



Reentrant Neural Pathways and the Theory-Ladenness of Perception

Athanassios Raftopoulos

Philosophy of Science, Vol. 68, No. 3, Supplement: Proceedings of the 2000 Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association. Part I: Contributed Papers. (Sep., 2001), pp. S187-S199.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0031-8248%28200109%2968%3A3%3CS187%3ARNPATT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-I>

Philosophy of Science is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Reentrant Neural Pathways and the Theory-Ladenness of Perception

Athanassios Raftopoulos†

University of Cyprus

In this paper I argue for the cognitive impenetrability of perception by undermining the argument from reentrant pathways. To do that I will adduce psychological and neuropsychological evidence showing that (a) early vision processing is not affected by our knowledge about specific objects and events, and (b) that the role of the descending pathways is to enable the early-vision processing modules to participate in higher-level visual or cognitive functions. My thesis is that a part of observation, which I will call perception, is bottom-up and theory neutral. As such, perception could play the role of common ground on which a naturalized epistemology can be built and relativism avoided.

1. Introduction. The issue of the role of top-down, or reentrant, neural pathways that transmit signals from the higher cognitive centers to the perceptual modules is important to the philosophy of science, since it is the existence of these pathways that is used as one of the arguments for the cognitive penetrability, and thus for the theory-ladenness, of perception (Churchland 1989), thus clearing the way for relativistic theories of meaning and scientific theories.

The argument consists in evidence concerning top-down links from higher cognitive centers to the peripheral systems. Findings from cell-staining techniques show that the ascending pathways from the retinal to the geniculate nucleus (*LGN*), and from there to the visual cortices and other centers higher in the processing hierarchy, are matched by descending pathways from the highest levels of processing to even the earliest processing systems at the retina (Zeki 1978; Van Essen 1985). The function of these descending pathways is “centrifugal control,” that is, the modu-

†Send requests for reprints to the author, Department of Education, University of Cyprus, P.O. Box 20537, Kallipoleos 75, Nicosia 1678, Cyprus; email: raftop@ucy.ac.cy.

lation of neural activity in the periphery by the demands sent down from higher cognitive levels (Churchland 1989).

In this paper I argue for the impenetrability of perception by undermining the argument from reentrant pathways. To do that I adduce psychological and neuropsychological evidence showing that (a) early vision processing is not affected by our knowledge about specific objects and events, and (b) that the role of the descending pathways is to enable the early-vision processing modules to participate in higher-level cognitive functions. I then discuss evidence from connectionism showing the way the brain could implement a process in which peripheral systems are the locus of higher cortical functions. This same evidence suggests that the perceptual input modules are necessarily involved in higher cognitive tasks. This is not a proof of the cognitive impenetrability of our perception (to do that one must account for illusions and other evidence suggesting the cognitive penetrability of perception) but it is a step towards it.

My thesis is that a part of observation, which I will call perception, is bottom-up and in some important sense theory neutral. Thus, it can play the role of common ground on which a naturalized epistemology could be built and relativism could be avoided. I will not elaborate here on the form of the product of perceptual processes except to say a few things at the end of the paper, where I address Churchland's (1989) claims that even if there is some theoretical neutrality at an early perceptual process, this "pure given" is useless and cannot be used for any "discursive judgment," since sensations are states that lack semantic content. I will argue that although the theory-neutral given does not have, and should not have, a semantic content, it has a nonconceptual content in which cognition is grounded.

2. Observation and Perception: An Issue of Terminology. I have spoken of perception and observation, or vision. These terms are not employed consistently in the literature. Sometimes 'perception' purports to signify our phenomenological experience, and thus includes the recognition and identification of objects and events. Since I do not use the terms the same way—I adopt Dretske's (1985) and Shrager's (1990) usage—I will introduce some terminology to explicate my usage of the terms.

I call *sensation* all processes that lead to the formation of the retinal image. This image, which initially is cognitively useless, is gradually transformed along the visual pathways in increasingly structured representations that are more convenient for subsequent processing. I call these processes that transform sensation to a representation that can be processed by cognition *perception*. Perception includes both low-level and intermediate-level vision and is bottom-up. In Marr's (1982) model of vision the $2\frac{1}{2} D$ sketch is the final product of perception. All subsequent visual pro-

cesses fall within *cognition*, and include both the post-sensory/semantic interface at which the object recognition units intervene as well as purely semantic processes that lead to the identification of the array (high-level vision). At this level we have observation (Marr's *3D model*), which is a cognitive activity.

