

## TRANSCRIPT WITH COMMENTARY

### *A Case of Face Blindness*

#### Sadie Interview 2:

#### Second day of DES sampling

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the March 5 interview with Sadie that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/N1E9v4CHgFI>. In green are comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

AK = Alek Krumm

Sadie = Sadie Dingfelder

0:01 RTH: So this is going to be Sadie's day number two. [AK: Yep.] And is there anything that we should be talking about before we do that?

#### SAMPLE 2.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

0:12 Sadie: Um, no, I don't think so. So, so starting, um, it was, ah, Thursday at 1:15. I got my first beep for that session. And I had no thoughts in my head *at all*, but my eyes were pointed at the cement, the sunny, like a sun patch on the cement. I was just walking.

0:40 RTH: So when you say your eyes were pointed at the cement, does that mean as a matter of the physical reality my eyes were pointed there, but I wasn't really seeing it? Or I was *seeing* this sun patch on the cement.

0:50 Sadie: I feel like I was seeing it. Yeah. I was seeing, I was seeing the sun patch on the cement. But I wasn't like, it didn't feel like I was like, I certainly wasn't *thinking* anything about it. I was just *seeing* it.

1:03 RTH: Okay. So see, so seeing it in your experience, but not commenting on it in any way. [Sadie: right.] Is that what we're saying here?

1:16 Sadie: Yeah. And it was interesting 'cause like it was really just the splotch of light. Like at that moment, I wasn't really, I really don't feel like I was seeing like much else, just that little sort of amoeba-shaped splotch.

1:30 RTH: Okay. And so it sounds like you were in some way sort of intent on that. You were captured by that visual thing at the moment. Is that right? [Sadie: Yeah!] Okay. And so when you started by saying "I'm not *thinking* about anything," you didn't mean "I didn't have any *experience*." You meant, "I didn't have any cognitive *analytical* experience. What I had was this perceptual experience." [Sadie: Yeah. Yeah, yeah.] Okay.

1:30 Russ comments: This is a textbook example of the appearance of what DES calls *sensory awareness* (Hurlburt, Heavey, & Bensaheb, 2009)—the interest or focus on some

sensory aspect of the (inner or outer) environment without regard for its instrumental nature. DES participants often start out by saying something that could be understood to mean that nothing is ongoing (as here at 0:28: “I had no thoughts in my head *at all*”). Even amidst those claims of nothingness, participants often leave clues that point to sensory awareness. For example, Sadie (at 0:12) provides seemingly unnecessary details about the cement—that it was “sunny, like a sun patch, on the cement.” Skilled interviewers will follow up about that sun patch detail and, as is the case here, clarification reveals that there is a sensory aspect of experience (as here at 0:52: “Yeah. I was seeing, I was seeing the sun patch on the cement”). Thus sensory awareness is not hidden, unconscious, subconscious, or pre-reflective (to use Petitmengin’s, 2006, term)—Sadie experienced the sun-patch directly, vividly at the moment of the beep.

Participants often downplay the importance of sensory awareness experiences (as here at 0:56: “But I wasn’t like, it didn’t feel like I was like, I certainly wasn’t *thinking* anything about it”). It is as if participants are shy or bashful about describing sensory awareness, as here: two of Sadie’s samples on her first sampling day involved sensory awareness (muscle twitch in 1.1, tongue squishing in 1.2), and we discussed those in detail there, but still we need to be supportive of the emergence of sensory aspects.

Sensory awareness has nothing to do with the instrumental (or “objective” or “content” or “what” to use Petitmengin’s 2021 terms) aspect of ongoing behavior (as here: Sadie’s interest in the sunny patch is entirely unrelated to the destination of her walking).

2:00 [RTH continues] And visually, Sadie is frozen for me. Is she frozen for you to, Alek? [AK: No.] Alright. Well then we’ll just carry on here [they laugh] and hope for the best, as far as the recording is concerned. [AK: Yeah.]

2:15 Sadie: I can also record just audio, if that would be helpful.

2:21 RTH: It might be worthwhile [Sadie: Okay. I’ll do that.] Just as a triple backup. [Sadie: Yeah.] Given the, given that the first two are at least somewhat flaky [Sadie: Yeah, I got it.] it might be worth doin’. So is there anything else in your experience about beep number 1 other than I’m seeing this amoeba-shaped blotch of sunshine on the pavement? [Sadie: Yep.] Okay. And, and I guess I should ask, I understand that I’m sort of into the bright sunshininess, not the, on-the-concrete-y-ness of it. Is that correct?

3:05 Sadie: Hmm. I don’t know. I don’t know if I split, if I split that hair.

3:09 RTH: Okay. That’s fine. I’m perfectly capable of as, answering questions, which are not possible to answer. [Sadie laughs.]

3:18 Sadie: All right, then I think I’m good.

3:19 AK: Yeah. Number 2.

## SAMPLE 2.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

3:23 Sadie: Oh yes. Okay. You don’t have this! Um, 1:35. I was thinking of a dialogue, a hypothetical dialogue in my brain, um, that I might have with an editor about a story. (And, um, I’m

just setting it up.) Just both voices were my own. Both were faster than talking. In real life, this exchange would happen in writing, in an email. The whole phrase was, “I’m told my mom, I’m told *the* mom supports it.” Um, and I was sort of simultaneously assessing whether or not it was true. And right before the beep went off, I just thought that the “it,” in “I’m told the mom supports it.” But I was like, *was I told the mom support it?* Like just asking myself in a vague way, but not in words while I was saying that.

4:15 AK: Okay. [Sadie laughs] So at the moment of the beep, how many voices are present?

4:20 Sadie: Um, w at the moment of the beep it was just one voice. It was just my voice.

4:25 AK: Um hmm. But, but it’s in a, it’s within a dialogue or...

4:29 Sadie: Y’know, I called it a dialogue, but it was all in my voice, but it had a back and forth quality. [AK: Okay.] Um, yeah.

4:39 AK: Okay. And the other person is the editor, it’s just your voice as editor? [Sadie: Yeah.] Is that...?

4:45 Sadie: Exactly? And the funny thing is, it would never be *anyone’s* voice. Like, I would just be reading an email from her. Like I was anticipating a question from her and, and figuring out how I would answer it. And then asking myself if that answer was actually correct.

4:45 Russ comments: Inner experience does not need to mirror reality. The fact that both parts of the dialogue are spoken in the same voice did not seem surprising at the time of the beep—it’s only on retrospection, with its reality-based perspective, does that seem weird.

This suspension of the natural attitude so that the actual characteristics of inner experience can be described with fidelity (regardless of whether they conform to reality) is a major part of the DES skill.

5:00 AK: Ah hah. So, in reality, you’re gonna write these things in an email, but for whatever reason in your experience, they are present in a voice as if spoken.

5:10 Sadie: Yeah. In my voice.

5:14 AK: And at the moment of the beep it’s your turn to speak or whatever, in this back and forth. And you’re saying, “I’m told the mom supports it.” [Sadie: Yeah.] And the beep interrupts at the end of that? Or...

5:27 Sadie: Yeah. The beep was right after I got to the “it.”

5:31 AK: Okay. And is the whole phrase present? Or just the word it? Or some chunk of it or something?

