *86*(4), 521–55.

Carruthers, P. (2002). Human Creativity: Its Cognitive Basis, Its Evolution, and Its Connections with Childhood Pretence. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, *53*(2), 225–49.

Carruthers, P. (2006). Why Pretend? In S. Nichols (Ed.), *The Architecture of Imagination* (pp. 89–110). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carruthers, P. (2011). Creative Action in Mind. *Philosophical Psychology*, *24*(4), 437–61.

Carruthers, P. (2018). Mechanisms for Constrained Stochasticity. *Synthese*. doi:10.1007/s11229-018-01933-9

Chalmers, D. (1996). *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chalmers, D. (2002). Does Conceivability Entail Possibility? In T. Gendler & J. Hawthorne (Eds.), *Conceivability and Possibility* (pp. 145–200). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chasid, A. (2017). Imaginative Content, Design-Assumptions and Immersion. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*, *8*(2), 259–72.

Chemero, A. (2011). *Radical Embodied Cognitive Science*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chihara, C. S., & Fodor, J. A. (1965). Operationalism and Ordinary Language: A Critique of Wittgenstein. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, *2*(4), 281–95.

Churchland, P. M. (1981). Eliminative Materialism and the Propositional Attitudes. *Journal of Philosophy*, *78*, 67–90.

Churchland, P. S., & Sejnowski, T. J. (1989). Neural Representation and Neural Computation. In L. Nadel, L. Cooper, P. W. Culicover, & R. N. Harnish (Eds.), *Neural Connections, Mental Computations* (pp. 15–480). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Clark, A. (2013). Whatever Next? Predictive Brains, Situated Agents, and the Future of Cognitive Science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *36*(3), 181–204.

Clark, A. (2015). *Surfing Uncertainty: Prediction, Action, and the Embodied Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, H. (2009). The Art of Self-Assembly: The Self-Assembly of Art. Paper presented at the Dagstuhl Seminar on Computational Creativity.

Collins, A. M., & Loftus, E. F. (1975). A Spreading-activation Theory of Semantic Processing. *Psychological Review*, *82*(6), 407.

Cope, D. (1991). *Computers and Musical Style*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cova, F., & Teroni, F. (2016). Is the Paradox of Fiction Soluble in Psychology? *Philosophical Psychology*, *29*(6), 930–42. doi:10.1080/09515089.2016.1164306

Currie, G. (1990). *The Nature of Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Currie, G. (1995). Imagination and Simulation: Aesthetics Meets Cognitive Science. In M. Davies & T. Stone (Eds.), *Mental Simulation: Evaluations and Applications* (pp. 151–69). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Currie, G. (2002). Desire in Imagination. In T. S. Gendler & J. Hawthorne (Eds.), *Conceivability and Possibility* (pp. 201–21). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Currie, G. (2010). Tragedy. *Analysis*, *70*(4), 632–8.

Currie, G. (2018). Reply to Peter Langland-Hassan. Retrieved from https://junkyardofthemind.com/blog/2018/7/17/reply-to-peter-langland-hassan

Currie, G., & Ravenscroft, I. (2002). *Recreative Minds: Imagination in Philosophy and Psychology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

D'Arms, J., & Jacobson, D. (2000). Sentiment and Value. *Ethics*, *110*(4), 722–48. doi:10.1086/233371

Damasio, A. R. (1999). *The Feeling of What Happens*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Damasio, A. R., Everitt, B. J., & Bishop, D. (1996). The Somatic Marker Hypothesis and the Possible Functions of the Prefrontal Cortex. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *351*(1346), 1413–20.

Davies, M., & Stone, T. (2001). Mental Simulation, Tacit Theory, and the Threat of Collapse. *Philosophical Topics*, *29*, 127–73.

Dawson, G., Meltzoff, A. N., Osterling, J., Rinaldi, J., & Brown, E. (1998). Children with Autism Fail to Orient to Naturally Occurring Social Stimuli. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *28*(6), 479–85. doi:10.1023/a:1026043926488

Dawson, G., Toth, K., Abbott, R., Osterling, J., Munson, J., Estes, A., & Liaw, J. (2004). Early Social Attention Impairments in Autism: Social Orienting, Joint Attention, and Attention to Distress. *Developmental Psychology*, *40*(2), 271.

Dawson, G., Webb, S. J., & McPartland, J. (2005). Understanding the Nature of Face Processing Impairment in Autism: Insights From Behavioral and Electrophysiological Studies. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, *27*(3), 403–24. doi:10.1207/s15326942dn2703_6

Debus, D. (2014). 'Mental time travel': Remembering the past, imagining the future, and the particularity of events. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology, 5*(3), 333–350.

Dennett, D. C. (1989). *The Intentional Stance*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dennett, D. C. (1991). Real Patterns. *Journal of Philosophy*, *88*(1), 27–51.

Denton, E. L., Chintala, S., & Fergus, R. (2015). Deep Generative Image Models Using a Laplacian Pyramid of Adversarial Networks. Paper presented at the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems Conference.

Doggett, T., & Egan, A. (2007). Wanting Things You Don't Want: The Case for an Imaginative Analogue of Desire. *Philosophers' Imprint*, *7*(9), 1–17.