Before I proceed I would like to explain the qualification "knowledge about specific objects." Even if perception turns out to be bottom-up in character, still it is not insulated from knowledge. Knowledge intrudes on perception, since early vision is informed and constrained by some general world principles that reduce indeterminacies in information (mainly the underdetermination of the $2\frac{1}{2} D$ structure from the $2D$ retinal stimulation). Such principles are general assumptions about the world constraining visual processing (Marr 1982; Spelke 1990; Pylyshyn 1999; Ulmann 1979). These principles, however, are not the result of explicit knowledge acquisition about specific objects but are general, reliable regularities about the optico-spatial properties of our world hardwired in our perceptual systems.

This knowledge is implicit in that it is available only for the processing of the retinal image, whereas explicit knowledge is available for a wide range of cognitive applications. Implicit knowledge cannot be overridden. The general constraints hardwired in the visual system can be overridden only by other similar general constraints with which they happen to compete (although no one yet knows how the system "decides" which constraint to apply). Still, one cannot decide to substitute it with another body of knowledge, even if one knows that under certain conditions this implicit knowledge may lead to errors (as is the case with the visual illusions). This theoretical ladenness, therefore, cannot be used as an argument against the existence of a theory-neutral ground because perception based on a shared theory is common ground.

3. The Role of Reentrant Connections. Leopold and Logothetis (1996) studied the activity of neurons in animals in areas ranging from the primary visual cortex, where retinal signals first enter the brain, to the area called *IT*, which is the very end of one fork of visual processing. Their study showed that in the primary cortex only 18% of neurons changed their response according to the image perceived by the animal. In areas corresponding to the midway of visual processing about one half of the neurons changed their response. In the *IT* area almost all neurons did. These findings suggest that most of the neurons in early processing report information that can be extracted from the information recorded on the retina and are not influenced by the higher cognitive functions (that is, by what the animal perceives the object to be). Other studies of visual perception

by Perrett et al. (1990) show that cell firing in the temporal cortex is not modulated by the significance of the event for the animal. But then what is the function of the descending pathways?

The answer comes from cognitive neuroscience. Research (Posner and Petersen 1990; Posner and Carr 1992; Kosslyn et al. 1993; Posner and Raichle 1994; Heinze et al. 1994; Ziegler et al. 1997) with positron emission topography (PET) and event-related potential (ERP) provides a spatio-temporal picture (literally) of the brain of subjects while they are performing (a) bottom-up processes, such as passive visual tasks (viewing on a screen strings of consonants, words, and pseudowords), (b) processes that require some top-down influences, such as active attention-driven tasks (searching visual arrays for thickened letters), (c) processes that rely heavily on top-down semantic processing (generating a use in response to a visual word), and (d) processes that are purely top-down, such as imagery. This picture sheds light on the role of top-down pathways and supports the principle of modular design and the independence of low level visual processing from top-down influences.

In studies of passive visual tasks, subjects were asked to fix their gaze on a point in the middle of a monitor in which four kinds of complex stimuli were to appear: false fonts, letter strings, pseudowords, and words. PET scans provided pictures of the activation of visual areas in the brain during these tasks. The analysis of these pictures relied on the assumption that the visual stimuli consisted of four codes: first, the "words" presented were complex collections of visual features; second, these features were aligned to form the letters of the English alphabet; third, some of the "words" had forms that satisfied the rules of English language (that is, they were English words); fourth, some of these words had meanings.

The responses observed were responses to some, or all, of the four codes. All four groups produced bilateral responses in multiple areas of the visual system. The subtraction of the PET images when the brain processes the visual features of the array from the PET images when semantic processing shows that only words and pseudowords produced characteristic responses in the inner surface of the left cerebral hemisphere, an area which is related to semantic processes. This suggests the existence of two levels of analysis in the visual system. The brain initially analyzes the visual features of the stimulus regardless of relationships to letters and words. At a second level, the brain analyzes the visual word forms. The fact that the subtraction of the PET images reveals an intense activity in the left hemisphere when semantic processing is taking place, however, does not mean that semantic processing is localized only at that area. The method of subtraction only highlights areas that are activated in the one task but not in the other; it does not reveal the entire area of semantic processing. In fact, we know that areas in both hemispheres are related to semantic

activity (for a criticism of attempts to localize brain functions by using imagining techniques see Bechtel and Mundale 1999).

