

Austrian Philosophy: Outlines of a Discipline at the University of Vienna in the 20th Century*

I. BACKGROUND

Since the foundation of the University of Vienna, the Faculty of Philosophy, as a “faculty of the arts”, had played a subordinate role – also as a field of study – in relation to the faculties of Medicine, Law and Theology.¹ The Faculty continued to be instrumentalized as an *ancilla* by the respective prevailing powers until 1848. In predominantly Catholic Austria, Immanuel Kant’s philosophy was marginalized for being enlightening or revolutionary, and the position on the philosophy of German idealism was regarded as crucial to the development of a specifically “Austrian philosophy” after 1848. This happened in the spirit of an alleged Austrian *Sonderweg* (distinct course in Austria-Hungary) against each form of dialectic, transcendental and aprioristic philosophy of Prussian-German origin.² But given the specific development in the monarchy, this very claim should be examined with a critical eye to increase the focus on Kant’s polarizing or identity-defining role in proportion to the Austrian line of tradition extending from Bernard Bolzano through Robert Zimmermann and up to Franz Brentano and his influential school.³ There is no question that the Königsberg philosopher remained a reference until the heyday of the Vienna Circle and also thereafter. It was about answering the question of the autonomy and scientific nature of philosophy given the growing importance of individual disciplines of the cultural, social and natural sciences (including mathematics) in the maelstrom of the second scientific revolution. From the beginning, the propaedeutic nature of the Faculty of Philosophy and the subordinate role of philosophy had in any case simultaneously prompted Kant’s appeal to revalue the “lower” faculty against the three “higher” ones due to its intrinsic formative aspect and the

* This article is an abridged English version of Stadler 2015.

¹ A descriptive overview is the unpublished dissertation of Wieser 1950.

² Regarding the thesis of a typical “Austrian philosophy”: Lehrer et al. 1997.

³ On the relation of scientific philosophy and the Vienna Circle to (Neo-)Kantianism see Stadler 2015 and 2018.

reflective reason versus the profession-oriented faculties for physicians, government officials and theologians.⁴

If we characterize the philosophical scene at the University of Vienna during the Austro-Hungarian Empire from the mid-19th century to the end of the First World War, we can identify the following main lines:

- A marginal Hegelianism and a moderate Kantian tradition.
- A predominantly anti-idealistic philosophy concerned with linguistic criticism, which was oriented towards empirical individual disciplines and spanned ideologically from the Catholic to the social-liberal (late-) Enlightenment. The direction of empirical philosophy and psychology claiming exact methodology that took its origin from Brentano dominated towards the end of the 19th century; in the latter phase, up until the First World War, Ernst Mach prevailed with his teaching, which had an impact up until the inter-war period.
- At the same time, a diverse philosophical “counter world” of a metaphysical supreme discipline existed apart from actual research work.

If – despite all differentiation – we want to mention essential characteristics of “Austrian philosophy” in Vienna during the monarchy, we can certainly agree with Carl Siegel in noting a trend towards objectivism and realism from an epistemological and logical perspective (Siegel 1930). Schools, institutions and social movements make the contents and outlines of all these trends more understandable, which document a stronger presence of philosophy within the faculty and university.⁵

II. NEW BEGINNINGS IN THE FIRST AUSTRIAN REPUBLIC

Following the vacancies during the First World War (with the exception Adolf Stöhr), three chairs were filled at the same time in 1922. This represented an upswing, which was to secure Viennese philosophy and psychology being recognized worldwide up until the time of the Austro-fascist *Ständestaat* (corporative state).

With this unique initiative, Moritz Schlick who was to become the centre of the world-famous Vienna Circle until his assassination at the university in June 1936 and also served as head of the Ernst Mach Society (1928–1934) continued the direction pursued since Mach and Boltzmann. On the other hand, the emerging developmental, experimental and cognitive psychology became established till 1938 with Karl Bühler and his wife Charlotte Bühler.

⁴ Kant 1798/1986; for a discussion of Kant’s late writing: Gerhardt 2005.

⁵ As general references: Meister 1927 and 1937; Bauer 1966; Benedikt 1992; Acham 1999.

