

Bergman and Brentano

Guillaume Fréchette

1. Biography

Shmuel Hugo Bergmanⁱ was born in Prague to a modest family. He started school in 1889 at the *Deutsche Volks- und Bürgerschule*, where he first met Franz Kafka (1883–1924). Together with Kafka and art historian Oskar Pollak (1883–1915), aesthetician and Brentano student Emil Utitz (1883–1956), and Paul Kisch (1883–1944), brother of Egon Erwin Kisch and editor of the *Neue Freie Presse*, Bergman entered the *Altstädter Gymnasium* in Prague in 1893, from which he received his diploma in 1901.

Together with Kafka and Pollak, Bergman enrolled at the German University in Prague, where he studied chemistry in his first university year, changing to philosophy in 1902, under the influence of Marty's lectures on descriptive psychology (1901/02) and selected metaphysical questions (1902).ⁱⁱ A year later, he joined the *Cercle du Louvre*, a circle of Prague intellectuals meeting at the Café Louvre, which was influenced by Brentanian philosophy and to which Marty's students belonged – Oskar Kraus, Emil Arleth, Emil Utitz, Max Brod, Benno Urbach, Josef Adolf Bondy, Josef Eisenmeier, and Franz Kafka, but also Christian von Ehrenfels.ⁱⁱⁱ A few years later, under the supervision of Marty, Bergman wrote his PhD dissertation on atomic theory in the 19th Century (Bergman 1905). Between 1905 and 1911, he paid at least five visits to Brentano in Schönbühel and Florence.^{iv} As a Jew, Zionist, and follower of Brentano, Bergman's options for an academic career were practically nonexistent. Of all the Jewish students and 'grand-students' of Brentano, only Husserl, Kraus, and Utitz – who all converted to Protestantism very early in their career – were able to pursue an academic career in philosophy in Germany or Austria. As he had done for Husserl, but with less success, Brentano repeatedly tried to convince Bergman to abandon the Jewish faith, seeing in his Zionism an "exaggerated feeling of Israelite belongingness",^v and his faith as a "tough

devotion to a legacy from barbaric times”.^{vi} Stumpf accused Bergman of showing two contradictory faces, as a Zionist and German philosopher (Bergman 1985: 49),^{vii} which made it impossible for Bergman, in his view, to habilitate in Berlin. Marty saw Zionism as Bergman’s mortal sin.^{viii} He didn’t actually see Bergman’s Jewish faith as an obstacle to his habilitation in Prague, but couldn’t promote him “insofar as it would endanger Kraus’ future – and with it the future of the School”.^{ix} Without this opportunity, Bergman was forced to take up a career as assistant librarian at the University Library in Prague,^x but continued to publish extensively in philosophy and engaged in an intense philosophical correspondence with Brentano.^{xi}

In 1920, Bergman emigrated to Palestine and settled in Jerusalem, where he was appointed the first director of the Jewish National and University Library. Bergman began lecturing at the newly founded National Hebrew University in 1928, just after the creation of the Faculty of Humanities, and was appointed Professor of Philosophy in 1935. On 11 November 1935, he was elected the first rector of the Hebrew University. He retired from the university in 1955.

To some extent, it might be helpful to divide Bergman’s philosophical development into a Brentanian and a Post-Brentanian phase.^{xii} This shouldn’t, however, be taken to mean that Bergman’s later philosophy is completely free of Brentanian influence, since many of the works of the late Bergman engage with Bolzano and the School of Brentano. In the first period (1902–1913), which covers the years between his studies and his repeated attempts to habilitate in Germany and Austria, Bergman endorsed, developed, and discussed many of Brentano’s philosophical positions: his philosophy of history (Bergman 1905), his theory of inner perception (Bergman 1908), his conception of intentionality (Bergman 1909), and the rejection of *irrealia* (Bergman 1908; 1910).

The second period (1913–1975) is characterized primarily by Bergman’s dominant interest in the history and philosophy of science, already obvious in Bergman (1905) but more critically developed around 1912–13, and which remained constant until the end of his life. More decisively, however, Bergman’s growing sympathies for Kantian philosophy and his rejection of empiricism in the philosophy of mathematics in Bergman 1913 mark the change between the Brentanian and Post-Brentanian phases.^{xiii} Although he continued to engage with issues in Brentanian philosophy during this

second period, he also became interested in advances in philosophical and mathematical logic (Bergman 1950), in logical positivism, and in the works of Carnap (Bergman 1948) and Quine, like some other students of Brentano in the 1930s in Prague and later on in Innsbruck.^{xiv}

Bergman's career as a professor of philosophy in Jerusalem after 1935, and more generally his works on Judaism, Kantian philosophy, idealism, and his pioneering role in the development of logic and epistemology soon after the birth of the State of Israel, would each need a treatment of their own.^{xv} They will be dealt with here only to the extent that they are directly relevant to Bergman's position in the Brentano School. However, a larger picture of Bergman's achievements as a philosopher might be helpful. As a Prague Jew at the turn of the 20th century, as a philosopher formed at the School of Brentano, who also fought in World War I as an Austrian citizen in the Imperial and Royal Army,^{xvi} Bergman's world-view was aptly described by his friend Brod as that of 'Generation nevertheless' (*Generation des Trotzdem*):

It is incorrect ... to characterize the generation that received its decisive impulses in the sufferings of the First World War a "lost generation", as happened in England and America. On the contrary, this generation, which has been sorely tried, is a courageous generation, with a strong propensity in attempting to let the Good become reality: I would like to call it a "Generation of 'nevertheless'". ... Ehrenfels' *Cosmogony* was a document of this generation, which for the first time embodied a mood of impending doom, tough without vanishing into fear. (1960: 340)

... it was a generation of unafraid humanists. (1960: 371)^{xvii}

As a "particularly impressive representative" of this generation (Brod 1960: 371), Bergman was convinced from early on, even in his early articles on Zionism (Bergman 1903; 1903a; 1904; 1904a), of the necessity of a binational solution in Palestine, which would bring equal good to both nations, much along the lines of the Habsburger multinational state. In his years as a student of Brentano, he was also convinced by the intrinsic value of all acts of thought – the idea that every act of thought is something good in itself (see Brentano 1889: 22–3/1969: 12; also CHAP. 24) –, a conviction stemming from Brentanian practical philosophy that didn't fade in his later years, despite his growing affinity for Kant (see for instance Bergman 1938, 1966). Years later, and in a similar way, in proclaiming the need for a courageous philosophy (Bergman 1960), Bergman showed himself to be part of this 'Generation nevertheless',

characteristic of many important figures from the Prague branch of the School of Brentano.

