

“Cognitional Structure”

Bernard Lonergan

[From Bernard Lonergan, *Collection*, vol. 3 of *The Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, University of Toronto Press, 1988, 205-221. Originally published in the journal *Continuum* in an issue dedicated to Lonergan entitled *Spirit as Inquiry: Studies in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*.]

Let me begin by expressing my appreciation and gratitude to *Continuum* for its hospitality, to Fr Crowe for his initiative and organizational labors, to the contributors for their serious interest in my writings.

I had thought, when consenting to undertake the present task that I might most usefully address myself to an effort to come to grips with the thought of the other contributors. But I was informed that that could not be arranged. There was, of course, no lack of devotion to dialogue. But there did exist the mysterious complexities of editing and publishing by a fixed date the labors of many authors. Into these mysteries I was not to attempt to penetrate. I was to sit down at once, select a topic, and write on it.

I have chosen cognitional structure as my topic, partly because I regard it as basic, partly because greater clarity may be hoped for from an exposition that does not attempt to describe the ingredients that enter into the structure, and partly because I have been told that my view of human knowing as a dynamic structure has been pronounced excessively obscure.

1 Dynamic Structure

A whole, then, has parts. The whole is related to each of the parts, and each of the parts is related to the other parts and to the whole.

Not every whole is a structure. When one thinks of a whole, there may come to mind some conventional quantity or arbitrary collection whose parts are determined by an equally conventional or arbitrary division. In such a case, e.g., a gallon of milk, the closed set of relations between whole and parts will be a no less arbitrary jumble of arithmetic ratios. But it may also happen that the whole one thinks of is some highly organized product of nature or art. Then the set of internal relations is of the greatest significance. Each part is what it is in virtue of its functional relations to other parts; there is no part that is not determined by the exigences of other parts; and the whole possesses a certain inevitability in its unity, so that the removal of any part would destroy the whole, and the addition of any further part would be ludicrous. Such a whole is a structure.

The parts of a whole may be things, bricks, timbers, glass, rubber, chrome. But the parts may also be activities, as in a song, a dance, a chorus, a symphony, a drama. Such a whole is dynamic materially. But dynamism may not be restricted to the parts. The

whole itself may be self-assembling, self-constituting; then it is formally dynamic. It is a dynamic structure.

2 Human Knowing as Dynamic Structure

Now human knowing involves many distinct and irreducible activities: seeing, hearing, smelling, touching, tasting, inquiring, imagining, understanding, conceiving, reflecting, weighing the evidence, judging.

No one of these activities, alone and by itself, may be named human knowing. An act of ocular vision may be perfect as ocular vision; yet if it occurs without any accompanying glimmer of understanding, it is mere gaping; and mere gaping, so far from being the beau ideal of human knowing, is just stupidity. As merely seeing is not human knowing, so for the same reason merely hearing, merely smelling, merely touching, merely tasting, may be parts, potential components, of human knowing, but they are not human knowing itself.

What is true of sense is no less true of understanding. Without the prior presentations of sense, there is nothing for a man to understand; and when there is nothing to be understood, there is no occurrence of understanding. Moreover, the combination of the operations of sense and of understanding does not suffice for human knowing. There must be added judging. To omit judgment is quite literally silly: it is only by judgment that there emerges a distinction between fact and fiction, logic and sophistry, philosophy and myth, history and legend, astronomy and astrology, chemistry and alchemy.

Nor can one place human knowing in judging to the exclusion of experience and understanding. To pass judgment on what one does not understand is, not human knowing, but human arrogance. To pass judgment independently of all experience is to set fact aside.

Human knowing, then, is not experience alone, not understanding alone, not judgment alone; it is not a combination of only experience and understanding, or of only experience and judgment, or of only understanding and judgment; finally, it is not something totally apart from experience, understanding, and judgment. Inevitably, one has to regard an instance of human knowing, not as this or that operation, but as a whole whose parts are operations. It is a structure and, indeed, a materially dynamic structure.