The history of philosophy and the tradition of transcendental philosophy continued to be systematically backed, also by Robert Reininger, within the Vienna Philosophical Society, later on covering the Austrian Kant-Gesellschaft. As of 1924, the history of ancient philosophy was further strengthened through Heinrich Gomperz's appointment to the fourth chair before he had to leave his position early due to his opposition to the Schuschnigg regime. In 1935, his full professorship was converted into a tenure track assistant professorship to which the Catholic philosopher Dietrich von Hildebrand who came from Munich was appointed for two years until the "annexation".

Alois Dempf who held this professorship from 1937 to 1938 until his dismissal by the national socialists was called to succeed Schlick. This represented a markedly radical change of the tradition and denomination of Schlick's chair for natural philosophy, which now became Catholic-oriented metaphysics and Christian *Weltanschauung* – a direction that again displayed continuity in terms of personnel and content after 1945 with Dempf's return and the appointment of Leo Gabriel.

Among the external lecturers who attained their *habilitation* (*venia docendi*) in the inter-war period, Sigmund Kornfeld, Hans Eibl, Karl von Roretz and Rudolf Carnap, who along with Schlick was to be found at the very core of the Vienna Circle before moving to Prague in 1931, are worth mentioning here. Friedrich Waismann, a student and long-term assistant of Schlick's was able to work at the institute as a librarian until 1936 without being officially employed. He gave lectures on a regular basis and was a key member of the Vienna Circle, also as a dialogue partner of Ludwig Wittgenstein (McGuinness 1984).

Looking at the subject of philosophy at the Vienna University in concrete terms, we can see that the teaching faculty (altogether 22) during the period from 1918 to 1938 included Moritz Schlick who taught scientific and analytical philosophy as a full professor from 1922 to 1936, Rudolf Carnap as an extraordinary lecturer and titular professor from 1926 to 1931 and Viktor Kraft as an extraordinary lecturer and titular professor from 1914 to 1938. The most widely taught subject was history of philosophy, which along with ethics also drew the largest number of listeners. The already mentioned *Philosophical Society of the University of Vienna* was a crucial affiliated institution and simultaneously the local group of the Kant-Gesellschaft (*Kant Society*) from 1927. Scientific philosophy accounted for about one seventh of the lectures held at the Philosophical Society as was the case in Vienna International University Courses. If we focus on the discipline philosophy at the University of Vienna between 1918 and 1938 (Wieser 1950, 158, 231 and 235 ff.), we can identify as proponents of scientific philosophy Moritz Schlick, Rudolf Carnap, and Viktor Kraft out of 22 teachers in total. The most frequent topics were history of philosophy together with ethics, both of which had also the largest attendance of students. In parallel, the *Philosophische Gesellschaft an der Universität Wien* (*Philosophical Society at the University of Vienna*), since 1927 also acting as the

Austrian branch of the German Kant-Gesellschaft (Kant Society), was an important and influential society covering a broad spectrum of philosophical research (Reininger 1938. 21–43). As in the “Wiener Internationale Hochschulkurse” (Vienna International University Lectures) only one seventh is to be judged as part of the scientific philosophy paradigm (Gabriel 1972. 8 and 14).

III. ON PHILOSOPHY DURING AUSTROFASCISM AND NATIONAL SOCIALISM

Schlick’s assassination on 22 June 1936⁶ marked a de facto end to the then already world-famous Vienna Circle and to analytic and scientific philosophy in Austria before National Socialism caused a violent and definitive close to this philosophical movement.⁷ The consequences of the destruction and expulsion of this scientific culture by the anti-Semitic forces at the University of Vienna continued to have an impact for a long time well into the Second Republic (Stadler 2005; Pasteur et.al. 2003–2004). After the Nazis seized power in March 1938, dismissals and expulsions in the spirit of the racist dictatorial state occurred, with support also coming from members of the University of Vienna.

Prior to the “annexation”, three chairs existed at the Institute of Philosophy. (As an overview: Benetka 1995. 338 ff.) These chairs were held by Alois Dempf, Robert Reininger and Karl Bühler.⁸ The changes due to the takeover of power by the National Socialists after March 1938 signaled the attempt of political and ideological “standardizing” but were also an expression of a polycratic science policy of National Socialists between the poles of Berlin and the “Ostmark”.⁹

Professor of Christian philosophy Alois Dempf’s *venia docendi* was withdrawn and he was forced to retire for political and ideological reasons. Due to his activities in Red Vienna and his Jewish wife Charlotte Bühler, Karl Bühler, founder of the Vienna school of cognitive and Gestalt psychology was also dismissed and forced to emigrate to the U.S.¹⁰ His long-standing coworker Egon Brunswik had emigrated to the US to Berkeley one year earlier, too, and was followed by his later wife Else Frenkel-Brunswik. We can thus speak of a total break at the University of Vienna in the case of the Bühler school. This break also meant the end

⁶ On the background of this murder: Lotz 2009.

