Maritain

In his essay, "Critical Realism," Jacques Maritain told us that "The problem of thing and object is the nub of the critical problem."[1] Since that time, the thing/object distinction has been almost totally ignored. Either Maritain was very mistaken, or we have been missing something very important. In fact, if Maritain was correct, "Critical Realism" must be the most important epistemological work of this century. For it alone can claim to have addressed "the nub of the critical problem," since it alone approaches epistemological questions from the perspective of "the problem of thing and object."

One reason we have failed to grasp the significance of the thing/object distinction may be this. Maritain tells us "We would say in Thomistic language that the thing is the 'material object' of the sense and intellect, whereas what we are calling object in this context . . . is their 'formal object'." (93) When we read that, there is a temptation to think we know what we need to know about the thing/object distinction, because we understand the scholastic distinction between formal and material objects. And if that is all there is to the thing/object distinction, we have good reason to think that Maritain exagerrated its significance for epistemological problems. In fact, it is hard to see how Maritain can use that distinction against the skeptics and idealists he addresses in "Critical Realism" without begging their questions.

For the scholastics, it is true that "material object and formal object are grasped at a single stroke and indivisibly by the very same perceptions" (93), because formal objects "are aspects (it would be better to say 'inspects') of elements of knowability in certain ontological nuclei called things." (92) But for the modern epistemologist, these claims about the relation of our objects to things are precisely what stand in need of justification. The modern epistemologist will grant that our awareness relates us to objects, but she wonders about the relation of our objects to

extramental things. If she is a skeptic, she may not doubt the possibility of their being extramental things, but she will doubt whethe our consciousness gives us accurate information about things. If she is an idealist, she may not doubt that our consciousness gives us accurate information about things, but she will doubt whether these things have an existence that is other than being known.

Maritain, of course, did not seek a "justification" of knowledge in the sense of a direct proof that our awareness reaches things in their extramental existence. He sought no more than to be able to reduce the opposite position to absurdity. He can prove realism without making our awareness of things indirect, because it is the proof that is indirect. But he claimed that the thing/object distinction allowed him to reduce the skeptic or idealist to absurdity. And it is difficult to see how the scholastic distinction between formal and material objects can serve to do that.

But while Maritain's analysis of thing and object is consistent with the scholastic use of the material object/formal object distinction, his analysis goes further, or rather, deeper. He asks us to consider what we are doing when we call something an "object" of consciousness; what conditions are necessary for calling something an "object." The subject-object polarity is a fundamental fact of consciousness, encountered in our reflective self-awareness. We can ask epistemological questions only because we are aware of our own consciousness. And this reality we call "consciousness" is a relational reality, a way of relating to terms non-identical with itself that we call its "objects." Maritain saw that the conditions necessary for recognizing the situation we call consciousness's relation to objects provide a reduction to absurdity of the positions of the skeptic and the idealist.

But that reduction to absurdity is only the first step. The ground-floor analysis of what it

means to call something an object provides us with a tool, the thing/object distinction, applicable to the whole range of questions about human knowledge, from the distinction and nature of the sciences, as the scholasitcs had seen, to contemporary problems of the relativity of truth in hermeneutics, the history of science, and cultural and psychological linquistics. As Kant gave us a Copernican revolution, Maritain makes possible an Einsteinian revolution where, as in Einstein, we account for the relative by situating it properly with respect to something absolute. In Einstein, measurements of space and measurements of time are relativized by recognizing the absoluteness of the measurement of the spatial-temporal interval. In Maritain, relativity can characterize objects as objects without interfering with the absoluteness of our knowledge of things as things.

1.

How, then, do the conditions required for using the concept of object enable us to defend realism? An "object" is an object of knowledge. "We must distinguish," Maritain tells us, "between the thing as thing -- as existing or able to exist for itself -- and the thing as object -- when it is set before the faculty of knowing and made present to it." (91) "The object is the correlative of a knowing subject . . . which precisely takes the name 'object' from the fact that is is presented to the mind." (93) When we describe something as an object, we are describing it as the term of a knowledge relation. We are saying that it is known, conceived, seen, heard, referred to, described, mentioned, thought about, remembered, etc. Any state of awareness has an object, since an an awareness is an awareness of something.[2] And just as we can describe awareness as a relation to something, we can describe that something as a term of a relation of awareness, as an object.