But human knowing is also formally dynamic. It is self-assembling, self-constituting. It puts itself together, one part summoning forth the next, till the whole is reached. And this occurs, not with the blindness of natural process, but consciously, intelligently, rationally. Experience stimulates inquiry, and inquiry is intelligence bringing itself to act; it leads from experience through imagination to insight, and from insight to the concepts that combine in single objects both what has been grasped by insight and what in experience or imagination is relevant to the insight. In turn, concepts stimulate reflection, and reflection is the conscious exigence of rationality; it marshals the evidence and weighs it either to judge or else to doubt and so renew inquiry.

Such in briefest outline is what is meant by saying that human knowing is a dynamic structure. Let us briefly note its implications.

First, on the verbal level, it implies a distinction between 'knowing' in a loose or generic sense and 'knowing' in a strict and specific sense. Loosely, any cognitional activity may be named knowing; so one may speak of seeing, inquiring, understanding, thinking, weighing the evidence, judging, as each an instance of knowing. Strictly, one will distinguish animal, human, angelic, and divine knowing, and one will investigate what in each case is necessary and sufficient for an instance of knowing.

Secondly, the view that human knowing is a dynamic structure implies that human knowing is not some single operation or activity but, on the contrary, a whole whose parts are cognitional activities.

Thirdly, the parts of a structure are related to one another, not by similarity, but functionally. As in a motorcar the engine is not like the tires and the muffler is not like the differential, so too in human knowing, conceived as a dynamic structure, there is no reason to expect the several cognitional activities to resemble one another. It follows that a study of human knowing cannot safely follow the broad and downhill path of analogy. It will not do, for instance, to scrutinize ocular vision and then assume that other cognitional activities must be the same sort of thing. They may turn out to be quite different and so, if one is to proceed scientifically, each cognitional activity must be examined in and for itself and, no less, in its functional relations to other cognitional activities. This third conclusion brings us to the question of consciousness and self-knowledge, which calls for another section.

3 Consciousness and Self-knowledge

Where knowing is a structure, knowing knowing must be a reduplication of the structure. Thus if knowing is just looking, then knowing knowing will be looking at looking. But if knowing is a conjunction of experience, understanding, and judging, then knowing knowing has to be a conjunction of (1) experiencing experience, understanding and judging, (2) understanding one's experience of experience, understanding, and judging, and (3) judging one's understanding of experience, understanding, and judging to be correct.

On the latter view there follows at once a distinction between consciousness and self-knowledge. Self-knowledge is the reduplicated structure: it is experience, understanding, and judging with respect to experience, understanding, and judging. Consciousness, on the other hand, is not knowing knowing but merely experience of knowing, experience, that is, of experiencing, of understanding, and of judging.

Secondly, it follows that all cognitional activities may be conscious yet none or only some may be known. So it is, in fact, that both acts of seeing and acts of understanding occur consciously, yet most people know what seeing is and most are mystified when asked what understanding is.

Thirdly, it follows that different cognitional activities are not equally accessible.

Experience is of the given. Experience of seeing is to be had only when one actually is seeing. Experience of insight is to be had only when one actually is having an insight. But one has only to open one's eyes and one will see; one has only to open and close one's eyes a number of times to alternate the experience of seeing and of not seeing. Insights, on the other hand, cannot be turned on and off in that fashion. To have an insight, one has to be in the process of learning or, at least, one has to reenact in oneself previous processes of learning. While that is not peculiarly difficult, it does require (1) the authenticity that is ready to get down to the elements of a subject, (2) close attention to instances of one's own understanding and, equally, one's failing to understand, and (3) the repeated use of personal experiments in which, at first, one is genuinely puzzled and then catches on.

Fourthly, because human knowing is a structure of different activities, experience of human knowing is qualitatively differentiated. When one is reflecting, weighing the evidence, judging, one is experiencing one's own rationality. When one is inquiring, understanding, conceiving, thinking, one is experiencing one's own intelligence. When one is seeing or hearing, touching or tasting, one is experiencing one's own sensitivity. Just as rationality is quite different from intelligence, so the experience of one's rationality is quite different from the experience of one's intelligence; and just as intelligence is quite different from sensitivity, so the experience of one's intelligence is quite different from the experience of one's sensitivity. Indeed, since consciousness is of the acting subject *qua* acting, the experience of one's rationality is identical with one's rationality bringing itself to act; the experience of one's intelligence is identical with one's bringing one's intelligence to act; and the experiencing of one's sensitivity is identical with one's sensitivity coming to act.