2. Philosophy

2.1. Ontology and Logic

In Bergman (1909), the first monograph devoted exclusively to the philosophy of Bolzano, Bergman discusses the main theses of Bolzano's ontology and logic. His standpoint is largely Brentanian: Bolzano's realist thesis that there are propositions (*Sätze an sich*) (and notions (*Vorstellungen an sich*)) in themselves, independently of their being thought of, is interpreted by Bergman in terms of the mental contents of actual or possible judgers (Bergman 1909: 14f.), thereby rejecting propositions as *entia rationis* in a Brentanian fashion (See Brentano 1930: 139/1966b: 122). His reading of Bolzano also makes use of a distinction inspired by Marty: in his discussion of Bolzano's claim that there are objectless notions, Bergman insists on a distinction between having an object and being directed toward an object – a distinction that Bolzano only sketches *en passant* in the *Wissenschaftslehre* –, seeing in it a forerunner of Marty's distinction between real and possible correlation (Bergman 1909: 35).^{xviii} According to Bergman, Bolzano's claim that there are objectless notions – like the notion of a golden mountain – simply means that there is no real correlation between the notion and the object, but only an ideal correlation: there *would* be a correlation *if* there were a golden mountain. This idea is at the basis of Marty's correspondence account of truth, which presupposes the acceptance of *irrealia*, namely of the states of affairs that are the truth-makers of true propositions, e.g. the non-existence of a golden mountain.^{xix}

Bergman never pursued this early attempt to reconcile Brentano's reism with Marty's realism towards subsisting states of affairs – as an interpretation of Bolzano – and it remained as such unsuccessful.^{xx} Many years later, he developed a different account of the opposition between Brentano and Marty. In a lecture presented at Harvard's Philosophy Club in 1937, Bergman clarified his position, attributing to Marty's judgment-contents just the same Platonic properties as Bolzano's propositions in themselves, and isolating Brentano's account of truth in terms of self-evidence from

Marty's and Bolzano's.^{xxi} At this point, however, Bergman was dissatisfied with both the Brentanian and the Martian theories:

The proposition P is true when it is possible that somebody will evidently judge ["P is true"]. But what is the meaning of the words ["It is possible that somebody will evidently judge"]? The existence of the possibility is only the existence of the proposition in itself, and this proposition can [only] be explained in the way [that the] truth of P was explained. ["It is possible that..."] means ["It is possible that somebody will evidently judge: 'It is possible that...'"]. (Bergman 1937: 12)

Here, Bergman obviously agrees with Husserl's account of possibilities as ideal objects (in the *Logical Investigations*). If the truth of P is to be explained by "the possible being of what is real, [it] must obviously suffer shipwreck on the fact that possibilities themselves are ideal objects" (Husserl 1901: 115/2001: 243). In Bergman's account of the late Brentano's analysis of the concept of truth for non-evident propositions, this shipwreck is the infinite regress of the truth of non-evident propositions. It stops only when one actually states an evident proposition, which brings Brentano's account of truth too close to subjectivism, according to Bergman. As for Marty, Bergman affirms that his account of objective judgment-contents as truth-makers has the inconvenient consequence, mentioned earlier, of accepting entities like *the non-existence of A* as the truth-maker of the true proposition "A is not", i.e. of explaining the truth of a proposition by the existence of non-existence. More problematically, it is unable to account for the truth of first-person propositions such as "I exist", whose truth involves the actual thinking of the utterer of the proposition.

In his later works on logic, Bergman developed a strong interest for the logic of Solomon Maimon,^{xxii} and more particularly for his principle of determinability. According to Maimon, the standard for synthetic a priori judgments is a relation between a determinable (the subject) and a determinate (the predicate). Subject-concepts and predicate-concepts belong together organically and are essentially ordered in series of degrees of determinateness: for example, space-figure-triangle, or color-yellow. In logical or a priori truths, a subject-concept is determined by the predicate-concept which belongs to the same series, and not to another. This explains why judgements like "a triangle is yellow" are not logical judgments in Maimon's view. Following the principle of determinability, the determinable may be determined in different ways (the concept of figure may be determined by the concept of triangle,

rectangle, etc.) and may be thought independently of the determinate, while the determinate can only be thought with its determinable. Maimon's principle of determinability, which Bergman also connects with Marty's critique of Meinong's Theory of Objects and with Brentano's mereological principle (Bergman 1967: 120), plays also an important role in Bergman 1932/1967 and in Bergman 1953, the first work on logic to appear in Hebrew in modern times,^{xxiii} where the contributions to symbolic logic by Maimon, Bolzano, and Brentano are developed in detail.^{xxiv}

Bergman comes back to Brentano's existential theory of judgment (see CHAP. 10) in Bergman 1950, where he argues against the conception of existence defended for instance in Frege's logic, where existence is considered a second-order property, using Brentano's reduction of predicative judgments to existential judgments as a reference point: "the connection of the concept of existence with a predicate and the corresponding statement function is certainly right in many cases, but it doesn't exhaust the essence of the concept of existence" (Bergman 1950: 33). Existence in mathematical logic is a property of classes of individuals, while existence in the usual, or Brentanian, sense of acknowledgement, is the acknowledgement of what the presentation the acknowledgement is based on presents. He therefore argues for a *logical* distinction between being and existence, but refuses to see an *ontological* distinction:

