

Hermann Lotze and the genesis of Husserl's early philosophy (1886-1901) •

Denis Fiset

Université du Québec à Montréal

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this study is to assess Husserl's debt to Lotze's philosophy during the Halle period (1886-1901). I shall first track the sources of Husserl's knowledge of Lotze's philosophy during his studies with Brentano in Vienna and then with Stumpf in Halle. I shall then briefly comment on Husserl's references to Lotze in his early work and research manuscripts for the second volume of his *Philosophy of Arithmetic*. In the third section, I examine Lotze's influence on Husserl's antipsychologistic turn in the mid-1890s. The fourth section is a commentary on Husserl's manuscript entitled "Microcosmus," to which he explicitly refers in his *Prolegomena*, and which he planned to publish as an annex of his *Logical Investigations*. This work contains a detailed analysis of the third book of Lotze's 1874 *Logic*. The last section examines Husserl's arguments against logical psychologism in his *Prolegomena*, which I discuss through the lens of Stumpf's critique of psychologism in his paper "Psychology and theory of knowledge". I argue that Stumpf's early works on this topic make it possible to establish a connection between Lotze's interpretation of Plato's theory of Ideas and Husserl's antipsychologism. My hypothesis is that Stumpf's analyses represent the background of Husserl's critique of logical psychologism in his *Logical Investigations*. I shall conclude this study by showing that Husserl's position with respect to Lotze's philosophy remains basically unchanged after the publication of his *Logical Investigations*, and that Husserl's main criticism of Lotze pertains, in the final analysis, to the absence of a theory of intentionality in Lotze's philosophy.

Husserl once said of Hermann Lotze that he was one of the greatest philosophers since Kant. (*Briefwechsel* IX, p. 154) Husserl's reverent remark about the Göttingen philosopher shows not only his respect for his philosophy, but also the central place Lotze deserves in the history of philosophy during the second half of the nineteenth century. Most commentaries on Husserl's relationship to Lotze during that period have emphasized his debt to Lotze's interpretation of the Platonic theory of Ideas in his 1874 *Logic*. Although this aspect of Husserl's relationship to Lotze is indeed decisive in the interpretation of his own Platonism, it does not itself explain why Husserl considered Lotze one of the most important researchers of his time, as he once again asserted in 1909 in his appraisal on A. Reinach's habilitation thesis. (*Briefwechsel*, II, p. 206) The historical significance granted to Lotze's philosophy can be measured in part by the influence he has had on the history of philosophy, not only in Germany but also in Great Britain and America. The historian John Merz, a student of Lotze in the mid-1860s and the author of the monumental *History of European Thought in the XIXth Century in Great*

Britain, has pointed out that Lotze's philosophy was at that time considered authoritative among the British idealists, nearly on equal footing with Hegel and Kant.

But of the Germans who followed the classic days of Idealism none was more zealously studied, more deeply respected, and more frequently plundered (*sit venia verbo*) than Lotze. His influence was immeasurable, less only than that of Kant and Hegel. [...] Many Britons even came into personal relation with Lotze; indeed, at one time it was almost a fashion to spend a period of study at Gottingen University, so as to receive philosophical wisdom from the master's own lips. (J. Merz, 1938, p. 256)

Merz here refers to the generation of British philosophers who succeeded the idealists and who were mainly interested in Lotze's scientific work and in his contribution to the emergence of the "new psychology".¹ In America, William James, whom Husserl held in great esteem, had also been greatly influenced by Brentano and Lotze, "the two great masters of psychological analysis and introspection." (Stumpf, 1927, p. 225)²

In Germany, Lotze's work was a major reference in philosophy when the young Husserl began his philosophical studies shortly after Lotze's death in 1881. (R. Pester, 1977) The influence of Lotze's philosophy in Germany is associated with three of his prestigious

¹ George Croom Robertson, a student of Alexander Bain and co-founder of the famous journal *Mind*, studied with Lotze and the physicist Weber in Göttingen in 1862, and we know that he encouraged William Robertson Smith to attend Lotze's lectures. During his stay in Göttingen, Robertson Smith maintained close relationships with Carl Stumpf and the mathematician Felix Klein, and we also know that he acted as an emissary of Brentano during his trip to England in the early 1870s. (cf. B. Maier, 2009) James Sully, the author of several influential books in psychology, studied with Lotze in the late 1860s and is known to have reviewed several of Stumpf's works for *Mind*. (J. Sully, 1878; 1884; 1886; 1891) James Ward, who also studied with Lotze in Göttingen in the 1870s, is the author of the article "Psychology" published in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which is the basis of his major 1918 work *Psychological Principles*, in which he acknowledges his debt to Lotze, Brentano and "his Austrian connections". (1918, p. IX) His student G. F. Stout, the mentor of Moore and Russell, was deeply interested in the work of Brentano and his students, and Bell has said of his book *Analytic Psychology* (1896) that it is essentially "a presentation, for an English audience, of the doctrines which have emerged some 22 years earlier in *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*." (Bell, 1999, p. 201) That is why it has been said that Stout served as a mediator between his students Moore and Russell, on the one hand, and Brentano and his students in the field of descriptive psychology, on the other hand. (see van der Schaar, 1996, 2013) Bell examined the factors and forces responsible for the emergence of analytic philosophy and argued that the most important factor concerns the debates over the emergence of the new psychology: "Moore, I have suggested, is best seen as the major, though by no means the first, British participant in an existing debate whose other participants included Ward, Stout, Russell, Meinong, Stumpf, Husserl, Twardowski and Brentano. Many of the terms and goals of this debate originated in Germany, during the 1870s, in the attempts by philosophers, physiologists, theologians and others to come to terms with, and contribute to, the emergence of psychology as a discipline in its own right". (Bell, 1999, p. 208) Of course, I would add the name of Lotze as the central piece of this complex puzzle.

² In a series of articles on James and Lotze, O. Krausharr nicely summarizes Lotze's major influence on James's *Psychology*: "There was so much in Lotze that coincided with and paralleled the course of James's ideas, that he became for a time very much enmeshed in Lotze's *Problemlage*. The philosophical position that is developed in the *Principles of Psychology* leans heavily upon Lotze's philosophical and psychological doctrines. He did not extricate himself therefrom fully until the final working out of his philosophy of pure experience." (1939, p. 458) Krausharr (1936, p. 245) rightly pointed out that it was under the influence of Stumpf's *Raumbuch* that James became interested in Lotze's theory of local signs.

students in Göttingen, all born in the so-called Year of Revolution in Europe, namely Gottlob Frege (1848-1925), Wilhelm Windelband (1848-1915) and Carl Stumpf (1848-1936). Windelband studied under Lotze in the early 1870s and is known as the leader of the so-called Southwestern or Baden school of neo-Kantianism, whose main members were Heinrich Rickert and Bruno Bauch, the latter of which was Frege's colleague in Jena from 1911 onwards. Rickert and Bauch developed a philosophy of culture, based on an interpretation of Lotze's theory of values, which had become one of the dominant trends in German philosophy by the end of the nineteenth century. (see G. Misch, 1912; P. F. Linke, 1926, 1924)

Frege pursued his studies in mathematics in Göttingen between 1871 and 1873, and although he only attended Lotze's lecture on philosophy of religion, many of his ideas were anticipated in Lotze's logic.³ In the context of this study, it is important to recall that Frege has long been considered the father of the two main traditions that have dominated the history of philosophy starting from the beginning of the twentieth century, namely phenomenology (see D. W. Smith 2013) and analytic philosophy (M. Dummett, 1993). Commentators of Frege, including H. Sluga (1984, 1980) and G. Gabriel (1989, 2002, 2013), have called into question Dummett's thesis about the Fregean origin of analytic philosophy and stressed the alleged influence of Lotze and the Baden neo-Kantians on the young Frege, such that Frege could plausibly be considered a *Neokantianer*. They further argued "that at least *early* analytic philosophy has its roots in the tradition of continental philosophy, especially in the philosophy of Hermann Lotze". (Gabriel, 2002, p. 39) However, even if one recognizes Lotze's influence on Frege, this does not *ipso facto* make him a neo-Kantian, unless one uses the concept of neo-Kantianism in a sense broad enough to include the Lotze's philosophy.⁴

³ See L. Kreiser's biography of Frege (2001, p. 86-111). Frege himself acknowledged Lotze's influence on his thought, as evidenced by his colleague B. Bauch: "I heard it myself from the mouth of Frege, our great mathematician, that for his mathematical—and, if I may add what Frege modestly did not mention—epochmaking investigations, impulses from Lotze were of decisive importance". (in S. Schlotter, 2006, p. 45) See also G. Gabriel (1989) who convincingly shows the influence of Lotze's logic on Frege.

⁴ Gabriel's arguments, which support his construal of Frege as a neo-Kantian, are mainly based on Frege's personal acquaintance with his colleague B. Bauch in Jena and on the alleged affinities of Frege's epistemological positions with those of neo-Kantian Windelband, even if Frege almost never refers to neo-Kantians. Paul F. Linke, who was Frege's colleague in Jena starting from 1907 and one of his strongest supporters in Germany, excludes any influence of his fellow neo-Kantians in Jena on Frege. (Linke, 1946, p. 77) Linke was close to Husserl and to the Brentanian circles. He published in Husserl's *Jahrbuch* and he was one of the first to emphasize the influence of Frege on Husserl. (Linke, 1926, p. 228-229) Through his conversations with Linke, Frege might have been informed of Husserl's work and that of Brentano's students in general. In any case, it is worth remembering that Brentano's students were responsible for the early reception of Frege's work in Germany. Indeed, in 1882, Stumpf received a letter from Frege, in

Finally, the name of Carl Stumpf is of particular importance in this study because of his close relationship with Lotze during the six years he spent in Göttingen (1867-1873) and later with Husserl in Halle, where he held a chair in philosophy from 1884 to 1889. Stumpf attended Lotze's lectures, and successfully defended a dissertation on Plato (1869) and then his habilitation thesis on mathematical axioms (1870) under his direction. At age 22, Stumpf became *privatdozent* at the University of Göttingen, where he was Lotze's colleague. During his three years as *privatdozent* in Göttingen, he maintained a close relationship with Lotze, and undertook extensive research on the topic of space perception, which led to the publication of his book *On the Origin of the Representation of Space* in 1873, dedicated to Lotze.⁵

Lotze's three main students in Germany find a common starting point in a theme that Lotze had already set up in his logic, organized around the epistemological issues arising from the unprecedented development of both the new psychology and logic, which in turn led to many reform projects at the time. These epistemological questions are at the heart of the early debates over psychologism, to which contributed not only Frege (1884), but also Windelband (1877) and Stumpf (1891). Although the positions

which he described the basic ideas of his *Begriffsschrift* in great detail and asked Stumpf to publish a review of his book, which, at that time, had been ignored since its publication in 1879. Frege feared above all that the works he was preparing on the logical foundation of arithmetic would suffer the same fate as his *Begriffsschrift* and approached Stumpf for advice. Stumpf responded to Frege's letter a few weeks later by promising to review his *Begriffsschrift* and recommended that Frege first publish his research in vernacular language (*gewöhnlich*) and postpone the publication of his theory of arithmetic based on the technical language of his *Begriffsschrift*. Yet, as we know, it was not Stumpf but Anton Marty, another of Brentano's students, who in 1884 reviewed and commented Frege's theory of judgment and his *Begriffsschrift* in the second article in a series of papers on subjectless propositions. (A. Marty, 1884) Finally, let us mention Benno Kerry, another student of Brentano. Kerry was very interested in Frege's works (see V. Peckhaus, 1994); he was the author of "Gottlob Frege als Philosoph" and in his later writings showed great interest in Frege. (see U. Dathe, 2000)