Doggett, T., & Egan, A. (2012). How We Feel about Terrible, Non-existent Mafiosi. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, *84*(2), 277–306.

Dretske, F. (1991). *Explaining Behavior: Reasons in a World of Causes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dretske, F. (2002). A Recipe for Thought. In D. Chalmers (Ed.), *Philosophy of Mind: Classical and Contemporary Readings* (pp. 491–9). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Edgington, D. (1995). On Conditionals. *Mind*, *104*, 235–329.

Edgington, D. (2008). I—Counterfactuals. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society (Hardback).

Egan, F. (1995). Folk Psychology and Cognitive Architecture. *Philosophy of Science*, *62*(2), 179–96. doi:10.1086/289851

Evans, J. S. B., Newstead, S. E., & Byrne, R. M. (1993). *Human Reasoning: The Psychology of Deduction*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Evans, J. S. B. T. (2002). Logic and Human Reasoning: An Assessment of the Deduction Paradigm. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*(6), 978–96. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.128.6.978

Evans, J. S. B. T., & Over, D. E. (2004). *If: Supposition, Pragmatics, and Dual Processes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, J. S. B. T., Clibbens, J., & Rood, B. (1995). Bias in Conditional Inference: Implications for Mental Models and Mental Logic. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *48*(3), 644–70.

Finke, R. A., Ward, T. B., & Smith, S. M. (1992). *Creative Cognition: Theory, Research, and Applications*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fodor, J. A. (1974). Special Sciences (Or: The Disunity of Science as a Working Hypothesis). *Synthese*, *28*(2), 97–115.

Fodor, J. A. (1975). *The Language of Thought*. New York: Crowell.

Fodor, J. A. (1987). *Psychosemantics: The Problem of Meaning in the Philosophy of Mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fodor, J. A. (2003). *Hume Variations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Forti, S., Valli, A., Perego, P., Nobile, M., Crippa, A., & Molteni, M. (2011). Motor Planning and Control in Autism: A Kinematic Analysis of Preschool Children. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, *5*(2), 834–42. doi:10.1016/j.rasd.2010.09.013

Fournier, K. A., Hass, C. J., Naik, S. K., Lodha, N., & Cauraugh, J. H. (2010). Motor Coordination in Autism Spectrum Disorders: A Synthesis and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *40*(10), 1227–40. doi:10.1007/s10803-010-0981-3

Frege, G. (1879). *Begriffsschrift, a Formula Language, Modeled upon that of Arithmetic, for Pure Thought*. Reprinted in *From Frege to Gödel: A Source Book in Mathematical Logic, 1879–1931* (pp. 1–82). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Friedman, O., & Leslie, A. (2007). The Conceptual Underpinnings of Pretense: Pretending Is Not "Behaving-as-if." *Cognition*, *105*, 103–24.

Friedman, O., Neary, K. R., Burnstein, C. L., & Leslie, A. (2010). Is Young Children's Recognition of Pretense Metarepresentational or Merely Behavioral? Evidence from 2- and 3-year-olds' Understanding of Pretend Sounds and Speech. *Cognition*, *115*, 314–19.

Friend, S. (2003). How I Really Feel about JFK. In M. Kieran & D. M. Lopes (Eds.), *Imagination, Philosophy, and the Arts* (pp. 43–62). London: Routledge.

Friend, S. (2008). Imagining Fact and Fiction. In K. Stock & K. Thomson-Jones (Eds.), *New Waves in Aesthetics* (pp. 150–69). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Friend, S. (2012). Fiction and Genre. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, *62*(2), 179–209.

Friend, S. (2016). Fiction and Emotion. In A. Kind (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of the Philosophy of Imagination* (pp. 217–30). London: Routledge.

Garson, J. (2018). Connectionism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2018 ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gaut, B. (2003). Creativity and Imagination. In B. Gaut & P. N. Livingston (Eds.), *The Creation of Art: New Essays in Philosophical Aesthetics* (pp. 268–93). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gaut, B. (2010). The Philosophy of Creativity. *Philosophy Compass*, *5*(12), 1034–46.

Gendler, T. (2000). The Puzzle of Imaginative Resistance. *Journal of Philosophy*, *97*(2), 55.

Gendler, T. (2006). Imaginative Contagion. *Metaphilosophy*, *37*(2), 183–203.

Gendler, T., & Liao, S.-y. (2016). The Problem of Imaginative Resistance. In J. Gibson & N. Carroll (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Literature* (Vol. 97, pp. 405–18). London: Routledge.

Gendler, T. S., & Kovakovich, K. (2006). Genuine Rational Fictional Emotions. In M. Kieren (Ed.), *Contemporary Debates in Aesthetics* (pp. 241–53). New York: Blackwell.

Gentzen, G. (1934). Untersuchugen über das Logische Schliessen, *Mathematische Zeitschrift,* 39, 176-210, 405-431.

Gettier, E. (1963). Is Justified True Belief Knowledge? *Analysis*, *23*(6), 121–3.

Gilmore, J. (2011). Aptness of Emotions for Fictions and Imaginings. *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly*, *92*(4), 468–89.

