

Original citation:

Poellner, Peter. (2016) XII Phenomenology and the perceptual model of emotion. Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, CXVI (3). pp. 261-288.

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/81746>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society following peer review. The version of record Poellner, Peter. (2016) XII Phenomenology and the perceptual model of emotion. Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, CXVI (3). pp. 261-288. Is available online at <https://doi.org/10.1093/arisoc/aow015>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP URL' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

Phenomenology and the Perceptual Model of Emotion

Peter Poellner

1. The perceptual model and its motivations

In the last decade or so there has been a revival of an account of occurrent conscious emotions as analogous in important ways to perceptual experiences, or even as being such experiences. According to this view, emotional experiences in favourable circumstances *disclose* value properties to the subjects of those experiences, properties that are, in the basic cases, typically instantiated in the subjects' environment.¹ Usually, the properties in question are taken to be determinate, 'thick' evaluative properties. The thought is that, in an episode of indignation about an unjust action that I am witnessing, I may have or acquire a perceptual acquaintance with the action's injustice, in fear I may have a perceptual experience of an object's or event's fearsomeness, in aesthetic admiration I can become acquainted with an object's determinate beauty, and so forth.

If one is sympathetic to this construal of the basic cases of emotional experience, that is, those cases in which the particular target of the emotion is itself directly presented to the subject, it is tempting to modify it slightly for other cases, in which the target is represented indirectly, for example in verbally entertained belief, or imagistic memory, or expectation. The modification might go roughly as follows: when I feel moved by the beauty of a piece of music that I recall, or when I fear an anticipated danger, these affective experiences involve indirect intuitive representations of the relevant evaluative properties, representations that are parasitic on direct perceptual acquaintance. In fearing an impending battle, the soldier imagines 'from the inside' a direct encounter with the target of his fear, in feeling moved by the recalled piece of music I imagine relevant evaluative properties of the music as these would show up in direct auditory experience. In both cases, the claim is, the evaluative properties – determinates of fearsomeness and beauty,

¹ Supporters of perceptual accounts of at least some emotional or affective experiences include Johnston (2001), Goldie (2007), Tappolet (2011, 2012), and Pelser (2014).

respectively – would need to be *intuitively* represented via images or analoga taken as resembling evaluative features of the intentional targets (the enemy assault or the musical performance). If it is right to say that to imagine in this way is to imagine directly experiencing the target, these cases may then be thought to be parasitic on the more basic perceptual case. I shall call the latter, where the target object or event is presented directly, *basic-case* emotional experience, and the cases in which the target is represented indirectly *derivative*.²

But why should one be tempted by this sort of perception-based model of emotional experience at all? Most contemporary advocates of the model appeal to phenomenological considerations about what it is like to undergo emotional experiences, drawing attention to apparent close similarities between emotional experiences and paradigmatic perceptual experiences such as sense perceptions: (i) Both sense perceptions and emotions have intentional objects. (ii) Both sense perceptions and basic case emotions seem to involve a direct access to distinctive phenomenal characteristics of those objects. In the sense- perceptual case these might include an object's shape, colour, or movement; in the emotional case (on the mainstream perceptualist view) the properties accessed essentially include 'thick' evaluative properties such as injustice, cruelty, fearsomeness, beauty, and so forth. Both types of experience thus involve distinctive phenomenal properties that present themselves as properties *of* the object. (iii) Sense perceptions and basic-case emotions are partly, albeit not exclusively, passive or receptive experiences. (iv) Finally, both, while being intentional, seem to differ from judgements or beliefs in similar ways: just as a subject in visual illusion can have a sense-perceptual experience of something as being thus-and-so,³ and simultaneously believe that it is not thus-and-so without thereby having contradictory beliefs, so there can be

² Contemporary perceptualists usually say little about the derivative cases. It is clear that the intuitive representation of value features of the target in imagination cannot be sufficient to explain the character of most, if any, of these emotions; one does not feel real grief about a merely imagined loss. Is it even necessary? For some thoughts on this on behalf of a qualified perceptualist view, see note 19 below.

³ 'Perceptual experience' is here and throughout used in a non-factive sense, applying also to perceptual illusions. If one finds this objectionable one may replace it by 'perceptual or quasi-perceptual experience' or some such paraphrase.

‘recalcitrant emotions’ such as phobic experiences in which a subject affectively continues to experience a situation or object as terrifying while simultaneously and with full conviction judging it to be harmless, without thereby evincing contradictory beliefs.⁴

A qualified version of the perceptual model was canvassed in the early 20th century by the classical phenomenologists, most explicitly by Scheler and Sartre.⁵ It was qualified in the sense that their view was not that all emotions are perceptual experiences as of specific values, or derivatives of such experiences, but rather that intelligible emotions – emotions that make sense to the subject – are experiential encounters with value properties *as* such properties, and that *some* emotion types involve perceptual experiences, or derivative intuitive experiences, as of value properties in ‘objects’. (‘Objects’ in the broad sense deployed by the phenomenologists include physical particulars, persons,⁶ their properties, as well as

⁴ The analogy with perceptual illusion is challenged by Helm (2001: 42f., 2015). For a persuasive defence, see Doering (2015).

⁵ The inclusion of Sartre among the advocates of a perceptual account of some emotions may seem surprising. Sartre is usually taken to hold a view of emotions as entirely non-receptive purposeful mental acts in which a subject attempts to misrepresent the world in situations of difficulty – a kind of autosuggestion. This reading is based exclusively on his *Sketch for a Theory of the Emotions*. But even in that text he recognizes another ‘main type’ of emotion that is not purposefully distorting in this way but whose evaluative content is supplied ‘by the object itself’ (Sartre 2002b: 57-8). Some emotions therefore are ‘ways of discovering the world’ (2002a: 383-4). This second type of emotion is fundamental to Sartre’s account of our access to value, but Sartre never develops it in detail, sometimes simply referring to Scheler’s authority in this context (Sartre 1999: 88; 2004a: 68-9; cf. 2003: 62, 624-5). There are important differences between Scheler’s and Sartre’s positions. For Sartre, the affective perceptual disclosure of value in the world essentially depends on the subject having a transformative project whose end, while conscious, need not be in its entirety explicitly (conceptually) represented by the subject at the time. Sartre holds, further, that the experienced positive value of any contingent object or ensemble of objects is necessarily given as relative (‘surpassable’), i.e. as trumped by values that cannot be had by contingent objects. For present purposes I shall ignore these aspects of his view since they have no bearing on the central issues of this paper.

⁶ ‘Persons’ is here used in the everyday sense, referring to individuals to whom both physical and mental predicates apply. By the phenomenologists’ lights, this does not capture what a person (a for-itself, in Sartre’s language) most fundamentally is. This claim need not concern us here.

events or states of affairs involving such entities.) This qualified version of the perceptual model – the Scheler-Sartre view as I shall call it – seems to me to have better prospects than a global perceptualist account. In the remainder of this Section, I shall reconstruct its motivations. Many of the current criticisms of the perceptual model seek to show that the model does not apply to any emotions at all. If they go through they obviously also invalidate the Scheler-Sartre view. In the subsequent Sections of this paper I shall assess some of these objections.