More interesting were the PET images obtained in the active attention-driven visual tasks and in tasks of visual imagery. In the active attention-driven visual tasks, subjects were presented with a succession of images on a screen and were asked to react whenever some attributes (color, motion, form) differed from one image to another (focal attention groups). Members of the passive control group were instructed to watch the screen without reacting. Those in the divided attention group, finally, were instructed to react to any changes whatsoever in the images.

The PET images of the passive group showed activations of areas traditionally associated with registration of color, motion, and form in the extrastriate cortex. The subtraction of the divided attention PET images from the focal attention PET images allows the isolation of the areas that compute the specific features of the focal attention groups. The results were clear. Attention enhances blood flow at the same areas that are activated during the passive tasks. The same areas that process information in the passive tasks later on process information in the active attention tasks, only this time their activation is amplified. The subtraction of the PET images in the passive acts from the PET images in the focal attention tasks allows us to track those areas (if any) outside the visual areas that are also activated only during the focal attention tasks and not during the passive tasks. Indeed, the research found such areas in the basal ganglia and the anterior cingulate gyrus (an area at the underside of the frontal lobe). These areas seem to be the sources of the amplification observed when attention is involved and it is likely that they constitute the attentional networks activated in the focal group conditions.

Similar results were obtained with the visual imagery tasks. Visual imagery activates the same brain areas as visual perception (Damasio et al. 1993; Farah 1984). Behavioral studies suggest that the processing of imagery and of visual perception share some mental operations. Studies with patients show, first, that the mental operations that support visual imagery are highly localized (i.e., they are carried out in precise locations) and distributed in many different areas in the brain (Kosslyn 1988). Second, many of the neural systems at which mental images are generated are the same as those activated during visual perception. Neuroimaging studies confirm these results. The subtraction of PET images during passive control tasks from both the PET images in imagery tasks and the PET images in visual perceptual tasks shows similar activations in imagery and perception, especially in posterior areas.

The PET studies were complemented by ERP studies of subjects who view words and consonant strings. Certain areas in the brain are activated about 100 ms after the word or the string is presented. Since these areas

are activated irrespective of the stimulus, it can be surmised that they are activated by the features that words and consonant strings share, namely, visual physical features. Differences in the responses to words and consonant strings started about 150 ms after the stimulus appeared. This means that the brain registers the word form 50 ms later than the visual features. What is important to note is that the ERP study shows that the distinction between words and consonant strings is not fed back by other higher processing areas but arises at the posterior sites of the cortex.

In other ERP studies, subjects were asked to search for a thickened letter in letter strings. This is clearly an attention-driven task in which one would expect to find some top-down, task-driven processes. Records of the electrical activity during the search show that this top-down activity involves the same processing areas that are involved in computing visual features. But the search for the thickened letter causes activity in these same areas only about 200 ms after the stimulus (recall that the activity recorded when these sites register the visual features takes place 100 ms after the stimulus). Thus, the computations involved in the top-down, attention driven tasks take place in roughly the same brain areas—the same electrodes are activated (predominately in the right posterior areas)—in which the bottom-up registration of visual features occurs, with a time delay of about 100 ms. Finally, similar studies of subjects performing semantic tasks, such as generation of the use of a noun, showed that word meaning is registered about 250 ms after presentation of the stimulus, and some of the areas activated are the same as those areas activated when processing of visual physical features takes place.

Let me redraw the picture. 100 ms after the presentation of the stimulus (letter strings) an extensive part of our brain responds to the physical characteristics of the visual array. 150 ms following the stimulus these features fuse to a single form, and about 200 ms after presentation the voluntary task-driven search is registered in the same areas that process the visual features. Thus, the top-down effects of attention are delayed in time and involve the same anatomical areas as passive perception, except that attention amplifies the recordings in these areas. Finally, about 250 ms after the stimulus, some of the same areas participate in the semantic processing of the input.