[F]rom the standpoint of logic, it suffices to distinguish between the concept of being and the concept of existence ... and to hold the view that a judgment of being is not a predicative judgment and that being is not a property nor dependent upon a property. However, the question of which objects to attribute being or reality in the strict sense is not a question of logic. [Logic] has only to establish a framework for all sciences, including ontology. (Bergman 1950: 35)

This attempt to coordinate Brentanian and Fregean logic into a general logic understood as a framework for all sciences was received very critically however, and it is indeed not clear what kind of ontology would be at play here.^{xxv} Here again, as in some of his later reviews of Brentano's editions (see Bergman 1936; 1952; 1965), Bergman remains doubtful about the late Brentano's reistic enterprise (see CHAP. 15), as championed by his epigones Kastil, Kraus, and Mayer-Hillebrand. According to him, it is not at all clear where to draw the line between the late Brentano (or its reconstruction by the epigones) and Nominalism (Bergman 1966: 366). In Bergman's view, Brentano defended an ontological conception of truth before his reistic phase, and this conception, which is developed further in Marty 1908, should be given priority. Bergman's reading

of Brentano's theory of judgment (Bergman 1950) also gives an interesting perspective on the Prague school of Brentano: in his view, Brentano was misled in his interpretation of "A is" as the acknowledgement of A. Rather, he should have said that it was the acceptance of a state of affairs (1950: 25).

2.2. *Philosophy of Mind*

Bergman's early views on philosophy of mind can be found in Bergman 1908, where he attempts to defend the Brentanian view that inner perception should be understood in terms of elementary simple judgment, in "the simple acceptance of the intuited object" (1908: 6). In this work, Bergman advocates the view that in inner perception, act and object are *identical*, although conceptually distinct (see for instance pp. 12 and 83, but also elsewhere).^{xxvi} He also defends the Brentanian view that inner perception is simultaneous with the acts perceived through it. For this reason, he argues against Ehrenfels and Meinong that there can't be a perception of temporally extended objects.

Bergman (1908: 56ff.) also follows Brentano and Marty (against Husserl) in their conception of improper presentations. In his view, intending (*meinen*) a content that isn't intuitively present (like thinking of a chiliagon) is always based on an intuitive presentation of something else (e.g. a presentation of the square instantiated by the surface of a table) and on a presentation of the relation (e.g. the relation of having 250 times more sides than the square). Strictly speaking, there is no perception of improperly presented objects: "authentic perception is always a simple judgment (*eingliedriges Urteil*), an intuitive, simple act. It doesn't have anything to do with naming (*Benennung*), interpreting, or classifying" (Bergman 1908: 58). Bergman therefore rejects Husserl's account, according to which there is a change in the mode of consciousness depending on whether you perceive something or intend it in a particular way; and also rejects Meinong's conception of *Meinen* as the act through which one grasps objects (Bergman 1910).

2.3. *Metaphysics, Epistemology, and Philosophy of Science*

Bergman's philosophical dissertation (Bergman 1905) is concerned with atomic theory in physics and was written under the supervision of Marty, with Alois Höfler as a second

evaluator. In his thesis, Bergman applies Brentano's theory of the four phases of philosophy to the atomic theory of the 19th century, with John Dalton's theory of atoms representing the first and ascendant phase, while Ostwald's natural philosophy and Mach's theory of elements, rejecting atoms as fictions, represent the phase of utmost decline.^{xxvii}

Albert Einstein's stay in Prague in 1911/12 made an impression on the young Bergman, who was able to further develop his interest in the history and philosophy of science and in the theory of relativity thanks to his participation in Einstein's seminar and numerous discussions (Bergman 1974a). Many years later, Einstein prefaced Bergman's book on the theory of relativity (Bergman 1929/1974), which is dedicated to Marty.

Interestingly, in this book Bergman rejects Brentanian epistemology and the idea that the law of causality could be proven thanks to the probability calculus, an idea which he was keen to defend in Bergman 1906. In his later view, published in his 1929 with a foreword by Einstein, the theory of relativity showed that causality could not be proven and was a mere hypothesis, pointing to a new path in the philosophy of science (see also Bergman 1944). In this sense, Bergman clearly positioned himself against Kraus' attacks on the theory of relativity as a mistake in "taking fictions for reality" and "introducing a metaphysics which overshadows in paradoxes everything that has been done in philosophy until today" (Kraus 1919: 152).^{xxviii} Discussing the accounts of causality proposed by Einstein, Weyl, Schlick, Reichenbach, Planck, and other philosophers of science, Bergman argues for an understanding of the law of causality based on the practical necessity of the hypothesis of causality, seeing in it – as did his fellow Brentano-student Benno Kerry many years before him – an "earthly creation of our thought which we should mould daily as we use it" (Bergman 1929: 73/1974: 458 and Kerry [Kohn] 1881: 127). This change of view follows from Bergman's observation that the development of the theory of relativity and quantum mechanics showed the failure of empiricism and positivism, i.e. of the views that we read off the physical laws from our experience.

2.4. Philosophy of Mathematics

Bergman's early works on the philosophy of mathematics were conducted in a Brentanian spirit. In Bergman 1909a and 1910a, he offers a defence of the Brentanian thesis of the analyticity of mathematics against the Kantian conception of mathematical propositions as synthetic a priori. In Bergman 1913 however, his position undergoes significant changes: he describes mathematics as "freed from any existential considerations whatsoever in the empirical sense" (Bergman 1913: 1), as "moving purely in the domain of the a priori" (ibid.: 2). Mathematics "doesn't need something real to be counted in the exposition of its theorems" (ibid.: 5). In this work, he follows Cantor and Bolzano in acknowledging the existence of infinite sets, classes, and pluralities (1913: 19). In Bergman's view, a number (in the sense of quantity: *Anzahl*) answers the question "how many?" (Bergman 1913: 13, 19) and is countable, while infinite sets are by definition not countable. Following this distinction, Bergman refuses to identify the cardinality (of infinite sets) with the concept of counting (*Anzahlbegriff*).