The considerations which Scheler and Sartre take to favour a qualified perceptualist account start from reflections about what is involved in grasp of the everyday concepts of value and of specific values. They claim that these value concepts are not fundamentally theoretical concepts but are experientially grounded. What they refer to can be encountered in experience. Moreover, an unprejudiced description of what it is to experientially encounter value or disvalue needs to acknowledge that, in very many cases, we experience these as properties qualifying particular objects. We experience such things as paintings, buildings, musical performances, or the actions of other people as being valuable or disvaluable in determinate ways, and this is not just a matter of what phenomenologists call ‘empty’ (i.e. symbolically mediated) judgement distinct from what seems manifest in the experience itself. Scheler and Sartre contend that what is experienced here is not adequately described as a feature of a strictly subjective, qualia-like aspect of the experience that might be characterized without adverting to apparent objectual properties. It is the music *itself* that strikes me as grand, the other person’s comportment itself that seems graceful, the colleague’s reply itself that strikes me as mean-spirited.

When we try to grasp the nature of this kind of experience more precisely, we find that it typically includes a valenced (positive or negative) affective component, a felt approval or disapproval. For the phenomenologists, understanding this aspect of evaluative experience is key to understanding the phenomenon of value. Their descriptions of it are suggestive but not as clear as they might be. Scheler says:

Values *as* values ... are experienced as efficacious or motivating They ‘attract’ or ‘repel’, and this doesn’t just mean, as it might easily be

misconstrued: we desire or abhor them, but merely in an urge-like (*triebhaft*) manner ... There is a clear difference between ... 'I am hungry' or 'I am desirous of...' on the one hand and that attraction or repulsion which is experienced as coming from the valuable things themselves, and not, like those occurrences, as pertaining to myself. (Scheler 1980/1973: 253/247; cf. Sartre 2004b: 20).⁷

Scheler's talk here of experienced values being 'efficacious or motivating' doesn't fully get to the heart of the matter, since it says nothing about the justificatory or reason-giving dimension of value. Elsewhere he adds in clarification:

It lies in the essence of ... values as objects that are distinct from the occurrences in which they are grasped that they *demand* acknowledgment (Scheler 1980/1973: 185/176; my italics).

These points are then taken up by Sartre in his dicta that 'values in actuality are demands' (Sartre 2003: 62), that 'by their nature they "ought to be"' (Sartre 1999: 88).

The idea gestured at in these passages seems to be this. Experiencing something transparently as a value requires experiencing it as making a 'demand' of some sort. What kind of demand is this supposed to be? Sartre has it that the value essentially demands 'to be', that is, to be or to remain actualized, if it is a positive value; and presumably not to be or to remain actualized if it is a negative value. In fact, the talk of 'demand' here is slightly misleading: grasping something as a demand is not the same as grasping that demand to be justified. But presumably when I experience something as a value, and I take that experience at face value, I do take its 'demand', whatever it is, to be *justified*. Scheler (and occasionally also Sartre – see citation above) therefore speaks more helpfully of an 'ideal ought-to-be' (*ideales Seinsollen*) attaching essentially to positive value properties, and

⁷ Translations from Scheler's *Formalism in Ethics* are my own. References to the English edition, which is not always reliable, are given after page references to the standard German edition.

distinguishes this kind of 'ought' from the 'normative ought' or ought-to-do (*Tunsollen*, Scheler 1980/1973: 225f./218f.) that can be expressed as an imperative. What the terminology of an ideal ought-to-be seeks to capture is the familiar intuition that to acknowledge something to be of positive value is to acknowledge that it pro tanto merits or deserves to be or to remain actualized, while to acknowledge something to be of negative value is to acknowledge that it pro tanto merits not to be (or to remain) realized.

Now if one accepts this, and if one is also sympathetic to the phenomenologists' initial claim that values can be experientially encountered as such, this commits one to the conclusion that, in the case of positive values, they would have to be *experienced* as involving, or co-constituted by, the property of meriting-to-be-actual (or to remain so). What would such an experience be? It is this question that Scheler seeks to answer when he says that 'values *as* values ... are experienced as efficacious or motivating ... they "attract" or "repel"', and that the kind of 'attraction' or 'repulsion' at issue here is not simply urge-like but experienced as *intelligibly* motivated by features of the object itself. We might perhaps call the experiences he has in mind *felt approval* or *felt disapproval* of an actual or possible 'object' existing or continuing to exist in so far as it possesses the relevant (dis)value. The felt approval or disapproval here, Scheler wants to say, is not a reaction to another, putatively non-valenced kind of experiential access to those values; rather, it presents itself as an *uptake* of the value's pro tanto justified 'demand' to be or remain actual (if it is a positive value). And it is that property of meriting-to-be-actual that partly constitutes a positive evaluative property as such. It is (partly) what that evaluative property is. Hence there could not be a non-valenced transparent experience of it, one that did not essentially involve such felt favour or disfavour.

If the experience of something as positively valuable involves something like a felt approval (felt favouring, 'attraction'), it is plausible to think that this experience is inherently such as to motivate other mental states, actions or inclinations to act with respect to that thing in suitable circumstances. My experience, whether direct or imaginatively indirect, of a particular painting as having a specific kind of aesthetic worth will, if taken at face value, motivate an inclination to contemplate or explore it, or inclinations to protect it if I believe its existence to be threatened (say, by a

bombing raid in a war situation) and if I also believe that I am in a position to prevent its destruction; and it will motivate anger or sadness when I learn that it has actually been destroyed.

Such motivating powers, Scheler holds, are essential to the experience of value *as* value in relevant contexts, and this seems plausible if that experience is or includes a felt, as opposed to ‘emptily’ judged, acknowledgement of the value meriting to be actual. As Scheler puts it: ‘the felt knowledge determines my will *immediately* without the need for an intervening “I ought”’ (Scheler 1980/1973: 217/210). His idea here is that the relevant experience, if taken at face value, and given appropriate background beliefs, essentially includes action inclinations by virtue of its intuitively presented evaluative content. Unlike a mere (‘empty’) evaluative judgement, it cannot be motivationally inert (given suitable background beliefs); nor does it require a reflective acknowledgement of deontic reasons to acquire motivational force.⁸

If we now ask what sort of experiences satisfy these requirements – presenting themselves as disclosures of values *as* values in objects, being valenced and inherently such as to motivate action inclinations in suitable circumstances – it seems that many conscious emotions are just the sort of experiences that fit the bill. Scheler therefore speaks of these sorts of emotional experiences as ‘feeling-intuitions’ (i.e. emotional perceptions or perception-derivative imaginings; Scheler 1980: 270/265).⁹ And Sartre says that it is ‘my indignation [that] has given to me the

⁸ Nor, Scheler thinks, is such a reflective acknowledgement of deontic reasons required for the action motivated by the experience to be potentially *justified*.

