

## Both Modes of Knowing

There is another reason why growth must be toward greater implicitness as well as explicitness, and this may be the real reason for literature. Language must do justice to the two main ways by which, we said earlier, the hemispheres of the brain abstract experience. French, German, and other languages have two different verbs for these two modes of knowing (*savoir* and *connaître*, *wissen* and *können*), so well were they recognized centuries before modern brain research—intuitively at least! The one associated with the analytic hemisphere is the intellect, and the one associated with the synthesizing hemisphere is intuition. Interestingly, all cultures consider intuitive knowing “direct.” Intellect emphasizes parts and differences; intuition, wholes and similarities.

The analytic hemisphere sequences separate items in linear, cumulative fashion, moving in a time progression. It is digital and specializes in seriation. It is called the verbal hemisphere because language too is linear and analytic and seems to be essentially controlled by this half of the brain. But the two halves do work in tandem, after all, so that verbalization is significantly influenced by the mode of operation of the synthesizing hemisphere, even though that half is regarded as nonverbal.

The synthesizing hemisphere processes items simultaneously instead of sequentially and therefore is associated with space rather than time. It is analogical and specializes in classification. In holistic fashion, it fuses information coming from different sources at the same time. Because of its spatial orienting, it is associated with arts, sports, and crafts. It works by collecting diverse items together into a constellation based on some intuition of affinity among them. It is metaphorical. It links experience *implicitly*, whereas the analytic hemisphere names and states explicitly.

If language is to render thought effectively, it must somehow capture both of these modes of knowing—even though its own functioning is characterized by the analytic/linear hemisphere. Since growth occurs in both modes, and since language tries to do justice to both, we have to look at how it pulls off this feat.

To be explicit is to verbalize, to put into words rather than merely to imply. This difference between what is actually stated and what is left unstated strikes at the heart of our matter here, the rendering of thought into speech. The working of the analytic hemisphere naturally tends to make thought explicit in language, because it breaks thinking down into the kinds of items and relations that characterize language—the grammatical parts of speech, the types of sentence structures, and the kinds of discourse. Indeed, the fact

that only humans have specialized hemispheres has prompted a hypothesis that specialization evolved to facilitate speech. But how does language render the thought that characterizes the synthesizing hemisphere?