Goldman, A. (2006a). Imagination and Simulation in Audience Responses to Fiction. In S. Nichols (Ed.), *The Architecture of Imagination* (pp. 41–56). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goldman, A. (2006b). *Simulating Minds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goñi, J., Arrondo, G., Sepulcre, J., Martincorena, I., Vélez de Mendizábal, N., Corominas-Murtra, B.,... Villoslada, P. (2011). The Semantic Organization of the Animal Category: Evidence from Semantic Verbal Fluency and Network Theory. *Cognitive Processing*, *12*(2), 183–96. doi:10.1007/s10339-010-0372-x

Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S.,... Bengio, Y. (2014). Generative Adversarial Nets. Paper presented at the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems Conference.

Goodman, N. (1983). *Fact, Fiction, and Forecast*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gopnik, A., & Astington, J. W. (1988). Children's Understanding of Representational Change and Its Relation to the Understanding of False Belief and the Appearance–Reality Distinction. *Child Development*, *59*(1), 26–37.

Gordon, R. M. (1987). *The Structure of Emotions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, G., & Horgan, T. (1988). How to Be Realistic about Folk Psychology. *Philosophical Psychology*, *1*(1), 69–81. doi:10.1080/09515088808572926

Grant, C. M., Riggs, K. J., & Boucher, J. (2004). Counterfactual and Mental State Reasoning in Children with Autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *34*(2), 177–88. doi:10.1023/b:jadd.0000022608.57470.29

Greenberg, D. L., Eacott, M. J., Brechin, D., & Rubin, D. C. (2005). Visual Memory Loss and Autobiographical Amnesia: A Case Study. *Neuropsychologia*, *43*(10), 1493–502. doi:S0028-3932(05)00015-1 [pii]10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2004.12.009

Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Grill-Spector, K., & Malach, R. (2004). The Human Visual Cortex. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *27*(1), 649–77. doi:10.1146/annurev.neuro.27.070203.144220

Grush, R. (2004). The Emulation Theory of Representation: Motor Control, Imagery, and Perception. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *27*, 377–442.

Hadwin, J., & Bruins, J. (1998). *The Role of Counterfactual Thought in Children's Judgements of Sadness*. Paper presented at the XVth Biennial Meeting of the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development, Berne, Switzerland.

Harris, P., & Kavanaugh, R. D. (1993). Young Children's Understanding of Pretense. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *58*(1), i–107.

Harris, P. L. (2000). *The Work of the Imagination*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harris, P. L. (2001). The Veridicality Assumption. *Mind and Language*, *16*(3), 247–62.

Hinton, G., Deng, L., Yu, D., Dahl, G. E., Mohamed, A. r., Jaitly, N., . . . Kingsbury, B. (2012). Deep Neural Networks for Acoustic Modeling in Speech Recognition: The Shared Views of Four Research Groups. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, *29*(6), 82–97. doi:10.1109/MSP.2012.2205597

Hogrefe, G.-J., Wimmer, H., & Perner, J. (1986). Ignorance versus False Belief: A Developmental Lag in Attribution of Epistemic States. *Child Development*, *57*(3), 567–82.

Hohwy, J. (2013). *The Predictive Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hume, D. (1738/2012). *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Chelmsford, MA: Courier Corporation.

Jackendoff, R. (1996). How Language Helps Us Think. *Pragmatics and Cognition*, *4*(1), 1–34.

Jackson, F. (1982). Epiphenomenal Qualia. *The Philosophical Quarterly (1950-)*, *32*(127), 127–36.

Jackson, F. (1987). *Conditionals*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jarrold, C., Boucher, J., & Smith, P. K. (1994). Executive Function Deficits and the Pretend Play of Children with Autism: A Research Note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *35*(8), 1473–82. doi:doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.1994.tb01288.x

Jaśkowski, S. (1934). *On the Rules of Suppositions in Formal Logic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Johnson-Laird, P. N. (1983). *Mental Models: Towards a Cognitive Science of Language, Inference, and Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Johnson-Laird, P. N. (1996). Images, Models, and Propositional Representations. In M. de Vega, M. Intons-Peterson, P. N. Johnson-Laird, M. Denis, & M. Marschark (Eds.), *Models of Visuospatial Cognition* (pp. 90–127). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnson-Laird, P. N., & Byrne, R. M. J. (2002). Conditionals: A Theory of Meaning, Prgamatics, and Inference. *Psychological Review*, *109*(4), 646–78.

Johnson-Laird, P. N., Byrne, R. M., & Schaeken, W. (1992). Propositional Reasoning by Model. *Psychological Review*, *99*(3), 418–39.

Just, M. A., Cherkassky, V. L., Keller, T. A., Kana, R. K., & Minshew, N. J. (2007). Functional and Anatomical Cortical Underconnectivity in Autism: Evidence from an fMRI Study of an Executive Function Task and Corpus Callosum Morphometry. *Cerebral Cortex*, *17*(4), 951–61. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhl006

Kampa, S. (2018). Imaginative Transportation. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, *96*(4), 683–96.

Kaplan, D. (1968). Quantifying in. *Synthese*, *19*(1–2), 178–214.

Karras, T., Aila, T., Laine, S., & Lehtinen, J. (2017). Progressive Growing of GANs for Improved Quality, Stability, and Variation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10196*.