5:39 Sadie: It was definitely like, it definitely happened temporally, right? So like, it just depends on how you define it, how far in front of the beep. [AK: Um hmm.] But like, it would, I

definitely would thought, y'know, "I'm told that mom supports it. Beep!" So that was like... [laughs]

5:54 AK: Well, that's tricky, right? Because in, in the physical world, yes, it happens temporally. But I think in the experiential world, it's *possible* that, that even though all of that can't be, y'know, simultaneously present, it, it *is* in experience. Well, my experience is of the whole phrase, even though certainly some time would have had to transpire to get from beginning to end.

6:19 Sadie: Yeah. So it was...

6:20 RTH: [interrupts] Well it could... Alek isn't trying to talk you into that. She's just stating that as a possibility.

6:20 Russ comments: The beep is an element of the real world. But Sadie's *apprehension of the beep* or recognition that the beep had occurred is the result of an experiential process.

DES participants very often report (as here) that the beep comes at the end of a sentence or phrase—more often than could be possible by the random nature of the beep. So we must conclude that the physical beep occurs and then Sadie's auditory system processes it, but she doesn't actually *hear* it until somewhat later, when she has mostly finished processing the inner dialogue turn. That is, it doubtless seems to Sadie that she hears the beep when it (physically) sounds, but DES thinks she actually hears the beep when her processing system (whatever that is) has the capacity to process the beep. That lag is probably typically on the order of fractions of seconds, but Hurlburt (1990) claimed it could be on the order of seconds in his schizophrenic patient.

To investigate this lag is a challenge, because it has to be explored in the participant's natural environment. The challenge has been known in astronomy since 1796, when the Astronomer Royal Neville Maskelyne fired his assistant Kinnebrooke because Kinnebrooke's time measurements differed from Maskelyne's own measurements by about a second. That difference became known as the "personal equation."

6:20 AK: Exactly.

6:25 Sadie: No, I definitely had like thoughts that were a whole phrase at once. But that was just me. It was almost like I was composing it while I was typing it, but I wasn't typing it. So,

6:38 AK: Hmm. So definitely it sounds like the word "it" is there. And, and am I hearing like *maybe* the rest? Or... [inaudible]

6:38 Russ comments: RTH thinks AK is on the wrong track here—he has not heard Sadie say that she has focused on just the one word "it." Sadie's comments at 5:27 and 5:39 are about the entire sentence, not just the word "it."

6:46 Sadie: The rest is not, I mean, it's gone by the time it's yeah, it's disappeared.

- 6:52 AK: Okay. So it's just the word "it" left. [Sadie: Um hmm.] Okay. And "it" is, I understand this is internal. I'm not saying this out loud. [Sadie: Yeah.] Does it make sense to say whether "it" feels *spoken* or *heard*? Some people make that distinction. They say, y'know, it really seems like I was innerly *hearing* this. Or it really seems like I was innerly speaking. I'm the *producer* of the words.
- 7:21 Sadie: Yeah. I was *definitely* the producer of the words. I had that sense. [AK: Um hmm.] Not like the sense sense the, what's the word, the sense, I didn't have the *sensual* sense [inaudible] that I knew that I was producing the thought, [AK: Um hmm.] I don't know.
- 7:43 RTH: And by "sensual sense," do you mean like the sensations on my lips of speaking or some...?, Or what are you referring to?
- 7:50 Sadie: Yeah, that *is* what I was referring to, I think. Yeah, it was just in my head.
- 7:57 AK: Okay. So I experienced myself as if speaking, but I don't have any of the physicality of if I were *really* speaking out loud. [Sadie: Yeah.] But otherwise it's really just like speaking out loud, but it's in my head.
- 8:08 Sadie: Yeah. Well, just like, [AK: Hmm.] I guess it's pretty similar in that it just kind of emerges from me at that point. Like when I talk, I don't really think before I s... y'know, I've kind of, well, anyway, I don't, I, uh, I don't know if I answered that. It's not just like speaking, obviously. I... But it's hard to sort of define qualitatively what I mean.
- 8:42 RTH: Okay. And you seemed pretty sure about, I would call this *speaking*, not *hearing*.
- 8:48 Sadie: Just because I'm *producing* it in my head. So hearing seems like sort of passive, and I *assume* that that would feel like you were observing a thought versus producing a thought.
- 9:01 AK: Okay. I think that sounds fair. Um, okay.
- 9:01 Russ comments: RTH thinks the distinction between speaking and hearing is not merely one of producing. In the upcoming he will try to clarify.
- 9:09 RTH: Okay. So can I ask a couple more questions about that? (Maybe you already asked them because I've had, I've been having a little bit of audio and visual stuff here.) So I'm understanding you're *producing* the words. And I'm understanding that there's a *voice* involved. This is *my* voice? [Sadie: Um hmm.] And this is my voice as if *spoken*. It's not just as if I am producing words, but I'm producing them in the manner of speaking?
- 9:37 Sadie: Yeah. Yeah. It's it has an, it does have an audio quality to it.
- 9:42 RTH: Okay. And that is more like I'm producing *spoken* words as opposed to producing *heard* words. [Sadie: Yeah.] Theoretically that would be possible.
- 10:03 Sadie: Yeah. Yeah, that's what I [inaudible].

- 10:03 AK: Okay. And I understand that at the same time, there was some like analysis or process about, *is this even really true?*
- 10:10 Sadie: Yeah. As I was saying that whole phrase, and also simultaneously when I was at the end of the phrase, at the “it,” um, I was like, I knew that I was asking myself if that was true or not. Like I knew I was like trying to assess whether it was true or not, but I didn’t, that, it was like, um, a very abstract knowing. Like I didn’t, y’know, I could just metaphorically feel my head sort of churning.
- 10:39 AK: Were there words present in that thinking? [Sadie: No.] Okay. So this isn’t like, “is that right?” Quote? it’s, it’s more the *idea* of that. [Sadie: Yeah.] Okay.
- 10:53 Sadie: Maybe it hadn’t been interrupted by the beep, that could have been the *next* thing I thought / said to myself though, y’know what I mean? Like maybe that was queuing up.
- 11:01 AK: Hmm. Okay. And does this seem, I mean, is it fair to call this like a, a thought process? Is this a cognitive analytical kind of thing?
- 11:11 Sadie: Um, yeah. Yeah. I think both aspects are sort of different or analytical. Like I was sort of trying to compose an email in advance while simultaneously like assessing whether or not it was good, a good email or not.
- 11:32 AK: And between the two, the, the back and forth with your editor and the, the assessing *is this true?* [Sadie: Yeah.] Um, is one of those more prominent, more powerful at the moment of the beep?
- 11:45 Sadie: Yeah, I would say it’s, um, like maybe 80%, um, the, my own voice and 20% the, this sort of feeling of thinking.
- 11:57 AK: Okay. Okay. Can I just kind of summarize what I’ve heard, to see if I got it here? [Sadie: Yeah.] Okay. So I’m, I’m in this internal back and forth imagining what I might say to my editor. And at the moment of the beep, it’s me speaking for me. And I’m, I’m innerly saying, “I’m told the mom supports it.” The beep interrupts me at “it.” And really the rest of the sentence is gone. It’s just the word “it” left at the moment. [Sadie: Uh huh.] And at the same time, I’m wondering, assessing, analyzing whether that’s really true. And that is a unworded kind of thoughty process. [Sadie: Yeah.] Okay. Then I’m good for this one.
- 11:57 Russ comments: RTH thinks that “It’s just the word “it” left at the moment” is not quite right (see the comment at 6:38), but he lets it slide. DES is a performance art, and RTH thinks that it is probably impossible to disentangle this detail—too much has already been said.
- 12:42 RTH: And I guess I have one more detail about the voice. I think you said that the voice was softer than it would have been if you’d spoken out loud?
- 12:49 Sadie: Oh, yes. It was softer, definitely softer.