Fifthly, then, experience commonly is divided into external and internal. External experience is of sights and sounds, of odors and tastes, of the hot and cold, hard and soft, rough and smooth, wet and dry. Internal experience is of oneself and one's apprehensive and appetitive activities. Still, if the meaning of the distinction is clear, the usage of the adjectives, internal and external, calls for explanation. Strictly, only spatial objects are internal or external and, while external experience may be of spatial objects, it itself is not a spatial object and, still less, is internal experience. Accordingly, we must ask what is the original datum that has been expressed by a spatial metaphor; and to that end we draw attention to different modes of presence.

There is material presence, in which no knowing is involved, and such is the presence of the statue in the courtyard. There is intentional presence, in which knowing is involved, and it is of two quite distinct kinds. There is the presence of the object to the subject, of the spectacle to the spectator; there is also the presence of the subject to himself, and this is not the presence of another object dividing his attention, of another spectacle distracting the spectator; it is presence in, as it were, another dimension, presence concomitant and correlative and opposite to the presence of the object. Objects are present by being attended to; but subjects are present as subjects, not by being attended to, but by attending. As the parade of objects marches by, spectators do not have to slip into the parade to become present to themselves; they have to be present to themselves for anything to be present to them; and they are present to themselves by the same watching that, as it were, at its other pole makes the parade present to them.

I have been attempting to describe the subject's presence to himself. But the reader, if he tries to find himself as subject, to reach back and, as it were, uncover his subjectivity, cannot succeed. Any such effort is introspecting, attending to the subject; and what is found is, not the subject as subject, but only the subject as object; it is the subject as subject that does the finding. To heighten one's presence to oneself, one does not introspect; one raises the level of one's activity. If one sleeps and dreams, one is present to oneself as the frightened dreamer. If one wakes, one becomes present to oneself, not as moved but as moving, not as felt but as feeling, not as seen but as seeing. If one is puzzled and wonders and inquires, the empirical subject becomes an intellectual subject as well. If one reflects and considers the evidence, the empirical and intellectual subject becomes a rational subject, an incarnate reasonableness. If one deliberates and chooses, one has moved to the level of the rationally conscious, free, responsible subject that by his choices makes himself what he is to be and his world what it is to be.

Sixthly, does this many-leveled subject exist? Each man has to answer that question for himself. But I do not think that the answers are in doubt. Not even behaviorists claim that they are unaware whether or not they see or hear, taste or touch. Not even positivists preface their lectures and their books with the frank avowal that never in their lives did they have the experience of understanding anything whatever. Not even relativists claim that never in their lives did they have the experience of making a rational judgment. Not even determinists claim that never in their lives did they have the experience of making a responsible choice. There exist subjects that are empirically, intellectually, rationally, morally conscious. Not all know themselves as such, for consciousness is not human knowing but only a potential component in the structured whole that is human knowing. But all can know themselves as such, for they have only to attend to what they are already conscious of, and understand what they attend to, and pass judgment on the correctness of their understanding.

4 The Epistemological Theorem

At this point one may ask why knowing should result from the performance of such immanent activities as experiencing, understanding, and judging. This brings us to the epistemological theorem; namely, that knowledge in the proper sense is knowledge of reality or, more fully, that knowledge is intrinsically objective, that objectivity is the intrinsic relation of knowing to being, and that being and reality are identical.