Kieran, M. (2014). Creativity as a Virtue of Character. In E. Paul & S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Philosophy of Creativity* (pp. 125–46). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kim, S. (2010). The Rationality of Emotion toward Fiction. *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, *34*(1), 106–19.

Kind, A. (2001). Putting the Image Back in Imagination. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, *62*(1), 85–109.

Kind, A. (2011). The Puzzle of Imaginative Desire. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, *89*(3), 421–39.

Kind, A. (2013). The Heterogeneity of the Imagination. *Erkenntnis*, *78*(1), 141–59. doi:10.1007/s10670-011-9313-z

Kind, A. (2016a). Imagining under Constraints. In A. Kind & P. Kung (Eds.), *Knowledge through Imagination* (pp. 145–59). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kind, A. (2016b). Introduction: Exploring Imagination. In A. Kind (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Imagination* (pp. 1–11). New York: Routledge.

Kind, A., & Kung, P. (2016). Introduction: The Puzzle of Imaginative Use. In A. Kind & P. Kung (Eds.), *Knowledge through Imagination* (pp. 1–37). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kitcher, P. (1981). Explanatory Unification. *Philosophy of Science*, *48*(4), 507–31.

Kosslyn, S. (1994). *Image and Brain: The Resolution of the Imagery Debate*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kosslyn, S., Pascual-Leone, A., Felician, O., Camposano, S., Keenan, J. P., Thompson, W. L.,…Alpert, N. M. (1999). The Role of Area 17 in Visual Imagery: Convergent Evidence from PET and rTMS. *Science*, *2*(5411), 167–70.

Kosslyn, S., Thompson, W. L., & Alpert, N. M. (1997). Neural Systems Shared by Visual Imagery and Visual Perception: A Positron Emission Tomography Study. *Neuro-Image*, *6*, 320–34.

Kosslyn, S., Thompson, W. L., & Ganis, G. (2006). *The Case of Mental Imagery*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kosslyn, S. M., Behrmann, M., & Jeannerod, M. (1995). The Cognitive Neuroscience of Mental Imagery. *Neuropsychologia*, *33*(11), 1335–44. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932(95)00067-D

Kripke, S. A. (1980). *Naming and Necessity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kung, P. (2010). Imagining as a Guide to Possibility. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, *81*(3), 620–33.

Lamarque, P. (1981). How Can We Fear and Pity Fictions? *British Journal of Aesthetics*, *21*(4), 291–304.

Lamarque, P. (1990). Reasoning to What Is True in Fiction. *Argumentation*, *4*(3), 333–46.

Langland-Hassan, P. (2012). Pretense, Imagination, and Belief: The Single Attitude Theory. *Philosophical Studies*, *159*, 155–79.

Langland-Hassan, P. (2014a). Inner Speech and Metacognition: In Search of a Connection. *Mind and Language*, *29*(5), 511–33.

Langland-Hassan, P. (2014b). What It Is to Pretend. *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly*, *95*, 397–420.

Langland-Hassan, P. (2015). Imaginative Attitudes. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, *90*(3), 664–86. doi:10.1111/phpr.12115

Langland-Hassan, P. (2016). On Choosing What to Imagine. In A. Kind & P. Kung (Eds.), *Knowledge through Imagination* (pp. 61–84). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Langland-Hassan, P. (2017). Imagination, Emotion, and Desire. Retrieved from https://junkyardofthemind.com/blog/2017/8/5/imagination-emotion-and-desire?rq=Langland-Hassan

Langland-Hassan, P. (2018a). Imagining Experiences. *Nous*, *52*(3), 561–86. doi:doi:10.1111/nous.12167

Langland-Hassan, P. (2018b). To Which Fiction Do Your Imaginings Refer? Retrieved from https://junkyardofthemind.com/blog/2018/6/24/to-which-fiction-do-your-imaginings-refer

Lassiter, D. (2017). Probabilistic Language in Indicative and Counterfactual Conditionals. *Proceedings of SALT*, *27*, 525–46.

Lawrence, S., Giles, C. L., Tsoi, A. C., & Back, A. D. (1997). Face Recognition: A Convolutional Neural-network Approach. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, *8*(1), 98–113.

Ledig, C., Theis, L., Huszár, F., Caballero, J., Cunningham, A., Acosta, A.,…Wang, Z. (2017). Photo-realistic Single Image Super-resolution Using a Generative Adversarial Network. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition.

Leevers, H. J., & Harris, P. L. (2000). Counterfactual Syllogistic Reasoning in Normal 4-year-olds, Children with Learning Disabilities, and Children with Autism. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *76*, 64–87.

Leslie, A. M. (1987). Pretense and Representation: The Origins of "Theory of Mind." *Psychological Review*, *94*, 412–26.

Leslie, A. M. (1994). Pretending and Believing: Issues in the Theory of ToMM. *Cognition*, *50*, 211–38.

Lewis, D. (1972). Psychophysical and Theoretical Identifications. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, *50*, 249–58.

Lewis, D. (1973). *Counterfactuals*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Lewis, D. (1978). Truth in Fiction. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, *15*(1), 37–46.

Liao, S.-y., & Doggett, T. (2014). The Imagination Box. *Journal of Philosophy*, *111*(5), 259–75.

