

The Baltic International Yearbook of  
Cognition, Logic and Communication

August 2009  
pages 1-23

Volume 4: *200 Years of Analytical Philosophy*  
DOI: 10.4148/biyclc.v4i0.130

ROBIN D. ROLLINGER  
University of Salzburg, AT

## BRENTANO'S PSYCHOLOGY AND LOGIC AND THE BASIS OF TWARDOWSKI'S THEORY OF PRESENTATIONS

### 1. INTRODUCTION

It is widely known that Kasimir Twardowski was a student of Franz Brentano.<sup>1</sup> In view of the fact that Brentano generally had great impact through his lectures, especially during his Vienna period (1874-1895),<sup>2</sup> and consequently became one of the towering figures of Austrian philosophy,<sup>3</sup> it is a matter of no small interest to determine how he influenced Twardowski. There are, however, difficulties in examining the relationship of Twardowski to his teacher, as there are in the case of the relationships between Brentano and his students generally.<sup>4</sup> The main obstacle to this endeavor lies in the fact that Brentano published very little during his lifetime. Moreover, what has been published posthumously is far from adequate in terms of both the quantity of texts and the quality of editing. For this reason it is highly desirable to discuss Brentano in relation to his students by drawing upon his hitherto unpublished manuscripts. This is the strategy that I will pursue in the following analysis of Brentano and Twardowski on the topic of presentations (*Vorstellungen*).<sup>5</sup>

### 2. BRENTANO ON PRESENTATIONS

The main source for Brentano's psychology is his most significant publication, *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*.<sup>6</sup> Aside from this, one

of his most important lecture courses in psychology, namely the one on "psychognosy" from the winter semester 1890/91, has been published.<sup>7</sup> While the latter is by no means a critical edition, it is certainly an improvement over previous editions of materials from Brentano's manuscripts. In addition to these two works, however, other material on psychology is of considerable importance in relation to the topic of presentations. But aside from the material on psychology, there is one absolutely crucial manuscript on logic originally from the winter semester 1869/70 and repeatedly revised in the Vienna period. I'll first consider presentations as they are described in Brentano's psychology and then proceed to discuss Brentano's account of the latter in his logic.

#### 2.1. Presentations in Brentano's Psychology

As is familiar from *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, Brentano regards presentations as a class of psychical phenomena.<sup>8</sup> Generally speaking, a psychical phenomenon is involved in any instance of intentional reference or relation to an object or content.<sup>9</sup> Whenever something is imagined, desired, perceived, or is in some way an object of consciousness, the phenomenon that thereby takes place is a psychical one. Physical phenomena such as colors and tones, by contrast, do not exhibit such relations to objects. Since presentations are in all cases presentations of objects, they are accordingly psychical phenomena for Brentano. While Brentano also identifies two other classes of psychical phenomena, namely judgments (*Urteile*) and love and hate (*Liebe und Haß*), he assigns to presentations a special status insofar as he regards them as the basis (*Grundlage*) for all other psychical phenomena.<sup>10</sup> Hence, judgment about a certain object is possible only because the judgment is based on a presentation of the object in question. The same goes for love and hate. It is possible to love or hate only that which one is presented with. This founding character of presentations is so important for Brentano that he even proposes it as providing an alternative criterion for distinguishing psychical phenomena from physical ones: psychical phenomena are either presentations or phenomena which are based on presentations.

The rest of what Brentano has to say in the published text of *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* is primarily restricted to the thesis that judgments may not be regarded merely as combinations of presen-

tations.<sup>11</sup> While it is tempting to consider a judgment such as “A tree is green” as a combination of the presentation of a tree and the presentation of green, it is possible to present a green tree without engaging in any judgment at all about it. Accordingly, Brentano insists that in judgment there is something in addition to mere presentations. This additional element is to be found in two attitudes : accepting (*Anerkennen*) and rejecting (*Verwerfen*), a contrast which he most emphatically *only* finds among judgments.<sup>12</sup> The act of presenting for him does not exhibit any such contrast, nor do acts such as loving and hating.<sup>13</sup>

Further considerations on the topic are to be found in a volume that misleadingly announces itself as if it were a continuation of *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*.<sup>14</sup> However it consists of materials from much later dates which were not intended by Brentano to be continuations of the earlier work. As it turns out, in Brentano’s *Nachlass* there actually is a manuscript that was intended for publication as a partial continuation of *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*.<sup>15</sup> The part that was published consisted of two “books”<sup>16</sup> and the manuscript in question also contains drafts for additional chapters that were intended as additions to the second book as well as for a third one.<sup>17</sup> The third book is of interest here because it is devoted to the topic of presentations.

In Brentano’s treatment of presentations one finds two features that become more and more prominent in Brentano’s lectures during his Vienna period. The first of these features is his notion of descriptive as opposed to genetic psychology. The second is the distinction between the content and object of thought. Let us say a word about each of these features.

Though the published part of *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* contains no systematic distinction between descriptive as opposed to genetic psychology, Brentano says the following at the outset of the unpublished part of this work concerning presentations:

The task that we have to fulfill regarding presentations is twofold. We must describe them and state the laws to which they are subject in their origination and their occurrence.<sup>18</sup>

This is an explicit statement of the distinction between descriptive and genetic psychology, though these terms are not yet used here. In Brentano’s lecture course given in 1885/86, entitled *Selected Questions from Psychology and Aesthetics*, the first public discussion of the distinction

in question appears.<sup>19</sup> Here Brentano puts forward a descriptive theory of the imagination that had already been sketched out in his draft for the continuation of *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*. The distinction between descriptive and genetic psychology became even more prominent in three lecture courses given in succession, *Descriptive Psychology* (1887/88),<sup>20</sup> *Descriptive Psychology or Phenomenology* (1888/89),<sup>21</sup> and *Psychognosy* (1890/91).<sup>22</sup> Though it is impossible to discuss Brentano’s descriptive psychology (phenomenology or psychognosy) in detail here, a few words on this topic will prove helpful.

Brentano’s mature conception of descriptive psychology consists in the analysis of consciousness into its elements (i.e. the psychical phenomena belonging to the three distinct classes) and the specification of their modes of combination.<sup>23</sup> Genetic psychology, by contrast, is concerned with the causal origin of psychical phenomena and must rely heavily on physiology. While Brentano thought that he could deal with the issues of genetic psychology in his draft of the continuation of *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, as plainly indicated in the passage quoted above, he became more and more convinced that physiology had not reached an adequate level of development for genetic psychology. He was nonetheless convinced that, in spite of the difficulties involved in descriptive psychology, he had made contributions not only to this discipline as such, but also to its application to the branches of practical philosophy (logic, ethics, and aesthetics) as well as to metaphysics. At a time when psychology was establishing itself academically as a discipline independent from philosophy, Brentano’s efforts in his Vienna period were in fact a thoroughgoing integration of psychology and philosophy.<sup>24</sup> While such efforts were hardly appreciated in some circles, they certainly came to have great impact on his students from this period, such as Twardowski, Meinong, and Husserl, but also on earlier students, such as Stumpf and Marty.