⁷ As a characterization of the preceding “conservative revolution”: Mohler 1972; on the expulsion of scientific philosophers and philosophers of science: Stadler 2010; on the intellectual migration in general: Stadler et al. 1995.

⁸ It has to be mentioned that psychology and pedagogy were linked together within a research and teaching field. Cf. Brezinka 2000; Olechowski 2015.

⁹ Heiss 2003; Huber et al. 2011; Huber 2012; Pfefferle 2014. Memory book for the victims of NS at the University of Vienna: < <http://gedenkbuch.univie.ac.at> > Last access 30-11-2018.

¹⁰ On the dismissal and forced migration of Karl and Charlotte Bühler: Ash 2004; Eschbach et al. 2004. On the consequences of the NS for psychology: Benetka et al. 1988. 147–167.

of an innovative cooperation between philosophy and psychology (Karl Bühler and Moritz Schlick) as well psychoanalysis, which failed to gain a foothold as an academic discipline, and social research (as part of the Research Unit for Economic Psychology around the Büblers).¹¹ It was during the National Socialist era that the psychologist Hubert Rohrer launched his career. Similar to Richard Meister in pedagogy, Rohrer worked for psychology and university politics well into the Second Republic. After the “annexation”, psycholinguist Friedrich Kainz was appointed provisional head of the Institute of Psychology and – as a successor to Dietrich von Hildebrand who was dismissed in March and emigrated to the U.S. later – received the vacant tenure track position as an associate professor for philosophy with a particular focus on aesthetics and the psychology of language. (On Kainz in more detail: Heiss 1993.) Kainz is a typical example of an opportunist and wryneck who moved up the career ladder in the Second Republic (Tilitzky 2002. 778 ff.) and worked as a full professor for psychology of language, aesthetics, art philosophy and history of philosophy. (On the life and work of Kainz: Gelbmann 2004; Levelt 2014.)

Finally, reconstruction in the Nazi spirit was to be put into practice by electing Gunter Ipsen and Arnold Gehlen to the two chairs in philosophy: Karl Bühler’s chair was filled by SA and NSDAP member Ipsen who came from Königsberg on 22 May 1939 as professor for *philosophy and ethnology* (*Philosophie und Volkslehre*) and was appointed director of the Institute of Psychology in September 1943. Expectations of a new philosophy for the purposes of the National Socialist expansion policy in the East and South East seem to have played a role just as the interdisciplinary perspective for National Socialism’s demographic policy ambitions. Since Ipsen was recruited to the military after the outbreak of the war, his field of action with regard to the expected philosophical and sociological support of *Ostforschung* (*research on the East*) remained limited until 1945 when he was dismissed from the University of Vienna like all *Reichsdeutschen* (*Germans of the Reich*). From November 1940, Robert Reininger who retired in 1939 was succeeded by philosopher and sociologist Gehlen who had held the *Kant chair* in Königsberg since 1938 and was subsequently commissioned after the “annexation” by the Reich Ministry of Education to reorganize philosophy and the institutes of the Faculty of Philosophy in Vienna. Simultaneously, he took up the directorship of the Institute of Psychology in April 1940 and that of the Institute of Philosophy in 1942. He supported philosophical anthropology and the sociological approach in the context of the new *Volksforschung* (*Volk research*). Hans Eibl’s extraordinary professorship was maintained even though he strongly urged that it be converted into a full professorship with the help of

¹¹ Regarding the Pedagogical Institute of the City of Vienna headed by Karl Bühler, and the linked research unit with Marie Jahoda and Paul Lazarsfeld see Benetka 1990.

Dean Viktor Christian. Due to his strong involvement in National Socialism, he was obliged to retire early after 1945.

At the beginning of the Second Republic, the philosophers active prior to 1938 who had not emigrated were recalled, and – after a delayed denazification which was terminated as of 1948 – the members of the institute active during the national socialist era were rehabilitated and put back into service. This is evident in the emerging careers of Erich Heintel and Friedrich Kainz. Between clerical restoration and a failed de-nazification, the way was paved for a conservative restoration of philosophy after 1945.