Liao, S.-y., & Gendler, T. (2011). Pretense and Imagination. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, *2*(1), 79–94. doi:10.1002/wcs.91

Liao, S.-y., Strohminger, N., & Sripada, C. S. (2014). Empirically Investigating Imaginative Resistance. *British Journal of Aesthetics*, *54*(3), 339–55.

Lillard, A. (1993). Young Children's Conceptualization of Pretense: Action or Mental Representation State? *Child Development*, *64*(2), 372–86.

Livingston, P., & Mele, A. (1997). Evaluating Emotional Responses to Fiction. In M. Hjort & S. Laver (Eds.), *Emotion and the Arts* (pp. 157–76). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lormand, E. (2007). Phenomenal Impressions. In T. Gendler & J. Hawthorne (Eds.), *Perceptual Experience* (pp. 317–53). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lycan, W. G. (2001). *Real Conditionals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mandelbaum, E. (2017). Associationist Theories of Thought. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2017 ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Manktelow, K. I. (1999). *Reasoning and Thinking*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Marr, D. (1982). *Vision: A Computational Investigation into the Human Representation and Processing of Visual Information*. New York: Henry Holt.

Marsh, K. L., Isenhower, R. W., Richardson, M. J., Helt, M., Verbalis, A. D., Schmidt, R. C., & Fein, D. (2013). Autism and Social Disconnection in Interpersonal Rocking. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, *7*(4). doi:10.3389/fnint.2013.00004

Martin, M. G. F. (2002). The Transparency of Experience. *Mind and Language*, *17*(4), 376–425.

Martinez-Manrique, F., & Vicente, A. (2010). "What the…!" The Role of Inner Speech in Conscious Thought. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, *17*(9–10), 141–67.

Matravers, D. (2006). The Challenge of Irrationalism, and How Not to Meet It. In M. Kieran (Ed.), *Contemporary Debates in Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Art* (pp. 254–66). Oxford: Blackwell.

Matravers, D. (2014). *Fiction and Narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGinn, C. (2004). *Mindsight: Image, Dream, Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Merchant, B. (2015). The Poem that Passed the Turing Test. *Motherboard*, February 5.

Meskin, A., & Weinberg, J. M. (2003). Emotions, Fiction, and Cognitive Architecture. *British Journal of Aesthetics*, *43*(1), 18–34. doi:10.1093/bjaesthetics/43.1.18

Metz, C., & Collins, K. (2018). How an A.I. "Cat-and-Mouse Game" Generates Believable Fake Photos. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/01/02/technology/ai-generated-photos.html

Michaelian, K. (2016a). Against Discontinuism: Mental Time Travel and Our Knowledge of Past and Future Events. In K. Michaelian, S. B. Klein, & K. K. Szpunar (Eds.), *Seeing the Future: Theoretical Perspectives on Future-Oriented Mental Time Travel* (pp. 62–92). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Michaelian, K. (2016b). *Mental Time Travel: Episodic Memory and Our Knowledge of the Personal Past*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Miyazono, K., & Liao, S.-y. (2016). The Cognitive Architecture of Imaginative Resistance. In A. Kind (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Imagination* (pp. 233–46). New York: Routledge.

Moran, R. (1994). The Expression of Feeling in Imagination, *The Philosophical Review, 103*(1), 75–106.

Murphy, D. (2017). Brains and Beliefs: On the Scientific Integration of Folk Psychology. In D. Kaplan (Ed.), *Explanation and Integration in Mind and Brain Science* (pp. 119–45). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nagel, T. (1974). What Is It Like to Be a Bat? *Philosophical Review*, *83*(4), 435–50.

Nanay, B. (2010). Perception and Imagination: Amodal Perception as Mental Imagery. *Philosophical Studies*, *150*(239–54).

Nanay, B. (2016). Imagination and Perception. In A. Kind (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Imagination* (pp. 124–34). New York: Routledge.

Nanay, B. (2018a). The Importance of Amodal Completion in Everyday Perception. *i-Perception*, *9*(4), 2041669518788887. doi:10.1177/2041669518788887

Nanay, B. (2018b). Multimodal Mental Imagery. *Cortex*, *105*, 125–34. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2017.07.006

Nichols, S. (2004a). Imagining and Believing: The Promise of a Single Code. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, *62*, 129–39.

Nichols, S. (2004b). Review: Recreative Minds. *Mind*, *113*(450), 329–34. doi:10.1093/mind/113.450.329

Nichols, S. (2006a). Introduction. In S. Nichols (Ed.), *The Architecture of the Imagination* (pp. 1–18). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nichols, S. (2006b). Just the Imagination: Why Imagining Doesn't Behave Like Believing. *Mind and Language*, *21*, 459–74.

Nichols, S. (Ed.) (2006c). *The Architecture of Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nichols, S. (2008). Imagination and the I. *Mind and Language*, *23*(5), 518–35.

Nichols, S., & Stich, S. (2000). A Cognitive Theory of Pretense. *Cognition*, *74*, 115–47.

Nichols, S., & Stich, S. (2003). *Mindreading: An Integrated Account of Pretence, Self-Awareness, and Understanding of Other Minds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Noordhof, P. (2002). Imagining Objects and Imagining Experiences. *Mind and Language*, *17*(4), 426–55.