The intrinsic objectivity of human cognitional activity is its intentionality. Nor need this intentionality be inferred, for it is the dominant content of the dynamic structure that assembles and unites several activities into a single knowing of a single object. Human intelligence actively greets every content of experience with the perplexity, the wonder, the drive, the intention, that may be thematized by (but does not consist in) such questions as, What is it? Why is it so? Inquiry through insight issues forth in thought that, when scrutinized, becomes formulated in definitions, postulates, suppositions, hypotheses, theories. Thought in turn is actively greeted by human rationality with a reflective exigence that, when thematized, is expressed in such questions as, Is that so? Are you certain? All marshaling and weighing of evidence, all judging and doubting, are efforts to say of what is that it is and of what is not that it is not. Accordingly, the dynamic structure of human knowing intends being. That intention is unrestricted, for there is nothing that we cannot at least question.

The same intention is comprehensive, for questioning probes every aspect of everything; its ultimate goal is the universe in its full concreteness. Being in that sense is identical with reality: as apart from being there is nothing, so apart from reality there is nothing; as being embraces the concrete totality of everything, so too does reality.

This intrinsic relation of the dynamic structure of human knowing to being and so to reality primarily is not *pensée pensée* but *pensée pensante*, not *intentio intenta* but *intentio intendens*, not *νόημα* but *νόησις*. It is the originating drive of human knowing. Consciously, intelligently, rationally it goes beyond: beyond data to intelligibility; beyond intelligibility to truth and through truth to being; and beyond known truth and being to the truth and being still to be known. But though it goes beyond, it does not leave behind. It goes beyond to add, and when it has added, it unites. It is the active principle that calls forth in turn our several cognitional activities and, as it assembles them into single instances of knowing, so it assembles their many partial objects into single total objects. By inquiry it moves us from sensing to understanding only to combine the sensed and understood into an object of thought. By reflection it moves us from objects of thought through rationally compelling evidence to judgments about reality. From the partial knowledge we have reached it sends us back to fuller experiencing, fuller understanding, broader and deeper judgments, for what it intends includes far more than we succeed in knowing. It is all-inclusive, but the knowing we achieve is always limited.

As answers stand to questions, so cognitional activities stand to the intention of being. But an answer is *to* a question, because it and the question have the same object. So it is that the intrinsic relation of the dynamic structure of human knowing passes from the side of the subject to the side of the object, that the *intentio intendens* of being becomes the *intentio intenta* of this or that being. So the question, What's this? promotes the datum of sense to a 'this' that has a 'what-ness' and 'is.' The promotion settles no issues, but it does raise issues. It is neither knowledge nor ignorance of essence and existence, but it is the intention of both. What the essence is and whether that essence exists are, not answers, but questions. Still, the questions have been raised, and the very fact of raising them settles what the answers will have to be about. The *intentio intendens* of the subject summons forth and unites cognitional activities to objectify itself in an *intentio intenta* that unites and is determined by the partial objects of the partial activities. As the *intentio intendens* of the dynamic structure, so the corresponding *intentio intenta* of the structured cognitional activities is intrinsically related to being and reality.

It remains that the two relations are not identical. The *intentio intendens* is not knowing but merely intending: it is objectivity in potency. But the *intentio intenta* resides not in mere intending but in structured activities of knowing: it is objectivity in act. Moreover, objectivity in act, because it resides not in a single operation but in a structured manifold of operations, is not some single property of human knowing but a compound of quite different properties. Empiricists have tried to find the ground of objectivity in experience, rationalists have tried to place it in necessity, idealists have had recourse to coherence. All are partly right and partly wrong, right in their affirmation, but mistaken in their exclusion. For the objectivity of human knowing is a triple cord; there is an experiential component that resides in the givenness of relevant data; there is a normative component that resides in the exigences of intelligence and rationality guiding the process of knowing from data to judging; there finally is an absolute component that is reached when reflective understanding combines the normative and the experiential elements into a virtually unconditioned, i.e., a conditioned whose

conditions are fulfilled.