IV. PHILOSOPHY IN THE SECOND AUSTRIAN REPUBLIC BETWEEN PROVINCIALIZATION AND INTERNATIONALIZATION

Along the lines of the general political and cultural development at the beginning of the Second Republic, a characterization of the *supreme discipline* of philosophy along with psychology and pedagogy at the University of Vienna in the first decade after the Second World War can be described as a phenomenon of both continuity and disruption (Stadler 2004a). For a long time, the Faculty of Philosophy was an important organizational unit of the university in faculty dynamics and also had more than just subject-specific significance with the mandatory *Philosophicum* and the general standards in teacher training for secondary schools. (On doctoral studies and the *Philosophicum*: Meister 1958.) As programmatically signaled by the headline of a relevant journal, that's where *science and world view* (*Wissenschaft und Weltbild*) was taught and transmitted. With the *Wiener Zeitschrift für Philosophie, Psychologie und Pädagogik* (*Vienna Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Pedagogy*), the *Fächerbündel* (individual combinations of courses taken from different subjects) which also denoted the corresponding teacher training for the subject at secondary schools, the so-called *Gymnasien* (*Philosophischer Einführungsunterricht; philosophical introduction lessons*) was featured in another periodical. The biographies of the most important editors of these two journals – Alois Dempf and Leo Gabriel at the one hand and Richard Meister and Hubert Rohrer on the other – allow us to reconstruct the development of these disciplines from the First to the Second Republic on the basis of various university appointments.

Here, we are confronted with considerable elite continuity, which is linked to the phenomenon of forced emigration and non-existent remigration in the context of half-hearted denazification followed by the Cold War period. A critical examination of the individual disciplines was carried out relatively late (Fischer et al. 1993) after a deepening had been provoked in connection with exile and emigration research (Stadler 2004b).

As far as the correlated break is concerned, relevant research has already brought substantial findings to light: In the context of *Vertriebene Vernunft* (*exiled*

reason), innovative movements such as the Vienna Circle or the school of Gestalt and cognitive psychology, which have an international recognition up to this day, were expelled and destroyed (Ash 1995; Ash et al. 1996; Benetka 1995; Stadler 1997/2001). An adequate description of philosophy, psychology and pedagogy at the University of Vienna during the period of “reconstruction” since the so-called *zero hour* (*Stunde Null*) is only possible against the backdrop of this dual history of science. The hardly practiced remigration is to be included in an overall assessment just as the related “second wave” of emigration of a younger generation of philosophers from Vienna as a result of the dominance of a clerical-conservative culture. (Pasteur et al. 2003–2004; *Österreich – Geistige Provinz?* 1965.)

What needs to be noted from a gender perspective is that – unlike exiled philosophy – the proportion of women in home-grown philosophical activity was virtually zero after 1938 and 1945. This is also related to the fact that the proportion of male and female philosophers of Jewish origin in philosophers forced to emigrate was relatively high prior to the ‘annexation’ (Frauen im Exil 2005; Stadler 1998; Korotin 1997; Ingrisch 2015).

In more recent studies, the social framework has been described as restoration under the sway of the founding myth (Hanisch 1994). To be sure, the university-wide context as well as the general situation of philosophy, pedagogy and psychology in Austria represents a specific general frame of reference (Preglau-Hämmerle 1986. 197 ff.; Gabriel et al. 1968; Haller 2004; Acham 2004, Vol. 6.1; Benedikt et al. 2005, Vol. 5).

Only the most important developments can be discussed here (Korotin 1993–1994; Leaman 1993–1994): Alois Dempf, who had published for a while even after his forced retirement, was able to resume his activities after the war in Vienna (Heiss 1993. 138 ff.). He was called to the University of Munich in the year 1948 but continued to work as a visiting professor in Vienna for several more years. Leo Gabriel who had already been active as a cultural official, teacher and instructor in adult education during Austro-fascism and had attained his *habilitation* in 1947, became Dempf’s successor to the chair, ensuring the continuity of political Catholicism at the university. With his holistic philosophy inspired by Othmar Spann – e.g., his *Führertum und Gefolgschaft* (1937) (leadership and followership) – as well as the all-embracing *integral logic*, he would also shape philosophy in Vienna for some decades to come. (As to the autobiographical description of Gabriel: Lotz-Rimbach 2004.) As mentioned earlier, Friedrich Kainz’s career continued to evolve steadily after 1945 until the crisis year of 1968 (Heiss 1993. 145 f.; Rathkolb et al. 2010). After 1945, Viktor Kraft was the only member of the Vienna Circle who managed to resume his teaching and research activities after having been dismissed by the Nazis. In 1945 the university library was reactivated and he retired as national librarian two years later. In 1947, when Kraft was 67, he was appointed associate professor and finally full professor for philosophy from 1950 to 1952 – for almost two years until his retirement.