- 12:53 RTH: And by sometimes when people say softer, they mean, well, it's in my imagination, the words aren't coming out of my mouth. Do you mean that? Or do you mean that, that somehow it is like a sotto voce kind of voice?
- 13:04 Sadie: Yeah. It was very like, it was, it was like, if I was trying to tell a secret. Not really. I mean, when, y'know, it's like, if it was like a, a sotto voce [laughs].
- 13:17 RTH: So you, you mean, you, you mean that it was experienced as being soft?
- 13:22 Sadie: Soft. Yeah, my experience was that it was pretty soft.
- 13:26 RTH: But not as if you were trying to [mimes whispering]
- 13:28 Sadie: But not a whisper. [laughs] [AK: Um hmm.]

13:28 Russ comments: Psychologists and phenomenologists acknowledge that intrapersonal communication can involve more than one point of view, for example, distinguishing between self-talk and dialogue<sup>1</sup>, or distinguishing among (1) inner monologue, where there is a single speaker (one "I-position") who is influenced by a silent audience; (2) inner dialogue, where at least two speakers (two I-positions) are voiced and interacting as interlocutors; and (3) a change of perspective where the experiencer takes someone else's point of view with or without voicing it<sup>2</sup>. All such writers (that we know of) presume that the voices in dialogue are different in each I-position, writing, for example, "Inner dialogues refer to various forms of intrapersonal communication where *different voices* can represent not only the self but also close persons, imagined friends, lost relatives and spouses, teachers and mentors, media stars, voices of culture, and others"<sup>3</sup>; or "the I has the capacity to imaginatively endow each position with a voice, so that each of them has a story to tell about its own experiences from its own stance."<sup>4</sup>

No writer about inner dialogue (that we know of) has raised the possibility that the two speakers are (or can be) both voiced *in the same voice*, as Sadie does here. We suspect that such oversight stems from the fact that the writers base their theoretical stance on rational consideration (if it's two different people it *must be* two different voices) and/or questionnaire-based studies where questionnaire respondents typically each hold a similar rational belief.

Such rational beliefs are presuppositions, and any exploration that seeks to be based on a high-fidelity apprehension of inner-voice phenomena must somehow bracket such presuppositions. Bracketing presuppositions is hard work, as the Sadie interviews (and the other interviews in this series) demonstrate.

See also the second half of the comment at 25:20.

<sup>1</sup> Oleś, P. K., Brinthaupt, T. M., Dier, R., & Polak, D. (2020). Types of inner dialogues and functions of self-talk: Comparisons and implications. *Frontiers in psychology*, 11, 227. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00227>

<sup>2</sup> Puchalska-Wasył, M. (2010). Dialogue, monologue, and change of perspective—three forms of dialogicality. *International Journal for Dialogical Science*, 4(1), 67-79.

<sup>3</sup> Oleś, p. 2, emphasis added.

<sup>4</sup> Puchalska-Wasył, p. 68.

13:31 RTH: Alright. Then I think I'm good. [AK: Okay.] Number 3.

### SAMPLE 2.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

13:37 Sadie: Okay. I was thinking, let's see. Oh, the whole phrase would have been, "It's just too big a group." But right before the beep I was on the word "too." Um, I had the shape of the *t* [inaudible] the *t* in my mouth for "too," really, really faintly. And, um, yeah, I can tell you more context, but that's probably what you want to know. But yeah, I was just having, I was just like, it was weird. Okay. Actually, I'll tell you what I wrote. Okay. [reads from notes] This was part of an imagined dialogue with the person I was writing about that then merged with what I imagined a mayor, our DC mayor, would say with regard, if she decided to exclude obese people from the medical conditions, the first set that, uh, for vaccination. [laughs] [RTH: Okay.]

14:28 AK: That's quite a context.

14:38 Sadie: So this is a... go ahead.

14:38 AK: I said it's quite a context!

14:40 Sadie: [laughs] I thought, I didn't know if you guys cared or not, but I just thought I'd tell you anyway.

14:46 RTH: It's a complicated world that we live in, I'll say that! So about your inner experience, is this a *dialogue* in the sense that you, you, you were, you were in the process of saying "It's just too big a group" [Sadie: Yeah.] and then somebody else was going to respond.

15:04 Sadie: Yeah. Like I was the mayor, I think at that point. It was in my voice though. And I, it was almost like I was the mayor's press secretary or something, I think, I don't know. But it's in my voice. And I was pretending to be the mayor for some reason. And I'm like, "It's just too big a group." Wait, was that the, what was the question again?

15:24 RTH: Well, we're getting there.

15:26 Sadie: It was in my voice, though.

15:26 RTH: So, so this is, this is, I'm gathering, somewhat similar to the previous beep in the sense that it's a dialogue where both halves of the dialogue are in your own voice. [Sadie: Yeah, exactly.] And at this particular moment you were in the part of the dialogue that wasn't you. [Sadie: Yes.] And would the other part of the dialogue have been you?

15:48 Sadie: Yes. I cast myself in all the parts.

15:51 RTH: Okay. So this is, this is Sadie as the spokesperson speaking. [Sadie: Yeah.] And a moment earlier, or a moment later or something, it would have been Sadie as Sadie speaking. [Sadie: Yeah.] Okay. And, and I'm in the middle of this sentence, "It's just too big a group."

16:11 Sadie: Yeah. I'm just on "too."

16:14 RTH: And, and I almost feel the *t* of "too" on my lips and tongue, is that what, do I understand that right? [Sadie: Exactly. Yeah.] Lips *and* tongue.

16:26 Sadie: Um, I can't remember, but I *do* remember that it felt like more like a pre, like, I didn't actually think the muscle had fired, but it felt like what happens right before, like you make a shape? Not that I was going to, but that's kinda just, I didn't think like if you actually like looked in my mouth at that point, I don't think you would've seen the *t*. Like, I think I was just almost *preparing* to make the tiniest little *t*.

16:56 RTH: So it was like, you're, like, your muscles are involved with this saying, but they're not as big-time involved as it would've if you had been speaking them out loud.

17:05 Sadie: Oh yeah, definitely. Yeah. It was like the tiniest little, um, version of that.

17:09 RTH: Okay. And yet there's, there's enough of it to be sensed. I can. I *feel* it. [Sadie: Yeah, I did.] And, and that makes that *different* from the previous beep. Is that correct? [Sadie: Yes.] That this one is more mouthy articulated than the previous one was. [Sadie: Yeah.] Okay. And is there anything else in your experience at this moment? [Sadie: Um, nope.] So w, I understand that at least in part, that, and part the context. And so w w w are there, is there anything visual about the context or anything? [Sadie: Nah.] Okay. So I don't need to know that 'cause I'm, I'm speaking to myself and I know what I'm talking about. [Sadie laughs] And, and you weren't exactly sure, if I understood you correctly, who, what, what person you were portraying, whether it was the press secretary or the mayor herself or, or some other spokesperson representing the mayor. Is that right?

