

TRANSCRIPT WITH COMMENTARY

Phil J.: A neuroscience writer

Phil Interview 8

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the July 5 interview with Phil that is available on YouTube at https://youtu.be/wWM_9bHQ3gE. 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

CK = Cody Kaneshiro

AG = Amber Goto

Phil = Phil J.

0:01 Phil: Good morning.

0:02 RTH: Good morning. How are you?

0:03 CK: Morning, Phil.

0:04 Phil: Good morning. Seems like the audio's working alright?

0:11 RTH: Every, everything looks good at the moment.

0:14 Phil: Yeah.

0:16 RTH: So this is gonna be day 7.

0:19 Phil: I think it's 8.

0:22 RTH: Is that right? I think that, I think you're right about that. I think it is day 8.

0:29 Phil: Yep. Cuz I put 7 for the last one, so, and I had 8. Yep.

0:35 RTH: Okay. And anything we should be talking about before we launch into the beeps?

0:42 Phil: Um, no, I, I still, I don't have the, um, the volume control, but I just didn't I just used it with the existing earphone, and it was, it was okay. It was okay. Still, it startles me a little bit, but uh, but I don't think it got in the way of anything.

1:02 RTH: I'm looking into rebuilding the beepers with it, different volume control so. Most, most people find it okay, but not everybody so. [Phil: Mm hmm.] So I'm, I'm in the process of trying to solve that problem. But I'm ready to go to number 1 if everybody else is.

SAMPLE 8.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 1:24 Phil: Yep. Um, okay. So beep 1. [Reads from notes.] I was taking, um, puppy Max for a walk. But it had been more like he was taking me for a walk because he was pulling on the leash so much. We were about to exit a trail that we had been walking on through the woods. And um, I noticed he was pulling a little bit less on the leash, but still pulling, nonetheless. At the moment before the beep, I was saying to him out loud, “you’re still pulling.” But at the same time I was innerly saying with words, “but not as much.” [finishes reading]
- 2:02 RTH: “But not as much”?
- 2:03 Phil: “But not as much.” Yep.
- 2:09 RTH: And you’re saying *out loud*, “you’re still pulling”?
- 2:15 Phil: That’s correct.
- 2:17 RTH: And when you say “at the same time,” do you mean, “but not as much” finishes that sentence? Or does it seem like those are actually simultaneous like the external voice is saying “you’re still pulling” and the internal voice is saying at the same time, “but not as much”?
- 2:31 Phil: I would say simultaneous. Yep.
- 2:34 RTH: So not a sequ, not, not one sentence broken up half an inner speech and half an outer speech, but two simultaneous sentences that?
- 2:45 Phil: That’s how I recall it. Yes.
- 2:50 RTH: And then the...
- 2:51 Phil: I kinda just, sometimes I kind of just, sometimes I speak to him a little bit here and there as we walk, because I don’t know. I think it’s, um, positive reinforcement, so I just kind of say anything.
- 3:07 RTH: Okay. And, and when you say that you were noticing that he was pulling, “but not as much,” is that the context for what’s in your experience or is that I’m still noticing that at the moment of the beep?
- 3:22 Phil: I thought about that. I thought about that. And um, it, it, the pulling, the amount of pulling was not apparent to me at the moment, right before the beep.
- 3:34 RTH: So at the moment, right before the beep there are two verbal things going on in your experience, simultaneously, one inner and one outer?
- 3:44 Phil: Yup.
- 3:45 RTH: And, and we have debated from time to time the notion of inner speech versus inner hearing, as far as the “but not so much is that”? [inaudible]

4:03 Phil: It felt like I was, it felt like I was, I felt like I was saying that, but to kind of, to myself, like as an observation to myself, not to him.

4:19 RTH: So two speakings, one outer and one inner, both simultaneous [inaudible]?

4:23 Phil: There is a chance, okay. There is a chance I might have, I don't think it was like, I was finishing my own sentence, but there is a chance that I, I might've said, um. But not as like, it might have been overlap and like "you're still pulling," but as I get to the word pulling, I, I, I start thinking, "but not as much." Something like that.



Figure 1 Overlapping experiences

4:23 Comment: Compare sample 6.7.

4:52 RTH: And, and is, is that a *theoretical* statement or an *observational* statement, I guess that, does it seem like they're overlapping, so they're not starting at the same time, but overlapping?

5:04 Phil: Possibly. Yes.

5:08 RTH: And I'm, I'm interested in the word *possibly* there. Is that *possibly* because, because, well, theoretically it seems like that's the way it ought to be, that the, "you're still pulling..."

5:17 Phil: I'm, I'm trying my best to recall.

5:20 RTH: Okay.

5:21 Phil: Yeah.

5:28 RTH: Then I think I'm, I'm good. Anybody else have any questions about that, that, about that sample?

5:38 Phil: Okay and good morning, Amber.

5:42 CK: I do have a quick question about the, actually about both of these verbally said, uh, sentences, I guess you would call it phrases. But for you, Phil, is there anything to be said about any of the characteristics about that? Like, y' know, "you're not pulling" exclamation point or, "but not as much" exclamation point or something in terms of just the vocal characteristics of that?

6:08 Phil: Oh, um, nothing significant to report about the intonation of either of those just "you're still *pulling*." I guess maybe there was a bit of intonation there, but, um, when I thought, "but not as much," I remember it as though it was kind of observational, like, "but not as much" just quite casual, relaxed.

