The Emergence of the Desire to Know: Reflections on Curiosity, Questionability, and Epistemic Subjectivity

Wanhong HUANG
huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

Abstract

This paper examines how the desire to know arises and how a world becomes available to a subject as something that can be questioned. It begins from an ambiguity within apparently simple questions such as why humans need," want," or "ought" to know. These formulations can conflate the genesis of epistemic desire, the structural role of curiosity in inquiry, the functions served by knowing, and the normative justification of epistemic activity. The paper therefore decomposes the initial question before attempting to answer it.

The inquiry focuses primarily on the genesis and constitution of curiosity. Curiosity is treated provisionally as a historically situated and relationally generated epistemic event through which an object, discrepancy, encounter, or aspect of the world acquires epistemic salience for a subject. Explicit questioning may arise only after prior structures of perception, language, expectation, memory, affect, and relation have already made a phenomenon capable of becoming questionable. The paper accordingly examines whether curiosity should be understood less as a fixed possession of an already constituted subject and more as one possible manifestation of a generative subject–world relation.

A Generative Relational perspective is used to organize these questions while leaving the metaphysical status of curiosity open. The analysis distinguishes the emergence of epistemic desire from later claims concerning its usefulness or normative value. It therefore does not attempt to establish an unconditional obligation to preserve human curiosity. Instead, it develops a preliminary account of how subjects, questions, and objects of inquiry may become mutually articulated within historical and relational conditions. This account provides a conceptual basis for subsequent work on epistemic trajectories, artificial intelligence, and forms of knowledge production that can increasingly proceed without equivalent human participation in the genesis of inquiry.

Keywords: desire to know; curiosity; questionability; question formation; epistemic subjectivity; epistemic salience; relational epistemology; historical situatedness; Generative Relational theory

Discussion Paper Note

This paper is a conceptual and exploratory inquiry into the emergence of the desire to know. Its starting point is an apparently simple question: why do human beings want, need, or seek to know? The inquiry does not assume that these expressions identify a single philosophical problem. Ordinary language can compress several distinct questions into the same formulation, including the genesis of epistemic desire, the formation of questions, the structural role of curiosity in inquiry, the functions served by knowing, and the normative justification of epistemic activity.

The paper therefore begins by examining the question itself. In particular, terms such as "want," "need," "ought," and the Chinese expression "要" can carry different modal, dispositional, intentional, and normative meanings. Treating these meanings as interchangeable can move an inquiry prematurely from the emergence of wanting-to-know into questions concerning utility, obligation, optimization, autonomy, or the value of human subjectivity. These later questions remain philosophically important, but they require separate treatment.

The present inquiry concentrates primarily on the emergence and constitution of epistemic desire. It asks how a phenomenon becomes salient to a subject as something that can be questioned, how an explicit question can arise from a previously unarticulated relation to the world, and whether curiosity is best treated as a fixed property possessed by an already constituted subject. Curiosity is instead approached provisionally as one possible mode of a historically situated and relationally generated epistemic event.

This provisional account does not claim that curiosity possesses a single underlying essence. Neither does it claim that all instances of curiosity share an identical causal mechanism. A child's question about the Moon, anger directed toward an experienced injustice, astonishment before the night sky, confusion produced by an unexpected experimental result, and an apparently spontaneous desire to investigate an unfamiliar object can differ substantially in affect, history, motivation, and cognitive organization. Their comparison is used to examine a more limited structural possibility: an aspect of the world can move from the background of experience into a position from which further inquiry becomes possible.

The paper consequently distinguishes the existence of an explicit question from the conditions through which that question becomes possible. Perceptual organization, language, memory, previous inquiry, expectation, affect, historical experience, social relations, and material conditions may already structure a field of possible questioning before a particular question is formulated. The appearance of curiosity can therefore be temporally later than some of the structures through which its object becomes questionable.

This distinction is explored without assuming a deterministic account of inquiry. A prior structure does not constitute a completed script for a later question. Historical and relational conditions can delimit, enable, suppress, or reshape fields of possible inquiry while leaving room for contingency, encounter, and transformation. The paper therefore treats the relation between latent structure and manifest questioning as generative rather than predetermined.

Several philosophical traditions provide comparative resources for this inquiry. Historical materialist approaches are relevant to the historical and material conditioning of subjects, practices, and domains of inquiry. Phenomenological approaches are relevant to the manner in which phenomena become salient or appear as requiring attention. Psychoanalytic and structural approaches provide resources for considering structures that can precede their explicit manifestation within a subject's self-description. Buddhist accounts of dependent origination and seed–manifestation relations provide another comparative vocabulary for thinking about latent conditions, manifestation, and recursive transformation. These traditions are not treated as equivalent, and structural similarities among them do not establish doctrinal identity.

The Generative Relational perspective developed in this paper serves primarily as an organizing framework for these problems. It allows epistemic events to be examined through relations among subjects, objects, histories, contexts, practices, and changing generative conditions without requiring curiosity to be assigned a fixed substantial ontology. The term "relation" is likewise used as an analytical convenience rather than as a claim that all relevant phenomena can be reduced to one ontological primitive.

The inquiry also leaves the metaphysical status of pre-articulated or pre-symbolic epistemic states

DRAFT

open. A subject can experience a discrepancy, attraction, disturbance, uncertainty, or sense that "something is here" before a stable question or concept has been formulated. Such cases motivate the possibility of epistemic organization preceding explicit symbolic articulation. They do not by themselves establish a universal pre-symbolic substrate, an ineffable realm beyond language, or a fixed sequence through which every act of inquiry must proceed.

A further distinction concerns the dissolution of a philosophical question. To decompose the question "why do humans need to know?" is not to declare the question false, meaningless, unanswerable, or unworthy of investigation. Rather, conceptual analysis can reveal that an apparently unified question contains several questions with different logical forms. The present paper therefore treats dissolution as clarification through decomposition. The resulting questions can subsequently be investigated on their own terms.

The normative status of curiosity remains deliberately open. The paper does not attempt to establish that human curiosity possesses unconditional intrinsic value, that human beings have a universal obligation to remain epistemically curious, or that every form of curiosity should be preserved. Such claims would require additional normative premises concerning human subjectivity, autonomy, practice, flourishing, historical continuation, or other values. The present inquiry instead examines whether curiosity can have a constitutive role within some forms of human knowing and what kind of subject–world relation is present when something becomes worth asking about.

Artificial intelligence provides an important later context for this inquiry, but it is not the principal object of the present paper. AI systems increasingly generate questions, explanations, hypotheses, summaries, and other epistemic artifacts without reproducing an equivalent human trajectory of curiosity, encounter, and question formation. This development makes the distinction between epistemic output and the genesis of inquiry especially visible. The analysis developed here is intended to provide conceptual groundwork for subsequent studies of epistemic trajectories, pre-symbolic apprehension, AI-mediated knowledge production, and the possible separation between knowledge-like outputs and human epistemic formation.

The paper should therefore be read as a preliminary clarification of a problem-space rather than as a completed theory of curiosity. Its principal aim is to identify distinctions that must remain visible before stronger causal, metaphysical, normative, educational, or technological claims can be made.

Responsible Use and Rights Reservation

This section separates requested scholarly conduct from the legal permissions stated on the following page. It records an ethical request for responsible use and then defines the narrower scope of retained legal rights.

The author encourages good-faith discussion, criticism, independent inquiry, and responsible use of the material in this work. Separately from the licence's terms, the author asks users to consider foreseeable harms when adapting or applying the proposed framework. This ethical request leaves the licence's permissions and legally authorized uses unchanged.

The author retains the rights preserved under CC BY-NC 4.0 and may pursue remedies to which the author is legally entitled for breach of the licence or violation of the author's independently applicable rights. Reuse remains independent from authorial endorsement. Third-party rights require authorization from their respective holders where applicable. Copyright exceptions and limitations, including applicable forms of fair use or fair dealing, remain fully available.

DRAFT

Notices

This page consolidates the manuscript's publication status, licence, development disclosure, research-programme relation, and suggested citation.

Status. This working draft records an evolving stage of the author's position and is circulated for discussion. Definitions, section structure, formal statements, and numbering remain subject to revision. A systematic value-theory review, expanded recognition-theory review, empirical network cases, specialist statistical review, institutional design, and originality audit remain future research stages.

Licence. Except where otherwise indicated, copyright 2026 Wanhong Huang. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0). Subject to its terms, the licence permits sharing and adaptation for noncommercial purposes with appropriate attribution, a link to the licence, an indication of changes, and attribution that preserves the licensor's independence from the reuse. Reuse is governed solely by that licence; the responsible-use request on the preceding page remains separate from its terms. The licence deed and legal-code link are available at `https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/`. The licence governs in case of conflict with this summary. Third-party material remains subject to the rights held by its respective rights holders.

Statement on the use of language models. The exploratory discussions and preparation of this paper involved OpenAI's ChatGPT. ChatGPT supported exploratory dialogue, formal reconstruction, source discovery followed by website verification, exact calculation, argumentative criticism, and drafting in LaTeX. The author selected the research questions, directed and approved the theoretical commitments and epistemic status of the claims, and bears sole responsibility for the manuscript, including its definitions, formal constructions, taxonomy, calculations, arguments, conclusions, and errors. Authorship credit remains with the human author. The access level and claim limit for every cited source are recorded in the accompanying literature audit.

DRAFT

1 Introduction

The desire for knowledge occupies an unusual position in the history of philosophy. Aristotle opens the *Metaphysics* with the claim that human beings desire to know by nature and later relates the emergence of philosophy to wonder [1]. The formulation is familiar, yet the phenomenon to which it points remains conceptually difficult. Human beings do not merely possess incomplete knowledge and subsequently fill identifiable gaps. Particular objects, discrepancies, events, relations, and experiences become salient in ways that give rise to further attention, questioning, and inquiry. Others remain epistemically inactive despite being equally unknown. The problem therefore concerns more than the presence of ignorance. It concerns the conditions under which something comes to matter epistemically to a subject.

Contemporary research provides several powerful accounts of curiosity once an episode of curiosity has become identifiable. Loewenstein's information-gap account interprets curiosity through the perception of a gap between existing knowledge and desired knowledge [11]. Subsequent psychological and neuroscientific research has examined curiosity in relation to information seeking, uncertainty, reward, learning, attention, and decision-making [8]. Philosophical work has likewise treated curiosity through questions of epistemic motivation, intellectual character, inquiry, and the value of seeking knowledge. Pragmatist accounts of inquiry provide another important orientation. Dewey, for example, describes inquiry as emerging from an initially indeterminate or problematic situation that must itself become articulated as a problem [3]. These traditions approach different dimensions of a phenomenon whose apparent familiarity can conceal substantial conceptual variation.

The present paper isolates a narrower problem that cuts across these approaches. It examines the emergence of the desire to know and the formation of *questionability*: the condition through which a phenomenon becomes available to a subject as something that can sustain inquiry. This problem arises prior to several questions that are often associated with curiosity. It is distinct from an account of the practical advantages produced by curiosity, from an explanation of curiosity's contribution to learning or discovery, and from a normative argument concerning why human beings ought to remain curious. These questions can become connected within a larger theory of epistemic life, although they concern different explanatory objects.

The distinction becomes necessary because ordinary formulations concerning the human need or desire for knowledge can combine several modalities within one expression. A subject can want to know, require information for some practical purpose, possess a disposition toward inquiry, or stand under an epistemic or institutional obligation to investigate. These relations can occur together, but an explanation of one does not automatically explain the others. Practical necessity can motivate the acquisition of information without producing curiosity. Curiosity can arise where no identifiable practical need is present. An obligation to investigate can exist without an independently generated desire to know. A stable disposition toward inquiry can likewise coexist with indifference toward a particular object.

This modal ambiguity has a broader philosophical consequence. A question concerning the emergence of epistemic desire can easily be transformed into a question concerning the justification of epistemic activity. Once this occurs, the analysis moves toward the value of knowledge, the preservation of human agency, the purposes of inquiry, or the normative status of epistemic subjectivity. These are substantive philosophical problems. They do not, however, explain the event through which a subject first comes to experience something as worth knowing. The present paper therefore suspends the stronger normative question and concentrates on the genesis and constitution of inquiry.

This change of focus also requires caution concerning the status of curiosity itself. The grammatical form of ordinary descriptions encourages a subject-property model in which an already constituted subject *has* curiosity and subsequently directs it toward an independently constituted object. Such a model is useful for many psychological purposes, especially where curiosity is examined as a measurable state or disposition. It need not settle the philosophical structure of every episode of curiosity. A different possibility is that some instances of curiosity emerge within relations through which a subject, an object of inquiry, and an orientation toward further knowing become jointly articulated.

Consider the difference between an unknown and an unknown that becomes questionable. At any

DRAFT

moment, a subject fails to know indefinitely many facts. The overwhelming majority of these absences do not generate inquiry. An information deficit becomes epistemically active only under conditions through which it is registered as relevant, unresolved, surprising, disturbing, attractive, anomalous, or otherwise capable of reorganizing attention. The formation of curiosity therefore requires some account of selective epistemic salience. The relevant problem is not exhausted by the quantity of information absent from the subject's knowledge. It concerns the relation through which a particular absence or discrepancy becomes significant.

The same phenomenon can occupy different epistemic positions for different subjects and for the same subject at different moments. A familiar object can remain unnoticed over repeated encounters and later become the source of a question. A theoretical inconsistency can remain invisible until another concept, observation, or comparison makes the tension recognizable. A social arrangement can be experienced as ordinary within one historical configuration and become an object of criticism within another. These variations suggest that questionability depends upon more than stable properties of an isolated object. They also resist an account in which question formation is treated as an arbitrary projection of an isolated subject. The encounter is conditioned by prior knowledge, perception, language, affect, practice, social relations, material circumstances, historical organization, and features of the phenomenon encountered.

The temporal structure of inquiry introduces a further difficulty. An explicit question can appear later than some of the epistemic changes through which that question becomes possible. A subject can register that something is wrong before identifying what is wrong. A researcher can experience an unresolved tension between two accounts before possessing the conceptual distinction required to formulate the problem precisely. An unexpected observation can interrupt an established interpretation before the resulting disturbance has been stabilized in language. The explicit question is therefore not necessarily the first epistemic event in the trajectory of inquiry.

This point does not require a general doctrine of pre-symbolic knowledge. A subject's capacities for perception, attention, discrimination, and expectation can themselves be historically shaped by language and previous symbolic practices. The relevant distinction is narrower. Symbolic articulation and epistemic emergence need not occur at the same moment. Something can begin to reorganize a subject's epistemic orientation before the subject possesses a determinate proposition or question through which that reorganization can be expressed. The relation between pre-articulated disturbance and explicit question formation consequently deserves analysis without assuming either complete independence from language or complete reducibility to already available linguistic categories.

A related distinction concerns the structures that precede manifest curiosity. Questions presuppose capacities and distinctions that are not created at the instant of interrogation. Recognition of novelty depends upon some background against which difference can appear. Recognition of anomaly depends upon expectations or regularities that can be disrupted. Causal inquiry requires ways of distinguishing events and dependencies. Social and political questions depend upon inherited categories, practices, histories, and normative vocabularies through which relations become intelligible. An episode of curiosity can therefore emerge from an epistemic organization whose formation precedes the conscious experience of curiosity itself.

Prior organization should not be interpreted as a predetermined representation of a future question. A structure can condition a field of possible inquiry without containing a completed script for subsequent epistemic events. Contingent encounters remain capable of changing what becomes salient and how existing distinctions are reorganized. An accidental juxtaposition can disclose an unnoticed relation. A practical failure can expose an assumption that had remained tacit. A conversation can redirect attention toward a distinction that had previously carried no epistemic weight. The resulting account must therefore accommodate historical structure and contingency within the same process.

This requirement becomes especially important once inquiry is considered historically. What can become an object of curiosity depends partly upon what a historical world makes available for perception, articulation, comparison, and investigation. Instruments disclose phenomena that were previously inaccessible. Conceptual developments establish new distinctions. Institutions organize sustained forms

DRAFT

of attention. Material and technical capacities generate new objects and relations. Forms of production, social organization, and conflict affect which phenomena become visible as problems and which remain normalized or obscure. Historical conditions consequently participate in the formation of both epistemic subjects and possible objects of inquiry.

A historical account alone does not exhaust the event-level problem. The availability of a conceptual or material possibility for inquiry does not determine why a particular phenomenon becomes compelling for a particular subject at a particular moment. Historical conditions can help explain the formation of a field of possible questions, while the emergence of a concrete question can depend upon local relations, affective states, contingent encounters, previous trajectories, and features of the encountered phenomenon. The distinction between historical conditioning and concrete emergence is therefore maintained throughout the analysis.