The objectivity of human knowing, then, rests upon an unrestricted intention and an unconditioned result. Because the intention is unrestricted, it is not restricted to the immanent content of knowing, to *Bewusstseinsinhalte*; at least, we can ask whether there is anything beyond that, and the mere fact that the question can be asked reveals that the intention which the question manifests is not limited by any principle of immanence. But answers are *to* questions, so that if questions are transcendent, so also must be the meaning of corresponding answers. If I am asked whether mice and men really exist, I am not answering the question when I talk about images of mice and men, concepts of mice and men, or the words, mice and men; I answer the question only if I affirm or deny the real existence of mice and men. Further, true answers express an unconditioned. Mice and men are contingent, and so their existence has its conditions. My knowing mice and men is contingent, and so my knowing of their existence has its conditions. But the conditions of the conditioned may be fulfilled, and then the conditioned is virtually an unconditioned; it has the properties of an unconditioned, not absolutely, but *de facto*. Because human knowing reaches such an unconditioned, it transcends itself. For the unconditioned *qua* unconditioned cannot be restricted, qualified, limited; and so we all distinguish sharply between what is and, on the other hand, what appears, what seems to be, what is imagined or thought or might possibly or probably be affirmed; in the latter cases the object is still tied down by relativity to the subject; in the former the self-transcendence of human knowing has come to its term; when we say that something is, we mean that its reality does not depend upon our cognitional activity.

The possibility of human knowing, then, is an unrestricted intention that intends the transcendent, and a process of self-transcendence that reaches it. The unrestricted intention directs the process to being; the attainment of the unconditioned reveals that at some point being has been reached. So, quite manifestly, a grasp of dynamic structure is essential to a grasp of the objectivity of our knowing. Without the dynamism one may speak of concepts of being, affirmations of being, even the idea of being; but unfailingly one overlooks the overarching intention of being which is neither concept nor affirmation nor idea.¹ Again, without the structure there is no place for three quite different elements of objectivity and no thought of a third resulting from a reflective understanding of the other two; yet the empiricists are right in their insistence on data, for in the givenness of data resides the experiential component of objectivity; there is something to the idealist insistence on coherence, for in the directive exigences of intelligence and rationality there resides the normative component of objectivity; and there is something to the rationalist insistence on necessity, for a conditioned whose conditions are fulfilled is virtually an unconditioned, and reflective understanding grasps such a virtually unconditioned whenever it finds the fulfillment of conditions in the data of sense or consciousness and, at the same time, derives from normative objectivity the link that binds conditions with conditioned.

5 Counterpositions Criticized

The alternative to distinguishing is confusion. We have been engaged in distinguishing between human knowing and its component elements and between the objectivity of human knowing and the objectivity proper to different components in human knowing. When, however, the distinctions are not drawn, confusion easily if not

inevitably occurs.

From the viewpoint of the validity of human knowing, such confusions may be divided into two classes that are dialectically related. The naive realist correctly asserts the validity of human knowing, but mistakenly attributes the objectivity of human knowing, not to human knowing, but to some component in human knowing. The idealist, on the other hand, correctly refutes the naive-realist claim that the whole objectivity of human knowing is found in some component of human knowing, but mistakenly concludes that human knowing does not yield valid knowledge of reality. The strength of the naive-realist position is its confidence in the validity of human knowing; its weakness is its inability to learn. On the other hand, the strength of the idealist position is the sharpness with which it refutes the mistaken claims of naive realists; its weakness is its inability to break completely with the confusions introduced by naive realism.

If theoretically this dialectical process could begin from any confusion, commonly its starting point is the myth that knowing is looking. Jack or Jill is invited to raise a hand and to look at it. The hand is really out there; it is the object. The eye, strangely, is not in the hand; it is some distance away in the head; it is the subject. The eye really sees the hand; it sees what is there to be seen; it does not see what is not there to be seen. That is objectivity.

Once the essence of objectivity has been grasped in this dramatic instance, there follow generalization and deduction. The generalization contains two elements, one positive, and the other negative. The positive element in the generalization is that any cognitional activity that sufficiently resembles ocular vision *must* be objective; for if it sufficiently resembles ocular vision, one can grasp the essence of objectivity in it no less than in ocular vision; and an activity that possesses the essence of objectivity *must* be objective. The negative element is that any cognitional activity that does not sufficiently resemble ocular vision *cannot* be objective; for it lacks what is essential to objectivity; of itself, therefore, any such activity is merely immanent; it may have some subordinate or derivative role to play in human knowing, particularly when knowing is not immediate but mediate; but from the nature of the case it can make no proper contribution to the objectivity of human knowing, for of itself it has nothing to contribute.