18:22 Sadie: It's even weirder than that actually. It's I, I definitely was like, sort of advising the mayor on what she should say, but..

18:32 RTH: Sadie as Sadie is advising the mayor?

18:34 Sadie: Well, yeah, sort of. [RTH: Okay.] But I also was like having a hypothetical exchange with my *editor*, too. So I was *me talking to an editor* and then *me talking to the mayor* at the same time, kind of.

18:57 RTH: In this sample are we talking about?

18:57 Sadie: I think so. Yeah. Yeah. It doesn't really make sense, but that is the experience I have.

18:57 Russ comments: People sometimes ask why we should believe what DES participants say—they think that participants are just trying to please, or trying to look good, or so on. This exchange provides a bit of evidence: Sadie is presenting a description that is, by her own lights, a bit weird, and yet she doesn't flinch from relaying it. It's hard to imagine why she would say such a thing unless (a) it is true or (b) she is skillfully trying to screw around with us. I think (a) is far more likely.

19:04 RTH: So, so somewhere about beep 3, the one we're talking about now, [Sadie: Yeah.] we haven't yet talked about the fact that there's an editor involved somehow in this conversation as well. Is that right?

19:16 Sadie: We have not, I don't think, I think I mentioned it at the very beginning.

19:19 AK: You did. You mentioned something at the outset, yeah.

19:23 Sadie: Um, that, that, I feel like if it, yeah, like there's, there's like sort of a fading-away editor who I'm talking to and a fading-in mayor, but that is completely metaphorical.

19:42 AK: And are you saying the same thing to...?

19:45 Sadie: ...both of them? Yeah.

19:47 AK: Like this comment here, "it's just too big a group,"[Sadie: Yeah.] is that... Who's the audience of that comment? Is that for...

19:57 Sadie: I think like 90%, I'm trying to, I mean, 90% it's advising the mayor. Not that I have a sense that she's there or anything, but 90% it's like the audience would be... The audience is *me* for both of them. But, um, but in the dialogue, in the world of the two sort of simultaneous dialogues, my... It's like the, the mayor one, it feels much heavily weighted, more heavily weighted. And the editor one, um, is not as heavily weighted. And I *think* that I was... The whole, I think what had happened was I was still having that dialogue with my editor from the previous like time, but then it was sort of transitioning into a whole, a different story for some reason. [AK: Hmm.]

20:49 RTH: So, so there's too many Sadies involved in this for me to keep track! So there's, there's the Sadie as Sadie, and there's the Sadie as the spokesperson.

21:03 Sadie: Well, um, it's more like, there's really, I'm really just, they're really just me talking to myself.

21:10 RTH: I understand. And they're both, you talking to yourself. But you're talking to yourself in two different roles.

21:15 Sadie: Right. Yeah. [RTH: Is that right?] Yeah. I felt like I was still in the role of me, um, t talking to have making that hypothetical, um, email to my editor. But for some reason it was also more, it was much more strongly that I was talking to, but I was sort of talking as the mayor. Um, or I was writing, or I was just *thinking* of what the mayor should say if she, um, what she should say, if she had to say, [laughs] whatever, like what....

21:47 RTH: So "it's too big a group" [Sadie: Yeah.] is your proposal for what the mayor should say in this situation.

21:54 Sadie: Yeah. But it's not really that concrete. That was the concept. Like it was in those words, but like, I wasn't actually like composing like a PR release for her or something. I was just like, she *would* say "it's just too big a group."

- 22:14 RTH: And is, and is that in a response to something that Sadie had said, like an alternative suggestion? And she's saying, "well, I can't do that. It's too big a group"?
- 22:22 Sadie: Yes. But not a very articulated question. It was just, um, the idea that she would get criticism. Like I had this sense that she would get criticism as she took obesity out of the group of, uh, medical conditions. And then I was *thinking*, she would say, "it's just too big a group."
- 22:47 AK: Hmm. And was the criticism actually, um, coming from Sadie in that this *is* a back and forth. Like before the beep, Sadie as Sadie had said something? Or are you just imagining more abstractly: y'know, what if she were to get criticism, here's what she might say? Does that make sense?
- 23:08 Sadie: Right. Yeah, it was definitely abstractly.
- 23:11 AK: So it's not that *Sadie* said something to her, the mayor, and then mayor says, "it's just too big a group." It's you're musing about the criticism she might get and how she might respond.
- 23:22 Sadie: Yeah, exactly.
- 23:26 RTH: So does that mean that I experienced this as a dialogue, but maybe there haven't actually, hasn't actually been a previous turn in dialogue? Seems to, it seems like I'm engaged in a dialogue, but it's not like there, it's not like there was a somebody, somebody else, namely me, who said something before this.
- 23:47 Sadie: Yeah. There wasn't someone that says something before that. But it was... At least not for the mayor part of the dialogue.
- 23:57 RTH: So I'm both engaged in a dialogue and *not* engaged in a dialogue at the same time in some way. Which is perfectly legitimate. I'm not trying to suggest that this is not possible. [Sadie: Yeah.] So it seems like I'm engaged in the dialogue, but it doesn't seem like if I had rolled the clock back a second, there would have been somebody else speaking. [Sadie: Right.] [AK: Um hmm. Okay.] And, and the presence of the editor: somehow the editor seems like she is part of this dialogue.
- 24:40 Sadie: Yes. Yeah. But, um, yeah, it was like, I had the sense that I was like continuing a dialogue with her...
- 24:49 RTH: But what I'm saying isn't really relevant to her, it's relevant to the other guy.
- 24:53 Sadie: Yeah. It's totally not relevant to her. [RTH: The other woman.] Yeah. Yeah.
- 24:57 RTH: Okay. So the imagination is a wonderful thing. It does *not* have to conform to reality. That's, that's what makes it imagination. [Sadie: Yeah.] There's a lot of things in this, in this particular beep, which do not [laughs] conform to reality.

25:12 Sadie: Yeah. Totally. It's more like a dream-like logic.

25:16 RTH: Yeah. Alright. I think I'm good.

25:20 AK: Yeah. Totally interesting. Number 4.

25:20 Russ comments: To summarize this rather complex experience: There were somehow two dialogues present at this moment, both involving the same words ("It's just too big a group") but each involving different people. There is the dialogue involving the mayor (or representative) and Sadie. There is also a dialogue between an editor and Sadie. The mayor dialogue is definitely more prominent (90-10). Sadie was innerly saying "It's just too big a group" both as the mayor (or representative) to Sadie, but also in some inchoate/barely present way, as Sadie's editor might say to her [even though the obesity conversation is irrelevant to her editor.]