The paper approaches these problems through a provisional Generative Relational perspective. The framework is used to organize inquiry into the changing relations among subjects, objects, histories, contexts, practices, and conditions of epistemic emergence. It does not require the claim that relation constitutes an exclusive ontological primitive, nor does it assign curiosity a fixed metaphysical essence. Its role is methodological and conceptual. It permits the analysis to consider how an epistemic subject, an object as questionable, and an orientation toward further knowing can emerge through a common relational event while remaining open to different psychological, phenomenological, historical, and social explanations of the process.

This perspective also changes the location of the problem of epistemic subjectivity. A subject engaged in inquiry is not exhausted by the possession of correct propositions. Inquiry can involve becoming sensitive to a difference, recognizing that an existing organization is insufficient, sustaining attention toward an unresolved phenomenon, forming a question, encountering resistance, revising an interpretation, and acquiring new capacities through which further questions become possible. The significance of curiosity within such a process may therefore be constitutive even where it is not instrumentally necessary for the production of a particular epistemic output.

The distinction between constitutive and instrumental significance is central to the paper's broader motivation. If curiosity improves learning, exploration, or discovery, it can be defended instrumentally through those consequences. Such a defense remains dependent upon the value assigned to the relevant ends. A different claim is that curiosity participates in the organization of a particular mode of knowing. Under this interpretation, eliminating curiosity does not simply reduce or improve the efficiency of an otherwise identical process. It can alter the relation among the subject, the object, the question, and the trajectory through which knowing occurs. This constitutive possibility can be investigated without yet establishing that the resulting mode of knowing ought to be preserved.

Artificial intelligence makes this distinction increasingly visible. Systems can generate questions, hypotheses, summaries, explanations, counterarguments, and other epistemic outputs without requiring an equivalent human episode of curiosity for each output. The development is philosophically important because it weakens an association that could previously remain implicit: sophisticated epistemic production and the epistemic formation of a human producer need not develop together. Yet the existence of machine-generated questions does not settle the present problem. It establishes that some epistemic outputs can be produced without corresponding human curiosity. It does not establish that question production, epistemic desire, questionability, and epistemic subjectivity are identical phenomena.

For this reason, artificial intelligence remains a motivating boundary condition rather than the principal object of the present paper. A direct argument concerning whether artificial systems can replace human curiosity would be premature without first specifying what is being replaced. The same qualification applies to normative claims concerning the preservation of human knowing. The present analysis does not attempt to establish an unconditional value of curiosity, a universal obligation to inquire, or an intrinsic priority of human epistemic subjectivity. These issues require additional premises that extend beyond the explanatory problem developed here.

The paper makes four principal contributions. First, it decomposes the general problem of the human desire for knowledge into distinct questions concerning genesis, questionability, constitution, function,

DRAFT

and normativity. This decomposition prevents functional and normative explanations from being used as substitutes for an account of epistemic emergence. Second, it develops *questionability* as a provisional relational concept for describing how a phenomenon moves from epistemic background into a position capable of sustaining inquiry. Third, it distinguishes manifest curiosity and explicit question formation from prior forms of epistemic organization without presupposing that later questions are predetermined by those structures. Fourth, it places these distinctions within a historical and relational account in which inquiry can transform the conditions through which subsequent inquiry becomes possible.

The contribution is intentionally limited. The paper does not offer a complete psychological theory of curiosity, a universal metaphysics of epistemic desire, or a general normative theory of inquiry. It also does not claim that all forms of curiosity share an identical mechanism or that every episode of inquiry passes through the same sequence of stages. Its purpose is to clarify a problem-space that becomes obscured when curiosity, wanting to know, question formation, information seeking, and the value of inquiry are treated as interchangeable.

Section 2 develops the conceptual decomposition required for the argument and specifies the distinction among epistemic desire, curiosity, questionability, and the different forms of epistemic significance. The subsequent literature review situates these distinctions within research on curiosity, wonder, inquiry, historical situatedness, and subject formation. The central analytical sections then examine the relational and historical formation of questionability, the relation between prior epistemic organization and manifest curiosity, and the recursive transformation of the conditions of inquiry. The concluding discussion returns to epistemic subjectivity and identifies the functional, normative, and technological questions that remain open for subsequent work.

2 Conceptual Decomposition of Epistemic Desire

This section clarifies the conceptual distinctions required before the emergence of curiosity can be examined in historical and relational terms. Its objective is to separate several problems that can be compressed into the general question of why human beings seek knowledge. The section distinguishes the emergence of epistemic desire from practical need, epistemic function, and normative justification; separates curiosity from explicit question formation; and introduces questionability as a provisional concept for examining how a phenomenon becomes available to inquiry. The method is conceptual. No general psychological mechanism or fixed metaphysical account of curiosity is assumed at this stage.

2.1 Modalities of Epistemic Desire

This subsection distinguishes several modalities through which a subject can be oriented toward further knowing. The distinction is necessary because desire, practical need, disposition, and obligation can all motivate inquiry while referring to different relations between a subject and a possible epistemic state.

A subject can desire to know something without requiring that knowledge for an independent practical end. A subject can also require information for action without experiencing substantial curiosity toward the relevant object. Inquiry can further arise through professional responsibility, institutional obligation, delegated research, or relatively stable dispositions toward investigation. These conditions can coexist within one epistemic episode, but they do not constitute the same explanandum.

The difference becomes important when asking why inquiry occurs. An account of the utility of knowledge can explain why information contributes to action without explaining how an object becomes epistemically compelling to a particular subject. An account of epistemic obligation can provide reasons for investigation without explaining the genesis of a desire to know. A theory of intellectual dispositions can describe recurring orientations toward inquiry while leaving open why a particular phenomenon becomes salient at a particular time.

The present paper therefore treats the emergence of epistemic desire as a distinct problem. This analytical separation does not imply that epistemic desire arises independently of practical needs, social norms, institutions, or historical conditions. Such conditions can participate directly in its formation.

DRAFT

The distinction concerns the object of explanation: the emergence of wanting to know is not exhausted by an account of what knowledge is useful for or why an agent ought to pursue it.

2.2 Epistemic Desire and Curiosity

This subsection specifies the relation between epistemic desire and curiosity used in the present paper. Its objective is to preserve conceptual openness before the relevant psychological and philosophical accounts are examined. Epistemic desire is used as a broad term for an orientation toward further knowing, while curiosity refers to a family of phenomena through which such an orientation can become manifest.

Existing accounts characterize curiosity in different ways, including as a response to perceived gaps in knowledge, a motivational state associated with information seeking, and an epistemically significant attitude or disposition [11, 8, 18, 17]. These approaches identify important dimensions of curiosity without requiring every desire to know to share a single psychological structure.

The distinction also prevents the grammar of possessing curiosity from determining the ontology of curiosity in advance. Describing a subject as having curiosity can be useful at the psychological or dispositional level, but this description does not establish that curiosity must be understood as a fixed internal property of an independently constituted subject. Some episodes identified as curiosity may instead arise through relations in which a subject, an object of inquiry, and an orientation toward further knowing become jointly articulated.

The relevant object of analysis is therefore broader than an isolated mental state. It includes changes in attention, disturbances of expectation, perceived discrepancies, unresolved significance, and the conditions through which further inquiry becomes possible. Curiosity can consequently remain psychologically describable while also being investigated as a historically situated and relationally generated epistemic phenomenon.

2.3 Questionability and Inquiry Formation

This subsection introduces *questionability* as a provisional concept for examining how a phenomenon becomes available to inquiry. Its objective is to distinguish the existence of something unknown from the emergence of that unknown as epistemically significant to a subject.

Subjects are continuously surrounded by facts, relations, and processes they do not know. Most of these unknowns do not become objects of inquiry. The presence of missing information is therefore insufficient to explain question formation. A phenomenon must become situated in a relation through which it can be experienced as unresolved, surprising, anomalous, significant, disturbing, attractive, or otherwise capable of sustaining epistemic attention.

Loewenstein's information-gap account identifies an important form of this transition by relating curiosity to awareness of a discrepancy between what is known and what one wishes to know [11]. A perceived gap, however, already presupposes some epistemic organization. The subject must be capable of distinguishing the relevant phenomenon, locating it against existing expectations or knowledge, and recognizing the resulting difference as significant enough to warrant attention.

Questionability is therefore not treated as a context-independent property of an object. The same phenomenon can remain unremarkable for one subject and become compelling for another. It can also remain unnoticed by the same subject at one time and become an object of sustained inquiry at another. Questionability is likewise not reduced to arbitrary subjective projection. Features of the encountered phenomenon, evidence, material resistance, social relations, practices, and surrounding conditions participate in what can become epistemically salient.

Questionability consequently refers to a relational position rather than an independent property. It designates the condition under which a phenomenon enters an epistemic configuration in which continued indifference is disrupted and further inquiry becomes possible.

DRAFT

2.4 Explicit Questions and Pre-Articulated Inquiry

This subsection separates explicit question formation from the earlier epistemic changes through which a phenomenon can become questionable. Its objective is to avoid identifying the appearance of a linguistically stable question with the beginning of inquiry.

A subject can experience discrepancy, surprise, confusion, attraction, disturbance, or unresolved significance before being able to formulate a determinate question. A researcher can recognize that two theoretical descriptions fail to fit together before being able to identify the exact source of the conflict. An unexpected observation can disturb an existing interpretation before the subject possesses the conceptual resources required to state what has become problematic.

The possibility of such cases suggests that symbolic articulation can occur later than the epistemic event that motivates it. This claim does not require the stronger assumption that all inquiry originates in a universal pre-symbolic state. Nor does it imply that pre-articulated experience is independent of language, concepts, or prior symbolic organization. It supports the more limited distinction between the beginning of an epistemic disturbance and the later stabilization of that disturbance as an explicit question.

The distinction also separates question production from curiosity. Questions can be generated through examination requirements, institutional routines, professional obligations, delegated tasks, or externally supplied research agendas without a corresponding episode of independently arising curiosity. The production of an interrogative form and the emergence of an epistemically significant problem should therefore remain analytically distinct.

2.5 Prior Organization and Manifest Curiosity

This subsection examines the possibility that some of the structures through which curiosity becomes manifest are operative before curiosity is consciously identified. Its objective is to distinguish prior generative organization from the later appearance of a specific question or desire to know.

A question does not create, at the moment of its formulation, all of the distinctions required for that question to be intelligible. Recognition of an anomaly presupposes some expectation against which an event can appear anomalous. Recognition of inconsistency presupposes an organization within which observations or claims can stand in tension. Causal inquiry presupposes ways of distinguishing events, persistence, change, and dependence. Social and political inquiry can depend upon inherited categories, normative vocabularies, institutional experience, and historical narratives.

Perceptual organization, linguistic competence, previous learning, memory, affect, social relations, and practices can therefore structure a field of possible inquiry before a particular episode of curiosity appears. Manifest curiosity can be later than some of the conditions through which its object has become capable of appearing as questionable.

Prior organization does not imply a predetermined outcome. A generative condition is not a completed question stored in advance. Historically formed structures can make some distinctions available, render other distinctions difficult, orient attention, and shape fields of possible inquiry without determining which specific question will emerge or whether a question will emerge at all.

Contingency remains important within this account. A familiar phenomenon can become questionable through an unexpected encounter. An accidental comparison can disclose a relation that had previously remained unnoticed. A disagreement can expose a tacit assumption. A practical failure can disturb an interpretation that had previously remained stable. The emergence of curiosity can therefore be structurally conditioned without being reducible to structural determination.

Inquiry also modifies the organization from which later inquiry emerges. Acquired concepts, practices, experiences, and previous questions can alter what subsequently attracts attention, what appears anomalous, and what kinds of unknowns can become recognizable. The conditions of curiosity consequently possess a recursive history.

DRAFT

2.6 Historical Conditions of Questionability

This subsection extends the analysis from individual epistemic history to the broader historical conditions within which questions become possible. Its objective is to distinguish the emergence of a particular episode of curiosity from the formation of the material, conceptual, and social field within which such an episode can occur.

The range of possible objects of inquiry changes historically. Instruments can make previously inaccessible phenomena available to observation. Conceptual developments can establish distinctions that earlier vocabularies did not sustain. Institutions can stabilize practices of inquiry and organize attention toward particular domains. Forms of production and technical capacity can generate new objects, environments, dependencies, and risks. Social conflict can make previously normalized relations available to criticism.

Historical conditions therefore participate in the formation of both objects of inquiry and subjects capable of recognizing those objects in particular ways. What can become questionable depends partly upon the resources through which differences can be perceived, articulated, preserved, compared, and investigated.

This historical conditioning does not imply that a particular episode of curiosity can be exhaustively derived from macrohistorical conditions. An account of the historical availability of a question does not by itself explain why a particular subject encounters that question as compelling at a particular moment. Historical conditioning and event-level emergence operate at different explanatory scales.

Maintaining this distinction allows historical analysis to contribute to an account of curiosity without reducing concrete epistemic events to their social background. It also leaves open the possibility that material, institutional, phenomenological, psychological, and relational conditions contribute differently to the formation of questionability.

2.7 Constitutive, Functional, and Normative Significance

This subsection distinguishes three senses in which curiosity can be described as significant. Its objective is to prevent empirical claims concerning the effects of curiosity, structural claims concerning its place within inquiry, and normative claims concerning its value from being treated as equivalent.

Functional significance concerns what curiosity enables or modifies. Curiosity has been associated with exploration, information seeking, learning, memory, and the allocation of attention [8]. Claims of this kind concern consequences of curiosity for epistemic activity.

Constitutive significance concerns the place of curiosity within a particular form of knowing. Some forms of inquiry involve a subject becoming affected by an unresolved phenomenon, developing a question through that encounter, pursuing the object, revising an interpretation, and acquiring new capacities for later inquiry. Curiosity can participate in the constitution of such an epistemic trajectory even when the same final proposition could be produced through another route.

Normative significance concerns whether curiosity ought to be valued, cultivated, preserved, or protected. Claims at this level require additional premises concerning epistemic goods, human agency, education, autonomy, flourishing, historical participation, or other values. Functional usefulness does not establish normative value by itself. Constitutive participation in a particular form of knowing likewise does not establish that the form must be preserved under every condition.

The distinction becomes especially important where epistemic outputs can be produced without an equivalent human trajectory of curiosity. Such production can establish that human curiosity is not necessary for a particular output without establishing that curiosity lacks a constitutive role in human epistemic subjectivity. It also leaves unresolved the separate normative question of whether that form of subjectivity should be preserved.

DRAFT

2.8 Conceptual Dissolution

This subsection states the result of the preceding decomposition and defines the scope of the remaining analysis. The general problem concerning the human orientation toward knowledge can now be separated into several questions with different explanatory structures.

The first concerns genesis: under what conditions does an orientation toward further knowing emerge?

The second concerns questionability: how does a phenomenon become epistemically significant enough to sustain inquiry?

The third concerns constitution: what role does curiosity play within the formation of particular modes of epistemic subjectivity?

The fourth concerns function: what epistemic, practical, or social consequences follow from curiosity?

The fifth concerns normativity: what reasons, if any, support the cultivation or preservation of human curiosity and epistemic subjectivity?

These questions can interact, but they cannot be resolved by a single form of argument. A causal or historical account of the emergence of curiosity does not establish its normative value. An account of its functional consequences does not explain how an object becomes questionable. A defense of human epistemic agency does not determine why a particular desire to know arises.

The initial problem is therefore dissolved only in an analytical sense. Dissolution does not imply that the problem is false, meaningless, unanswerable, or unworthy of investigation. It indicates that its apparent unity depended upon the compression of several distinct questions. Once their different objects are made explicit, the expectation of a single answer is no longer warranted.

The present paper concentrates on the first three questions: the emergence of epistemic desire, the formation of questionability, and the possible constitutive relation between curiosity and epistemic subjectivity. Functional accounts are considered where they clarify these problems. The stronger normative question concerning whether human curiosity ought to be preserved remains open.

The next section situates these problems within the relevant philosophical and empirical literature. It examines psychological accounts of curiosity and information seeking, philosophical treatments of wonder and inquiry, historical approaches to the formation of epistemic possibilities, and theoretical resources for examining the relation between prior organization and manifest epistemic experience.