⁹ Mulligan (2012) interprets Scheler as claiming that emotions are *reactions* to values that are experientially presented in a prior, non-emotional kind of ‘value-feeling’ (*Wertfühlen*), which is always non-valenced. This is a misinterpretation, explicable by some obscurities and inconsistencies in Scheler’s terminology, particularly between the first part of *Formalism* (1913) – which in some places might seem to support Mulligan’s reading – and the second part (1916). In the latter, Scheler explicitly holds that there are four classes of *Gefühle*, including emotions (Scheler 1980/1973: 331f./328f.), and these correspond to his four generic classes of values (Scheler 1980/1973: 122f./104f.). There is no mention of an additional kind of non-valenced, *sui generis* value-feeling. The distinction he is concerned to draw in Part 1 of *Formalism* is not between intentional emotions and supposedly *sui generis* value-feelings, but between non-intentional bodily feeling states (*Gefühlszustände*; Scheler 1980: 119, 262-3) and intentional

negative value “baseness”, my admiration [that] has presented the positive value “grandeur” (Sartre 2003:62). In these cases of emotional experience, evaluative features are given as attaching to ‘the object itself’ (Sartre 2002b: 57), hence the ‘meaning of the emotion [here comes] from the world and not from ourselves’ (ibid.: 58): ‘An unpleasantness on the unreflective level transcends itself in the same manner as an unreflective consciousness of pity. It is the intuitive grasping of a disagreeable quality of an object’. (Sartre 2004b: 18; trans. modified).

The Scheler-Sartre view as outlined so far obviously leaves many questions unanswered. It also seems to be vulnerable to many of the recent criticisms of perceptual accounts of emotion. The main worries that bear on this version of the model can perhaps be grouped into four clusters. First, it has been charged with *misdescribing* even the kinds of emotional experience that are taken to be central by its advocates. Second, it is objected that there are *phenomenological disanalogies* between emotions and standard perceptual experiences that fatally undermine the model. Third, it has been argued that there are fundamental *differences in the rationalizing properties* of standard perceptions and emotions. Fourth, there seems to be something just fundamentally mysterious about the very idea of evaluative properties had by objects, and of these being directly accessible as such in emotional experience.

2. Does the qualified perceptual model misdescribe emotional experience?

The Scheler-Sartre view contends that many conscious emotions involve an intuitive consciousness of objects (events, etc.) as having various determinate evaluative properties. Their manifest *content* is partly evaluative and their evaluative content serves to individuate the emotion as the type of emotion it is. (I am using ‘content’ here and throughout in the minimal Husserlian sense – the object presented as it is

feelings. In his later *The Nature of Sympathy* (1923), he again states that values are the noematic correlates (contents) of intentional feelings and here too he recognizes no additional kind of putatively non-valenced value-feeling: ‘emotional act-forms ... have an essential reference to particular kinds of *value* as their noematic correlates’ (Scheler 2009: 169).

presented – without further theoretical commitments to, for example, the claim that the content has the structure of a proposition).

This idea is often challenged by critics of the perceptual model. Deonna and Teroni (2012, 2015) insist that there is no ‘perception-like phenomenology of danger [fearsomeness]’ (2015: 308), and that the content of emotions, supplied by their cognitive base (a judgement, memory, sense perception, etc.) can be adequately characterized in terms of non-evaluative properties: ‘evaluative properties ... do not figure in the content of the emotions’ (2012: 84). Hence evaluative properties that may be possessed by the target of the emotion do not individuate emotions about the target.

Dokic and Lemaire argue that ‘it is hard to understand ... how ... qualitative feelings could present something evaluative. In general, we have no idea of qualitative experiences presenting evaluative properties’ (Dokic and Lemaire 2013: 235). They grant that conscious emotions may sometimes *seem* to do so, but this misleading appearance is a result of what they call informational enrichment. It is like seeming to see that a cooking plate is hot by seeing it reddening. I can be immediately, non-inferentially aware of the cooking plate as hot, but its heat is not literally (‘openly and transparently’; 2013: 228) presented in or through the visual experience, although it may seem to me that way because my cognitive state has been enriched by information supplied by other states external to it; here, by my background knowledge about correlations between reddening cooking plates and heat. Just so when an observed action’s cruelty seems to me to be presented in my experience of indignation about the action.

Let me take these objections in turn.

(a) Is the content of emotional experience non-evaluative? This would entail that when, say, I feel aesthetically moved by a Mozart piano concerto I am listening to, the target of my emotion as it is experienced in the emotion is presented entirely in terms of those non-evaluative features – chord successions, harmonic and melodic patterns, tempi, and so forth – on which the music’s aesthetic value, in this instance, supervenes. The Schelerian response is that I can have a very distinct sense of what it is about the music that my aesthetic emotion, my being moved, appears to

respond to without having any distinct grasp of those subtending non-evaluative features (Scheler 1980/1973: 40/17, 203/195). So my emotional experience cannot present itself to me as a response to those non-evaluative features; rather it appears to me to be a response to something I may be inclined to describe as a harmoniously balanced yet dynamic grace, or some such –something that is adequately characterized only in evaluative terms.

Take another example. In conversation at a party I am affectively ‘put off’ by what I am inclined to describe as my interlocutor’s deviously insincere behaviour. Again, it may be perfectly obvious to me that *that* is what my experience is picking up without my being able to pinpoint the non-evaluative features of his expressive behaviour on which the apparent devious insincerity supervenes. No doubt there are such features. Psychologists tell us that posed, ‘fake’ facial expressions have typical features distinguishing them from spontaneous expressions (more abrupt onset and end, greater asymmetry, different patterns of activation of facial muscles, etc.).¹⁰ And no doubt there are also such non-evaluative features subtending my apprehension of the expressive behaviour as devious. But none of these features may be identifiable by me when I respond to it with negative emotion, nor in subsequent reflection on the experience; therefore it is difficult to see how they could be what my emotion presents itself as a response to. This strongly supports the idea, shared by the Scheler-Sartre view and contemporary perceptualists, that the phenomenology cannot be captured without the use of evaluative terms in describing its manifest content.