The views on numbers and sets advocated in Bergman 1913 were totally unacceptable for Brentano: the rejection of empiricism, the distinction between mathematics and the sciences of realities, and the criticism of Gutberlet's (and Brentano's) position against the actual infinite in Cantor were clear signs, in Brentano's view, that Bergman no longer belonged to the school (see Bergman 1946: 138f.).

2.5. History of Philosophy

While in his early years, thanks to the influence of his teacher Marty, Bergman was a truly orthodox defender of Brentano's philosophy, this orthodoxy was more questionable in his later years. Concerning the history of philosophy, this becomes clear in Bergman 1965, where he calls Brentano's four-phase law of development of the history of philosophy into question:

[T]his law seems to me now ... neither important nor right. It seems to me that this alleged law had devastating consequences for Brentano's School. The thinkers of the alleged periods of decline ... remained for his disciples a closed book. (Bergman 1965: 95)

Bergman also published extensively on the history of philosophy. His four volumes on the History of Philosophy from Cusanus to Post-Kantian philosophy (Bergman 1970; 1973; 1977; 1979) are probably the best example of his erudition and are still the main

reference in Israel in this field. The last volume contains a detailed overview of Brentano's thought (Bergman 1979: 145–71).

3. Epilogue

Bergman taught at the University of Jerusalem from 1928 to 1955 and continued to lecture there many years after his retirement. He held lectures and seminars on the most varied topics, ranging from Cusanus to Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Maimon, Brentano, Husserl, Heidegger, Carnap, Reichenbach, Wittgenstein, and Quine, among others. Among the many students he introduced to and guided in philosophy was Beno Rothenberg, who would later become an important figure in Israeli archaeology, and who in 1937 wrote an M.A. thesis comparing Brentano's logic with modern mathematical logic, which he expanded into a PhD dissertation written in Hebrew in 1940. Both works were written under the supervision of Bergman.^{xxix} The same year, Edward Poznanski – not a student of Bergman but a close collaborator – from the Lwow-Warsaw school, settled down in Jerusalem, where he lectured in philosophy and took part in the lecture and research groups supervised by Bergman. These groups were also attended by another student of Bergman's, Yehoshua Bar-Hillel, best known for his work in formal linguistics and set theory and his later collaborations with Carnap and Chomsky. Bar-Hillel was introduced by Bergman to the works of Bolzano, Husserl, Carnap, and Reichenbach and defended his PhD thesis in 1949,^{xxx} one year after Nathan Rotenstreich, best known for his works on Jewish philosophy and German idealism, who was a close student of Bergman's. Among Bergman's students, it is worth mentioning Jacob Fleischmann, well known for his work in German philosophy, and philosopher of science Joseph Agassi. Finally, it is worth mentioning that Bergman also had Arab students, among them Wasfi Ahmad Hijab (1919–2004), who later pursued his studies in Cambridge under the supervision of Wittgenstein.^{xxxi}

After the Nazi book burnings of Spring 1933, the journal *Cahiers juifs* invited many Jewish intellectuals to reflect on the contribution of German Jews to German culture, including, among others, Siegfried Kracauer (published anonymously), Joseph Roth, and Hugo Bergman. After going into detail on the contribution from Mendelssohn to Husserl, with an important section on the School of Brentano and Husserl's phenomenology,

Bergman makes it clear that it would be mistaken to speak of a German–Jewish philosophy, and by extension, one may add, of a Jewish branch of the school of Brentano:

Let us admit frankly that the philosophy of the scholars mentioned above is not a Jewish philosophy, neither by its language, nor by its sources or by the audience to which it is addressed. ... While we were bringing here so many brilliant gifts, our own spiritual existence remained poor, narrow, and anaemic. The great problem of the fifty years to come is to know whether we are able to make room for great philosophical talents in our lives. (Bergman 1933: 187)

Sadly enough, Bergman's own philosophy, both in his Brentanian and Post-Brentanian phases, has been largely ignored, as much by Brentanians as by historians of Jewish philosophy.^{xxxii} We should certainly make room for this great philosophical talent.^{xxxiii}

References

- Angermann, A (ed.) (2015), *Theodor W. Adorno, Gershom Scholem. Briefwechsel 1939-1969*, Frankfurt, Suhrkamp.
- Bar-Hillel, Y. (1950), "Bolzano's Definition of Analytic Propositions", in *Theoria*, 16, p. 91-117.
- Bar-Hillel, Y. (1952), "Bolzano's Propositional Logic", in *Archiv für mathematische Logik und Grundlagenforschung*, 1, p. 65-98.
- Bar-Hillel, Y. (1954), "Bergmann Shmuel Hugo. M'vo l'torat ha-higayon (Introduction to logic)." Bialik Institute, Jerusalem 1953, xviii + 466 pp." *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 19, no. 2, p. 149.
- Bar-Hillel, Y. (1955), "מבוא לתורת ההיגיון: השגות על הספר 'מבוא לתורת ההיגיון' לפרופסור ש.ה. ברגמן" [Some objections to 'An Introduction to Logic' by S.H. Bergman], *Iyyun*, vol. 5, p. 25-37.
- Bar-Hillel, Y. (1957), "Husserl's Conception of a Purely Logical Grammar", in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 17, p. 362-369.
- Bergman, S.H. (1903), "Jüdische Schulfragen", *Revue der israelitischen Kultusgemeinden in Böhmen*, Oktober 1903, S. 3ff.
- Bergman, S.H. (1903a), *Die Judenfrage und ihre Lösungsversuche*, Prague.
- Bergman, S.H. (1904), "Über die Bedeutung des Hebräischen für die jüdischen Studenten", in *Unsere Hoffnung*, 1 (1904), 85-88.
- Bergman, S.H. (1904a), "Einiges über das jüdische ("Jargon")", in *Unsere Hoffnung*, 1, 1904, 292-296.

