

# NOTES AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR RUSSELL'S 1905 REVIEW OF MEINONG

BERNARD LINSKY

Philosophy / U. of Alberta

Edmonton, AB, Canada T6G 2E5

BERNARD.LINSKY@UALBERTA.CA

Bertrand Russell took fourteen pages of notes on Meinong's *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie* [Studies in object theory and psychology] in preparation for his review of the book in *Mind*. Translations of Russell's letters from Alexius Meinong, Rudolf Ameseder and Ernst Mally discuss their contributions to the volume (with transcriptions of the German originals appended in this journal's online edition). Together the notes and correspondence record the origin of Russell's famous criticisms of Meinong's theory of non-existent objects, which appeared in both "On Denoting" and the review in *Mind* in October 1905.

**B**ertrand Russell published a review in *Mind* 1905 of a collection of papers by Alexius Meinong and his students, *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie* (1904).<sup>1</sup> The review appeared later in the same issue of *Mind* as Russell's most famous paper from 1905, "On Denoting", in which Meinong's views are discussed in passing. To prepare for writing the review Russell read through the book's contents, making several comments in the margins, and then wrote fourteen leaves of notes on the articles that figure in the review. Russell also corresponded with Meinong and two of his authors, Ernst Mally and Rudolf Ameseder, in early 1905.<sup>2</sup> The reading notes are described in the prefatory notes to the edition of the

<sup>1</sup> "Review of Meinong and Others, *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie*", *Mind* 14 (Oct. 1905): 530–8; *Papers* 4: 34 (pp. 595–604). Page references are to this edition.

<sup>2</sup> The "Notes on Meinong" are in the Bertrand Russell Archives, RAI 230.030450. *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie* (Leipzig: Johann Barth, 1904). With Mally and Ameseder, it has been said that Russell "apparently had some cor-

review in *Papers* 4, but have not previously been published. The three letters from Meinong, Ameseder and Mally are translated and published here in their entirety for the first time, with a corrected translation of a response to Meinong from Russell.<sup>3</sup> Transcriptions of the German originals are appended to the electronic edition of this paper.

Russell made fourteen leaves of notes that he numbered I through 14. These appear to have been written consecutively as he worked his way through the book, although he had seen Meinong's Chapter I, Chapters II and VIII by Ameseder, and apparently Chapter III by Mally, separately before he received the whole collection. The body of the notes for the book, which are here listed by the numbers of the pages from which they are taken, is limited to those chapters. Although Russell had read offprints (or drafts or proofs) of those four chapters in advance, presumably he took the notes after the book was printed with the page numbers to which the notes are keyed.

There is a separate summary of Chapter IV, "Ueber Oekonomie des Denkens" by Wilhelm Frankl on folio 13 of the notes which contains one reference to a page number. The other articles are only listed by title at the end of the notes.

Russell's copy of *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie* contains only one marginal marking—in Mally's article (next to the discussion of the *Sein* and *Sosein* of the round square on page 128)—out of the four that he had received before the book appeared. Of the articles he saw for the first time in the published book, there are markings only in those by Frankl, Benussi and Saxinger. They are on explicitly psychological topics. Meinong published *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie* to mark the tenth anniversary of his founding in 1894 of the "Psychological Laboratory" at the University of Graz. He had been a student under Franz Brentano and then a *Privatdozent* at the University of Vienna in 1874–89, when he took up his position at Graz. Several of the leading members of the "Austrian School" of psychology that Brentano had founded, including Stephan Witasek, Christian von Ehrenfels and Vittorio Benussi, were students

---

respondence" (ELIZABETH RAMSDEN EAMES, *Russell's Dialogue*, p. 86), but that "neither letter appears to have survived" (*Papers* 4: 666). The letters were always in the Russell Archives, but the signatures presented difficulties.

<sup>3</sup> In "Russell's Study of Meinong", EAMES presented an overview of RA material relating Russell and Meinong in 1971. The findings of this paper and its companion in the previous issue of *Russell* confirm her assessment of the documents.

---

of Meinong at Graz. Benussi contributed three psychological essays to the volume. Mally and Ameseder wrote philosophical essays, however, and it is those, along with the introductory essay by Meinong, which attracted most of Russell's attention in the review.<sup>4</sup>

#### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NOTES AND CORRESPONDENCE

The letters and notes are of value for the light they shed on Russell's composition of the review and provide important information for interpreting the references to Meinong in "On Denoting", published in the same issue of *Mind*. The notes reveal that Russell concentrated his attention on the first three philosophical articles, by Meinong, Ameseder and Mally, although he read through the psychological papers in the rest of the volume. The notes address a number of technical issues in Meinong's philosophy and contain the logical objections to non-existent objects as they occurred to him in the reading. It appears that once Ameseder had confirmed that "the present King of France" is to denote a non-existent object, Russell settled on the examples that illustrate the objections as they appear in the review. He first used this example in print in "On Denoting". The focus of the review on these articles, and then the distribution of attention to the rest of the book, are reflected in the notes, which he followed while composing the review. In "On Denoting" he presented his famous theory of descriptions, and argued for it both as a solution to his three "puzzles" about the logical form of sentences using definite descriptions, but also as an improvement on the rival theories of Gottlob Frege and Meinong. The dismissal of Meinong occurs in this memorable paragraph:

The evidence for the above theory is derived from the difficulties which seem unavoidable if we regard denoting phrases as standing for genuine constituents of the propositions in whose verbal expressions they occur. Of the possible theories which admit such constituents the simplest is that of Meinong. This theory regards any grammatically correct denoting phrase as standing for an *object*. Thus "the present King of

---

---

<sup>4</sup> For an account of Meinong's school see the chapter "Act Psychology and the Austrian School" in BORING, *A History of Experimental Psychology*. Boring lists "the important names" of the Austrian School as: Vittorio Benussi, Franz Brentano, Hans Cornelius, Christian Ehrenfels, Oswald Külpe, Theodore Lipps, Alexius Meinong, Carl Stumpf, Stephan Witasek, Ernst Mach and August Messer (2nd edn., p. 440).

France”, “the round square”, etc., are supposed to be genuine objects. It is admitted that such objects do not *subsist*, but nevertheless they are supposed to be objects. This is in itself a difficult view; but the chief objection is that such objects, admittedly, are apt to infringe the law of contradiction. It is contended, for example, that the existent present King of France exists, and also does not exist; that the round square is round, and also not round; etc. But this is intolerable; and if any theory can be found to avoid this result, it is surely to be preferred.

(*Papers 4*: 418)

Another reference to Meinong occurs near the end of “On Denoting” in a comparison with MacColl, who distinguishes between real and unreal objects:

This assumes that such phrases as “the present King of France”, which do not denote a real individual, do, nevertheless, denote an individual, but an unreal one. This is essentially Meinong’s theory, which we have seen reason to reject because it conflicts with the law of contradiction.

(*Papers 4*: 426)

The correspondence between Russell and three of the authors, Meinong, Ameseder and Mally, adds to our understanding of the origin of these brief statements in “On Denoting”, which was written in July 1905.<sup>5</sup> Meinong wrote to Russell on 7 December 1904:

Universität—Graz.

Very honoured Sir!

Although I had already gotten the feeling from your friendly notice of my work on Weber’s Law<sup>6</sup> that I was better understood by you than by most of my German readers, it was your three-part *Mind* article that gave me a clear understanding of the extent to which we share scientific goals. I hope therefore that it will not be unwelcome if I acquaint you with the first three articles from *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie*, edited by me. I have enclosed with these lines Chapter I, which I have written, while I have arranged with the authors of numbers II and III to send them to your address. Unfortunately the work of Frege, no

---

<sup>5</sup> See the headnote to “On Denoting”, *Papers 4*: 414, and SMITH, “The Russell–Meinong Debate”, for Russell’s letters to Meinong.