3 Literature Review and Philosophical Background

This section situates the problem of epistemic desire and questionability within several bodies of literature that address different stages or conditions of inquiry. Its objective is comparative rather than synthetic. The traditions reviewed below do not describe a single phenomenon in different vocabularies, and the present paper does not attempt to reconcile their metaphysical commitments. They are examined according to the particular resources they provide for understanding the emergence of inquiry: wonder, epistemic motivation, problem formation, perceptual salience, historical conditioning, prior symbolic organization, and latent conditions of manifestation.

The review proceeds from accounts that treat curiosity relatively directly toward traditions that address its conditions more indirectly. Classical discussions of wonder establish an early philosophical connection between encounter and inquiry. Psychological and epistemological theories characterize curiosity as a motivational or intellectual phenomenon. Pragmatist accounts shift attention toward the formation of problematic situations. Phenomenological approaches clarify the situated and pre-reflective structure of disclosure. Historical materialist, Kuhnian, and Foucauldian approaches show how domains of possible inquiry are historically organized. Finally, psychoanalytic and Yogācāra resources provide comparative models for thinking about structures or dispositions that can precede their manifest expression. The final subsection identifies the conceptual space in which the present inquiry is located.

DRAFT

3.1 Wonder and the Philosophical Beginning of Inquiry

This subsection examines classical treatments of wonder because they place the beginning of inquiry in an affective and epistemic disturbance rather than in the prior possession of a determinate research problem. The relevant contribution is structural: philosophy begins when an apparently familiar world ceases to remain entirely settled.

In the *Theaetetus*, Plato associates philosophy with wonder, presenting wonder as a condition through which philosophical questioning becomes possible [15]. Aristotle likewise connects the desire to know with human cognitive life at the beginning of the *Metaphysics*, and later describes wonder as a source of philosophical inquiry [1]. These passages have frequently been read as claims concerning the origin or motivation of philosophy. For the present paper, their significance lies in the relation they establish among encounter, disturbance, recognition of ignorance, and inquiry.

Wonder differs from a fully articulated information request. It can arise before the subject possesses a precise account of what is missing. A phenomenon can become strange, surprising, or resistant to an existing understanding before that disturbance has been transformed into a determinate question. Classical wonder therefore provides an early conceptual resource for distinguishing the emergence of epistemic significance from the later formulation of an explicit problem.

The concept nevertheless remains too broad to function as a complete theory of curiosity. Inquiry can emerge from affects other than wonder. Confusion, frustration, anxiety, perceived contradiction, practical failure, moral disturbance, or sustained attraction can also reorganize epistemic attention. Wonder is therefore treated here as one historically influential example of a more general transition through which the world ceases to remain epistemically indifferent.

3.2 Psychological Models of Curiosity

This subsection reviews psychological approaches that treat curiosity as a motivational phenomenon associated with uncertainty, information seeking, and learning. Their principal contribution to the present inquiry is the analysis of conditions under which missing information becomes motivationally active.

Loewenstein's information-gap theory remains one of the most influential modern accounts of curiosity. On this view, curiosity arises when attention is directed toward a perceived discrepancy between what a person knows and what the person wishes to know [11]. The model is important because ignorance alone does not generate curiosity. The subject must represent an absence in a way that makes the absence psychologically salient. Curiosity can consequently intensify when enough knowledge is present to make the boundary of what remains unknown visible.

Subsequent work has expanded the study of curiosity across motivational, developmental, cognitive, and neuroscientific domains. Kidd and Hayden review evidence connecting curiosity with learning, information seeking, decision-making, reward processing, and development while also emphasizing the continuing difficulty of establishing a single agreed delineation of curiosity [8]. This definitional heterogeneity is relevant to the present paper because it cautions against treating curiosity as an unproblematic natural kind whose boundaries are already settled.

Research on epistemic curiosity has also distinguished different motivational profiles. Litman and Silvia provide evidence for interest-type and deprivation-type dimensions of trait curiosity [10]. Interest-type curiosity is associated with the positive attraction of novelty and learning, whereas deprivation-type curiosity is more closely associated with the tension produced by missing information or unresolved uncertainty. This distinction supports a broader point relevant here: epistemic desire does not possess a uniform affective structure. Inquiry can be generated through attraction toward what is new or through discomfort with what remains unresolved.

Psychological models therefore provide detailed accounts of curiosity after a relevant gap, novelty, uncertainty, or informational opportunity has become psychologically available. The present paper extends the inquiry toward the conditions of that availability. A perceived information gap already requires some capacity to distinguish the relevant object, organize a background of expectation, recognize a difference, and assign the difference sufficient epistemic significance. The formation of the gap as a salient

DRAFT

gap therefore remains a further problem.

3.3 Epistemological Accounts of Curiosity and Inquisitiveness

This subsection examines philosophical work that places curiosity within the structure and evaluation of inquiry. Its role is to clarify the relation between episodic curiosity, intellectual motivation, questioning, and epistemic character.

Whitcomb develops an explicitly epistemological investigation of curiosity, treating its nature as a legitimate object of epistemological analysis [18]. The importance of this move is methodological. Curiosity cannot be confined to psychology when its structure affects how subjects pursue questions, seek truth, and organize epistemic activity. Questions concerning curiosity therefore intersect with questions concerning epistemic agency and the conduct of inquiry.

Watson's account of inquisitiveness shifts the focus from isolated episodes of curiosity toward intellectual character. Inquisitiveness is characterized through a stable motivation to engage sincerely in good questioning and is situated within virtue epistemology [17]. This account is especially relevant to the distinction between episodic curiosity and dispositional orientation developed in Section 2. A subject can possess a relatively durable orientation toward questioning while particular episodes of inquiry continue to depend upon local objects, situations, and encounters.

The virtue-epistemological literature also makes the normative dimension of curiosity explicit. Once inquisitiveness is considered an intellectual virtue, questions concerning good questioning, intellectual agency, and epistemic value become central. The present paper retains these concerns while placing them later in the explanatory sequence. A theory of good epistemic character can evaluate how a subject ought to inquire. The emergence of an object as questionable remains a distinct problem concerning how inquiry becomes possible and motivationally operative in the first place.

This distinction is particularly important for cases in which curiosity is episodic, involuntary, affectively disruptive, or poorly aligned with deliberative judgments concerning epistemic value. A subject can become curious before deciding that curiosity is appropriate. The genesis of curiosity can therefore precede its reflective evaluation.

3.4 Pragmatist Accounts of Problem Formation

This subsection considers Deweyan inquiry because it provides one of the closest precedents for treating the problem itself as something generated within an initially unsettled situation. Its contribution lies in relocating the beginning of inquiry from a fully specified question to a transformation within the situation of the inquirer.

In *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*, Dewey describes inquiry as emerging from an indeterminate situation and proceeding through the determination of a problem [3]. The problem is therefore formed within inquiry. The initial state can involve a pervasive sense that something is doubtful, confused, conflicting, or unsettled before the difficulty has received an adequate conceptual formulation.

This account closely approaches the distinction between questionability and explicit question formation developed in the present paper. A situation can acquire epistemic tension before the subject has identified a determinate question. Inquiry then participates in reorganizing the situation until its relevant distinctions and relations become sufficiently determinate for further investigation.

Dewey also resists an exclusively internal account of doubt. Inquiry concerns the transformation of an indeterminate situation rather than only the replacement of a deficient belief state. This feature is especially relevant to a relational account of questionability. The epistemic problem is generated through the subject's involvement within a situation containing material, practical, perceptual, and conceptual relations.

The pragmatist framework nevertheless assigns substantial importance to the movement from indeterminacy toward a more determinate and practically resolvable situation. The present inquiry has a narrower and earlier emphasis. It asks how some aspect of a situation acquires epistemic salience at all

DRAFT

and how historically formed subjects differ in what can become indeterminate, anomalous, or worthy of investigation for them.

3.5 Phenomenological Accounts of Salience and Situated Perception

This subsection examines phenomenological resources for understanding how a phenomenon can emerge from a background of practical or perceptual familiarity. Its objective is to clarify the relation between pre-reflective engagement and the later thematic appearance of an object.

Heidegger's analysis of equipment in *Being and Time* provides a useful model of thematic emergence within a pre-existing practical world [7]. In ordinary involvement, equipment can remain relatively unobtrusive within a network of practical relations. Breakdown, obstruction, or other disturbances can make what had remained practically transparent conspicuous. The significance of this analysis for the present paper lies in the transition from background involvement to thematic salience. A phenomenon can become explicit through a disturbance within a relation that was already operative.

This structure should not be identified directly with curiosity. Heidegger's analysis concerns world-hood, equipment, and modes of disclosure rather than a psychological theory of epistemic desire. It nevertheless shows how thematic attention can depend upon prior involvement and how disruption can disclose relations that previously remained unthematized.

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology provides a complementary resource. His account of perception emphasizes embodied, situated, and pre-reflective engagement with a meaningful perceptual field rather than the reconstruction of experience from isolated sensory atoms [14]. Figure-ground organization, bodily orientation, sedimented habit, and the historical character of perception complicate any model in which an already completed subject receives neutral objects and subsequently assigns them significance.

For the present inquiry, the phenomenological contribution is therefore twofold. First, perceptual and practical significance can precede explicit judgment. Second, salience is field-dependent. What appears as figure depends upon a background that is itself structured through bodily capacities, previous experience, practical involvement, and context. These resources support the possibility that epistemic questionability can emerge from a pre-reflective reorganization of subject-world involvement before an explicit question is available.

Phenomenology alone does not explain why different historical societies possess different spaces of possible inquiry. Its strength lies closer to the event of situated disclosure. The broader historical formation of perceptual, conceptual, and institutional possibilities therefore requires additional approaches.

3.6 Historical and Material Conditions of Inquiry

This subsection addresses the historical formation of epistemic subjects and domains of possible questioning. Its objective is to clarify why the field of what can become epistemically salient changes with material practices, technologies, institutions, conceptual systems, and forms of social life.

Marx and Engels provide an important starting point by locating consciousness within the historical life-process of socially and materially situated individuals rather than treating consciousness as independent of the conditions under which life is reproduced [13]. Their account emphasizes productive activity, social relations, material conditions, language, and historical development in the formation of consciousness. Applied cautiously to the present problem, this orientation suggests that epistemic subjects and their possible objects of attention cannot be abstracted completely from the historical organization of material and social life.

This perspective is particularly relevant to the historical variability of questionability. Technical capacities alter what can be observed and manipulated. Forms of production generate new objects and dependencies. Institutional arrangements distribute time, attention, authority, and access to instruments. Social conflicts can render previously normalized relations available to explicit criticism. The range of phenomena capable of becoming objects of inquiry is therefore historically conditioned.

Historical material conditioning does not provide a complete event-level account of curiosity. The existence of a material and conceptual possibility for inquiry does not determine which subject will

DRAFT

become curious, when an episode will occur, or which local encounter will activate a question. Historical materialism is consequently used here to characterize conditions of epistemic possibility rather than as a sufficient causal theory of particular curiosity episodes.

Kuhn's historical philosophy of science provides a more domain-specific account of the organization of legitimate problems within scientific communities [9]. Paradigms and disciplinary matrices provide exemplary problems, standards, instruments, concepts, and techniques through which normal scientific inquiry is organized. Scientific communities therefore inherit structured spaces of puzzles rather than beginning from an undifferentiated universe of possible questions.

Kuhn's account also clarifies the relation between anomaly and background structure. An observation becomes anomalous only relative to expectations and commitments through which normal research is organized. The same empirical event can occupy different epistemic positions under different disciplinary configurations. This feature provides a historically specific analogue of the present paper's broader concept of questionability.

Foucault's archaeological work extends the historical problem beyond scientific paradigms. Discursive formations establish rules governing what can appear as an object, concept, statement, or legitimate domain of discourse within a particular historical configuration [5]. His analysis is useful for considering how spaces of intelligibility can be historically organized beneath the level of an individual subject's explicit decisions.

The approaches of Marx and Engels, Kuhn, and Foucault differ substantially in method, explanatory scale, and theoretical commitment. Their common relevance to the present paper is limited but important. Each provides resources for rejecting the assumption that the field of possible inquiry is historically neutral. What can become a recognizable problem depends partly upon conditions that precede the local act of questioning.

3.7 Structural and Latent Conditions of Manifestation

This subsection introduces two comparative resources for the possibility that manifest experience can depend upon structures or dispositions that are operative before the subject explicitly identifies them. Psychoanalytic and Yogācāra theories are included for this limited structural purpose. They are not treated as theories of curiosity, and no equivalence between their conceptual systems is proposed.

Lacanian psychoanalysis provides a model in which subjectivity and desire develop within a symbolic order that precedes the mature subject's explicit self-understanding. Language, kinship, norms, demands, and positions within the field of the Other participate in the formation of the desiring subject [4]. This model is relevant to the present inquiry because it reverses a simple sequence in which a fully constituted subject first exists and later acquires structured desires. Some of the conditions through which desire becomes manifest can be operative before the subject is capable of describing them.

The relevance of this structure to curiosity remains analogical. The present paper does not infer that epistemic desire follows the Lacanian theory of desire or that curiosity can be derived from psychoanalytic lack. The narrower lesson concerns temporal and structural priority: the manifest statement of a desire need not coincide with the beginning of the organization through which that desire becomes possible.

Yogācāra accounts of seeds and store consciousness provide a different model of latent disposition and manifestation. In this tradition, seeds or impressions can function as potentialities for later experiences and perceptions, while subsequent activity can in turn alter the dispositions from which later experience develops [12]. This recursive structure provides a useful comparative vocabulary for thinking about latent conditions that become manifest only when further conditions are present.

The comparison requires substantial restraint. Yogācāra theories arise within Buddhist accounts of karma, consciousness, no-self, cognition, and liberation. They should not be translated directly into contemporary psychological variables or treated as an early theory of curiosity. Their relevance here is formal and comparative. They provide an example of a philosophical system in which manifest experience can depend upon prior dispositions without requiring a permanent substantial self and in which manifestation can recursively modify future conditions.

DRAFT

These psychoanalytic and Yogācāra resources therefore support a general possibility rather than a shared explanatory theory. What becomes explicit in a subject's experience can have a generative history that precedes conscious articulation. The present paper develops this possibility within a narrower epistemic context concerned with curiosity and question formation.

3.8 Position of the Present Inquiry

The literatures reviewed above provide several components required for an account of epistemic desire. Classical theories of wonder identify a disturbance through which inquiry can begin. Psychological research explains important motivational relations among information gaps, uncertainty, interest, deprivation, learning, and information seeking. Epistemological accounts clarify curiosity and inquisitiveness as epistemically significant states or dispositions. Pragmatism shows that a problem can be formed through the transformation of an initially indeterminate situation. Phenomenology provides resources for understanding pre-reflective salience and the emergence of thematic objects from situated engagement. Historical materialist, Kuhnian, and Foucauldian approaches show that subjects and spaces of legitimate questioning are historically conditioned. Psychoanalytic and Yogācāra models provide comparative resources for thinking about structures or dispositions that precede their manifest articulation.

These contributions operate at different explanatory levels. Psychological models commonly begin once a relevant novelty, uncertainty, or knowledge gap has become psychologically available. Epistemological theories typically examine the nature or value of curiosity and inquisitiveness once these can be identified as attitudes or dispositions. Phenomenology provides a richer account of situated disclosure but does not by itself explain the historical distribution of possible questions. Historical theories explain the formation of broader epistemic conditions while leaving substantial room for analysis of the local event through which one phenomenon becomes compelling to one subject. Structural and latent-condition theories clarify temporal priority without providing a direct theory of epistemic question formation.

The present paper is located at the intersection of these explanatory levels. Its principal object is the transition through which a phenomenon becomes *questionable* within a historically situated subject-world relation. Questionability is intended to designate a stage of epistemic organization that can precede a fully articulated question and that cannot be reduced to the mere existence of missing information. The concept also permits the historical conditions of inquiry and the local event of epistemic salience to be examined within the same analytical framework without collapsing one scale into the other.

The proposed Generative Relational account therefore develops three connections left only partially integrated by the preceding literatures. First, it relates historically formed epistemic organization to event-level question formation. Second, it treats the subject, the object as questionable, and the desire to know as potentially co-articulated within an epistemic event rather than assigning the explanatory burden exclusively to a pre-existing subject or object. Third, it treats inquiry recursively, since previous acts of knowing can transform the organization through which later objects become salient and later questions become possible.