⁵ See Stumpf (1917; 1976, p. 18 ff) for an account of his activity in Göttingen between 1870 and 1873. The main subject of Stumpf's *Raumbuch* is the nativism-empiricism controversy; Stumpf's starting point is Lotze's theory of local signs, which represents, according to many, his main contribution to the problem of space perception. Lotze responded to Stumpf's criticism in his "Mitteilung an Stumpf," which is annexed to Stumpf's work. (1873, p. 315-324) After leaving Göttingen, Stumpf continued to consider Lotze's work. Besides his reminiscences of Lotze published in *Kantstudien* (Stumpf, 1917) and the constant references to his work, Stumpf reviewed most of Lotze's posthumous works published in German between 1882 and 1892. (see D. Fisette, 2005d) In 1893, he published an article in which he revised his position on local signs. (Stumpf, 1893) In his inaugural address as Rector of the University of Berlin, delivered in 1907 under the title "The renaissance of philosophy", Stumpf associates Lotze's thought with a revival of German philosophy in the mid-nineteenth century. Stumpf distinguishes two main orientations of German philosophy in the second half of the nineteenth century, the first being neo-Kantianism, which advocated a return to Kant, and the second being the so-called *Erfahrungsphilosophie*. At the time, in Germany at least, *Erfahrungsphilosophie* was the common denominator of several schools of thought, including the school of Brentano, which sought to practice philosophy in the spirit of the natural sciences. Stumpf maintains that, through their empirical work in the field of philosophy of mind and physiological psychology, philosophers like Lotze and Fechner contributed significantly to a renaissance of philosophy in Germany.

advocated by these students of Lotze are slightly different, their struggle against psychologism converges towards Husserl's position in his *Prolegomena*. This line of criticism targets a research program not very different from Quine's program to naturalize epistemology in contemporary philosophy. At that time, this program was widespread among philosophers such as W. Wundt and J. Stuart Mill, for example, who are the main targets of Frege, Stumpf, and Husserl in their criticism of logical psychologism. Husserl's main argument against Mill is based on the ideal or objective character of the laws of logic, which Husserl conceived of in terms of *Geltung*. But while Frege and the neo-Kantians advocated a solution to this problem that involved the outright rejection of psychology as a philosophical discipline⁶, Brentano's students recognized, as Lotze had as well, the indispensable contribution of psychology to the theory of knowledge. This theme is at the heart of the young Husserl's research during the Halle period and it is sufficient on its own to justify his judgment on the importance of Lotze's philosophy to the development of his phenomenology and pure logic during that period.

The purpose of this study is to assess Husserl's debt to Lotze's philosophy during the Halle period. I am mainly interested in the genesis of the young Husserl's thought from his arrival in Halle in 1886 to the publication of his *Hauptwerk* in 1900-1901. I shall first track the sources of Husserl's knowledge of Lotze's philosophy during his studies with Brentano in Vienna and then with Stumpf in Halle. I shall then briefly comment on Husserl's references to Lotze in his early work and research manuscripts for the second volume of his *Philosophy of Arithmetic*. In the third section, I examine Lotze's influence on Husserl's antipsychologistic turn in the mid-1890s. The fourth section is a commentary on Husserl's manuscript entitled "Microcosmus," to which he explicitly refers in his *Prolegomena*, and which he planned to publish as an annex of his *Logical Investigations*. This work contains a detailed analysis of the third book of Lotze's 1874 *Logic*. The last section examines Husserl's arguments against logical psychologism in his *Prolegomena*, which I discuss through the lens of Stumpf's critique of psychologism in

⁶ Windelband's and Rickert's positions on psychology come out clearly from their classification of sciences into idiographic and natural sciences, which was intended to replace the traditional classification based on the distinction between *Natur-* and *Geisteswissenschaften*. Windelband's and Rickert's main argument is that, methodologically, the new psychology was more akin to natural than to moral science and therefore could not be considered an idiographic science. In his 1927 lecture *Natur und Geist*, Husserl criticises their interpretation of Lotze's theory of values from the perspective of a philosophy of culture based on a "critical science of values" and accuses them of ruling out intentional psychology, to which Husserl assigns a central place in his Freiburg phenomenology. (Hua XXXIII, p. 80-81, 95)

his paper "Psychology and theory of knowledge". I argue that Stumpf's early works on this topic make it possible to establish a connection between Lotze's interpretation of Plato's theory of Ideas and Husserl's antipsychologism. My hypothesis is that Stumpf's analyses represent the background of Husserl's critique of logical psychologism in his *Logical Investigations*. I shall conclude this study by showing that Husserl's position with respect to Lotze's philosophy remains basically unchanged after the publication of his *Logical Investigations*, and that Husserl's main criticism of Lotze pertains, in the final analysis, to the absence of a theory of intentionality in Lotze's philosophy.

I. Husserl's main sources: Brentano and Stumpf

The young Husserl inherited his capital of sympathy for the philosophy of Lotze *via* his relationship with Brentano in Vienna (1884-1886) and then with Stumpf in Halle, where he arrived in the fall of 1886 to complete his habilitation thesis. There is indeed a direct filiation between Lotze, on the one hand, and Brentano and his students, on the other, including the young Husserl. Indeed, we know that Brentano, before obtaining his chair at Würzburg in 1872, was not habilitated to supervise theses, and that is why, in 1867, he recommended to Stumpf, and later to Anton Marty, that they move to Göttingen in order to study with Lotze. Although Brentano's philosophical program constitutes the main background of Marty's and Stumpf's thought, one cannot underestimate the influence of Lotze's philosophy on Stumpf's philosophy during the six years he spent in Göttingen. (Stumpf, 1895, p. 735)

In his correspondence with Stumpf, as well as in his *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, Brentano unequivocally expressed his esteem for Lotze and indicated several aspects of his work that he considered lasting contributions to philosophy. In a passage from a letter to Stumpf dated November 3, 1867, Brentano explains why Lotze was among the best German philosophers at the time to supervise his studies:

Because I could not name any other professor of philosophy whose doctrine in its essential aspects I do not hold to be false, and because Lotze, despite all that he lacks, is in many ways remarkable. Notably, his philosophical method, his emphasis on experience and observation, the way he uses scientific results, the caution and meticulousness with which he exposes his theses, all set him apart, and advantageously so, from most other scholars of our time. And I do not know anyone else from whom you could learn more in this regard. (Brentano, 1989, p. 3; see Stumpf, 1817, p. 2)

Brentano had even taken steps to facilitate Lotze's hiring at Würzburg, in order to keep his students in the same university. (Brentano 1989, p. 11) Elsewhere in his correspondence with Stumpf, Brentano criticizes Lotze for the noxious influence of Kantianism on his thinking, for his incomplete knowledge of ancient philosophy, and for his inadequate classification of mental phenomena. He nevertheless acknowledges that the writings of Lotze were "superior to those of most contemporary philosophers". Brentano confirms these views in the preface to his *Psychology*. There, he acknowledges the influence of Lotze on his thought (Brentano 2008, p. 4) and repeatedly refers to two of his important works, *Medical Psychology* and *Mikrocosmos*, thoroughly discussing Lotze's views on emotions and feelings (Brentano, 2008, p. 167 f.; p. 262 f.; 268 f.) along with his classification of acts. (Brentano 2008, p. 206 f.; p. 254 f.)

Furthermore, considering Lotze's great notoriety at the time, in Germany and abroad, and Stumpf's close relationship with the Göttingen philosopher, there is no doubt that Lotze was a key factor not only in Brentano's career, but also in Stumpf's and Marty's. Thanks to Lotze, Stumpf inherited Brentano's chair in Würzburg in 1874; the correspondence between Brentano and Stumpf also indicates that Lotze had a hand in Marty's hiring in Czernowirz in 1875 and in Prague in 1880. For, besides Brentano's and Stumpf's numerous manoeuvres to promote Marty's hiring in Czernowitz, we know that Stumpf went so far as to personally travel to Göttingen in order to gain the support of Lotze and of his student Baumann for Marty's candidature. Shortly after he resigned in Würzburg, Brentano undertook discussions with the University of Vienna to fill the position left vacant since the departure of F. Lott, a position he obtained thanks once again to Lotze, who spoke with the Austrian ministry in favour of his candidacy. (Stumpf, 1976, p. 34; Lotze, 2003, p. 595-596)

As we can see, the close relationship between Brentano, Stumpf and Lotze, both personally and philosophically, may have favourably disposed the young Husserl towards the Göttingen philosopher. However, Husserl's first significant exposure to Lotze's philosophy occurred during his two years of study with Brentano in Vienna (1884-1886), where he attended several of the great scholar's seminars (see R. Rollinger, 1999, p. 17), namely those on logic and psychology, in which Brentano occasionally discussed the work of Lotze.⁷ As Husserl explains in his "Reminiscences of

⁷ Although Husserl acquired a copy of Lotze's *Mikrocosmos* as early as 1880 (K. Schuhmann, 1977, p. 8), nothing indicates that he was interested in Lotze's philosophy at that time; and it is unlikely that he had

Franz Brentano," Brentano's main concern at that time was descriptive psychology. (Husserl, Hua XXV, p. 307) Husserl's correspondence with Brentano confirms his interest in Brentano's research on descriptive psychology during the Halle period (*Briefwechsel I*, p. 6) The results of Brentano's research were the subject of lectures he held in 1890-1891 on descriptive psychology (which he also calls "psychognosy" or "descriptive phenomenology"), in which he subjected his earlier conception of psychology to substantial revisions. In this regard, Brentano might have been influenced by Lotze, who frequently used the notions of descriptive psychology and phenomenology in his published writings and lectures. (G. Misch, 1912, p. L-LV; H. Orth, 1995, 1997)

Two years after Husserl completed studies in Vienna, Brentano recommended his student to Stumpf, who at that time had held a chair in Halle since 1884, in the hopes that he might also find an outstanding interlocutor for the mathematical aspect of his research in Georg Cantor, who was then a colleague of Stumpf in Halle. As Malvine Husserl reported in her memoirs, during the early Halle period, "Stumpf was the guide, adviser and fatherly friend." (M. Husserl, 1988, p. 114) Stumpf enthusiastically welcomed the young philosopher and mathematician and later confirmed that Husserl "was first my student, later an instructor, and became intimately associated with me scientifically and as a friend" in his autobiography. (Stumpf, 1930, p. 399) This event marks the beginning of a lasting and fruitful relationship, which lasted until Stumpf's death in 1936.⁸

Husserl thus arrived in Halle in the fall of 1886 to complete his habilitation thesis under the supervision of Stumpf. During his first year of study in Halle, the young Husserl attended Stumpf's lectures and was subjected to several examinations for his habilitation. Indeed, Husserl attended Stumpf's lecture on psychology during the winter semester 1886-1887, as well as his lecture on logic and on the encyclopedia of philosophy during the summer semester 1887. Husserl's notes on Stumpf's lectures, which are housed in the Husserl Archives in Leuven, bear witness to Husserl's

any direct contact with Lotze, who arrived in Berlin in April 1881 and passed away in July of the same year.

⁸ In his last letter to Masaryk, dated January 3, 1935, Husserl writes about his friend Stumpf: „Sie theilen darin leider das Schicksal mit meinem alten Lehrer und Freunde C. Stumpf. Er lebt noch, der 87jährige, in voller geistiger Frische, beschäftigt mit allgemein philosophischen, insbesondere erkenntnistheoretischen Problemen. Nur dass er sehr schwer an der neuen Zeit leidet, in die er sich gar nicht hineinflinden kann. Ueber mich selbst, der so viel stärker betroffen ist, will ich in diesen Hinsichten mich lieber ausschweigen“. (*Briefwechsel I*, p. 119)

acquaintance with Lotze's logic and psychology. In his lecture on psychology, Stumpf highly recommended the writings of Brentano and especially of Lotze, which he comments at length. He particularly appreciated his article "Seele und Seelenleben" because it constitutes the most developed and harmonious presentation written by Lotze on the subject. He also positively comments Lotze's main psychological writings and concludes that part of his lecture with praise for his psychology:

We are particularly indebted to Lotze for the orientation of psychology in Germany, which emphasizes the careful observation of the details of our psychical life and introspection. By studying these two authors [Brentano and Lotze], you will acquire the best training. (Stumpf, Q11-II p. 49)

I cannot comment here the rich content of Stumpf's lectures. Nevertheless, I would like to mention the long discussion Stumpf devoted to Lotze's position on sensations and location in § 26, entitled "Raumvorstellung of Gesichtssinnes" (Q11-II, p. 40-49), as well as his detailed exposition of Lotze's theory of local signs (Q11-II, p. 49 f.), and his examination of the main stakes in the nativism-empiricism debate, which constitutes the central topic of his *Raumbuch*. Stumpf's syllabi on logic and psychology are already known (Stumpf, 1999a, 1999b), but Husserl's notes on these lectures are worth mentioning because they contain, among other things, a long discussion on the different meanings of Lotze's notion of being, where Stumpf implicitly refers to Lotze's interpretation of Plato's doctrine of Ideas.⁹ We shall see that Lotze's work on Plato's theory of Ideas is central in Stumpf's dissertation on Plato and in his habilitation thesis on mathematical axioms.