During this time, Erich Heintel pursued his career. He attained his *habilitation* following the “annexation”, becoming a member of the NSDAP and “lecturer of the new system” (Dozent neuer Ordnung) for philosophy (metaphysics, epistemology, theory of value and ethics). Following an interruption for political reasons, he was able to lecture again in the 1949–1950 winter semester after having successfully applied for his *venia docendi* (authorization to teach) to be reissued. He was appointed associate professor in 1952 and full professor in 1960. With Gabriel and Heintel, both Christian existentialism and German idealism based on Protestant theology took root at the University of Vienna. Here, we have some sort of continuation of the polarization of the culture war during the inter-war period: From Gabriel’s and Heintel’s perspective, both Marxism and “positivism” were “labyrinths of philosophy”, which also reflected the view of the then minister of education Heinrich Drimmel (Knoll 1986: 278; Vienna University Archives: UAW, PhF, FSP, 16.10.48; Weiss 2009). The Vienna Circle, pure theory of law and psychoanalysis continued to be regarded as manifestations of a Jew-ridden liberalism and socialism (Topitsch 1967; König 2013; Nemeth 1993).

Ten years of “reconstruction” had resulted in a quantitative development of the classical philosophical teaching activities while continuation and stabilization were simultaneously observed in the conflicted area between “repressed humanism and delayed Enlightenment” (Benedikt et al. 2005, Vol. 5). The attempt to take up the scientific philosophy of the First Republic around Viktor Kraft who was reactivated at short notice remained episodic for a variety of reasons (Fischer et al. 2006). In the 1953–1954 academic years, he brought the young American philosopher Arthur Pap to Vienna as a visiting professor with the support of the Fulbright program. The latter was a pioneer in post-war analytic philosophy and had unsuccessfully attempted to pick up the earlier links of Viennese philosophy to what was the “golden age of Austrian philosophy” (Fischer 1995) on a global scale. For this purpose, he hired the highly talented Viennese philosopher Paul Feyerabend who assisted him in publishing his book *Analytische Philosophie. Kritische Übersicht über die neueste Entwicklung in den USA und England (Analytic Philosophy. A Critical Overview of the Most Recent Development in the U.S. and England)*, published by Viennese Springer Verlag in 1955 – “in memory of and for the revival of the Vienna Circle”. For Feyerabend, the Kraft Circle of the Austrian College 1949–1953 – which included a personal meeting with Ludwig Wittgenstein – and the working group at the Vienna Institute of Science and Art (Institut für Wissenschaft und Kunst) meant a break with the Austrian province and the beginning of his international career (Keupink–Shie 2006; Topitsch 1960; Feyerabend et al. 1966. 3; Stadler 2010).

This brief renewal attempt is typical for the decade of “reconstruction” – a situation Ernst Topitsch, another former member of the Institute of Philosophy, characterized as *Österreichs Philosophie – Zwischen totalitär und konservativ* (1967)

(*Austria's Philosophy – Between Totalitarian and Conservative*).¹² In this work, the author, an admirer of Heinrich Gomperz, criticized the ideological philosophy of the political Catholicism and the natural law variant of Christian philosophy in keeping with his book *Vom Ursprung und Ende der Metaphysik* (1958) (*On the Origin and the End of Metaphysics*). Troubled by the philosophy of Weltanschauung, Topitsch himself accepted a call to a chair in Heidelberg in the year 1962, before he went to the University of Graz in 1969, where he worked till the end of his life (2003).¹³ Another member of the Kraft circle was Béla Juhos who – despite his international reputation – only got as far as becoming an external lecturer for theoretical philosophy with the title of an associate professor and represents another example of the marginalization of science-driven philosophy. In November 1965, the “Juhos case” triggered by Béla Juhos’ article “Gibt es in Österreich eine wissenschaftliche Philosophie?” (Is there a thing as a scientific philosophy in Austria, 1965) even led to a parliamentary question being directed to the then minister of education (Theodor Piffl-Percevic), which prompted former Austrian President Heinz Fischer to publish a piece of writing on the issue of “freedom of science in Austria”. In Vienna, Juhos remained a “thinker without any impact” even though he had made significant contributions to epistemology and the philosophy of science (Schleichert 1971).