Recall that at 13:28, we commented that Sadie's both-parties-in-the-same-voice inner dialogue was not contemplated by writers about inner speech. Now we notice two additional aspects of Sadie's dialogue that are also not contemplated by other writers. First, in the present sample 2.3 she understands herself to be in a back-and-forth conversation with the mayor (thus, this is inner dialogue) and yet, she does not, or at least does not necessarily, experience the alternating turns of the conversation. Perhaps this is a limitation of the second-day (not yet highly skilled in this regard) sampling—should similar samples occur later in sampling, Sadie might be able to describe reliably the (for example) dialogue turn prior to the one at the moment of the beep. But it is also possible that Sadie does actually, at the moment of the beep, experience herself as replying to a previous turn, even though such turn had not actually occurred. That is well within the range of experiential possibilities, regardless of whether it obtained for Sadie at this beep.

Moreover, to our knowledge, no inner speech/inner dialogue theorists have considered the possibility of overlapping interlocutors—the same inner utterance being simultaneously directed to two different, separate, independent people, one clearly present (here, the mayor) and another barely/inchoately present with no relevance to the topic at hand (the editor).

It is not our aim here to create a new theory of inner dialogue. It does seem that an adequate theory of inner dialogue must take into account the possibility of the phenomena we are describing here.

#### SAMPLE 2.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

25:23 Sadie: Okay. Um. The, I was like thinking of the *su*h sound, but I wasn't like making it in my mouth. And I think that it was beginning the word "some," but when I got interrupted, I just, I like literally forgot what word I was thinking of. Um, I had the sense that I was working something out with little churn in my brain, but, um, but it was just like a feeling.

25:52 RTH: Would you say that last sentence again?

- 25:55 Sadie: Um, I had the, the, the sense that I was working something out, like I was thinking about something, but I don't know anything more specific than that. And it was just a feeling, or a hunch.
- 26:11 RTH: Hmm.
- 26:13 AK: And so in your experience at the moment of the beep is the *suh* sound and the working something out? Is that...?
- 26:22 Sadie: Yeah, that's it.
- 26:24 AK: And are those things related? Is the *suh* part of whatever I'm working out?
- 26:29 Sadie: I did not write... I don't think I knew. I don't think I was.... I don't think I knew.
- 26:34 AK: Okay. And when you said, *suh*, like, you mean like *s* like the sound, the *s* makes?
- 26:43 Sadie: Yeah. The sound of an *s*.
- 26:43 AK: Okay. [Sadie: Yeah.] And I think you said I'm thinking this *suh* sound. What, how is that thinking present?
- 26:51 Sadie: Um, I mean, I'm definitely generating it, but it's nothing like hearing and... Yeah. I just know that I'm thinking of an *s*, a *suh* sound.
- 27:08 AK: And generating it in a voice.?
- 27:12 Sadie: Um, I don't think so.
- 27:20 AK: Okay. So somehow the *suh*... Well, is there, is there audio? [Sadie: No.] Okay. So I'm generating a sound, but I don't *say* the sound or even hear the sound. [Sadie: (quizzically) Right.] And is this one about the physicality? About the...?
- 27:40 Sadie: No, it wasn't, I wasn't making it with my mouth at all. I just like, had that sound in my head.
- 27:40 Russ comments: Sadie is describing a sound that is innerly *present to her* but is *not* heard or spoken. The seeming impossibility of such a phenomenon is *not* merely the result of ambiguous word choice. For example, Sadie understands what it means to innerly hear something (compare the Brandenburg Concerto example of sample 2.6 below); and she understands what it means to innerly speak something (compare the mayor example of sample 2.3 above). The *suh* phenomenon is neither of those, and yet is directly present to her.
- 27:53 AK: Okay. And at the moment of the beep, do you apprehend, *suh* as the beginning of some [Sadie: ....word...] word or longer sound? Or is it, is it really just this isolated, it's only *suh* to me, not even the beginning of something.

28:07 Sadie: No, no. It was the beginning of the word *some*. [AK: Okay.]

28:10 RTH: S-O-M-E *some*?

28:13 Sadie: Yeah.

28:18 AK: But I take it. Your experience is not of *some*...

28:23 Sadie: No, it's just the *s*, *suh*.

28:25 AK: So it's just *suh*.

28:26 Sadie: Or maybe, yeah, the first, first part of the word.

28:29 AK: Okay. And so had the beep not interrupted. It would have been *some*, but the beep interrupted, and it was just *suh*. [Sadie: Yeah.] Is that...? Okay.

28:38 RTH: I'm not sure that I understood that. So do you, do you mean that I had the words, I was somehow thinking the word *some* and the beep caught me early enough in it that I didn't get to the *um* part of *some*? Or do you mean, I was somehow thinking this *ss* sound, and later on, I might've gotten the *um sound* and then it would have been *some*, but at the moment I was just into the *suh* part of it.

29:11 Sadie: I think both of those things are true. Like I was, I was just thinking of the *suh* part of *some*, but I knew where I was going.

29:21 RTH: So this isn't just an abstract *suh*, this is a *some*, but I haven't yet thought the *um* part of it. [Sadie: Yeah.] Okay.

29:31 AK: Okay. And I am working something out, [Sadie: Yeah.] which you said is like a churn in my brain. It's just a feeling. [Sadie: Yeah.] How, how do you experience that?

29:50 Sadie: Y'know, it's, it's just, it's just *knowing* that I'm thinking, really. Though, you... Though.... I mean, at that time it was just knowing that I was thinking.

29:59 AK: So churn in my brain is, is a metaphor. [Sadie: Yeah.] I understand. Okay. So I experienced myself as thinking, pondering, something like that. [Sadie: Yeah.]

30:21 RTH: And I know, (go ahead).

30:21 AK: [they speak over each other] And is it (go ahead) Is it any more specific than that? I'm thinking *about* something, or I'm working out X?

30:30 Sadie: It's if I was, I didn't write it down. Oh. But the thinking I definitely didn't like, yeah. I don't think, I don't think so. Or I would've written it down. [AK: Okay.]

30:44 RTH: So that means... At the moment of the beep as best I can recall from *here*, at the moment of the beep, I somehow recognize myself as, recognize myself as thinking, but I

don't know the topic at all of what I was thinking about. Could have been the tariffs on Boeing, or it could have been, what the mayor should have said about fat people, or whatever. [Sadie: Yeah! (laughs)] Okay. So I don't have any idea at all of the topic. [Sadie: Nope.] And, and I have, um, I was still had audio difficulties here is, is I noticed my mind *turning* or *churning*?

31:28 Sadie: Yeah. But that was entirely a metaphor. Like, I definitely didn't like feel that anyway. I just *knew* it was happening.

31:38 RTH: And so it doesn't much matter whether you use a *t* with *turning* or *ch* with *churning*? That's such a metaphor. It's just that there was something going on.

31:46 Sadie: Hmm. Yeah.

31:50 RTH: Okay. Okay. [AK: Then I'm good.] Me too. Number 5.

#### SAMPLE 2.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

31:57 Sadie: Alright! I was spelling the word "released" while tapping it on my phone. Um, I didn't write down like where I was on the word. Um, but I was also thinking vaguely about checking the vaccine website. And again, like, I don't, I didn't have a direct experience of the thought. I just knew that's what I was thinking about.

32:25 RTH: And, and this spelling, the word *relief*, is that in your experience? I'm actually somehow cognizing or thinking or whatever about that, spelling it.

32:35 Sadie: Yeah. I was like, literally spelling it, like in, it was like *r-e-l-e-a-s-e-d*. Y'know, it was like, 'cause I was also typing it into the phone at the same time.

32:50 RTH: Like with your thumb, thumb kind of typing.

32:52 Sadie: Yeah. Except with my finger. [RTH: Okay.] Do you type with your thumbs? That's a young-person thing to do.

32:59 RTH: I try to learn that because I try to be a young person, but it's a, challenge on both, at both ends.

33:10 Sadie: You do that? I'll have to try!

33:12 RTH: Um. So is, is one of those experiences more central to your inner experience? Either the *released* portion or the vaguely thinking about the website?

33:21 Sadie: Yeah, I was, um, the *released*, the letters of the word *released* were very much at the fore, like forefront of my mind.

33:28 RTH: And these letters are there one after another?

33:32 Sadie: They are very much one after another.

33:34 RTH: And how are they there?

33:37 Sadie: Um, well, I don't know.

33:46 RTH: So they're as letters [Sadie: Yeah.] one after another. [Sadie: Yeah.] And is, is a voice involved?

33:52 Sadie: No. [RTH: So there...] I can't tell you like what, whose voice it would be. I, I didn't have any, yeah. I don't think there's a voice.

34:05 RTH: So the letters are thought in some way that does not involve a voice. [Sadie: Yes.] And does that mean it also does not involve a *speaking* and it does not involve a *hearing*?

34:16 Sadie: Yeah. None of that, really.

34:19 RTH: So it's, so when I say, "I don't know how they're present," actually I know *quite a bit* about how they're present--they're not in a voice, they're not spoken, they're not heard. It's just that what's left is a little hard to fathom, I guess. So, so they're, they are individually thought letters, individually encountered letters somehow, [Sadie: Yeah.] but not spoken. [Sadie: Yeah.] And they're spoke... And they are encountered one after another. It's not like I got all the letters all at once. It's like, I got first the R and then E and then the L and whatever.

34:56 Sadie: Yeah. And I was typing them as I thought of each letter. So I might've been in the middle of that word and forgot the letter I was beeped on. [RTH: Okay.] Or it might've been right after I finished it. I don't know.

35:12 RTH: And do you have a, is part of your experience, the typing? or does that seem like, sort of automatically following the letters?

35:20 Sadie: It's definitely part of my experience 'cause I'm looking at the keyboard and, y'know, directing my finger to where to put it. And, and actually, well, yeah, I'm definitely, it's definitely in my experience, like I'm looking and targeting little keys, little tiny keys.

35:41 RTH: Okay. So, so I I'm, I'm not disbelieving that, but I w I would comment along, along the way that it is quite possible to look at something quite specifically and have that not be in your experience at all. [Sadie: Hmm! Well, then I guess...] So what I'm saying is that you said, "because I, because I was doing it," that...

36:04 Sadie: Yeah. I actually don't know. You're right. I don't know.

36:08 RTH: Okay. So in this mini lecture, here, is just about saying, let's, let's not just *assume* that, that we *must* be... [Sadie: Yeah.] It seems like a natural thing, that if my eyes are doing it and my hands or making like gestures towards these little tiny things, [Sadie: Yeah.] well, it must be in my experience. But that's really not true. I think, I think we can do all kinds of skilled things without experiencing it. We drive while engaged in a conversation with our friend or whatever, and get to the next town and not never realize how we got

there. [Sadie laughs.] And obviously we were doing a skilled, a *highly* skilled maneuvers while we were doing it. [pause] So, so are you happy with the *released* portion, Alek? [AK: Um hmm.] There's the I'm vaguely checking the vaccine website.

37:06 Sadie: Yeah. I was vaguely thinking about checking the vaccine website. Um, but that was not like experienced, that was that's that was like not experienced as a sentence or something. Like, it was just like, just sort of amorphously in my head.

37:25 RTH: And so does "vaguely" mean "not clear"? Or does "vaguely" mean "it's just not in words, and so I have a hard time articulating it."

37:32 Sadie: Right. It's just, it's not in words, but it's also a small amount of my experience at that moment.

37:39 RTH: Okay. So *some part* of my experience is thinking I should check the vaccine website. [Sadie: Yeah.] And is it, is it, I should check, is that the gist here?

37:49 Sadie: It is actually a couple of things that went. Like, it's not just that I *should* check the vaccine website, but it was also like *what* I was looking for if I checked the vaccine website.

38:03 RTH: And by what you're looking for, do you, what do you mean?

38:06 Sadie: I don't know. Like, I think I'm... N.

38:11 RTH: So not necessarily visual. Like I'm looking for the blue button.

38:14 Sadie: Oh yeah! Nothing visual. Like I was like, I was, it was almost like, I was like, why would I check? I should check the website. What would I be looking for at the same time? Like, like, uh, it should have been in that order, but it wasn't.

38:34 RTH: And does this seem like a thinky kind of a deal? Is this a cognitive...? [Sadie: Yeah.] So it's not like I'm visualizing vaguely the website. This is like, I'm cognizing about, [Sadie: Yeah.] and it's fairly complex in the sense that I should check the website and this is what I'm going to check, even though it's not specified exactly what it is that I'm going to check. [Sadie: Yeah.] And this whole thing is substantially less salient than the realized, realized portion. [Sadie: Yeah.] Did we give a number to that? It's like 60-40 or 90-10, or...?

39:25 Sadie: Um, it was definitely like, I don't know. Let's see. I feel like it was like 80-20 again.

39:42 RTH: Okay. Then I think I'm good.

39:42 Russ comments: This is only Sadie's second sampling day, so we are still developing the skills necessary for high fidelity descriptions, and still keeping alive the possibilities that Sadie is captured by some presuppositions about the nature of her inner experience. That said, there is a characteristic that seems to be emerging across this sampling day:

there is frequent thinking without words or imagery. This occurred with a range of clarity/specificity, so it might be worthwhile to review them here:

*Quite specific:*

10:00 "I knew that I was asking myself if that was true or not. Like I knew I was like trying to assess whether it was true or not, but I didn't, that, it was like, um, a very abstract knowing"

*Moderately specific:*

37:06 "I was vaguely thinking about checking the vaccine website. Um, but that was not like experienced, that was that's that was like not experienced as a sentence or something. Like, it was just like, just sort of amorously in my head."

*Nonspecific/Inchoate:*

25:55 "I had the, the, the sense that I was working something out, like I was thinking about something, but I don't know anything more specific than that."

*Thinking specific letters one after another but with no voice:*

32:36 "I was like, literally spelling it, like in, it was like r-e-l-e-a-s-e-d."

*Thinking a sound but with no hearing or speaking:*

26:52 "I'm definitely generating it, but it's nothing like hearing and... Yeah. I just know that I'm thinking of an s, a suh sound."

The DES object is to let the details of that characteristic emerge across sampling days, or to let what seems today to be an emerging characteristic simply fade away. We shall see.

39:44 AK: Me too. Number 6.

SAMPLE 2.6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

39:47 Sadie: Okay. I was so excited to tell you guys about this. [AK laughs] Um, I was hearing the Brandenburg Concerto Number 2, the first mov, the first movement. Um, I was right at the recorder solo. I know what beat, I was at the fifth beat of the recorder solo. And th that was like the end of the phrase. And that was the one that goes doo, doo doooo [trill or turn] dum. And that's where I was at, was the dum when it beeped.

39:47 Russ comments: This is the melody Sadie



refers to:

40:23 Sadie: So what, sorry, what were you listening to again? It cut out right as you said that you said I'm hearing some...

40:29 Sadie: It was a Brandenburg concerto, um, number two, the first movement. [AK: Okay.]

40:36 RTH: And are you saying Brandenburg is in Bach's Brandenburg. Concerto? [Sadie: Yeah.] Okay. You cut out, you cut out again.

40:44 AK: I know it keeps, it doesn't want me to hear that!

40:46 RTH: Skype, Skype doesn't want us to think about Bach, I guess! [they laugh]

40:52 AK: Okay. And so I think I finally got what we're listening to and where we're at. And what, what exactly is in your experience?

41:01 Sadie: It's just like the sort of hollow sound of like a period recorder, and on playing that note at the end of the phrase.

41:14 AK: And so is, is your experience of hearing, hearing the sound, and it *happens* to be sort of hollow? Or I'm sort of paying attention to, or noticing the hollow, hollowness of the sound?

41:34 Sadie: No, not really paying attention at all. I'm I just, uh, I just hear it.

41:39 AK: Um hmm. So that's the, I just hear it and it happens to have these qualities. I'm not picking them out. Does that?

41:44 Sadie: Yeah, definitely not picking them out.

41:47 RTH: So I missed the, in the breaking up. Is, is this, is this happening in real life? The actual sound is coming out of a speaker somewhere?

41:56 Sadie: No, but, but that...

41:58 AK: Oh! I thought that!

41:58 Sadie: No! No, no, no! I was, uh, it was just in playing in my head, like the internal radio station. [RTH: Okay.]

42:08 AK: Okay. Well that changes things for me!

42:12 Sadie: Sorry.

42:13 AK: No, no, that's fine. [RTH: It is that, the down...] 'Cause you just take it for granted. I just thought for sure we're...

42:19 RTH: It, it, I think it's a penalty of Skype or--and it's not *Skype's* problem--it's a penalty of this kind of communication. We wouldn't make that kind of a mistake. I don't think, if we were face to face with each other.

42:30 Sadie: Yeah. Yeah.

42:32 AK: Quite a bit is lost. Isn't it? Okay. So this is playing in my head. [Sadie: Yes!] Okay. And I'm at the fifth beat, it's a dum, dum sound or something.

42:41 Sadie: It's I mean, it's, uh, I just had to give it a syllable, so I could sing it for you. But it's um, it's the fifth beat of the recorder solo, um, and it's dah dah, dah, dah, dah, dah dum. And that was the last note that right before the beep.

43:01 AK: And w would you say I'm hearing that? I'm, I'm singing that? making that sound?

43:10 Sadie: I'm definitely hearing it. [AK: Okay.]

43:14 RTH: And have you heard this from the beginning of the movement?

43:18 Sadie: Yes. And I honestly think I was probably list...like heard, the previous movement before that too. [inaudible voice off camera].

43:18 Russ comments: We are talking about the first movement of Concerto #2, so what "the previous movement" refers to was not clear during the interview. On reviewing the transcript, Sadie said that she meant the final movement of Concerto #1, which precedes #2 in the recording.

43:36 AK: Hmm. And I mean, as best you can say, does it seem accurate? Like...,

43:40 Sadie: Yeah. It seems to...

43:40 AK: Like really like a radio playin' in your head.

43:43 Sadie: I pulled it up on my phone, the, the version I thought I was thinking about, and it was totally right. [AK: Hmm.] I mean, my husband's right here and he would attest to the fact that I listen to this version of the Brandenburg Concertos a lot.

44:00 AK: Cool. I was just going to ask that. I was like, okay, now I have to know, do y'know this well? Or is this just an amazing quirk?

44:06 Sadie's husband off camera: I can attest to the fact that she has a fantastic musical memory and can like pull out like details, like, from memory. [Sadie laughs] [RTH: Okay.]

44:17 AK: Okay. Is there anything else in your experience? I mean, including anything in the external world, anything you're doing?

44:25 Sadie: No, I'm just I'm walking at that moment, but it was just automatic walking. [AK: Okay.]

44:32 RTH: Inside walking? Outside walking?

44:33 Sadie: Outdoors.

44:34 RTH: And like on a little hike? Or ...

44:37 Sadie: No, that was like walk, crossing, um, like a concrete plaza.

44:42 RTH: Okay. And, and so you said that you maybe heard though the previous movement, the whole thing?

44:50 Sadie: Yeah, I think I did. I'm not sure though. But then after the beep I had to start over with that movement.

44:57 RTH: Okay. So the, so the experience at the moment is I'm hearing the beginning of the second movement as if I had already heard the beginning of, the *whole* of the first moment. [Sadie: Yes.] And whether I actually did hear the whole of the first movement, that's a different deal, but, but it *seems* like I'm hearing the second movement following the first movement. [Sadie: Yes.]

44:57 Russ comments: This continues the confusion between the first movement (as described in the initial description at 39:47) and the second movement (as mentioned at 43:43). The phrase she describes is actually part of the first movement.

45:20 [RTH continues] And a lot of people say they hear music in their head and it's just sort of a background-y kind of a thing, and they're not really paying attention to it. Is, is this a background-y thing for you? Or are you sort of listening to it purposefully?

45:36 Sadie: I wasn't listening to it purposely, but it was definitely pretty salient.

45:44 RTH: Okay. And some people, when they hear music, they say it's repetitive. Like I've been hearing this over and over and over again. Is that, um,

45:52 Sadie: I mean, no, it wasn't repetitive. That was the first time that day I was listening to [laughs] that piece.

46:02 RTH: So I'm semi-intently listening because for whatever reason, I'm sort of interested in, in this piece for...so I'm gonna play it for myself. [Sadie: Yeah.] [AK: Hmm.] And, and am I listening particularly to the recorder? Or is it that the recorder happens to be the, the primary instrument being played right now?

46:29 Sadie: Yeah, I think it was, I mean, I guess I don't know the score, but I think it was only the recorder playing at that moment. So I wasn't listening for the recorder, like the whole time. I just... That's what was playing.

46:41 RTH: And, and does that mean, and I can't remember the, how this piece goes that accurately. So does that mean that the rest of the orchestra has stopped playing for the moment and the recorder has continued?

46:53 Sadie: Yeah, I think no one's doing like basso continuo or anything. I think it's just the recorder being playing.

47:00 RTH: Okay. And so it's not like you've abstracted the recorder out from it. It's that Bach wanted you to hear only the recorder at this time. And so he only *wrote* a recorder at this time, and the orchestra is just playing it.

47:11 Sadie: Yeah, exactly.

47:11 Russ comments: We will return to discuss this exchange below.

- 47:13 RTH: Okay. [AK: I'm good, then.] I think I'm good, too. Well, is, is this, is this experience similar to, or different from if you were, if you had played this version on your stereo at home?
- 47:39 Sadie: Um, only in that, it, it was like... It *is* different and I wanna say like, maybe it's like, like it's more distant? Um, just not as... It's like not... It's I wanna say *quieter*, but that's not quite right.
- 48:00 RTH: Doesn't have as much presence?
- 48:02 Sadie: Doesn't have as much presence. Yeah.
- 48:07 RTH: And, and it is specifically this particular version of the Brandenburg Concerto that you're listening to. And who, which version is it? Whose version is it?
- 48:19 Sadie: It is. And I actually had to check a few, like, I think I sang it or like, yeah. And then it, and then I checked a few to find out which version it was, and it is Academy of St. Martins in the Fields.
- 48:42 RTH: And, and, and was that part of your experience? [Sadie: No.] So it's not like at the moment I'm listening to St. Martin's. It's at the [Sadie: later (inaudible)] at the moment of the beep I'm listening, I'm just listening to this piece and, and the version that I happen to be listening to happens to be the Academy of St. Martins in the Fields version.
- 49:02 Sadie: Yeah. Which is the one I mostly listened to in real life, too. [AK: Hm. Interesting.] [RTH: Okay.] Those pieces are my favorite pieces.
- 49:19 RTH: They are totally my favorite pieces, too. As a trumpet player, the Brandenburg number 2 is always the, y'know, if you can play that with finesse, man, then you've, you've arrived there somewhere.
- 49:37 Sadie: It's very high, it sounds like.
- 49:42 RTH: Yes it is.

49:42 Russ comments: This discussion of the Brandenburg Concerto provides a fascinating opportunity to glimpse the veridicality of inner experience descriptions. For the reader who would like to follow along carefully, the recording that Sadie is referring to is Sir Neville Marriner conducting the Academy of St. Martin in the Fields, which can be found on YouTube at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PUbjXQEknJM>. In that YouTube recording, the first movement of Concerto #2 starts at 19:10 (the second movement starts at 24:06); the phrase Sadie discusses is at 21:34. The score for Brandenburg Concerto #2 can be found at <https://musopen.org/music/3499-brandenburg-concerto-no-2-in-f-major-bwv-1047/>; the passage we are interested in is at the top of p. 39.

Sadie (a) believes herself at the moment of the beep to be re-hearing the original just as it originally was (see 43:18; 43:40); and (b) what she hears is an

unaccompanied recorder (see 46:29 to 47:13). However, the phrase that Sadie says she is hearing at the moment of the beep is actually a recorder accompanied by violin and basso continuo. That is, Sadie's characterization of how her experience conforms to reality is mistaken. And the facts that she has stated her characterization with confidence and with detail does not change its mistakenness.

On that basis, one might conclude that Sadie is an unreliable participant and therefore we should abandon her participation. We think that would be an unwarranted and unfortunate over-reaction. Yes, Sadie is mistaken about whether her experience conforms to reality, but I have been saying quite publicly for years (decades, really) that people's inner experience does not always conform to reality, and that people are often mistaken about the features of their own inner experience. So the present situation is absolutely not surprising.

I think if psychological science / experiential science / neuroscience / the human condition in general is to advance, we have to accept that these kinds of anomalies / inaccuracies are frequent features of inner experience. Science for the most part overlooks them or, worse, systematically misrepresents them. For example, any questionnaire that inquires about inner experience pretends that respondents have direct and unmistakable access to their own experience.

Eric Schwitzgebel, in our 2007 book, wrote a longish discussion that begins:

Mid-twentieth-century philosophers, despite the skepticism about introspection that was commonplace in research psychology, commonly accepted something like Cartesian introspective infallibility or incorrigibility (e.g., Lewis, 1946; Ewing, 1951; Ayer, 1963; Shoemaker, 1963; Rorty, 1970), often supporting their claims by appeal to the example of pain. How could one be mistaken, or justifiably correctible by an outside observer, in the judgment that one is, or is not, in severe pain? (Schwitzgebel, in Hurlburt & Schwitzgebel, 2007, p. 42)

He then gave the later-twentieth-century arguments against that view, arriving at this conclusion:

Thus, the debate between fallibilists and infallibilists within philosophy has almost always been conducted under the shared assumption that introspection – that is, whatever process(es) drive our ordinary judgments about our currently ongoing or immediately past conscious experience – is a broadly trustworthy method, at least in favorable circumstances. No prominent philosopher has clearly and unequivocally put forward a case for thinking that we often go grossly wrong about our current conscious experiences, even in calm and ordinary circumstances of extended reflection....

Why should philosophers – an ornery lot who rarely reach general consensus about anything – almost universally regard the introspection of one's ongoing phenomenology, or stream of experience, as trustworthy and reliable? (Schwitzgebel, in Hurlburt & Schwitzgebel, 2007, pp. 44-45)

In short, I think exploration of the accuracy or fidelity of access to and descriptions of inner experience is a big deal, and when opportunities arise, facing them straight on is of great value. But such exploration is not easy, and it requires a method and attention to detail at least somewhat like what we are doing together.

Back to Bach. Sadie was confident that she innerly heard a veridical replay of the Brandenburg Concerto #2. It turns out that her confidence was unwarranted. This is *not*, in the world according to Hurlburt, a criticism of Sadie—*everyone* (possibly excepting those who are genuinely enlightened) is confident but mistaken about some aspects of their inner experience. In fact, in the world according to Hurlburt, Sadie's action here is highly praiseworthy: she exposed her confidence to public view, which opened up the possibility of discovering that it was unwarranted, and that (it seems to me) is a valuable contribution.

The bottom line: this kind of detail is, in my view, exquisitely interesting and hugely worth the substantial effort necessarily expended by all concerned.

The main cited reference here is Hurlburt, R. T., & Schwitzgebel, E. (2007). *Describing inner experience? Proponent meets skeptic*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

49:43 [RTH continues] Okay. So I think we are a done deal for today. [AK: Um hmm.] And I would like to do this again, if everybody else would like to do this again, [Sadie: Really.] [AK: Yeah, I'd love to.] And I will leave it up to you all to figure out when that's going to be. And, uh, and I will set about doing what I usually do and make a transcript, which I, I think I'm still working on.... I have I sent the first transcript?... I guess I have sent the first transcript.

50:08 AK: I think so. Yeah.

50:10 Sadie: Yeah, you posted it. You guys didn't believe me! [laughs]

50:10 Russ comments: Yes, we didn't believe at least parts of Sadie's descriptions on her first sampling day, and (as just discussed), we didn't believe at least parts of her descriptions on her second sampling day, either. I re-emphasize that this is not a criticism of Sadie, but rather must be a characteristic of the DES method (or any other method that values fidelity of description). Part of the DES art is gradually (DES would call it "iteratively") to increase the conformity of description to actual experience. An important piece of that art is to cultivate in ourselves and our participants the preference for truth (or fidelity) over opinion / presupposition. (As the current political situation makes clear, that is not a trivial endeavor.)

50:13 RTH: Have we sent it to Sadie? [AK: Yeah, I think so.] The first transcript.

50:20 AK: Yeah. I think when you included in the email about the site, I think.

50:27 RTH: Yeah. There's sort of a lot going on and I can't remember., But I'm planning on doing that again, whatever it is I did before, I'll do again! [they laugh]. Alright. Well, thank you very much. I look forward to doing this again.

50:44 Sadie: Yeah.

50:45 AK: Have a nice weekend guys and gals.

50:45 Sadie: You too!

50:46 RTH: Thanks. See you.