- Bergman, S.H. (1905), *Die Atomtheorie im 19. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag für die Problemgeschichte der Philosophie*. [unpublished dissertation, Prague, Charles University]
- Bergman, S.H. (1906), "Das philosophische Bedürfnis in der modernen Physik", in *Philosophische Wochenschrift und Literaturzeitung*, Bd. 1, Nr. 11, pp. 332-338.
- Bergman, S.H. (1908), *Untersuchungen zum Problem der Evidenz der inneren Wahrnehmung*, Halle, Niemeyer.
- Bergman, S.H. (1909), *Das philosophische Werk Bernard Bolzanos: mit Benützung ungedruckter Quellen kritisch untersucht; nebst einem Anhang: Bolzanos Beiträge zur philosophischen Grundlegung der Mathematik*, Halle, Niemeyer.
- Bergman, S.H. (1909a), "Über den analytischen Charakter des Existenztheorems in der reinen Mathematik", in *Annalen der Naturphilosophie*, vol. 8, p. 495-502.
- Bergman, S.H. (1910), "Review of Über Annahme (Alexius Meinong)", in *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, bol. 143, p. 111-117.
- Bergman, S.H. (1910a), "Zur Frage des Nachweises synthetischer Urteile a priori in der Mathematik", in *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, vol. 14, no. 2, p. 254-273.
- Bergman, S.H. (1911) „Alfred Brunswig: Das Vergleichen und die Relationserkenntnis– Deutsche Literaturzeitung, nr. 45, col. 2844-6
- Bergman, S.H. (1913), *Das Unendliche und die Zahl*, Halle, Niemeyer.
- Bergman, S.H. (1927), *Ha-Pilosofyah Shel Immanuel Kant [The Philosophy of Immanuel Kant]*, Jerusalem, Magnes Press.
- Bergman, S.H. (1929), *Der Kampf um das Kausalgesetz in der jüngsten Physik*, Braunschweig, Vieweg & Sohn. English translation in Bergman (1974)
- Bergman, S.H. (1931), "Salomon Maimons Philosophie der Mathematik", in *Isis*, vol. 16, no. 2, p. 220-232.
- Bergman, S.H. (1933), "De Kant à Husserl", in *Cahiers Juifs*, vol. 2, no. 5/6, p. 180-187.
- Bergman, S.H. (1936), "Book reviews of *Wahrheit und Evidenz, Vom Ursprung sittlicher Erkenntnis, Kategorienlehre* (Franz Brentano)", in *Scripta Mathematica*, vol. 4 no. 2, p. 161-165.
- Bergman, S.H. (1938), "Maimons logischer Kalkül", in *Philosophia*, vol. 3, p. 252-265.
- Bergman, S.H. (1944), "Brentano's Theory of Induction", in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 5, no 2, p. 281-292.
- Bergman, S.H. and F. Brentano (1946), "Briefe Franz Brentanos and Hugo Bergmann", *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 7 no. 1, ppp. 83-158.

- Bergman, S.H. (1948), „Physicalism“, in *The Philosophical Quarterly (Calcutta, Indian Institute of Philosophy)*, July 1948, vol. XXI, no. 2, p. 57-81.
- Bergman, S.H. (1950), „Probleme des Existenzbegriffes“, in *Theoria*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 21-35.
- Bergman, S.H. (1952), „Review of *Die Philosophie Franz Brentanos* (Alfred Kastil)“, in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 13 no. 2, p. 267-268.
- Bergman, S.H. (1953), *M'vo l'torat ha-higayon [Introduction to Logic]*, Jerusalem, Bialik Institute, 1953.
- Bergman, S.H. (1953a), „Philosophy and Religion“, in *Actes du onzième congrès international de philosophie, Bruxelles, 20-26 août 1953. Vol. 11: Philosophie de la religion*, Amsterdam, North-Holland Publishing Company, p. 11-17.
- Bergman, S.H. (1955), „Metaphysical Implications of Husserl's Phenomenology“, in *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, vol.2, p. 220-230.
- Bergman, S.H. (1960), „The Need of a Courageous Philosophy“, in *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, vol. 6, p. 104-119.
- Bergman, S.H. (1964), „Schelling on the Source of Eternal Truth“, in *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, vol 2 no. 2, p. 17-28.
- Bergman, S.H. (1965), „Brentano on the History of Greek Philosophy“, in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 26, no. 1, p. 94-99.
- Bergman, S.H. (1966), „Franz Brentano“, in *Revue internationale de philosophie*, vol. 20, no. 78 (4), p. 349-372.
- Bergman, S.H. (1967)[1932], *The Philosophy of Solomon Maimon*, translated from the Hebrew by Noah J. Jacobs, Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1967.
- Bergman, S.H. (1972/1940), *Mavo le-torat ha-hakarah [Introduction to the theory of knowledge]*, Jerusalem, Magnes Press.
- Bergman, S.H. (1970), *Toldot ha-filosofyah ha-hadashah : me-Nikolaus Kuzanus 'ad tekufat ha-haškalah [A History of Philosophy : from Nicolaus Cusanus to the Age of the Enlightenment]*, Jerusalem, Bialik, 1970.
- Bergman, S.H. (1972), „Erinnerungen an Franz Kafka“, *Universitas (Stuttgart)*, vol. 27, p. 739-750.
- Bergman, S.H. (1973), *Toldot ha-filosofyah ha-hadashah: mi-tekufat ha-haškalah 'ad 'Imanu'el Kant*, [A History of philosophy: from the age of Enlightenment to Immanuel Kant] Jerusalem, Bialik.
- Bergman, S.H. (1974), „The Controversy Concerning the Law of Causality in Contemporary Physics“, in R. Cohen and M. Wartofsky (eds.), *Logical and Epistemological Studies in Contemporary Physics*, Reidel, Dordrecht, p. 395-462. [Engl. Transl. of Bergman (1929)]