Following Gottlob Frege, Bertrand Russell, Alfred North Whitehead and especially world-famous Kurt Gödel, the establishment of modern (symbolic) logic in Vienna – besides the traditional fields of philosophy, metaphysics, epistemology, ethics and logic, came late with a separate institute of logistics headed by Curt Christian. In the 1980s, a separate (meanwhile closed down) institute of philosophy of science and science studies was added (Stadler 2012). Against this backdrop, the “autochthonous provincialization” (Fleck 1996) appears to be a targeted strategy of immunization of the political and scientific elites. This is all the more the case given the fact that a promising younger generation of philosophers went abroad or left Vienna due to these structural deficiencies: Besides the already mentioned Feyerabend and Topitsch, this was, for instance, also true for Heinz von Foerster, Werner Leinfellner, Hubert Schleichert, Heinrich Kleiner – and not least for Austrian Wolfgang Stegmüller who was most influential in Germany (Stadler 2010). In Vienna, it is only since the 1970s that returned emigrant Kurt Rudolf Fischer, a fellow student of Feyerabend in Berkeley, contributed to a slow internationalization and pluralization process in his many years of working as a visiting and honorary professor at the Institute of

¹² E.g., there was an attractive list of candidates for an associate professor (1. Friedrich Waismann and Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker, 2. Béla Juhos, 3. Erich Heintel), to which Heintel was appointed. Cf. Reiter 2011. 77–84.

¹³ *Aufklärung und Kritik*, 2004.

Philosophy and, above all, thanks to his contacts with Anglo-American analytical philosophy (Diem-Wille et al. 2002; Stadler 2017).

Curiously, Leo Gabriel began his career in the Second Republic by taking over Schlick's former chair in the year 1951. "Integral logic and universalism" as "all-encompassing truth" was the motto now. The fact that this philosophical program did not remain just a personal opinion is demonstrated by the symptomatic historical influence in subsequent decades: at the 1968 *XIV. International Congress of Philosophy* in Vienna, Gabriel succeeded in having integral philosophy declared as a state philosophy, so to speak.

As a result, we have a continuity, which followed on political Catholicism and universalism of the corporative state with "integral logic" and at the same time prevented the remigration of philosophers who had been forced into exile. Add to this Erich Heintel's post-war career as an advocate of transcendental philosophy, neither the international remoteness of Viennese philosophy in the first decades after 1945 nor the continued exiling of philosophers are surprising. This bipolarity was still passed on students of the two mentioned full professors before the Institute of Philosophy began opening up and assumed a more pluralist orientation since the 1970s.

The development after the large 1968 International Congress of Philosophy in Vienna with the subsequent retirements of Gabriel (1972) and Heintel (1982) put an end to the dual dominance with two separate institutes of philosophy since the UOG 1975 (university act 1975). It is characterized by the establishment of the second generation of the two full professorships and additional appointments and calls, which can, first and foremost, be outlined by way of calls here. Karl Ulmer from Germany, who succeeded Kainz, was active as a hermeneutical philosopher focusing on immanent text interpretation and rational argumentation for about ten years from 1970. In 1982, he was followed by Hans Dieter Klein who had attained his *habilitation* at the institute and continued to nurture German idealism and transcendental philosophy towards systematic philosophy. Herta Nagl who developed the classical canon towards philosophy of history and feminist philosophy also came from this generation. Hans-Dieter Bahr was called from Germany to succeed Heintel who mainly advocated a postmodern philosophy of technology apart from the philosophical tradition. Norbert Leser was called to a newly created chair in social philosophy and hermeneutics. He dealt with the Catholic social teaching in the context of Austrian intellectual history besides his specialization in Austro-Marxism. By focusing on (applied) ethics, French existential philosophy and Austrian philosophy, Peter Kampits who came from Gabriel has changed his mentor.