What do these PET and ERP findings suggest for our discussion? Tasks that require top-down flow of information activate broadly the same areas that are needed to compute the purely bottom-up tasks. The active attention studies showed that when top-down processes occur, the activation of these areas is enhanced and the source of this amplification lies in higher areas of the brain. In order for the factors that cause this amplification to be transmitted to the lower areas certain descending pathways are required. The same conclusion can be drawn from the visual imagery studies.

Visual imagery demands that activation originates in higher cognitive centers and descends to the visual cortex in which imagined images are formed.

How does the brain do this? The answer is found in the role of the *reentrant connections* or *mappings* among neurons in the brain, and explains the abundance of interconnections between neurons. These reentry connections map, as it were, the activity of any system onto other systems, reciprocally, by allowing the transmission of information in all directions.

The point here is that imagery and perception share some processing sites. The same conclusion can be drawn from the attention-driven tasks. The amplification implies that the "attention centers" modulate the processes that take place in the relevant peripheral sites. This modulation, however, may be explained in two ways, both of which do not entail the cognitive penetrability of perception. On one hand one might say that these centers allocate attention to locations or properties of the upcoming visual scene prior to perception (and hence no cognitive penetrability of perception occurs), thus increasing sensitivity to a particular class of upcoming stimuli.

The other way concedes that the foregoing constitutes evidence for task-dependent, top-down processes that influence perceptual processes. But these are not influenced by specific object knowledge. Active attention determines the kind of task to be performed. In that respect Hildreth and Ulmann (1989) argue for the existence of an *intermediate level* of vision. At this level occur processes (such as the extraction of shape and of spatial relations) that cannot be purely bottom-up, but which do not require information from higher cognitive states. These tasks do not require recognition of objects, nor, it follows, any semantic processes that would have justified the cognitive penetrability of perception. They require the spatial analysis of shape and spatial relations among objects as well as detection of motion, which are the most relevant physical properties that form the basis for focused attention (Egeth et al. 1984; McCleod et al. 1991). This analysis is task-dependent, since the processes involved may vary depending on the task being accomplished even when the same visual array is being viewed, but is not modulated by cognition.

4. The Evidence from Connectionism. I have argued that certain higher cognitive functions and the visual system share to a certain extent the same processing sites. Research with neural nets gives us an idea of how this can be implemented. Regier (1996) constructed a hybrid connectionist system which receives as input some simple geometrical figures in various static and moving spatial relations and the spatial relation terms for these relations (the term 'on', for instance, when a circle is on top of another

figure). The task for the network is to learn the spatial terms so that it can assign the proper concept for a novel spatial configuration.

Classical PDP networks could not handle the task. The hybrid model that learned the spatial concepts consisted of two parts. One was a PDP model that learned via back-propagation. The other was a network with a specific architecture (a structured network). Regier designed this second sub-network so that its architecture reflected that of the human visual system (the topographic maps of the visual field, the orientation sensitive cells, the center-surround receptive fields, and top-down pathways).

The fact that a standard PDP network without a specific architecture could not learn the task and only the hybrid network could indicates that the success of the latter may be due to the second sub-network, namely, the one implementing the architecture of the actual visual system. This means that conceptual categories are created using the perceptual apparatus of vision, which implies that the higher concept-formation cognitive activity involves crucially a perceptual module. The same holds for imagery during which the visual system is employed to see things that are activated not from external input to the peripheral module but from top-down modulation. The qualification "crucially" means that the perceptual module is not merely a provider of input to, but it actively participates in, the cognitive processing. What connectionist research adds is the necessity of the peripheral module as a part of the higher cognitive process required for learning to ensue.

5. Conclusion-Discussion. Consider the argument for cognitive penetrability. We know that there are many neural connections devoted to bringing information back to the sensory systems from higher cognitive centers. This constitutes evidence for the mediation of the output of the perceptual modules by information from higher cognitive states. But the descending pathways most likely have another role to play. The sensory systems are fed back information from higher centers and signals from higher areas reenter the brain areas that had earlier processed the signals that were transformed by the higher centers to the reentrant new signals. The same areas that process in a bottom-up way sensory specific information are also involved in higher-level activities (voluntarily attention-driven search, imagery, concept formation), except that in the latter case they are reentered in a top-down manner.