- Bergman, S.H. (1974a), "Personal Remembrances of Albert Einstein", in R. Cohen and M. Wartofsky (eds.), *Logical and Epistemological Studies in Contemporary Physics*, Reidel, Dordrecht, p. 388–394.
- Bergman, S.H. (1977), *Toldot ha-filosofyah ha-hadashah: Ya 'akobi, Fikhte, Sheling* [A History of Philosophy: Jakobi, Fichte, Schelling], Jerusalem, Bialik.
- Bergman, S.H. (1979), *Toldot ha-filosofyah ha-hadashah: Shithoth ba-filosofyah shele 'akhar Kant* [A History of Philosophy : Systems of Post-Kantian Philosophy], Jerusalem, Bialik. (Chapters on Reinhold, Maimon, Herbart, Bolzano, Schopenhauer, E. van Hartmann, Brentano, Hermann Cohen and Edmund Husserl)
- Bergman, S.H. (1985), *Tagebücher und Briefe I. 1901-1948*, ed. by M. Sambursky, Athenäum, Königstein.
- Bolzano, B. (1837), *Wissenschaftslehre*, 4 vols, Sulzbach, Seidel'sche Buchhandlung. Complete English translation in Bolzano (2014).
- Bolzano, B. (2014), *Theory of Science*, 4 vols, translated by Paul Rusnock and Rolf George, Oxford, Oxford University Press. (translation of Bolzano (1837)).
- Brentano, F (1921), *Vom Ursprung sittlicher Erkenntnis*, Leipzig, Meiner. English translation in Brentano (1969)
- Brentano, F. (1969), *On the Origins of Our Knowledge of Right and Wrong*, London, Routledge (engl translation of Brentano 1921 by E. Schneewind).
- Brentano, F. (1930), *Wahrheit und Evidenz*, Leipzig, Felix Meiner.
- Brentano, F. (1966b), *The True and the Evident*. Trans. R.M. Chisholm, I. Politzer, & K.R. Fischer. London, Routledge.
- Brod, M. (1960), *Streitbares Leben. Autobiographie*, Munich, Kindler.
- Ehrenfels, C. (1916), *Kosmogonie*, Jena, Dietrichs. English translation in Ehrenfels (1948).
- Ehrenfels, C. (1948), *Cosmogony*, translation by Mildred Focht, New York, The Comet Press.
- Frank, D.H. and O. Leaman (1997) (eds.), *History of Jewish Philosophy*, London, Routledge.
- Fréchette, G. (2010), *Gegenstandslose Vorstellungen. Bolzano und seine Kritiker*, St-Augustin, Academia Verlag.
- Gimpl, G. (2001), *Weil der Boden selbst hier brennt. Aus dem Prager Salon der Berta Fanta (1865-1918)*, Prague, Vitalis.
- Husserl, E. (1901), *Logische Untersuchungen. Zweiter Band. Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis. I. Teil*, Halle, Max Niemeyer.
- Husserl, E. (2001), *Logical Investigations Volume 1*, engl. transl. by J.N. Findlay, London, Routledge.

- Johnston, W. (1972), *The Austrian Mind*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Kerry [b. Kohn], B. (1881), *Untersuchungen über das Causalproblem auf dem Boden einer Kritik der einschlägigen Lehren J. St. Mills*, Vienna, Carl Gerold's son.
- Kowalewski, G. (1950) *Bestand und Wandel. Meine Lebenserinnerungen. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur neueren Geschichte der Mathematik*, Munich, Oldenburg.
- Kluback, William (1992), *Courageous Universality. The Work of Schmuel Hugo Bergman*, Atlanta, Scholars Press.
- Kavka, M., Z. Braiterman, and D. Novak (2012) (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Jewish Philosophy. The Modern Era*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kraus, O. (1919), "Über die Deutung der Relativitätstheorie Einsteins", in *Lotos*, 67, p. 146-152.
- Maimon, S. (1794), *Versuch einer neuen Logik oder Theorie des Denkens*, Berlin, Ernst Felisch.
- Marty, A. (1908), *Untersuchungen zur allgemeinen Grammatik und Sprachphilosophie*, Halle, Niemeyer.
- Melzer, Y. (ed.) (1975), *Shmuel Hugo Bergman*, Special Issue of *Iyyun. A Hebrew Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 26, no. 4.
- Meyer, S. (1903), "Die Vorgeschichte der Gründung und das erste Jahrzehnt des Institutes für Radiumforschung", in *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Klasse*, 159, pp.1-26. Partial Engl. trans. in Meyer (1992).
- Meyer, S. (1992), "Mach looks through a spinthariscopes", in J. Blackmore (ed), *Ernst Mach – A Deeper Look*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, p. 151-152.
- Neesen, Peter (1972), *Vom Louvrezirkel zum Prozess. Franz Kafka und die Psychologie Franz Brentanos*, Göttingen, Alfred Kümmerle.
- Reichenbach, H. (1921) "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Relativitätsdiskussion", in *Lotos*, 10, p. 316-378. English translation in Reichenbach (1978).
- Reichenbach, H. (1978), "The Present State of the Discussion on Relativity", transl. M. Reichenbach, in H. Reichenbach, *Selected Writings, 1909-1953, Vol. II*, Dordrecht, Reidel, 1978, p. 3-48.
- Rotenstreich, N. (1985), "Between Construction and Evidence", in Zvi Bar-on, A. (ed.) (1985), p. 3-14.
- Rothenberg, B. (1962), *Studien zur Logik Franz Brentanos*, PhD Dissertation, University of Frankfurt.
- Reuveni, A. (1993), "Berta Fanta zu ihrem 75. Todestag", *Das Goethanum: Wochenschrift für Anthroposophie*, vol. 50, p. 515-517.
- Sambursky, M. (1981), "Zionist und Philosoph. Das Habilitierungsproblem des jungen Hugo Bergmann", *Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts*, vol. 58, p. 17-39.