If one judges by the themes imposed on Husserl for his nostrification test, which was intended to homologate his Austrian diploma, one can assume that Husserl's knowledge of Lotze's psychology and logic, acquired mainly through Stumpf's lectures, was not superficial. For, we must assume that Husserl was sufficiently prepared to address the main questions of this exam, which were about "Lotze's theory of local signs, the history of the theories of space as well as the relationship between mathematics and logic"

⁹ "Es ist zu erwägen, daß gerade hier eine Verwechslung vorliegen kann zwischen dem Seienden im Sinn eines Dinges und dem Sein in dem Sinn: Es besteht etwas, Es gibt einen Gott. Hier wird ein Ding, ein Seiendes gesetzt, anerkannt. Wir haben also hier das Sein in zweifacher Bedeutung: 1) im Sinne des Bestehens, das ist das existentielle; 2) das Sein, wo ein Ding gegenüber einem bloßen Verhältnis, einer bloßen Eigenschaft gemeint ist. Dieses Sein kommt in der Logik nicht in Betracht. Das Sein der Logik bedeutet bloß die Funktion der Zustimmung, Anerkennung, und hat nichts mit dem Dingsein zu tun." (Stumpf, Q11-II, p. 63-64)

(Stumpf in Gerlach, 1994, p. 184), three central topics in the young Husserl's research in Halle, as Stumpf explained in his final report.

Furthermore, at the beginning of July 1887, Husserl successfully defended his habilitation. His *Habilitationsschrift*, in which he explored the theme of the psychological origin of the fundamental concepts of arithmetic, was published a few months later under the title "On the concept of number: Psychological analysis". In his report, Stumpf noted the remarkable analytical skills of the candidate and emphasized the important methodological contribution to descriptive psychology in this work. (Stumpf in H. Gerlach, 1994, p. 173) In 1887, a few months after defending his habilitation thesis, Husserl delivered his inaugural lecture at the University of Halle on the topic "Über Ziele und Aufgaben der Metaphysik" and became *privatdozent* at this university, a position he held until he left for Göttingen in 1901. Although Husserl's inaugural lecture has been lost, we now have access to the transcript of his notes on Stumpf's lecture on metaphysics (Stumpf, 2015), which contain some discussions of Lotze. (D. Fiset, 2015b) Metaphysical issues were central to Husserl's teaching in Halle, and we know that several lectures held by Husserl during this period were either specifically on metaphysics, or on related topics, such as theism, free will, or Lotze's proofs of the existence of God. (cf. H. Gerlach and H. Sepp, 1994, p. 35 f.)

III. Lotze and Husserl's anti-psychologistic turn

The Halle period is one of the richest in the development of Husserl's thought, and it has been repeatedly commented in Husserl studies. However, besides the studies that have focused on Husserl's assessment of Lotze's logic in his *Logical Investigations*,¹⁰ the importance of Lotze in the genesis of Husserl's phenomenology during this period has not been sufficiently investigated. Yet there are many indications in Husserl's work, namely in his 1896 lecture on logic, which confirm that Lotze is not foreign to Husserl's abandonment of the research program that guided his early work, and that the reform of logic he began to carry out in the mid-1890s goes hand in hand with his anti-psychologistic turn. The other main aspect of Husserl's research during this period relates to descriptive psychology, on the basis of which he defines his own phenomenology (in the *Logical Investigations*) and his theory of intentionality, which he

¹⁰ There are indeed quite a few studies on Husserl's relationship to Lotze's philosophy. Let me here mention the latest: F. Dastur (1994); C. Beyer (1996); K. Hauser (2003); A. Dewalque (2012a; 2012b); A. Varga (2013).

elaborated in several writings of this period. These include his 1894 “Psychological studies” and several research manuscripts, such as “Intentional object,” where he critically examines K. Twardowski’s book *On the Content and Object of Presentations* (1894). We shall see that this manuscript bears the mark of Lotze’s influence and constitutes an essential complement to another important manuscript entitled “Microcosmus” (1895-1897), in which Husserl initiates a critical examination of Lotze’s theory of knowledge in his “greater” *Logic*. Finally, Husserl discusses Lotze’s positions on space perception in his draft of a *Raumbuch*, which belongs to the same period. We shall see that accounting for the Lotzean elements in the young Husserl’s work opens new perspectives on this complicated period in the genesis of his thought.

Let me first say a few words about the project of a *Raumbuch*, which was part of Husserl’s research for the second volume of his *Philosophy of Arithmetic*. Those fragments from this project that have survived evince a marked interest for the psychological question of the origin of space perception and for the nativism-empiricism debate. Husserl’s position in these manuscripts, and especially in the important fragment §10, are very close to the kind of “nativism” advocated by Stumpf in his own *Raumbuch*, and there one also finds discussions on Lotze’s theory of local signs. (Hua XXI, p. 269, 309) In an article published two years later entitled “Psychological studies for elementary logic,” Husserl describes the work of Lotze and Stumpf on space perception as “masterful research”. (Hua XXII, p. 123) Although this project was never carried out, we can still distill some results, which are partly exposed in his “Psychological studies”. The most important of these lies in the concept of psychological part or moment, on which is based Stumpf’s main position in § 5 of his *Raumbuch*. Now, the first version of Husserl’s theory of parts and wholes, which he develops in the first part of this article, is based primarily on Stumpf’s ideas, as Husserl acknowledges in this article and later in the third *Investigation*. (Hua XXII, p. 92, 94)

Part-whole relations pertain to a general theory of relations, which Husserl briefly mentions in his *Philosophy of Arithmetic* and outlines in this article. In a footnote to chapter III of this book, in which he deals with collective relations (2003, p. 84), Husserl refers to Lotze’s *Metaphysics* and to the first volume of Stumpf’s *Psychology of Sound* (1883, p. 96), in which he introduced his famous notion of fusion in the context of a study of basic relations (*Grundverhältnisse*). Drawing on the work of Stumpf and Lotze, Husserl distinguishes two classes of relations: intentional and primary relations. The

latter class of relations bear the character of primary contents (or sensory content) and they have a “peculiar phenomenal character”. (Husserl, 2003, p. 71)¹¹

Each relation belonging to this class, for example the relation of analogy between two contents, is included non-intentionally in a presentation. (2003, p. 71) The relations belonging to the class of intentional relations pertain exclusively to the class of psychical phenomena. They are characterized by acts, which relate and unify several contents. The main difference between these two classes of relations is that, for the first class, “the relation is immediately given along with representing the terms, as a moment of the same representational content,” (2003, p. 72) whereas for the second, in order to represent the relation, one has to perform “a reflexive act of representing bearing upon the relating act”. (2003, p. 73)¹²

As for the class of intentional relations, Husserl’s conception considerably evolved from that in his first works, in which he uncritically adopted Brentano’s immanent theory. This uncritical adoption lasted until 1894, as shown in his work “Intentional objects,” where he critically examines Twardowski’s treatment of the problem of objectless presentations. In addition to the significant contribution of this text to Husserl’s theory of intentionality in the fifth *Investigation* (D. Fisette, 2003), the problem of intentional objects is not unrelated to the central issue in Husserl’s 1895-1897 manuscript on Lotze’s logic and his interpretation of Plato’s Ideas in terms of *Geltung*. Indeed, Lotze himself in his greater 1874 logic (Lotze 1884, p. 504) explicitly related the problem he sought to solve with the concept of *Geltung* and that of objects of thought (*Gedankendinge*) in Medieval philosophy. This issue is related to Brentano’s and Twardowski’s postulation of an immanent mode of existence for intentional objects of thought. In his 1894 manuscript, Husserl repudiates this postulate and accuses Twardowski of conflating objective and subjective intention in his discussion with Bolzano. Husserl (1990, p. 168) argues that the discourse on the in-existence of intentional objects is an improper way of speaking and calls into question the view advocated by Twardowski and Brentano, according to which an existential valid

¹¹ Husserl seeks to avoid Brentano’s concept of physical phenomenon because it does not properly designate an analogy, gradation, etc., and he instead prefers the concept of primary or immanent content. Nevertheless, the concept of intentional inexistence, which is Brentano’s criterion for the distinction between these two classes of phenomena, remains the basis for the classification of relations in this work. (Husserl, 2003, p. 73)

¹² The importance of the distinction between these two classes of relations is confirmed by several other texts belonging to the Halle period. (see D. Fisette, 2000)

affirmative judgment of the form “A exists” presupposes the in-existence of an intentional object. (Husserl, 1990, p. 145) Husserl’s solution in this work, in his unpublished review of Twardowski’s book (Husserl, 1994, p. 391-392) and in the Appendix to §§ 11 and 20 of the fifth *Investigation*, rests on the identification of intentional and valid objects.¹³ This solution is very likely inspired by Lotze, as shown by the following passage, in which Husserl summarizes his solution to the problem of intentional objects following the paradigm of objects of judgment, i.e., states of affairs:

If, for example, we impute an object to the *proposition*, as what is represented by means of its signification content and indeed its *whole* signification content (thus we have in mind not the mere object for which the subject of the proposition stands, the characteristic corresponding to the predicate, and the like)—then by that we pick out the “state of affairs,” which subsists if the proposition holds true, and does not subsist if it does not hold true. If the question about the distinction between true and intentional objects in the case of nominal representations has led us to existential assertions in which those representations function as subject representations, and which, depending on the circumstances, were advanced absolutely or were understood as only conditioned, then all of that carries over analogically to the case now at hand, if only we replace the assertions of *existence* with assertions of *validity* (*Gültigkeitsbehauptungen*) (*A is valid [A gilt]*). But these assertions, too, can be meant, at one time absolutely, and at another time under hypothesis. The circumstance that with reference to each proposition an equivalent existential proposition can be found, which, however its signification content may be modified, represents the same state of affairs as the proposition originally given, in a way reduces the present case back to the earlier one, comprising merely nominal representations. And so the talk of intentional and true objects agrees in the two cases. (transl. modified), (Husserl, 1994, p. 376-377)

Several other aspects of this writing are relevant in the context of this study, namely the parallel Husserl establishes between the problem of the imaginary in mathematics and that of objectless presentations in psychology. For the mathematical problem pertains to justification in mathematical calculation that employ imaginary numbers. We know that this problem was at the heart of Husserl’s concerns ever since his habilitation thesis (Husserl, 2003, p. 307) and constitutes one of the main factors at the origin of the abandonment of the research program of *Philosophy of Arithmetic*. Likewise, Husserl’s remarks on assumptions (*Annahmen*) (Husserl, 1994, p. 363-368) constitute an important step towards the final solution that he proposed to the problem of imaginary

¹³ Husserl writes: “It need only be acknowledged that the intentional object of a presentation is the same as its actual object, and on occasion the same as its external object, and that it is absurd to distinguish between them. The transcendent object would not be the object of this presentation, if it was not its intentional object. This is plainly a merely analytic proposition. The object of the presentation, of the ‘intention’, is and means what is presented, the intentional object”. (Husserl, 1982b, p. 127)

numbers through his doctrine of definite multiplicities, which in turn represents the cornerstone of his *Wissenschaftslehre*. (Husserl, 2001; D. Fisette, 2003)