But we cannot describe that something only as a term of a relation of awareness.

Whatever we are aware of, we must be aware of more than its being an object. If the only thing we were aware of were that something was an object, the only thing we would be aware of was that something was a term of a relation of awareness. In order for something to be recognized as a term of a relation of awareness, we must recognize the awareness of which it is the term. In order to describe something as what is "seen," we must be aware of what sight is; in order to describe something as what is "imagined," we must be aware of what imagination is. We know states of awareness, like seeing and imagining, through reflective self-awareness, secondary states of awareness that relate us to prior states of awareness.[3] Like any awareness, reflective self-awareness is a relation to a term which, ipso facto, is distinct from the awareness as the term of any relation is distinct from the relation. The distinct term of reflective self-awareness is a prior, primary awareness. But what is the term of that prior awareness? What is it aware of? What is the something of which it is an awareness?

If it is aware only that something is an object of awareness, it is aware of an an awareness, just as reflective self-awareness is. And there must be an additional awareness for it to be aware of. But what is that additional awareness aware of? That something is an object of awareness? An infinite regress is underway. If the only thing we know about something is that it is an object of consciousness, consciousness must start be being consciousness of consciousness. Consciousness could never come into existence on that condition, because a requirement for its coming into existence would be a series of prior consciousnesses that, being infinite, would neverterminate at the consciousness whose existence we are considering. But that consciousness does exist; epistemological only questions arise because we recognize the existence of conscious states. Therefore objects of consciousness are always known as more than objects of consciousness. What is seen is not that something is seen but that something is red or round or

moving. What is imagined, in the first instance, is not that something is imagined but that it is tall or swift or soft. Later, we can imagine(2) that something is imagined(1). But what is imagined(1) cannot be the something is imagined; otherwise, there would be nothing for imagining(2) to imagine.

This argument derives from Maritain, but he puts in an a compressed and oblique manner, which may be another reason we have failed to grasp the significance of his analysis. We can see that it derives from Maritain by looking at the paragraphs where he justifies his assertion that the problem of thing and object is the nub of the critical problem. Immediately after making that statement, he criticizes those who consider it "'naive realism' . . . to start with an act of knowledge about things rather than an act of knowledge about knowledge." (107) So those who deny that objects of knowledge are also things are starting with an act of knowledge about knowledge. The knowledge that something is an object is knowledge about knowledge, since something "precisely takes the name 'object' from the fact that it is presented to the mind" (93), that is, "is set before the faculty of knowing" (91). And to start with knowledge about knowledge is to "fain start with what comes second." (108)

To claim that we are aware of objects without being aware that they are things is to start with and what we know to come second in awareness, because we know that awareness is awareness of something other than awareness. For, as Maritain continues, "One cannot think about a 'thought thing' until after one has thought about a 'thinkable thing.'" To call something an object is to thik about a "<u>thought</u> thing"; for to call it an object is to describe it as term of a relation of awareness. But for awareness to have a term, that term must be other than awareness itself. The term must not be a "thought thing" but a "think<u>able</u> thing," that is, something whose nature makes it <u>potentially</u> the term of a knowledge relation, but whose nature is more than the

term of a knowledge relation. For unless it were something more than the term of a knowledge relation, more than an object, it could not be the term of a knowledge relation even potentially, because then the first term of a knowledge relation would be knowledge.

Again, "The cogitatum (the object) of the first cogito is not cogitatum (the fact that something is an object) but ens." The cogitatum of the first cogito must be something more than cogitatum or else the first cogito could have nothing for its cogitatum. For "We do not eat what has been eaten; we eat bread." (108) Like cogitating, eating is a relation to a term; we eat something. And for the relation of cogitating to have as its first term the fact that something is cogitated would be like eating, not bread with its quality of having carbohydrates or meat with its quality of having protein, but something with one quality only, the quality of being "that which is eaten." And if that were its only quality, there would be nothing eaten, even potentially. To be "that which is eaten" the term of the relation of eating must have other characteristics. Likewise, if the cogitated were nothing more than "that which is cogitated," there would be nothing cogitated, even potentially. To be that which is cogitated, the cogitated must be more than that which is cogitated. It must be cogitated as green or organic or at rest or oblong or possessing mass, etc. Objects of awareness must be more than "objects of awareness."

And we are capable of knowing they are more than mere objects as soon as we form the notion of object. The original data presupposed to the asking of epistemological questions is the bipolarity of consciousness, the relation of consciousness to something other than itself. Modern philosophy spontaneously calls that other the object. Many a student encountering philosophy for the first time has reached the point of describing consciousness as a subject-object polarity, only to wonder how to establish the relation of objects to what is independent of consciousness. Maritain shows that what we spontaneously call an object we must be aware of all along as

something other than an object. He shows that what is known at the outset is necessarily something later recognizable as being more than the "known."

And as he notes "In current modern language, it (the word 'object') has received a very different meaning inasmuch as the opposition of objective to subjective has finally made the values proper to "thing" or the "real" pass on to the object." (91, n. 1) To express realism, we say there are "objective truths" and "objective facts"; we speak of what comes from the side of the "object" of knowledge rather than the subject; we accuse skeptics and idealists of denying the "objective" character of knowledge. In other words, we find it natural, when describing things as what I have called "more than objects," to call them "objects." Why? When we are reflecting on the subject of knowledge, which is what we are doing in epistemology, it is proper to distinguish the known from the subject of knowledge by calling the known an "object." In Latin, "objicio" means what is "to throw in the way of, against, or before something." When we describe the known as an object, we are describing it as thrown against the knower and, therefore, as distinguished from the knower. We recognize the distinction of object from subject in the act by which we recognize, and for the same reason that we recognize, the subject as related to the object. And in reflecting on the bipolarity of consciousness, we instinctively recognize that in being aware of the object-pole, as distinct from being aware of the subject-pole, we are aware of more than the subject's relation to the object or the object's relation to it. In recognizing the distinction between the subject-pole and the object-pole, we implicitly recognize the independence from the subject of that which we have distinguished from the subject by calling it an "object." Therefore, we use "object" and "objective" to express that independence.

What Maritain does is show that the data we are aware of when we use "object" in this way, namely, necessarily justifies our calling them things as well as objects, since to be aware of

them as objects we must be aware of them as more than objects. The object-pole of the bipolarity of consciousness is known from the very beginning, before reflection, as what we can later call, after reflection, more than an object. All along, the data we need to affirm realism is there, is directly there, and is demonstrably (by indirect proof) directly there. When we describe one pole of consciousness as an "object," we are already expressing secondary knowledge of it; so we must have a primary knowledge of it other than as an object. If not, there would be no secondary knowledge. That which we are aware of must be more than "that which we are aware of."

The argument as so far presented is far from being the whole of Maritain's defense of realism, but it is the necessary presupposition of the rest of his argument. That more is needed is obvious from the fact that the thing/object analysis so far given applies as much to the objects of imagination or conception, which need not really exist outside of awareness, as to the objects of sense perception, which (presumably) do have extramental existence. And has the argument even proven that, if something really exists, as opposed to being merely imagined or conceived, that existence is something other than being an object of knowledge? Granted, what is known, at any level of consciousness, is known as more than "known." Does it follow that this something more has an existence independent of consciousness. For example, what is seen is not seen as "seen," it is seen as red or some other color. But it does not follow that color has an existence in things independent of our perception.

Maritain's answer is that existence is the primary value included in our objects as more than objects; existence is included in what is known insofar as what is known is more than "what is known." Therefore, even thought not all our objects really exist or are known to really exist, if and when they really exist, that existence is other than being known. Furthermore, sense

experience lets us know that its objects really exist, even if perceived qualities like colors do not exist in things as they are perceived. We do have objects that are not capable of extramental existence. These are beings of reason. But we can have beings of reason as objects only by thinking them on the pattern of real being, and so only in dependence of our awareness of real being.

Maritain offers a variety of arguments in support of these conclusions. To appreciate the force of these arguments, we have to understand them in relation to Maritain's analysis of truth, because that analysis of truth is his reason for introducting the thing/object distinction to begin with.

2.

If they were asked what does Maritain consider "the first problem for critique to solve," how many of his readers would answer "the elucidation of the notion of truth"? (76) He had said the same thing in his earlier work on epistemology, Reflexions sur l'intelligence.[4] There he makes clear that by the elucidation of truth he means, first, the answer to the question, "What is truth?" and, second, the solution to problems about how truth is possible that arise from the answer to that question. To understand Maritain, therefore, we have to understand why he considers that the first question critique must answer and how the answer to that question creates problems for explaining how truth so understood is possible.

For Maritain, the job of epistemology is to evaluate, to show what "value," (73, 92) what goal,[5] is achieved "on the different levels of elaborating knowledge" (73), or "in the various moments of human knowledge (74). Knowledge begins with percipere (73) and ends with judicare (74). But what is achieved in perception and in the judgments of mathematics, logic, physical science, metaphysics, natural theology? Is the same goal achieved by perception and by

all the diverse kinds of judgments that derive from it? And how does the goal attained in perception enable us attain the goals attained in those other levels of human knowledge?

The ultimate state of human knowledge is judgment. In judgment we evaluate statements by deciding whether or not they achieve the goal of being true. So knowledge of the truth or falsity of statements is the fundamental and principal evaluation with which epistemology is concerned. In the case of any "level of elaborating knowledge," epistemology seeks first to determine that we can know the truth of statements made at that level. The answer to that question will necessarily involve some understanding of the relation of that level of knowledge to perception, from which every level of knowledge derives. After determining that the goal of truth is attained at more than one level of knowledge, epistemology seeks to know how the goals attained at those levels differ.

But if truth is the primary goal with reference to which epistemology evaluates, we first need to know what truth is. Hence the question of what is truth is epistemology's first problem. The answer to any other question that might claim to be epistemology's first question would presuppose an answer to the question, "What is truth." For example, if I set out to answer whether consciousness attains the external world, I am setting out to determine whether the statement "Consciousness attains the external world" achieves the goal of truth.

In answering the question, "What is this goal: truth?" epistemology is only making explicit something we are aware of prephilosophically. Indeed, epistemology is just an extension of the kind of evaluating we do whenever we judge some statement true or false. In any judgment, there is an initial, implicit reflection of the knower on her knowledge. For in judging truth, one is not only aware of the existence of a state of affairs, but she is also aware of the existence of a statement making a claim about the state of affairs. Every evaluation of the truth

of a statement is an implicit critique asking whether thought achieves its goal; and epistemology is an explicit extension of the kind of reflection on knowledge every evaluation of the truth of statements requires.

Furthermore, the very asking of epistemological questions presupposes knowledge, including knowledge of the nature of truth, we possess prior to our explicit epistemological reflection:

> An authentic critique of knowledge does not imply a single instant of real or universal doubt. Such an instant of doubt in effect includes in actu exercito the negation of something about which we pretend not to know anything as yet[6] (I mean the essential ordination of the intellect to being). And that is a vicious circle.
>
> And that is not the only one. The value of certitude cannot be cast into doubt in reflection without expressly referring to an absolute and incontestable ideal of certitude, to a notion of certainty that is already acquired and held to be guaranteed, to a strict principle that will command the entire discussion that follows, namely, that valid scientific certitude -- certitude that has objective truth as its correlative -- bears certain characteristics, and demands certain conditions. There is at least something for reflection which cannot be at all doubtful. That is a reflex and, indeed, philosophical certitude, one that may easily be recognized and that has to be put outside universal doubt. And it implies all the elements of critical philosophy: a notion of truth, reality, objectivity, etc. Critical philosophy has, therefore, begun even before the start assigned to it (by the opponent). (78 and 78, n. 3)

The conditions for asking epistemological questions are what enable us to answer them. But those conditions are also what give rise to epistemological questions to begin with. Maritain holds that "critical" questions arise "naturally." As the quoted passage indicates, he does not mean that lived skeptical doubt arises naturally; such a doubt would contradict the conditions necessary for its existence. But reflection on things we know prephilosophically gives rise to critical questions in "signified act." That is, issues such as the possibility of universal doubt arise naturally as hypotheses to be examined.

In RI, he had shown how critical questions had arisen naturally in Greek philosophy from reflection on the unavoidable question: what is truth. Epistemological problems did not have to wait for the howlers of modern philosophers. In DK, he argues that critical questions arise naturally, not from an analysis of the history of philosophy, but from a reflection on the common sense idea of truth that epistemology must start from.[7] In both cases, he comes to the conclusion that truth is a conformity between thought and things, in particular, between a statement to be judged and things. But he also comes to the conclusion that:

> We are compelled to effect a certain disjunction between the thing and thought, to recognize that the conditions that attach to one do not attach to the other. (84)

Otherwise:

> How could we know a thing that was one in itself, for example, what we call "man" by means of a complex thought like the idea "living being" joined to the idea "capable of sensation" and the idea "capable of understanding"? And how could we know by

> universal ideas a thing that is singular in its proper existence? (84)
>
> In the inner world of our understanding there is a whole multitude of distinct views or distinct concepts for things that exist undivided in the world of nature, and they lead quite a different life in the latter than they do in the former. In the world of nature the lion eats the antelope; in the world of understanding the lion receives the predicate carnivorous by means of the copula. And the possibility of error arises simply from the disparity in the way things exist in these two worlds. (86)

In the face of this diversity between thought and things, how are we to understand the conformity required for truth? As it did among the Greeks, philosophic reflection on the prephilosophic understanding of truth leads to problems for philosophy to solve. In RI, he put the problem this way:

> If, on the one hand, there is being independent of my mind and, on the other hand, there is my mind, and if an identity, in the strictest sense, between them in no way occurs, then my mind attains only a resemblance of being, not being itself. And the philosopher will always ask, "What guarantees that that this resemblance really resembles, that the conformity of my mind with being is real and not only apparent?" (RI, 16-17)

Given the diversity between the conditions of thought and the conditions of things, how can thought attain more than a resemblance of what exists, a resemblance whose value as a resemblance can always be open to doubt? To what degree does the "resemblance" resemble,

and to what degree does it not resemble? We can have no answer to such a question, since the only available bases for an answer would be other imperfect resemblances.[8]

So far, Maritain's analysis of truth is not original, and his initial statement about the nature of the conformity required for truth (88) will not be remembered for its clarity. But his main contribution is yet to come. In RI, he solved the problem by saying that we can "distinguish in our thought that which is of things themselves and that which is of our manner of knowing." (RI, 17). In DK, he repeats and expands on what he had said in RI; the conformity in truth is between that which is known and what exists outside the mind, not between the manner in which it exists in the mind in order to be known and the manner in which it exists outside the mind. But then he goes beyond the analysis of RI to introduce the problem of thing and object.

Consider the statement "Some lion is carnivorous." Being aware of the truth of that statement requires being aware that something has been made an object, made the term of a knowledge relation, in two different ways, once as what is described by "some lion" and once as what is described by "carnivorous." If that statement is true, at least one of the things in the extension of "lion" must be the same as one of the things in the extension of "carnivorous." So the truth of that statement requires identity between what has been made an object in one way and what has been made an object in another. The truth of the statement requires that what are distinct from the point of view of the diverse way they are made objects (let us say "logically" distinct[9]) are not distinct but are identical as <u>things</u>, that is, as more than objects. And to know the truth of the statement is to know the identity of logically distinct objects as things. If the relation <u>identity</u> holds between thing and object as required by the statement, then the relation of <u>truth</u>, conformity with things, holds between the statement and things. The truth (conformity with things) of a statement is a function of the identity of its objects with things.

So, to the relation of conformity between thought and things of the traditional correspondence theory of truth, Maritain adds the identity between object and things. What does Maritain gain by speaking about the relation between objects of thought and things and not, more simply, between thought and things. He gains many things, as we will see. But the most fundamental thing he gains, the gain from which his other gains derive, is a solution to the problem of the correspondence theory of truth. If correspondence is a relation between thought and things, we first have the problem of what this relation is, since it is not identity. Again, is it resemblance? Then resemblance in what respect and to what degree? And resemblance between what? One of the terms of the relation is an extramental thing, but what is the other term? And what are the rules for judging that this resemblance holds?

If the relation is not resemblance, perhaps our thoughts are true when they satisfy some built in rules of "projection" or "representation." For example, the meaning of the word "lion" may have nothing to do with the nature of the thing we are discussing, but that meaning happens to be what represents individual's of that kind in the human system of projection. Then to judge the truth of "This is a lion" or "Some lion is carnivorous," we would have to consult those rules, since there is no other relation between the sensory evidence and the meanings of the words in those sentences. But if we consult those rules, we ought to know what they are, and wemanifestly do not; we do not even know that they exist. And what do the rules say about how things we know nothing about as yet are to be represented? Do they already state the right ways to project tomorrow's discoveries in science and technology? Then what those things are must somehow already be coded into the rules, even though they do not yet exist, and we do not know what they will be. For the rules relate what things are to terms otherwise unrelated to what things are.

There might be something analogous to rules of projection in the human thought process, but if so, their function, whatever that may be and at whatever stage it may take place, is not to provide an answer to what is the "correspondence" in the correspondence theory of truth. In fact, by explaining "correspondence" by rules of projection or representation, we merely push the question back to what is "projection" or "representation." In other words, we can ask "Rules of what?" What makes, A, something otherwise totally unrelated to B, a "representation" of B? We might be tempted to say the "rules" of connection make A a representation of B. But there are all sorts of rules. The mere existence of a rule establishing a connection between one thing and another does not make one of them something "represented" and the other a "representation." And by "rules" we ordinarily mean strings of marks that have an interpretation, that "signify" something; this understanding of "rules" cannot help us here. To function as rules, strings of marks have to be interpreted by relating them to something other than themselves, their signification, to which they are not related by being what they are. But what is it is for marks to "signify," and how do marks become related to that which they signify? By other "rules"?

A could be connected with B otherwise than by rules. There might be some causal connection uniquely linking A to B such that, if we discover that causal connection, we can use A as a representation of B. For that, however, we would have to know the connection between A and B; the truth that this connection holds would have to be an object of our awareness. But then we could not explain our awareness of truth by the existence of the connection.

In attempting to explain "correspondence" by "representation" or "projection," we are explaining is more fundamental by the less, the cause by the effect. We have in mind the model of a rule that associates the word "lion" with with lions. But the functioning of that rule presupposes our awareness of lions, our awareness of "lion" and our awareness of the relation

established between the two. What is happening is that we start with consciousness of what it is to be a lion; we start with familiarity with that kind of consciousness. And that gives us a model for our idea of "projection" or "representation." They are projection and representation of what it is to be a lion. They are relations tied to what it is to be a lion the way our consciousness is. But then they can neither substitute for nor explain that consciousness.

If something anaogous to rules of projection help explain that consciousness, they must do so preconsciously. That is, they function in a process whose result is consciousness of what it is to be a lion, not consciousness of something other than what it is to be a lion. If the process that has such a result uses something like rules of representation, the result of using those rules is not something which, under different rules, might not be of what it is to be a lion but of something else. The result is consciousness of what it is to be a lion, and that consciousness would not, under different circumnstances, remain what it is and yet be consciousness of what it is to be something other than a lion.

Furthermore, if correspondence is a relation between thought and things, we also have the problem of how that relation could be known to hold. If to know the truth we need to know the relation of our thoughts to things beyond our thoughts yet our thoughts are the means by which we know, we would have to go beyond that which we know to know that our thoughts are true; for we would have to go beyond the means by which we know, our thoughts. Or, if the result of "projecting" B were consciousness of an object, A, other than B, we could never know that A is a representation of B. For to know that A is a representation of B, we have to know B; one of our objects must be B, not something other than B. (And if B itself is an object of our awareness, then whatever the "rules of projection" do, the result is a relation of awareness between ourselves and B, not between ourselves and some tertium quid that would be a

"representation" of B.)

Maritain's position is that correspondence is a side effect of another relation, a relation not of representation or resemblance, but of strict identity. In judging "This is a rose," we do not compare the perceived individual designated by "This" to a mental entity called a "thought" or "concept" of a rose. We compare the perceived individual to that which is meant by the word "rose," namely, what it is to be a rose, what something is when it is a rose. What it is to be a rose is the object of the concept of a rose, the term of the relation "thought about" or "conceived of," a term thought about or conceived of by means of a mental entity, a thought or a concept, we postulate precisely as the vehicle for our conscious relation to what it is to be a rose (not for our concsious relation to the vehicle).

> To see in the judgment . . . a comparison between the mental word and the object thought about, and an affirmation of the mental word's conformity with the object, would be to involve oneself in the Cartesian path of thought in spite of oneself. On the contrary, the thing is declared to be what the object (the predicate) attained in the mental word is. (97, n. 2)

To say that "This is a rose" is true, that this statement "conforms to reality," is to say that the thing made object by our use of "this" and one of the things made object by our use of "rose" is identically the same thing. There is a identity between what some sensed singular -- objectified by "this" -- is and that for which we use the word "rose," namely, a certain kind of thing. We are related to that for which we use the word "rose" by means of a concept; for we introduce "concept" into the vocabulary to refer to a psychological modification enabling us to understand

that for which words are used. But the knowledge telling us that "This is a rose" is true is not knowledge of a relation between a concept and a sensed thing; it is knowledge of a relation between an object of a concept and a sensed thing, that is, between what is objectified when we understand the kind of thing meant by "rose" and a sensed thing. And that knowledge is knowledge of an identity relation between these two terms, not something short of identity like mere "representation."

The "conformity" in truth is between an identification, in the the mind, and an identity, in things. A statement effects an identification between objects, not an identification of them as objects, since they are distinct as objects, but an identification of them as more than objects, as things. When the objects so identified are identical as things, the statement so identifying them corresponds to things.

There is the correspondence between statements and reality meant by "truth" when there is nothing short of identity between what is made an object in diverse ways in the statement and what exists extraobjectively as a thing. In judgment, we do not compare a thought with a thing, we identify an object to which we are related by means of a thought and a thing. Here "thought" is taken in the sense of a psychological modification that we acquire. We speak of having the thought, say, of a lion, because we are consciously related to the object, lion, and we postulate the thought as the psychological modification that we acquire by means of which we have that conscious relation.

An object of concept can be called an "intentional object" if we do not mean by this that the nature so objectified is something "intentional" as opposed to physical. The mode of being objectified by our concept of a lion is a physical mode of being. That is its nature <u>as a thing</u>. And when this physical nature becomes an object, it remains a physical mode of being but

acquires a new status; while remaining what it is, it acquires a mode of presence that is nonidentical with its physical nature. No contradiction occurs, since what is an object is always necessarily more than, and hence other than, just an object, always has a nature beyond the state that constitutes it "an object." In this case, what acquires an intentional status is something that, in itself, is physical.

The "correspondence" of the correspondence theory of truth is the effect of a strict identity between what is an object and what is more than an object.

The common sense notion of truth naturally gives rise to epistemological problems because, in common sense, a correct notion of truth is associated with extraneous elements that would render

Before turning to Maritain's next arguments, it will be helpful to consider two arguments closely related to his, but not explicitly made by him.

that statement is true, some "thing," something that is more than an object, is twice made an object, once by means of the noun "lion" and once by means of the adjective "carnivorous." And if

Awareness that something is a term of a relation of awareness is what occurs in reflective self-awareness. In reflection, we recognize the existence of a previous state of awareness, and since awareness is awareness of something, in reflection, we recognize that something is the term of a previous act of awareness. But what about the prior, prereflective awareness of something, the prior awareness without which there would not be a reflective awareness? What is it aware of?

In our epistemological reflection on the bipolarity of consciousness, it is proper to use the word "object" to distinguish that which is known from the knowing subject.

1. Reference.

2. Maritain recognizes the existence of modes of consciousness not describable by the subject-object polarity. But these modes exist secondarily and in dependence on the prior awareness of objects on the part of the subject, especially in sensation.

3. Both Maritain and Aquinas affirm the existence of an implicit self-awareness in any direct awareness of the other. And Causal Realism shows how the thing/object distinction can be made independent of the "act-object" analysis of consciousness.

4. Give a reference and perhaps use the footnote to make some remarks that would otherwise have to go in, and lengthen, the text.

5. Cite Introduction to Philosophy, epistemology deals with final causes. Maybe use this footnote to explain why philosophy is critical.

6. My emphasis.

7. Quote Gilson that he does not disagree with Maritain's views on common sense. But add that Maritain attributes his views to Aquinas, i.e., Maritain claims that the views he very precisely defines concerning "common sense" can be found scattered in Aquinas.

8. Notice the "resemblance" between the resemblance theory Maritain rejects and Wittgenstein's picture theory of truth. Of course, there is much more to the picture theory, but the problems the picture theory inevitably got into are basically the same as the problems that Maritain's solution to the problems of correspondence overcome.

9. Maritain defines the logical as the order of the "known as known," i.e., of what belongs to objects as objects.