As is well known, Brentano was, from his earliest encounter with philosophy and onward to his death, very heavily influenced by Aristotle.<sup>25</sup> Though he parts from Aristotelian doctrines in various ways (especially in the theory of judgment), Aristotle and Aristotelians are always among his most respected discussion partners in formulating his views. For this reason he and his school were sometimes regarded as “scholastic”, a term typically used in a derogatory sense at the time.

Aristotle's influence on Brentano's descriptive psychology, as we will see, is of some relevance to Twardowski.

Brentano did not underestimate the difficulties involved in the endeavor to analyze consciousness into its elements and to specify their modes of combination. Such difficulties come poignantly to light when the differences between philosophers and psychologists regarding consciousness are considered.<sup>26</sup> Brentano critically examines views on consciousness that were to be found among his predecessors and contemporaries. In responding to these views Brentano is particularly critical of the division of consciousness into three classes: thinking, feeling, and willing. This division, which was the dominant one in the German-speaking world for most of the nineteenth century, was to be replaced by Brentano with the one he put forward in *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* and continued to defend for the remainder of his philosophical career. On Brentano's view, what was called "thinking" is in fact divided into two classes: presentations and judgments. What was called feeling and what was called willing are united into one class: acts of love and hate. This is an aspect of Brentano's theory that will be retained by Twardowski. Though theories of judgments were common among various schools during the late nineteenth century, a theory of presentations was quite unusual and it may be said to have been one of the most original aspects of Brentano's descriptive psychology.<sup>27</sup>

Now let us turn to the distinction Brentano makes between content and object. While this distinction is not explicitly made in the published part of *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* and one may easily get the impression that the distinction in question was first made by Twardowski and elaborated on by other students of Brentano, the manuscripts of Brentano give us an entirely different picture. This is a substantial point and I quote again from the unpublished part of *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*:

We speak of indistinctness of a presentation in two senses, in a proper one and in an improper one. When we say, "Objects that we saw in the distance appeared indistinctly to us", what we mean is: "The visual presentations that they caused in us did not allow for a judgment about how the objects would appear up close, and did not allow us for this very reason to come to an assured conjecture regarding

other peculiarities". Which *content* they had may be completely clear to us. Thus they are indistinct in an improper sense. In the proper sense, by contrast, we call those presentations indistinct in which we are unable with assurance to give an account of the *content* itself.<sup>28</sup>

Examples of the distinction that Brentano is making here are not difficult to cite. We may see an object at a distance and not be able to make out whether it is a human being or a wax figure. In the content, however, it is very distinct which colors are presented and how they are juxtaposed to each other. While it is accordingly evident that Brentano distinguishes between objects and contents of presentations in his psychology, the way he makes this distinction in his logic is even more noteworthy and of greater relevance to the topic at hand.

## 2.2. Presentations in Brentano's Logic

The lecture course that is of special interest to us here is one that Brentano first gave in Würzburg and again in Vienna with certain revisions and simply entitled *Logic (Logik)*.<sup>29</sup> While it has not been determined exactly in which semesters these lectures were held and it is thus difficult to know if Twardowski actually attended them or not, it is quite certain that they had considerable impact within Brentano's circle of students, including even students from an earlier period, such as Stumpf and Marty.<sup>30</sup> As a student of Brentano during the late 1880s, Twardowski likewise would have been influenced by the lectures under consideration here, whether he attended the lectures or not. This will become clearer as our discussion advances.

What is of special interest in this lecture course is that Brentano not only distinguishes between contents and external objects, but also distinguishes between the contents that are characteristic of the various classes of mental phenomena. He says that a presentation has a content that is as such different from the content of a judgment and also from a content of love and hate. Likewise, a judgment has a content that differs from the content of a phenomenon that belongs to one of the other two classes. The content of a presentation is called "the presented as such" (*das Vorgestellte als solches*).<sup>31</sup> The content of a judgment is called "the judged as such" (*das Geurteilte als solches*).<sup>32</sup>

Brentano approaches the distinction among contents in the course of his reflection on the expression of mental phenomena in language. Brentano regards names as appropriate for expressing presentations, statements (*Aussagen*) as appropriate for expressing judgments. But what is the meaning (*Bedeutung*) of a name? And what is the meaning of a statement? Brentano's answer to the first question is that the content of the expressed presentation, the presented as such, as distinct from the named object, is the meaning of the name.<sup>33</sup> In order to support his point, Brentano makes use of an argument we will find later in Twardowski and in Husserl, namely that there are cases where two names have the same object and yet differ in meaning.<sup>34</sup> As Brentano's own example indicates, the names "the son of Phaenarete" and "the wisest among the Athenians" both name the same individual, that is Socrates, but their meanings are different.<sup>35</sup>

If we now consider Brentano's thesis of intentional reference in application to presentations, it should be taken to mean that every act of presenting has a content, not that every presentation has an external object. In this connection Brentano in fact speaks of objectless presentations (*gegenstandslose Vorstellungen*), though without any reference to Bernard Bolzano, who had used the term long before him:<sup>36</sup>

There is no presentation for which something would not exist intentionally in the mind, but there are *objectless presentations*. Also something that is not, indeed something that cannot be, can be presented.<sup>37</sup>

The "something existing intentionally in the mind" in this passage is the content of a presentation or what Brentano calls the *intentional* or *immanent* object. In Brentano's lecture notes, we find the notion of a content of a presentation cropping up again and again. Perhaps one of the most interesting applications of this notion arises when Brentano comes to distinguish between universal (*universell*) and individual (*individuell*) concepts.<sup>38</sup> While the latter are characterized as concepts to which in each case there corresponds only one object, the former are characterized as concepts to which there correspond more than one object in each case. In this connection he explicitly tells us that a concept (*Begriff*) is the same as the content of a presentation. As regards the old debate between realists and nominalists, he says that the realists were wrong to regard universals as objects outside the mind. However, he

says that they were right to regard the status of universality as parallel to that of individuality. Presumably he thinks that the nominalists were wrong in this regard. The distinction between universality and individuality for Brentano is restricted to the meanings of names, that is, to concepts, in other words to the contents of presentations. As a consequence, it would be wrong to say along with Locke that everything that exists is a particular<sup>39</sup> as it would be wrong to embrace full-blown Platonism.

Now let us turn to Brentano's conception of the meaning of a statement. Brentano says that the meaning in this case is to be identified with the content of the expressed judgment, the judged as such, as distinct from the object designated by the statement.<sup>40</sup> While this thesis is of course highly suggestive, we must be cautious about reading later developments in the school of Brentano into it. Brentano does not speak here of propositions, states of affairs, or objectives,<sup>41</sup> but simply of the content of a judgment or the judged as such. In the lecture course on logic under consideration here Brentano says little more about what he has in mind here. If, however, we take into account what Brentano says in the lecture on truth he gave at the Philosophical Society of Vienna in 1889, the contents of judgments turn out to include all sorts of *irrealia*, such as a lack, a possibility, or even impossibilities.<sup>42</sup> What makes a judgment about these *irrealia* true cannot be things in the strict sense (such as a man or a horse). Moreover, they cannot be the acts of consciousness, which cohere together in what Brentano calls "physical phenomena" such as colors, sounds, and the like. Nor can the *irrealia* be objects such as Platonic Ideas existing outside of the mind, which can have no place in any respectable ontology according to Brentano. The contents of judgment for Brentano at this stage of his philosophical development are accordingly the only non-things which can take on the role of truth-makers whenever there are no real things to do so. However, instead of continuing to develop and elaborate on the notion under consideration here, he later shifted to a position that no longer allowed for contents of judgments.<sup>43</sup> But as this later position which he worked out after 1905 apparently had no influence on Twardowski, it will not be considered further here.