<sup>6</sup> MEINONG, *Über die Bedeutung des Weber’schen Gesetzes* (1896); reviewed by RUSSELL in *Mind* in 1899 (*Papers 2*: 17).

---

less your *Principles*, was unknown to us. Despite this and many other deficiencies I hope that the point of the programme that is contained in the words "Object Theory" becomes sufficiently clear, and it will very much interest me if you will take a private or public position on it.

With excellent high esteem

A. Meinong<sup>7</sup>

Russell's response of 15 December 1904 thanks Meinong for the first three papers (I, II and VIII), and says the fourth, Chapter III, has not yet arrived.<sup>8</sup> Russell says that although he is in agreement with Meinong on most important matters, he still maintains that every object

<sup>7</sup> I am grateful to Alexander Rueger for assistance with the translation of the Meinong, Mally and Ameseder letters. The original letter is at RA1 710.052866. The "three-part *Mind* article" to which Meinong refers is "Meinong's Theory of Complexes and Assumptions", which was published in *Mind* in 1904 (*Papers* 4: 16). References are to this edition; see as well the annotations at 4: 651–2. See also LINSKY, "Russell's Notes for 'Meinong's Theory of Complexes and Assumptions'", this journal (2013).

<sup>8</sup> As translated by Janet Farrell Smith (1985), with modifications and the bracketed restoration of a sentence about the non-arrival of Chap. III:

15.XII.1904.

Highly honoured Sir,

Many thanks for your friendly letter, and for the article "Theory of Objects". I have read this article, as well as No. II and VIII by Dr. Ameseder with great interest. [(No. III has not yet arrived.)] I find myself in almost complete agreement with the general viewpoint, and the problems dealt with seem to me very important. I myself have been accustomed to use the name "Logic" for what you call "Theory of Objects"; and the reasons you cite against this use on p. 20 ff. appear to me hardly decisive. Still, this is a matter of secondary importance; and I admit that a new viewpoint should be signified by a new name.

I have always believed until now that every object must *be* [*sein*] in some sense, and I find it difficult to recognize non-existent [*nichtseinde*] objects. In a case such as the golden mountain or the round square one must distinguish between *sense* and *reference* (in accordance with Frege's distinction): the sense is an object, and has being, whereas the reference on the other hand is not an object. One sees the difference between sense and reference best in mathematical examples: "The positive square root of 4" is a complex sense, whose reference is the number 2.

I am in complete agreement with the view that mathematics is object theory; this is in fact one of the main theses of my "Principles". If you do not possess the book, I shall gladly send it to you. Its entire first part is explicitly concerned with questions concerning object theory. Of course there are many discussions whose purpose is purely formal, that is, only as preliminary to lead into technical mathematical developments; yet the general questions are the essential matters treated there.

I find a certain difficulty with what you say about metaphysics on p. 40, although I agree with the main thesis: it seems to me that we cannot be instructed about *all* that exists from the empirical; consequently, if there is a metaphysics, it must be of

must exist in some sense, and proposes Frege's distinction between sense [*Sinn*] and reference [*Bedeutung*] as a way out.

Russell must have written to Ameseder within days of receiving the letter from Meinong and presumably Ameseder's chapter, as the latter's response is dated 3 January 1905:

Highly honoured Sir!

Your friendly letter was extremely pleasing and I must ask your forgiveness for only now answering it. This has happened because I first had to reflect on the points that you raise in your letter; however, I was not able to get very far with that.

To begin with, I cannot decide whether a mathematical function is an objective [*Objektiv*]; I had an inclination to treat them as a "*Relat*", because a function does not seem to be a being itself. Admittedly you present the propositional function as an objective, and it clearly constitutes only a special case of an objective. My account of pure [*reine*] and unobjectified objectives [*nicht vergegenständlichen Objektives*] is unfortunately very defective. I find it necessary to distinguish these two, and this is not made express in my work. I obtain a pure objective—psychologically speaking—when I abstract from its objects, for example, in the case where *a* is *b*, I abstract from *a* and *b*; the objectless, on the other hand, is one which has no *a* or *b* at all, and that obviously cannot be.

Objects, such as  $\sin \pi/2$ , I also would not consider objectives but rather "common primary objects of objective complexes" [*gemeinsame primäre Gegenstände von Objektiv komplexen*].

Our difference with respect to non-existent and impossible objects must derive from the defects of my formulation, as I want to hold onto my correctness in the matter. When I speak of "the present King of France", I still speak of *something* [*etwas*], and, namely, of something that is not. Such a something that is not, is a something in spite of that, and hence, an object [*Gegenstand*], and if you will not admit this, then I would gladly speak of the "theory of somethings" [*Theorie der Etwasse*] instead of "object theory" if that were proper language. By the way, "something" seems completely indistinguishable from "object". Once one has acknowledged non-existing objects as objects then it is naturally only a small step further to objects which *cannot* exist. I believe that of

an à priori nature.

I hope that your philosophical methods will soon be widely known, and it will be a pleasure to me to contribute to this as much as possible.

Respectfully yours,  
Bertrand Russell.

---

these [objects that cannot exist] the consequence on page 88 is true.

I would have liked to avoid entering into the difficult question of the reality or ideality of space and time. For my part, I believe that space and time are completely the same in this respect, as the remaining objects of sensation [*die übrigen Empfindungsgegenstände*], whose existence [*Existenzfähigkeit*] I also doubt; although I cannot sufficiently support this position at the moment. I am most grateful for the reference to *Mind x*, and I will look at the article as soon as possible.

Most honoured sir, I am most thankful for your warm interest and your kind letter, which is most valuable to me, and remain

Your most devoted  
Rudolf Ameseder<sup>9</sup>

Ameseder's response is not mentioned explicitly in the review, but is in the notes.<sup>10</sup> The letter is clearly the source for Russell's attribution to Meinong of the view that an apparently non-denoting description such as "the present King of France" nevertheless denotes an unreal object.<sup>11</sup> Ameseder's letter makes an explicit reference to "the present King of France", asserting that it is a "something" [*etwas*]. It would appear that Russell had presented the example "the present King of France" to Ameseder, as an example of a contingently non-existing object, like "the golden mountain", and unlike the impossible "round square."

The definite description "the present King of France" occurs as an example in Richard Whately's *Elements of Logic*, a standard text of syllogistic logic in the preceding century.<sup>12</sup> Whately's *Logic* was first published in 1827, at which time France was ruled by Charles X, and so it was not at first an example of a non-denoting description. The example remained in later editions of the text, however, well after 1848, when France no longer had a King but was first a republic and

<sup>9</sup> My translation. The term "*Relat*" is from Ameseder's article, p. 72. The reference to "*Mind x*" may be to RUSSELL's "On the Notion of Order", *Mind* 10 (1901) (*Papers* 3: 7). I am grateful to Susanne Riehemann for assistance with the transcription and translation of this letter, which is filed at RA1 710.047044.

<sup>10</sup> See p. 52 for Russell's notes on this letter.

<sup>11</sup> See my "Leonard Linsky on Russell against Meinong" (2014), p. 16.

<sup>12</sup> Richard WHATELY, *Elements of Logic*, 2nd edn., p. 61, and 9th edn., p. 84. Whately's *Logic* was originally published in the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*. In the second, 1840, version published in London by Richard Griffin, at p. 25 the example is corrected to "the present ex-King of France".

then had an Emperor.

Apparently Russell had presented the example “the present King of France” to Ameseder, as an example of a contingently non-existing object, like “the Golden Mountain”, and unlike the impossible “round square”. This letter has not been found. When he composed “On Denoting” in July 1905, he could thus base his attribution of this view to Meinong on the basis of Ameseder’s explicit statement. There is no mention in Ameseder’s letter of any acknowledgement that these “things that are not” produce violations of the law of contradiction.<sup>13</sup> That is Russell’s argument in the review. It is the basis for the second of the three puzzles in “On Denoting”, namely that sentences about non-existents will also violate the law of the excluded middle, for the “present King of France” will be neither bald nor not bald.