The importance of the peripheral modules in the execution of higher cognitive functions not only undermines the descending pathways argument for the theory-ladenness of perception, but in addition shows that our conceptual systems are severely constrained by the architecture of the perceptual modules, since the cognitive processes that give rise to concepts involve in a significant way the perceptual processes. Perception does not

serve only as the faculty that provides input to higher cognition and then comes on-line after the cessation of the conceptual processing in order to test empirically its outcome, but also constitutes an active participant of the conceptual processing itself.

Consequently, our discussion questions the standard distinction between conception and perception. According to this view, conception is thought of as a mental process, whereas perception is deemed to be bodily in nature. The new picture emerging, which draws attention to the fact that perceptual processes are inextricably involved in higher cognitive processing, rejects this distinction and forces us to extend cognition to encompass the body, insofar as the perceptual bodily mechanisms do some conceptual work.

The perception/observation distinction runs along the distinction between *seeing something* and *seeing something as being such and such*. Perception corresponds to *seeing*, whereas observation corresponds to *seeing as*, that is, to identifying or recognizing visual patterns that are being *seen*. Brown (1987), Churchland (1989), Gregory (1974), Hanson (1958), Kuhn (1962), and others argue that such a distinction does not exist, and that all *seeing* is *seeing as*, since all stages of visual processing are cognitively penetrable. By undermining one of the arguments for this penetrability and reinstating the old distinction I add a step towards showing the cognitive impenetrability of some stages of vision. Consequently, the outcome of the perceptual processes can serve as the theory-neutral (in the sense explained in the introduction) basis whose existence would undermine relativism.

I must note that the above distinction is somewhat simplistic in that it leaves aside the issue of *vision for*, that is, the issue of the evidence regarding the existence of various (at least two) visual pathways with different outputs, each of which supplies different information to specific brain areas, such as the motor system and the system responsible for categorization (Goodale 1995). Since, however, the controversy regarding the cognitive penetrability of vision concerns the extent to which the percepts used in cognition are informed from a top-down flow of information, I will restrict my discussion to the visual path that leads to the formation of these percepts.

Thus, Fodor's (1984) distinction between "fixation of appearances" or "observation," which is the result of the functioning of the perceptual modules, and "fixation of belief" is misguided. He seems to distinguish between the "sensory" and "cognitive" or "semantic" processes that are involved in the formation of observation statements and considers observation as a pre-cognitive activity whose output is processed by cognition, thus giving rise to the observation statements. Philosophers would recognize here the distinction between what we see and how we perceive it to

be, or how we interpret it. But this distinction is misleading because object recognition is a cognitive process, and observation involves object-recognition. The distinction Fodor wishes to draw between a bottom-up, theory-neutral process, and a top-down, theory-laden process should not be cut at the observation/cognition interface, since such an interface does not exist, but at the perception/cognition interface.

Churchland (1989) claims that even if there is some rigidity and theoretical neutrality at an early perceptual process, this sensation is useless in that it cannot be used for any "discursive judgment," since sensations are states that lack truth-value, or semantic content. Only "observation judgments" can do that because they have content, which is a function of a conceptual framework. I shall not argue here in detail whether this theory-neutral perceptual basis has semantic content and I will offer only a sketch of the kind of content of theory-neutral perception.

This theory-neutral "given" does not consist in sensations without any content, but in perceptions. The perception of a visual scene is an image schema of this scene. This schema consists in some form of Marr's $2\frac{1}{2}$ models of the objects present in the scene (Pylyshyn 1999), that is, as representations of shapes (structured representations of $2\frac{1}{2} D$ surfaces of objects), on the one hand, and on the other, in the rich kinaesthetic (Bickhard 1993; Johnson 1987; Lakoff and Johnson 1999) and positional (local) content-structure of the scene (Petitot 1995). The positional content is not semantic (nonconceptual) and, along with the kinaesthetic structure, conveys information about nonvisual properties, such as causal relations (e.g., X "transfers" something to Y), and about functional properties of objects, what Gibson (1979) referred to as *affordances* of objects (for a similar conclusion see Pylyshyn 1999, 361). This content can be retrieved from the morphology of the scene and can be extracted from the visual array by the mechanisms of early vision (Petitot 1995).