What precedes should have established that Brentano, on the one hand, distinguished between the contents of presentations and those of

judgments, that is, between the presented as such and the judged as such and, on the other hand, assigned to the latter the role of meanings of names and of statements respectively. Let us now turn to examine the impact these distinctions had on Twardowski.

### 3. TWARDOWSKI ON PRESENTATIONS

Twardowski's most important contribution to philosophy is a short work that he wrote and published in 1894, while he was still in Vienna, entitled *On the Content and Object of Presentations*.<sup>44</sup> This work had considerable impact. In the cases of both Meinong and Husserl the critical reception of this work, especially with regard to the content-object distinction, marked an important turning point in their philosophical developments.<sup>45</sup> *On the Content and Object of Presentations* was Twardowski's "habilitation thesis" and was written after his doctoral dissertation in order to grant him the status of a lecturer. Officially, Brentano could have directed neither Twardowski's dissertation<sup>46</sup> nor his habilitation thesis because at that time Brentano himself was only a lecturer and not a professor. (After he got married, Brentano had to give up his professorship in Vienna: he had earlier been ordained and his marriage was impermissible by Catholic standards which prevailed in Austria at that time.) The professor who officially directed Twardowski's dissertation was Robert Zimmermann (to be discussed further below), who as a young man had been a member of Bernard Bolzano's circle of students. While the habilitation thesis was more or less independently written, it nonetheless had to be approved. As a mere lecturer Brentano was unable to be involved in any official capacity in Twardowski's early philosophical work. Be that as it may, Brentano's substantial influence is easily traceable in the habilitation thesis.

#### 3.1. Brentanian Aspects of Twardowski's Theory of Presentations

The subtitle of Twardowski's habilitation thesis is "A Psychological Investigation".<sup>47</sup> It is accordingly not meant to be a work in logic, ontology, semantics, philosophy of language, or epistemology, but rather one in the philosophy of mind. From the Brentanian standpoint this does not make the work unphilosophical. Quite the contrary. According to Brentano, a "psychological" work understood in the latter sense, es-

pecially one that is concerned with the fundamental class of psychical phenomenal, has potential applications in all areas of philosophy.<sup>48</sup>

Moreover, inasmuch as the work in question is plainly one in the lineage of Brentanian *descriptive* psychology, it presupposes that mental phenomena divide into three classes: presentations, judgments, and acts of love and hate. In Twardowski, these classes are understood as three different modes of intentional reference. There is, moreover, no indication of an allegiance to any kind of style of investigation aside from an empirical one and in particular, the high-minded rationalism that could be found among the Neo-Kantians at the time is completely alien to Twardowski. Twardowski's habilitation thesis is one of the most extreme cases of "scholasticism" to have come out of Brentano's school. That is to say, it is more a product of conceptual analysis than of the observation of "facts", either from everyday life or from laboratory experiments. Like Brentano, and though this was by no means the usual practice among those developing the psychological theories of the time, Twardowski does not hesitate to cite scholastic philosophers.<sup>49</sup> While these general points are no doubt true, there are, however, two very specific aspects of Twardowski's work which exhibit the influence of the lecture course on logic that Brentano held in Würzburg and again in Vienna.

The first of these aspects lies in Twardowski's very explicit distinction between the contents of presentations and the contents of judgments.<sup>50</sup> According to Twardowski, there is a perfect analogy between presentations and judgments. As acts of consciousness, judgments have contents and objects as well. While others spoke of contents of judgments, it was unique to Brentano and his followers, including Twardowski, to do so by pointing out this analogy. One can see the difference here by looking at the way in which Stumpf spoke of the content of a judgment in his lecture course on logic in 1887. Here Stumpf uses this term (*Urteilsinhalt*) as what is meant by the combined names of a predicative statement ("Sp" in the case of "S is P") and therefore as something hardly different from the content of the underlying presentation.<sup>51</sup> To be sure, Stumpf was later (within a year's time no less) to speak of the content of a judgment in a very different way that exhibited the influence of the previously discussed lecture course that Brentano had held in Vienna.<sup>52</sup> The point here, however, is that it was Brentano



who began speaking of contents of judgments as distinct from and yet analogous to contents of presentations. When Twardowski elaborated on the contents of presentations and insisted on this analogy, he was thus, as a member of Brentano's circle, clearly under the influence of the master.

One additional remark may be made here regarding Brentano's influence on Twardowski's content-object distinction. It is widely known that Twardowski regards contents as analogous to pictures.<sup>53</sup> Here I will not discuss how strictly this analogy is to be taken. I wish only to observe that we find something similar in Brentano's content-object distinction as it is made in the unpublished part of *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*. We have seen that he says therein that in an improper sense we speak of a presentation being indistinct when we cannot decide from the content how the object would look close-up. In that case we are dealing with contents in a sense that is somewhat analogous to a picture. It is therefore entirely possible that the source of Twardowski's picture-analogy is to be found in Brentano's psychology as well.

The second way in which Twardowski exhibits the influence of Brentano's aforementioned lectures on logic lies in his views on presentations in relation to names.<sup>54</sup> Though it was by no means unusual to speak of contents of consciousness in the late nineteenth century and even to distinguish them from objects, the characterization of contents as meanings, more specifically the characterization of contents of presentations as meanings of names as distinct from the named objects, is a notion that Brentano introduced. By advocating this view, Twardowski is once again following in the footsteps of the master. To be sure, he refers to Anton Marty's articles "On Subjectless Sentences", where the view in question is stated.<sup>55</sup> In these articles, however, Marty is likewise following Brentano regarding meanings as contents.

The influence of Brentano on Twardowski that is being pointed out here is one that is often understated or completely overlooked by commentators. All too often we get the impression that Brentano used the terms "content" and "object" interchangeably and Twardowski in fact went beyond Brentano by making a sharp distinction between content and object.<sup>56</sup> This impression prevails, however, because there tends to be too much reliance on the published text of *Psychology from an Em-*

*pirical Standpoint* as the source for Brentano's position. Brentano's students, however, were much more inclined to rely on his lectures, and often the most recent ones to which they could gain access, whether they actually attended them, copied the notes from others (as Husserl often did<sup>57</sup>), or were informed about them in some other secondhand manner. This fact will not become as evident as it should be, however, until Brentano's lectures are properly edited and published. As things now stand, researchers of his work and of the work of his students have little choice but to draw primarily from *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* and a few other works that he published. Whoever relies on the editions of material that he left unpublished, as they have been produced thus far, is engaging in research at his own risk.