Oaksford, M., & Chater, N. (2003). Conditional Probability and the Cognitive Science of Conditional Reasoning. *Mind and Language*, *18*(4), 359–79. doi:10.1111/1468-0017.00232

Olewitz, C. (2016). A Japanese AI Program Just Wrote a Short Novel, and It Almost Won a Literary Prize. *Digital Trends*, March 23.

Onishi, K. H., & Baillargeon, R. (2005). Do 15-month-old Infants Understand False Beliefs? *Science*, *308*(5719), 255–8. doi:10.1126/science.1107621

Onishi, K. H., Baillargeon, R., & Leslie, A. (2007). 15-month-old Infants Detect Violations in Pretend Scenarios. *Acta Pscychologica*, *124*, 106–28.

Oxford English Dictionary (2009). "imagine, v." Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Parkhi, O. M., Vedaldi, A., & Zisserman, A. (2015). Deep Face Recognition. Paper presented at the British Machine Vision Conference.

Paul, E., & Kaufman, S. B. (2014). Introducing the Philosophy of Creativity. In E. Paul & S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Philosophy of Creativity* (pp. 3–14). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peacocke, C. (1985). Imagination, Possibility and Experience. In J. Foster & H. Robinson (Eds.), *Essays on Berkeley: A Tercentennial Celebration* (pp. 19–35). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pearson, J., & Kosslyn, S. M. (2015). The Heterogeneity of Mental Representation: Ending the Imagery Debate. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *112*(33), 10089–92. doi:10.1073/pnas.1504933112

Pearson, J., & Westbrook, F. (2015). Phantom Perception: Voluntary and Involuntary Nonretinal Vision. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *19*(5), 278–84. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.03.004

Pelletier, F. J. (2000). A History of Natural Deduction and Elementary Logic Textbooks. *Logical Consequence: Rival Approaches*, *1*, 105–38.

Perner, J. (1991). *Understanding the Representational Mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Perrin, D. (2016). Asymmetries in Subjective Time. In K. Michaelian, S. B. Klein, & K. K. Szpunar (Eds.), *Seeing the Future: Theoretical Perspectives on Future-oriented Mental Time Travel* (pp. 39–61). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, D. M., & Bowler, D. M. (1996). Subtractive Reasoning and False Belief Understanding in Autistic, SLD and Non-handicapped Children. Paper presented at the British Psychological Society, Developmental Psychology Section Annual Conference, Oxford, UK.

Peterson, D. M., & Bowler, D. M. (2000). Counterfactual Reasoning and False Belief Understanding in Children with Autism. *Autism*, *4*(4), 391–405.

Picciuto, E., & Carruthers, P. (2014). The Origins of Creativity. In E. Paul & S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Philosophy of Creativity: New Essays* (pp. 199–223). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Picciuto, E., & Carruthers, P. (2016). Imagination and Pretense. In A. Kind (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Imagination* (pp. 314–25). New York: Routledge.

Pitt, D. (2020). Mental Representation. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2020 ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pollock, J. (2008). Defeasible Reasoning. In J. E. Adler & L. J. Rips (Eds.), *Reasoning: Studies of Human Inference and Its Foundations* (pp. 451–70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prinz, J. J. (2004). *Gut Reactions: A Perceptual Theory of Emotion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Putnam, H. (1975). The Meaning of "Meaning." *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, *7*, 131–93.

Pylyshyn, Z. (2002). Mental Imagery: In Search of a Theory. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *25*(2), 157–237.

Quilty-Dunn, J., & Mandelbaum, E. (2018). Against Dispositionalism: Belief in Cognitive Science. *Philosophical Studies*, 175(9), 2353–72. doi:10.1007/s11098-017-0962-x

Radford, A., Metz, L., & Chintala, S. (2015). Unsupervised Representation Learning with Deep Convolutional Generative Adversarial Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06434*.

Radford, C. (1975). How Can We Be Moved by the Fate of Anna Karenina? *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Supplementary Volumes, *49*, 67–80.

Radford, C. (1982). Philosophers and Their Monstrous Thoughts. *British Journal of Aesthetics*, *22*(3), 261–3.

Reisberg, D. (1996). The Nonambiguity of Mental Images. In C. Cornoldi, R. Logie, M. A. Brandimonte, G. Kaufman, & D. Resisberg (Eds.), *Stretching the Imagination: Representation and Transformation in Mental Imagery* (pp. 119–72). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rescher, N. (2018). Reductio ad Absurdum. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* Retrieved from https://www.iep.utm.edu/reductio/

Richert, R. A., & Lillard, A. S. (2004). Observers' Proficiency at Identifying Pretense Acts Based on Behavioral Cues. *Cognitive Development*, *19*(2), 223–40. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2004.01.001

Rinehart, N. J., Tonge, B. J., Iansek, R., McGinley, J., Brereton, A. V., Enticott, P. G., & Bradshaw, J. L. (2006). Gait Function in Newly Diagnosed Children with Autism: Cerebellar and Basal Ganglia Related Motor Disorder. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, 48(10), 819–24.

Robins, S. (2020). Defending Discontinuism, Naturally. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13164-020-00462-0.