(b) Dokic and Lemaire (2013) agree with the Scheler-Sartre view that the content of many emotions *seems* at least partly evaluative – that it immediately, non-inferentially, strikes the subject that way. But they contend that this is a result of ‘cognitive enrichment’. The apparent evaluative content ‘does not come from the experience itself, but has been brought in by background beliefs or cognitive habits’ (Dokic and Lemaire 2013: 232). There are different ways of interpreting this suggestion. One reading is that the experience has as its enabling conditions the occurrence of other mental states, such as judgements, with that content, and

¹⁰ Ekman, Hager and Friesen (1981: 101-6).

perhaps also other experiences with a relevantly similar (but, e.g., non-conceptualized) content. If that is the suggestion it should not trouble the perceptualist, for the same is true of many bona fide perceptual contents. I can see a certain item to be a washing machine, and I can hear a string of sounds coming from someone's mouth as a sentence having a certain meaning. Given appropriate prior knowledge and instruction, my experience itself can come to present an item as a washing machine or a string of noises as meaningful in a certain way. Or at least it's natural to think that experiences can acquire such rich contents. This is in fact a key idea in Husserlian phenomenology: the contents of earlier experiences and judgements can become 'sedimented' in later experiences and in this sense enrich the latter's content.

Dokic and Lemaire's illustration of the reddening cooking plate 'seen' to be hot suggests that they may have a different point in mind. It's plausible to suppose that the content *hot* here is supplied not by the experience but by another component of the subject's total state of mind *at the time*, most likely a judgement. Might something similar be said for the apparent evaluative content of emotional experience?

The phenomenon of recalcitrant emotion suggests that this hypothesis is mistaken. In recalcitrant emotion I consciously and confidently judge that the target object does not have the evaluative property my emotion presents it as having (which is what invites the analogy with sense-perceptual illusion). I may have come to the settled view that physical accomplishments are utterly worthless, and yet, when witnessing a gymnastics competition I may be struck with admiration for the gymnasts' feats as quite terrific.

The objector may take the heroic line here and argue that in recalcitrant emotion there must be an unconscious belief contradicting one's consciously held judgement. But whether this line holds out any promise in explaining cases of emotional recalcitrance more generally, it won't help in the present context. What we are trying to explain is how my emotional experience can appear to me to be value-presenting. We are trying to account for the *phenomenal difference* between an emotion and mental states that quite evidently lack evaluative content, such as

disinterestedly watching the rain outside. This phenomenal difference cannot be explained by a content or act that is phenomenally unconscious.¹¹

3. Do phenomenological differences between emotions and standard perceptions undermine the Scheler-Sartre view?

The second cluster of objections I want to consider turns on alleged essential phenomenological differences between uncontroversial cases of perception (such as visual perception) and basic-case emotions.

First, it is widely held that perceptual experiences are *transparent*. When we try to characterize the phenomenal character, the what-it-is-likeness of, say, the visual experience of a particular scene, we need to mention properties of the perceived scene. On a strong version of the thesis, there is nothing beyond properties of the latter, seen from a particular point view and under specific environmental conditions, that goes to make up the phenomenal character of the visual experience. On a weaker version, at least the core of the phenomenology is constituted by properties of the scene perceived. This seems quite different from the phenomenology of emotions:

the felt quality of fear is not clearly experienced by us as a feature of the spider that frightens us If you are to describe how it feels to be frightened by a spider, you would not do so in terms of the spider's qualities, but rather in terms of how it feels to experience ... muscles freezing, heart jumping, etc. (Deonna and Teroni 2012: 69)

In order to assess this point, we should recall that the Scheler-Sartre view is not committed to the claim that *all* basic-case emotions only or primarily present apparent value-features of their objectual targets. Many emotion types – standard

¹¹ Might the phenomenal difference be explained by other components of the subject's overall mental state, such as bodily feels? As Dokic and Lemaire themselves observe when discussing the attitudinal theory, it is unclear how such experiential components could even seem to us to present an external *object* as having some value or other (Dokic and Lemaire 2015: 280).

fear being a case in point – have self-referential components in the sense that they include an awareness of the *subject* of the experience under an evaluative aspect. (Think, for another example, of conscious envy, which involves such an awareness of oneself as lacking something one values.) In fear one typically is aware of oneself as something one values and as being endangered. The somatic processes mentioned by Deonna and Teroni reflect this awareness and it is plausible to think that they are normally caused by it. If the relevant self-awareness is not itself perceptual, then these emotions are unhelpful examples to illustrate the perceptual thesis and it is unfortunate that they figure so prominently in discussions of it.

If any emotions are plausibly construed on the perceptual model, they would have to be emotions that are not obviously self-referential in this way. Consider the kind of examples favoured by Scheler:

I am awed by the grandeur of a natural scenery.

I am indignant about a malicious remark about another person that I overhear.

I admire the justice of an action I witness.

I feel pity for a person in severe mental distress.

What these cases have in common is that the emotions here (i) typically do not include a self-referential component in the above sense, and that (ii) they are what Scheler calls ‘psychic’ (*seelische*) emotions, mental states which a subject can experience without undergoing any distinctive somatic feelings or other bodily responses (Scheler 1980/1973: 344/342; cf. Stein 1980: 55).¹² They *may* be associated with a bodily phenomenology, as when I feel ready to upbraid the person making the malicious remark, or poised to take action to alleviate the sufferer’s distress. But they need not be. I may believe that I am quite incapable of helping the

¹² This is one of the places where the translation (Scheler 1973: 342) gets Scheler’s point seriously wrong. What he says is that ‘a person whose psychic feelings were not “motivated” (in the sense of the intelligible connections mentioned earlier), and the continuity of whose [psychic] feelings was constantly disrupted by any changing emotion-accompanying bodily states, would be just as unintelligible as someone who is intellectually severely disturbed’ (Scheler 1980: 344).

distressed person, and this belief may penetrate my experience in such a way that I feel no inclination to intervene. It's just implausible to say that in that case my experience could no longer be one of pity. In other cases, such as the first example above, it's not even clear what a relevant bodily response or action inclination might be (Scheler 1980/1973: 183/173). There may be somatic accompaniments as when I feel my body opening up or relaxing, but it is hard to believe that I could not experience awe without something like these feelings, and even harder to accept that they can serve to distinguish an experience of awe from one of, say relaxed curiosity. And even when I do have such bodily feelings, they seem to be effects of other components of the emotional experience, in particular of the way the objects is experienced anyway, without the putative contribution of those feelings.

But aren't even these sorts of emotions opaque in a way that sense perceptions are not, their value-bearing components being not features of the object but distinctly 'subjective', non-intentional qualia, supposedly inner but non-somatic feelings of pleasure, displeasure or the like? Scheler explicitly considers this objection and rejects it:

the value quality is not a [non-intentional] feeling state or a relation to some such state, just as the quality 'blue' [when looking at a blue object] is not a visual sensation or a relation to some such sensation-state (Scheler 1980/1973: 249/243).

His point is that when we try to adequately characterize the value component of the kinds of emotions we are considering, we cannot do so without adverting to apparent value features of the object, just as when we try to characterize a putative sense perception as of a blue flower we cannot do so without reference to a colour property the object appears as having. When we admire the landscape, we do not experience a neutrally presented landscape plus some positive quasi-sensational or adverbial quale. There is no such quale in the experience, one that we might then mistake for a quality of the object when we judge, on the basis of the experience, 'this landscape is sublime' (cf. Scheler 1980/1973: 182/172-3). Nor is the affective

attitudinal component of the experience, the felt approval or disapproval, given as the bearer of the value, although it is experienced as registering that value.