### 3.2. The Question of Influence from Others

Twardowski's habilitation thesis, I claim, including its content-object distinction, is by and large the result of Brentano's influence. But to what extent was Twardowski also influenced by that other towering figure of Austrian philosophy, namely Bolzano, whom Twardowski repeatedly cites and who was later perceived by Brentano as the very one whose work misguided not only Twardowski, but also Husserl as well as other students?<sup>58</sup> Overall, Twardowski tends to assimilate Bolzano to Brentano and, by contrast to Husserl, does not seem to see conflicts between their views.<sup>59</sup> Twardowski sees Bolzano's notion of a presentation in itself as equivalent to that of the content of a presentation<sup>60</sup> and does not make a big deal about presentations' being in themselves, that is to say, independently from the presenting consciousness.<sup>61</sup> The very term "content" suggests quite the opposite, namely that the item under consideration is as such contained in the presenting consciousness.<sup>62</sup> Though this version of the content-object distinction is not the one Bolzano had in mind, Twardowski nevertheless played an important role in the transmission of Bolzanian thought among other students of Brentano as well as among the Polish logicians.<sup>63</sup>

According to one commentator, the content-object distinction that Twardowski develops in his theory of presentations had its origins in the works of Zimmermann and Benno Kerry.<sup>64</sup> While Twardowski cites both of these authors, this hardly indicates that the distinction in question was initially made by them. He tells us, to be sure, that Zimmer-

mann stresses the need to distinguish between content and object, but the passages to which he refers in this regard are concerned only with the contents and objects of concepts (*Begriffe*).<sup>65</sup> Objects in this sense would simply be the extension of a concept. The concept of man, for instance, has all individual human beings as its objects, whereas the content (or, as one could say, intension) of this concept would consist of whatever is mentioned in the definition of “man”. This distinction, however, had been standard fare of logic textbooks for a very long time.<sup>66</sup> It is no doubt true that Twardowski wants his content-object distinction to extend to the intension-extension distinction. Accordingly, he cites Zimmermann and others who also make the latter distinction as if they agreed with him. At the same time, however, he goes beyond this distinction in making the analogy between the content of a presentation (or the intension of a concept) and the content of a judgment. This is something that he uniquely gets from Brentano, not from Zimmermann or apparently from anyone else.

As regards Kerry, it lies far beyond the scope of this paper to enter into a lengthy discussion of his series of articles “On Intuitions and their Psychical Processing”<sup>67</sup>. However, a few points of interest here may be briefly touched upon. First of all, Kerry does extensively refer to Bolzano and shows considerable appreciation of the notions of a presentation in itself and a proposition in itself.<sup>68</sup> Be this as it may, these notions, as already pointed out, must not be equated with Twardowski’s notions of contents of presentations and of judgments respectively. Secondly, Twardowski adopts one of Kerry’s arguments for the content-object distinction, namely that what can be ascribed to an object need not be ascribable to the concept of that object (or, in Twardowski’s terms, to the content of the relevant presentation).<sup>69</sup> Thirdly, Twardowski explicitly rejects one of the arguments Kerry makes in favor of the content-object distinction when considering general presentations.<sup>70</sup> This argument was not in fact made by Brentano. Fourthly and most importantly, whatever one may find in Kerry’s texts, one must be reminded that he was attending Brentano’s lectures and was also involved in discussions with Brentano’s students.<sup>71</sup> His series of articles “On Intuitions and their Psychical Processing” seems by and large to be the fruit of his Brentanian education (which was abruptly ended in 1889 due to his untimely death). Therefore, if the content-object distinction

under consideration was made by Kerry, this in no way eliminates Brentano’s influence from the picture.

Finally, mention should be made of Twardowski’s reference to the logic textbook that Alois Höfler wrote in collaboration with Meinong. There the distinction between contents and objects of presentations is explicitly made<sup>72</sup> but there is no mention of the content of a presentation being analogous to the content of a judgment. In addition, we should not forget that both Höfler and Meinong were themselves students of Brentano, in spite of whatever antipathy they might have shown in reaction to commentators who viewed them as mere disciples.

### 3.3. Twardowski’ Originality

I do not want to give the impression that Twardowski merely repeats Brentanian doctrines in his habilitation thesis and was accordingly a mere disciple. It was indeed a mistake on Husserl’s part, in his manuscript of 1894 on intentional objects, to think that Twardowski was merely saying that there are presentations which are indeed without external objects, but none without intentional objects, that is to say, no presentations without immanent objects.<sup>73</sup> This was in fact the position of Brentano, who uses the term “objectless presentations”, as already pointed out, in precisely the way just indicated. Twardowski, by contrast, criticizes the thesis that there are objectless presentations.<sup>74</sup> To be sure, he explicitly criticizes Bolzano in this regard, but his criticism applies to Brentano as well. While the object of a presentation need not be real or exist in the strict and proper sense, this fact, from Twardowski’s point of view, does not in any way put into question the objectivity of the object, so to speak. Accordingly, unicorns and round squares are indeed objects. On this view it is even permissible to speak of general objects,<sup>75</sup> a notion that was anathema to Brentano. In this regard Twardowski breaks away from Brentano and shows a greater proximity to the theory of objects which Meinong was later to work out in detail. It was in fact Twardowski’s habilitation thesis which prompted Meinong in his article “On Objects of Higher Order”<sup>76</sup> to make a sharper distinction between contents and objects than he had made previously and thus to bring objects as such into view as the subject matter of a special discipline distinct from psychology.<sup>77</sup> The relation between Twardowski

and Meinong is yet another one that merits close examination. Suffice it to say that Twardowski sets out from the standpoint of a Brentanian descriptive psychology and arrives at a point of view which was certainly original in 1894 when he published his habilitation thesis. This originality on Twardowski's part, however, can only be seen against the background of those aspects of Brentano's philosophical work, especially to be found in his manuscripts, which have been discussed above.