- Shohetman, B. and S. Shunami (1968), *The Writings of Hugo Bergman. A Bibliography. 1903-1967*, Jerusalem, The Magnes Press.
- Stallo, J.B. (1901), *Die Begriffe und Theorien der modernen Physik*, German transl. from the 3rd English edition by Hans Kleinpeter, with a foreword by E. Mach, Leipzig, Barth.
- Utitz, E. (1954), "Erinnerungen an Franz Brentano", *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther Universität Halle-Wittenberg*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 73-90.
- Zvie Bar-on, A. (ed.) (1985), *On Shmuel Hugo Bergman's Philosophy*, Special Issue of *Grazer Philosophische Studien*, vol. 24.
- Zvie Bar-on, A. (1985a), "From Prague to Jerusalem", in Zvie Bar-on, A. (ed.) (1985), p. 29-46.

Archive materials

- Bergman, S.H. (1937) "What is Truth?", lecture presented in Harvard, 1937. Archives of the National and University Library of Jerusalem, ARC. 4* 1502 03 70b.
- Rothenberg, B. (1937), Work without title [Bez označení titulu – práce z odborné logiky. Strojopis, 74 s.], Archiv akademie věd České Republiky Praha, Osobní fond Oskara Krause, IIIa-Č-15-17. [Authorship attributed by the author of this paper, *GF*]
- Letter from Brentano to Marty, October 3, 1911. Archives of the Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge (MA).
- Letter from Marty to Brentano, January 12th, 1912. Archives of the Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge (MA).
- Letter from Marty to Brentano, April 8th, 1912. Archives of the Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge (MA).
- Letter from Marvin Farber to Hugo Bergman, August 27th, 1941. Archives of the National and University Library of Jerusalem, ARC. 4* 1502 01 858.
- Letter from Georg Katkov to Hugo Bergman, February 17th, 1938. Archives of the National and University Library of Jerusalem, ARC. 4* 1502 01 1415.
- Letter from Wasfi Hamad Hijab to Hugo Bergman, January 26th, 1947. Archives of the National and University Library of Jerusalem, ARC. 4* 1502 01 1421.

ⁱ After his settlement in Jerusalem in the early 1920s, Bergman changed the presentation of his name in publications from Hugo Bergmann to Shmuel Hugo Bergman. For the sake of unity, the latter spelling is preserved here for all publications, both pre- and post 1920s.

ⁱⁱ A reference to these lectures and to the impression that the school of Brentano left on Kafka are given in Bergman (1972).

ⁱⁱⁱ On the Café Louvre and these Brentanians, see Neesen 1972, Utitz 1954, Brod 1960 this volume, CHAP. 36.

^{iv} These meetings are described in Bergman 1985. See also Sambursky 1981.

^v From a letter from Brentano to Marty, dated October 3, 1911.

^{vi} Letter from Brentano to Bergman from December 23, 1911 reproduced in Bergman 1985: 42. In the same letter, Brentano makes it clear that only a conversion would give him access to a university career: “you are certainly gaining more and more the knowledge of how important it would be if an obstacle of completely external nature [=Bergman’s confession, *GF*], which threatens your university career, could be eliminated”. Here as in all other places, all translations from German and French into English are my own.

^{vii} In a letter from Marty to Brentano, dated January 12th, 1911, Marty reports from a discussion with Stumpf that “he [Stumpf] ... would give his approval to Bergmann’s habilitation if he weren’t a Jew, since they are so richly blessed with this race in Berlin”. Quoted in Gimpl 2001: 366.

^{viii} See in particular Marty’s letter to Brentano from January 9, 1912, also quoted in Gimpl 2001: 330f.

^{ix} Letter from Marty to Brentano, April 8, 1912, also quoted in Gimpl 2001: 332. Marty retired in 1913, a year before his death. Kraus took over Marty’s chair in 1916.

^x During these years, Bergman was also very active in the Jewish intellectual circle led by his mother-in-law Berta Fanta (1866–1918), who also attended Marty’s lectures. See Gimpl 2001 and Reuveni 1993. As Bergman recalls in Bergman 1974, Albert Einstein also took part in these meetings during his Prague years in 1911/12. According to another member of the circle, mathematician Gerhard Kowalewski (Kowalewski 1950: 249ff), Ehrenfels, and Philipp Frank attended regularly.

^{xi} See Bergman 1946 for a selection of these letters. According to Marvin Farber, editor of *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* at the time when Bergman published these letters, Brentano’s son John Brentano, following the advice of Kraus, insisted on ‘omitting’ certain letters. Bergman agreed, since eight letters from Brentano to Bergman are still preserved in the Bergman Archives in Jerusalem, which are not published in Bergman 1946. See Bergman, ARC 1502-01-858, which also contains Farber’s letter to Bergman from August 27, 1941.

^{xii} Slightly different characterizations have been proposed by Rotenstreich (1985), who sees the line falling between the Prague School period and his later interest in the natural sciences, and by Zvie Bar-On (1985a), who sees the settlement in Jerusalem in 1920 as the intersection between the early and the late Bergman.