The positive and negative elements of the generalization provide a basis whence one can deduce what human knowing must be and what it cannot be. With such premises to hand, one does not have to bother too much about cognitional fact. The analogy of ocular vision reveals what intellectual activity must be like if it is objective; it must be like seeing. Even if introspection discovers no intellectual activity that resembles seeing, still some such activity really must exist; for if it did not, then our intellectual activity would be merely immanent, and idealism would be correct; but the conclusion is false, and therefore the premise must be false. Again, no serious difficulty arises from the fact that introspection brings to light intellectual activities that do not resemble seeing; it is true that such activities make no contribution of their own to the objectivity of human knowing; they are not constitutive of our immediate knowledge or our knowledge by acquaintance; but they can perform some useful function in the subordinate and derivative parts of our knowing, in our mediate knowledge or our knowledge by description. Just what these functions are, of course, is somewhat obscure; but we may with confidence look forward to the time when sound and sane study and research will have cleared up these extraordinarily difficult and

complicated problems. In the meantime, however, we have complete certitude with regard to the essentials of the matter. Knowing, if objective, is like seeing. We know that we know, and so, in some analogous sense of the word, see, see our knowing. We know the truth of our knowing; but truth is the correspondence of the knowing to the known; therefore, in some analogous sense of the word, see, we see the correspondence of our knowing to the known. Finally, science is of the universal; but scientific knowledge is at least possible; therefore, in some analogous sense of the word, see, we see universals.

The idealist is not impressed. He feels that the distinction between appearance and reality has been overlooked. By appearance he does not mean any illusion or hallucination. He means precisely what Jack or Jill really does see: the shape of an outstretched hand, its color, the lines that mark it, its position out there in front of the head. He is willing to add what Jack and Jill do not see: the feelings inside the hand and the conjunction in ordinary experience of the feelings with the visible object. All of that is not reality but appearance. And by reality he means what is meant by Jack, Jill, and the naive realist. Such is his thesis, and he argues as follows.

When I lift a lump of lead, I may report either that the lead is heavy or that the lead feels heavy. When I gaze out my window at a green field, I may report either that the field is green or that the field looks green. Such alternative reports are not equivalent. When I say 'is heavy' or 'is green,' I am using language that purports to report the real properties of real things. When I say 'feels heavy' or 'looks green,' I am not committing myself to any statement about the objective properties of things but, on the contrary, am limiting my statement to impressions made on me. Hence it is quite possible for one to say that, while he does not know whether or not the field really is green, at least it appears green to him. Knowledge of appearance, then, is one thing; and knowledge of reality is another.

Now what does Jack know when he looks at his hand? What does Jill know when she looks at hers? Two answers are possible, so Jack may say that his hand is out there in front of his face, and Jill may say that her hand at least *seems* to be out there in front of her face. Nor is the difference between the two answers difficult to detect. When Jack says 'is,' he is not reporting what he knows by sight alone; he also has made a judgment; he has added *Denken to Anschauen*. When Jill says 'seems,' she is limiting her report to what is known by sight alone; the act of reporting involves thought and judgment; but what is reported is simply and solely what is known by her seeing, the appearance of a hand in front of her face.

No less than the naive realist, the idealist is capable of generalization and deduction. As sight, so also hearing, smelling, tasting, touching are constitutive, not of knowledge of reality, but only of knowledge of appearances. What is true of outer sense also is true of inner sense: by our consciousness we know, not our reality, but only its appearance. Hence, when we inquire, understand, think, we have only appearances to investigate, to understand, to think about. When we judge, our judgments must be based, not on things themselves, but only on their appearance. There is no way in which knowledge of reality could creep into our cognitional operations. Hence all our statements must be modified with the qualification, 'as far as appearances go.' To say that men commonly do not add that qualification or that they are not ready to admit it even when its necessity is demonstrated, is just another way of saying that they suffer from a transcendental illusion.