These claims remain preliminary. The review does not establish that curiosity has a single relational essence, that all question formation follows one sequence, or that the traditions surveyed can be subsumed under a common ontology. It establishes a narrower basis for the analysis that follows: epistemic desire can be studied at the level of motivational state, situated disclosure, historical condition, prior organization, and concrete question-formation event, and these levels should remain distinguishable when the emergence of inquiry is explained.

The next section develops the Generative Relational account of questionability and specifies the relations among historically formed epistemic organization, concrete encounter, epistemic salience, and manifest curiosity.

DRAFT

4 A Generative Relational Account of Questionability

This section develops the paper's positive account of questionability. Its objective is to explain how a phenomenon can move from epistemic background into a position from which inquiry becomes possible without locating the relevant explanatory burden exclusively in either a pre-existing subject or an independently constituted object. The analysis proceeds through four elements: historically formed epistemic organization, concrete encounter, the emergence of epistemic salience, and the subsequent articulation of inquiry. The account is generative because these elements can transform one another across time, and relational because their epistemic roles depend upon the configuration in which they become operative.

The account is intended as a conceptual framework rather than a complete causal theory of curiosity. It does not assume that all curiosity follows an identical sequence, that every episode contains the same affective states, or that questionability can be reduced to a single psychological variable. The purpose is narrower: to identify a structure within which historically conditioned subjects can encounter phenomena that acquire epistemic significance and thereby reorganize the possibilities of subsequent inquiry.

4.1 Unit of Analysis

The primary unit of analysis is an epistemic event situated within an evolving subject-world relation. This choice differs from approaches that begin with curiosity as an isolated internal state and from approaches that assign questionability to an object independently of the conditions through which the object becomes epistemically available.

An epistemic event includes at least a situated subject, a phenomenon capable of entering attention, the relations through which the encounter occurs, and the historical organization that shapes what can be perceived, distinguished, remembered, and interpreted. These elements need not be treated as metaphysically independent entities prior to the event. Their relevant epistemic roles can emerge through the relation itself.

The term *subject* therefore refers to a historically formed epistemic position rather than to an abstract and context-free observer. A subject arrives at an encounter with perceptual habits, linguistic resources, conceptual distinctions, memories, expectations, affective dispositions, practices, social positions, and previous trajectories of inquiry. These conditions influence what can become salient without determining in advance which particular phenomenon will become an object of curiosity.

The term *object* is used in an equally limited analytical sense. The object of inquiry can be a material thing, an event, a social relation, a conceptual discrepancy, a symbolic form, a remembered experience, or another phenomenon capable of sustaining epistemic attention. What matters is the transition through which the phenomenon becomes organized as something toward which further knowing can be directed.

Questionability therefore concerns an event of epistemic positioning. A phenomenon becomes questionable when its place within the subject's existing epistemic organization changes sufficiently to sustain unresolved attention and make further inquiry possible.

4.2 Historically Formed Epistemic Organization

This subsection specifies the background organization from which episodes of questionability emerge. The objective is to explain how prior history enters a present epistemic event without treating history as a complete determination of future questions.

Epistemic organization includes the distinctions through which a subject can identify objects, recognize similarities and differences, form expectations, attribute relevance, and articulate uncertainty. It also includes less explicit forms of organization such as perceptual habit, bodily orientation, affective sensitivity, familiarity with practices, and sedimented expectations. These resources have individual histories, while many also depend upon collective histories of language, education, institutions, technology, and social life.

A subject can recognize an anomaly only where some background regularity or expectation is already operative. A conceptual contradiction becomes visible only where the relevant claims can be

DRAFT

related within a common field of comparison. A social arrangement becomes available to criticism through categories that make the relation describable and through historical conditions that permit its previous normalization to be disturbed. The questionability of a phenomenon is therefore conditioned by an organization that precedes the explicit question.

This historical organization is neither static nor homogeneous. Different domains of practice can organize attention differently within the same subject. A phenomenon that is unremarkable within everyday perception can become salient within scientific observation, artistic practice, legal reasoning, religious practice, or political experience. The relevant epistemic organization is therefore domain-sensitive and can contain tensions among multiple inherited modes of interpretation.

The historical character of this organization also limits the range of available questions. Scientific instruments, conceptual vocabularies, archival resources, institutions, and technical capacities affect which distinctions can be made and which phenomena can become objects of sustained inquiry [9, 5]. Material and social conditions likewise shape the activities through which subjects encounter the world and acquire the resources required for questioning [13]. These conditions contribute to a field of possible inquiry without specifying a unique future trajectory.

4.3 Encounter and Epistemic Disturbance

Prior organization alone does not explain why a particular episode of inquiry occurs. This subsection introduces encounter as the event through which an existing epistemic organization comes into contact with a phenomenon that can modify its local stability. The objective is to distinguish the historical availability of a question from the concrete occurrence through which that question begins to emerge.

An encounter can confirm existing expectations and remain epistemically unremarkable. It can also introduce a difference that is difficult to absorb within the subject's present organization. Such differences can take many forms: an unexpected observation, a failed prediction, an unfamiliar object, a contradiction among claims, a practical obstruction, an affectively powerful event, a moral disturbance, or an accidental juxtaposition that reveals a previously unnoticed relation.

Dewey's account of an indeterminate situation provides an important precedent for locating inquiry within such disturbances [3]. Phenomenological analyses likewise show how breakdown or disruption can make previously background relations conspicuous [7]. The present account adopts the more limited claim that an encounter can disturb the sufficiency of an existing epistemic organization before a determinate problem has been articulated.

The disturbance need not initially take propositional form. A subject can experience a mismatch, hesitation, attraction, discomfort, surprise, or sense of unresolved significance without possessing a stable representation of its source. The event can therefore begin through a change in attention or orientation before it becomes expressible as an explicit claim concerning what is missing.

The term *disturbance* is used descriptively and does not imply that the experience is unpleasant. Wonder, fascination, aesthetic arrest, and attraction can disturb an established organization by making something newly salient. Anger, fear, frustration, and confusion can perform a similar epistemic function through different affective pathways. The common feature is a local failure of continued epistemic indifference.

4.4 Epistemic Salience

This subsection examines the transition from disturbance to epistemic salience. Its objective is to explain why only a small subset of discrepancies, differences, and unknowns become capable of sustaining inquiry.

A difference can be registered without becoming epistemically important. Subjects routinely encounter irregularities that are ignored, forgotten, or absorbed into existing interpretations. Questionability therefore requires more than discrepancy. The phenomenon must acquire sufficient significance to reorganize attention and remain available for further epistemic engagement.

DRAFT

Epistemic salience is used here to designate this change in position. A salient phenomenon occupies more than perceptual foreground. It enters a relation in which the subject's existing organization becomes locally insufficient, unfinished, or open to revision. The phenomenon can then function as a source of continued attention even before the subject knows what precise question should be asked.

Salience is relationally generated. Features of the phenomenon contribute to the event, but the same feature can carry different epistemic significance under different histories and contexts. Prior knowledge can make a small difference highly significant to an expert while leaving it invisible to a novice. A previous experience can make a familiar object newly compelling. Social conflict can transform an ordinary practice into an object of critical attention. An accidental encounter can activate a relation among concepts that had previously remained disconnected.

This formulation extends information-gap accounts without rejecting their central insight. A perceived gap can strongly motivate inquiry [11]. The relational problem concerns how a gap becomes perceptible as a gap and why one absence becomes motivationally active while many other unknowns remain epistemically inert. Epistemic salience therefore precedes or accompanies the formation of a determinate information gap in at least some cases.

4.5 Formation of Questionability

Questionability emerges when epistemic salience becomes organized in a way that supports further inquiry. This subsection distinguishes questionability from both momentary attention and fully articulated questioning.

A phenomenon can attract attention transiently without becoming an object of inquiry. Questionability requires a degree of unresolved persistence. The subject must remain related to the phenomenon through an orientation in which further differentiation, explanation, comparison, observation, or interpretation becomes possible. This orientation can remain diffuse and need not initially specify a determinate epistemic target.

Questionability therefore occupies an intermediate conceptual position. It is more structured than undifferentiated disturbance and less determinate than an explicit question. The concept is useful precisely where a subject has begun to experience something as epistemically unfinished but has not yet established the conceptual form through which the relevant problem can be stated.

The transition can occur rapidly or over an extended period. A surprising observation can produce an explicit question almost immediately. In other cases, a phenomenon can remain persistently unresolved across repeated encounters until a later concept or comparison allows the problem to be articulated. The temporal distance between first disturbance and explicit question formation can therefore vary substantially.

This account also permits questionability to disappear without producing inquiry. Attention can be redirected, a discrepancy can be normalized, an institution can suppress investigation, available concepts can prove insufficient, or practical conditions can make sustained inquiry impossible. The presence of questionability therefore creates a possibility of inquiry rather than guaranteeing its continuation.

4.6 Manifest Curiosity and Question Formation

This subsection locates manifest curiosity and explicit questioning within the preceding structure. Its objective is to clarify how an epistemic relation that has become questionable can develop into a recognizable desire to know and, under some conditions, into a determinate question.

Manifest curiosity occurs when the orientation toward unresolved epistemic significance becomes sufficiently organized to be experienced or described as a desire for further knowing. This formulation treats curiosity as one possible manifestation of questionability rather than as the necessary first cause of every inquiry. A subject can become capable of inquiry through different motivational and institutional pathways, and questionability can persist before curiosity is reflectively identified.

Explicit question formation introduces a further transformation. A diffuse epistemic disturbance becomes organized through concepts, distinctions, and linguistic forms that specify what is being sought.

DRAFT

The question thereby selects some features of the preceding encounter while leaving others outside its formulation. Question formation is consequently productive as well as descriptive. It does not merely report a fully formed problem that existed unchanged before articulation. The act of formulation can reorganize the problem itself.

This feature explains why philosophical and scientific inquiry often proceeds through repeated reformulation. An initial question can later appear misleading, overgeneralized, normatively loaded, or based upon an unstable distinction. Further inquiry can reveal that the most important development is a change in the question rather than the acquisition of an answer to its original formulation.

The relation between curiosity and question formation is therefore recursive. Curiosity can motivate the articulation of a question, while the resulting question can intensify, redirect, narrow, or dissolve the original curiosity. New distinctions introduced during inquiry can expose further unknowns and produce subsequent episodes of questionability.

4.7 Co-Articulation of Subject and Object of Inquiry

This subsection develops the relational consequence of the preceding analysis. Its objective is to clarify the claim that inquiry can transform both the epistemic position of the subject and the status of the phenomenon encountered.

At the beginning of an epistemic event, the relevant object of inquiry may not yet exist for the subject in the form through which it will later be investigated. A phenomenon can initially appear as a vague disturbance, an unexplained difference, or an unclassified relation. Through inquiry it becomes differentiated, named, compared, and situated within a more determinate epistemic field.

The subject is transformed through the same process. Inquiry can generate new conceptual distinctions, perceptual sensitivities, methods of observation, expectations, and forms of attention. The subject who emerges from an inquiry can therefore possess capacities that were unavailable when the initial disturbance occurred.

The relation can be described as co-articulation. The object becomes more determinate as an object of inquiry while the subject becomes differently organized as an inquirer. This does not imply that the existence of the phenomenon depends entirely upon the subject. The claim concerns its epistemic status within the inquiry. A material phenomenon can exist independently of being investigated while becoming an *object of inquiry* only within a relation that renders it distinguishable and epistemically significant.

This distinction also applies to social and symbolic phenomena. A relation can exist historically before a conceptual vocabulary makes it available to systematic criticism. Once articulated, the new object of inquiry can alter the subject's subsequent perception of related phenomena. Inquiry therefore participates in the mutual differentiation of what is investigated and the epistemic organization through which investigation proceeds.

4.8 Recursive Transformation of Epistemic Organization

This subsection develops the temporal consequence of co-articulation. Its objective is to explain why curiosity and questionability should be understood through trajectories rather than isolated episodes.

An inquiry leaves more than an answer. It can modify the distinctions, expectations, practices, and sensitivities through which later encounters are interpreted. A concept acquired during one inquiry can make a previously invisible discrepancy salient in another domain. Practical experience can change the kinds of evidence to which a subject attends. Failed explanations can generate sensitivity to assumptions that had previously remained unquestioned.

The history of inquiry therefore participates in the production of future questionability. What a subject learns affects what the subject can later recognize as unknown. This recursive relation prevents the desire to know from being treated as a fixed capacity operating identically across time. The objects, forms, and intensities of curiosity can develop as the epistemic organization of the subject changes.

A similar recursion occurs collectively. Scientific disciplines, legal institutions, religious traditions, artistic practices, and political movements preserve previous questions and answers while also producing

DRAFT

new categories through which later problems become visible. Historical knowledge therefore changes the space of possible ignorance. A field can become capable of asking questions that could not have been formulated within its earlier conceptual organization.

This recursive structure provides one reason to distinguish the production of an epistemic output from the formation of an epistemic subject. Two processes can arrive at the same proposition while producing different transformations in the organization from which future inquiry proceeds. A subject who reaches a conclusion through observation, failed hypotheses, conceptual revision, and continued encounter can emerge with different capacities for later questioning than a subject who receives the same conclusion without that trajectory.

The distinction does not establish that the first process is normatively superior. It identifies a structural difference that becomes relevant once the subject's future capacity for inquiry is included in the object of analysis.

4.9 Contingency and Path Dependence

This subsection specifies the role of contingency within the relational account. Its objective is to preserve the difference between historically conditioned possibility and predetermined development.

Epistemic trajectories are path-dependent because previous encounters alter the organization through which later encounters are interpreted. A subject who has acquired one conceptual distinction can notice phenomena that would have remained undifferentiated along another trajectory. A chance conversation, an unexpected observation, a mistaken hypothesis, or an encounter outside an established field of practice can redirect subsequent inquiry.

Contingency therefore contributes to epistemic development without implying that inquiry is arbitrary. The effects of an encounter depend upon the organization into which it enters. The same event can have little epistemic consequence in one trajectory and become transformative in another. Historical structure conditions the significance of contingency, while contingent events can alter the development of that structure.

This relation is especially important for serendipitous inquiry. Serendipity does not require an event to occur without prior conditions. Its significance can arise because an unplanned encounter enters a prepared but incomplete epistemic organization and discloses a relation that had not previously been sought. The resulting question can subsequently reorganize the trajectory of inquiry.

The account therefore occupies a position between two inadequate extremes. A fully deterministic model would make manifest questions consequences already contained within prior structure. A radically spontaneous model would detach question formation from the historical and relational conditions that make the question intelligible. Generative questionability instead depends upon the interaction of inherited organization, concrete encounter, and contingent development.

4.10 Analytical Consequences

The account developed in this section has several consequences for the remaining argument.

First, curiosity should not be assumed to constitute the earliest stage of inquiry. Historically formed epistemic organization and concrete encounters can be operative before curiosity becomes manifest.

Second, the existence of unknown information is insufficient to explain question formation. An unknown must acquire epistemic salience within a subject-world relation before it can become an active object of inquiry.

Third, questionability is distinct from explicit questioning. A phenomenon can be epistemically unresolved before the subject possesses a determinate linguistic formulation of the problem.

Fourth, question formation participates in the organization of the problem it expresses. Inquiry can therefore progress through the revision, decomposition, or dissolution of an initial question rather than only through the production of an answer.

Fifth, inquiry is recursive. Epistemic outcomes can transform the organization through which later objects become salient and later questions become possible. The significance of curiosity therefore ex-

DRAFT

tends beyond individual episodes when the future formation of epistemic subjectivity is included in the analysis.

Finally, historical structure and contingency remain jointly relevant. Historical conditions shape fields of possible inquiry, while concrete and sometimes unplanned encounters influence which possibilities become manifest and how subsequent trajectories develop.

The next section examines the temporal dimension of this account in greater detail. It considers the interval between epistemic disturbance and explicit symbolic articulation, including cases in which a subject apprehends that an existing organization is insufficient before possessing a stable question or concept through which that insufficiency can be expressed.

5 Pre-Articulated Apprehension and Symbolic Formation

The preceding account located the emergence of curiosity within a transition from historically formed epistemic organization through encounter, disturbance, salience, and questionability. This section examines one temporal feature of that transition in greater detail: epistemic reorganization can begin before a subject possesses a stable symbolic formulation of what has become problematic. The objective is not to establish a general theory of pre-symbolic knowledge. It is to clarify the more limited possibility that explicit questions and propositions can occur later than some of the epistemic changes through which inquiry becomes possible.