### Notes

- <sup>1</sup> See Smith (1995), pp. 160-195, Poli (1996).
- <sup>2</sup> For a list of lecture courses that Brentano gave in Vienna, see Werle (1989), pp. 157-162.
- <sup>3</sup> Brentano Y 4/13: "In Austria nothing had been accomplished in the domain of philosophy in earlier times. Things have become different in recent times. [In Österreich wurde in früherer Zeit auf dem Gebiete der Philosophie nichts geleistet. In neuerer Zeit ist das anders geworden]".
- <sup>4</sup> For a discussion of the relationships of Edmund Husserl and of Alexius Meinong to Brentano, see Rollinger (1999), Rollinger (2004), and Rollinger (2005). An updated version of the latter study is to appear in Rollinger (2008) under the title "Brentano and Meinong". A study of Brentano's relationship to Anton Marty's early philosophy of language is found in Rollinger (2009).
- <sup>5</sup> While the German term here is translated by some as "idea" and by others as "representation", I still think that "presentation" is the best translation in the context of the present discussion. While Brentano and Twardowski conceive of *Vorstellungen* as acts of consciousness, it is hardly acceptable to speak of an idea as act, indicated by the fact that only a highly artificial verb ("to ideate") can be constructed from this term. The verb "to present" by contrast is very natural. And though it may in some sense be said that some sort of representation takes place in a *Vorstellung*, neither Brentano nor Twardowski conceive of the act of *Vorstellen* as the medium of representation. It is at best this act's *content* which could be said to be such a medium, i.e. something analogous to a sign or a picture. For an argument in favour of using the term "representation", see Hickerson (this issue).
- <sup>6</sup> See Brentano (1874), part of which appeared in a second edition in Brentano (1911) and again posthumously in its entirety in Brentano, (ed.) Kraus (1924) and Brentano, (ed.) Kraus (1925). The texts of both Brentano (1874) and Brentano (1911) are now available in Brentano, (eds.) Binder and Chrudzimski (2008).
- <sup>7</sup> Brentano, (eds.) Baumgartner and Chisholm (1982).
- <sup>8</sup> Brentano (1874, 256-265).
- <sup>9</sup> Brentano (1874, 115 ff.); see also Brentano (1889, 14).
- <sup>10</sup> Brentano (1874, 104-111).
- <sup>11</sup> Brentano (1874, 276 ff.) Every psychical phenomenon for Brentano is a presentation of itself. See Brentano (1874, 181): "The question thus arises whether psychical phenomena, when they are the object of a consciousness, are something of which we are conscious in one manner or in several. Up to now it has been proven only that they are

presented . . ." The entire second chapter of the Brentano's second book (1874, 101-180) is to be taken as a proof for this thesis.

<sup>12</sup> Brentano (1889, 15).

<sup>13</sup> Brentano (1874, 115 f.)

<sup>14</sup> Brentano, (ed.) Kraus (1928).

<sup>15</sup> This manuscript is to be found under the quote Ps 53 along with a later one on psychognosy (a term Brentano apparently did not use until 1889).

<sup>16</sup> A "book" in this context is not a "volume", but rather a block of chapters. Brentano (1874, v) planned a book on psychology as a science, one on psychical phenomena in general, one on presentations, one on judgments, one on emotion and will (i.e. love and hate), and finally one concerned with the mind-body problem and immortality. Only the first book and part of the second one were published.

<sup>17</sup> The unpublished material for the second book, which is concerned with psychical phenomena in general, consists of chapters on the narrowness of consciousness and exhaustion (*die Enge des Bewusstseins und Erschöpfung*), Bain's law of relativity and Mill's law of the relation to contradictory oppositions (*Bain's Gesetz der Relativität und Mills Gesetz der Beziehung auf kontradiktorische Gegensätze*), habit (*Gewohnheit*), and the law of self-advancement (*das Gesetz der Selbstförderung*). The unpublished material for the third book, which is specifically concerned with presentations, consists of chapters on the indistinctness of presentations (*Undeutlichkeit der Vorstellungen*), the unity and multiplicity of presentations (*Einheit und Vielheit der Vorstellungen*), presentations of perception and imagination (*Vorstellungen der Wahrnehmung und Phantasie*), intensity of phantasy presentations and their content (*Intensität der Phantasievorstellungen und ihre Fülle*), and a look at the traditional doctrine of the association of ideas (*Blick auf die überlieferte Lehre der Ideenassoziation*).

<sup>18</sup> Brentano, Ps 53/53002: "Zweifach ist die Aufgabe, die wir hinsichtlich der Vorstellungen zu lösen haben. Wir müssen sie beschreiben und die Gesetze feststellen, welchen sie in ihrer Entstehung und ihrem Verlaufe unterworfen sind."

<sup>19</sup> Brentano, Ps 58. This material is edited in Brentano, (ed.) Mayer-Hillebrand (1959) and is very much in need of a re-edition.

<sup>20</sup> Brentano, Ps 76.

<sup>21</sup> Brentano, Ps 77.

<sup>22</sup> Brentano, (eds.) Baumgartner and Chisholm (1982), edited from EL (74), which still contains unpublished passages.

<sup>23</sup> Brentano, (eds.) Baumgartner and Chisholm (1982, 1 ff).

<sup>24</sup> It was of course Wilhelm Wundt's establishment of a research institute for psychology in Leipzig which set the pace for the rest of the academic world. Twardowski in fact spent some time as a student in Wundt's institute between receiving his doctorate and doing his habilitation in Vienna. Brentano, by far the greater influence on Twardowski, was very critical of Wundt's experimental psychology, as can be seen from his remarks in *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* concerning Wundt (1874). See Brentano (1874, 85ff, 106ff, 223n). Wundt was no less critical of Brentano and attributed what he regarded as the weaknesses in Husserl's thought to the legacy of Brentano. See Wundt (1910, 511-634). See also Wundt (1904, 222n). For a discussion of the contrast between Brentano and Wundt, see Titchener (1929, 1-22) and Rancurello (1968, 78-97). It should be stressed that Brentano was not in principle opposed to experimental or physiological psychology. He only thought that it could not achieve anything of significance without



an adequate descriptive foundation. His most prominent students, even Meinong who himself established a research institute for psychology in Graz, followed their mentor in this regard.

<sup>25</sup> See George & Koehn (2004).

<sup>26</sup> Brentano, (eds.) Baumgartner and Chisholm, p. 28.

<sup>27</sup> Earlier Schopenhauer had published *World as Will and Presentation* (*Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*), but his use of the term has very little in common with the psychological or logical literature of the later nineteenth century.

<sup>28</sup> Brentano, Ps 53/53003. The emphasis on *Gegenstand* and *Inhalt* here, as well as “content” and “object” in the translation, are my own: “Wir sprechen von der Undeutlichkeit einer Vorstellung in einem doppelten, einem eigentlichen und uneigentlichen Sinne. Wenn wir sagen: Gegenstände, die wir in der Ferne sahen, erschienen uns undeutlich, so meinen wir damit: Die Gesichtsvorstellungen, die sie in uns erweckten, gestatteten kein Urteil darüber, wie die Gegenstände in der Nähe aussehen würden, und ließen uns eben darum hinsichtlich anderer Eigentümlichkeiten zu keiner sicheren Vermutung kommen. Welchen *Inhalt* die Vorstellungen hatten, mag uns dabei vollkommen klar sein. So sind sie undeutlich nur in uneigentlichem Sinne. Im eigentlichen Sinne undeutlich nennen wir dagegen solche Vorstellungen, bei welchen wir uns den *Inhalt* selbst nicht mit Sicherheit Rechenschaft zu geben fähig sind.”

<sup>29</sup> Brentano EL 80. Here we may note that the lectures under consideration were poorly edited. In the Mayer-Hillebrand (1956) edition, parts of the lectures are published, but indifferently mixed up with other texts of Brentano's and also with notes from his students.