The letter from Mally is dated 11 April 1905 and is devoted principally to explaining the notion of “implicit” and “explicit” objects and uses the example of the “number greater than 5” which appears in the notes and in the review. The notes also mention (pp. 50, 57 below) the Mally letter<sup>14</sup>:

Graz, Rechbauerstrasse 15

Very honoured Sir!

I have hesitated so long over my answer to your kind letter of February 27, because I hoped and in the meantime also endeavoured to find a satisfactory answer to your questions. I cannot now assess whether I have succeeded in this and ask you to let me know your own judgment of these results.

First of all, with respect to non-existing objects [*nichtbestehenden Gegenstände*], I can only say this: the assertion of any non-being has only a determinate sense when the non-being of *something* is asserted. The non-being needs an object, that is not, for its being as much as being needs an object, that is, for its being. Every non-being, that factually is, is the non-being of *something*, an *A* or an *X*, etc. I call this something an object

---

<sup>13</sup> Nicholas Griffin has pointed out a reference to discussions with Whitehead over “whether the present King of France is bald” in a letter from Russell to Alys on 9 April 1904, so Mally’s letter does not have Russell’s first recorded use of this example. See *SLBR* 1: 277.

<sup>14</sup> My translation. I am grateful to Ingo Brigandt and Johannes Brandl for assistance with the transcription of the handwritten letter, filed at RA1 710.053726. Brandl and Susanne Riehemann helped with the translation. A section on “*Vor- und nachgegebene Objective*” begins on p. 61.

---



[*Gegenstand*]. It will be granted that a non-existing object can be an object of our thought. For example, if I assert that there is no real square root of a negative number, I judge about the “real square root of a negative number”, and this is the object of my judgment. Given the fact, however, that something is or may be the object of a judgment, it certainly is an *object*, regardless of whether it happens to exist or not, for it is not “made” into an object through the judgment about it.

The “fictitious” [*fiktiven*] objects, also, are perhaps best characterized from the psychological side, even though I do not mean by that that they are somehow dependent on the psychological. If I think, for example, “number that is greater than 5,” the immediate object of my thought, that which is fully adequate to my thought, is not 6, nor 7, nor any specific number, of which one can say, when it is given, that it is greater than 5. This immediate and adequate [*unmittelbare adäquate*] object of my thought is also not the totality of the objects 6, 7, 8, etc., but indeed the “explicit” [*explizite*] object, “number which is greater than 5”.

With this general object (which is perhaps what one means when one speaks of the “concept” “number that is greater than 5”, when that is not meant as something psychological) there coincide infinitely many actual (“implicit” [*implizite*] or “concrete” [*konkrete*]) objects, for example 6, 7, 8, .... That is to say, there obtains the objective “6 is a number that is greater than 5” or “ $7 > 5$ ”, etc. If I now think: “a *specific* number that is greater than 5”, the immediate and completely adequate object of my thought, again, is not 6, 7, or 8, ..., and also not simply the “general” [*allgemeine*] or “explicit” object “number, that is greater than 5”, but precisely “*determinate* [*bestimmte*] (*concrete*) number that is greater than 5.” That is to say, my thinking concerns as before the explicit or general object, but adds, by making the assumption, the determination that it is concrete or “implicit”. That, which I think of in such a way, is now a *fictitious* object. This corresponds to the definition: an explicit object with the determination that it is implicit, is a fictitious object. This determination, to be implicit (or concrete or factual [*tatsächlich*]), is (following the terminology of Ameseder’s work) not later conjoined to the explicit object [*nachgegeben*], for example, “number that is greater than 5”, but *given beforehand* [*vorgegeben*]. By contrast, in the case of objects like 6 or 7, this determination is conjoined with these objects later; that is to say, it factually adheres [*kommt zu*] to a factual object.

With regard to your conception of magnitude, I am as of now not able to offer you any comments, as I am not yet acquainted enough with the English language.

Yours faithfully,  
Ernst Mally

After the letters and this review, Russell does not seem to have communicated much with Meinong or his school about these issues. Russell wrote short reviews of Meinong in 1906 and 1907,<sup>15</sup> and then no more articles on or reviews of his work. Meinong wrote a second edition of *Ueber Annahmen* in 1910 which contains numerous responses to Russell, mostly carried out in footnotes.<sup>16</sup> He does not seem to have responded to these objections, and apparently left the job of reviewing the second edition in *Mind* to C. D. Broad.<sup>17</sup>

This review, and the articles that it discusses, are thus the main source of information about the so-called “Russell–Meinong” debate over non-existent objects such as the “round square” and the “golden mountain”. It is Russell’s objections to these “Meinongian objects” and his desire to avoid them in his own ontology, that came to be seen as the upshot of his discussion of Meinong in “On Denoting,” and, consequently, one of the prime motivations for Russell’s theory of definite descriptions. It is indeed the account of objects [*Objekte*] that is the main topic of the review. As in the 1904 article “Meinong’s Theory of Complexes and Assumptions”, Russell also discusses Meinong’s theory of assumptions, or propositions, with which he does largely agree. It is on the point that impossible objects—such as “the round square” and the objectives of false judgments, false propositions—are not existent [*wirklich*] and do not even have *Sein* or *Bestehen* [being or subsistence]—where Russell parts company with Meinong. It is Meinong’s thesis that these objects are beyond being [*Aussersein*] to which Russell is primarily objecting. Meinong holds that one must distinguish the *Sein* of an object from its *Sosein*—as Russell puts it, the “being” of the object from its “being so-and-so”. Thus an object may have a property (and be so-and-so) independently of its ontological status; indeed it can have properties without having any being at all. In particular an object may have inconsistent properties and consequently not subsist and not even *possibly* subsist.

After the great impact of “On Denoting”, Russell’s positive attitude

---

<sup>15</sup> “Review of A. Meinong, *Über die Entfaltungsgrundlagen unseres Wissens*” (1906; *Papers* 5: 28a) and “Review of A. Meinong, *Über die Stellung der Gegenstandstheorie im System der Wissenschaften*” (1907; *Papers* 5: 28b).

<sup>16</sup> *Ueber Annahmen* (1902); 2nd edn., 1910; Volume 4 of MEINONG’S *Gesamtausgabe*. The 1910 edition was translated by JAMES HEANUE as *On Assumptions* (1983).

<sup>17</sup> C. D. BROAD, “Critical Notice of *Über Annahmen* von A. Meinong”, *Mind* (1913).

---

towards much of Meinong's work seems to have faded from his thinking. By 1933, in a review of the first edition of J. N. Findlay's book *Meinong's Theory of Objects*, Gilbert Ryle states what had become the accepted view of Russell's relationship with Meinong:

He [Meinong] was perhaps the supreme entity-multiplier in the history of philosophy, and yet, I suppose, the main service which he really rendered philosophy was to force logicians to see that "wherever possible logical constructions are to be substituted for inferred entities."<sup>18</sup>

It is clear from this review, and Russell's three-part article the year before, that Meinong was of more interest to Russell than just showing the necessity of the theory of descriptions in "On Denoting" as the alternative to adopting an excessive ontology as a way of solving philosophical problems. Russell's principal objection to Meinong is based on his problem about the logical properties of non-existent objects, not simply on his ability to provide an analysis of sentences using definite descriptions that requires a lighter ontological commitment.

#### SYNOPSIS OF THE REVIEW

Russell begins the review by saying that from this large volume, which includes eleven essays by Alexius Meinong and his school, he will concentrate on the first three essays by Meinong, Ameseder and Mally, and the eighth, also by Ameseder.<sup>19</sup> These essays in particular develop the Object Theory (*Gegenstandstheorie*) of Meinong's earlier *Ueber Annahmen*, the subject of an article in *Mind* the year before.

Russell cites Meinong's assertions that a round square is impossible and so "the round square" is an impossible object, while it is still necessary that the round square is round. He says (at *Papers* 4: 598):

It is not customary for philosophers to face the round square with so much courage; and indeed few logicians can withstand its onset. But if we are to be clear about the supposed non-subsistent objects, it is quite essential that we should have a satisfactory theory about the round

---

---

<sup>18</sup> GILBERT RYLE, review of *Meinong's Theory of Objects* by J. N. FINDLAY, p. 118.

<sup>19</sup> MEINONG's essay "Ueber Gegenstandstheorie" is translated by Isaac Levi, D. B. Terrell and Roderick Chisholm as "The Theory of Objects" in CHISHOLM, ed., *Realism and the Background of Phenomenology*.

square. For my part, I am not convinced that there are any non-subsistent objects. But let us see what the arguments against them are.

The next paragraph contains the objections that have been the source of the literature which attempts to individuate and count “Russell’s objections to Meinongian objects”.<sup>20</sup> First he suggests the argument that there can be subsisting propositions about non-subsisting objects, which is incompatible with the view that objects are constituents of the propositions about them. (Russell himself had abandoned this view even before “On Denoting” by allowing that a proposition can be about an object that is not among its constituents by containing a denoting concept that is about the object.) Russell then says that the “chief objection” to Meinong’s view is that his objects involve denying the law of non-contradiction. Consider impossible objects, *A* and *B*, impossible because *A* is both the same as *B* and not. Then “*A* differs from *B*” and “*A* does not differ from *B*” would seem to be both true, a true contradiction. Consequently we cannot count impossible objects, for there are both one object *B* and two, *A* and *B*. He adds to this perhaps the most famous objection:

And the difficulty is that impossible objects often subsist, and even exist. For if the round square is round and square, the existent round square is existent and round and square. Thus something round and square exists, although everything round and square is impossible. This ontological argument cannot be avoided by Kant’s device of saying that existence is not a predicate, for Ameseder admits (p. 79) that “existing” applies when and only when “being actual (*wirklich*)” applies, and that the latter is a *Sosein*. Thus we cannot escape the consequence that “the existent God” both exists and is God; and it is hard to see how it can be maintained, as Mally implies (p. 133), that this has no bearing on the question whether God exists. (Papers 4: 598–9)

In this passage Russell alludes to Meinong’s distinction between *Sein* [being] and *Sosein* [being so]. The doctrine that “*Sein* is independent of *Sosein*”, or that a beingless object can nonetheless have properties,

---

<sup>20</sup> See SMITH, “The Russell–Meinong Debate”, for an overview of the debate in published works, as well as for her translation of three letters from Russell to Meinong between 1904 and 1907. See also the more recent book, CAROLYN SWANSON, *Reburial of Nonexistents: Reconsidering the Meinong–Russell Debate* for a different enumeration and discussion of these arguments.

is an important consideration in recent attempts to revive “neo-Meinongian” theories of objects or deal with these phenomena with “free logic”, by which sentences with non-referring singular terms can nevertheless be true.<sup>21</sup> He criticizes Mally’s essay for introducing too many new notions without adequate definitions. One of these notions is the distinction between “explicit” and “implicit” objects.

Russell must have questioned this notion in his letter to Mally, for he uses an example from Mally’s response in his review. Russell says that “Number which is greater than 5” is an *explicit* object which is neither 6, nor 7, nor 8, etc. On the other hand 6 will be an *implicit* object of that expression. Russell rightly observes that the distinction seems to be like his own distinction between different ways concepts can *denote* objects. At this point he had still not abandoned his earlier notion of “denoting concept”, which was to be the main conclusion of “On Denoting”.

Russell then goes on to criticize Mally’s theory of number, as the main topic of Mally’s paper is the application of Object Theory to measurement, rather than a defence of impossible objects. Mally asserts that numbers apply to aggregates, rather than concepts or classes as with Frege and Russell. Ameseder’s contribution on the theory of sensation presents a notion of “production” by which perceptual objects are constructed out of experience.<sup>22</sup> This has application to illusions, such as the “Müller–Lyer” diagram. The other articles that are mentioned at all in the review, by Benussi, Liel, Frankl and Saxinger, are then discussed briefly. The review closes with the judgment that the volume “does the highest credit to the Graz school of psychology and philosophy” and concludes that:

The first article gives what we may suspect is the final term of Meinong’s development away from psychologism; his present position appears to me clear and consistent and fruitful of valuable results for philosophy.

(*Papers* 4: 604)

---

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. RICHARD ROUTLEY, *Exploring Meinong’s Jungle*, TERENCE PARSONS, *Nonexistent Objects*, E. N. ZALTA, *Abstract Objects*, and KAREL LAMBERT, *Meinong and the Principle of Independence*. Mally’s distinction between being existent and existing is again denied by Russell in his 1907 review of Meinong, cited in note 15.

<sup>22</sup> Russell mentioned this chapter two years later in the section III he later deleted from “On the Nature of Truth” (*Papers* 5: 452n.).

That first article has become a representative of Meinong's views from its translation as "The Theory of Objects" in Chisholm's volume, *Realism and the Background of Phenomenology*. Russell's review closes with a view of Meinong more in keeping with Chisholm's placement of the essay in his collection, rather than as the model of ontological excess that he was for analytic philosophers after Ryle's review.

#### RUSSELL'S MARGINALIA IN HIS COPY

Russell's copy of *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie* is number 2,877 in his library in the Bertrand Russell Archives. There are relatively few markings in the book, although they are distributed throughout the book. Russell inscribed his name, as "B. Russell", on the upper right of the title-page where "A. Meinong" is cited as editor. The next page states that the volume marks the tenth anniversary of the Psychological Laboratory of the University of Graz, and a brief preface describes it as the first psychological laboratory in Austria.<sup>23</sup> There are no markings in the first two papers, by Meinong and Ameseder, which are the first 120 pages of the book. In the margins of Mally's article, a passage on pages 128–9 is marked in the margins and then is the subject of a note. Russell used marginal lines to indicate passages that might be the subject of a note, either on a second reading, or as he turned to make a note while reading.

There are no markings in the text until Frankl's article "Ueber Oekonomie des Denkens" [On the economy of thinking]. Here there are 39 marked passages and some marginal comments:

- p. 266 Assumes plurality of effects? Cf. p. 277.
- p. 267 1 = buying cheap 2 = selling dear
- p. 285 Simpler still: Not- $p$  is more complicated than  $p$ , even when  $p$  is false.

After page 308 are then no markings in the text until page 376, in Benussi's article "Zur Psychologie des Gestalterfassens" [On the psychology of grasping *gestalts*]. Then follow 33 different lines marked in the margin before a comment on page 398:

---

<sup>23</sup> The book is variously described as by "Meinong, Ameseder and Mally" and the review is titled as "Review of Meinong and Others ..." in *Papers* 4: 595, although the book and the original review in *Mind* both list MEINONG alone as author.

p. 398 Yes, but in *a* the illusion  $>$  in  $\bar{a}$ , which *seems* contrary to your principle. But *cf.* p. 401 and p. 402n.<sup>24</sup>

Then follow fifteen passages marked in the margins up to page 416, with one comment of “Yes” next to a double line by the first paragraph of page 401, the passage he had noted in the previous marginal comment, and an arrow pointing to note 2 on page 414.

The article “Die verschobene Schachbrettfigur” [The shifted chess-board figure] by Benussi and Liel is marked only with a marginal line next to the first two paragraphs. Chapter VIII is by Ameseder and is unmarked. Ameseder’s third article, Chapter IX, “Über die absolute Auffälligkeit der Farben” [On the absolute impression of colours], has marginal lines on pages 510 and 511. Liel’s “Gegen eine voluntaristische Begründung der Werttheorie” [Against a voluntary basis for the theory of value] has marginal lines on 530, 532, 533, 541, 542, 572, 573 and 577. The last contribution, “Ueber die Natur der Phantasiegefühle und Phantasiebegehungen” [On the nature of fantasy feeling and desire], Chapter XI, by Saxinger, pages 579–606, has extensive markings and some marginal comments. There are marginal lines on 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587 (with a marginal question mark “?” on the last line of 587, and the underlined words “dieses erhält sich dauernd”). Further marginal lines are on 589, 591, 594, 595, 596, 598, 599 (with “Don’t agree” next to it), 600, 601 (with a corrected typo [“aufgeworfenen” changed to “aufgeworfene”]), and a “?” later on the page. On 602 there are three marginal lines, with “unconvincing” next to the last on lines 21–3, another correction (“geleistet” for “gleistet”) on 603, and two marginal lines on the last page of the book, 606.

These markings and comments suggest that Russell had already read the four papers by Meinong, Ameseder and Mally that he had been sent earlier, although he read through the Mally paper again upon receiving the volume. He also read through the other papers dealing with purely psychological matters, paying attention to the results, and venturing his own opinions on matters of psychology, even though he made a firm distinction between logic and theory of knowledge on the one hand and “psychological” issues in his writings, and restricted himself to the former.

<sup>24</sup> Figure *a* is the familiar Müller-Lyer figure:  $>—<$ , figure  $\bar{a}$  is missing the middle line thus:  $> <$ .

## ABOUT THE NOTES

The fourteen leaves of notes on *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie* transcribed here are numbered *xvi* through *xxix* to indicate their placement in file RAI 230.030450, following the notes for Russell's 1904 paper "On Meinong's Theory of Complexes and Assumptions". They are numbered (foliated) consecutively in Russell's hand from I to 14, and that number appears on the right.

The fragment of notes (*xvii verso*) comes from Russell's reading of the last sections of Volume I of Frege's *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik*, from Russell's reading in the summer of 1902.<sup>25</sup>

Note contents that are cited within the review are indicated by \*. There are a handful of page references in the published review that do not appear in the notes. They indicate that Russell looked through the texts again when writing, and did not solely rely on his notes. In the transcription his abbreviations are expanded, and all German terms are italicized. Some explanatory footnotes were needed.

## TEXT OF RUSSELL'S NOTES

(xvi)

I

*Meinong etc.***Mally, letter to me.**<sup>26</sup>

"Number which is  $> 5$ " is an *explicit* object, neither 6 nor 7 ... nor all together.

6, 7, ... are *implicit* or *concrete* objects, which coincide fully with "number  $> 5$ "

"A *particular* number which  $> 5$ " is a *fictitious object*, not quite same as "number  $> 5$ ".

(I.) ***Meinong, Ueber Gegenstandstheorie.***p. 2 Probably *everything* psychical has an object.

p. 3 § 2, "The prejudice in favour of the existent."

Knowledge is a two-sided fact: what is known is relatively independent of the knowing.

<sup>25</sup> This leaf is described in my "Russell's Notes on Frege's *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik*, from §53", pp. 128, 158. Russell reused this sheet for the Meinong notes, and began by repeating his notes on these last theorems of Volume I when he continued the notes upon receiving Volume II.

<sup>26</sup> This is the letter from Mally to Russell of 11 April 1905, quoted above, p. 42.



- p. 4 Is theory of objects anything but whole of knowledge? There is a general study, as e.g.
- p. 5 metaphysics; but this is only concerned with existents, which is an infinitesimal part of objects of knowledge. Ideal objects, e.g. I and 7 and Nc (natural numbers), *subsist* but don't *exist*.<sup>27</sup>
- p. 6 This is illustrated in mathematics, which *never* deals with anything to which existence is essential.
- p. 7 Division of knowledge into natural and mental only takes account of what exists; omits mathematics.  
Two sorts of judgments, *thetic* and *synthetic*; former assert *being*, latter
- p. 8 *being so-and-so*. Latter may subsist when object does not have being. The round square is certainly both round and square. [Is the existent God both existent and God?]
- p. 9\* An object which is not is subject of proposition that it is not. We may say, if we like: "There are objects of which it is true that there are no such objects."
- p. 10 If I say "blue does not exist", I am not talking of a presentation, but of blue itself.
- p. 11 We don't need a third kind of being, besides existence and subsistence. No use in a being to which no non-being is opposed.
- p. 12\* Only strong argument for being of non-subsistent objects is that Objectives in which they are subjects subsist. This depends on regarding Objective as a complex, and subject as a constituent of it; but such a view is only to be taken figuratively. Thus being of Objective doesn't involve being of its subject.<sup>28</sup>

(xvii)

2

*Meinong etc.*

Gegenstandstheorie not merely psychology.

- p. 20 May be identified with theory of objects of knowledge, without fear of undue limitation.
- p. 21 Not identified with pure logic, because this an essentially *practical* study;
- p. 26 Nor with theory of knowledge: this has two parts, one psychological, one theory of objects. Don't need to get at objects only by first studying knowledge.

<sup>27</sup> *I* is the identity relation, which Meinong holds to be ideal.

<sup>28</sup> This will remind the reader of the doctrine in modal metaphysics by which a proposition does not exist in a possible world in which its constituents don't exist, sometimes called "existentialism".

- p. 27 Mathematics essentially part of theory of objects.
- p. 28 At present mathematics is the only special science of this sort.
- p. 33 General theory of objects may learn from *grammar*, as special theory from mathematics.
- p. 36 Phenomena as such are a species of pseudo-existent objects.
- p. 38 Call *metaphysics* the general study of the real.
- p. 39 Every cognition<sup>29</sup> must have a subsistent *Objective*.
- p. 40 Some judgments can be justified by the nature of their objects, others not; former à priori, latter empirical. Whatever can be known à priori about an object belongs to theory of objects. Thus 2 general studies: (1) theory of objects, which is concerned with whatever can be given; (2) metaphysics, concerned with whole reality.
- p. 41 Knowledge of reality only to be got by experience. If this gives nothing of sufficient generality to be called metaphysics, then there is no metaphysics. [? Causality ?]

(xviii recto)

3

*Meinong etc.*(II.) **Ameseder, Beiträge zur Grundlegung der Gegenstandstheorie.**

- p. 53 Whatever can be that to which a psychical state is directed, is an *object*.
- p. 54 But object independent of this relation: may subsist when not apprehended, and may be apprehended without subsisting.  
2 classes: objects and Objectives. Latter those which *are* subsistence as well as *have* subsistence.
- p. 55 2 classes of Objectives: subsistence-Objectives and predicative Objectives.  
Relation of objects and Objectives: former *stand* in latter, latter *apply* to former.
- p. 56 Call this *Zuordnung* [? correlation]  
False Objectives don't subsist.
- p. 57 Call it *Zegehörigkeit* when Objective true. [? applicability]  
[There seems to me some confusion between  $p$  and  $\phi'x$ . He puts *Zegehörig* ' $x = \dot{\phi}(\phi'x)$  Df  
But he seems to mean *Zegehörig* ' $x = \dot{p}\{(\exists\phi) . \phi'x . p = \phi'x\}$  Df.]  
Object is Pi (Primitive idea). Nearest to Df: *object* is what is correlated with an Objective.  
**Letter to me**<sup>30</sup>: Function is a *Relat*, not an Objective, except *propositional* function. Distinguish *pure* Objective from *unobjectified* Objective. Get first from "a is b" by abstracting from a and b; latter, when

<sup>29</sup> Meinong's German term is "Erkennen".<sup>30</sup> See p. 40 for Ameseder's letter.

- no *a* and no *b*; this cannot subsist.
- p. 58 The Objective is not composed of 2 parts, the object and the rest, so that either could be alone. But it is complex, in the sense that each can be with another: if *A* is *B*, may have *A'* is *B* or *A* is *B'*. The being *B* would be an Objective free from *A*, but doesn't subsist.
- p. 59 Pure Objective got by abstracting from object.—In “*A* is *B*”, *A* is given before Objective, *B* with it. *A* is *primary* object, *B* *secondary*.
- p. 60 Call a complex of Objectives with a common object [ $\phi x \cdot \psi x$ ] *gemeinsam vergegenständlicht*.

(xviii verso)<sup>31</sup>

23

**Frege.**

- §158 Here it is to be shown  
 $\exists \rho - \check{\rho} \exists \check{\rho} - \rho . R \in N \leftrightarrow 1 . x \in \rho . \supset . \check{\rho}' x \in Cls \text{ fin.}$   
 [This takes 23 pp.]<sup>32</sup>
- §172 Here the converse of the above is to be proved.  
 [This takes 14 pp.]

(xix)

4

*Meinong etc.*

**Ameseder (continued)**

- p. 61 If we have  $f' \phi . \supset \phi . \phi' x$ , and then we take the  $\phi$ 's satisfying  $g' \phi$ , the resulting  $\wedge ' F$ , '*x* requires an *x* of a certain class [ $\check{x}(\wedge ' f , ' x)$ ].<sup>33</sup>  
 Here  $\check{\phi}(f' \phi)$  are *vorgegebene* Objectives,  $\check{\phi}(F' \phi)$  *nachgegebene*.
- p. 62 E.g. “the table in my room is red”; here “being a table” and “being in my room” are *vorgegeben*, and “being red” is *nachgegeben*.
- p. 64 Can divide Objectives into positive and negative.—Existent and non-existent are particular case of subsistent and non-subsistent.—Positive and negative are qualities of Objectives; not same as Yes and No, which belongs to Psychology.
- p. 66 All Objectives are facts or not-facts. Can't call anything else a *fact*; but may say an object has *Tatsächlichkeit*<sup>34</sup> when belongs to positive subsistence-Objective.
- p. 71 Relation of superius to inferiora. Besides this, superius involves a relation identical, wholly or partially, with itself.

<sup>31</sup> This sheet of notes from Frege's *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik* dates from 1902 and was being reused. See note 25.

<sup>32</sup> Russell's “up down harpoon” in the formula would nowadays be replaced with a right arrow to indicate a mapping. It may derive from the koppa, an obsolete Greek letter used in geometry.

<sup>33</sup> “ $\wedge ' F$ ” is the logical product of the *F*s (see *PoM*, pp. 527–8, *Papers* 4: 360, 5: 205).

<sup>34</sup> Factuality.

- p. 72 In “A differs from B”, call whole proposition the *relation*, the object *differente* the relate (*Relat*). The inferiora in the relate form the *complex*; the Objective, “forming the complex”, is the *complexion*.
- p. 75 If *a* and *b* have the difference *D*, this *D* is a *Sosein*. Every positive *So-seinsobjektiv* is a relation and vice versa. But negation of a relation is a *Seinsobjektiv*; but this only applies when relation taken as an *object*.
- p. 76 Call relation “difference” the Objective *given with* relate “different”.

(xx)

5

*Meinong etc.***Ameseder (continued).**

- p. 79\* Whereas existence is temporal, being is timeless. Hence no existence is a subsistence.  
Only “actual” (“*wirkliche*”) objects exist, and only those objects which exist are actual. But “being actual” is not the same as “existing”, if only because former is a *Sosein*. [Why not latter?] Actuality is relation to existence; particular case of *Zugehörigkeit*.<sup>35</sup>
- p. 80 Division of objects into real and unreal useless for theory of objects, because this only deals with *necessary* facts.  
Object doesn’t cease to be object by ceasing to exist, but it does cease to subsist. [Not so: forgets that existential propositions express 3-term relation, in which time is third term].<sup>36</sup> [His position inconsistent with p. 79, *being* timeless.]
- p. 81 “Real = possible existent, ideal = everything else” is not a good division. Don’t know whether existence is species of being, or being of a species of objects.
- p. 82\* Divide objects into those whose being is necessary, possible and impossible.
- p. 83\* The being of what is possible, if it is an *Objekt*, is *existence* (by Df); but a possible Objective (e.g. the existence of a possible *Objekt*) is being. *Causal* necessity not included in above.
- p. 84\* Only Objectives are necessary.
- p. 88\* If *A* is impossible, we may have both “*B* differs from *A*” and “*B* does not differ from *A*”, without *B*’s being impossible.<sup>37</sup>  
[Thus an object which does not subsist doesn’t obey law of contradiction. Point out that non-subsistent subsistent objects are impossible, and yet subsist.]

<sup>35</sup> “Connect with ontological argument” is written in the left-hand margin.

<sup>36</sup> “This criticism is doubtful” also in left-hand margin.

<sup>37</sup> Marginal note: “But cf. p. 133.”

*Meinong etc.*

**Ameseder (continued).**

- p. 91 The objects which *cause* sense-perceptions are different from the objects of sense-perceptions; former things-in-themselves, latter phenomena. Former, if they have being, are actual; latter not. Former are thing-objects.  
First of these comes matter.
- p. 93 There may also be psychical thing-objects.  
*Sensation-objects* are colours, tones, tastes, etc. and determinations of time and place.
- p. 94 Only what can be a cause is actual. Colour can't be a cause; therefore its being is not existence.
- p. 95 What can exist, exists if it is; being of a subsistent colour is not existence; therefore colours can't exist.  
Relations of comparison: Identity (*Gleichheit*), similarity, difference.
- p. 96 *Gleichheit* is maximum of similarity.
- p. 97 Likeness is not small difference: if it were, a great enough likeness would be difference.
- p. 98 Not all likeness is identity of parts.
- p. 100 Where there is quantity, as in "difference of *A* and *B*", quantity is in *Relate*, not in relation.  
Call two relations *coincident* when either occurs where other occurs. Similarity and difference (the relates) are quanta: quanta are always *Objekte*.
- p. 103 There is no maximum to likeness and to difference. Hence
- p. 104 no such thing as *Gleichheit*. That of numbers is mere coincidence.
- p. 106 If no continuous connection is possible between 2 objects, they found no similarity or difference-relate. Such objects are of different kinds, e.g. colours and tones.  
The difference of 2 places is called their *distance*; their similarity, nearness.
- p. 116 Combination-objects: "*A* and *B*", where *A* and *B* are inferiora. Can extend to any number.
- p. 117 Such objects have magnitude, distinguished by divisibility.—Speak of *mediate* coincidence where mediate inferiora of one complex same as mediate or immediate of another. This occurs in all mathematical equations, e.g.  $3 \cdot 5 = 15$ .<sup>38</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Russell followed the British custom of writing the multiplier dot on the line.

*Meinong etc.*

(III.) **Mally Zur Gegenstandstheorie des Messens.**

- p. 125 This subject deals with all properties of qualities, not only their magnitude.
- p. 128\* Objective as object of another Objective is called “Objective in object-position”.
- A being-so whose subsistence excludes that of its object is called *contradictory*. An object with a non-contradictory being-so is *possible*. “The roundness of what is square” is an impossible being-so; but the roundness and squareness of the round square, though contradictory, are not impossible, but necessary. It is impossible a square should be round, but not that the round square should be round, which is necessary.
- p. 129 Call a possible object *real* (*real*) if it can exist.
- p. 133\* “Even if *A* ... in fact is *not*, it is yet tautologically certain that the being of ... “the subsistent *A*” subsists.(?)” By a judgment “the subsistent *A* is” no more is judged about the (factual) being or not-being of *A* ... than by the hypothetical judgment: “if *A* is, it is.” ... “The ‘being and not-being’ of the ‘*A* which is and is not’ subsists.(?)” [I infer there are no non-entities.]
- p. 135 All objects which are determinations or determining objects of the same object form a system of coincident objects. E.g. if *A* is a sphere and is red, *being a sphere* and *being red* as determinations, *sphere* and *red* as determining objects, lastly *A* as object of determination, are coincident objects (of one system). Every being-so is either a quiddity or a quality.

*Meinong etc.*

**Mally continued.**

- p. 137\* An Objective in the form “*A* is” or “that *A* is” or “that *A* is *B*” “*A* is  $\beta$ ” or “that *A* is  $\beta$ ” is an *explicit* Objective or determination. [Translate *Eigenschaftsgegenstand* by *subject*.] The subject of an explicit Objective is an *explicit subject*. It has the form “*A* which is” “*A* which is *b*”, etc.
- p. 138\* A determination which coincides essentially with an explicit Objective without being one is to be called an *implicit determination*. Ditto for subjects.
- An explicit determination with the determination of being implicit is *fictitious*. An explicit subject with determination of being implicit is a

- fictitious* subject. [See letter to me<sup>39</sup>]
- p. 141 “Every implicit determination, which essentially coincides with an explicit being-so, is an implicit property. Implicit properties are either Objectives or objects in the narrower sense. Every implicit property, which is not an Objective, is a *quality*. With every *Wiessein* a proper or fictitious quality essentially coincides.” (Cf. p. 135). Every quality is either of an object or *between* objects. Latter relation (*Relation*).
- p. 144 A quality is *real* (*real*) if it can exist, *ideal* if possible but can't exist.<sup>40</sup>
- p. 147\* A quality with several objects of determination and *one* implicit subject is an *implicit complexion*. The implicit subject of an<sup>41</sup> complexion is an *implicit complex*<sup>42</sup>; the objects of determination of an implicit complexion are its *inferiora*. The objects of determination of an implicit complex are its constituents (*Bestandstücke*), or its inferiora.
- p. 148 Triplicity is an implicit complexion; it has 3 objects of determination 1, 1, 1; but its implicit subject is one, namely the implicit complex called 3 (or the pure number 3). Same applies to circularity.

(xxiv)

9

*Meinong etc.***Mally continued.**

- p. 153 *General Definitions*: A *complexion* is a determination with several objects of determination and one subject. A *complex* is a subject with several objects of determination.
- Meinong's *law of coincidence*: With every complexion a relation between its inferiora coincides essentially, and vice versa.
- p. 155 “Every implicit complex, which we in any way (directly) apprehend, is given us in an unintuitive assumptive presentation. The psychological process, by which we pass from the unintuitive presentation of the explicit complex (the explicit complexion) to the intuitive presentation of the coincident implicit complex (the implicit complexion) is called *synthesis*.” Thus e.g. given objects *A, B, C*, we easily get to the presentation of the implicit *triplicity*; but with larger numbers, have explicit complex with determination of being implicit, i.e. fictitious complex.
- p. 159 A chemical combination is a real complex of its elements.
- p. 163\* With every complexion the multiplicity of its objects of determination

<sup>39</sup> Above, p. 42.<sup>40</sup> See note to p. 128 on preceding leaf.<sup>41</sup> The word “implicit” is deleted here; it was inserted after “a” had been changed to “an”.<sup>42</sup> Marginal note: “Hitherto called by Meinong *complexion*.”

- coincides, as a complexion of the same inferiora. Hence an aggregate-complex (*Mengenkomplex*) of its constituents coincides with *every* complex.
- p. 164\* Plurality is an ideal complex; for its constituents may be ideal. An aggregate-complex wholly determined by its complexion—i.e. an aggregate of wholly indeterminate objects—is a *pure* aggregate-complex. The *degree* of an aggregate is number of constituents: depends on complexion above.
- p. 165\* An aggregate-complex of determinate degree is called a *number complex* or *number*.
- p. 166\* Couple, trio, etc. better words than 2, 3, etc.

(xxv)

10

*Meinong* etc.**Mally continued.**

- p. 168 A complex whose constituents are complexes of its own complexion is a *homoimeric* complex. [i.e.  $u \in k \cap \text{Cls}'k$ ]. Such are  $2 \times 2$ ,  $n^2$  generally. If constituents of constituents, etc., are of its own complexion, called *throughout* homoimeric. Then its infima are fictitious. But it is explicit, and we must reach last *explicit* constituents.
- p. 169\* An implicit complex completely coincident with a throughout homoimeric complex is a *continuum*.
- p. 171 Everything which has magnitude is not biggest or smallest of its kind. A least quantity
- p. 172 is therefore nothing and contradictory; it is called zero. Quantity defined by series towards zero. [Cf. Meinong]
- p. 177 “Every divisible quantum is an implicit complex, which completely coincides with a throughout-homoimeric aggregate-complex.”
- p. 180 *Boundaries*: Divide continuum into 2 parts: limits as we approach one part from the other are boundary.
- p. 181 If only points boundaries, *linear* continuum; if lines also, surface; etc. Surface in which, when 3 lines don’t intersect, 1 is between other 2, called *plane*. [Euclid!]  
Thence dimensions.
- p. 190 Indivisible quanta can always be diminished.
- p. 191 They are properties.
- p. 196 *Difference* is a quantum.
- p. 202 Every explicit aggregate-complex of numbers coincides with an implicit number [its sum]. To seek the implicit complex is called *addition*.  
Multiplication and powers follow.



*Meinong etc.*

**Mally (continued).**

- p. 207\* An (impossible) number, whose being is the same as the not-being of another number, is called *negative*. [Won't do.]  
Ditto for division and roots.
- p. 212 For every fictitious number, same laws of operation hold as for a proper number; for it is also a number.—The mathematical definitions of numbers, even where they are contradictory, are *subsistent* Objectives, and thus not impossible. [Don't agree]
- p. 214 Numbers are not really magnitudes, because can't always be diminished.
- p. 215 But numbers really are *greater* and *smaller*. May therefore be called *relative* quanta.
- p. 217 A subject in whose determination variable determinants appear is called a *function* of these.
- p. 229 Indivisible quanta are measurable if they can be directly correlated with measurable ones.
- p. 235 Similarity and difference are the only relations known to us which are quanta.
- p. 244 The similarity of 2 numbers  $a$  and  $b$  or of 2 quantities whose measures are  $a$  and  $b$  is measurable by  $1/(\log a - \log b)$ .
- p. 248 "A general measure-Objective  $Q = aQ_1$  is the Objective that the object of measurement  $Q$  is as different from the unit quantity  $Q_1$  as its measure  $a$  is from the number 1."
- p. 251 Theoretically, all quanta are measurable.—*Pure* quanta are only distinguished by their magnitude: 1 for each magnitude and vice versa; they are series of *all* magnitudes.
- p. 253 All *pure* quanta belong to 1 series: if we could determine them for quanta of different sorts, we could measure a quantum of one sort by one of another.
- p. 257 Measure-Objectives concerning pure quanta are pure, and belong to pure mathematics.
- p. 259 Mathematics deals with fictitious objects; theory of objects tries to reduce these to the most general groups of implicit objects.

*Meinong etc.*

VIII. **Ameseder, Ueber Vorstellungsproduktion.**

- p. 481\* Sensations have objects and causes, but these are not identical. Objects neither physical nor psychical.
- p. 482\* Objects of sensation are not dependent on sensation or on its causes.

- p. 483\* The being of an object of sensation does not presuppose the being of anything else. Inner *dependence* belongs to founded objects and presentations which apprehend them. There can be no difference, without something different.
- p. 484 Presentation of a difference impossible without presentations of objects which are different. The presentations of the inferiora are a necessary constituent of presentation of superius. [?]  
A perceptive presentation may have object of higher order, e.g. melody.
- p. 486 Presentations of independent objects may be called *elementary* presentations.
- p. 487 Presentation of difference of *A* and *B* is not founded, for nothing founded is actual. Nevertheless presentation of a complex is built on presentations of inferiora. How?
- p. 488 Call the process *Production*. What is produced is a presentation, not its object.
- p. 489 Whatever, in a perceptive presentation, is not sensation, must be *produced*.
- p. 496\* The produced presentation seems to consist of the presentations of the inferiora in a real relation.
- p. 503 In such cases as Müller–Lyer’s figure, the superius whose presentation is produced is compounded of presentations which are not those of the objects of the elementary presentations. Thus the presentation of the superius is *inadequate* to the isolated elementary presentations.
- p. 504–5 In Müller–Lyer’s figure: The elementary presentations are still adequate to the inferiora; but by production they change so that they become inadequate to the previously-given objects, so that the presentation of the superius must also be inadequate.

(xxviii)

13

*Meinong etc.*IV. **Wilhelm Frankl, Ueber Oekonomie des Denkens.**

Two sorts of economy, 1. buying cheap, 2. selling dear.

Two forms of economy of thought asserted by Avenarius; neither universally true. Simplicity is not always mark of truth.

No general principle of economy for probable truth any more than for certain truths.

Economy not foundation of values, but presupposes them.

*Summary:* A *biological* principle: as much economy as necessary for life.*Psychical:* All habitual psychic activities are economical.*Epistemological:* Judgments based on induction more economical than

others concerning same thing.

*Theory of sciences*: Science prefers simpler foundations to less simple *ceterus paribus*.

*Methodological*: Formulate problems as simply as possible.

*Emotional*: (1) Pleasure due to psychic work grows with economy. (2)

*Didactic*: State things simply.

V. Zur Psychologie des Gestalterfassens: *Vittorio Benussi*.

On Müller-Lyer's figure. Two attitudes: Be aware of whole figure, or as far as possible abstract from all but the line to be estimated. It appears that the more the figure is present to the mind, the greater the error.

Inadequacies of sensation have following marks: (1) they depend on stimulus, and can't be modified by subject. (2) They are uniquely determined by stimulus. (3) Their magnitude has in principle no limits. (4) They are not altered by practice. No one of these applies to our case. But our case fits perfectly with illusion of production.

The illusion is not one of judgment, for it remains when we know the facts. It is the presentation of the *figure* that causes an apparent change of its constituents.

p. 395\* Contents in a real relation influence each other in the sense of their own nature. The presentation of shapes has this effect in a high degree, because it involves a real relation of the contents.

(xxix)

14

*Meinong etc.*

VI. *Vittorio Benussi und Wilhelmine Liel*, Die verschobene Schachbrattfigur.

Brings arguments similar to those of V to prove illusion of shifted chess-board also one of *production*.

VII. *Vittorio Benussi*, a new proof of the specific brightness of colours.

IX. *Ameseder* Ueber absolute Auffälligkeit der Farben, contends that Auffälligkeit is a specific quality determinable by experiment.

X. *Wilhelmine Liel*, Gengen eine voluntaristische Begründung der Werttheorie, polemic against Schwarz, arguing that value is based on feeling, not on conation.

XI. *Saxinifer*, Ueber die Natur der Phantasiegefühle und Phantasiebegehungen. Contends that both are facts *sui generis*, not reducible to feeling and desires proper, but related to these as assumptions to judgments. I differ on points of introspection: he says e.g. feelings proper weaken with time, not feelings of imagination.

## WORKS CITED

- BORING, EDWIN G. *A History of Experimental Psychology*. New York: Century, 1929. 2nd edn., Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950.
- BROAD, C. D. "Critical Notice of *Über Annahmen* von. A. Meinong": *Mind* 22 (1913): 90–102.
- CHISHOLM, RODERICK M., ed. *Realism and the Background of Phenomenology*. Buffalo: Free P., 1960.
- EAMES, ELIZABETH RAMSDEN. "Russell's Study of Meinong". *Russell*, o.s. no. 4 (winter 1971–72): 4–7.
- . *Bertrand Russell's Dialogue with His Contemporaries*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois U. P., 1989.
- FINDLAY, J. N. *Meinong's Theory of Objects*. London: Oxford U. P., 1933. Foreword by Mally. 2nd edn. as *Meinong's Theory of Objects and Values*, 1963.
- FREGE, GOTTLIEB. *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik*. 2 vols. Jena: Verlag Hermann Pohle, 1893, 1903.
- HEANUE, JAMES, trans. A. Meinong, *On Assumptions*. (2nd edn. of *Ueber Annahmen*.) Berkeley: U. of Calif. P., 1983.
- LAMBERT, KAREL. *Meinong and the Principle of Independence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge U. P., 1983.
- LINSKY, BERNARD. "Russell's Notes on Frege's *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik*, from §53", *Russell* 26 (2006): 127–66.
- . "Russell's Notes for 'Meinong's Theory of Complexes and Assumptions'". *Russell* 33 (2013): 143–70.
- . "Leonard Linsky on Russell against Meinong". *Bertrand Russell Society Bulletin*, no. 149 (spring 2014): 13–18.
- MEINONG, ALEXIUS. *Über die Bedeutung des Weber'schen Gesetzes*. Hamburg and Leipzig: Leopold Voss, 1896.
- . *Ueber Annahmen*. Leipzig: Johann Barth, 1902. 2nd edn., 1910; repr. *Gesamtausgabe*, Vol. 4.
- . *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie*. Leipzig: Barth, 1904.
- . *Über die Stellung der Gegenstandstheorie im System der Wissenschaften*. Leipzig: R. Voigtländer, 1907.
- . *Gesamtausgabe*. Ed. Rudolf Haller and Rudolf Kindinger. 7 vols. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck, 1968.
- PARSONS, TERENCE. *Nonexistent Objects*. New Haven: Yale U. P., 1980.
- ROUTLEY, RICHARD. *Exploring Meinong's Jungle and Beyond: an Investigation of Noneism and the Theory of Items*. Canberra: Australian National U., 1980.
- RUSSELL, BERTRAND. "Review of Meinong, *Ueber die Bedeutung des Weber'schen Gesetzes*". *Mind* 8 (1899); *Papers* 2: 7.
- . "On the Notion of Order". *Mind* 10 (1901): 30–51; *Papers* 3: 7.
- . "Notes on Meinong". [1902?–05]. RAI 230.030450.
- . *PoM*.
- . "Meinong's Theory of Complexes and Assumptions". *Mind* 13 (April, July, Oct. 1904): 204–19, 336–54, 509–24; *EA*; *Papers* 4: 17.
- . "Review of *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie*". *Mind* 14 (1905): 530–8; *EA*; *Papers* 4: 34.
- . "Review of Meinong, *Über die Erfahrungsgrundlagen unseres Wissens*". *Mind* 15 (1906): 412–15; *Papers* 5: 28a.
- . "Review of Meinong, *Über die Stellung der Gegenstandstheorie im System der Wissenschaften*". *Mind* 16 (1907): 436–9; *Papers* 5: 28b.
- RYLE, GILBERT. Review of J. N. FINDLAY, *Meinong's Theory of Objects*. *The Oxford Magazine* 52 (26 Oct. 1933): 118–20.
- SMITH, JANET FARRELL. "The Russell–Meinong Debate". *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 45 (1985): 305–50.
- SWANSON, CAROLYN. *Reburial of Nonexistents: Reconsidering the Meinong–Russell Debate*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2001.
- WHATELY, RICHARD. *Elements of Logic*. 2nd edn., London: J. Mawman, 1827. 9th edn., London: Parker & Sons, 1853.
- ZALTA, E. N. *Abstract Objects*. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1983.