Robinson, J. (2005). *Deeper than Reason: Emotion and Its Role in Literature, Music and Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rubin, D. C., & Greenberg, D. L. (1998). Visual Memory-deficit Amnesia: A Distinct Amnesiac Presentation and Etiology. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, *95*, 5413–16.

Ryle, G. (1949/2009). *The Concept of Mind*. New York: Routledge.

Sahyoun, C. P., Belliveau, J. W., Soulières, I., Schwartz, S., & Mody, M. (2010). Neuroimaging of the Functional and Structural Networks Underlying Visuospatial vs. Linguistic Reasoning in High-functioning Autism. *Neuropsychologia*, *48*(1), 86–95. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.08.013

Sainsbury, M. (2014). Fictional Worlds and Fiction Operators. In Manuel García-Carpintero and Martí Genoveva (Eds.), *Empty Representations: Reference and Non-existence* (pp. 277–89). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schacter, D. L., & Addis, D. R. (2007). Constructive Memory: The Ghosts of Past and Future. *Nature*, *445*(7123), 27. doi:445027a [pii]10.1038/445027a

Schacter, D. L., Addis, D. R., & Buckner, R. L. (2007). Remembering the Past to Imagine the Future: The Prospective Brain. *Nature Reviews Neurosciences*, *8*(9), 657–61.

Schellenberg, S. (2013). Belief and Desire in Imagination and Immersion. *Journal of Philosophy*, *110*, 497–517.

Schiffer, S. (1981). Truth and the Theory of Content. In H. Parret & J. Bouveresse (Eds.), *Meaning and Understanding*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Schmidhuber, J. (2015). Deep Learning in Neural Networks: An Overview. *Neural Networks*, *61*, 85–117. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2014.09.003

Schroeder, T. (2006). Propositional Attitudes. *Philosophy Compass*, *1*(1), 65–73.

Schroeder, T., & Matheson, C. (2006). Imagination and Emotion. In S. Nichols (Ed.), *The Architecture of the Imagination* (pp. 19–40). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schwitzgebel, E. (2002). A Phenomenal, Dispositional Account of Belief. *Nous*, *36*(2), 249–75. doi:10.1111/1468-0068.00370

Schwitzgebel, E. (2013). A Dispositional Approach to Attitudes: Thinking Outside of the Belief Box. In N. Nottelmann (Ed.), *New Essays on Belief* (pp. 75–99). London: Macmillan.

Scott, F. J., Baron-Cohen, S., & Leslie, A. (1999). 'If Pigs Could Fly': A Test of Counterfactual Reasoning and Pretense in Children with Autism. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *17*(3), 349–62.

Scott, R. M., & Baillargeon, R. (2009). Which Penguin Is This? Attributing False Beliefs about Object Identity at 18 Months. *Child Development*, *80*(4), 1172–96.

Searle, J. (1983). *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1980). Minds, Brains, and Programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *3*(3), 417–24.

Sellars, W. (1956). Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind. *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, *1*(19), 253–329.

Shepard, R. N., & Metzler, J. (1971). Mental Rotation of Three-dimensional Objects. *Science*, *171*(3972), 701–3.

Shetreat-Klein, M., Shinnar, S., & Rapin, I. (2014). Abnormalities of Joint Mobility and Gait in Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Brain and Development*, *36*(2), 91–6. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.braindev.2012.02.005

Shoemaker, S. (1968). Self-knowledge and Self-awareness. *Journal of Philosophy*, *19*, 555–67.

Silver, D., Huang, A., Maddison, C. J., Guez, A., Sifre, L., Van Den Driessche, G.,... Lanctot, M. (2016). Mastering the Game of Go with Deep Neural Networks and Tree Search. *Nature*, *529*(7587), 484–9.

Sinhababu, N. (2016). Imagination and Belief. In A. Kind (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of the Philosophy of Imagination* (pp. 111–23). New York: Routledge.

Slotnick, S., Thompson, W., & Kosslyn, S. (2005). Visual Mental Imagery Induces Retinotopically Organized Activation of Early Visual Areas. *Cerebral Cortex*, *15*, 1570–83.

Sowa, J. F. (1991). *Principles of Semantic Networks: Explorations in the Representation of Knowledge*. Burlington, MA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Spaulding, S. (2015). Imagination, Desire, and Rationality. *Journal of Philosophy*, *112*(9), 457–76.

Stalnaker, R. C. (1968). A Theory of Conditionals. In W. L. Harper, R. Stalnaker, & G. Pearce (Eds.), *Ifs* (pp. 41–55): Dordrecht: Springer.

Stel, M., van den Heuvel, C., & Smeets, R. C. (2008). Facial Feedback Mechanisms in Autistic Spectrum Disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *38*, 1250–8.

Stevenson, L. (2003). Twelve Conceptions of Imagination. *British Journal of Aesthetics*, *43*(3), 238–59.

Stich, S. P. (1983). *From Folk Psychology to Cognitive Science: The Case against Belief*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Stich, S., & Nichols, S. (1992). Folk Psychology: Simulation or Tacit Theory? *Mind and Language*, *7*, 35–71.

Stich, S., & Tarzia, J. (2015). The Pretense Debate. *Cognition*, *143*, 1–12.