<sup>30</sup> A case can also be made that they influenced Husserl, namely in his distinction between the noema on the one hand and the object *simpliciter* on the other (see *Husserliana* III/1). This aspect of Husserl's philosophical development becomes all the more prominent in *Husserliana* XXXX.

<sup>31</sup> Brentano, EL 80/13014.

<sup>32</sup> Brentano, EL 80/13020. The lectures under consideration are first and foremost concerned with judgments and secondarily with presentations. Acts of love and hate or their contents are hardly touched upon.

<sup>33</sup> Brentano, EL/13012-13019.

<sup>34</sup> See Twardowski (1894, 31ff) and Husserl (1901, 47).

<sup>35</sup> Brentano, EL/13017.

<sup>36</sup> Bolzano (1837, vol. I, § 67). Bolzano uses the term *gegenstandlos*, though few have followed him in this regard. In another lecture course, entitled *Elementary Logic and the Reforms Necessary in It* (EL 72), Brentano did explicitly refer to Bolzano, specifically to Bolzano's *Paradoxes of the Infinite*. He did not refer to Bolzano's four-volume *Theory of Science*, which came to have such a great impact among Brentano's students.

<sup>37</sup> Brentano, EL 80/13016. This passage is from an earlier version of the lecture in question. The emphasis on *gegenstandslose Vorstellungen* and the translation thereof is my own; “Es gibt keine Vorstellung, bei welcher nicht etwas intentional im Geiste existierte, aber es gibt *gegenstandslose Vorstellungen*. Auch etwas was nicht ist, ja etwas was gar nicht sein kann, kann vorgestellt werden.”

<sup>38</sup> Brentano, EL 80/13024-13025.

<sup>39</sup> *An Essay concerning Human Understanding*, III.iii.1

<sup>40</sup> Brentano, EL 80/13020-13022.

<sup>41</sup> Propositions and states of affairs became important concepts for Husserl, whereas “objective” is Meinong's neologism for designating something comparable. For a more extensive discussion of this topic see the relevant parts of Rollinger (1999). In Dummett (1991, 250), the question is left open whether Brentano, Husserl, or Meinong fall prey to criticisms that the author makes of the Fregean concept of a thought (*Gedanke*). What is at stake in this concept is its independence from the mind. In this regard it may be said without hesitation that Brentano does not conceive of contents of judgments in this manner and is accordingly not susceptible to criticisms which presuppose that they are conceived of in this manner.

<sup>42</sup> See Brentano, (ed.) Kraus (1930, 3-29).

<sup>43</sup> Brentano (1911, 149) explains that “something other than things, all of which fall under the concept of the real, does not provide psychical relations with an object”. This view, “reism”, is elaborated in Brentano (ed.) Kastil (1933) and Brentano, (ed.) Mayer-Hillebrand (1952). Though it was not accepted by Brentano's most prominent students, it became the official doctrine for the next generation of disciples, such as Alfred Kastil, Oskar Kraus, and Franziska Mayer-Hillebrand, who accordingly made this standpoint the basis for editing material from Brentano's *Nachlass*. See Kastil (1951). For this reason, in the attempt to examine Brentano's philosophical orientation in the Vienna period it is necessary to make use of unpublished material. It is of interest to note here that, while Twardowski did not embrace Brentano's reism, Twardowski's student Tadeusz Kotarbiński independently worked out a position that was comparable to the later Brentano's. See Smith (1995, 193-246).

<sup>44</sup> Twardowski (1894).

<sup>45</sup> The relation between Husserl and Twardowski is explored in Schuhmann (1993), Cavallin (1997), and Rollinger (1999, 139-153).

<sup>46</sup> Twardowski (1892).

<sup>47</sup> Twardowski (1894, 1). The dissertation, by contrast, is subtitled “An Epistemological Investigation of Descartes” (Twardowski 1894, 1). The concern with Descartes is by no means alien to Brentano, who in fact regarded Descartes, along with Locke and Leibniz, as one of the philosophers of prime interest in the modern period, followed by practically oriented philosophers (e.g. Berkeley), sceptics (e.g. Hume), and finally mystics (i.e. the German Idealists). See Brentano (1895, 22ff). Further investigations concerning Brentano's philosophical work in relation to that of Descartes are certainly to be encouraged, though hardly possible within the scope of the present paper.

<sup>48</sup> As indicated in Cavallin (1997), p. 35, Twardowski “explicitly declares himself to be an adherent of psychologism” in a manuscript from 1897. This was of course a few years before Husserl (1900) made “psychologism” a derogatory term. Twardowski's psychologism, just like Brentano's, lies in the priority of empirically oriented psychological investigations in philosophy and the exclusion of all speculations of the kind that had been rife in Germany during the early nineteenth century (“metaphysicism”). In this sense psychologism was only a further elaboration of Brentano's thesis, defended in his habilitation in Würzburg, that the method of philosophy is no different from that of natural science. See Brentano, (ed.) Kraus (1929), p. 147. As a teacher in Lvón Twardowski became father of Polish logic, which however was anything but psychologistic in Husserl's sense.

<sup>49</sup> See the references to Suarez and Aquinas in Twardowski (1894, 38) and the reference to Abelard in Twardowski (1894, 56).

<sup>50</sup> Twardowski (1894, 1-9).

- <sup>51</sup> Stumpf, Q 14/41.  
<sup>52</sup> See Rollinger (1999, 313).  
<sup>53</sup> Twardowski (1894, 12-20).  
<sup>54</sup> Twardowski (1894, 10ff).  
<sup>55</sup> See Marty (1884), Marty (1894), and Marty (1895). In Twardowski (1894, 11), there are explicit references made to Marty (1884, 293; 300).  
<sup>56</sup> See, for instance, Jacquette (2004a, 111 ff). The same error can most likely be found in some of my previous work as well.  
<sup>57</sup> The notes from Brentano's lecture *Selected Psychological Questions* (Brentano, Q 9) were copied by Husserl in Gabelsberger shorthand from another student. As Husserl suggests in (1919, 153), he attended only three of Brentano's series of lectures on the topic, namely EL 72, Eth 21, and Ps 58, but he gave 28 notebooks from Brentano's lectures to the Brentano Archives in Prague. Though these notebooks were left behind when Brentano's manuscripts had to be taken out of Czechoslovakia, due to the German invasion of 1938, and have never been found again, most of the material contained in them must have been copied from notes of others.  
<sup>58</sup> Brentano & Bergmann, (ed.) Bergmann (1946/47, 125 f).  
<sup>59</sup> Rollinger (1999, 69-82).  
<sup>60</sup> Twardowski (1894, 17), where Bolzano (1837, I, § 49) is cited.  
<sup>61</sup> What motivated this assimilation may have been Bolzano's characterization of presentations in themselves as the "material" (*Stoff*) of subjective presentations and of propositions in themselves as the "material" of judgments. See Bolzano (1837, I, § 48) and Bolzano (1837, III, § 291). Bolzano, however, apparently uses this peculiar term only for lack of a better word. He does, to be sure, see an analogy between presentations and judgments, but it is not entirely the same as Brentano's or Twardowski's. The fact that it is not anything transcendent to consciousness, but rather the contents of presentations and judgments which are at stake, is for them the crucial point.  
<sup>62</sup> We see the same sort of mistake occurring again in Stumpf (1907, 29f.), where states of affairs (*Sachverhalte*), explicitly conceived of as contents of judgment and indeed immanent to consciousness, are equated with Bolzanian "propositions in themselves" (*Sätze an sich*).  
<sup>63</sup> Morscher (2008, 155f).  
<sup>64</sup> Poli (1996, 210 n).  
<sup>65</sup> Zimmermann (1867, § 18; § 20) as cited in Twardowski (1894, 17).  
<sup>66</sup> The Port Royal logic was of great importance in calling attention to this distinction. See Arnauld & Nicole, (trans.) anonymous (1693), Part One, Chapter Three. See also Kneale & Kneale (1984, 318 f).  
<sup>67</sup> Kerry (1885), Kerry (1886), Kerry (1887), Kerry (1889), Kerry (1890a), and Kerry (1891).  
<sup>68</sup> See especially Kerry (1891).  
<sup>69</sup> Kerry (1886, 428), as cited in Twardowski (1894, 30).  
<sup>70</sup> Kerry (1886, 432), as cited in Twardowski (1894, 34).  
<sup>71</sup> Höfler (1892).  
<sup>72</sup> Höfler & Meinong (1890, § 6) as cited in Twardowski (1894, 4).  
<sup>73</sup> This manuscript has been translated into English as Appendix One of Rollinger (1999, 251-284). The best edition of the German text can be found in Husserl & Schuhmann, (ed.) Schuhmann (1990/91). An earlier edition is found in (*Husserliana* XXII, 303-348).