The next step in the genesis of the *Logical Investigations* leads to the issue of Husserl's antipsychologistic turn, which occurred between 1894 and 1896, i.e., between the definitive abandonment of the research program that guided Husserl since his habilitation thesis and the new program based on pure logic. The "cause" of this paradigm shift has long been associated with Frege's 1984 review of Husserl's *Philosophy of Arithmetic* and the so-called Fregean reading of Husserl's phenomenology, which I mentioned earlier. We have no evidence that corroborates the alleged influence Frege might have had on Husserl's "conversion," but there are good reasons to assume that Husserl could not remain indifferent to Frege's criticism. I cannot address the issue as to whether Frege's review had a triggering effect on Husserl's turn, and it is not necessarily the best way of addressing the conversion. For we know from the correspondence they exchanged in 1891 (*Briefwechsel*, Bd. VI, p. 106-118) that Husserl knew the work of Frege, which he extensively discusses in his *Philosophy of Arithmetic*. (D. Fisette, 2004) How could Husserl have possibly ignored the contribution of this student of Lotze to an issue that animated the entirety of his thought during this period? Moreover, we know that Frege's criticism in his correspondence and in his review of Husserl's first book is based on several distinctions that are essential to Husserl's pure logic, including the distinctions between proposition and concept, between subjective and objective presentations, between *Sinn* and *Bedeutung*, etc. (cf. Husserl 1982a, p. 201)¹⁴

¹⁴ These distinctions are also central in Husserl's criticism of Twardowski. (Husserl, 1994, p. 374-375, 388-390; 1982b, p. 125-127) In a footnote to his *Prolegomena* (1982a, p. 318), Husserl confirms Frege's influence: "G. Frege's stimulating work *Die Grundlagen der Arithmetik* (1884, p. vi) [I need hardly say that I no longer approve of my own fundamental criticisms of Frege's antipsychologistic position set forth in my *Philosophie der Arithmetik*, I, pp. 129-32]. Here, I may seize the opportunity, in relation to all of the discussions of these *Prolegomena*, to refer to the Preface of Frege's later work *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik*, vol. I (Jena, 1893)". However, this reference to the *Grundgesetze* is problematic because Frege's main argument against psychologism is based on the normative character of the laws of logic, an argument that Husserl dismisses in the *Prolegomena*. This is shown by the following passage from Frege's *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik*: „Daß die logischen Gesetze Richtschnüre für das Denken sein sollen zur Erreichung der Wahrheit, wird zwar vorweg allgemein zugegeben; aber es geräht nur zu leicht in Vergessenheit. Der Doppelsinn des Wortes "Gesetz" ist hier verhängnisvoll. In dem einen Sinne besagt es, was ist, in dem andern schreibt es vor, was sein soll. Nur in diesem Sinne können die logischen Gesetze Denkgesetze genannt werden, indem sie festsetzen, wie gedacht werden soll. Jedes Gesetz, das besagt, was ist, kann aufgefaßt werden als vorschreibend, es solle im Einklange damit gedacht werden, und es ist also in dem Sinne ein Denkgesetze. Das gilt von den geometrischen und physikalischen nicht minder als von den logischen. Diese verdienen den Namen "Denkgesetze" nur dann mit mehr Recht, wenn damit gesagt

That being said, the two names that Husserl explicitly associates with his antipsychologistic turn and his conversion to Platonism are those of Bolzano and Lotze, as Husserl confirms in his correspondence with Brentano: “These conceptions of Bolzano [representation and proposition in itself] have produced a major effect on me, as did Lotze’s interpretation of Plato’s theory of Ideas.” (*Briefwechsel*, I, p. 39)¹⁵ As early as 1896, in his lecture on logic, Husserl recognizes his debt to Bolzano’s *Wissenschaftslehre* with respect to his pure logic, understood as a theory of science, and he also refers to Lotze’s thesis that arithmetic is only *ein Stück* from logic, a thesis formulated at the beginning of his *Logic*. Husserl stresses the great importance of Lotze’s thesis for his own reform of logic and asserts that it is the most powerful tool invented by the human mind for the purposes of deduction.¹⁶ Lotze’s logicist thesis had a lasting effect on Husserl, as confirmed by several passages of his work, particularly in the *Prolegomena*.¹⁷

IV. Remarks on Husserl’s manuscript K I 59 (Microkosmos)

The Husserl Archives in Leuven have preserved some of Husserl’s manuscripts, in which he provides a critical examination of Lotze’s *Logic*. Besides the annotations in the margins of his copy of Lotze’s *Logic*, the manuscript (K I 59), to which Husserl explicitly

sein soll, daß sie die allgemeinsten sind, die überall da vorschreiben, wie gedacht werden soll, wo überhaupt gedacht wird“. (Frege, 1893, XV)

¹⁵ This dual influence is well documented in Husserl’s work, particularly in his 1903 review of M. Palagyi, in which he once again confirms the influence of Lotze’s and Bolzano’s contributions: “In particular, Lotze’s reflections about the interpretation of Plato’s theory of forms had a profound effect on me. Only by thinking out these thoughts from Lotze—and in my opinion he failed to get completely clear on them—did I find the key to the curious conceptions of Bolzano, which in all their phenomenological naivety were at first unintelligible, and to the treasures of his *Wissenschaftslehre*.” (Husserl, 1994, p. 201)

¹⁶ Here’s the passage: „Und so werden wir uns der zunächst wohl befremdlichen Auffassung Lotzes befreunden müssen, dass die Arithmetik nur rein relativ selbständiges und von alters her besonders hoch entwickeltes Stück der Logik sei. Tatsächlich repräsentiert sie auch in praktischer Hinsicht das großartigster Instrument, das der menschliche Geist zu Zwecken der Deduktionersonnen hat.“ (Husserl, 2001b, p. 271-272) Husserl discusses several other aspects of Lotze’s logic in this lecture: § 44 („Inhaltsinterpretation dieser Form“ p. 152-153; § 45 „Die negativen kategorischen Sätze und die Bedeutung der Negation“, p. 155-157, 162. It is also worth recalling that, in his correspondence with Stumpf in the early 1890s as well as in a letter to Brentano published recently (Husserl, 2015), Husserl emphasized the urgent need for a thorough reform of logic. He already considered the hypothesis that the *arithmetica universalis* “is a segment of formal logic.” (1994, p. 17) However, logic was at that time defined as a practical science, as “a symbolic technique” and not as a purely theoretical logic or as a theory of science, as will be the case starting from his 1896 lecture on logic.

¹⁷ Husserl, 1982a, p. 108, 136 ff. In his *Prolegomena and Formal and Transcendental Logic* (1969, p. 83), Husserl refers to the following passage of Lotze’s *Logic*: “It is necessary, however, to expressly point out that all calculation is a kind of thought, that the fundamental concepts and principles of mathematics have their systematic place in logic, and that we must retain the right, at a later period, when occasion requires, to return without scruple upon the results that mathematics have been achieving, as an independently progressive branch of universal logic.” (Lotze, 1884, p. 26)

refers in his *Prolegomena* and which he intended to publish as an appendix of his *Logical Investigations*, provides a detailed analysis of the third book of Lotze's *Logic*, entitled "Vom Erkennen".¹⁸ This manuscript is dated 1895-1897 and essentially consists in a critical commentary on the third book of Lotze's *Logic*. It is divided into two parts. In the first part, which is incomplete in the transcription I am using in this study (KI 59, p. 4a-7a), Husserl briefly comments on some passages from §§ 314-316 of the second chapter, entitled "The world of ideas," and attributes to Lotze the merit of having stressed the decisive significance of the distinction between the subjective aspects of thought and the objective aspects of its propositional contents. Husserl also credited Lotze for having formulated the principle of the independence of *Gedanken* as the guiding principle of his logic and theory of knowledge. (KI 59, p. 5a) The second part, which occupies the major part of the manuscript, is a critical examination of §§ 316 f. of Lotze's *Logic*. Husserl tries to show that several passages of Lotze's *Logic* do not always harmonize with Lotze's objectivism in his interpretation of Plato's Ideas and that Lotze does not always respect the boundary between the objective and the subjective. Husserl claims that Lotze has not succeeded in standing out decisively from what he calls subjectivism in this manuscript, which was the main subject of the first part of this writing, according to Husserl's indications in the manuscript (KI 59, p. 5a).

The manuscript begins with the conclusion of this analysis of subjectivism, a position that Husserl accuses of omitting numerous basic distinctions essential to pure logic, especially those between thought and its objective content, between objective forms and subjective acts, between concept and proposition, object and state of affairs, existence and truth. (KI 59, p. 4a) In conceiving of judgement and inference solely in terms of

¹⁸ Lotze's *Logic* belongs to the last period of his work (1869-1881), during which he began to develop a comprehensive and systematic exposition of his philosophy, which he calls his system of philosophy. His 1874 *Logic* is actually the first book of his "System of philosophy"; the second book is his *Metaphysics*, published in 1879. The third volume, which has never been published, was to contain his aesthetic, moral theories as well as his philosophy of religion. His *Logic* is divided into three parts. In the first book, entitled "Pure logic," Lotze describes systematically the formation of concepts, judgments, and inferences independently of their context of application, and especially of psychology. In the second book, "Applied logic," Lotze explains how the particular contents of our representations are subject to the ideal forms of concepts, judgments, and inferences. The third book, entitled "On Knowledge," addresses the question of how our thoughts can lay claim to an objective understanding of the objective correlates and causes of our representations, i.e., the real world. In the first chapter of this third book, Lotze discards the skeptical arguments by arguing, as Husserl does in his *Prolegomena*, that skeptical doubt presupposes a recognized truth and that skepticism is a contradictory doctrine. The second chapter, entitled "The world of ideas" (§§ 313-321), contains Lotze's well-known interpretation of Plato's Ideas, which Lotze seeks to defend against the objection of hypostasis, as well as the famous notion of *Geltung*.

mental acts of judging, subjectivism does not respect the boundary between psychology and logic. On the other hand, Husserl suggests that the normative character of logic is not a decisive argument against subjectivism and in favor of the separation between logic and psychology. In this context, Husserl criticizes Herbart for conceiving of logic as merely a normative science and for thus conflating the normative use of the laws of logic with their theoretical content. Husserl's pure logic is a theoretical science and the main argument against psychologism that he elaborates during this period is not based on normativity, but rather on the ideality and objectivity of the laws of logic, which he conceives, in this manuscript, in terms of *Geltung*. Husserl credited Lotze for having introduced the main conditions that a pure logic has to meet in his 1874 *Logic*, but, on the other hand, he criticized him for his subjectivist interpretation of logical forms (as mental or subjective movements of the thinking subject), relations, *Gedanken* (as product of judgment), inferences, etc. That is why Husserl considers that Lotze failed to draw all the logical and epistemological consequences from the objectivist position he attributes to Plato in his interpretation of Plato's Ideas.

Now, let us see what we can draw from Husserl's remarks on the chapter "The world of ideas." Let me begin with the cardinal distinction between proposition and concept, on which depend most of the distinctions mentioned above. In this chapter, Lotze criticizes Plato's conception of Ideas as isolated concepts and argues that a concept only has a meaning in the context of a complete sentence or statement, which expresses a *Gedanke* and the content of a propositional attitude. The same criticism holds for Kant's forms of thought, conceived as general concepts or categories. (Lotze 1884, p. 448) Plato's world of eternal truths must necessarily take a propositional form insofar as propositions are the smallest unit of meaning and the only bearers of truth. Husserl conceives of propositions in terms of Bolzano's propositions in themselves, as shown in this passage from his review of M. Palagyi, where they are defined as follows:

... under "proposition in itself" is to be understood what is designated in ordinary discourse—which always objectifies the Ideal—as the "sense" (*"Sinn"*) of a statement. It is that which is explained as one and the same where, for example, different persons are said to have asserted the same thing. Or, again, it is what, in science, is simply called a theorem, e.g., the theorem about the sum of the angles in a triangle, which no one would think of taking to be someone's lived experience of judging. (Husserl, 1994, p. 201)

This is actually Husserl's starting point in this manuscript, given that the objective character of propositions had been clearly established in his debate with Twardowski.