Stock, K. (2005). Resisting Imaginative Resistance. *Philosophical Quarterly*, *55*(221), 607–24. doi:10.1111/j.0031-8094.2005.00419.x

Stock, K. (2017). *Only Imagine: Fiction, Interpretation, and Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stokes, D. (2014). The Role of Imagination in Creativity. In E. Paul & S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Philosophy of Creativity* (pp. 157–84). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stokes, D. (2019). Mental Imagery and Fiction. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, *49*(6), 731–54.

Strawson, P. F. (1970). Imagination and Perception. In L. Foster & J. W. Swanson (Eds.), *Experience and Theory* (pp. 31–54). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Strawson, P. F. (1986). "If" and "⊃." In R. Grandy & R. Warner (Eds.), *Philosophical Grounds of Rationality: Intentions, Categories, Ends*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Strohminger, M., & Yli-Vakkuri, J. (2017). The Epistemology of Modality. *Analysis*, *77*(4), 825–38. doi:10.1093/analys/anx058

Tenenbaum, J. B., Kemp, C., Griffiths, T. L., & Goodman, N. D. (2011). How to Grow a Mind: Statistics, Structure, and Abstraction. *Science*, *331*(6022), 1279–85.

Tye, M. (1991). *The Imagery Debate*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Van Fraassen, B. C. (1980). A Temporal Framework for Conditionals and Chance. In W. L. Harper, R. Stalnaker, & G. Pearce (Eds.), *Ifs: Conditionals, Belief, Decision, Chance and Time* (pp. 323–40). Dordrecht: Springer.

Van Gelder, T. (1990). Compositionality: A Connectionist Variation on a Classical Theme. *Cognitive Science*, *14*(3), 355–84.

Van Gelder, T. (1998). The Dynamical Hypothesis in Cognitive Science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *21*(5), 615–28.

Van Leeuwen, N. (2011). Imagination Is Where the Action Is. *Journal of Philosophy*, *108*(2), 55–77.

Van Leeuwen, N. (2013). The Meanings of "Imagine" Part I: Constructive Imagination. *Philosophy Compass*, *8*(3), 220–30.

Van Leeuwen, N. (2014). The Meanings of "Imagine" Part II: Attitude and Action. *Philosophy Compass*, *9*(11), 791–802.

Van Leeuwen, N. (2016). The Imaginative Agent. In A. Kind & P. Kung (Eds.), *Knowledge through Imagination* (pp. 85–109). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Leeuwen, N. (2020). Imagining stories: attitudes and operators. *Philosophical Studies*. doi:10.1007/s11098-020-01449-4

Van Wagner, T. (2017). *A Pluralistic Account of Social Cognition in Autism Spectrum Disorder*. University of Cincinnati (dissertation).

Vandegrift, D. (2016). Can Artificial Intelligence be Creative? *Medium*, June 9.

Velleman, J. D. (2000). *The Possibility of Practical Reasoning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walton, K. (1990). *Mimesis as Make-Believe: On the Foundations of the Representational Arts*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walton, K. (2015). Fictionality and Imagination: Mind the Gap. In K. Walton, *In Other Shoes: Music, Metaphor, Empathy, Existence* (pp. 17–35). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wason, P. C. (1968). Reasoning about a Rule. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *20*(3), 273–81.

Weatherson, B. (2005). Morality, Fiction, and Possibility. *Philosophers' Imprint*, *4*(3), 1–27.

Weinberg, J., & Meskin, A. (2006a). Imagine That! In M. Kieran (Ed.), *Contemporary Debates in Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Art* (pp. 222–35). Oxford: Blackwell.

Weinberg, J., & Meskin, A. (2006b). Puzzling over the Imagination: Philosophical Problems, Architectural Solutions. In S. Nichols (Ed.), *The Architecture of Imagination* (pp. 175–204). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weisberg, R. W. (2006). *Creativity: Understanding Innovation in Problem Solving, Science, Invention, and the Arts*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Wellman, H. M., Cross, D., & Watson, J. K. (2001). A Meta-analysis of Theory of Mind: The Truth about False Belief. *Child Development*, *72*, 655–84.

Williamson, T. (2005). I—Armchair Philosophy, Metaphysical Modality and Counterfactual Thinking. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society (Hardback).

Williamson, T. (2007). *The Philosophy of Philosophy*. New York: Blackwell.

Williamson, T. (2016). Knowing by Imagining. In A. Kind & P. Kung (Eds.), *Knowledge through Imagination* (pp. 113–23). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiltsher, N. (2016). Against the Additive View of Imagination. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, *94*(2), 266–82.

Wimmer, H., & Perner, J. (1983). Beliefs about Beliefs: Representation and Constraining Function of Wrong Beliefs in Young Children's Understanding of Deception. *Cognition*, *13*(1), 103–28.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Yablo, S. (1993). Is Conceivability a Guide to Possibility? *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, *53*(1), 1–42.

Zeman, A., Dewar, M., & Della Sala, S. (2016). Reflections on Aphantasia. *Cortex*, *74*, 336–7.

Zhu, J. Y., Park, T., Isola, P., & Efros, A. A. (2017). Unpaired Image-to-image Translation Using Cycle-consistent Adversarial Networks. *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision* (pp. 2223–32).

Zollo, P. (1997). *Songwriters on Songwriting*. New York: Da Capo Press.