Though Husserl misunderstands Twardowski's position, much of his argument still has bearing on the proto-Meinongian view that Twardowski develops and consequently on the Meinongian thesis that it is possible for something not to exist (or subsist) and still to be an object.

- <sup>74</sup> Twardowski (1894, 20-29).  
<sup>75</sup> Twardowski (1894, 102-111).  
<sup>76</sup> Meinong (1899). See Chrudzimski (2007, 103-118).  
<sup>77</sup> The full-blown statement in favor of object theory came as late as 1904. See Meinong (1904a). Though Twardowski was thus Meinong's predecessor in this regard by ten years, it should also be kept in mind that Meinong repeatedly insisted that the seeds of object theory were already in his earlier writings. Moreover, he was not entirely pleased with the way in which Twardowski made the distinction between content and object. See the quote from a letter from Meinong to Cornelius (6 October 1899) in Rollinger (1993, 70 n).

## References

- Albertazzi, Liliana, Libardi, Massimo & Poli, Roberto (eds.). 1996. *The School of Franz Brentano*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Arnauld, Antoine & Nicole, Pierre, (trans.) anonymous. 1693. *Logic; or, the Art of Thinking in which besides the Common, are contain'd many Excellent New Rules very profitable for directing of Reason, and acquiring of Judgment in things as well as relating to the Instruction a Mans self, as of others*. London: John Taylor.
- Bolzano, Bernard. 1837. *Wissenschaftslehre. Versuch einer ausführlichen und größtenteils neuen Darstellung der Logik mit steter Rücksicht auf deren bisherige Bearbeiter*. Sulzbach: J. C. von Seidel. 4 vols.
- Brentano, Franz. 1874. *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkte*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
- . 1889. *Vom Ursprung sittlicher Erkenntnis*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
- . 1895. *Die Vier Phasen der Philosophie und ihr augenblicklicher Stand*. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta.
- . 1911. *Von der Klassifikation der psychischen Phänomene*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
- . 1924. *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt*, vol. I, ed. Oskar Kraus. Leipzig: Felix Meiner.
- . 1925. *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt*, vol. II, ed. Oskar Kraus. Leipzig: Felix Meiner.
- . 1928. *Vom sinnlichen und noetischen Bewußtsein, (Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt, Bd. 3)*, ed. Oskar Kraus. Leipzig: Felix Meiner.
- . 1929. *Über die Zukunft der Philosophie*, ed. Oskar Kraus. Leipzig: Felix Meiner.
- . 1930. *Wahrheit und Evidenz*, ed. Oskar Kraus. Leipzig: Felix Meiner.
- . 1933. *Kategorienlehre*, ed. Alfred Kastil. Leipzig: Felix Meiner.
- . 1952. *Die Abkehr vom Nichtrealen. Briefe und Abhandlungen aus dem Nachlass*, ed. Franziska Mayer-Hillebrand. Bern: Francke.
- . 1956. *Die Lehre vom richtigen Urteil*, ed. Franziska Mayer-Hillebrand. Bern: Francke.
- . 1959. *Grundzüge der Logik*, ed. Franziska Mayer-Hillebrand. Bern: Francke.

- . 1982. *Deskriptive Psychologie*, ed. Wilhelm Baumgartner and Roderick M. Chisholm. Hamburg: Felix Meiner.
- . 2008. *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkte. Von der Klassifikation psychischer Phänomene*, ed. Thomas Binder and Arkadiusz Chrudzinski. Frankfurt am Main: Ontos-Verlag.
- . (EL 72). 'Die elementare Logik und die in ihr nötigen Reformen'. Unpublished lecture notes from 1884/85. Houghton Library, Harvard.
- . (EL 74). 'Psychognosie'. Lecture notes from 1889/90, published in [Brentano](#), (eds.) Baumgartner and Chisholm. Houghton Library, Harvard.
- . (EL 80). 'Logik'. Unpublished lecture notes from the Würzburg and Vienna periods. Houghton Library: Harvard.
- . (Eth 21). 'Praktische Philosophie'. Lecture notes used and repeatedly revised from 1874 to 1895. Houghton Library, Harvard.
- . (Ps 53). 'Drittes Buch: Von den Vorstellungen'. Unpublished manuscripts, probably from circa 1874, containing drafts not only for the third "book" of *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkte*, but also for the continuation of the second one. Houghton Library, Harvard.
- . (Ps 76). 'Deskriptive Psychologie'. Unpublished lecture notes from 1887/88. Houghton Library, Harvard.
- . (Ps 77). 'Deskriptive Psychologie oder beschreibende Phänomenologie'. Unpublished lecture notes from 1888/89. Houghton Library, Harvard.
- . (Ps 78). 'Ausgewählte Fragen aus Psychologie und Ästhetik'. Unpublished lecture notes from 1885/86. Houghton Library, Harvard.
- . (Q 9). 'Ausgewählte Psychologische Fragen (die Raum-Theorien)'. Unpublished lecture notes from 1883 taken by Franz Hillebrand, copied by Edmund Husserl. Husserl Archives, Leuven.
- Brentano, Franz & Bergmann, Hugo (ed.). 1946/47. 'Briefe Franz Brentanos an Hugo Bergmann'. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 7: 83–158.
- Cavallin, Jens. 1997. *Content and Object. Husserl, Twardowski and Psychologism*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Chrudzinski, Arkadiusz. 2007. *Gegenstandstheorie und Theorie der Intentionalität bei Alexius Meinong*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Coniglione, Francesco, Poli, Roberto & Wolenski, Jan (eds.). 1993. *Polish Scientific Philosophy: The Lvów-Warsaw School*. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Dummett, Michael. 1991. *Frege and Other Philosophers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- George, Rolf & Koehn. 2004. 'Brentano's Relation to Aristotle'. In [Jacquette \(2004a\)](#), 20–44.
- Höfler, Alois. 1892. 'Review of [Kerry](#), (ed.) Kohn (1890)'. *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie* 16: 230–242.
- Höfler, Alois & Meinong, Alexius. 1890. *Philosophische Propädeutik. Erster Theil: Logik*. Prague / Vienna: F. Tempski. Leipzig: G. Freytag.
- Husserl, Edmund. 1900. *Logische Untersuchungen. Erster Theil: Prolegomena zur reinen Logik*. Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer.
- . 1901. *Logische Untersuchungen. Zweiter Theil: Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis*. Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer.
- . 1919. 'Erinnerungen an Brentano'. In [Kraus \(1919\)](#), 151–167.
- . 1976. *Husserliana III/1: Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologis-*