The nonconceptual content is a theme frequently discussed in philosophy and cognitive science. Consider the interaction of a frog with a fly (Bickhard and Campbell 1996). The induced neural activity in the frog is not an internal representation of the fly. The "representational" content of the neural activity induced by the fly consists in the possibility of tongue flicking and eating on the basis of indications about potentialities that are afforded by specific objects in the environment. Thus, representational content is about the potentialities, or possibilities of further interactions, that are afforded by the environment for the system's interactions with it. They implicitly predicate those interactive properties of the environment that could support the indicated interactions of the cognizer with it.

The mechanisms implementing these interactions with the environment are the hardwired, implicit principles inherent to the input systems that constrain perceptual computations and coordinate perception with the

motor systems. These principles are not explicitly represented by the system as general beliefs about the world. Instead, they determine the modus operandi of the systems. As such, they account for reactions only to specific object tokens, not to object types, as it happens with our fly (for a similar analysis regarding the object-centered attentional indexing mechanisms see Scholl and Leslie 1999). Findings regarding the different routes in vision support this analysis, suggesting that the content of the information transmitted via the route of vision for action to the motor systems is nonconceptual.

These interactive anticipations are representational for the system, being implicit predications about the environment. Cussins (1990) has called the content of such implicit representations "nonconceptual," by which he means those properties that are canonically characterized by means of concepts which are such that the organism need not have those concepts in order to satisfy the property. I am going to call such nonconceptual representations "pre-representations."

Thus, the perceptual outcomes are pre-representational, nonconceptual information-content bearers that constrain, and form the basis for, cognitive processing. Far from being without content or far from having a content that is a function of a conceptual framework, perception provides the foundation upon which conceptual frameworks are being built and is the locus in which meaning is infused into conceptual systems and the representations are grounded. Perception must be pre-representational and not non-representational for its output to be cognitively processed. The *pre-representational* character is due to its having a rich experiential structure: what makes perceptual schemata *pre-representational* is that they pick out the entities, actions, and events that fit our recurrent experiences; yet, they are not conceptual representations of these experiences.

REFERENCES

- Bechtel, William and Jennifer Mundale (1999), "Multiple Realizability Revisited: Linking Cognitive and Neural States", *Philosophy of Science* 66: 175-208.
- Bickhard, Mark H. (1993), "Representational Content in Humans and Machines", *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Artificial Intelligence* 5: 285-333.
- Bickhard, Mark H. and R. L. Campbell (1996), "Topologies of Learning and Development", *New Ideas in Psychology* 14: 111-156.
- Brown, Harold I. (1987), *Observation and Objectivity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Churchland, Paul M. (1989), *A Neurocomputational Perspective: The Nature of Mind and the Structure of Science*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Cussins, A. (1990), "The Connectionist Construction of Concepts", in Margaret Boden (ed.), *The Philosophy of Artificial Intelligence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 368-440.
- Damasio, Hana, T. J. Grabowski, Antonio Damasio, Daniel Tranel, L. Boles-Ponto, G. L. Watkins, and R. D. Hichwa (1993), "Visual Recall with Eyes Closed and Covered Activates Early Visual Cortices", *Society for Neuroscience Abstracts* 19: 1603.
- Dretske, Fred (1985), "Précis of Knowledge and the Flow of Information", in H. Kornblith (ed.), *Naturalizing Epistemology*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 169-189.