His interest for Lotze in this manuscript primarily concerns the nature of propositions (in relation to Lotze's *Geltung*), the logical conditions of the objective truth (truth in itself), the logico-psychological (or noetico-noematic) conditions of judgment, and the epistemological conditions for our knowledge of the external world in connection with Lotze's theory of knowledge.

Let us first examine the famous passage from § 316 of Lotze's *Logic*, in which he introduces the concept of *Geltung* in the context of a distinction between four forms of effectivity (*Wirklichkeit*):

For we call a thing Real (*wirklich*) which is, in contradistinction to another which is not; an event Real which occurs or has occurred, in contradistinction to that which does not occur; a relation Real which obtains, as opposed to one which does not obtain; lastly we call a proposition Really true which holds or is valid as opposed to one of which the validity is still doubtful. (Lotze, 1884, p. 439)

Validity (*Geltung*) is a primitive form of effectivity and should therefore not be confused with the three other forms of effectivity. Lotze explains that the effectivity of Platonic Ideas (or propositions) should be understood in the sense of validity, which is a logical form that holds only for the truth of a proposition, and it is therefore independent of the existence of things in the outside world and of one's mental states, which are called real in an ontological sense. (Lotze 1884, p. 448) Husserl fully agrees with Lotze's interpretation (KI 59, p. 7a), and explains in his review of M. Palagyi that the notion of *Geltung* makes it possible to understand in a non-metaphysical way Bolzano's *Sätze an sich* and the ideality of meaning, which he conceives of in the *Logical Investigations* as species of acts:

The proposition thus relates to those acts of judgment to which it belongs as their identical meaning (*Meinung*) in the same way, for example, as the species *redness* relates to individuals of "the same" red color. Now, with this view of things as a basis, *Bolzano's* theory, that propositions are objects which nonetheless have no "existence," comes to have the following quite intelligible signification: —They have the "Ideal" being (*Sein*) or validity (*Gelten*) of objects which are universals ("*allgemeiner Gegenstände*")—and, thus, that being which is established, for example, in the "existence proofs" of mathematics. But they do not have the real being of things, or of dependent, thinglike *Moments*—of temporal particulars in general. (Husserl, 1994, p. 201-202)

As for the notion of effectivity (*Wirklichkeit*), which Lotze associates not only with the truth of a proposition but also with the existence of things, it is conceived in terms of assent or affirmation (*Wirklichkeit als Bejahung*), as confirmed by the following passage quoted by Husserl in his manuscript:

This use of language is intelligible; it shows that when we call anything Real, we mean always to *affirm* (*Bejahung*) it, though in different senses according to the different forms which it assumes, but one or another of which it must necessarily assume, and of which no one is reducible to or contained in the other. (Lotze, 1884, p. 439)

In his commentary on this passage, Husserl observed that this concept of ascent is only compatible with the validity and objectivity of *Gedanken* if one understands it as a “relation” and not as an act or an operation of positing (*Operation der Setzung*) in the Kantian sense, which Lotze discards because it would amount to making a proposition (*Satz*) the product of this operation. Husserl argues that the meaning of the “relation” to reality is one and the same relation while the differences (between the forms) reside in the matter to which one assents.¹⁹

Husserl’s important remark takes on its full significance in light of his theory of judgment. Following Brentano, Husserl conceives of ascent (and of its opposite, negation) as a judgment and distinguishes the quality and the matter of an act of judgment or, to use a better-known distinction, between the noesis and the noema of an act. The term quality refers to the type of act, such as the act of judgment as opposed to a representation, a desire, an emotion, etc., while the term matter stands for the contents of an act, and in this case, for the propositional content of judgment. In his discussion of Twardowski, Husserl already distinguished, on the one hand, the quality of an act from its content and its object, and on the other hand, the sensory content (Twardowski’s depictive content or image) from the objective or logical content, which is similar, as I remarked, to Bolzano’s propositions in themselves. Specific as well to the class of judgment are their objects, which Husserl calls, after Lotze and Stumpf, states of affairs. What binds all the elements that are part of an act of judgment is intentionality, which constitutes the common structure to all acts and whose main property is aboutness or directionality (*Richtung*), i.e., the property of an act of being about something or being related to an object. This property belongs to the matter of an act insofar as its main function consists in conferring to an act its relation to an object. More precisely, the function of the propositional content of a judgment is to mediate the relation of an act to its object:

¹⁹ „Jedenfalls könnten wir dieser, Missdeutungen nicht unzugänglichen Rede unsere Zustimmung nur geben, wenn sie, dem Wortlaut entgegen, meinte, dass der *Sinn* der « Beziehung » hier wie in allen Fällen nur einer sei und dass die Unterschiede bloß in der bejahten Materie lägen. Die Bejahung als Akt liegt uns aber fern“. (KI 59, p. 8a-9a)

Das Denken denkt nur den Inhalt, d.h. es bezieht sich, auf ihn mittelst dieser oder jener Gedanken. Der Gehalt an objektiven Gedanken (z.B. an Begriffen, an Sätzen) kann wechseln, aber der Gegenstand, den sie (und mittels ihrer und in anderer Weise die Denkakte) intendieren, bleibt identisch derselbe. [...] Was das heisst, es beziehen sich Gedanken, etwa verschiedene Sätze, auf denselben Gegenstand, davon haben wir das unmittelbarste und sicherste Wissen, kein Bild kann uns das Evidente noch evidenter machen, kann das, was wir direkt sehen, verdeutlichen wollen. (KI 59, p. 11a)

It follows that, from this perspective, the effectivity of a thing that exists, or that of a valid proposition, does not vary according to one's attitude or ascent as Lotze argues, but according to the matter or content, which is always variable but whose "meaning relation" to effectivity remains the same. The invariant is the intentional relation of the act of judgment to its object, while its objective correlate, the judged state of affairs, varies as a function of its propositional content. The effectivity or existence of a judged state of affairs depends neither on ascent nor on what is taken for true, but rather on the validity of its propositional content (the state of affairs exists or is effective only when the proposition is valid).

After having established the distinction between *Sein* and *Geltung*, Lotze claims that the concept of validity has lost nothing of its "wonderful character," considering the difficulties that still remain with respect to the relationship between the being of things and that of general truths (the valid laws) that govern the relation between these things. It is in this context that Lotze speaks of an *Abgrund der Wunderbarkeit* (Lotze 1884, p. 446), to which Husserl attaches considerable interest in his commentary. For, Husserl sees in this remark an admission of failure by Lotze to satisfactorily explain the foundation (*Grund*) of the correspondence (*Übereinstimmung*) between the world of things (reality in the sense of being) and the world of thought (reality in the sense of validity). The source of this problem stems from the fact that, after having established the conditions for a pure logic in his chapter on the world of ideas, Lotze then relapsed into a form of subjectivism by creating a dependency between his *Gedanken* and the experiences of the knowing subject. This is what Husserl seeks to show in the second part of his commentary. (Husserl, 1975, p. 46) On the other hand, in so doing, Lotze creates an insurmountable gap between the field of objective realities and that of subjective thoughts, as Husserl claims in this passage:

Freilich, wer im Subjektivismus zu einer Hälfte stecken bleibt, wer einerseits Dinge, Ereignisse, Welten als an sich existierend annimmt, und auf der anderen

Seite doch alles Logische in den subjektiven Denktätigkeiten aufgehen lässt, für den öffnet sich, eben als Konsequenz der unklaren Halbheit dieser Abgrund von Wunderbarkeit : Hier die Dinge, dort unser Denken. Wie kommen beide zusammen, wie das Wunder ihrer Harmonie erklären? Und für diesen Standpunkt bleibt es ein Wunder. Aber merkt man denn nicht, dass wenn alles Logische subjektivistisch verflüchtigt wird, auch vom Sein der Dinge nichts übrig bliebe und wieder dass auch von der Harmonie zwischen Denken und Sein nichts übrig bliebe? (K I 59, p. 10a)

The answer to this last question again lies in Husserl's doctrine of intentionality, more precisely in the concept of correlation, which he uses here to demystify the *Abgrund* (strangeness) and to restore the harmony between thought and world. For, we are not dealing here with two incommensurable worlds, but rather with correlates of an intentional relation that "gehören zusammen und stimmen zusammen, wie Wahrheit und wahre Sache, das Eine so objektiv wie das andere, und beide korrelativ, also untrennbar aufeinander bezogen."²⁰ (K I 59, p. 10a)

We can see that most of the problems that Husserl attributes to Lotze's theory of knowledge in this manuscript stem from the lack of an adequate theory of intentionality, which would have allowed Lotze to combine the psychological conditions for an act of judgment with the logical conditions for objective truth into a coherent structure. It would have also enabled him to develop a theory of knowledge immune to the objection of psychologism. We shall see that, in his later writings, Husserl criticizes Lotze and Bolzano for the absence of an adequate theory of knowledge, as well as for having neglected the elucidation of the basic concepts of logic and of the fundamental relation "between signification, signification moment, and full act of signifying." (Husserl, 1994, p. 202; see *Briefwechsel* I, p. 39; 1975, p. 46) Hence the repeated criticism that Husserl addressed to Lotze's theory of knowledge, which he characterized as a hermaphrodite or a contradictory hybrid of pure and psychologistic logic.

V. Lotze and the criticism of logical psychologism in the *Prolegomena*

²⁰ Compare with what Husserl says about the mythical conception of Lotze's two worlds in the draft of a preface to the *Logical Investigations*: "Another such presupposition in Lotze is a mythological metaphysics: he distinguishes a representational world (*Vorstellungswelt*), which has merely human-subjective validity, from a metaphysical world of monads in-themselves, concerning which, under the label of metaphysics, we can venture metaphysical proposals by completely mysterious methods. Such proposals are inferior to novels, since novels have an aesthetic truth, and hence, an essential common ground with reality that is intelligible, something which is necessarily lacking in all such metaphysical fiction". (Husserl, 1975, p. 47)

The Halle period culminated in the publication in 1900-1901 of Husserl's *Hauptwerk, Logical Investigations*, whose first volume, *Prolegomena to Pure Logic*, can be considered a plea against logical psychologism. I propose to address this issue by following the thread that I have unravelled since the beginning of this study, i.e., the connection to Brentano and especially to Stumpf, who published a treatise entitled "Psychologie und Erkenntnistheorie," which focuses on psychologism, the same year that Husserl published his *Philosophy of Arithmetic*. E. Höltenstein (Hua XVIII, p. XIX) and D. Münch (2002, p. 50) rightly point out that Stumpf's position on psychologism in this paper is not foreign to Husserl's criticism of logical psychologism in his *Prolegomena*. Moreover, Münch clearly saw that this issue was also central to Stumpf's reflections in the first part of his habilitation thesis, in which he sides against J. S. Mill and Kant on the nature of mathematical axioms. The recent publication of Stumpf's habilitation thesis raises many interesting questions, which have been the subject of several recent studies, notably by W. Ewen (2008), who emphasizes Stumpf's relation to Frege and draws several parallels between the contributions of Stumpf, Husserl, and Frege to the foundation of mathematics and to the criticism of psychologism. (see W. Ewen, 2008, 97 ff.) Ewen (2008, 13, 22) claims that Stumpf's position on psychologism is closer to Frege's anti-psychologistic position than to his student Husserl's. Ewen's argument rests on Stumpf's and Frege's relationship with Lotze during their stay in Göttingen in the early 1870s. Historical testimony shows neither whether Frege attended Stumpf's lectures on Aristotle's metaphysics, which he taught for three consecutive years in Göttingen, nor whether he attended his lecture on "inductive logic with a particular focus on the problem of natural science," which he taught during the summer semester of 1873. But since Ewen does not provide a clear definition of what is meant by "psychologism" and does not clearly expose Stumpf's, Frege's, and Husserl's respective arguments against psychologism, there is no way to settle this debate. Nevertheless, we shall see that Stumpf's position on psychologism is closer to Husserl's than to Frege's.