Granting this for the moment, there is still a crucial difference between these sorts of emotions and ordinary perceptions, and this might be thought to vindicate the transparency objection after all. Like other emotions, those ‘psychic’ emotions are valenced; they involve what Scheler calls ‘attraction’ or ‘repulsion’, which I have paraphrased as felt approval or disapproval. But these are clearly attitudes. In so far as they are part of the phenomenal character of the emotion, that character therefore includes components that are not properties of the emotional target. Even if one rejects a strong transparency account of sense perception and holds that the phenomenal character of sense-perceptual experience also includes attitudes (such as expectations), there remains an important contrast: standard perceptions do not include *valenced* attitudes.

The response available to the advocate of the Scheler-Sartre view is that this difference does not show that emotions cannot be perceptions; rather it is due to the distinctive nature of their content and the manner of access to it, viz. to the fact that emotional content involves *value* properties experientially given as such.¹³ Recall that for something to be a positive value property is for it to merit, *pro tanto*, to be or to remain realized. An experiential encounter with that property as such would therefore require an experiential registering of that aspect of it. It would need to present itself as an *uptake* of the value’s ‘merit’, its justified ‘demand’ which makes it a positive value in the first place. Scheler’s contention is that this is just what the valenced attitudinal component of the emotional experience is, for example, admiration presents itself as.¹⁴

But *can* such an attitudinal response to an object present itself in this way as appropriate in the sense of: serving to disclose a value property of the object, rather than merely as caused or motivated by something in the object (cf. Dokic and

¹³ The evaluative nature of the content also explains why affectively presented contents, unlike sense-perceptual contents, typically capture attention (cf. Brady 2013: 90f.): their content is given as *mattering*.

¹⁴ This explains what is right about the observation that emotions violate the attitude/content distinction: ‘their force (attitude) is an indissoluble aspect of their content’ (Gunther 2004: 43).

Lemaire 2013: 236-7)? As often with disputed phenomenological claims, a contrast may help to sharpen intuitions. Compare your indignation about the malicious remark you overheard with a case of aggressive envy, where you dislike someone merely for having some good you lack; or the case where you have been irritable all day due to some unpleasant news and in the evening you snap in anger at an innocent remark made by your partner. In the last two cases, unlike in the first case, it seems right to say that your affective state presents itself *merely* as motivated by some property of the target object, but not as an appropriate response to it. And you can recognize this phenomenal difference on the basis of an awareness of differences in the experiences themselves and their respective contents.

Deonna and Teroni highlight a further putative phenomenological contrast between standard perceptions and the ‘psychic’ emotions focused on by Scheler:

[Emotions] differ from perceptions in that they cannot be seen as independent ways of accessing the objects that exemplify these properties. For instance, while the injustice of Jonas’s remark is perceived by Mary through her indignation, the remark itself is not. ... [S]he hears the remark and feels it is unjust. The evaluative apprehension ... is grounded in such non-evaluative bases: ... [T]here is no such comparable distinction between two psychological levels ... within the field of perception proper. (Deonna and Teroni 2012: 69).

It’s fairly uncontroversial that values are higher-order properties. It makes no sense to think of a remark as being *just* malicious without it having relevant non-evaluative, lower-level properties such as being a sequence of sounds, being an utterance, being used to refer to another person and to express and to implicate certain meanings, and so forth.¹⁵

¹⁵ The relation between value properties and those lower-order properties is often held to be one of strong supervenience: necessarily, if x has a specific value property, then there is some (usually quite complex and perhaps disjunctive) lower-order non-evaluative property that x has and, necessarily, if anything has that non-

It seems clear that if a remark is to appear to me to be malicious then at least some of those subtending properties need also to be consciously present to me, or represented by me, since otherwise I couldn't identify the particular item I take to be malicious. The objection turns on the fact that this need not be the case in uncontroversial cases of perception such as sense perception. When I perceive a disk in front of me to be chrome-coloured I don't need to be aware of any lower-level properties subtending the phenomenal colour even if there are such properties.

The question is whether that tells against the perceptual analogy. A quick reply on behalf of the Scheler-Sartre view would be that there are many manifestly supervenient properties that plausibly figure in the content of perceptual experience. Something can strike me in visual experience as a chestnut tree, or as a TV screen. A tune can strike me in auditory experience as tonal or as dissonant. In order for these things to appear in those ways I need to be aware of at least some relevant subtending properties, such as shapes or chord successions. But this does not by itself impugn the claim that I can perceptually experience the higher-order properties. The problem for the Scheler-Sartre view, though, is that in these cases there aren't different putative types of perception involved: I can *visually* perceive both the shapes and the higher-order properties, and I can *hear* both the pitched sounds and their unresolved dissonance. In the emotion case this is not so. I need to hear the remark, but the value property of maliciousness is supposed to be perceived *affectively*. Affective perception, if there is such a thing, would be a dependent sort of perception in the sense that it would constitutively depend on other perceptual modalities.

This fact only counts as an objection to the perceptual account if there is reason to think that there is something inherently problematic about the idea of dependent perception in this sense. This is by no means obvious and would need to be independently argued for. Absent such an argument the supporter of the Scheler-Sartre view may adopt an 'innocence by association' strategy, pointing to other, non-

evaluative property, then it also has the evaluative property. The advocate of the Scheler-Sartre view can remain neutral on whether that is the best way to characterize the relation between values and the lower-level properties in all cases, and (if it is) on the best interpretation of the second necessity operator.

affective modes of apparently direct experience that are similarly dependent. When I hear the person next to me utter the string of sounds 'It's raining outside', then I will normally experience this vocal sequence as having a certain specific meaning. I will have what is sometimes called an *experience of meaning* (which is of course not sufficient for actually having understood that meaning). Whatever that experience is, it is not identical with my sensory perception of the sounds, but it is dependent on that auditory perception. It seems to us in such cases that we directly and experientially 'grasp' semantic properties, yet that grasp is dependent on accessing various lower-level properties by way of a different experiential modality, viz. by hearing the sounds.

Or consider the Husserlian claim that there can be a perception of standard perceptible properties *as* properties, i.e. as items that are *multiply exemplifiable*. In the Husserlian picture, this is a 'founded' mode of perception and it is dependent on having exemplifying items presented in sensory or quasi-sensory (e.g. imagistic) experience. If there is a perception of properties as such, it cannot be identical with the sensory relation on which it is founded because that sensory relation on its own only provides access to a particular. So it would be a dependent mode of perception in the sense at issue.

None of these examples are uncontroversial. What they do show is that it can't simply be taken for granted that there cannot be a direct experiential access to contents that is modally dependent or 'founded' in the ways illustrated by the examples. The burden of argument to show that there can't be is on the opponents of the affective perception thesis.

4. Different rationalizing properties?

Critics of the perceptual model often point to putative differences in the epistemic roles of emotions and sense perceptions. They argue that there obtain quite different rationalizing relations between emotional experiences and evaluative beliefs on the one hand, and between sense perceptual experiences and ordinary perceptual beliefs on the other. There clearly are such differences between the

rationalizing properties of *some* emotions and uncontroversial cases of perceptual experience. But what would be needed to undermine the Scheler-Sartre view would be an argument that shows that no emotions can have the sorts of rationalizing properties that sense perceptions have. It is not clear that the arguments that figure most prominently in the current debate establish this.

There are many different theories on the justifying role of perceptual experience. The general sort of approach favoured by classical phenomenologists was that perceptual experiences can in the right circumstances immediately justify corresponding perceptual judgements. For example, my perceptual experience as of wet ground under my feet can immediately justify the judgement that the ground here is wet. To say that it can immediately justify this judgement is to say that when giving reasons for the judgement I do not need to appeal to other beliefs – such as beliefs about putative causal relations between my experience and some worldly state or event, or beliefs about my visual system being in good order. If the relevant portion of the world is as it appears to be in my perceptual experience, and there is no reason to think that my cognitive system is malfunctioning, then simply appealing to what my experience appears to disclose will suffice for justification of my judgement that the ground here is wet. It is difficult to see how perceptual experience should be capable of immediately justifying perceptual judgements in this way unless, in the case where the experience is veridical, the object and the features that it is judged to have are *themselves* present or manifest in the experience itself, such that they contribute to the experience's identity. This is the picture of perception that we find in Husserl. Husserl characterizes perception proper as the direct self-presence (*Selbstgegebenheit in propria persona*) of the perceived object and its perceived properties in the perceptual experience.¹⁶ On this point Scheler and Sartre adopt Husserl's position in full.

If this general approach is broadly right, it explains why it is appropriate in favourable circumstances to answer the question 'why do you think that the ground is wet?' by responding 'I see it'. What I appeal to in justification here is the fact *that*

¹⁶ So for Husserl it is a substantive question – which he answers in the affirmative – whether ordinary 'sense perception' of independent spatial objects is genuine perception.

the ground is wet, or, on some views, some other suitable worldly item such as *the ground's wetness*, which is itself present and manifest in my perceptual experience if it is a case of successful, i.e. genuine, sense perception.

The Scheler-Sartre view has it that there are some emotional experiences that can similarly count as direct disclosures of evaluative facts or evaluative properties instantiated in the world such that the latter are present in the experience itself. The most promising candidates for such experiences are basic-case psychic emotions such as those mentioned earlier, where the target of the emotion (its particular object) is itself perceptually given.¹⁷

It may be objected that even in these cases there are epistemic disanalogies undermining the affective perception model. First, it seems that these emotions can be assessed for rationality in a way that perceptual experiences cannot (Brady 2011: 139; Deonna and Teroni 2012: 69). Even when a subject is suffering from sense-perceptual illusion, it makes no sense to ask 'why are you having that experience?' if the why-question is understood in a normative sense. But such normative why-questions always seem to make sense with respect to intentional emotions. When someone feels overwhelmed by a natural scenery I can meaningfully ask 'Why are you feeling that way? What's so grand about *that*?'

Second, normally reports of sense-perceptual experience can silence the demand for further reasons for belief. When you respond to my question 'why do you believe that the ground is wet?' by appealing to your perceptual experience of it, that can settle the matter. By contrast, it is very rarely if ever sufficient to answer the normative question 'why do you believe that his state is pitiable?' by responding 'because I feel it' (cf. Brady 2013: 86-90).

Third, it has been argued that not only can emotions not supply sufficient reasons for evaluative belief, they cannot provide any justifying reasons at all. This is because for an emotion to be justified it needs to be an *appropriate* response to the

¹⁷ Since these emotions on the Scheler-Sartre view also have causal content – the affective state is experienced as *motivated* by the object (Scheler 1980/1973: 253/246-7; Sartre 2004b: 19) – this entails that cause and effect here violate the Humean injunction that they should be logically 'distinct existences'. According to the classical phenomenologists, intentional phenomena quite generally violate the Humean requirement (see e.g. Stein 1980: 56f.).

target state of affairs. But if an emotional experience itself could provide reasons or evidence for judging that state of affairs to involve some value or other, then the mere occurrence of the emotion would supply reasons for thinking that that emotion is appropriate. It would thus provide some justification (albeit not conclusive justification) for itself. But it is implausible to think that emotions can be normatively self-supporting in this way, providing reasons to believe that they are appropriate. (Brady 2010: 123; 2011: 144-5).

The Scheler-Sartre view has resources to defuse these worries.

The key to its response to the first objection is that the value properties that figure in the content of emotions are higher-order properties, usually dependent on quite complex combinations of lower-level properties. We often ask normative why-questions about emotions, even the basic-case psychic emotions Scheler has centrally in mind, because we are in doubt whether some of the relevant lower-level properties really are instantiated in this instance and, therefore, whether the experience is veridical. But there is no significant disanalogy here with higher-order properties figuring in sense-perceptual experience with a similarly complex base. When somebody claims, on the basis of his auditory experience, that a certain musical phrase is incomplete or 'unresolved', or that a certain chord is dissonant, we can also entertain such doubts and quite properly ask why he hears it that way. And when someone claims to see a smile on her interlocutor's face as a 'false smile' we can similarly ask for reasons.

These considerations also partly explain the second difference pointed out by Brady. We are normally not satisfied when, in reply to our question 'why do you believe his remark was malicious?', we receive the answer 'because I could feel it'. But nor does the response 'I could see it' settle the matter when we ask for somebody's reasons for judging that a smile he perceived was a false smile. Still, the objection does point to a genuine difference. In the sense-perceptual case the default scenario is that our sensory systems are working properly and, given suitable attention, fairly reliably reveal much of the perceptible layout of our environment. This can hardly be said for our affective systems. On the Scheler-Sartre view, the relevant affective receptivity is not the standard case and appeal to emotional

experience when grounding evaluative judgement is therefore widely, and rightly, treated with caution.¹⁸

As for Brady's third point, if we accept his neo-sentimentalist premise that to judge that X is valuable is at least in part to judge that certain sentiments are appropriate with respect to X; and if we also assume (with the Scheler-Sartre view) that among these sentiments are emotions and that these can in favourable circumstances supply reasons for the judgement that X is valuable, does it follow that the mere *occurrence* of an emotion provides a reason for believing that that very emotion is appropriate?

In the basic case scenario of the 'psychic' emotions under consideration, the emotion's appropriateness on the Scheler-Sartre view is a matter of its providing access to evaluative features of its target. If the emotion is appropriate, these features are disclosed – they are self-present in the emotional experience. As such, they are presented as *pro tanto* meriting to be actual (or not to be actual, in the case of disvalues). Their presence explains the affective valence of the emotion and, provided the subject has suitable background beliefs, also its motivational aspect. So what justifies the corresponding evaluative judgement, on this picture, is the evaluative state of affairs itself, which is immediately present to the subject in the emotional experience.

It does not follow that whenever I have an emotional experience that seems to me to directly disclose some such evaluative state of affairs that it does in fact do so. The emotion may therefore seem to me to be appropriate (i.e. value-revealing) without being so. It may be, and no doubt often is, an affective illusion. The perceptualist can insist that, if it is an affective illusion, not only does it not give me a conclusive reason to make the corresponding value judgement, it does not give me any reason at all. So it is not the case that all emotions construed on the perceptual model would (implausibly) emerge as self-justifying.

5. Experiencing values in objects: the very idea

¹⁸ Similar points are made by Pelsner (2014: 120-1).

One question that has received relatively little treatment in the recent debates around the perceptual model is: what would it be for value properties to be instantiated *in objects* (or events, or other persons) such that they might be affectively perceivable *as* evaluative properties had by those objects (etc)? Since an answer to this question is obviously crucial if the perceptual model is to get off the ground, the relative silence on this is surprising. The classical expositions in Scheler and Sartre do have something to say on it, but their views here remain somewhat gestural and elusive. Let me conclude with some remarks on the direction that a reconstruction of these views should take.

A positive value property is a property that is inherently such as pro tanto to merit – to make a justified ‘demand’ – to be or to remain realized. It is not a novel point to note that such properties are metaphysically distinctly odd. How could any property be such as to make demands? To make sense of this, it helps to recall what the target objects of Scheler’s psychic emotions typically are:

I am indignant about a malicious remark about another person that I overhear.

I admire the justice of an action I witness.

I feel pity for a person in severe mental distress.

In all these cases, the target object *itself* is or includes a conscious mental state.

Now, it is relatively uncontroversial that conscious mental states can be intrinsically valuable. For classical utilitarians, experiences of pleasure instantiate intrinsic value (though one might add that this depends on what the pleasure is about). For Kantians, the good will qua conscious mental act in which a person determines herself on the basis of the categorical imperative is intrinsically valuable. If this intrinsic positive value is itself experienced by the subject, then, given the characterization of value properties canvassed, these mental states would have to be experienced by the subject as meriting to remain actualized. The pleasure, experienced as positively valuable, would have to be experienced as a pleasure that *ought to go on*, the Kantian good will would similarly have to be experienced by the subject as ‘making a demand on the future’ (Sartre 2004b: 23; Scheler 1980/1973: 108-9/90-92): as making a justified demand on the subject to *continue* to be

motivated by the categorical imperative. And this seems phenomenologically apt. In so far as one experiences one's state of pleasure as positively valuable one experiences it as something that ought to go on, as meriting continuation, and the same goes for experiencing one's being motivated by the categorical imperative as a good thing.

On the Scheler-Sartre view, this experience necessarily has an attitudinal dimension, but this should not be thought of as typically involving a reflective emotion directed at the experience (being pleased about one's pleasure; admiring one's own good will). Rather, the relevant 'felt approval' usually remains at the unreflective level and then is perhaps best described as a contented acquiescence in the mental state, normally motivating an inclination to remain in it. But the affective awareness of the value of the mental state can become a reflective emotion, typically when the state has ceased while its value is still experientially given in memory; the appropriate reflective emotion then is one of regret (in the pleasure example) or guilt (in the Kantian example).¹⁹

Conscious mental states, then, are frequently experienced as having value by their subjects and it's plausible to say that they sometimes actually are valuable. Now, Scheler's psychic emotions are often, as in the examples above, directed at intentional objects that are or include conscious mental states of *others*. This

¹⁹ It is worth stressing just how many episodic emotions have targets that are no longer actually present while the emotion is felt. Think of the anger you feel at an insulting remark made by someone a few seconds ago. On the Scheler-Sartre view, these emotions, if full-blown (see below), need to be understood as involving an experiential representation of the relevant value properties in imagistic or simulating memory (cf. Sartre 2004a: 68f.). One problem here is that, on the view proposed, an experiential access to the evaluative aspect of the target requires the affective attitudes Scheler calls 'attraction' or 'repulsion' (unless the target is evaluatively neutral). The supporter of the view therefore needs to give an account of what it would be to have that evaluative aspect present in imagistic or simulating memory without the *attitude* being merely simulated or imagined. Obviously, when feeling anger about a remark just past, I do not merely simulate or imagine my felt disapproval of it. One might add that emotional responses in this type of situation are often reflex or truncated affects involving no explicit evaluative component. Such truncated affects are often best understood as arousals and action inclinations triggered by perceptual stimuli in conjunction with dispositions generated by previous evaluations of objects (events, etc.) of the relevant type (cf. Lyons 1980: 85-9).

commits the Scheler-Sartre view to the thesis that, in the basic and ‘successful’ case of this sort of emotional experience, the value properties of other people’s mental states are affectively perceived through these emotions directed at them: I perceive the specific value of another’s just decision in admiration, or the disvalue of his malice in indignation, or the disvalue of his distress in pity. This requires, on the account given earlier, that relevant lower-order properties of their mental states are also directly present – perceptually disclosed – to me from a third-personal perspective.

The idea that mental states of others can be perceived in this way is a core claim of classical phenomenology. It was first articulated by Husserl and then refined by Stein and Scheler.²⁰ In the latter versions, the claim is that, in some contexts, conscious mental states of other people are perceptually accessible in perceiving their expressive behaviour:

[I]t seems to us that we are directly acquainted with [*haben*] another person’s joy in his smile, with his sorrow and pain in his tears, with his shame in his blushing If anyone tells me that this is not ‘perception’, for it ‘cannot’ be so ... I would beg him ... to compare these examples with cases in which there is in fact what he ... tends to suppose here too, namely a demonstrable inference. ... For example, ... where ... I am compelled to assume a discrepancy between experience and expression for ‘reasons’ that are themselves due (in the last resort) to perception. (Scheler 2009: 260; trans. modified)

Unfortunately this argument doesn’t give Scheler what he needs. A belief may be phenomenologically immediate (non-inferential) without being epistemically immediate. What is needed to show that beliefs about another’s mental states can be both immediately and *rationaly* grounded in the content of perceptual experience is the idea that the other’s mental state in such cases is not, or not always, a ‘distinct existence’ from his directly given expressive behaviour and merely

²⁰ Husserl (1977: 89f.); Stein (1980: 85-97); Scheler (2009: 259-64).

contingently linked with it. Otherwise my perceptual experience of the other's behaviour would not give me direct perceptual access to that mental state. The claim has to be that the other's expressive behaviour is at least sometimes part of his relevant mental state, such that that mental state is itself, in the right circumstances, perceptually given to me in my perceptual access to the other's expressive behaviour. This is the position defended explicitly by Edith Stein in *On the Problem of Empathy* (1917):

The facial expression is the external aspect of the grief, both form a natural unity ... fear is one thing with the cry of fear, just as the grief is with its facial expression, and it differs in its [third-personal perceptual] givenness from that of a coach that is indicated to me [the perceiver] through the rumbling of its wheels, just as the [perceptual] presentation of grief through its facial expression differs from that of a fire indicated by smoke. (Stein 1980: 87, 89).