This distinction matters for the present account because curiosity is often identified through its manifest forms. A subject reports wanting to know, formulates a question, searches for information, or pursues an explanation. These events provide observable indicators of inquiry, but they do not necessarily coincide with its beginning. A phenomenon can first appear as strange, unresolved, resistant, significant, or difficult to assimilate before the subject can identify what has changed or state what should be asked.

5.1 Epistemic Change Before Explicit Formulation

The formation of an explicit question requires more than the presence of an epistemic disturbance. It requires a sufficiently determinate organization of the disturbance through concepts, distinctions, and linguistic forms. The subject must be able to identify some aspect of the situation as problematic and establish a relation between what is available and what remains to be clarified.

The temporal order need not therefore begin with a fully articulated interrogative. A subject can recognize that an interpretation is insufficient before identifying the source of the insufficiency. A theoretical comparison can produce a persistent sense of incompatibility before the relevant distinction has been formulated. An observation can attract repeated attention without immediately yielding a determinate hypothesis. In such cases, the epistemic relation has already changed even though its symbolic description remains incomplete.

Dewey's analysis of inquiry provides an important precedent for this distinction. An indeterminate situation does not begin as a fully specified problem. Inquiry participates in transforming the initial indeterminacy into a more determinate problem capable of directing subsequent investigation [3]. The present analysis retains this temporal distinction while concentrating more specifically on the epistemic relation through which a phenomenon first becomes capable of sustaining such determination.

The existence of a pre-articulated phase should not be interpreted as evidence for a self-contained cognitive content that merely waits to receive a verbal label. The process of articulation can modify the phenomenon being articulated. A vague incompatibility can become a different problem once a new concept makes one of its dimensions explicit. The transition from pre-articulated disturbance to question formation is therefore potentially transformative rather than merely translational.

5.2 Pre-Articulated Apprehension

The term *pre-articulated apprehension* is used here for cases in which a subject is epistemically affected by a phenomenon before possessing a stable symbolic formulation of what has been apprehended. The

DRAFT

term is intentionally weaker than *pre-symbolic knowledge*. It does not assume that the subject already possesses a determinate item of knowledge independently of language, nor does it imply that the apprehended content could never become symbolically articulated.

Pre-articulated apprehension can include a sense of discrepancy, unresolved fit, unfamiliarity, attraction, disturbance, or incomplete intelligibility. In such cases, the subject can distinguish the present situation from a state of complete epistemic indifference without yet being able to state the relevant difference propositionally.

This intermediate status is important. If the phenomenon were entirely unregistered, there would be no basis for further inquiry. If it were already fully articulated, the problem of question formation would largely have been completed. Pre-articulated apprehension designates the interval in which something has begun to matter epistemically while the form of that mattering remains unsettled.

The concept also accommodates degrees of articulation. An inquiry can begin with a diffuse sense that something is unusual, proceed through provisional descriptions, and only later acquire a stable conceptual form. The difference between articulated and unarticulated experience should therefore not be treated as an absolute binary. Epistemic formation can involve successive degrees of differentiation in which partial descriptions reorganize what the subject is subsequently able to notice.

5.3 Tacit and Embodied Conditions of Articulation

Several philosophical traditions provide resources for understanding why explicit articulation may depend upon forms of organization that are not themselves fully explicit. Polanyi's account of tacit knowing is especially relevant. His analysis rejects the assumption that everything operative in knowledge can be exhaustively stated in propositional form and emphasizes the role of tacit integration in skilled perception, judgment, and scientific knowing [16]. The significance of this account for the present paper is not that curiosity itself is tacit knowledge. It is that epistemic activity can depend upon discriminations and integrations that exceed what the subject can presently formulate.

An experienced practitioner, for example, can notice that something is unusual before being able to specify which feature generated the judgment. The epistemic importance of the difference can precede its analytical decomposition. Such cases illustrate how prior organization can guide attention and recognition without appearing as an explicit set of premises in the subject's reasoning.

Merleau-Ponty's account of embodied perception provides a related but distinct resource. Perception is situated within bodily orientation, habit, background, and practical involvement rather than being assembled from independently identified sensory data [14]. The distinction is relevant to questionability because changes in perceptual significance can occur before a subject formulates an explicit judgment about what has changed.

These approaches should not be collapsed into a single theory. Tacit knowing and embodied perception concern different philosophical problems. Their common relevance is limited to the present analytical point: what becomes available for explicit inquiry can depend upon forms of organization that are operative before the subject can represent them exhaustively in language.

5.4 Experiencing and the Emergence of Formulation

Gendlin's account of experiencing provides a particularly direct resource for examining the movement between what is not yet articulated and what becomes conceptually formulated. His analysis gives sustained attention to preconceptual experiencing and to the way formulation can emerge through interaction with what is already experienced but not yet adequately expressed [6].

The relevance of this approach lies in its refusal to reduce the relation between experience and language to the simple translation of a completed inner content. Formulation can differentiate what was previously experienced in a less determinate manner. New symbols can alter the organization of the experience to which they refer, making further distinctions possible and changing the direction of subsequent thought.

DRAFT

This structure is particularly useful for the present account of philosophical and theoretical inquiry. A subject can recognize that an argument, category, or question is unsatisfactory before possessing the conceptual resources required to state why. Attempts at formulation can then expose additional distinctions, reveal hidden assumptions, or transform the original problem. The eventual question can differ substantially from the form in which the initial disturbance would have been described.

Question formation should therefore not always be understood as the representation of a problem that was already fully constituted before language. In at least some cases, the problem itself becomes more determinate through successive attempts at articulation.

5.5 Symbolic Formation as Epistemic Transformation

The preceding analysis suggests that symbolic articulation performs an epistemic function beyond external communication. Formulating a question can reorganize the subject's relation to the phenomenon and thereby change what can subsequently be investigated.

An explicit term can make a previously diffuse distinction stable enough to be compared across cases. A provisional question can disclose assumptions that were not visible in the initial disturbance. A failed formulation can reveal that the relevant problem lies at another conceptual level. Symbolic activity therefore participates in inquiry by producing new relations among what had previously been only partially differentiated.

This account avoids two opposing reductions. The first treats every epistemic event as already fully symbolic and therefore identifies the beginning of inquiry with the availability of an explicit proposition or question. The second treats language as a secondary surface placed upon an independently complete pre-symbolic reality. The present position requires neither claim. Historically formed symbolic structures participate in perception, expectation, and attention, while concrete epistemic events can nevertheless contain differences that are not yet adequately articulated within those structures.

The relation between pre-articulated apprehension and symbolic formulation is therefore recursive. Existing concepts shape what can become salient, while encounters can expose limitations in those concepts. New formulations emerge in response to those limitations and subsequently reorganize the field through which later phenomena are interpreted.

5.6 Pre-Articulated Apprehension and Curiosity

The distinction developed in this section modifies the relation between curiosity and question formation. Curiosity need not begin with the conscious possession of a clearly specified informational target. In some cases, the orientation toward further knowing can arise while the relevant object remains only partially articulated.

This possibility helps explain why curiosity can precede the question through which it is later expressed. A subject can repeatedly return to a phenomenon, sustain attention toward it, or experience a persistent sense of unresolved significance before identifying the exact object of inquiry. Curiosity can therefore be directed toward an epistemic remainder whose conceptual form is still developing.

The claim also clarifies why questionability is analytically useful. Questionability names the condition through which a phenomenon has become sufficiently epistemically significant to sustain further engagement without requiring that the subject already possess a determinate question. Pre-articulated apprehension concerns one possible experiential form of that condition.

The relation should not be universalized. Some inquiries begin with explicit questions supplied by existing practices, institutions, or other agents. Others arise from well-defined information gaps. The present argument concerns the existence and philosophical significance of a class of cases in which epistemic emergence precedes stable articulation.

DRAFT

5.7 The Boundary Between the Pre-Articulated and the Ineffable

A further distinction is required between what is not yet articulated and what is claimed to be intrinsically resistant to articulation. The present paper requires only the former.

A pre-articulated epistemic state can later become expressible through a new concept, question, analogy, distinction, or representational system. The initial absence of adequate language therefore does not establish permanent ineffability. A researcher who cannot presently explain why a theoretical relation appears unstable may later formulate the relevant distinction with considerable precision.

Even successful articulation need not imply exhaustive representation. Experience can contain dimensions that remain difficult to preserve in the resulting proposition or question. Establishing the existence or metaphysical status of such a remainder, however, requires a broader argument than the one offered here.

The present paper therefore distinguishes three possibilities: what has not yet been articulated, what can be only partially articulated under present conditions, and what might be claimed to resist symbolic articulation in principle. Only the first two are required for the account of questionability. No general thesis concerning ineffability follows from the argument.

This limitation is important because the existence of pre-articulated apprehension should not be used to romanticize silence, intuition, or non-conceptual experience. Symbolic articulation remains a central part of inquiry. The claim is that articulation can emerge from an epistemic process whose beginning is not exhausted by the explicit symbols eventually produced.

5.8 Implications for Epistemic Subjectivity

The possibility of pre-articulated apprehension has consequences for the account of epistemic subjectivity developed in this paper. An epistemic subject is not only a bearer of propositions or a producer of explicit questions. The subject can also participate in inquiry through sensitivity to differences that have not yet received adequate symbolic form.

This sensitivity matters because new questions cannot always be generated by operating exclusively within an already stabilized conceptual vocabulary. A subject must sometimes remain responsive to a discrepancy before knowing how the discrepancy should be classified. The capacity to sustain such unresolved attention can provide the interval within which new distinctions and questions become possible.

This point does not establish a normative obligation to preserve every instance of unresolved experience. Nor does it imply that prolonged uncertainty is epistemically superior to rapid clarification. It identifies a constitutive possibility: some forms of inquiry depend upon an interval in which the subject recognizes epistemic insufficiency before possessing the symbolic resources required to resolve it.

The distinction will become relevant to later work on epistemic trajectories and technologically mediated inquiry. A system can supply a ready-made classification or question at the moment an unresolved difference appears. Such assistance can expand inquiry by providing conceptual resources that would otherwise remain unavailable. It can also alter the trajectory by reducing the interval in which the subject attempts to differentiate the problem independently. Evaluating these possibilities requires a separate analysis of epistemic process and cannot be settled by the present account alone.

5.9 Scope of the Pre-Articulated Account

The argument of this section can be stated narrowly. Explicit symbolic questions need not mark the beginning of every epistemic event. A phenomenon can acquire epistemic significance before the subject possesses a stable formulation of what has become problematic. Tacit, embodied, historical, and conceptual organization can participate in this transition, and symbolic formulation can subsequently transform rather than merely record the emerging problem.

The argument does not establish a universal sequence from non-symbolic experience to language, a metaphysical realm independent of symbolic mediation, or an intrinsic superiority of unarticulated experience. It also does not claim that every form of curiosity requires a pre-articulated stage.

DRAFT

Its significance for the present paper is more limited. It explains how questionability can precede explicit questioning and why curiosity can emerge within an epistemic trajectory whose operative conditions are partially prior to conscious formulation. This account provides the basis for examining, in the next section, how curiosity participates in the formation and transformation of epistemic subjectivity without assuming that curiosity is necessary for every possible form of knowledge production.

6 Curiosity and the Formation of Epistemic Subjectivity

The preceding sections have examined how a phenomenon becomes questionable and how epistemic change can precede explicit symbolic articulation. This section turns from the formation of the question to the formation of the questioning subject. Its objective is to clarify the sense in which curiosity can be constitutive of particular forms of epistemic subjectivity without assuming that curiosity is necessary for knowledge, truth, or the successful production of epistemic outputs.

The distinction is important because several different claims can otherwise be conflated. Curiosity can contribute causally to learning, motivate information seeking, characterize an intellectual disposition, participate in the development of an inquirer, or be regarded as an epistemic virtue. These claims operate at different levels. The present section concentrates on a structural claim: in some forms of inquiry, the subject is partly constituted through the trajectory by which phenomena become salient, questions are formed, interpretations are revised, and capacities for subsequent inquiry are transformed.

6.1 Epistemic Subjectivity as a Historical Capacity for Inquiry

Epistemic subjectivity is used here to designate more than the possession of beliefs or propositions. It concerns the historically developed capacities through which a subject encounters, differentiates, questions, interprets, and revises relations to what can be known. These capacities include forms of attention, sensitivity to discrepancy, conceptual discrimination, tolerance of unresolved problems, question formation, judgment, and the ability to modify one's own epistemic organization through inquiry.

This formulation treats epistemic subjectivity as temporally extended. A subject at a particular moment inherits capacities produced through previous encounters, learning, practices, institutions, languages, and relations with other subjects. The ability to formulate a question can therefore have a history that extends substantially beyond the episode in which the question becomes explicit.

Such a history is compatible with the relational account developed in Section 4. The subject does not enter every epistemic event with an invariant set of capacities that merely operates upon different objects. Previous inquiries can alter the organization through which later objects become salient. A new conceptual distinction can change what the subject notices. A previous failure can modify sensitivity to evidence. A learned method can make a previously inaccessible class of phenomena available to systematic investigation.

Epistemic subjectivity therefore includes a capacity for transformation through knowing. The significance of an inquiry can lie partly in the proposition, explanation, or skill acquired and partly in the modification of the subject's capacity to engage in subsequent inquiry.

6.2 Curiosity as a Constitutive Epistemic Relation

The constitutive claim developed in this paper concerns the position curiosity can occupy within such a transformative process. Curiosity can participate in the formation of epistemic subjectivity when a subject becomes responsive to an unresolved phenomenon, sustains attention toward it, contributes to the formation of a question, and develops new epistemic capacities through the resulting inquiry.

This claim differs from the proposition that curiosity is universally required for knowing. Many epistemic achievements occur without a substantial episode of curiosity. A person can acquire reliable information through testimony, instruction, routine observation, professional obligation, or externally

DRAFT

assigned inquiry. Correct answers can also be produced through computational procedures that do not depend upon a human subject becoming curious about the relevant problem.

Constitutive significance concerns a different relation. Within a form of knowing organized around the subject's own encounter with questionability, curiosity can participate in what makes that process the kind of epistemic process it is. Removing the trajectory of becoming interested, noticing an insufficiency, sustaining unresolved attention, and forming the question can therefore produce a structurally different relation to the same eventual epistemic content.

The point can be stated without assigning intrinsic superiority to either process. Two subjects can possess the same proposition while having reached it through substantially different epistemic histories. One can have received the proposition through testimony. Another can have arrived at it through an extended investigation generated by a discrepancy encountered in practice. The propositional outcome can coincide while the capacities, expectations, conceptual organization, and possibilities for subsequent inquiry differ.

Curiosity is constitutive in the relevant sense when it participates in this formation of the inquirer rather than merely increasing the probability that a predefined answer will be acquired.

6.3 Question Formation and Epistemic Agency

The relation between curiosity and epistemic subjectivity becomes especially visible in question formation. Questions organize inquiry by selecting what requires explanation, determining which distinctions become relevant, and constraining the forms that an adequate answer can take. The capacity to form and revise questions is consequently an important component of epistemic agency.

Contemporary virtue-epistemological work provides useful resources for this connection. Watson characterizes inquisitiveness through a characteristic motivation to engage sincerely in good questioning and places it centrally within intellectually virtuous inquiry [17]. More recent work on intellectual virtue and agency similarly places curiosity among the dispositions through which agents orient themselves toward epistemic goods [2].

The present account adopts a broader and less normatively committed conception of epistemic agency. Question formation can be epistemically significant even where the question is initially confused, poorly formulated, or later dissolved. Indeed, the ability to discover that an initial question was misformed can itself constitute a substantial epistemic achievement.

This possibility is important because inquiry is sometimes represented as a sequence beginning with a given problem and ending with its solution. In many forms of philosophical, scientific, and interpretive inquiry, however, the problem itself changes. The subject can discover that the original categories were inadequate, that an assumed distinction cannot be maintained, or that several different problems had been compressed into one formulation.

Epistemic agency therefore includes participation in the formation of the problem-space, not only the selection of an answer within a previously specified space. Curiosity contributes to agency where it sustains engagement with an unresolved phenomenon long enough for the initial organization of the problem to become revisable.

6.4 Receiving an Answer and Arriving at a Distinction

The distinction between epistemic output and epistemic formation can be clarified by comparing the reception of an answer with the process through which a subject arrives at a distinction.

Suppose that a subject experiences a theoretical difficulty but cannot yet identify its source. One possibility is that an external agent immediately provides the conceptual distinction required to resolve the difficulty. The subject can understand the distinction, recognize its applicability, and subsequently employ it correctly. Another possibility is that the subject remains with the difficulty, tests several formulations, rejects inadequate distinctions, and eventually develops an articulation that resolves the problem.

The final explicit distinction can be identical in both cases. The epistemic trajectories need not be. In the latter process, the subject has encountered the limits of several possible formulations, learned which

DRAFT

differences matter to the problem, and reorganized prior concepts through repeated attempts at articulation. The resulting knowledge includes a history of discrimination that is not necessarily reproduced through immediate reception of the final formulation.

This does not imply that independently arriving at a distinction is always epistemically preferable. External articulation can make possible an inquiry that would otherwise remain inaccessible. Testimony, teaching, collaboration, books, and conceptual traditions are indispensable to human knowledge. No epistemic subject generates its conceptual resources independently.

The relevant distinction is therefore between two forms of epistemic event rather than between authentic self-production and deficient dependence. Receiving a distinction and arriving at a distinction can both constitute genuine knowing while producing different transformations in the organization of the knower.

The distinction also admits intermediate cases. A concept supplied by another person can become generative only after the recipient tests it against experience and reorganizes it through further inquiry. Conversely, a subject who appears to develop an idea independently relies upon inherited language, previous education, institutional practices, and prior interactions. Epistemic formation is relational in both cases.

6.5 Epistemic Friction and the Development of the Inquirer

The interval between questionability and resolution can impose what may be called *epistemic friction*. The term refers to the resistance encountered when existing epistemic organization proves insufficient and a subject must remain engaged with a phenomenon before a satisfactory formulation or resolution becomes available.

Epistemic friction can arise through conflicting evidence, conceptual instability, failed explanation, ambiguity, inability to classify an experience, or repeated mismatch between expectation and observation. It can be brief or extended and can generate frustration as readily as fascination.

The significance of friction lies in the transformations it can produce. A subject who repeatedly attempts to articulate a difficult distinction can develop greater sensitivity to the structure of the problem. Failed interpretations can disclose assumptions that successful immediate classification would leave unnoticed. Uncertainty can require comparison among alternative explanatory structures. In these cases, friction contributes to the formation of epistemic capacities rather than functioning merely as an obstacle to efficient information acquisition.

This possibility should be stated cautiously. Friction is not inherently valuable. Excessive difficulty can terminate inquiry, reinforce confusion, exclude subjects from participation, or consume resources without producing epistemic development. The absence of assistance can likewise preserve an unresolved problem without generating any new capacity.

The relevant claim is conditional. Some degree of sustained contact with epistemic insufficiency can participate in the development of the capacities through which subjects learn to discriminate, question, revise, and inquire. Whether a particular form of friction is generative depends upon the subject, the domain, the available resources, and the surrounding relational conditions.

6.6 Relational Dependence and Epistemic Autonomy

The preceding argument might appear to place epistemic autonomy in tension with reliance upon other subjects. Such an opposition would be inconsistent with the relational framework developed here. Human epistemic agency is formed through dependence upon linguistic, social, educational, technical, and institutional resources that no individual produces independently.

The relevant issue is therefore not the elimination of dependence. It concerns the kind of relation through which dependence contributes to the future capacity of a subject to participate in inquiry. Some relations provide answers while simultaneously expanding the recipient's ability to recognize problems, evaluate explanations, and generate further questions. Others can provide accurate outputs while leaving the recipient increasingly dependent upon external problem formulation and judgment.

DRAFT

Epistemic autonomy can consequently be understood in a relational rather than an isolationist sense. An autonomous inquirer need not originate every concept, method, or question independently. The subject must instead possess sufficient capacity to participate in the organization of inquiry: to recognize reasons for revision, interpret evidence, distinguish problems, evaluate competing formulations, and contribute to the direction of subsequent questioning.

Curiosity can support this capacity because it orients the subject toward what remains unresolved rather than only toward the possession of completed answers. Inquisitiveness, in Watson's account, is especially closely connected with the activity of good questioning [17]. The present analysis extends the structural point while leaving open the stronger virtue-epistemological evaluation of the resulting disposition.

Relational dependence and epistemic autonomy therefore need not vary inversely. A well-structured epistemic relation can increase dependence upon shared resources while simultaneously expanding the subject's capacity for independent judgment and future participation in inquiry.

6.7 Transformation Through Inquiry

If epistemic subjectivity is historically formed, the endpoint of inquiry cannot be represented adequately by the epistemic content acquired. Inquiry can also modify the subject who acquires it.

The transformation can occur at several levels. A subject can acquire new concepts through which previously undifferentiated phenomena become distinguishable. Perceptual training can make subtle features salient. Methodological experience can change the kinds of evidence regarded as relevant. Encounter with failed explanations can produce greater sensitivity to assumptions. Repeated questioning can modify the standards through which future questions are evaluated.

This recursive transformation connects epistemic subjectivity to the account of questionability developed earlier. An inquiry changes the historical organization through which future phenomena will become questionable. The subject who has completed one inquiry enters the next encounter with a different field of possible distinctions.

Knowing therefore has a generative dimension when an epistemic event changes the conditions of later epistemic events. The knowledge produced at one moment can become part of the organization through which later unknowns become recognizable.

This feature also complicates any attempt to measure epistemic processes solely through final answer accuracy. Two processes that produce the same answer can differ in the range of subsequent questions they make possible. A process can be highly efficient in delivering a correct proposition while producing little change in the recipient's capacity to recognize related problems. Another can produce a slower or initially incomplete result while generating substantial new capacities for later inquiry.

No general ranking follows from this distinction. Different epistemic contexts can legitimately prioritize accuracy, speed, safety, skill acquisition, independent judgment, conceptual development, or other ends. The point is that these ends should remain analytically visible rather than being compressed into a single measure of successful knowing.

6.8 Externally Generated Questions

The constitutive account of curiosity must also accommodate inquiry whose initial question originates elsewhere. Much human epistemic activity begins from questions inherited from teachers, institutions, disciplines, texts, communities, or collaborators. The relational origin of a question does not prevent it from becoming constitutive of the recipient's epistemic subjectivity.

An externally supplied question can remain merely instrumental, as when a subject completes a required task with minimal engagement. It can also become internally generative. The subject can discover previously unnoticed dimensions of the problem, reformulate the inherited question, connect it with other concerns, or develop further questions that were not contained in the original assignment.

The distinction between externally and internally originated questions is therefore insufficient for determining the structure of epistemic formation. What matters is how the question enters the subject's

DRAFT

epistemic organization and what transformations follow from engagement with it.

This point prevents the account from romanticizing spontaneous curiosity. Disciplines transmit questions across generations precisely because many important problems would not arise independently within every individual subject. Education expands possible curiosity by introducing objects, distinctions, histories, and problems that would otherwise remain inaccessible.

The relational question concerns whether these inherited resources become conditions for further generativity. A supplied question can function as an endpoint of instruction or as an opening through which the subject becomes capable of generating new inquiry.

6.9 Epistemic Output and Process Equivalence

The distinctions developed above permit a more precise separation between output equivalence and process equivalence.

Two epistemic processes are output-equivalent with respect to a particular criterion when they produce the same relevant answer, proposition, classification, prediction, or explanation. Output equivalence does not imply that the processes contain the same encounters, questions, judgments, revisions, or transformations of the subject.

Process equivalence would require a substantially stronger comparison. It would concern the organization through which the result was produced, including the formation of the problem, the relations to evidence, the distribution of judgment, the experience of error or resistance, and the changes in capacities for subsequent inquiry.

The distinction is especially important where the object of evaluation is a human epistemic subject rather than an isolated proposition. If only the final answer is relevant, differences in epistemic trajectory can legitimately be ignored. If future judgment, question formation, conceptual sensitivity, or epistemic autonomy are relevant, the trajectory becomes part of the object that must be evaluated.

This does not imply that every epistemic history must be preserved in full. Most knowledge necessarily relies upon compression, testimony, inherited results, and division of cognitive labor. The distinction establishes only that epistemic compression can remove process information that may matter for some forms of subject formation.

6.10 Artificial Intelligence as a Boundary Case

Artificial intelligence provides a useful boundary case because it makes the separation between question production and human question formation especially visible. Contemporary systems can generate possible research questions, explanations, hypotheses, objections, classifications, and conceptual distinctions in response to relatively limited prompts. The existence of such outputs demonstrates that a human episode of curiosity is not required for every instance of sophisticated symbolic question production.

The philosophical consequence should be stated narrowly. Machine-generated questions do not show that human curiosity lacks epistemic significance. They show that the production of a question-shaped symbolic artifact and the formation of a questioning human subject are separable processes.

The same distinction applies when an artificial system assists a human inquirer. Rapid access to conceptual distinctions can expand the subject's field of inquiry, disclose literatures that would otherwise remain inaccessible, and make possible comparisons that exceed unaided human memory or search capacity. Such assistance can therefore increase epistemic generativity.

The same intervention can alter the trajectory through which a subject encounters uncertainty. If a classification or formulation is supplied before the subject has differentiated the problem, some forms of epistemic friction can be shortened or bypassed. Whether this constitutes a loss depends upon what the inquiry is intended to develop. Where the aim is timely access to reliable information, such compression can be advantageous. Where the formation of judgment, discrimination, or autonomous question formation is itself an epistemic objective, the process requires a broader evaluation.

Artificial intelligence therefore functions here as an analytical contrast. It reveals the need to distinguish the capacity to produce epistemic artifacts from the formation of the subject who recognizes

DRAFT

why those artifacts matter, how their problems were constituted, and when their underlying distinctions should be revised.

A systematic account of AI-mediated epistemic trajectories lies beyond the scope of the present paper. The present argument supplies only the conceptual distinctions required for that later inquiry.

6.11 Limits of the Constitutive Claim

The argument of this section is deliberately restricted. It does not establish that curiosity is necessary for knowledge, that every epistemically competent subject must be curious in the same way, or that independently generated questions possess greater epistemic value than inherited questions.

It also does not establish that trajectories involving greater difficulty, longer reflection, or less external assistance are intrinsically superior. Epistemic friction can be generative, neutral, or destructive depending upon the conditions in which it occurs. External resources can constrain inquiry, but they can also create capacities that would not emerge without relational support.

The constitutive claim is instead conditional. Where an epistemic practice values the formation of subjects capable of recognizing unresolved phenomena, forming and revising questions, judging competing interpretations, and generating subsequent inquiry, curiosity can participate in the constitution of those capacities. Its significance then cannot be measured solely by the accuracy of the immediate output it helps to produce.

This conditional formulation preserves the distinction between structural and normative analysis. Establishing that curiosity participates in a mode of epistemic subjectivity does not establish that society ought to preserve that mode, that every individual should cultivate it, or that it should take priority over other epistemic goals. Those conclusions require a further account of value.

The next section therefore turns to the boundary between constitutive significance and normative justification. It examines what follows from the relational account of curiosity and what remains unresolved when the question changes from how epistemic subjectivity is formed to whether particular forms of epistemic subjectivity ought to be preserved.

7 Constitutive Significance and Normative Boundaries

The preceding sections have developed a relational account of questionability, pre-articulated epistemic change, and the role curiosity can play in the formation of epistemic subjectivity. This section clarifies the normative limits of those claims. Its objective is to distinguish conclusions that follow from the structural analysis from claims that require additional premises concerning epistemic value, autonomy, education, human flourishing, social participation, or other normative commitments.

The distinction is necessary because a constitutive claim can easily acquire normative force through implicit assumptions. If curiosity participates in the formation of a particular mode of epistemic subjectivity, it can appear natural to conclude that curiosity should therefore be preserved. That conclusion does not follow without further argument. A practice can be constitutive of a form of life without that form of life possessing unconditional normative priority. The present section therefore identifies the evaluative questions generated by the analysis while leaving their stronger resolution outside the principal argument of this paper.

7.1 Structural Claims and Normative Claims

The first distinction concerns the logical relation between describing a structure and evaluating it. A structural claim identifies how a process is organized. A normative claim identifies reasons for preferring, preserving, cultivating, restricting, or transforming that process.

The account developed in this paper supports several structural claims. Questionability can precede explicit questioning. Curiosity can emerge through historically and relationally formed conditions. Inquiry can transform the epistemic organization of the subject. The same propositional outcome can be

DRAFT

reached through different epistemic trajectories. Curiosity can therefore participate in the constitution of some forms of epistemic subjectivity without being necessary for every successful epistemic output.

None of these claims establishes independently that the relevant form of epistemic subjectivity ought to be preserved. A further premise is required. Such a premise might concern the value of epistemic agency, the value of participation in inquiry, the value of intellectual autonomy, the importance of education as subject formation, the social value of distributed judgment, or some other normative consideration.

The distinction is especially important because different epistemic contexts can legitimately prioritize different goods. A medical emergency can place greater weight on rapid and reliable access to information than on the independent formation of a question by every participant. An educational setting can instead assign substantial importance to the development of judgment and question formation. A scientific collaboration can distribute epistemic labor across subjects with different roles. A normative evaluation therefore depends upon which goods are relevant to the practice under consideration.

7.2 Instrumental Value and Constitutive Value

The second distinction concerns different ways curiosity can be valued. Curiosity can have instrumental value when it contributes to independently specified ends such as learning, discovery, information acquisition, or adaptive exploration. Psychological research provides substantial reason to treat curiosity as relevant to several such processes [8].

Instrumental justification is conditional upon the value of the end. If curiosity improves learning, its value depends partly upon the importance assigned to the relevant learning. If curiosity improves exploration, its value depends upon the desirability of exploration within the context. Instrumental arguments can therefore support strong practical reasons for cultivating curiosity without establishing that curiosity possesses unconditional value.

Constitutive value concerns a different possibility. Some activities derive part of their identity or significance from the manner in which participants engage in them. If inquiry is valued partly as a mode through which subjects encounter uncertainty, formulate questions, exercise judgment, and transform their own epistemic capacities, curiosity can become internal to the valued practice rather than merely a means to an external result.

This stronger relation still requires a normative premise. The fact that curiosity is constitutive of a mode of inquiry does not establish that the mode is valuable. Constitutive analysis identifies what would be altered if curiosity were removed. Normative analysis determines whether that alteration should count as a loss, an improvement, or a context-dependent transformation.

The distinction can therefore be summarized conceptually. Instrumental evaluation asks what curiosity helps to produce. Constitutive evaluation asks what kind of epistemic practice or subject would remain if curiosity were substantially removed from the process. Normative judgment then asks what reasons exist for preferring one resulting configuration over another.

7.3 Epistemic Agency as a Candidate Normative Ground

One possible normative ground concerns epistemic agency. If subjects should possess meaningful capacities to participate in the organization of inquiry, then the ability to recognize problems, formulate questions, evaluate explanations, and revise epistemic positions can acquire normative significance.

This possibility connects the present analysis with work on inquisitiveness, intellectual virtue, and epistemic agency [17, 2]. The relevant claim would be that epistemic life has value partly because subjects participate actively in the processes through which knowledge is sought and evaluated.

Such an argument requires care. Epistemic agency does not require independence from testimony, institutions, technologies, or other subjects. Human knowing is deeply dependent upon inherited concepts, shared practices, educational relations, archives, instruments, and divisions of cognitive labor. A normative ideal of agency therefore cannot plausibly require epistemic self-sufficiency.

DRAFT

A relational conception of epistemic agency is more compatible with the present framework. Agency can consist in the capacity to participate meaningfully within epistemic relations: to understand why a distinction matters, recognize reasons for revision, evaluate competing interpretations, identify uncertainty, and contribute to the formation of subsequent inquiry. Dependence upon others is compatible with such agency when the relation supports rather than eliminates these capacities.

Curiosity can contribute to this form of agency by orienting the subject toward unresolved aspects of experience and sustaining participation in the formation of questions. The normative conclusion, however, depends upon accepting epistemic agency itself as a value that relevant institutions or practices should protect.

7.4 Education and the Formation of Epistemic Capacities

Education provides a domain in which the distinction between epistemic output and epistemic formation becomes especially visible. If education is evaluated only through the acquisition of correct answers or transferable information, the trajectory through which the learner arrives at those outcomes can appear secondary. If education also concerns the formation of capacities for future inquiry, the structure of the trajectory becomes more significant.

A learner can receive a correct explanation without acquiring the capacity to recognize the underlying problem independently. The same explanation can instead enter a process in which the learner has already encountered a difficulty, attempted distinctions, received guidance, and subsequently reorganized the problem. The informational content can be similar while the resulting epistemic capacities differ.

The present account therefore provides a basis for distinguishing *answer acquisition* from *epistemic formation*. The distinction is structural. A normative educational theory must then determine which forms of formation deserve cultivation and under what conditions.

This point also complicates simplistic ideals of independent discovery. Learners require conceptual resources they could not generate alone. Effective teaching often supplies distinctions, examples, methods, and questions at precisely the moment when they can reorganize an emerging inquiry. The normative problem concerns the relation between assistance and formation rather than the maximization of unaided struggle.

A pedagogical environment can therefore be evaluated partly through whether support expands the learner's future capacity for question formation and judgment. Such an evaluation moves beyond immediate correctness while avoiding the assumption that withholding answers is inherently beneficial.

7.5 Distributed Knowledge and Relational Dependence

The normative significance of curiosity must also be considered within epistemic systems characterized by extensive division of labor. Modern knowledge practices depend upon specialization, testimony, technical infrastructure, institutional trust, and reliance upon results that individual subjects cannot independently reconstruct.

Under such conditions, no plausible normative account can require every participant to reproduce the complete epistemic trajectory behind every item of knowledge. Human inquiry depends upon selective trust and epistemic compression. The relevant question concerns how such dependence is organized.

A subject can rely upon external expertise while retaining meaningful capacities to recognize uncertainty, identify the limits of personal competence, ask relevant questions, evaluate reasons at an appropriate level, and determine when further verification is required. Another configuration can produce greater dependence upon external judgment while reducing the subject's capacity to identify when a problem exists at all.

The distinction suggests that the normative issue is not the quantity of dependence considered in isolation. It concerns the distribution of epistemic capacities within a relational system. A highly interdependent community can remain epistemically generative when different participants retain capacities for judgment, criticism, question formation, and revision.

DRAFT

Curiosity can contribute to such distributed systems by creating local sources of challenge and exploration. Its value within the system would then depend partly upon whether plural sites of inquiry improve collective responsiveness, criticism, or adaptation. These are further normative and institutional questions rather than direct consequences of the conceptual analysis.

7.6 Technological Mediation and Epistemic Substitution

Artificial intelligence makes the normative boundary particularly visible because it can substitute for some epistemic functions while leaving others unchanged, transformed, or redistributed. A system can search, summarize, classify, propose hypotheses, formulate questions, or generate explanations. The normative significance of such substitution depends upon which function is being evaluated.

If the principal objective is reliable access to a determinate answer, substitution of human effort can be straightforwardly beneficial. If the practice also aims to develop the subject's capacity to identify problems, evaluate alternatives, or generate future inquiry, the same substitution may have additional consequences that are not captured by answer accuracy.

The proper unit of normative evaluation is therefore the epistemic relation created by the technology rather than the mere presence or absence of automation. A technological system can reduce unnecessary cognitive burden while expanding the user's capacity to investigate more difficult problems. It can also supply formulations so early and so completely that some forms of problem differentiation are transferred away from the user.

Neither possibility follows necessarily from the technology itself. The effect depends upon interaction design, institutional context, user practice, educational purpose, distribution of authority, and the kind of epistemic task being performed.

This relational formulation avoids treating artificial intelligence as either an intrinsic threat to epistemic subjectivity or an automatically neutral instrument. The relevant normative object is the configuration through which human and artificial capacities are combined and the kinds of future epistemic agency that configuration supports.

A systematic normative theory of AI-mediated inquiry lies beyond the present paper. The current analysis establishes only why output substitution and subject formation should remain conceptually distinct.

7.7 Plurality of Epistemic Goods

The normative problem is further complicated by the plurality of goods that epistemic practices can pursue. Accuracy, speed, reliability, creativity, understanding, explanatory depth, autonomy, accessibility, participation, critical capacity, and the generation of new questions can all be relevant under different conditions.

These goods can conflict. Increasing speed can reduce opportunities for independent problem formulation. Maximizing individual reconstruction of knowledge can impose unnecessary costs and reduce access. Expanding exploratory freedom can reduce efficiency. Strong reliance upon expert systems can improve accuracy in one domain while weakening local capacities for independent judgment.

No single measure of epistemic success therefore follows from the relational account developed here. The significance of curiosity depends partly upon which epistemic goods are prioritized and how they are distributed across subjects, institutions, and temporal horizons.

Temporal scale is particularly important. A process that appears efficient at the level of one task can have different consequences when evaluated across a longer trajectory of subject formation. Immediate answer acquisition and the development of future question-forming capacity can diverge. Conversely, a process that strengthens long-term epistemic capacities can impose costs that are unacceptable in contexts requiring rapid decisions.

Normative evaluation must therefore specify both the relevant good and the scale at which the good is assessed.

DRAFT

7.8 Normative Underdetermination

The analysis developed in this paper results in a form of normative underdetermination. Structural description narrows the relevant normative questions but does not uniquely answer them.

Suppose that curiosity is shown to participate in the formation of subjects capable of generating and revising questions. Several normative positions remain possible. One can assign substantial value to such capacities and argue for their preservation. One can regard them as valuable primarily in selected domains such as education, research, democratic participation, or professional judgment. One can consider them secondary where reliable external systems perform the relevant functions more effectively. One can also defend a plural arrangement in which different subjects and institutions sustain different levels of independent epistemic participation.

Choosing among these positions requires principles that the structural account does not itself supply.

This underdetermination is not a defect in the argument. It marks the boundary between explanatory and normative inquiry. Attempting to derive the value of human curiosity directly from its role in human epistemic development would conceal the additional premises required for that conclusion.

The appropriate result at this stage is therefore a more precise formulation of the normative problem. If epistemic technologies, institutions, or educational practices reduce human participation in question formation, the relevant issue is not simply whether fewer human questions are produced. It is whether the affected forms of epistemic subjectivity possess values that provide reasons for their preservation, transformation, or redistribution.

7.9 Conditions for a Future Normative Inquiry

A fuller normative account would need to address several issues that remain outside the present paper.

First, it would require an account of the value of epistemic agency. Such an account would need to explain why participation in inquiry matters beyond the instrumental value of the resulting answers.

Second, it would require a theory of relational dependence capable of distinguishing enabling forms of epistemic reliance from forms that systematically reduce capacities for judgment and revision.

Third, it would need to consider distributive questions. Even if advanced epistemic systems preserve curiosity and agency at the collective level, the distribution of those capacities across individuals and institutions can have normative significance.

Fourth, the analysis would need to address domain variation. The appropriate degree of human participation can differ across education, scientific research, medicine, law, governance, everyday information seeking, and other practices.

Fifth, a normative theory would need to distinguish temporary delegation from long-term transformation. A subject can reasonably delegate a task without losing the relevant underlying capacity. Persistent delegation across developmental periods can have different consequences.

Finally, such an inquiry would require an account of what kinds of epistemic subjectivity are worth sustaining. The present paper cannot assume the answer without reproducing the very normative compression it has sought to avoid.

7.10 Boundary of the Present Argument

The principal conclusion of this section is therefore one of scope. The Generative Relational account developed in the paper supports a distinction between the production of epistemic outputs and the formation of epistemic subjects. It also supports the possibility that curiosity can have constitutive significance within some forms of inquiry.

The account does not establish an unconditional obligation to preserve human curiosity. It does not establish that every technologically mediated reduction of epistemic friction constitutes a loss. It does not establish that independent inquiry should take priority over testimony, instruction, collaboration, or automation. It also does not establish that one form of epistemic subjectivity is universally appropriate across domains.

DRAFT

What follows is a more limited conclusion. Where a practice values capacities for recognizing unresolved phenomena, forming and revising questions, evaluating interpretations, and generating subsequent inquiry, the effects of that practice upon curiosity and epistemic subject formation become relevant to its evaluation. Correct output alone is then an incomplete description of the epistemic process being assessed.

This conclusion preserves the normative question rather than resolving it prematurely. It also clarifies the transition to the final discussion. The remaining task is to integrate the paper's account of epistemic desire, questionability, pre-articulated apprehension, and epistemic subjectivity, identify the principal theoretical limitations, and specify the implications for subsequent work on epistemic trajectories and artificial intelligence.

8 Implications for Epistemic Subjectivity and Inquiry

The preceding analysis has developed a relational account of epistemic desire through the concepts of questionability, pre-articulated apprehension, and epistemic subject formation. This section considers the implications of that account and clarifies its theoretical boundaries. Its purpose is not to add a further explanatory layer, but to examine what follows once curiosity is treated as a historically situated epistemic event rather than only as an isolated motivational state or intellectual disposition.

The central implication concerns the location of inquiry. Inquiry cannot always be represented adequately as a process that begins with a fully specified question and terminates with an answer. In some cases, a substantial part of the epistemic work precedes the stable formulation of the question itself. A phenomenon becomes salient, an existing organization becomes insufficient, an unresolved relation is sustained, and only later does a sufficiently determinate question emerge. The formation of the problem is therefore part of inquiry.

This shift has consequences for how curiosity, epistemic agency, historical situatedness, and technological mediation are understood. It also exposes several limitations of the present framework that should remain visible before the analysis is extended to stronger causal or normative claims.

8.1 Question Formation as an Epistemic Achievement

One implication of the preceding account is that question formation can itself constitute an epistemic achievement. A question is often treated as an input to inquiry: the problem is given, and the epistemic task consists in identifying an adequate answer. Such a model is appropriate in many contexts, but it does not capture inquiries in which the initial formulation is itself unstable.

The conceptual decomposition developed in Section 2 illustrates this structure. A question concerning why human beings seek or need knowledge can initially appear to identify a single philosophical problem. Further analysis reveals several distinct problems concerning genesis, function, constitution, and normativity. Progress in such a case consists partly in discovering that the original question cannot sustain the explanatory burden assigned to it.

The epistemic achievement therefore lies in a reorganization of the problem-space. The subject acquires distinctions through which what previously appeared to be one problem becomes several differently structured inquiries. No new factual proposition need be sufficient to produce this development. The change occurs in the organization through which further inquiry becomes possible.

This form of epistemic progress is especially important in philosophical, theoretical, interpretive, and exploratory research. The development of a more adequate question can alter the relevant literature, methods, objects of comparison, and standards of explanation. Question formation consequently belongs to the epistemic substance of inquiry rather than merely to its preparatory stage.

8.2 Questionability Beyond Information Deficit

The concept of questionability adds a distinction between the existence of an unknown and the activation of that unknown within inquiry. This distinction helps explain why ignorance alone does not generate

curiosity.

Information-gap theories provide an important account of cases in which a subject becomes aware of a discrepancy between what is known and what is desired [11]. The relational analysis developed here concerns a condition that can precede or accompany such awareness. A subject must first be capable of locating a difference within an epistemic field, experiencing that difference as significant, and sustaining sufficient attention for the difference to become an object of inquiry.

Questionability is therefore concerned with the formation of epistemic relevance. It asks how one unknown becomes active while indefinitely many others remain inert. This cannot be explained solely by reference to the objective quantity of missing information because subjects can remain indifferent to large gaps and intensely curious about small ones.

The concept also avoids treating epistemic relevance as an exclusively internal preference. What becomes salient depends upon prior knowledge and affect, but also upon the encounter, material resistance, evidence, social relations, practical context, and characteristics of the phenomenon itself. Questionability is therefore relationally distributed across an epistemic configuration.

This distribution is important because it prevents the account from reducing curiosity either to a property of a subject or to a property of an object. The relevant phenomenon is the emergence of an epistemic relation in which further knowing becomes possible and motivationally significant.

8.3 The Historical Variability of Epistemic Salience

A second implication concerns the historical variability of what can become questionable. If epistemic salience depends partly upon concepts, instruments, practices, institutions, and previous trajectories, then fields of possible curiosity cannot be treated as historically invariant.

This claim is stronger than the observation that people in different periods are interested in different topics. Historical transformation can modify the conditions through which an object is recognizable as an object of inquiry at all. Scientific instruments make new phenomena observable. Conceptual vocabularies make new distinctions articulable. Institutional practices create stable sites in which observations can accumulate and become comparable. Social conflict can transform normalized relations into explicit objects of criticism.

Kuhn's account of paradigms and anomaly provides a clear scientific example of this dependence [9]. What appears anomalous depends upon the expectations and problem structures organized by an existing disciplinary configuration. Foucault's archaeological analysis extends the issue toward the historical conditions under which objects and statements become available within discursive formations [5]. Historical materialist approaches similarly emphasize the dependence of consciousness and practice upon materially and socially organized life [13].

The present framework draws a limited implication from these traditions. Curiosity has a historical dimension because the space of possible questionability is historically structured. The subject's desire to know does not begin from a neutral world containing an invariant list of possible questions.

This conclusion also applies to apparently personal or spontaneous curiosity. An episode can be experienced as sudden and unplanned while depending upon concepts, practices, and histories acquired over many years. Spontaneity at the level of conscious experience is therefore compatible with substantial historical preparation.

8.4 Contingency Within Historically Formed Inquiry

Historical conditioning does not eliminate contingency. The relational account requires both because the occurrence of a particular question cannot be derived completely from the structures that make it possible.

A subject can possess the conceptual resources required to recognize a problem without ever encountering the event that makes the problem salient. A chance comparison can connect previously separate domains. An unexpected observation can destabilize a settled interpretation. A conversation can intro-

DRAFT

duce a distinction whose relevance was not anticipated. A practical failure can make visible a relation that remained hidden while the practice functioned smoothly.

The epistemic effect of such events is path-dependent. An encounter becomes significant through the organization into which it enters. The same event can be transformative for one subject and epistemically negligible for another because their prior trajectories differ.

Contingency therefore does not imply arbitrariness. Its generative force is conditioned. At the same time, historical structure does not imply predetermination because the significance and timing of future encounters remain open.

This relation provides a useful account of serendipitous inquiry. Serendipity can occur where an encounter was not deliberately sought yet becomes epistemically productive because the subject possesses an organization capable of recognizing an unexpected relation. The resulting insight depends upon both the contingency of the encounter and the history that makes the encounter intelligible.

8.5 Curiosity as Event and Disposition

The relational account also clarifies the relation between episodic and dispositional understandings of curiosity. These approaches need not be competitors if they operate at different temporal scales.

A disposition toward inquiry can influence the probability that a subject sustains attention toward unresolved phenomena. Inquisitiveness can therefore shape how encounters are handled across multiple situations [17]. At the same time, individual episodes of curiosity remain dependent upon local objects, contexts, histories, and encounters.

Repeated epistemic events can also modify dispositions. A subject who develops successful practices of questioning can become increasingly sensitive to particular forms of anomaly or uncertainty. Conversely, environments that repeatedly discourage inquiry can alter the likelihood that emerging questionability develops into manifest curiosity.

Disposition and event can therefore stand in a recursive relation. Historical dispositions shape encounters, while encounters can transform dispositions. The relational framework accommodates both without reducing one to the other.

This recursion is important for theories of epistemic formation because it connects local episodes of inquiry with longer-term changes in the subject. Curiosity can be transient in one episode while contributing cumulatively to a more durable orientation toward questioning.

8.6 The Epistemic Importance of Unresolved States

The account of pre-articulated apprehension suggests that unresolved epistemic states deserve greater analytical attention. Such states are often treated as temporary deficiencies preceding successful formulation. In some forms of inquiry, however, the ability to remain responsive to an unresolved difference is part of the process through which new distinctions become possible.

This claim should not be interpreted as an endorsement of indeterminacy for its own sake. An unresolved state can be unproductive, confusing, or harmful. Inquiry ultimately requires sufficient differentiation for judgment and action. The relevant point is temporal: premature stabilization can sometimes prevent the subject from discovering that the available categories are inadequate.

A ready-made formulation can resolve uncertainty by placing the phenomenon within an existing symbolic structure. This can be epistemically beneficial when the structure is adequate. Where the existing distinctions are themselves part of the problem, rapid classification can conceal rather than resolve the underlying tension.

The capacity to sustain a period of unresolved attention therefore has a conditional epistemic significance. It allows the possibility that the question, rather than only the answer, requires transformation.

This feature connects curiosity with philosophical inquiry in a particularly direct manner. Philosophical progress frequently depends upon recognizing that an apparently familiar concept has become unstable. The initial development can consist only in an inability to continue using the concept as before. A more precise distinction can emerge later.

DRAFT

8.7 Epistemic Trajectories and Outcome Equivalence

The distinction between epistemic output and epistemic formation developed in Section 6 has a broader consequence. Equivalent outcomes do not imply equivalent epistemic trajectories.

Two subjects can possess the same proposition while differing in the processes through which the proposition became meaningful. One can receive a statement through testimony and understand it competently. Another can arrive at the same statement through a sequence of observations, failed interpretations, conceptual revisions, and encounters with counterevidence.

The difference should not be expressed as a simple hierarchy. Testimony is indispensable to human knowledge, and independently reconstructing every epistemic result would be impossible. The relevant point concerns what else is generated through the trajectory.

An extended inquiry can alter the subject's sensitivity to evidence, capacity to distinguish related problems, understanding of the boundaries of a concept, and ability to generate further questions. A compressed trajectory can produce the same immediate answer without reproducing these transformations. In other contexts, compression can release cognitive resources for more advanced forms of inquiry and thereby increase future generativity.

Outcome equivalence therefore leaves the epistemic significance of the process underdetermined. Evaluation depends upon which capacities and temporal horizons matter in the relevant practice.

This distinction provides a conceptual bridge toward later work on epistemic trajectories. The present paper establishes only that the path through which knowing occurs can matter when the object of evaluation includes the evolving epistemic subject.

8.8 Relational Conditions of Epistemic Generativity

The recursive account developed throughout the paper suggests a broader concept of epistemic generativity. An epistemic process is generative in the relevant sense when it contributes to the conditions through which further epistemic events become possible.

An answer can be generative when it supplies a distinction that opens new questions. An unresolved encounter can be generative when it reorganizes attention. A teacher can be generative by introducing a concept that enables the learner to recognize previously inaccessible problems. A failed hypothesis can be generative by exposing assumptions and modifying subsequent standards of evidence.

Generativity therefore cannot be identified with novelty alone. A novel idea can terminate inquiry, while an inherited concept can become highly generative within a new relation. The relevant property concerns changes in the field of future epistemic possibilities.

This formulation is consistent with the limited role assigned to the Generative Relational framework in the present paper. The framework does not require a universal metric of generativity. It identifies a direction of analysis: attention should be given to how epistemic relations alter the conditions under which subsequent questions, distinctions, judgments, and inquiries can emerge.

Such an approach also prevents the subject from being treated as the sole bearer of generativity. Epistemic possibilities can be expanded or constrained through institutions, tools, communities, texts, material environments, and relations among subjects. The unit of analysis can therefore extend beyond individual cognition where the relevant question concerns the preservation or transformation of conditions for future inquiry.

8.9 Implications for Artificially Mediated Inquiry

Artificial intelligence provides a particularly clear setting in which the preceding distinctions become operationally important. Systems can increasingly supply explanations, classifications, questions, distinctions, and possible interpretations at stages where a human subject would previously have spent more time differentiating an unresolved problem.

The immediate consequence can be strongly positive. Artificial systems can reduce search costs, increase access to conceptual resources, expose users to unfamiliar literatures, and generate comparisons

DRAFT

that stimulate further inquiry. A previously inaccessible question can become tractable because the system supplies vocabulary or background knowledge that the user lacks.

At the same time, technologically supplied articulation can change the temporal structure of inquiry. The interval between disturbance and formulation can contract. A subject can receive a stable interpretation before independently exploring alternative ways of distinguishing the problem.

The present paper does not establish whether such contraction is beneficial or harmful. It identifies the dimensions that a later evaluation would need to consider. These include whether the intervention expands future question formation, whether the user retains capacity to revise supplied distinctions, whether epistemic friction is productively reduced or entirely displaced, and whether the relation produces increasing or decreasing dependence upon external problem formulation.

The central issue is therefore not the presence of artificial assistance considered in isolation. It is the structure of the resulting epistemic trajectory.

This distinction will be particularly important for later work on knowledge production that can proceed without equivalent human participation in the genesis of inquiry. The present paper provides the conceptual vocabulary required for that analysis while leaving the technological question outside its principal scope.

8.10 Implications for Education

The same distinctions have educational implications. If learning is evaluated solely through the acquisition of correct information, rapid provision of answers can appear uniformly desirable. If education also concerns the development of capacities for question formation, judgment, and further inquiry, the timing and structure of assistance become relevant.

This does not support a general pedagogy of withholding information. Learners require guidance, inherited knowledge, conceptual vocabulary, and access to expertise. Educational generativity can depend precisely upon supplying a distinction that the learner could not develop independently.

The relational question concerns how assistance enters the learner's epistemic trajectory. A supplied answer can terminate an emerging inquiry or open a more advanced one. A question posed by a teacher can remain externally imposed or become internally generative. A period of uncertainty can stimulate differentiation or simply produce confusion.

Educational evaluation therefore requires attention to the relation among timing, difficulty, support, prior organization, and the future capacities of the learner. The present framework provides conceptual distinctions for such an analysis without specifying a universal pedagogical strategy.

A fuller educational theory would require a separate account of developmental variation, institutional conditions, unequal access to epistemic resources, and the normative purposes of education. Those questions remain beyond the current paper.

8.11 Theoretical Limitations

Several limitations of the present account should be stated explicitly.

First, the paper develops a conceptual framework rather than an empirical model of curiosity. Terms such as questionability, epistemic salience, and pre-articulated apprehension identify distinctions that require further operationalization before they can support psychological measurement or causal testing.

Second, the analysis does not establish a universal sequence of epistemic development. Encounter, disturbance, salience, curiosity, and question formation can overlap, recur, or appear in different orders. Some inquiries begin directly from explicit questions inherited from existing practices.

Third, the framework remains deliberately plural concerning levels of explanation. Psychological, phenomenological, social, historical, and institutional accounts can contribute to the same epistemic event without being reducible to one another. The present paper does not provide a theory of how these levels should be integrated causally.

Fourth, the concept of historical conditioning remains broad. Different forms of historical explanation operate at substantially different scales, from individual biography to disciplinary development,

DRAFT

institutional history, political economy, and long-term conceptual change. Further work must specify which historical mechanisms are relevant in particular domains.

Fifth, the paper does not settle the metaphysical status of pre-articulated experience. It requires only the possibility that epistemic reorganization can precede stable symbolic formulation. Stronger claims concerning non-conceptual content, ineffability, consciousness, or the ontology of symbolic mediation would require independent argument.

Sixth, the Generative Relational framework is employed provisionally. The analysis does not establish that all epistemic phenomena are fundamentally relational or that relation should function as a universal ontological primitive. Its use is justified here by the explanatory value of examining subjects, objects, histories, and encounters within evolving configurations.

Finally, the normative status of curiosity remains unresolved. The paper can identify where curiosity participates in forms of epistemic subjectivity and what could change when those processes are transformed. It cannot infer from those structural claims alone that curiosity possesses unconditional value.

8.12 Directions for Subsequent Inquiry

The analysis opens several directions for subsequent work.

One direction concerns epistemic trajectories. If the same symbolic outcome can emerge through different histories, further analysis is required to determine which features of those histories matter for understanding, judgment, transfer, and future question formation.

A second direction concerns pre-symbolic and partially symbolic epistemic processes. The present paper has distinguished pre-articulated apprehension from strong claims of ineffability. Further work can investigate how conceptual formation emerges from states that are only partially differentiated and how symbolic articulation transforms rather than simply records those states.

A third direction concerns artificial intelligence. Systems capable of generating sophisticated symbolic outputs create a widening separation between the production of epistemic artifacts and the human histories through which questions traditionally became meaningful. This raises questions concerning epistemic provenance, subject formation, trust, and the distribution of question-forming capacities.

A fourth direction concerns education. If question formation and epistemic friction can contribute to the development of inquirers, pedagogical design must consider the conditions under which assistance supports self-sustaining inquiry rather than only immediate answer acquisition.

A fifth direction concerns historical and political economy. If fields of questionability depend upon institutions, material resources, technologies, and relations of authority, then the distribution of opportunities to generate and pursue questions becomes an object of governance as well as epistemology.

These directions require separate analyses because each introduces additional empirical, historical, or normative commitments. The present paper provides a common conceptual starting point: knowing begins neither with ignorance alone nor necessarily with an already articulated question. It can begin with a historically situated transformation through which something becomes epistemically significant to a subject.

The final section summarizes this account and states its contribution in a restricted form.

9 Conclusion

This paper has examined the emergence of the desire to know by shifting attention from the possession of curiosity to the conditions under which something becomes epistemically significant to a subject. The central problem was formulated through the concept of *questionability*: the condition in which a phenomenon moves from epistemic background into a position capable of sustaining further inquiry. This shift made it possible to distinguish the existence of unknown information from the event through which an unknown becomes active within an epistemic relation.

The analysis began by decomposing several questions that are frequently compressed into general claims concerning the human desire or need for knowledge. The genesis of epistemic desire, the functions

DRAFT

of curiosity, the constitution of epistemic subjectivity, and the normative value of inquiry require different forms of explanation. The distinction is methodologically important because an account of the usefulness of curiosity does not explain its emergence, while a description of its role in human inquiry does not by itself establish an obligation to preserve it.

The literature reviewed in Section 3 showed that different traditions illuminate different dimensions of this problem. Classical accounts of wonder locate the beginning of inquiry in a disturbance of familiarity. Psychological theories analyze curiosity through information gaps, uncertainty, motivation, and information seeking. Pragmatist accounts emphasize the formation of problems within initially indeterminate situations. Phenomenological approaches provide resources for understanding salience and the transition from background involvement to thematic attention. Historical approaches show that fields of possible inquiry depend upon inherited conceptual, material, institutional, and discursive conditions. Structural and latent-condition accounts further illustrate how manifest epistemic states can depend upon organizations whose formation precedes conscious articulation.

The Generative Relational account developed in Section 4 brought these concerns together at the level of the epistemic event. A subject enters an encounter through historically formed perceptual, conceptual, affective, linguistic, and practical organization. A phenomenon can remain compatible with this organization and pass without substantial epistemic consequence. Under other conditions, the encounter can generate disturbance, salience, and sustained unresolved significance. Questionability designates the epistemic position that emerges when such significance becomes capable of supporting further inquiry.

This account treats questionability as relationally constituted. Its emergence depends neither upon an isolated property of the object nor upon an unconstrained state of the subject. Features of the phenomenon, the subject's history, prior knowledge, expectations, practices, material conditions, relations with others, and the circumstances of encounter can all participate in the event. The same phenomenon can therefore occupy different epistemic positions across subjects, contexts, and historical moments.

The temporal analysis in Section 5 further showed that explicit symbolic formulation need not coincide with the beginning of inquiry. A subject can register discrepancy, insufficiency, or unresolved significance before possessing a stable question through which the relevant difference can be expressed. The concept of pre-articulated apprehension was introduced for this limited class of cases. The concept does not require a universal pre-symbolic stage or a domain intrinsically resistant to language. It identifies an interval in which epistemic organization has begun to change while symbolic articulation remains incomplete.

Symbolic formulation subsequently becomes part of the epistemic process itself. A question can stabilize distinctions, expose hidden assumptions, reorganize a problem, and disclose further unknowns. Question formation therefore cannot always be treated as a neutral representation of a previously completed problem. In some inquiries, the development of an adequate question constitutes a substantial part of the epistemic achievement.

This point led to the paper's account of epistemic subjectivity. As developed in Section 6, an epistemic subject is historically formed through capacities for attention, discrimination, questioning, interpretation, revision, and subsequent inquiry. Curiosity can participate in the constitution of these capacities where a subject encounters an unresolved phenomenon, sustains attention toward it, contributes to the formation of a question, and is transformed through the resulting inquiry.

The resulting claim is deliberately restricted. Curiosity is not required for every instance of knowledge acquisition or every successful epistemic output. Information can be received through testimony, instruction, institutional practice, computational systems, or other forms of epistemic dependence. Identical propositions can also arise through substantially different epistemic trajectories. The relevant distinction concerns what happens to the subject through those trajectories. An inquiry can produce an answer while also changing what the subject can subsequently notice, distinguish, question, and judge.

This recursive feature is central to the Generative Relational interpretation developed here. Previous inquiry becomes part of the organization through which later questionability emerges. Knowing can therefore alter the conditions of future knowing. Epistemic history affects the range of differences that can become salient, while new encounters can reorganize the historical structures through which later

DRAFT

inquiry proceeds.

The same recursive structure operates beyond the individual subject. Disciplines, institutions, technologies, educational practices, and communities preserve distinctions produced through previous inquiry and thereby alter the space of questions available to later participants. Historical conditions shape fields of possible inquiry, while concrete and contingent encounters can redirect those fields. The emergence of curiosity is consequently compatible with both historical conditioning and genuine path dependence.

The paper has also maintained a boundary between constitutive and normative significance. If curiosity participates in the formation of certain forms of epistemic subjectivity, then removing or transforming curiosity can alter those forms. This structural conclusion does not determine whether the resulting change should be regarded as a loss. A normative judgment requires additional commitments concerning epistemic agency, education, autonomy, participation, human flourishing, collective judgment, or other goods.

This distinction becomes increasingly important where epistemic functions are technologically mediated. Artificial systems can generate questions, explanations, hypotheses, distinctions, and other epistemic artifacts without requiring an equivalent human trajectory of curiosity for each output. Their existence makes visible a separation between the production of epistemic content and the formation of a questioning human subject. The present paper does not evaluate that separation normatively. It provides the distinctions required for a later evaluation.

Several limitations therefore remain. The account is conceptual rather than an empirically operationalized model of curiosity. It does not establish a universal developmental sequence, a complete causal integration of psychological and historical levels, a metaphysics of non-conceptual experience, or a general normative theory of epistemic subjectivity. The Generative Relational framework is used provisionally as a means of organizing relations among subjects, objects, histories, encounters, and changing epistemic conditions. Stronger ontological conclusions are unnecessary for the argument developed here.

Within these limits, the paper advances a more precise way of posing the initial problem. The desire to know can be studied through the event in which a historically situated subject encounters a phenomenon that acquires epistemic salience, becomes questionable, and generates an orientation toward further inquiry. The resulting question can transform both the object as an object of inquiry and the epistemic organization of the subject. Inquiry thereby becomes a generative process in which previous knowing conditions future questionability.

This conclusion also defines the boundary of the present paper within the larger research programme. Subsequent work can examine the epistemic trajectory between pre-articulated apprehension and symbolic knowledge in greater detail, including the role of contingency, lived history, and forms of understanding that are only partially preserved in their final propositional expression. Further work can then address knowledge production under artificial intelligence, where sophisticated symbolic outputs can increasingly be generated without an equivalent human trajectory through which the relevant questions, distinctions, and epistemic subjectivities were formed.

The present inquiry therefore ends with a limited proposition. Before asking whether curiosity is useful, replaceable, or normatively indispensable, it is necessary to understand what occurs when something first becomes worthy of inquiry for a subject. The emergence of that relation is itself part of the phenomenon of knowing.

References

[1] Aristotle. *Metaphysics, Volume I: Books 1–9*. Number 271 in Loeb Classical Library. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1933.

[2] Jason Baehr. *Inquiry and Agency: A Theory of Intellectual Virtues and Vices*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2025.

[3] John Dewey. *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*. Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1938.

DRAFT

[4] Bruce Fink. *The Lacanian Subject: Between Language and Jouissance*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1995.

[5] Michel Foucault. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Pantheon Books, New York, 1972.

[6] Eugene T. Gendlin. *Experiencing and the Creation of Meaning: A Philosophical and Psychological Approach to the Subjective*. Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1962.

[7] Martin Heidegger. *Being and Time*. State University of New York Press, Albany, NY, 2010.

[8] Celeste Kidd and Benjamin Y. Hayden. The psychology and neuroscience of curiosity. *Neuron*, 88(3):449–460, 2015.

[9] Thomas S. Kuhn. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, volume 2 of *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2 edition, 1970.

[10] Jordan A. Litman and Paul J. Silvia. The latent structure of trait curiosity: Evidence for interest and deprivation curiosity dimensions. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 86(3):318–328, 2006.

[11] George Loewenstein. The psychology of curiosity: A review and reinterpretation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(1):75–98, 1994.

[12] Dan Lusthaus. *Buddhist Phenomenology: A Philosophical Investigation of Yogacara Buddhism and the Ch'eng Wei-shih Lun*. Routledge, London, 2002.

[13] Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. The german ideology. In *Marx and Engels Collected Works*, volume 5. International Publishers, New York, 1975.

[14] Maurice Merleau-Ponty. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Routledge, London, 2012.

[15] Plato. *Theaetetus*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1921.

[16] Michael Polanyi. *The Tacit Dimension*. Doubleday, Garden City, NY, 1966.

[17] Lani Watson. What is inquisitiveness? *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 52(3):273–288, 2015.

[18] Dennis Whitcomb. Curiosity was framed. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 81(3):664–687, 2010.

DRAFT