Stumpf's 1891 article allows us to establish a new connection between Lotze's interpretation of Plato's theory of Ideas and the issues underlying logical psychologism in the *Prolegomena*. Prior to the publication of this article, one can find traces of Lotze's interpretation of Plato's Ideas in Stumpf's dissertation on Plato, published in 1869, and in

his 1870 habilitation on mathematical axioms.²¹ Indeed, one of Stumpf's central concerns in his dissertation *The Idea of the Good in Plato* is to defend Plato's theory of Ideas against the objection of hypostasis, as Lotze already had in his *Microcosmos* and then in his 1874 *Logic*. (Stumpf, 1869, II, 2, p. 46 ff.) In an article celebrating the centenary of Lotze's anniversary in the *Kant Studien*, Stumpf suggested that the discussions he had with Lotze on his interpretation of Plato's theory of Ideas were one of the motivating factors that led him to undertake his research on the nature of mathematical axioms in his habilitation thesis. (Stumpf, 1918, p. 7) And indeed, Stumpf's investigation in this work is based on the cardinal distinction, which we discussed previously, between concept and proposition; this Lotzean distinction is at the heart of his criticism of psychologism in his article "Psychology and Theory of Knowledge". Moreover, Husserl explicitly refers to Stumpf's article in his *Prolegomena* (Husserl 1982a, § 18, pp. 335), and we shall see that Husserl's *Prolegomena* (1982, pp. 40-42) adopted the same theoretical framework that we find in Stumpf's 1891 article and in his *Über die Grundsätze der Mathematik*. Husserl's debt to this student of Lotze in his *Logical Investigations* involves several central aspects of his logic and phenomenology (see R. Rollinger 1996), and it is no coincidence that this book is dedicated to Stumpf.

Husserl refers twice to Stumpf's 1891 article in his *Prolegomena*. The first reference is in a footnote to § 18, "The line of proof of the psychologistic thinkers," in which Husserl points out that he uses the term "psychologism" without any "evaluative colouring" (*abschätzende "Färbung"*), following Stumpf. This remark seems to suggest that, unlike the anti-psychologistic position defended by Kant, the neo-Kantians, and Frege, Husserl follows Stumpf in refusing to exclude the contribution of psychology to epistemological issues, as is confirmed by Husserl's definition of phenomenology as a descriptive psychology in Brentano's sense in his *Logical Investigations*. Husserl's second reference pertains to a passage in Stumpf's paper, where Stumpf (1891, 469) formulates his main argument against psychologism, i.e., that it can never lead to necessary truths. Husserl adds that even if Stumpf is mainly concerned, in this article, with the theory of knowledge and not with logic as such, this "is not an essential difference". For, as Husserl points out in his review of Palagyi, the main target of his criticism of logical

²¹ Although these two works by Stumpf were written before the publication of Lotze's greater *Logic* in 1874, one can find in Lotze's *Microcosmos*, first published in 1864, an outline of his interpretation of Plato's Ideas in terms of *Geltung*, as well as the distinction between concept and proposition. (see Lotze, 1899, Book VIII, chapter I, p. 325 ff.)

psychologism in his *Prolegomena* is also a kind of theory of knowledge.²² In this footnote, Husserl opposes Stumpf's position to that of Erdmann in his *Logic*, which he associates to an extreme form of subjectivism (Briefwechsel, III, p. 132), and to a passage from Lotze's *Logic* (Lotze, 1884, p. 467-468), which Husserl already quoted in his 1895-1897 manuscript (KI 59, p. 23a) to criticize Lotze's concessions to subjectivism. These two references to Stumpf thus suggest that Husserl's criticism of logical psychologism in his *Prolegomena* follows the path blazed by Stumpf in his 1891 treatise. In order to better understand Stumpf's critique of psychologism in 1891, I shall first say a few words on his habilitation thesis on the nature and origin of mathematical principles or axioms. His starting point is the following question: "Is there knowledge of scientific importance, which is in no way based immediately nor mediately on experience; and if there is such knowledge, what is its source?" (Stumpf, 2008, Bogen 1-1) It is divided into two parts. In the first part, Stumpf examines two antagonistic positions which prevailed at the time, namely J. S. Mill's empiricism, according to which there is no knowledge that is not acquired mediately by induction, and Kantian transcendentalism, which claims that our knowledge of general principles of mathematics is based on synthetic *a priori* judgments. Stumpf rules out both options and seeks to show, in the second part, that axioms and mathematical propositions are analytic *a priori*; they are not acquired through experience but are the result of a process of deduction from concepts. In the critical part of this work, Stumpf raises the problem of the origin of the laws and principles of logic and mathematics as follows: if, as Mill thinks, these principles are inductive in nature, then they do not constitute necessary truths; if, on the contrary, they are necessary truths, then the question arises as to whether they are synthetic *a priori* judgments as Kant claims or analytic *a priori* propositions as Stumpf maintains. Against Mill, Stumpf argues that the axioms are not the result of an empirical generalization based on an inductive process and that arithmetic, like geometry, is a deductive science based on *a priori* and necessary truths, which are justified through the evidence of internal perception. (Stumpf, 2008, Bogen 5-4) Stumpf therefore agrees with Kant that axioms are necessary truths, but he denies that they are based on synthetic *a priori* judgments. Consequently, Stumpf's fundamental

²² "My work shows that my struggle against Psychologism is in no way a struggle against the psychological grounding of Logic as methodology, nor against the descriptive-psychological illumination of the origin (*Ursprung*) of the logical concepts. Rather, it is only a struggle against an epistemological position, though certainly one which has had a very harmful influence upon the way in which logic is done". (Husserl, 1994, p. 199)

argument against empiricism and transcendental criticism rests on the cardinal distinction between concept and proposition, and this distinction is of major philosophical significance in Stumpf's subsequent work on the theory of knowledge.

In his habilitation thesis, Stumpf is more concerned with delimiting the field of logic and mathematics from that of psychology. In this regard, Stumpf clearly distinguishes the question of the origin of concepts, which is a psychological question, from the questions that pertain to logico-mathematical domain, to which propositions and axioms belong. For, as Stumpf argues in his posthumous work *Erkenntnislehre*, one can agree with empiricism on the psychological origin of concepts while admitting all the same that there is *a priori* knowledge that is independent of experience. (Stumpf, 1939-1940, p. 126) Stumpf admits that the basic concepts of arithmetic (the concept of number) and geometry (the concept of space) have their origin in experience. In his *Raumbuch*, published three years after his habilitation thesis, Stumpf provides a demonstration of the thesis that the concept of space has a psychological origin. However, the position one takes on this issue is distinct from that which one adopts regarding the nature of propositions and necessary truths in the logico-mathematical domain. For, in this domain, one is solely concerned with axioms and propositions that can be deductively inferred, and one also assumes the origin of the axioms and their justification as necessary truths. Stumpf argued in 1870 that these axioms are analytic *a priori* propositions and that arithmetic and geometry are deductive sciences.

Now, Stumpf's starting point in his paper "Psychology and theory of knowledge" is the distinction between research on the origin of concepts, which is a task specific to psychology, and a theory of knowledge that is limited to the search for, and the justification of, "the most general and immediately evident truths" (Stumpf, 1891, p. 501), such as laws and axioms that are necessary for knowledge. Stumpf's description of the debate on psychologism is based on this distinction. He opposes two schools of thought on the question of the relationship between the theory of knowledge and psychology: Kantianism²³ which dissociates the theory of knowledge from psychology, and psychologism, which Stumpf defines in this paper as "the reduction of all

²³ The Kantian position that serves as a starting point in Stumpf's paper "Psychology and Theory of Knowledge" is that of the neo-Kantian W. Windelband, another student of Lotze, who already used the term "psychologism" in 1877 in a pejorative sense to denounce those who, like Fries and Beneke, advocated a psychological interpretation of his doctrine. (W. Windelband, 1877, 224 f.) Windelband uses the term "psychologism" several times in this text, particularly in relation to the psychological interpretation of Kant's doctrine of transcendental deduction. (W. Windelband, 1877, p. 248, 259)

philosophical investigation, and especially all epistemological investigations, to psychology". (Stumpf, 1891, p. 468) The argument in favour of psychologism boils down to the idea that "knowledge is itself a mental process and accordingly the study of its conditions would be a psychological investigation". (Stumpf, 1891, p. 468) On the other hand, the opponents of psychologism argue that psychological investigations can never lead to "knowledge of general and necessary truths". (Stumpf, 1891, 469) Now, since the conditions of possibility for knowledge, i.e., the forms of intuition and thought, are themselves *a priori* and therefore not analyzable (Stumpf, 1891, p. 493), psychology is therefore useless for Kant's followers.

The position advocated by Stumpf in this debate consists in conceding to Kantianism that necessary truths are irreducible to facts, while admitting, as do the psychologists, that psychology is essential to the theory of knowledge. Hence the main mistake he imputes to Kantianism: to refuse the assistance of psychological research in the theory of knowledge. (Stumpf, 1891, p. 493, 500) The field of psychology is understood here in a sense that is broad enough to include sensory phenomena and mental functions because, in 1891, Stumpf did not explicitly distinguish the field of phenomenology from that of descriptive psychology. His main criticism of Kant thus focuses on the dichotomy between form and matter, and it is primarily the Kantian doctrine of phenomena (the manifold of intuition) that he holds responsible for its most obvious "mistakes". In his 1891 article, Stumpf reiterates the main criticism raised against Kant in his *Raumbuch*, i.e., against his doctrine of space as a subjective form and his conception of sensations as amorphous and unstructured matter designed to support the synthetic and unifying activity of the understanding. (Stumpf, 1873, p. 15 f.) However, this criticism does not make Stumpf an advocate of psychologism. For, Stumpf acknowledges that we must maintain a strict concept of necessity and thus oppose the reduction of the principles and laws of logic and of science in general to mere empirical generalizations. Stumpf explicitly refers to J. S. Mill and maintains that the laws of nature and the principles of logic, such as the principle of non-contradiction, cannot be merely acquired by induction and are as such irreducible to a process of empirical generalization or "an accumulation of observations". (Stumpf, 1891, p. 499-500)

Now, Husserl's starting point in his criticism of logical psychologism in his *Prolegomena* is very similar to Stumpf's in his habilitation thesis, namely the opposition between J. S. Mill (Husserl, 1982, p. 40) and Kant (Husserl, 1982, p. 41-42) on the relation between

logic and psychology. In the controversy over logical psychologism, this opposition is expressed concretely as normative antipsychologism, which Husserl attributes to the Kantian tradition and sometimes to Frege,²⁴ and logical psychologism, to which are associated the names of J. S. Mill, W. Wundt, A. Bain, and T. Lipps, for example. Following Husserl's diagnosis, this controversy stems from the fact that both sides conceive of logic in two different ways: the psychologistic party only considers logic from the point of view of its method, i.e., as a technology dependent on psychology, while antipsychologistic sympathizers only consider it from the point of view of its theoretical content, and therefore as a theoretical discipline entirely independent from psychology. To this difference between two conceptions of logic corresponds two different conceptions of the laws of logic: as these laws "*serve as norms* for our knowledge-activities, and laws which include normativity in their thought-content, and *assert* its universal obligatoriness". (Husserl, 1982, p. 101) This distinction corresponds concretely to that of logic understood as a normative and practical discipline (as a *Kunstlehre* of knowledge) and of logic understood as a theoretical and ideal discipline. According to Husserl, the confusion underlying the psychologism-antipsychologism debate can be explained by the fact that the first party, when it claims to base logic on psychology, only considers the practical-normative aspect of logic, while the arguments of the opposing party rely on logic understood as a theoretical discipline. Thus, if one only considers the practical aspect of logic, the claims of psychologism to partially base logic on psychology are legitimate. However, Husserl criticizes the antipsychologistic partisans who conceive of logic strictly in normative terms, and thus ignore the essential difference between the proper content of logical propositions and their practical application (Husserl, 1982, p. 102), i.e., between the use of a proposition for normative means and its theoretical content, which is in principle separable from the idea of normativity. To acknowledge the validity of this distinction is to acknowledge that the one and only probative argument against logical psychologism does not rest on the opposition between the normative character of logical laws and the natural laws of

²⁴ Opinions diverge as to whether Frege would share ranks with the Kantians or with the phenomenologists. Some argue that Frege's antipsychologistic arguments are based on normativity and it is precisely on this point that he differs from the Husserl's position. Others, such as M. Dummett for example, dispute this interpretation of Frege's logic as a normative science. According to Dummett, there are no significant differences between the positions of Husserl and Frege on that issue: "a characterization of logic as a normative science is quite superficial, for logic is best regarded as the theoretical science underlying the relevant normative principles; the important question is the proper characterization of the subject-matter of this theoretical but non prescriptive science". (M. Dummett, 1991, p. 225)

psychology, but rather on the ideal character of the logical laws, which, as we have seen, is understood by Husserl in terms of *Geltung*.