- Egeth, H. E., R. A. Virzi, and H. Garbart (1984), "Searching for Conjectively Defined Targets", *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 10: 32–39.
- Farah, Martha J. (1984), "The Neurological Basis of Mental Imagery: A Component Analysis", in S. Pinker (ed.), *Visual Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 245–271.
- Fodor, Jerry (1984), "Observation Reconsidered", *Philosophy of Science* 51: 23–43. Reprinted in A. I. Goldman (ed.), *Readings in Philosophy and Cognitive Science* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press), 119–138.
- Gibson, J. J. (1979), *The Ecological to Visual Perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Goodale, Melvyn A. (1995), "The Cortical Organization of Visual Perception and Visuomotor Control", in Stephen M. Kosslyn and Daniel N. Osherson (eds.), *Visual Cognition*, Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 167–214.
- Gregory, Richard (1974), *Concepts and Mechanisms of Perception*. New York: Charles Scribners and Sons.
- Hanson, Norwood Russell (1958), *Patterns of Discovery*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heinze, H. J., G. R. Mangun, W. Burchert, H. Hinrichs, M. Scholtz, T. F. Muntel, A. Gosel, S. Schreg, S. Johannes, H. Hundeshagen, M. S. Gassaniga, and S. A. Hillyard (1994), "Combined Spatial and Temporal Imaging of Brain Activity During Visual Selective Attention in Humans", *Nature* 372: 543–546.
- Hildreth, Elen C. and Shimon Ullmann (1989), "The Computational Study of Vision", in Michael I. Posner (ed.), *Foundations of Cognitive Science*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 581–630.
- Johnson, Mark (1987), *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kosslyn, Stephen M. (1988), "Aspects of cognitive neuroscience of mental imagery", *Science* 240: 1621–1626.
- Kosslyn, Stephen M., N. M. Alpert, William L. Thompson, V. Malikovic, S. B. Weise, C. F. Chabris, S. E. Hamilton, S. L. Rauch, and F. S. Buonanno (1993), "Visual Mental Imagery Activates Topographically Organized Visual Cortex", *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 5: 263–287.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. (1962), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1999), *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Leopold, D. A. and N. K. Logothetis (1996), "Activity changes in early visual cortex reflect monkeys' percepts during binocular rivalry", *Nature* 379: 549
- Marr, David (1982), *Vision: A Computational Investigation into Human Representation and Processing of Visual Information*. San Francisco, CA: Freeman.
- McLeod, Peter, J. Driver, Z. Dienes, and J. Crisp (1991), "Filtering by Movement in Visual Search", *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 17: 55–64.
- Perrett, D. I., M. H. Harries, P. J. Benson, A. J. Chitty, and A. J. Mistlin (1990), "Retrieval of Structure from Rigid and Biological Motion: An Analysis of the Visual Responses of Neurons in the Macaque Temporal Cortex", in Andrew Blake and Tom Troscianko (eds.), *AI and the Eye*. Cornwall: John Wiley & Sons, 181–200.
- Petitot, Jean (1995), "Morphodynamics and Attractor Syntax: Constituency in Visual Perception and Cognitive Grammar", in R. E. Port and T. Van Gelder (eds.), *Mind as Motion*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 227–283.
- Posner, Michael I. and S. E. Petersen (1990), "The Attention System of the Human Brain", *Annual Review of Neuroscience* 13: 25–42.
- Posner, Michael I. and Thomas H. Carr (1992), "Lexical Access and the Brain: Anatomical Constraints on Cognitive Models of Word Recognition", *American Journal of Psychology* 105: 1–26.
- Posner, Michael I. and Marcus E. Raichle (1994), *Images of Mind*. New York: The American Scientific Library.
- Pylshyn, Zenon (1999), "Is Vision Continuous with Cognition?", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22: 341–365.

- Regier, T. (1996), *The Human Semantic Potential: Spatial Language and Constrained Connectionism*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Scholl, Brian J. and Alan M. Leslie (1999), "Explaining the Infant's Object Concept: Beyond the Perception/Cognition Dichotomy", in Ernest Lepore and Zenon Pylyshyn (eds.), *What is Cognitive Science?* Cambridge: Blackwell, 26–74.
- Shrager, Jeff F. (1990), "Common-Sense Perception and the Psychology of Theory Formation", in J. F. Shrager and P. Langley (eds.), *Computational Models of Scientific Discovery and Theory Formation*. San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann, 437–470.
- Spelke, Elizabeth S. (1990), "Principles of Object Perception", *Cognitive Science* 14: 29–56.
- Ulmann, Shimon (1979), *The Interpretation of Visual Motion*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Van Essen, D. C. (1985), "Functional Organization Of Primate Visual Cortex", in A. Peters and E. G. Jones (eds.), *Cerebral Cortex*, Vol. 3. New York: Plenum, 259–329.
- Zeki, S. M. (1978), "Uniformity and Diversity of Structure and Function in Rhesus Monkey Prestriate Visual Cortex", *Journal of Physiology* 277: 273–290.
- Ziegler, Johannes C., Mireille Besson, Arthur M. Jacobs, and Tatjana T. Nazir (1997), "Word, Pseudoword, and Nonword Processing: A Multitask Comparison Using Event-Related Brain Potentials", *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 9: 758–775.