As the idealist was not impressed by the naive realist, so the critical realist is impressed neither by the one nor by the other. Against the naive realist of the type in question he maintains that the essence of the objectivity of human knowing does not stand revealed in seeing or in any other single cognitional operation. His reason is simple: first, human knowing is not some single operation but a structure of several operations; secondly, the objectivity of human knowing is not some single property but a combination of distinct properties that reside severally in distinct operations. Further, he contends that intellectual operations are not similar to sensitive operations, that the objectivity of intellectual operations is not similar to the objectivity of sensitive operations, and that to demand similarity as an a priori condition of the possibility of objective intellectual operations is to demand that rational psychology be reduced to a *terra incognita*. Intellectual operations are related to sensitive operations, not by similarity, but by functional complementarity and intellectual operations have their objectivity, not because they resemble ocular vision, but because they are what ocular vision never is, namely, intelligent and rational.

Against the idealist of the type in question the critical realist maintains that sense does not know appearances. It is just as much a matter of judgment to know that an object is not real but apparent, as it is to know that an object is not apparent but real. Sense does not know appearances, because sense alone is not human knowing, and because sense alone does not possess the full objectivity of human knowing. By our senses we are given, not appearance, not reality, but data. By our consciousness, which is not an inner sense, we are given, not appearance, not reality, but data. Further, while it is true enough that data of sense result in us from the action of external objects, it is not true that we know this by sense alone; we know it as we know anything else, by experiencing, understanding, and judging. Again, it is not true that it is from sense that our cognitional activities derive their immediate relationship to real objects; that relationship is immediate in the intention of being; it is mediate in the data of sense and in the data of consciousness inasmuch as the intention of being makes use of data in promoting cognitional process to knowledge of being; similarly, that relationship is mediate in understanding and thought and judgment, because these activities stand to the originating intention of being as answers stand to questions.

Finally, against both the naive realist and the idealist of the types in question, the critical realist urges the charge of picture thinking. Why does the naive realist ground objective knowledge of reality in looking, perceiving, *Anschauung*? Why does the idealist assert that it is by *Anschauung* that our cognitional activities have their immediate relationship to objects?² It is because their world is a picture world. If their world were the universe of being, they would agree that the original relationship of cognitional activity to the universe of being must lie in the intention of being. But their world is a picture world; the original relationship of cognitional activity to the picture is the look; and so it is in looking that the naive realist finds revealed the essence of objectivity, and it is in *Anschauung* that the critical idealist places the immediate relation of cognitional activity to objects. There exists, then, something like a forgetfulness of being. There exists in man a need for an intellectual conversion *ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem*.

6 Knowing and Living

The forgetfulness of being, manifested by naive realists and idealists, has brought about

a semantic reversal. Subjectivity once was a pejorative term; it denoted a violation of the normative exigences of intelligence and rationality. But it has come to denote a rejection of misconceived objectivity and a reaffirmation of man's right to be himself even though he cannot untie the hard and intricate knots of philosophy.

This new usage is not without its own myth, in which Jack and Jill are concerned, not with their hands, but with one another. They look, of course, but much more they talk. They are not merely objects, but also subjects: an 'I' and 'thou' that add up to the single personal total of 'us' talking about 'ourselves' and what 'we' have done and shall do.

Objectivity, as misconceived, is transcended. The problem of the bridge from 'in here' to 'out there' tends to vanish when the whole stress falls on the interpersonal situation, on the psychic interchange of mutual presence, the beginnings of what may prove to be a lifelong union.

Objectivity, as correctly conceived, is by no means rejected. For Jack and Jill are not characters out of a social worker's casebook. They are neither unperceptive, nor stupid, nor silly. If they were, acquaintance would not blossom into friendship, nor friendship into intimacy.