Kantians are thus right to emphasize the theoretical content of logic and to argue, against logical psychologism, that the propositions of logic are independent of the “properties of human nature in general”. But they are wrong to conceive of this propositional content and logic in general in terms of normativity. Husserl uses two arguments against normative antipsychologism. First, normativity is not a decisive argument against psychologism because “every normative and likewise every practical discipline rests on one or more theoretical disciplines, inasmuch as its rules must have a theoretical content separable from the notion of normativity (of the ‘shall’ or ‘should’), whose scientific investigation is the duty of these theoretical disciplines”. (Husserl, 1982, p. 33) Thus, the principles of logic are not normative propositions, for any normative proposition presupposes a certain type of evaluation that refers to non-normative propositions and disciplines. Second, logic, understood as a normative discipline, in turn requires a psychological basis. Husserl is not saying that psychology provides its essential foundation, but he nevertheless concedes to psychologism that “psychology *helps* in the foundation of logic”. (Husserl, 1982, p. 45) Husserl's arguments against logical psychologism thus differ from Frege's in his *Grundgesetze*, whose critique of psychologism rests on the normative character of logic. Frege argues that the main error of psychologism is to confuse the normative character of the laws of logic—what ought to be—with the use of these laws to describe “what is”. Finally, unlike Lotze, Husserl, and Stumpf, Frege's antipsychologism amounts to entirely dismissing the field of mental phenomena, thereby creating an unbridgeable gap between this field of investigation and that of logic and philosophy as a whole.

VI. Conclusion

Despite the many changes that marked the development of his phenomenology after his arrival in Göttingen in 1901, Husserl never renounced his Platonism and always recognized his debt to Lotze, as evidenced by a letter to P. Welch in 1933:

Welche Rolle mein „Platonismus“, mein energisches Eintreten für eine universale Ontologie, also für die Erarbeitung von Wesenseinsichten (für das echte Apriori) in allen Erkenntnisphären, in meiner Entwicklung hatte und welche neue Bedeutung er in der gereiften transzendentalen Phänomenologie gewinnt, darüber wird Sie am Besten meine „Formale und transzendente Logik“ (insbesondere ihr II. Teil) aufklären, obschon darin nur die „formale Ontologie“ in

Frage ist. Dank schulde ich für diesen „Platonismus“ dem bekannten Kapitel in Lotze's Logik, wie sehr seine Erkenntnistheorie und Metaphysik mich stets abstieß. (*Briefwechsel* VI, p. 460-461; see Husserl, 1969, p. 83, 146, 264)

We also know that Husserl's interest in Lotze's theory of knowledge retained all its power, as shown by several lectures that he gave in 1912 in Göttingen (“Lotzes Erkenntnistheorie im Anschluss an das Buch der Logik 3. Lotzes”) and in 1922 in Freiburg. (see K. Schuhmann, *Hua* III / 1, p. xxxiii) However, Husserl's remarks on Lotze after the publication of his *Logical Investigations* show the same ambivalence toward the philosophy of Lotze as the 1895-1897 manuscript. For, while acknowledging his debt to Lotze's logic and theory of knowledge, Husserl criticizes him in the same breath for his subjectivism and for his failure to overcome psychologism. Husserl believes that Lotze did not see all the philosophical implications of his own interpretation of Plato's theory of Ideas in his logic and was not able to draw all the right consequences for his theory of knowledge. Rather, as Husserl explains in the sketch of a preface to the *Logical Investigations*, after having established Plato's theory of Ideas in all its purity, Lotze relapsed into a form of psychologism, namely anthropologism, by asserting a dependence of his *Gedanken* on the thinking subject. Hence the criticism that Husserl repeatedly addressed to Lotze's theory of knowledge, namely of being “a product of the incompleteness that balks at ultimate consistency”. (Husserl, 1980, p. 50)

In his writings after the publication of the *Logical Investigations*, Husserl confirms the diagnosis of his 1895-1897 manuscript by attributing part of the failure of Lotze's theory of knowledge to the absence of a theory of intentionality, as shown by his remarks on Lotze's descriptive psychology and phenomenology. Husserl acknowledges that the starting point of his “ontological” research in the field of consciousness was Lotze's idea that “the realm of sense-data, of color- and sound-data [are understood] as a field of ideal, and thus ‘ontological’ cognitions”. (Husserl, 1975, p. 43; 1977, p. 28) However, he deplores the fact that Lotze's phenomenology “reduces itself to the reference to a few *a priori* relations in the sphere of sensuous contents”. (Husserl, 1980, p. 50) This amounts to saying that Lotze's phenomenology, like Stumpf's (*Hua* III / 1, § 86; D. Fisette, 2005c), in the final analysis, only accounts for what Husserl called “primary relations” in his *Philosophy of Arithmetic*, i.e., the class of relations that have the character of primary contents and that have a “special phenomenal character”. But Lotze's theory does not account for intentional relations belonging to the class of mental phenomena. That is

why, despite of all his merits, Lotze never succeeded in elaborating a genuine phenomenology:

Finally, that there could be such a thing as an eidetic doctrine of consciousness at all, and further an eidetic doctrine of the relations of consciousness and noema of consciousness, a constitution of objectivities, etc., of that he never had a notion and therefore had no notion of what we here call phenomenology. (Husserl, 1980, p. 50)

This passage sums up Husserl's main criticism of Lotze, namely that he has not succeeded in reconciling the subjective and objective aspects of lived experience, i.e., the ideal noematic content, with the noetic aspect of the subject's experience. Therefore, Lotze lacked a theory of intentionality, which represents the heart of Husserl's phenomenology.

RÉFÉRENCES

- Bell, D. 1999, "The Revolution of Moore and Russell: A Very British Coup?" in A. O'Hear (ed.), *German Philosophy since Kant*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 137-66.
- Beyer, C. (1996) *Von Bolzano zu Husserl*, Dordrecht : Kluwer.
- Brentano, F. (2008) *Sämtliche veröffentlichte Schriften*, vol. 1, *Schriften zur Psychologie, Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkte*, M. Antonelli (ed.), Frankfurt a. M. : Ontos.
- (1995) *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, trans. A. C. Rancurello, D. B. Terrell, and L. McAlister, London: Routledge.
 - (1989) *Briefe an Carl Stumpf 1867-1917*, G. Oberkofler (ed.), Graz : Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt.
- Dathe, U. (2000) *Der „Geist“ Freges in Jena – Paul Ferdinand Linke. Ein Beitrag zur Jenaer Universitätsgeschichte*, in G. Gabriel & U. Dathe (eds.) *Gottlob Frege. Werk und Wirkung*. Mentis, Paderborn p. 227-244.
- Dastur, F. (1994) „Husserl, Lotze et la logique de la validité », *Kairos*, no. 5, 1994, p. 31-48.
- Devaux, P. (1932) *Lotze et son influence sur la philosophie anglo-saxonne*. Bruxelles : Maurice Lamertin.
- Dewalque, A. (2012a) « Idée et signification. Le legs de Lotze et les ambiguïtés du platonisme », C. Bernard & B. Leclercq (dir.), *La subjectivation de la notion d'Idée*, Louvain, Peeters, p. 187-213.
- (2012b) « Le sens de l'idéalisme platonicien selon Lotze », in S. Delcomminette & A. Mazzu (dir.) *L'Idée platonicienne dans la philosophie contemporaine*, Paris, Vrin, p. 71-95.
- Dummett, M. (1993) *Origins of Analytical Philosophy*, London: Duckworth.
- (1991) *Frege and other Philosophers*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ewen, W. (2008) *Carl Stumpf und Gottlob Frege*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Fisette, D. (2015a) "Reception and Actuality of Carl Stumpf's Philosophy", in D. Fisette and R. Martinelli (eds.) *Philosophy from an Empirical Standpoint. Carl Stumpf as a philosopher*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, p. 11-53.
- (2015b) "Introduction to Stumpf's Lectures on Metaphysics", *Philosophy from an Empirical Standpoint. Carl Stumpf as a Philosopher*, D. Fisette and R. Martinelli (eds.) Amsterdam, Rodopi, 2014, p. 433-442.