Even if one were to grant this, it still does not seem enough to get the Scheler-Sartre view off the hook. For on the present account we are assuming that the evaluative features of another's mental state that I affectively perceive in indignation, admiration or pity belong to the *experiential* dimension of that mental state – they belong to *what it is like for the other* to be in that state. But surely, it may be said, what it is like for the other to be in pain cannot be directly given to me in my perception of his pain behaviour, even if that behaviour is part of the other's token mental state that is his pain. For the Scheler-Sartre view to go through it needs to deny this. The advocate of the view has to say that the experienced first-personal dimension of the other's distress, or of his just decision, or of his malice, can be part of the content of my perceptual experience of its behavioural expression.

A possible line to make good on this claim is suggested by Husserl's account of what he (misleadingly) calls 'empathy'. This starts from the familiar thesis that there is more to the phenomenal content of one's perceptual experience than what one is currently sensorily related to. When I look at the front façade of a house this will normally appear to me as such in my perceptual experience. What I experience will strike me experientially as the front of a house rather than as just a two-

dimensional surface, although no light waves reflected from the back wall of the house currently impact on my visual systems. Yet it will appear to me as having a back wall and, arguably, also as being independent of my experience of it. Nor is this typically a matter of judgement upon the content of the experience. The content can continue to appear to me that way even if, for some reason, I come to judge that my experience is not veridical. Husserl calls those components of the experiential content to which am not currently sensorily related *horizontal* (or 'appresented') components of the content. He argues that a similar account can be given of some situations in which we seem to encounter the subjectivity of another in their expressive behaviour. We experience that behaviour *as* having a subjective dimension, a what-it-is-likeness for the other that belongs to it in (very roughly) the way in which the back of the house belongs to its façade. In this manner it could be argued that the evaluative properties had, for example, by another's experience of pain can be part of the horizontal content of my perception of his expressive pain behaviour.

If this sort of story can be made good, it might give the Scheler-Sartre view what it needs to motivate its claim that evaluative properties can in some contexts be affectively perceived. Some 'psychic' emotions may come out, on this construal, as perceptual experiences, third-personally appresenting value properties of others' mental states.²¹ Clearly more would need to be said in development and defence of this account. What I have offered here are some initial suggestions on the direction such a defence might take.

²¹ What about 'psychic' emotions whose targets, on most views, do not include mental states, such as being moved by the grandeur of a natural scenery? Here Sartre and Scheler part ways. For Sartre, such emotions, *if* they presented their objects as having entirely mind-independent value properties, would be non-veridical, since he takes value to be existentially dependent on consciousness (Sartre 2003: 62). Scheler, by contrast, seems to countenance the existence of such value properties. Given his account of value, this may well seem mysterious, although he might argue that it is at any rate no more mysterious than the mind-independent existence of deontic reasons or normative facts/properties regarded as indispensable in some meta-ethical approaches. However, regarding emotions about natural objects he seems to take the view that they often present the latter as expressive of mentality (cf. Scheler 2009: 107).

References

- Brady, Michael S. 2010, 'Virtue, Emotion, and Attention', *Metaphilosophy* 44, 1-2: 115-31.
- Brady, Michael S. 2011, 'Emotions, Perceptions, and Reasons', in: C. Bagnoli, ed., *Morality and the Emotions*, 135-48.
- Brady, Michael S. 2013, *Emotional Insight: The Epistemic Role of Emotional Experience*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deonna, Julien A., and Teroni, Fabrice 2012, *The Emotions*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Doering, Sabine A. 2015, 'What's Wrong with Recalcitrant Emotions? From Irrationality to Challenge of Agential Identity', *Dialectica* 69, 3: 381-402.
- Dokic, Jérôme, and Lemaire, Stéphane 2013, 'Are Emotions Perceptions of Value?', *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 43, 2: 227-47.
- Dokic, Jérôme, and Lemaire, Stéphane 2015, 'Are Emotions Evaluative Modes?', *Dialectica* 69, 3: 271-92.
- Ekman P., Hager, J. C., and Friesen, W. V. 1981, 'The Symmetry of Emotional and Deliberate Facial Actions', *Psychophysiology* 18: 101-6.
- Goldie, Peter 2007, 'Seeing What is the Kind Thing to Do: Perception and Emotion in Morality', *Dialectica* 61, 3: 347-61.
- Gunther, York H. 2004, 'The Phenomenology and Intentionality of Emotion', *Philosophical Studies* 117: 43-55.
- Helm, Bennett W. 2001, *Emotional Reason: Deliberation, Motivation, and the Nature of Value*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Helm, Bennett W. 2015, 'Emotions and Recalcitrance: Reevaluating the Perceptual Model', *Dialectica* 69, 3: 417-33.
- Husserl, Edmund 1977, *Cartesian Meditations*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Johnston, Mark 2001, 'The Authority of Affect', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 63: 181-214.
- Lyons, William 1980, *Emotion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mulligan, Kevin 2012, 'Max Scheler. Die Anatomie des Herzens oder was man alles fühlen kann', in H. Landweer and U. Renz, eds, *Handbuch klassische Emotionstheorien*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Pelser, Adam C. 2014, 'Emotion, Evaluative Perception, and Epistemic Justification', in S. Roeser and C. Todd, eds, *Emotion and Value*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sartre, J. P. 1999, *War Diaries*, London: Verso.
- Sartre, J. P. 2002a, 'Intentionality: A Fundamental Idea of Husserl's Phenomenology', in: D. Moran and T. Mooney, eds, *The Phenomenology Reader*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Sartre, J. P. 2002b, *Sketch for a Theory of the Emotions*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Sartre, J. P. 2003, *Being and Nothingness*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Sartre, J. P. 2004a, *The Imaginary*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Sartre, J. P. 2004b, *The Transcendence of the Ego*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Scheler, Max 1973, *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Scheler, Max 1980, *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik*, Berne and Munich: Francke.
- Scheler, Max 2009, *The Nature of Sympathy*, Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.
- Stein, Edith 1980, *Zum Problem der Einfühlung*, Munich: Kaffke.
- Tappolet, Christine 2011, 'Values and Emotions', in: C. Bagnoli, ed., *Morality and the Emotions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tappolet, Christine 2012, 'Emotions, Perceptions, and Emotional Illusions', in: C. Calabi, ed., *Perceptual Illusions*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.