Still, this recognition of objectivity is only implicit, and, above all, it is not objective knowing but human living that is the main point. To understand the myth, one has to move beyond strictly cognitional levels of empirical, intellectual, and rational consciousness to the more inclusive level of rational self-consciousness. Though being and the good are coextensive, the subject moves to a further dimension of consciousness as his concern shifts from knowing being to realizing the good. Now there emerge freedom and responsibility, encounter and trust, communication and belief, choice and promise and fidelity. On this level subjects both constitute themselves and make their world. On this level men are responsible, individually, for the lives they lead and, collectively, for the world in which they lead them. It is in this collective responsibility for common or complementary action that resides the principal constituent of the collective subject referred to by 'we,' 'us,' 'ourselves,' 'ours.'

The condition of possibility of the collective subject is communication, and the principal communication is not saying what we know but showing what we are. To say what one knows presupposes the labor of coming to know. But to show what one is, it is enough to be it; showing will follow; every movement, every word, every deed, reveal what the subject is. They reveal it to others, and the others, in the self-revelation that is their response, obliquely reveal to the intelligent subject what he is. In the main it is not by introspection but by reflecting on our living in common with others that we come to know ourselves.

What is revealed? It is an original creation. Freely the subject makes himself what he is; never in this life is the making finished; always it is still in process, always it is a precarious achievement that can slip and fall and shatter. Concern with subjectivity, then, is concern with the intimate reality of man. It is concern, not with the universal truths that hold whether a man is asleep or awake, not with the interplay of natural factors and determinants, but with the perpetual novelty of self-constitution, of free choices making the chooser what he is.

Further aspects of the significance of subjectivity are endless, for the intimate reality of man grounds and penetrates all that is human. But the point to be made here is, not to go on insisting on this significance which, commonly enough, is recognized, but to draw attention to a real danger inherent in the semantic reversal that we have noted. For the danger is that the values of subjectivity in its more recent sense will be squandered by subjectivity in its prior and pejorative sense. Unless the two meanings are sharply distinguished, praise of subjectivity seems to imply a condemnation of objectivity. But condemnation of objectivity induces, not a merely incidental blind spot in one's vision, but a radical undermining of authentic human existence.

It is quite true that objective knowing is not yet authentic human living; but without objective knowing there is no authentic living; for one knows objectively just insofar as one is neither unperceptive, nor stupid, nor silly; and one does not live authentically inasmuch as one is either unperceptive or stupid or silly.

It is quite true that the subject communicates not by saying what he knows but by showing what he is, and it is no less true that subjects are confronted with themselves more effectively by being confronted with others than by solitary introspection. But such facts by themselves only ground a technique for managing people; and managing people is not treating them as persons. To treat them as persons one must know and one must invite them to know. A real exclusion of objective knowing, so far from promoting, only destroys personalist values.

It is quite true that concern for subjectivity promotes as much objective knowing as men commonly feel ready to absorb. Authentic living includes objective knowing, and far more eagerly do human beings strive for the whole than for the part. Nonetheless it remains that the authentic living of anyone reading this paper, though it must start at home, cannot remain confined within the horizons of the home, the workshop, the village. We are citizens of our countries, men of the twentieth century, members of a universal church. If any authenticity we achieve is to radiate out into our troubled world, we need much more objective knowing than men commonly feel ready to absorb.

Conclusion

To resume, I have attempted (1) to state what is meant by a dynamic structure, (2) to indicate that human knowing is a dynamic structure, (3) to reveal the difference between consciousness and self-knowledge, (4) to conclude that the objectivity of human knowing is, not a single property of a single operation, but a triad of properties found in distinct operations, (5) to contrast this view of objectivity with views derived from picture thinking, and (6) to add a note on the relations between the dynamic structure of objective knowing and the larger dynamic structure that is human living.

¹ By an 'idea' is meant the content of an act of understanding; hence the idea of being is the content of the act that understands being; as being is unrestricted, so the act must be unrestricted. The idea of being, then, is the divine essence *qua species intelligibilis* of divine understanding.

² On *Anschauung* in Kant I may perhaps refer to my note in *Gregorianum* 44 (1963) 310-11. It was reprinted the following year in the spring issue of *The Current* (Harvard-Radcliffe Catholic Club), Vol. 5. [Lonergan is referring to paragraphs that appear on pp. 193-94 in this collection.]