- (2005c) “A Phenomenology without Phenomena? Stumpf’s Criticism of Husserl’s Ideas I”, in D. Fisette and R. Martinelli (eds.) *Philosophy from an Empirical Standpoint. Carl Stumpf as a philosopher*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, p. 319-356.
 - (2015d) “Bibliography of Carl Stumpf’s Publications / Bibliographie der Schriften von Carl Stumpf”, *Philosophy from an Empirical Standpoint. Carl Stumpf as a Philosopher*, D. Fisette and R. Martinelli (eds.) Amsterdam, Rodopi, p. 531-543.
 - (2015e) « La théorie des signes locaux de Hermann Lotze et la controverse empirisme-nativisme au XIXe siècle », in F. Boccaccini (dir.), *Lotze et son héritage. Son influence et son impact sur la philosophie du XXème siècle*, Frankfurt a. M., Peter Lang, p. 41-67.
 - (2010) “Descriptive Psychology and Natural Sciences. Husserl’s early Criticism of Brentano », in C. Ierna et al. (dir.), *Edmund Husserl 150 Years: Philosophy, Phenomenology, Sciences*, Berlin, Springer, p. 135-167.
 - (2009) “Husserl à Halle (1886-1901)”, *Philosophiques*, Vol. 36, no. 2, 277-306.
 - (2004) “Logical Analysis versus Phenomenological Descriptions”, Richard Feist (ed.) *Husserl and the Sciences*, Ottawa, University of Ottawa Press, p. 69-98.
 - (2003) « Représentations. Husserl critique de Twardowski », in D. Fisette et al. (dir.) *Aux origines de la phénoménologie. Husserl et le contexte des Recherches logiques*, Paris/Québec, Vrin/Presses de l’université Laval, p. 61-92.
- Fisette, D. & R. Martinelli (eds.) (2015) *Philosophy from an Empirical Standpoint. Carl Stumpf as a Philosopher*, Amsterdam : Rodopi.
- Fisette, D. & G. Fréchette (eds) (2013) *Themes from Brentano*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Frege, G. (1976) *Wissenschaftlicher Briefwechsel*, Hamburg: Meiner.
- (1894) ‘Rezension von: E. Husserl, *Philosophie der Arithmetik I*, in *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, vol. 103, p. 313–332.
 - (1893) *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik, begriffsschriftlich abgeleitet*, vol. I, Jena: H. Pohle.
 - (1884) *Die Grundlagen der Arithmetik: Eine logisch mathematische Untersuchung über den Begriff der Zahl*, Breslau: Koebner.
- Gabriel, G. (2013) « Frege and the German background to analytic philosophy », in M. Beaney (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Analytic Philosophy*, p. 280-297.
- (2002) Frege, Lotze, and the Continental Roots of Early Analytic Philosophy, in E.H. Reck (ed.) *From Frege to Wittgenstein. Perspectives on Early Analytic Philosophy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 39–51.
 - (1989) „Objektivität : Logik und Erkenntnistheorie bei Lotze und Frege“, in H. Lotze, *Logik. Ditttes Buch. Vom Erkennen*, Hamburg : Meiner, p. IX-XXXVI.
 - (1986) “Frege als Neukantianer”, *Kant-Studien*, vol. 77, p. 84-101.
- Gerlach, H. & H. Sepp (eds.) (1994) *Husserl in Halle*, Bern, Peter Lang.
- Hauser, K. (2003) “Husserl and Lotze”, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. 85, no. 2, p. 152-178.
- Husserl, E. (Hua III/1), (Hua III) *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie*, Husserliana Bd. III/1, 2nd ed., K. Schuhmann (ed.), Berlin: Springer, 1976.
- (Hua XXI) *Studien zur Arithmetik und Geometrie. Texte aus dem Nachlaß (1886-1901)*, Husserliana Bd. XXI, I. Strohmeyer (ed.), Berlin : Springer, 1983.
 - (Hua XXXIII) *Natur und Geist. Vorlesungen Sommersemester 1927*, Husserlian Bd. XXXIII, M. Weiler (ed.), Dordrecht : Kluwer, 2001.
 - (Briefwechsel) *Briefwechsel*, 10 vols, K. Schuhmann (eds.) Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994.
 - (2015) “A Letter from Edmund Husserl to Franz Brentano from 29 XII 1889”, C. Ierna (ed.), *Husserl Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 1, p. 65-72.
 - (2003) *Philosophy of Arithmetic*, transl. D. Willard, Collected Works X, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- (2001a) „Husserls Manuskripte zu seinem Göttinger Doppelvortrag von 1901“, K. Schuhmann (ed.), *Husserl Studies*, vol. 17, p. 87-123.
 - (2001b) *Logik. Vorlesung 1896*, Husserliana, Materialien, Bd. 1, E. Schuhmann (ed.), Dordrecht : Kluwer.
 - (1997) *Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology and the Confrontation with Heidegger (1927-1931)*, transl. T. Sheehan and E. Palmer, Collected Works VI, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
 - (1994) *Early Writings in the Philosophy of Logic and Mathematic*, trans. D. Willard, Berlin : Springer.
 - (1990-1991) „Ursprüngliche Druckfassung der Abhandlung ‚Intentionale Gegenstände‘ von Husserl“, in Karl Schuhmann, « Husserls Abhandlung „intentionale Gegenstände“. Edition der ursprünglichen Druckfassung, *Brentano Studien*, Vol. III, p. 142-176.
 - (1982a) *Logical Investigations*, vol. 1, transl. J. N. Findlay, 2nd ed., London: Routledge.
 - (1982b) *Logical Investigations*, vol. 2, 2nd ed., London: Routledge.
 - (1980) *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*, trans. T. Klein and W. Pohl, Collected Works, vol. 3, The Hague: Nijhoff.
 - (1977) *Phenomenological Psychology. Lectures, Summer Semester 1925*, J. Scanlon (ed.), The Hague, M. Nijhoff.
 - (1976) „Reminiscences of Franz Brentano“, trans. L. McAlister, in L. McAlister (ed.) *The Philosophy of Franz Brentano*, London: Duckworth, p. 47-55.
 - (1975) *Introduction to the Logical Investigations. A Draft of a Preface to the Logical Investigations*, trans. P. Bossert & C. Peters, The Hague : M. Nijhoff.
 - (1969) *Formal and Transcendental Logic*, trans. D. Cairn, The Hague: Nijhoff.
 - (K I 59) „Mikrokosmos“, 1895-1897, Husserl Archive, Leuven.
- Husserl, M. (1988) „Skizze eines Lenbenbildes von E. Husserl“, K. Schuhmann (ed.), *Husserl Studies*, vol. 5, p. 105-125.
- Kraushaar, O. F. (1939) „Lotze as a Factor in the Development of James’s Radical Empiricism and Pluralism“, *Philosophical Review*, vol. 48, p. 455-471.
- (1936) „Lotze’s influence on the psychology of William James“, *Psychological Review*, vol. XLIII, p. 235-257.
- Kreiser, L. (2001) *Gottlob Frege : Leben, Werk, Zeit*, Hamburg : Meiner.
- Linke, P. F. (1946-1947) « Gottlob Frege als Philosoph », *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung*, Vol. 1, p. 75-99.
- (1926) „The Present Status of Logic and Epistemology in Germany“, *The Monist*, Vol. 36, p. 222-255.
 - (1924) „Die Existentialtheorie der Wahrheit und der Psychologismus der Geltungslogik“, *Kant-Studien*, Vol. 29, p. 395-415.
- Lotze, H. (2003) *Briefe und Dokumente*, R. Pester (ed.), Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- (1899) *Microcosmus: An Essay Concerning Man and His Relation to the World* (1856-58, 1858-64), ; 4th ed., trans. E. Hamilton and E. C. Jones, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
 - (1887) *Metaphysics, in three books: Ontology, Cosmology, and Psychology* (1879), ed. and trans. B. Bosanquet, 2nd ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 - (1884) *Logic, in three books: of Thought, of Investigation, and of Knowledge*, ed. and trans. B. Bosanquet, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 - (1852) *Medicinische Psychologie oder Physiologie der Seele*, Leipzig.
- Marty, A. (1884) „Über subjektlose Sätze und das Verhältnis der Grammatik zur Logik und Psychologie“, *Vierteljahrschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie*, vol. 8, p. 161-192.
- Maier, B. (2009) *William Robertson Smith. His Life, his Work and his Times*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Merz, J. (1938) *History of European Thought in the XIXth Century*, 4 vols, London: Allen & Unwin.

- Misch, G. (1912) „Einleitung“, in H. Lotze, *System der Philosophie. Erster Teil: Drei Bücher der Logik*, Leipzig : Meiner, p. IX-XCI.
- Münch, D. (2002-2003) „Erkenntnistheorie und Psychologie. Die wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung Carl Stumpfs“, *Brentano Studien*, vol. 10, p. 11-66.
- Orth, E. W. (1997) „Metaphysische Implikationen der Intentionalität. Trendelenburg, Lotze, Brentano“, *Brentano Studien*, Vol. VII, p. 15-30.
- (1995) „Brentanos und Diltheys Konzeption einer beschreibenden Psychologie in ihrer Beziehung auf Lotze“, *Brentano Studien*, Vol. VI, p. 13-29.
- Palagyi, M. (1902) *Der Streit der Psychologen und Formalisten in der modernen Logik*, Leipzig: W. Engelmann.
- Peckhaus, V. (1994) „Benno Kerry. Beiträge zu seiner Biographie“, *History and Philosophy of Logic*, Vol. 15, p. 1-8.
- Pester, R. (1997) *Hermann Lotze. Wege seines Denkens und Forschens. Ein Kapitel deutscher Philosophie- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte im 19. Jahrhundert*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Rollinger, R. (1999) *Husserl's Position in the School of Brentano*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Schaar, M. van der (2013) *G. F. Stout and the Psychological Origins of Analytic Philosophy*, Hampshire : Palgrave.
- (1996) “From Analytic Psychology to Analytic Philosophy; the Reception of Twardowski's Ideas in Cambridge”, *Axiomathes*, Vol. 7, No. 3, p. 295-324.
- Schlotter, S. (2006) “Frege’s Anonymous Opponent in ‘Die Verneinung’”, *History and Philosophy of Logic*, vol. 27, p. 43 – 58.
- Schuhmann, K. (1977) *Husserl-Chronik: Denk- und Lebensweg Edmund Husserls*. Den Haag: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Sluga, H. (1984) “Frege: The Early Years”, in R. Rorty & Q. Skinner, (eds.), *Philosophy in History*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 329-356.
- (1980) *Gottlob Frege*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Smith, D. W. (2013) “The Role of phenomenology in analytic philosophy”, in M. Beaney (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Analytic Philosophy*, Oxford : Oxford University Press, p. 1495-1527.
- Stout, G. F. (1896) *Analytic Psychology*, Vols. I and II, London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Stumpf, C. (2015) *Metaphysik. Vorlesung*, R. Rollinger (ed.), in D. Fisette & R. Martinelli (eds), Amsterdam, Rodopi, p. 443-472.
- (2008) *Über die Grundsätze der Mathematik*, W. Ewen, (ed.), Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2008.
 - (1999a): Syllabus for Psychology. English tr. of “Vorlesungen über Psychologie, 1886-1887” by R. Rollinger, in R. Rollinger, *Husserl's Position in the School of Brentano*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, p. 285-309.
 - (1999b): Syllabus for Logic. English tr. of C. Stumpf “Vorlesungen über Logik, 1886-1887” by R. Rollinger, in R. Rollinger, *Husserl's Position in the School of Brentano*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 311-337.
 - (1976) „Reminiscences of Franz Brentano“, trans. L. McAlister, in L. McAlister (ed.) *The Philosophy of Franz Brentano*, London: Duckworth, 1976, p. 10-46.
 - (1939-1940) *Erkenntnislehre*, vol. I-II, Leipzig: Barth.
 - (1930) “Carl Stumpf”, transl. C. Murchison, in C. Murchison (ed.) *History of Psychology in Autobiography*, Vol. 1, Worcester : Clark University Press, p. 389-441.
 - (1927) *William James nach seinen Briefen*, *Kant Studien*, Vol. 32, No. 2-3, p. 205-241.
 - (1917) “Zum Gedächtnis Lotzes”, *Kant-Studien*, vol. 22, 1-26.
 - (1895) “Antrittsrede”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin: Reimer, 735-738.
 - (1893) „Zum Begriff der Lokalzeichen“, *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane*, Vol. 4, p. 70-73.

- (1891) “Psychologie und Erkenntnistheorie”, *Abhandlungen der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 19, zweite Abt., München: Franz, 465-516.
 - (1883) *Tonpsychologie*, vol. I. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
 - (1873) *Über den psychologischen Ursprung der Raumvorstellung*, Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
 - (1869) *Verhältnis des platonischen Gottes zur Idee des Guten*, Halle: C.E.M. Pfeffer.
- Sully, J. (1891) “Review of *Tonpsychologie* [vol. II] by Carl Stumpf,” *Mind*, Vol. 16, No. 62, p. 274–280.
- (1886) “Review of ‘Musikpsychologie in England’ by C. Stumpf”, *Mind*, Vol. 11, No. 44, p. 580–585.
 - (1884) “Review of *Tonpsychologie* [vol. I] by Carl Stumpf”, *Mind*, Vol. 9, No. 36, p. 593–602.
 - (1878) “The Question of Visual Perception in Germany”, *Mind*, Vol. 3, p. 167–195.
- Twardowski, K. (1894) *Zur Lehre vom Inhalt und Gegenstand der Vorstellungen: Eine psychologische Untersuchung*, Wien : Hölder.
- Ward, J. (1918) *Psychological Principles*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1886) “Psychology”, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th ed., Vol. 20, Edinburgh: Black, p. 37–85.
- Windelband, W. (1877) „Über die verschiedenen Phasen der Kantischen Lehre vom Ding-an-sich“, *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie*, Vol. 1, p. 224-266.

* Thanks to M. Ramstead for his stylistic remarks on an earlier version of this paper and N. de Warren from the Husserl Archives in Leuven for the permission to use and quote the manuscript “Mikrokosmos” (K I 59). An earlier and shorter version of this paper has been published in Spanish under the title: “Hermann Lotze y la génesis de la filosofía temprana de Husserl”, *Apeiron, Estudios de filosofía*, vol. 3, 2015, p. 13-35.