- chen Philosophie. Erstes Buch: Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie*, ed. Karl Schuhmann. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- . 2008. *Husserliana XXXX: Untersuchungen zur Urteilstheorie. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1893-1918)*, ed. Robin D. Rollinger. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Husserl, Edmund & Schuhmann, Karl (ed.). 1990/91. 'Husserls Abhandlung "Intentionale Gegenstände". Edition der ursprünglichen Druckfassung'. *Brentano Studien* 3: 137–176.
- Jacquette, Dale (ed.). 2004a. *The Cambridge Companion to Brentano*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacquette, Dale. 2004b. 'Brentano's Concept of Intentionality'. In [Jacquette \(2004a\)](#), 98–130.
- Kastil, Alfred. 1951. *Die Philosophie Franz Brentanos. Eine Einführung in seine Lehre*. Bern: Francke.
- Kerry, Benno. 1885. 'Über Anschauung und ihre psychische Verarbeitung'. *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie* 9: 433–493. 1st article.
- . 1886. 'Über Anschauung und ihre psychische Verarbeitung'. *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie* 10: 419–467. 2nd article.
- . 1887. 'Über Anschauung und ihre psychische Verarbeitung'. *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie* 11: 53–116, 249–307. 3rd and 4th articles.
- . 1889. 'Über Anschauung und ihre psychische Verarbeitung'. *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie* 13: 71–124, 392–419. 5th and 6th articles.
- . 1890a. 'Über Anschauung und ihre psychische Verarbeitung'. *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie* 14: 317–353. 7th article.
- . 1890b. *System einer Theorie der Grenzbegriffe. Ein Beitrag zu Erkenntnistheorie*, vol. I (only vol. published), ed. G. Kohn. Leipzig / Vienna: Deuticke.
- . 1891. 'Über Anschauung und ihre psychische Verarbeitung'. *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie* 15: 127–167. 8th article.
- Kneale, Martha & Kneale, William. 1984. *The Development of Logic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kraus, Oskar. 1919. *Zur Kenntnis seines Lebens und seiner Lehre*. Munich: Oskar Beck.
- Locke, John. 1975. *An Essay concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Peter H. Nidditch. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Marty, Anton. 1884. 'Über subjektlose Sätze und das Verhältnis der Grammatik zur Logik und Psychologie'. *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie* 8: 56–94, 161–192, 292–340. 1st, 2nd, and 3rd articles.
- . 1894. 'Über subjektlose Sätze und das Verhältnis der Grammatik zur Logik und Psychologie'. *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie* 18: 320–356, 421–471. 4th and 5th articles.
- . 1895. 'Über subjektlose Sätze und das Verhältnis der Grammatik zur Logik und Psychologie'. *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie* 19: 19–87, 263–334. 6th and 7th articles.
- Meinong, Alexius. 1899. 'Über Gegenstände höherer Ordnung und deren Verhältnis zur inneren Wahrnehmung'. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane* 21: 181–271.
- . 1904a. 'Über Gegenstandstheorie'. In [Meinong \(1904b\)](#), 1–50.
- Meinong, Alexius (ed.). 1904b. *Untersuchung zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie*. Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth.

- Morscher, Edgar. 2008. *Bolzano's Life and Work*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag.
- Poli, Roberto. 1996. 'Kazimierz Twardowski (1866-1938)'. In *Albertazzi et al. (1996)*, 207–231.
- Rancurello, Antos C. 1968. *A Study of Franz Brentano: His Psychological Standpoint and His Significance in the History of Psychology*. New York / London: Academic Press.
- Rollinger, Robin D. 1993. *Meinong and Husserl on Abstraction and Universals: From Hume Studies I to Logical Investigations II*. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.
- . 1999. *Husserl's Position in the School of Brentano*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- . 2004. 'Brentano and Husserl'. In *Jacquette (2004a)*, 255–276.
- . 2005. 'Meinong and Brentano'. *Meinong Studies / Meinong Studien* 1: 159–197.
- . 2008. *Austrian Phenomenology: Brentano, Husserl, Meinong, and Others on Mind and Object*. Frankfurt am Main: Ontos-Verlag.
- . 2009. 'Brentano's Logic and Marty's Early Philosophy of Language'. *Brentano Studien* XII (2006/09): 77–98.
- Schuhmann, Karl. 1993. 'Husserl and Twardowski'. In *Coniglione et al. (1993)*, 41–58.
- Smith, Barry. 1995. *Austrian Philosophy: The Legacy of Franz Brentano*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Stumpf, Carl. 1907. *Erscheinungen und psychische Funktionen*. Berlin: Königl. preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- . (Q 14). 'Logik und Enzyklopädie der Philosophie'. Lecture notes from summer semester 1887 taken by Edmund Husserl. Husserl Archives, Leuven.
- Titchener, Edward Bradford. 1929. *Systematic Psychology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Twardowski, Kasimir. 1892. *Idee und Perzeption. Eine erkenntnistheoretische Untersuchung aus Descartes*. Vienna: Carl Konegen.
- . 1894. *Zur Lehre vom Inhalt und Gegenstand der Vorstellungen. Eine psychologische Studie*. Vienna: Alfred Hölder.
- Werle, Josef M. 1989. *Franz Brentano and die Zukunft der Philosophie: Studien zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte und Wissenschaftssytematik im 19. Jahrhundert*. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Wundt, Wilhelm. 1874. *Grundzüge der physiologischen Psychologie*. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann.
- . 1904. *Völkerpsychologie. Eine Untersuchung der Entwicklungsgesetze von Sprache, Mythos und Sitte*, vol. I/2. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Engelmann.
- . 1910. *Kleine Schriften*, vol. I. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann.
- Zimmermann, Robert. 1867. *Philosophische Propädeutik. Prolegomena – Logik – empirische Psychologie. Zur Einleitung in die Philosophie*. 3rd ed. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller.