

Witold Płotka

## Approaching the Variety of Lived Experiences: On the Psychological Motives in Leopold Blaustein's Method

### 1. Introduction

The basic aim of this article is to present selected elements of the method developed by Leopold Blaustein (1905–1942 [or 1944]) as a part of his philosophical investigations into the structure of lived experiences. To make this general aim more specific it is worthwhile to briefly outline the biography of this philosopher. Blaustein read philosophy and German at the John Casimir University in Lvov and completed his education during study visits to Freiburg im Breisgau (in 1925) and Berlin (1927–1928). In Lvov, he attended lectures on logic delivered by Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz (1890–1963) as well as classes conducted by Roman Ingarden (1893–1970) who, at that time, was only partially related to the university although he already tried to obtain the title of professor. Blaustein's most important influence, however, was Kazimierz Twardowski (1866–1938), the founder of the Lvov-Warsaw School. It was under the supervision of Twardowski that he wrote his doctoral thesis published in 1928 under the title *Husserlowska nauka o akcie, treści i przedmiocie przedstawienia* [*Husserl's Theory of the Act, Content and the Object of Presentation*] (Blaustein, 1928; Płotka, 2017, pp. 85–86). The thesis shows that Blaustein favoured phenomenological methods as formulated by Edmund Husserl (1859–1938) in the first edition of *Logical Investigations* from 1900 and 1901. Phenomenology is understood there in the spirit of Franz Brentano (1838–1917), Husserl's and Twardowski's teacher from Vienna, as a form of descriptive psychology. Such a clear reference to descriptive psychology may come as a surprise, especially that, before he published his thesis, Blaustein studied under the supervision of Husserl at the time when the latter had long abandoned his project from the *Investigations* and was developing the fundamentals of phenomenological psychology. Importantly, when preparing the publication of his doctoral thesis, Blaustein was away on a scholarship in Berlin where he established research contacts with local philosophers and psychologists. At that time, he attended lectures by Carl Stumpf (1848–1936) and studied *Gestaltpsychologie* under Max Wertheimer (1880–1943) and Wolfgang Köhler (1887–1967). Another major point of reference for Blaustein was the conception of psychology put forward by Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911) that he learnt about in Berlin from the lectures by Dilthey's student, Eduard Spranger (1882–1963).

Back in Poland, Blaustein used the tools of phenomenology and the different forms of psychology in his investigations into aesthetics, pedagogy and broadly understood methodology. These studies were to be summarised in a more extensive dissertation entitled *Die ästhetische Perzeption* whose manuscript was completed by Blaustein in German in 1939 but was then lost during World War II (Ingarden, 1963, p. 87).

Given this multitude of influences, it is difficult to put Blaustein's thought into any clear-cut category. At times, the literature seems to put too much emphasis on one of these influential forces – the thought of Twardowski or Husserl – to the detriment of other, less obvious factors such as Stumpf's or Dilthey's psychology. Researchers are divided as to whether Blaustein's philosophy should be treated as phenomenology. The confusion is not helped by the fact that Blaustein understood phenomenology in a highly critical fashion and often went beyond the simple repetition of Husserl's line of argument or research results. Classifying Blaustein as a phenomenologist is called into question by, for example, Mieczysław Andrzej Dąbrowski (1981, p. 244) and Marek Pokropski (2015, p. 94). On the other hand, there are those researchers who, like Stanisław Pazura (1966, p. 90), and, more recently, Maria Van der Schaar (2015, p. 12), have unequivocally counted Blaustein among phenomenologists. Wioletta Miskiewicz (2009, p. 182) goes even further when she says that he was the founder of 'an entirely new branch of phenomenology' that is 'analytic, descriptive and interdisciplinary'. She does emphasise, however, the clear links between Blaustein's project and psychology. Bearing in mind these divergent accounts, my aim here is not to decide to what extent Blaustein's philosophy can be described as phenomenology. By examining selected elements of Blaustein's method, I want, rather, to highlight the psychological themes present in his thought. I do not, of course, claim that Blaustein was not a phenomenologist. Nonetheless, I do agree with Miskiewicz in that I believe that, in order to understand his phenomenology fully, we must first take stock of the contexts in which he reflected on psychology. Such an approach is justified by the commentary made by Blaustein himself at the beginning of his doctoral thesis where he stressed that 'a phenomenologist ... may find in these reflections the application of phenomenological claims in the domain of descriptive psychology, a descriptive psychologist — an analysis that is independent of any phenomenology' (Blaustein, 1928, p. 3). Hence, my declared aim is to reconstruct the psychological themes that can be found in the method developed by Blaustein.

To this end, I have divided this article into three basic parts. I start by looking at the selected methods and conceptions of descriptive psychology, a form of philosophical investigation that was popular at the turn of the 20th century and introduced in Poland by Twardowski. In this part of the article, I juxtapose the

conceptions of Brentano, Twardowski and Blaustein, focusing on the influences that helped shape the method of the latter. As I will try to demonstrate, due to these influences, Blaustein attached great importance to empirical research and, accordingly, rejected phenomenological reduction. In the following part, I briefly analyse how Blaustein's conception was influenced by Dilthey and his humanistic psychology. I argue that the Polish philosopher borrowed from Dilthey the holistic approach in describing psychic life and the attitude of methodological pluralism. Finally, I investigate the impact made by Stumpf and his Gestalt psychology. I develop the thesis that Blaustein follows Stumpf in believing that psychology cannot develop as an *a priori* discipline and should make use of experimental methods. In addition, the Polish philosopher refers to Stumpf's understanding of the world as a phenomenal world as well as his account of perception in *Gestaltpsychologie* as directed at Gestalt qualities. I will conclude with an attempt at defining the psychological themes in the method used by Blaustein.

## **2. Descriptive Psychology in the Lvov-Warsaw School and the Influence of Twardowski**

The Lvov-Warsaw School was one of the most important research schools in the late-19th and early-20th century in philosophy, mainly thanks to the writings and teaching of Brentano whose students exerted an enormous impact on the philosophy of the time. It is enough to mention Husserl, Stumpf, Anton Marty (1847–1914), Alexius Meinong (1853–1920) or Christian Freiherr von Ehrenfels (1859–1932). In Poland, Brentano's project was made popular by Twardowski who studied in Vienna from 1886 to 1895. When analysing the influence, Brentano had on Twardowski and the Lvov-Warsaw School, researchers often emphasise references in the areas of logic, methodology and metaphilosophy.<sup>1</sup> It might be argued that one of the major elements shaping that School was descriptive psychology (Płotka, 2020). In this part of the article, I would like to take a closer look at the role of the psychological theme in Twardowski's reflections as well as its links to Blaustein's philosophical project.

Teresa Rzepa has defined three periods in the development of psychology in the Lvov-Warsaw School: the *first* begins with Twardowski's recruitment by the University of Lvov (1895) and ends with Władysław Witwicki's (1878–1948) defence of this doctoral thesis in psychology (1901); the *second* covers the years 1902–1919 and is defined by Rzepa as the development period for Lvov psychology (1992, p. 37) that was 'clearly organized around Twardowski's psychological views. The specific feature of that period was the work undertaken

<sup>1</sup> For more information on this topic see Woleński, 1994, p. 83; 2017, pp. 47–64.

by the Master and his students to establish Polish psychological vocabulary'; and *third*, there are the years 1920–1939 when Twardowski's students pursue their original psychological projects, expanding on, and sometimes criticizing their master's theories; it is during this period that the members of the School start teaching at universities outside Lvov as was the case of Stefan Błachowski (1889–1962) and Ludwik Jaxa-Bykowski (1881–1948) who became professors in psychology in Poznan as early as 1919 (Woleński, 1989, p. 10). Rzepa (1992, p. 38) locates Blaustein's thought in the third period. Importantly, Blaustein not only argued with Twardowski but also referred to many elements of the project that the founder of the School consistently developed from the moment he first presented it after coming back to Lvov.

It is worth noting that Twardowski modified his project of descriptive psychology. Initially, clearly influenced by Brentano, he went on to introduce major changes in the years 1910–1913. His early work 'Psychology *vs* Physiology and Philosophy' contains a typically Brentanian thesis that 'psychology supplies philosophy not only with its method but also with its subject-matter' (Twardowski, 1999, p. 59). Twardowski (1999, p. 46), following Brentano (1995b, p. 24), accuses August Comte of unjustifiably rejecting the possibility of both introspection and internal observation. According to the Polish philosopher, Comte is right when he denies the possibility of observation as it is not possible to follow one's own lived experiences carefully, but he is wrong when it comes to introspection. The introspective method consists of undergoing lived experiences internally and is described by Twardowski as 'insight into oneself'. In other words, the method offers direct access to what is experienced internally and so opens up the possibility of further analytical stages: description and classification. Here, the method determines the object, namely lived experiences or psychic phenomena. Introspection does have some drawbacks, however, because it not only restricts the scope of the investigation to the lived experiences of the subject but also captures only instantaneous experiences that are gone at the moment of being captured. This is why psychology should be supported by other methods. Twardowski mentions two of them: retrospection and experiments. The first consists in apprehending lived experiences in memory, the second in evoking certain experiences by a psychologist or, if this is not possible, analyzing surveys of other subjects who undergo certain experiences (e.g. colour blindness). As we can see, Twardowski's early position combines methodological psychologism (the method of psychology is also the method of philosophy) with ontological psychologism (the object is reduced to lived experiences).<sup>2</sup> All the same, it should be emphasized that what Blaustein (1931, p. 183) borrows from the former

<sup>2</sup> On the discussion of whether early Brentano does indeed espouse psychologism or whether his theory may also be interpreted as anti-psychologistic, see Chrudzinski, 2001, pp. 33–37.

exposition of descriptive psychology is the identification of introspective and retrospective methods and, equally importantly, acceptance of experiments in psychological research. As he writes in *Przedstawienia imaginatywne [Imaginative presentations]*:

I do not oppose descriptive and experimental psychology ... Description and experiment are two methods of one and the same discipline. This is not to say that there are no areas in psychological research that are available only to the descriptive or only to the experimental method. In the great majority of cases, however, description and experiment are two phrases of psychological investigation. Even though experiments will sometimes verify the results of descriptive psychology, they are usually used to study specific problems on the basis of fundamental concepts that are analysed and defined within the framework of descriptive psychology (Blaustein, 2005, p. 40, footnote 1).

In 1911, Twardowski published an important article titled 'Actions and Products' where he clearly distinguished between the process and product of actions. He also applied the distinction to psychology which enabled him to overcome some limitations of the early Brentanian project of descriptive psychology (Bobryk, 2009). It is in this context that he prepared the publication of two major works: 'On the Method of Psychology. An Attempt at the Methodology of Scientific Research' (Twardowski, 1965, pp. 205–216) and (written like an encyclopaedic entry) 'On Psychology, its Subject-Matter, Aims, Method, Relation to Other Sciences and on its Development' (Twardowski, 1965, pp. 241–291). Both texts contain a lot of themes linking Twardowski with Brentano: (1) the method of introspection continues to be highlighted; (2) introspection is still understood as internal immanent perception and juxtaposed to the complex act of observation; (3) hence, the possibility of observing psychic states is rejected; (4) Twardowski does not reject the possibilities offered by retrospective methods and introspective experiments; (5) just like Brentano (1995a, p. 9), the founder of the Lvov-Warsaw School acknowledges the fact that descriptive and experimental psychology may be mutually supportive and stimulate research; (6) a psychic experience is accounted for as a whole comprised of dependent parts; and finally, (7) the overall aim of psychology is the classification of psychic life.

Still, the two texts are different. I mention two such differences. First, by adopting the findings he arrived at in 'Actions and Products', Twardowski (1999, pp. 103–132) expands the scope of research from psychic functions to psychic products. A psychic function is defined as, for example, 'perceiving' or 'considering', while a psychic product would be 'perception' and 'belief', respectively. Written words may also be a product. In this context, a psychologist

may investigate *hypothetical* mental states (understood as functions) that give rise to a given product (e.g. a literary work). The method, referred to as the method of interpretation,<sup>3</sup> significantly expands Brentano's method of introspection, because it enables the study of things that are not experienced directly. In addition to the method of interpretation, Twardowski continues to apply the method of introspection that consists of analyzing lived experiences not as specific experiences but as *types*.<sup>4</sup> More importantly, by differentiating functions from products on the one hand and focusing research on *types* of lived experiences on the other, Twardowski rejects psychologism as the status of experience (psychic function) and the product of this experience is different. It is this anti-psychological attitude that Blaustein seems to adopt in his approach when he underlines that 'phenomenology is possible only as an empirical, descriptive discipline about types (the lowest categories) of lived experiences in pure consciousness and not as an *a priori* descriptive science of higher beings as ideal objects' (Blaustein, 1928-1929, p. 165b). In phenomenology, which Blaustein wants to understand in terms of descriptive psychology, a philosopher investigates *types* of lived experiences, rather than specific experiences. This is why the object is not reduced to a lived experience (as in ontological psychologism) but retains its separate and general nature.

### 3. Dilthey's Holism and Accounting for the Subject as a Whole

It seems that, by defining the object of psychology as psychic life, Blaustein might be referring not only to Twardowski but also to Dilthey. In his work *Ideas Concerning a Descriptive and Analytic Psychology*, Dilthey opposes the explanatory and descriptive kinds of psychology. The former adopts different hypotheses about the nature of psychic life, such as the existence of impressions, and integrates them into cause-and-effect sequences in order to *explain* a given

---

<sup>3</sup> Rzepa describes the method as follows: 'The key feature of this method is the collection and investigation of any human products as manifestations of psychic life. A psychologist interprets the collected products psychologically. Interpreting them, he looks at the psychic phenomena that could be manifested by these products with the benefit of hindsight, as it were. Based on that, he draws inferences about other people's (and his own) psychic life. ... Having collected a sufficient "batch" of information on a given psychic phenomenon through his psychological interpretation of products, he formulates laws and concepts that apply to the studied phenomenon in general. He justifies those logically. ... Finally, he adds many examples, i.e. he complements the research with strict and diligently prepared reports describing a given psychic phenomenon' (Rzepa, 1992, p. 41).

<sup>4</sup> Rzepa claims that this method, referred to as 'analytical', comprises four steps: 'the researcher (a) arrives at analytical definitions from a small number of simple examples; (b) based on these definitions, defines the objects under study not as specific phenomena but as certain types; (c) uses the definitions to advance analytical claims, and then (d) verifies the claims in practice' (Rzepa, 1991, p. 171).

phenomenon.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, descriptive psychology presents elements and interdependencies of different forms of psychic life, such elements being not inferred or added, but specifically and vividly experienced (*erlebt*).<sup>6</sup> This method is also based on the internal experience and aims to account for psychic life as a whole. It may be called holistic. Although Dilthey, as opposed to Twardowski, did not reject psychologism, assuming that psychology is a fundamental science, he put greater emphasis on a holistic account of psychic life than did the Polish philosopher. Of course, Twardowski (1965, p 206) employs the term 'psychic life' when writing about the object of psychology but immediately adds that it can be treated as a conglomeration of psychic facts. Dilthey takes the opposite view, underlining consistently that the relationships shaping our psychic life are incomprehensible outside their overall contexts. As he writes:

In the human studies ... the nexus of psychic life constitutes originally a primitive and fundamental datum. We explain nature, we understand psychic life. For inner experience [*innere Erfahrung*] the processes of one thing acting on another, and the connections of functions or individual members of psychic life into a whole are also given. The experienced [*erlebte*] whole [*Zusammenhang*] is primary here, the distinction among its members only comes afterwards. It follows from this that the methods by means of which we study psychic life, history, and society are very different from those which have led to the knowledge of nature. As for the question which we are here considering, it follows from the difference we noted that hypotheses do not all play the same role in psychology as in the study of nature. In the latter, all connectedness [*Zusammenhang*] is obtained by means of the formation of hypotheses; in psychology it is precisely the connectedness which is originally and continually given in lived experience [*Erleben*]: life exists everywhere only as a nexus or coherent whole. Psychology therefore has no need of basing itself on the concepts yielded from inferences in order to establish a coherent whole among the main groups of mental affairs (Dilthey, 1977, pp. 27–28).

<sup>5</sup> 'Explanatory psychology can achieve its aim only by means of a combination of hypotheses. The concept of hypothesis can be conceived in different ways. To begin with, every inference or conclusion which supplements or adds to the contents of an experience through induction can be termed an hypothesis. The conclusion of such an inferential process implies an expectation which goes beyond what is given and extends to what is not given. Such supplementary inferences are naturally encountered in every kind of psychological exposition. I cannot connect a memory to a previous impression without the aid of such an inference. It would therefore be foolhardy to want to exclude every hypothetical ingredient from psychology. It would also be unjust to reproach explanatory psychology for the use it makes of these hypothetical ingredients, since descriptive psychology cannot dispense with them either' (Dilthey, 1977, p. 24).

<sup>6</sup> 'By descriptive psychology I understand the presentation of the components and continua which one finds uniformly throughout all developed modes of human psychic life, where these components form a unique nexus which is neither added nor deduced, but rather is concretely live [*erlebt*]. This psychology is thus the description and analysis of a nexus which is originally and continuously given as life itself. An important consequence follows. This psychology has for its object what one regularly finds in the nexus of adult psychic life. It describes this nexus of the inner life of a typical man. It examines, analyzes, experiments and compares. It makes use of all the possible devices in order to resolve its problem' (Dilthey, 1977, p. 35).



Blaustein (1935, pp. 36–38) refers to Dilthey in at least two aspects. First of all, he defines the object of psychology as a ‘primarily natural psychological whole’, and so as specific psychic life. The point here is not that psychic life or a given lived experience is a whole (in the sense of an object that comprised its parts). Following Dilthey, Blaustein shows that a holistic account of psychic life requires that its analysis includes other areas shaping that life such as religion and politics. This kind of psychology is called ‘humanistic’ because it includes a man in ‘the scope of humanistic reality’ (Blaustein, 1935, p. 44). One might add that, for Blaustein, the object of psychology is not only spiritual but also, if not primarily, embodied. Blaustein (2005) uses this claim in his analyses of aesthetic perception of, for instance, a theatre play. The viewer is always seated in a specific location in the audience which determines the way he perceives the show. His or her perception is further shaped by other factors that are not psychological such as the behaviour of other members of the audience seated around the subject. Naturally, it will also be influenced by factors that are related to his biography which, in turn, is rooted in culture and society. Hence, to be able to understand a simple act of perception, one must take into account all those elements that, as a whole, shape a complex lived experience in a given moment of psychic life. The other aspect has to do with Blaustein’s openness to the multitude of methods applied in psychology, methods that should be adapted to the object, and the broader context (Blaustein, 2005, p. 40, see footnote 1). The Polish philosopher seems to be aware that, restricted by a limited scope of one method, one cannot adequately describe what is given in the psychic life of the subject.

#### 4. Stumpf on Impressions and *Gestaltpsychologie* Themes

Another philosopher who Blaustein referred to and who may be categorised as a psychologist is Stumpf. Initially, he developed his conception under the influence of Brentano but then argued with Husserl, suggesting a different account of phenomenology (Stumpf, 1924, pp. 205–265).<sup>7</sup> Thus, Stumpf follows Brentano in claiming that psychology is the foundation of sciences, including philosophical sciences,<sup>8</sup> and Husserl when he says that *a priori* laws cannot be reduced to lived experiences. In doing so, he combined methodological psychologism with ontological anti-psychologism. He shared with the author of *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* the thesis about two types of perceptions – external and internal – but differed from him in that he (Stumpf, 1924, p. 243) considered the observation (*Beobachtung*) of internal life as a reliable method of psychological

<sup>7</sup> For an overview of Stumpf discussion with Brentano and Husserl see Fissette, 2010.

<sup>8</sup> Stumpf advanced this thesis when arguing with Kant’s criticism, showing that *a priori* investigations do not have an objective value per se. Hence ‘psychologische Untersuchungen für den Erkenntnistheoretiker unentbehrlich sind’ (Stumpf, 1891, p. 490).



investigation. His understanding of psychology and phenomenology is expounded in two treatises – *Erscheinungen und psychische Funktionen* and *Zur Einteilung der Wissenschaften* – written by the German philosopher in 1906 for *Königlich-Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. In the former, Stumpf identifies two types of objects: (1) phenomena (*Erscheinungen*) that are interrelated (*Verhältnisse*) and are accounted for as the content of sensory impressions (*Inhalte der Sinnesempfindungen*) and (2) psychic functions, described as acts or lived experiences, that integrate phenomena into certain compounds, developing concepts about them and exciting the will (Stumpf, 1906a, pp. 4–5). Both elements are dependent on one another and make up a real unity (*reale Einheit*), although they do enjoy ‘relative independence’ as it is possible to describe their differences.

In the other lecture, Stumpf (1906b, pp. 21, 27) makes use of this distinction to develop a classification of sciences, two of which are of interest here: *descriptive psychology* examines psychic functions or, more precisely, *elementary* psychic functions, whilst *phenomenology* examines phenomena. Consequently, Stumpf (1906b, p. 35, see footnote 2; 1924, pp. 40–41) suggests an understanding of phenomenology that is different from Husserl’s. His phenomenology is less interested in investigating internal experiences, that is, acts, and more focused on the content of impressions themselves. This difference is mentioned in *Ideas I* together with the suggestion that Stumpf’s phenomenology may be equated to hyletics, albeit not entirely as there are methodological differences between the two: Husserl’s (1983, p. 210) position is transcendental, while Stumpf’s is psychologistic. Blaustein (1928, p. 2, see footnote 2; 1937–1938, p. 34) was aware of these conceptual and methodological differences. It seems that the concepts outlined in the two lectures delivered in 1906 – where transcendental claims were abandoned – were close to the Polish philosopher. This is for two reasons. First, Blaustein seemed to accept that pure *a priori* psychology was not possible, which meant that observations and experiments were necessary; Stumpf used the same argument (1924, p. 214).<sup>9</sup> Second, already in his doctoral thesis, the Polish philosopher claimed that the world is composed of two parts – material and phenomenal — as he argued with Husserl’s account of consciousness and its elements (Blaustein, 1928, pp. 74, 76–77); further, he attributed impressions to the latter world. The very expression ‘phenomenal world’ seems to be taken directly from Stumpf’s philosophy (1906a, p. 11) with its ‘*Erscheinungswelt*’; similarly, phenomena are accounted for as the content of impressions and attributed to the layer of the world that is external to the psyche. It seems that Blaustein took this

<sup>9</sup> On this topic, see also Martinelli, 2015, pp. 23–43.

argument directly from Stumpf even though he does not refer to him explicitly in this part of his doctoral thesis.

What Blaustein also borrows from Stumpf and, more broadly, the Berlin school of *Gestaltpsychologie*, is the approach to perception as something focused on certain wholes. The very concept of ‘*Gestalt*’ is not clear-cut and may denote a form, a structure or an aspect (Murray, 2012, p. 475). Psychologists use it to underline the fact that, rather than being aspect-based only, experience captures its objects holistically. Wertheimer introduced the concept by pointing out the ordered nature of perception. In his early work entitled *Laws of Organization in Perceptual Forms*, he wrote ‘When we are presented with a number of stimuli we do not as a rule experience “a number” of individual things, this one and that and that. Instead of larger wholes separated from and related to one another are given in experience; their arrangement and division are concrete and definite’ (Wertheimer, 1938, p. 72). Hence, experience gives objects that are already ordered to a certain degree and given as higher-order wholes. Blaustein’s account of perception is similar. When writing about perception in *Przedstawienia imaginatywne [Imaginative Presentations]*, he emphasises that, in addition to colours, we are also given ‘*Gestalt* qualities’ (Blaustein, 2005, p. 61). This means the entirety of specific qualities that are given in perception in a certain order. Importantly, however, perception does not capture elements of the *Gestalt* but the entirety of their arrangement precisely as they are arranged. Blaustein stresses that the subject *anticipates* such wholes. The Polish philosopher understands this ‘anticipation’ as a psychic disposition of referring to complexes of psychic facts (Blaustein, 1926–1927, p. 192b). Thus, a given object may be accounted for in different ways, depending on the attitude of its perceiver. Blaustein uses a similar description to explain changes in the attitude of a subject to an object that, although unchanged, is captured differently, depending on the attitude. One example of this type of perception is accounting for a person of the stage this time as an actor, this time as, for instance, Shakespeare’s Henry IV.

## 5. Conclusion

This article aimed to identify the psychological themes present in Blaustein’s method. It was motivated by the need to address the problem of divergent interpretations of the philosopher’s thought. I outlined selected elements of descriptive psychology and *Gestalt* psychology. It turns out that Blaustein leaned on these traditions when defining the object of his analyses and the elements of his method. He understood the object of psychology as ‘psychic life’ (Twardowski, Dilthey), and its method as introspection and retrospection (Brentano, Twardowski) enabling a descriptive analysis of *types* of lived experiences (Twardowski). However, any investigation must be two-pronged, that is, it

must focus on acts as well as impressions (Stumpf). Blaustein's methodological approach does not exclude experiments (Twardowski, Stumpf). It also accounts for perception as an act directed at certain Gestalt forms (Wertheimer). It would be hard, however, to call the Polish philosopher an uncritical interpreter of descriptive psychology and *Gestaltpsychologie*. One proof of this is that, contrary to some schools operating in this tradition (early Twardowski, Dilthey, Stumpf), he does not accept psychologism. The impact descriptive and Gestalt types of psychology had on Blaustein are visible in his understanding of phenomenology not as *a priori* eidetics, but as empirical descriptive psychology. For Blaustein, a descriptive psychologist analyses phenomena and psychic life by describing moments of experience thanks to which the method makes it possible to undergo what is experienced as experienced. It seems that this last element – i.e. accounting for the object of psychology in a specific modus 'as' – determines the phenomenological nature of Blaustein's descriptive psychology. Furthermore, what the project of descriptive psychology shares with phenomenology is mistrust of the constructive-hypothetical approach and prioritizing direct experience. In light of the findings above, it may be concluded that Blaustein's phenomenology contains clear psychological motives that require further, more thorough studies to be described fully. It is beyond any doubt, however, that Blaustein's method is a case of a *phenomenologically oriented descriptive psychology* which is akin to (due to its rejection of reduction) but not identical with (due to the admittance of experiments as a complement of description) the project presented by Husserl in the first edition of the *Investigations*.

### Summary

The article explores psychological motives in Leopold Blaustein's philosophy. Blaustein was educated in Lvov, Freiburg im Breisgau and Berlin. In his original explorations, he attempted to connect a phenomenological perspective with descriptive psychology. As trained by Twardowski, he took over some motives of understanding the method of philosophy (psychology), its objectives and aims. The author situates Blaustein also in a dialogue with Stumpf and next to the context of Dilthey's humanistic psychology is examined. Finally, the article explores the influences of Gestalt psychology on Blaustein. The ultimate thesis of the article is that Blaustein's method can be grasped as a phenomenologically oriented descriptive psychology.

**Keywords:** Descriptive psychology, phenomenology, gestalt qualities, Blaustein, Twardowski, Lvov-Warsaw School.

## Annäherung an die Vielfalt lebendiger Erfahrungen: Die psychologischen Motive in Leopold Blausteins Methode

### Zusammenfassung

Der Artikel untersucht psychologische Motive in Leopold Blausteins Philosophie. Blaustein hat in Lemberg, Freiburg im Breisgau und in Berlin studiert. In seiner originellen Philosophie unternimmt er den Versuch, die phänomenologische Perspektive mit der deskriptiven Psychologie zu verbinden. Wie Twardowski versteht er die Methode der Philosophie, ihren Gegenstand und ihre Ziele, als psychologische Instrumente. Der Autor stellt Blaustein in einem Dialog mit Stumpf und Diltheys humanistischer Psychologie vor. Im weiteren werden Einflüsse der Gestaltpsychologie auf Blaustein untersucht. Die These des Artikels ist, dass Blausteins Methode als phänomenologisch orientierte deskriptive Psychologie verstanden werden kann.

**Schlüsselwörter:** Deskriptive Psychologie, Phänomenologie, Gestaltqualitäten, Blaustein, Twardowski, Lemberg-Warschauer Schule.

### Acknowledgement

The project was held within the research grant on ‘The Presence of Kazimierz Twardowski’s Thought in Early Phenomenology in Poland’ financed by the National Science Centre, Poland within the OPUS programme (No. 2017/27/B/HS1/02455).

### References

- Blaustein, L. (1926–1927). O niektórych nastawieniach na świat nas otaczający. Autoreferat [On some attitudes to the world surrounding us. Summary]. *Ruch Filozoficzny*, 10(7–12), 192b–193b.
- Blaustein, L. (1928). *Husserlowska nauka o akcie, treści i przedmiocie przedstawienia* [Husserl’s theory of the act, content and the object of presentation]. Lvov: Nakładem Towarzystwa Naukowego z Zasiłkiem Ministerstwa Wyznań Religijnych i Oświecenia Publicznego.
- Blaustein, L. (1928–1929). Próba krytycznej oceny fenomenologii [An attempt at the critical evaluation of phenomenology]. *Ruch Filozoficzny*, 11, 164b–166b.
- Blaustein, L. (1931). W sprawie wyobrażeń imaginatywnych [On the issue of imaginative presentations]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, 34(2–3), 180–187.
- Blaustein, L. (1935). O zadaniach psychologii humanistycznej [On the tasks of the humanistic psychology]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, 38(1–2), 33–57.
- Blaustein, L. (1937–1938). Karl Stumpf [Carl Stumpf]. *Polskie Archiwum Psychologii*, 10(1–4), 33–34.
- Blaustein, L. (2005). *Wybór pism estetycznych* [Selection of aesthetic writings], Z. Rosińska (Ed.). Krakow, Poland: Universitas.
- Bobryk, J. (2009). The genesis and history of Twardowski’s theory of actions and products. In S. Lapointe, J. Woleński, M. Marion, & W. Miskiewicz (Eds.), *The golden age of Polish philosophy. Kazimierz Twardowski’s philosophical legacy* (pp. 33–42). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Brentano, F. (1995a). *Descriptive psychology*, English trans. B. Müller. London, UK: Routledge.
- Brentano, F. (1995b). *Psychology from an empirical standpoint*, English trans. A. C. Rancurello, D. B. Terrell, & L. L. McAlister. London, UK: Routledge.
- Chrudzimski, A. (2001). *Intentionalitätstheorie beim frühen Brentano*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Dąbrowski, M. A. (1981). Bibliografia prac Leopolda Blausteina [A bibliography of Leopold Blaustein’s works]. *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, 29(1), 244–254.
- Dilthey, W. (1977). *Descriptive psychology and historical understanding*, English trans. R. M. Zaner & K. L. Heiges. The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.

- Fisette, D. (2010). Descriptive psychology and natural sciences: Husserl's early criticism of Brentano. In C. Ierna, H. Jacobs, & F. Mattens (Eds.), *Philosophy, phenomenology, sciences: Essays in commemoration of Edmund Husserl* (pp. 221–253). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Husserl, E. (1983). *Ideas pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy. First book. General introduction to a pure phenomenology*, English trans. F. Kersten. The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Ingarden, R. (1963). Leopold Blaustein – teoretyk radia i filmu [Leopold Blaustein – a theoretician of radio and film]. *Zeszyty Prasoznawcze*, 4(3), 86–93.
- Martinelli, R. (2015). A philosopher in the lab. Carl Stumpf on philosophy and experimental sciences. *Philosophia Scientia*, 19(3), 23–43.
- Miskiewicz, W. (2009). Leopold Blaustein's analytical phenomenology. In S. Lapointe, J. Woleński, M. Marion, & W. Miskiewicz (Eds.), *The golden age of Polish philosophy. Kazimierz Twardowski's philosophical legacy* (pp. 181–188). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Murray, D. J. (2012). Gestalt psychology. In R. W. Rieber (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of the history of psychological theories* (pp. 473–489). New York, NY: Springer.
- Pazura, S. (1966). Blaustein, Leopold. In I. Krońska (Ed.), *Słownik Filozofów, T. I* [Dictionary of philosophers, vol. I] (p. 90). Warsaw, Poland: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Plotka, W. (2017). Early phenomenology in Poland (1895–1945): Origins, development, and breakdown. *Studies in East European Thought*, 69(1), 79–91.
- Plotka, W. (2020). From psychology to phenomenology (and back again): A controversy over the method in the school of Twardowski. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 19(1), 141–167.
- Pokropski, M. (2015). Leopold Blaustein's critique of Husserl's early theory of intentional act, object and content. *Studia Phaenomenologica*, 15, 93–103.
- Rzepa, T. (1991). Psychologiczne poglądy Kazimierza Twardowskiego [Psychological views of Kazimierz Twardowski]. *Studia Philosophiae Christianae*, 27(2), 163–175.
- Rzepa, T. (1992). Psychologia w szkole lwowsko-warszawskiej [Psychology in the Lvov-Warsaw School]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria*, 1(1), 35–45.
- Stumpf, C. (1891). Psychologie und Erkenntnistheorie. *Abhandlungen der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 19(2), 465–516.
- Stumpf, C. (1906a). *Erscheinungen und psychische Funktionen*. Berlin, Germany: Verlag der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Stumpf, C. (1906b). *Zur Einteilung der Wissenschaften*, Berlin, Germany: Verlag der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Stumpf, C. (1924). Carl Stumpf. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, Bd. 5 (pp. 205–265). Leipzig, Germany: Felix Meiner.
- Twardowski, K. (1965). *Wybrane pisma filozoficzne* [Selected philosophical writings]. Warsaw, Poland: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Twardowski, K. (1999). *On actions, products and other topics in philosophy*. J. L. Brandl & J. Woleński (Eds.). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi.
- Van der Schaar, M. (2015). *Kazimierz Twardowski: A grammar for philosophy*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Wertheimer, M. (1938). Laws of organization in perceptual forms. In W. D. Ellis (Ed.), *A source book of Gestalt psychology* (pp. 71–88). London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Woleński, J. (1989). *Logic and philosophy in the Lvov-Warsaw School*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Woleński, J. (1994). Szkoła lwowsko-warszawska: między brentanizmem a pozytywizmem [The Lvov-Warsaw School: between Brentanianism and positivism]. *Principia*, 8–9, 69–89.
- Woleński, J. (2017). Brentanian motives in Kazimierz Twardowski and his students. In A. Brożek, F. Stadler, & J. Woleński (Eds.), *The significance of the Lvov–Warsaw School in the European culture* (pp. 47–64). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

**Witold Plotka**, Associate Professor at the Institute of Philosophy, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw. His publications include articles on, for instance, the theory of intentionality, theory of knowledge, and the history of the phenomenological movement. He published two books: *Studia z fenomenologii poznania. Transcendentalna filozofia Edmunda Husserla a problem wiedzy* [Studies in the Phenomenology of Cognition. Transcendental Philosophy of Edmund Husserl and the Problem of Knowledge] (2015) and *Fenomenologia jako filozofia mniejsza. Rozważania wokół sporów o metodę Husserla* [Phenomenology as a Minor Philosophy. Considering the Controversies over Husserl's Method] (2019). Recently he published, for instance, 'Reduction and the Question of Beginnings in Husserl, Fink and Patočka' (*Human Studies*, 41(4), 2018), 'From Psychology to Phenomenology (and Back Again): A Controversy over the Method in the School of Twardowski' (*Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 19(1), 2020), and 'A Controversy over the Existence of Fictional Objects: Husserl and Ingarden on Imagination and Fiction' (*Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, 51(1), 2020).

**Address:** Institute of Philosophy, Faculty of Christian Philosophy, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Wóycickiego St. 1/3, building 23, PL-01-938 Warsaw.

**E-mail:** witoldplotka@gmail.com; w.plotka@uksw.edu.pl