^{xiii} More on this in the next section. Bergman sent a copy of Bergman (1913) to Brentano in the Autumn of 1913. From that point on, Brentano stopped addressing Bergman in his letters as ‘Dear Friend’, but switched to ‘Esteemed Herr Doktor’. The tone of the correspondence between Brentano and Bergman changed drastically after this event and ceased shortly after. See Bergman (1946). On Bergman’s sympathies with idealism and transcendental phenomenology, see for instance Bergman 1927; 1955; 1964; 1967.

^{xiv} This was not only the case for Oskar Kraus, but also for Georg Katkov, Walter Del-Negro, Ernst Foradori, and many other ‘grand-students’ of Brentano and Meinong in Graz and Innsbruck (see CHAP. 39).

^{xv} On Bergman’s general contribution to philosophy, see the collections published in Zvi Bar-On 1985 and in the special issue of *Iyyun* (Melzer 1975). For a study of Bergman’s Judaism in English, see Kluback 1992.

An exhaustive bibliography of the works of Bergman published before 1967 has been published in Shohetman and Shunami 1968.

^{xvi} Bergman fought as a lieutenant and later on as a captain until the end of the war.

^{xvii} According to Johnston (1972: 306), Bergman held similar views on Ehrenfels 1916/1948.

^{xviii} For the relevant passages from Bolzano's *Wissenschaftslehre*, see Bolzano (1837/2014), I:316/I:228. For a discussion of Bergman's interpretation, see Fréchette 2010: 124ff.

^{xix} Like other irrealia (e.g. values, relations, collectives), the existence of Marty's states of affairs (*Urteilsinhalte*, 'judgment-contents') stands and falls with the existence of the objects (the realia) on which they are based. They are however ontologically independent of the act of judging. See Marty 1908: 294, and CHAP. 30.

^{xx} Bergman admitted later that his Brentanian interpretation of Bolzano in Bergman 1909 didn't fully do justice to the work of the Bohemian philosopher (according to his private correspondence with Edgar Morscher).

^{xxi} "[W]e must consider Bolzano and Lotze as its [Marty's theory] fathers, although the pedigree of this theory is much older and its foundation is Plato's theory of ideas" (Bergman 1937: 5).

^{xxii} See also Bergman 1931; 1938; 1967[1932]. Bergman (1938) proposes the first reconstruction of the symbolism of Maimon's logical calculus, as exposed in Maimon 1794.

^{xxiii} See Bar-Hillel (1954: 149). For a more critical view of Bergman 1953, see Bar-Hillel 1955.

^{xxiv} In Bergman 1953, he still defends the Brentanian view that logic concerns the laws of thought. On Maimon's principle of determinability, see also Bergman 1931; 1938.

^{xxv} The ideas of Bergman 1950 are developed further in Bergman 1953. Bar-Hillel (1955) is a very incisive critic of the latter work, although, according to Poznanski, it was the result of tremendous pressure put on him to attenuate its hostility (private communication from Joseph Agassi).

^{xxvi} The same idea is repeated in Bergman 1910: 112, where he endorses Marty's account of the reference to non-existence objects in terms of a possible correlation between consciousness and its objects.

^{xxvii} The dissertation also deals with the opposition between Boltzmann and Mach on the reality of atoms. Bergman relied to an important extent on the expositions of Stallo (1901), a friend of Mach and Brentano in Florence. The topic was of central interest at that time, especially since Elster and Geitel's experiments on Crooke's spintharoscope from 1903 was taken by some to be an empirical proof of the existence of atoms. Following the report of an assistant of Boltzmann, Stefan Meyer, even Mach accepted the proof after looking at the spintharoscope: "Now I believe in the existence of atoms" On Mach and Elster and Geitel's experiment, see the report in Meyer 1950/1992.

^{xxviii} Reichenbach (1921/1979) provides a systematic dismantling of the arguments of Kraus 1919.

^{xxix} According to a letter from the secretary of the Brentano Society, Georg Katkov, to Bergman from February 17, 1938, Rothenberg sent a version of his M.A. thesis written in German to Oskar Kraus, most likely hoping to get it published by the Brentano Society. Katkov judged the work to be insufficiently informed about Brentano's logic. See Bergman, ARC 4*1501-1415. The copy sent by Rothenberg (Rothenberg 1937) is still in Kraus' archives in Prague. In his later years, Rothenberg validated a German version of this PhD dissertation in his hometown of Frankfurt, probably the only work on Brentano or on mathematical logic supervised jointly by Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer. See Rothenberg 1962. On Adorno's and Horkheimer's appreciation of Rothenberg and his dissertation, see Adorno (2015:204ff).

^{xxx} See also his articles on Bolzano and analyticity (Bar-Hillel 1950; 1952) and on Husserl's purely logical grammar (1957).

^{xxx}ⁱ Hijab was secretary at the meeting of the Moral Sciences Club when the poker affair between Wittgenstein and Popper occurred. He left Cambridge in 1948 and later became Professor of Mathematics at the American University of Beirut. He reported to Bergman on his stay in Cambridge in a letter from January 26th, 1947.

^{xxx}ⁱⁱ For example, the name of Bergman is not mentioned once in the nearly 1000 pages on the history of Jewish philosophy by Frank and Leaman (1997). Kavka, Braiterman, and Novak 2012, focusing only on Jewish philosophy from the modern era, do slightly better: Bergman is mentioned in five footnotes distributed over 900 pages.

^{xxx}ⁱⁱⁱ I would like to thank the National and University Library of Jerusalem for giving me access to Hugo Bergman's archives, in particular Gil Weissblei and Oded Fluss for their support. Many thanks also to Joseph Agassi, Johannes Brandl, Denis Fisette, Uriah Kriegel, Enrico Lucca, Edgar Morscher, Kevin Mulligan, and Hamid Taieb for helpful comments. This paper has been written as part of the project "Signification et intentionnalité chez Anton Marty" directed by Kevin Mulligan and Laurent Cesalli and funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF), project number 152921.