6:38 CK: Got it. Okay. Then I am good on this beep.

6:41 Phil: Okay.

6:41 RTH: Number 2.

SAMPLE 8.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

6:45 Phil: Um, [reads from notes] there was an. [breaks off from reading] Yeah I thought, I think this is the most interesting one for me anyway. Um, [reads from notes] there was an internet service outage and I tried reconnecting. On my screen, I was looking at the network name in the list with the little wifi symbol. And at the moment before the beep, I vaguely was innerly saying to myself “sometimes it’s really.” But I, I don’t clearly know what this thought was, but I felt like I was like, I was, I felt like I was talking to Eva-stina. Um, even though she wasn’t present, uh, just prior I had been pondering the possibility that the network password had been changed by the family who lives upstairs, who we share the internet service with, and that we might need to find out from them if that’s the case. So maybe it was that I was thinking something like, *sometimes it’s really the case that we need to talk to them* [finishes reading] (about the service outage and see if we need a new password or if they got a new, a different service or something). But yeah, I said, I, I innerly said to myself and I know it was with words. Um, “sometimes it’s really.” But I, I is incomplete and I, I don’t know, I don’t know where I was going with that. [CK: Okay.] But it did, it did feel like I was talking, I remember *not* hearing. And it was like, I was, it was somehow like I was saying it to Eva-stina.

8:31 CK: Okay. Earlier you had used the word *vaguely* I think when you first started this?

8:37 Phil: Yes.

8:38 CK: And I wanted, I was curious about what *vaguely* meant. It seemed to me that you’re pretty clear by the end of this, that this, like, as you said, was like an, innerly said fragment to Eva-stina. But you know, is that, is there something more to be said the, the *vaguely*?

8:38 Comment: A DES maxim is: *It is not about the words*. There may come a time that it is desirable to ask about the meaning of the word *vaguely*, but RTH thinks there is much about the experience that should be explored before getting specific about the words.

Phil’s opening lines can be understood as a first draft, and together we will edit, eventually (if all goes well) coming to a satisfactory shared understanding of the experience. That shared understanding *might* be somewhat or entirely different from the first draft, might use the word *vaguely* or might not. The risk of starting with the word rather than aiming at the experience is that it constrains the exploration of the experience.

See the discussions at 39:28 and 40:32.

The way you discover whether a question was good or not is by observing the response. If Phil’s response seems to reflect a straightforward but deeper grasp of experience, then the question was a good one.

- 8:57 Phil: It had a very sort of distant or quiet feel to it. Like or slow or. Yeah, I don't know.
- 8:57 Comment: To my ear, Phil's demeanor says that CK's 8:38 question was on the wrong track.
- 9:15 CK: And is that distant, quiet, slowness about the, the, the way that I'm, innerly saying this or the, or perhaps the way I'm hearing it or the vocal characteristics of it, or some?
- 9:15 Comment: Phil's 8:57 response was, to my ear, primarily "I don't know," but CK pushes on.
- 9:32 Phil: Maybe all of those? [laughs] [CK: Difficult...] Or, well, you can't say and hear something, but, um, yeah. Or maybe not, uh, there was no, the tone I was using wasn't very confident or.
- 9:32 Comment: When Phil gives a philosophical response ("well, you can't say and hear something") and then its opposite ("or maybe not"), then I think we are pretty much on the wrong road.
- 9:51 RTH: So would *musingly* be as good as *vaguely*?
- 9:55 Phil: Would what?
- 9:57 RTH: The word *musingly* be a good substitute for *vaguely*?
- 10:02 Phil: Yeah, I think it could. I think it could,
- 10:05 RTH: But not exactly,
- 10:06 Phil: But not exactly. It was kind of like, as, as I remember it, it was like, "sometimes it's really."
- 10:21 CK: Sort of like, and is that sort of that positive?
- 10:24 Phil: I also I, sorry to interrupt. But I, I also apply, I think I might have applied the word vague in my description because I didn't know what I was saying. Like there, it, it, it's a phrase without any alluding to anything or any conclusion or any premise or.
- 10:43 CK: And that, that lack of clarity, it sounds like, is sort of, it's sort of like that what comes with follows "sometimes it's really" is the, maybe perhaps the vague part, right. That the *it* part of it that *it's* really it's like, well, *what's* really? That wasn't present to you at the moment,. It, is that correct?
- 11:03 Phil: Yep. That could have been part of it. Yes.
- 11:05 CK: But the, "sometimes it's really" was pretty clearly an innerly spoken sort of, [Phil: Yeah.] innerly spoken phenomena.

- 11:14 Phil: Yes.
- 11:15 CK: Okay. And I, again, you were saying, this is innerly spoken. Is there.... And when you say, y'know, it felt like you were talking to Eva-stina, how, how was that present to you?
- 11:29 Phil: It, it was like, um, well, it wasn't like I was speaking to her because I wasn't speaking out loud, but it was like, I was think, like. In a context where she's in the room and I say something to her, or I think about something I'm about to say to her. It was this presence of some of, of a directedness towards her for some reason.
- 11:57 CK: And by directedness, is that like a, like literally there, I like, y'know, it feels as though I, I'm saying it and it's going that way or, or that way?
- 12:09 Phil: No, no, not no spatial aspect to it [CK: Okay.] it's just directed at her in particular.
- 12:15 CK: I'm addressing Eva-stina the, the, this, this sometimes it's really is directed to Eva-stina?
- 12:20 Phil: I'm addressing Eva-stina. Sure. [CK: Okay. Okay.] Yes. Yep.
- 12:30 CK: And that stuff that you had said about, y'know, that the neighbors possibly changed the password or that you shared, that, that I took you to be saying most of that is context, correct? Like there's, [Phil: Yeah.] the neighbors stuff isn't really part of my experience?
- 12:43 Phil: No.
- 12:44 CK: And, okay. So at the moment of the beep I'm, innerly a, I'm innerly speaking. And by that, I mean, I'm addressing, Eva-stina saying "sometimes it's really," and that's pretty much it at, at the moment, the beep, if that's correct?
- 13:03 Phil: Yep. Yep. Think that's quite accurate.
- 13:03 **Comment:** I think our questioning about this beep was almost entirely heading down the wrong paths, and as a result we never really explored the heart of this experience, which is that Phil was innerly saying something that, even though it was in words, Phil did not know what he was meaning. "Sometimes it's really" was inner words without directly apprehended meaning.
 On other occasions, Phil has experienced meaning without words (or with words only very minimally present). For example, in sample 7.4 Phil looking at a picture and was wondering *whether a particular building was still there*. There, the meaning was clear and the words were minimally present if at all. Here, the situation is reversed. The words are clear ("sometimes it's really") but Phil does not apprehend the meaning. Our interview did not clarify those distinctions.
- 13:06 CK: Anyone else have any other questions?

13:06 RTH: Good to me.

13:11 CK: Okay.

13:11 RTH: Number 3.

SAMPLE 8.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

13:19 Phil: Okay. Uh, okay, [reads from notes] I was reading a portion of a carton of orange juice that said, (like, it was a little box in the bottom, on, in the corner, on the bottom) that said “*ena fem om dagen*” which, (um, well, I’ll tell you in a moment). I, I was pondering the translation, and the *ena fem* was e, was easy. It means *one of five*. And at the instant before the beep, I had just registered the meaning of *om dagen*, although not perfectly. I, I realized that it meant something like *per day* or *a day* as in “one in five a day.” So it was like other healthy eating campaigns I’ve seen on food labels before. [to Eva-stina, who enters the picture] Hello. [laughs] [Eva-stina off camera: Hello.] Um, but this was without actually innerly saying *om dagen* or *per day* or *a day* or campaign. [finishes reading] So it was without any speech inner speech or anything whatsoever.

14:25 RTH: So I’m, I’m not a hundred percent sure that I’ve got that. So lemme, lemme tell you what I’ve got. So I’m, I’m reading the orange juice thing and the process of translating it or trying, is it translating or figuring out what it means?

14:41 Phil: Um, I think I had translated it and I guess it’s more accurate to say I was trying to figure out what it meant.

14:51 RTH: And I’m trying to figure out... I, I’ve already figured out one word and now I’m trying to figure out another word and I’ve got sort of a rough idea of it. Or an approximate idea, is that right?

15:06 Phil: Yeah. Yes.

15:11 RTH: You don’t sound too sure of that.

15:13 Phil: It’s quite difficult to describe, actually, now that, now that I’m in a situation where I’m actually trying to do that. [RTH: Right.] Uh, so I got the first part of the translation. And then it was the last two words, the *per day* or *a day*. And I, I, I realized what it was trying to say, but I didn’t actually translate the words. [RTH: So...] Or translate or, or like, like, innerly say the words or yeah, I saw it. I kinda saw it visually and I knew what it meant or I, there was, it took me a, a, it took me a moment, but it, I realized what it meant. And that was just prior to the beep was when I realized what it meant.

16:06 RTH: And to realize what it meant, I’m gathering, It’s not in words, it’s not like this word means that word. It’s that I now recognize the meaning of these. I now, I now under, I now understand myself as knowing what these words mean, even though I’m not articulating those words to myself?

16:28 Phil: Yeah. It was, I think it was more like, I realize that this is another healthy eating campaign.

16:41 RTH: So that's a little bit away from the words themselves to the sort of the broader intention of the words.

16:50 Phil: Yes, you're correct.

16:53 RTH: So what I'm *realizing* is the sort of the bigger picture of the words. Now I've gotten through the, I've gotten through the words themselves, and now I am encountering what I take to be the bigger message?

17:09 Phil: It, I think it's possible that it was a little bit of both.

17:17 RTH: But none of it verbal?

17:19 Phil: None of it verbal. [RTH: So i'm recog...] The verbal aspects, there was a verbal aspect. But I would say, as I rec, recollect, the verbal aspects took place a moment before.

17:39 RTH: And the verbal aspect was about the *Norwegian* word? Not about the *English* word translation of it is that right? So I'd read the, I'd read the *Norwegian* word, I *recognize* what that means without articulating in English what it means, and I recognize that the whole thing is part of a larger message about healthful drinking?

18:04 Phil: Okay, okay I think it gets complicated. I, if I, if I remember correctly, I *did* translate into English. Um, the first portion that was "one, one of five" or "one in five," "one of five," but the, it was the *om dagen* that I had a little bit of difficulty with. And then that part I didn't translate into English I was just looking at it and then I, I had this realization that it was *per day* or whatever, and that I put it all together and, and realized this was a healthy eating campaign.

18:48 RTH: And the, the part of it is that the realization of *per day*, is that in words, *quote per day*? [Phil: No.] So I realize what it means without articulating those words...

19:03 Phil: Correct.

19:04 RTH: ...and I realized this is part of a healthy eating campaign?

19:09 Phil: Yes.

19:10 RTH: And there's no words there either?

19:12 Phil: Correct. I do, I do remember that. Yeah.

19:18 RTH: Okay.

- 19:19 Phil: It was kind of a, a visual thing. Like I just, I looked at the *om dagen* and then I, I sorta put that last part together and then I put the bigger picture together and I had this realization that the... I *do* remember that there were no words.
- 19:37 RTH: When you said it's a visual thing, do you mean that what I'm seeing on the carton? [Phil: Seeing the words on the...] As opposed to some visualization of a campaign and?
- 19:48 Phil: Right. Yeah. Looking at the words on the carton.
- 19:54 RTH: Okay.
- 19:55 Phil: Yeah.
- 19:59 RTH: So lemme say what I've got and you tell me whether this is right. I, I'm looking at the words on the carton, I translate in words, I look at the Norwegian and say, well, this is and say to myself, "one in five" or "one of five" or something like that. That's that part's in words and also slightly before the beep. And then at *the beep*, I'm looking at *om dagen*, trying to work out what that means. And as I, as I do that, it comes to me, but *not* in words, this means *per day* or *a day* or something like that. *And* I recognize that this is part of a healthy eating campaign?
- 20:33 Phil: Yeah. Yup.
- 20:36 RTH: Then I think I'm good.
- 20:39 CK: Me as well.
- 20:40 Phil: Yeah. Okay. Um.
- 20:46 CK: Alright, yeah. Beep four.

SAMPLE 8.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 20:49 Phil: Okay. [Reads from notes] Max (I guess, it was a lot of Max this time) Max was trying to get up onto the bench that I was sitting on outside. Um, he was awkwardly squirming underneath the armrest beside me. I tried to pull him up and simultane, and while simultaneously trying to pull his leash or cable, that he was on to see if it was caught on something or not. And I, I had innerly said "it might be" as in, "it might be stuck." Um, but the instant right before the beep, I was pulling the cable while holding him in place while he was mostly already up on the bench. Visually, I was focused on the cable while trying to move it. [finishes reading]
- 21:38 CK: So lemme see if I got this right, Phil. There at the moment of the beep there are three things going on?
- 21:46 Phil: No, I, I, I, maybe I gave some unnecessary context there. Um, at the moment of the beep I, I, I remember I was just, I, I was holding him and I was looking at the cable

underneath the table in front of me. And I was, I was pulling it to see if there was enough slack that he could actually get up on the bench with me.

- 22:10 CK: And is there also the innerly said portion. Was that at the moment or was that?
- 22:15 Phil: That, that was prior.
- 22:16 CK: Okay.
- 22:17 Phil: Yeah.
- 22:19 CK: So at the moment of the beep, this is maybe two simultaneous parts of a single action, like I'm holding Max and pulling the cable?
- 22:36 Phil: Yeah.
- 22:37 CK: Am I getting, I just wanna make sure that I'm getting I'm understanding what was present at the moment of the beep?
- 22:42 Phil: Oh yeah. [CK: Okay, okay.] Yes.
- 22:45 CK: And I guess that's my question first is does this feel like sort of two separate things that I'm doing, or is this sort of one thing, or does that not make sense?
- 22:55 Phil: I was, I was more focused on pulling on the cable.
- 23:00 CK: And more meaning like, you know, 90-10 or?
- 23:05 Phil: Um, yes.
- 23:09 CK: Something like that. Pretty strong, pretty, [Phil: Yeah.] a lot more into the pulling of the cable.
- 23:14 Phil: Yeah. Cuz it was cuz he, he was really trying to get up and I didn't want him to be like choking himself or something cuz, or trying in vain to squirm up. So there was an, a bit of urgency to the situation. So I just, I reached down kind of fast and I, I was pulling on that cable to see if there was some slack cuz it seemed like it was tight. So it was kind of a, a visual experience of looking at it as I was pulling it, to see if, um, if, if... There was a *knot* in it and I guess what I was doing, I'm just saying this now is if I pulled it, I would notice that knot move closer towards me. And that would be an immediate sign that there was, there was some slack and along with my ability to actually pull it forward. [CK: So that makes it sound...] I don't know if I've muddied the waters with this one but.
- 24:17 CK: No, well, maybe we'll, we'll see, we'll try. That's what we're, that's what this is all about is trying to figure out, right. So this, does it make sense to say that the pulling of the cable is sort of the context, and what's really in my experience is I'm seeing the

cable and how much slack there is on it? This is more about me *seeing* it versus *pulling*?

- 24:50 Phil: I guess it was a combination of seeing it and it, it's. [sighs] (it's very bright orange, it's very visually apparent) and um, and my actually pulling on it to, to see if it, if, uh, if there is slack. Like an analytical kinda thing.
- 25:16 CK: So that makes it sound like there's sort of a, an assessment portion. So maybe let's, let's try again and take a step back [Phil: Okay.] to start over from the beginning. So at the moment of the beep, in the real world, right, I'm pulling on the cable and I'm trying to get Max up onto the chair. [Phil: Yeah.] And at the moment what's, in my experience, the pulling the cable bit is there, it might be co, it might be sort of an analytical process of figuring out how much slack there is. It might be a visual kind of a thing of seeing the cable and how much slack there is. And there might be a physical component to the actual pulling of it?
- 26:03 Phil: Yeah. Yeah.
- 26:06 RTH: So can I ask one question about that? [CK: Yeah.] So is your, is your experience primarily visual or primarily kinesthetic, bodily, motional?
- 26:17 Phil: I would say it's a mixture of both.
- 26:21 RTH: Pretty, pretty evenly a mixture of both?
- 26:23 Phil: I think so. [RTH: Okay.] Yeah.
- 26:27 CK: And of that mixture is the, is the analytical portion of that context? Or is that something that's also directly present there too? So there's sort of three equally present components to this pulling on the cable?
- 26:41 Phil: I think it was present to me because I wanted to see as quickly as I could, if, if there was, if there was some slack. So I want to know if there is some slack and I'm doing this to figure it out.
- 26:59 CK: And, and so, and what you mean by that is to say that it's, um... Shucks I, I had it and then I lost it. [Phil: Oh.] I can see if I can find it again.
- 27:11 RTH: So lemme, lemme let ask the question. So what, what I think Cody's trying to get at here is whether there's the experience of *thinking about this* or whether that's...?
- 27:23 Phil: Yes. There was, there was this, this, something that was present to me was, was, um, the issue of whether or not there was slack in the cable. And I'm, I'm doing this to see if there is. But there is this, without words, *is there enough slack in the cable?*
- 27:43 RTH: And that, uh, that is a mental kind of a process that is not just in the pulling of the cable. I am pulling the cable *and at the same time* I am wondering whether there's enough slack or trying to figure out whether there's enough slack?

27:59 Phil: Right.

27:59 RTH: It's not just that the pulling is, is *itself* a way of determining whether there's enough slack.

28:16 Phil: [tentatively] Correct. I think. You might have to rephrase that.

28:22 RTH: So the, it's a difficult thing to do. So let's try it this way. If we could abstract out the pulling, is there still, other than the bodily portion, some kind of a mental working out about the slackness?

28:39 Phil: Yes. Yeah. I think that's what I've been trying to say.

28:42 RTH: Okay. So...

28:42 CK: That was, that was what my question was. And then I, I had lost the direction, I believe.

28:47 RTH: It's a tricky, tricky thing to do. [Phil: Yeah.] So there, there really are sort of three aspects of this experience. There's a mental aspect, there's a visual aspect and there's a bodily pulling aspect, but it's all the same thing. My bag of bones is trying to work out whether there's enough slack here?

29:06 Phil: Yeah, yup.

29:09 CK: Sure. Um, and then there's the *holding Max* portion of this, right, Phil? [Phil: Right.] Is there, um, how is that present to you?

29:24 Phil: It's almost as, almost as if I want to say it really, it, it *wasn't*. It was state of the world kinda thing. I was, I guess it had to do with the, my, my slightly awkward position that I was in. I don't know.

29:43 CK: So, so much more as in like, like kind of using the same line of question as Dr. Hurlburt just asked. Is like, if we abstract away the pulling of the cable, is there anything left of the holding of Max or is that mostly a fact of the universe?

29:56 Phil: I, I would say it's mostly a fact of the universe. [CK: Okay.] I don't remember like feeling his weight or like, yeah... No, I was, I was very focused on the cable.

30:10 CK: Obviously I'm holding Max, I'm not dropping him, right. I'm not, [Phil: Right.] I, I am holding him, but that's not directly present to me?

30:18 Phil: No.

30:19 CK: Aside I, or, or I should say that's not part of my experience, cuz my experience is wrapped up in the pulling of the, the cable?

- 30:26 Phil: Yep.
- 30:28 CK: Okay. Then I think I'm good.
- 30:31 RTH: Uh, I had one last question. So the, the cable is bright orange, you said?
- 30:36 Phil: Yes.
- 30:36 RTH: And, and I'm wondering whether that is a significant part of your experience or is that just a bit, sorta like the dog I guess. The fact of the matter is that the cable is orange, but I'm interested in the slackness of the cable, not the orangeness of or is it...?
- 30:52 Phil: No, I, I I've seen that cable a lot lately. I'm not, I was not particularly interested in the orangeness of it.
- 30:59 RTH: Okay. Then I'm good. Number 5.

SAMPLE 8.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 31:04 Phil: Um [laughs] okay. [reads from notes] I had just heard what sounded like a sneeze coming from outside, from outside a nearby open window, (relative to where I, I actually am right now). Um, it surprised me and instantly I realized it sounded like a person had just said "*duck shoe!*" "*duck shoe.*" At the moment right before the beep I reactively innerly replayed the sound of the, I replayed the sound of the sneeze, but this time, although it sounded the same, it had the quality of somebody actually saying "*duck shoe!*"
- 31:53 RTH: So at the moment of the beep this is an inner replay, you are hearing it again?
- 31:58 Phil: Yup.
- 32:00 RTH: And does this, does this seem on the second, at the moment of the beep experience, does it seem like this is a inside Phil deal? Or does it seem like I'm hearing it outside the window again?
- 32:13 Phil: It, it felt like an inside Phil deal.
- 32:16 RTH: Okay. And so I'm, I'm *innerly* replaying what I had heard, and it sounds exact, and so this is an auditory phenomenon, this is I'm *hearing* it?
- 32:26 Phil: Yeah. Yeah.
- 32:28 RTH: And I'm hearing it the same way as it sounded *before*, except that *now* I have I'm recognizing that there's this "*duck shoe*"?
- 32:43 Phil: It sounded, it.... Yeah. It sounded... Acoustically it sounded the same, but in, in, well it still sounded like a sneeze and I knew it was still a sneeze, but it, it had this quality of somebody actually saying "*duck shoe*" as best I can describe it.

33:00 RTH: Okay. So it sounds like... It *sounds* the same, but now it has some semantic meaning that it didn't have before.

33:13 Phil: Yup, sure.

33:15 RTH: Okay.

33:15 Phil: It sounded like words instead of a sneeze.

33:29 RTH: Okay. And, and because I'm gonna have to write this down a little, how does one write "duck shoe"?

33:37 Phil: Duck, (quack, quack).

33:39 RTH: D-U-C-K?

33:41 Phil: D-U-C-K. Yep. And then "shoe" as in what you put on your foot.

33:49 RTH: And, but these are, these are words in, in Norwegian that have some other meaning, is that?

33:54 Phil: No. [laughs]

33:57 RTH: Okay. So, so you are hearing, you are hearing *English* words, which is probably not what the guy outside the window actually was saying? [Phil: No!] So you've made up sort of a nonsense phrase, "duck shoe" is that right?

34:13 Phil: Yes.

34:14 RTH: In huh. So I've, so I hear what is, so what, and as best you can tell was the guy, was it really a sneeze, the guy has sneezed?

34:27 Phil: I I, I *guess* so. I gu, I can't, I have no way to verify that, [laughs] [RH: Alright.] but I think it's likely,

34:36 RTH: But it's, it seems like it's probably not likely that the guy actually said "duck shoe"?

34:40 Phil: No. [laughs]

34:42 RTH: [laughs] Okay. So, so you've, you've put a meaning on to this sound that, that probably wasn't there in the first place might have been, maybe the guy was outside saying "duck shoe", but... [Phil: Probably not.] But probably not. [they laugh] Okay. And, so now, *but* now, but now you are hearing it as if this guy is saying "duck shoe"?

35:15 Phil: Yes.

35:18 RTH: Alright. I think I'm good.

35:21 CK: Me as well.

35:21 Comment: We have seen instances where inner words occur without meaning (e.g., sample 8.2: “sometimes it’s really”); where meaning occurs without (inner or outer) words (e.g., sample 8.3, the *part of a healthy eating campaign* thinking); where inner rehearsing occurs with a change in semantic meaning (e.g., the present sample 8.5 and also 6.2).

SAMPLE 8.6 DISCUSSION BEGINS HERE

35:25 Phil: Okay. I, beep 6. [reads from notes] I was on the sofa (another Max one), and Max had worked himself up onto it and started spazzing out on me. Lipping, uh, licking, nipping, barking, and growling. He had his head between me and the sofa cushion behind me and, and was growling. Right before the beep, at the moment (just instantly right before the beep) I was listening to the growling and without words I observed how this growl was particularly extended in time. [finishes reading]

36:11 CK: And so at the moment, Phil, is there two things sorta going on I’m, or that that’s actually my first question. What’s in your experience at the moment?

36:26 Phil: Um, listening to him, listening to his growl and, um, making the observation that it was quite, consciously making the observation that it was quite extended in time.

36:44 CK: Okay. And are, are either of those *more* present, equally present?

36:54 Phil: I would say about equally present.

36:56 CK: Equally, okay. So let’s start first with the growl.

37:04 Phil: Yeah.

37:07 CK: When you say, you had used the word *listen*, right, to describe how this is present. Is, is that to say this is like a auditory thing I’m, I’m hearing this or [Phil: Yeah.] something else?

37:22 Phil: Yes. [CK: Okay.] Yeah. I was, I was, yeah. Yup.

37:28 CK: Any particular part of that, that I’m hearing like the, is it like the tone that I’m hearing? Like the, the, the pitch of the growl or how...?

37:39 Phil: Or the extended-in-timeness of it?

37:40 CK: Yeah.

37:44 Phil: Do you, well, you, I don’t think you can hear the extended in timeness of it, but you can make the observation that it was particularly extended in time.

- 38:03 CK: We might I'm, this is where experience can be pretty interesting, where there's things that happen that kind of can defy logic and so in terms of listening to the growl Phil is, is Max growling at the moment?
- 38:16 Phil: Yes.
- 38:17 CK: Okay. So it's not as if he stopped growling and somehow I'm still apprehending the growling, correct?
- 38:24 Phil: No.
- 38:25 CK: Okay. And so the other part of this, right, like the observation that it was extended in time, how is that present to you?
- 38:41 Phil: Um, as a, as a realization or observation.
- 38:53 CK: And is that observation of...
- 38:55 Phil: Like a, a cogniti, I guess, a straight-up cognitive kind of thing.
- 39:00 CK: So this is more an analytical or a cognitive sort of a deal than it is like a auditory thing or a?
- 39:11 Phil: Yeah.
- 39:11 CK: Okay.
- 39:13 Phil: Yeah. For me, at least.
- 39:16 CK: And that specific, the, the, the, the cog, the cognitive thing is about, again, the extended-in-time-ness of Max's growl?
- 39:28 Phil: Yeah.
- 39:28 CK: And by extended, is that...Again, is, is that sort of about the, the *length* of Max's growl like that this is, this is a long growl versus a short growl?
- 39:28 *Comment: See my comment about words at 8:38. Here, Cody is again focused on the word "extended," and trying to see what it applies to. See also the discussion at 40:32.*
- 39:44 Phil: Yeah. Um...
- 39:46 CK: Or is it, is it, you know, that there's, you know, that it's echoing somehow, right. Or, y'know, I'm, I'm curious as to what extended...?
- 39:53 Phil: No he was, he was, um, yeah, I, it's, um, he was, he was just making a really, really long growl, growling noise. He was growling and it, it went on, like a single growl that

was longer than I had heard him growl, potentially longer than I had heard him growl before.

40:22 CK: But at the moment of the beep, right, it's not a comparison? This is just the re, a recognition of like, this is a long growl, is that correct?

40:30 Phil: Yeah. Yup.

40:32 RTH: So you started out with, by saying *it was extended in time*, that, which is a sort of a formal way of saying things. So is, is it, *this is a long growl*, is that as good a translation as *this growl is extended in time*?

40:32 Comment: It might appear that RTH is focusing here on the words, and that he also did so at 9:51 (when he said, "So would *musingly* be as good as *vaguely*?"). Aren't those similar to the word-focus he has criticized at 8:38 and 39:28? The difference is that in 8:38 and 39:28, the focus is on the words themselves—in broad strokes, they are *What do you mean by X?* kind of questions. By contrast, in 9:51 and 40:32, the focus is on the experience—in broad strokes, these are *Is there a better way of saying X?* questions. 8:38 and 39:28 say, in effect, *You used the right word—what did you mean by that?* By contrast, 9:51 and 40:32 say, in effect, *You may have used the wrong word—is there perhaps a better way of saying that?* 8:38 and 39:28 invite Phil to define a term. 9:51 and 40:32 invite Phil to characterize his experience in greater fidelity. In my view, those are very different intentions.

But as in all things DES, don't take my word for it. Look at Phil's responses after those questions and ask yourself whether it appears that Phil is more genuinely connected to his experience.

40:46 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. Maybe I, maybe I sounded, maybe I made it sound more complicated or like it involved more than it did. But it was, it was simply, [laughs] [imitates growling noise] like, like a long growl.

41:04 RTH: So I'm, I'm noticing in a mental / cognitive way, *that's a long growl?*

41:09 Phil: Yes.

41:10 RTH: And is there anything more to it than that?

41:13 Phil: No.

41:14 RTH: So the fact that it's a long growl by comparison to his other growls, that's probably context that leads you to *think* that it's a long growl, but, but at the moment, it's just, I'm analyzing this or cognizing about this, or mentally-saying-to-myself-without-words about this, *that's a long growl?*

41:34 Phil: Yup. Yeah. Yep.

41:38 CK: And is there anything more to be said, Phil, about how that, that, that recognition of that this is a long growl is present? Y'know, I know you mentioned it was without

words, but in terms of, y'know, like Dr. Hurlburt mentioned, innerly spoken without words, innerly heard somehow nearly heard without words, no kind, y'know, something else?

42:06 Phil: Mmm. Innerly spoken without words, no. Um, no, it, I, as best I can describe it, it was just a, a realization.

42:17 CK: A pretty specific realization about the, the, how long this growl is.

42:22 Phil: Yeah.

42:26 CK: Okay. Then I think I'm good.

DEBRIEFING-TYPE CONVERSATION STARTS HERE

42:29 RTH: I'm good too. And, and I would note... That's six and I, I would notice that, that we seem more confident about things that we have been, that have been troublesome before we. Today, for whatever reason, we were *not* worried about whether something is innerly spoken or innerly heard. And we're *not* worried about something, whether, whether there's words or not. We seem confident that in like, [Phil: Yup.] in this particular beep, I was thinking, I was thinking...

42:56 Phil: Yup. I can't promise that I'll be as confident next time, but I'm, I'm trying to recognize that I've had some difficulty between inner speaking and inner hearing. And, uh, and I, I have, I was thinking about that somewhat. And, and I, I have some things to say about that, but that's that maybe that's for another time. It's not just about my own, like my own issue, but. I don't, I feel like it's very strange to be able to, like, if you're speaking, you're communicating to someone, if you're speaking to yourself, you, and, and that someone is listening *to you*. And if you're speaking to yourself, it's like speaking and listening at the same time somehow.

42:56 *Comment: That statement is the voicing of a presupposition (RTH thinks) and that's a good thing, because it will give us a chance to work towards bracketing that presupposition.*

43:54 RTH: So I don't think that's necessarily true. I think, I think the, I think the inner world is more complicated than that. So I think it, I think it is possible to utter words that are not intended for myself and not intended for some other person, but maybe the, maybe the words are just a caption or maybe they're, maybe they're just coming out like you had, like, "sometimes it's really" today. That might, well, that one, I guess I was aimed at Eva-stina.

44:30 Phil: But, but I, yeah, I, what you're saying.

44:33 RTH: Uh, the, it does *seem* that speaking *should be* aimed at somebody. But I don't, but I'm pretty sure that's not the case. Sometimes it is and sometimes it's not. (That I guess is [inaudible] And, and we, and we shouldn't *presume* that just because we're speaking, we *must have* somebody in mind at which to aim this speech.

- 44:57 Phil: Right. So then, then why, why innerly speak? I mean, if we know the contents of our, if we know our beliefs and desires and perceptions, and there are people who, who *don't*, who seem like they, they *don't* innerly speak, then, then why do it, or what is the advantage of doing it? Or like, or the purpose, or like, I don't, I don't know *why*.
- 45:29 RTH: So for, mo, mostly, I don't know the answer to that question. But I would, the way I think of it is that inner experience, like outer, like outer movement are skills that are applied. And sometimes I wave my hand and you might say, well, why did you wave your hand? And I would say, well, I dunno what, what I, I guess that's something that I know how to do, and I did it. And, uh, and I think the same thing is true in, in inner, in the inner world. I can speak because I know how to speak, and I did it. And I recognize that I did it, even though it, it has no more meaning than a, y'know, mo, mo... I, I would say if you're careful about it, and you ask what you do in the external world most of the time, why did I do that? You, you don't know the answer to that either, y'know. [Phil: Hmm.] Why, why are you sitting right now, leaning on your left elbow rather than on your right elbow? Well, y'know, I dunno, it's because my body adjusts in that way, and I think that's true in the inner life as well.
- 46:31 Phil: Mm. Hmm. But yeah, I guess, I guess what I was sort of trying to say is that if you're speaking to yourself, you're also, you also have to listen to yourself.
- 46:45 RTH: Nope. I don't think that's true.
- 46:45 Comment: You have said (see at 46:24 in Phil transcript 7) there is no point in trying to talk someone out of a presupposition (= delusion). Isn't that what you are doing here? Maybe. What makes me optimistic here is that Phil himself has stated his presupposition—he has put it on the table as an item for discussion. That may signal that there is the potential that he is amenable to altering his thinking about this.
- 46:47 Phil: Oh boy! No? Hmm.
- 46:48 RTH: I think those are, I think those are two separate deals. I can speak. And I can listen. And I can speak and listen at the same time. [Phil: Mm hmm.] But they don't necessarily have to be.
- 47:00 Phil: Do you think it's more like speaking and listening at the same time?
- 47:05 RTH: I think it, I think it depends. I think one can speak, and one can listen, and one can speak-and-listen. Those are three separate things that one can engage in. And, and everything breaks down. Like listen, and listen has a sort of a, a directedness to it. Listen, care a carefulness at it as opposed to hear. I heard, I heard a truck go, I, you could say, "I heard a truck go by." And I, it went by and I heard it. Or you could say, "I was *listening* to the truck go by," in which case I was sort of perking my ears up towards the truck go by. And so, and, and I think that that's true in the inner, inner world as well. I can hear something or I can listen to something innerly.

- 47:54 CK: I mean, I actually think too, it's, it's likely on a continuum, right, like there, there are some ex there are some, for lack, there's some beeps, right, there are some experiences that are purely I'm producing these words, or like, I am speaking these words innerly. [Phil: Mm hmm.] And on the opposite end, there's, there's nothing in the production of it. I am hearing these words and everything in between.
- 48:15 Phil: Mm hmm.
- 48:19 RTH: And the, what, I would say the aim of DES is *to set those questions aside*. Not because they're not important, but because the only way that they can *become* important is to have set the why-ness of it aside so that we can get the what-ness first. And then we can, then we can involve ourselves with the, with the why-ness, if, if we have a, if we have an interest about it.
- 48:46 Phil: Okay. Okay.
- 48:49 RTH: Another way of saying that is that the what-ness of it, as we've seen now, we're in our eighth day or whatever, and we're, we're still working at it. The, the what-ness is a fairly difficult thing to get right. [Phil: Yes.] And the why-ness, the, the why-ness, has so many different aspects to it. I mean, you can give a interpersonal why-ness and a social why-ness and a contextual why-ness and a, y'know state of the world why-ness and the world of, the war in Ukraine why-ness, you know, all, all that stuff has *some impact* on why you're saying whatever it is that you're saying.
- 49:28 Phil: Mm hmm. Yeah. Yeah. And I was also going to just mention that, going back to some of the previous beeps, where there was confusion between inner speaking and inner hearing myself. If I had to choose (and this might just be something to do with retrospection or bias or something), but I feel like it might have involved more speaking than listening. Cuz I was thinking about the, the examples where you've you've, you've asked me, where is it like I'm hearing a recording of myself. And I have to say, it's more like speaking than, than hear than genuinely hearing a recording of myself like I'm hearing a song or something like that, but...
- 50:18 RTH: So I've got two things to say about that. One is I think it's likely that you're right. And two, I don't think we should do that. The, because of the problems of retrospection, I, I, I think as a matter of probabilities, your statement that you just made is probably right. As a matter of actual description, I think we just shouldn't do it, then, which is why we have to do this process repeatedly so that we, so that we don't have to engage in that kind of speculative retrospection. [Phil: Yeah.] And we can, we can learn some distinctions about speaking into a tape recorder and getting it back, and then we can apply those things to *future* samples with the minimal as with, as, as minimal retrospection as, as possible.
- 51:04 Phil: Mm hmm. Okay.
- 51:12 RTH: So shall we do this again?
- 51:14 Phil: Yes. Um.

51:14 Comment: They compare calendars.

52:30 RTH: Alright. Sounds good to me.

52:32 Phil: Okay. Thanks very much again. [RTH: Thank you.] And enjoy your days.

52:38 AG: Thank you, Phil.

52:38 CK: Thanks, Phil.

52:39 Phil: Alright take care.

52:40 RTH: Alright.