From 1976 until his retirement, Michael Benedikt supported the Kantian tradition as a full professor and linked phenomenology to critical anthropology. He earned special merit from the publication of the voluminous six-volume book series *Verdrängter Humanismus – verzögerte Aufklärung* (*Repressed Humanism – De-*

layed *Enlightenment*) on philosophy in Austria from 1400 until the present day (Benedikt et.al. 2010).

Johann Mader worked as a professor from 1971 to 1996 in line with German transcendental philosophy and classical history of philosophy. During this period, Günther Pöltner and Helmuth Vetter, in particular, also developed and established phenomenology, which is still strongly represented today. Here, attention should be paid not least to Franz Martin Wimmer who was able to develop the focus on intercultural philosophy as it exists today in a sustainable manner. At the same time, mention should be made of the many representatives of the *Mittelbau* (academic teaching and research staff who are assistant or associate with *habilitation*).¹⁴

In the field of philosophy of science and analytical philosophy, a reconnection to and further development of the great tradition of the interwar period can be linked with Wittgenstein and Vienna Circle research, which had started already before at the remaining Austrian universities (Stadler 2012). In 1972, Erhard Oeser who had come from Heintel took over the newly created chair in philosophy and philosophy of science. As part of the large 1968 International Congress, philosophy of science was still represented marginally, this is confirmed by the analysis of the situation of *Philosophie in Österreich (Philosophy in Austria)* in an international comparison carried out at that time (Gabriel et al. 1968; Fischer et al. 1993; Stadler 2005; Generally on philosophy in Austria since the Monarchy: Benedikt et al. 2005, 2010; Acham 2004, 2006). Thus, it was no coincidence that the modern analytical direction has only manifested itself as part of an informal working group for linguistic analytical philosophy since 1983 at the Vienna institute, which was mainly enriched by visiting and honorary professor Kurt Rudolf Fischer (Diem-Wille et al. 2002). The institute was extended through the foundation of the no longer existing institute of philosophy of science and science studies in the year 1986.

Since the beginning of the 21st century, the Institute of Philosophy has developed into one of the largest ones in the German-speaking area as a result of several calls mainly from abroad.¹⁵ In the year 2011, the Institute Vienna Circle founded as an association in 1991 was established within the organizational unit of the Faculty of Philosophy and Education – as a kind of belated token of restitution and recognition of the Viennese heritage.¹⁶

The past and future calls open up specializations and pluralization between “continental” and “analytical”, practical and theoretical philosophy as well as an interdisciplinary and/or transnational networking with an increasing presence of

¹⁴ Already in 2013 ca. 50 members of the department incl. project researchers (third party financed investigators) were listed in the website.

¹⁵ See: < <https://philosophie.univie.ac.at> > Last access 30-11-2018.

¹⁶ See < <https://wienerkreis.univie.ac.at/das-institut/> > and < <https://univie.ac.at/ivc> > Last access 30-11-2018.

female philosophers. Given the institute's development from the First to the Second Republic, this has ushered in a new phase with growing international recognition. But that is already a different story.

REFERENCES

- Acham, Karl (ed.) 2004. *Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften. Vol. 6.1. Philosophie und Religion: Erleben, Wissen, Erkennen*. Wien, Passagen Verlag.
- Acham, Karl (ed.) 2006. *Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften. Vol. 6.2. Philosophie und Religion: Gott, Sein und Sollen*. Wien, Passagen Verlag.
- Ash, Mitchell 1995. *Gestalt Psychology in German Culture 1890–1967*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ash, Mitchell – Söllner, Alfred (eds.) 1996. *Forced Migration and Scientific Change. Émigré German-Speaking Scientists and Scholars after 1933*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ash, Mitchell G. 2004. Österreichische Psychologen in der Emigration. Fragestellungen und Überblick. In Friedrich Stadler (ed.): *Vertriebene Vernunft. Emigration und Exil österreichischer Wissenschaft*. Vol. 2. Münster, LIT Verlag. 252–287.
- Aufklärung und Kritik. Zeitschrift für freies Denken und humanistische Philosophie*. Sonderheft 8/2004. Schwerpunkt: Ernst Topitsch.
- Bauer, Roger 1966. *Der Idealismus und seine Gegner in Österreich*. Heidelberg, Winter.
- Benedikt, Michael et al. (eds.) 2005. *Verdrängter Humanismus – verzögerte Aufklärung. Philosophie in Österreich. Vol. 5. Im Schatten der Totalitarismen. Vom philosophischen Empirismus zur kritischen Anthropologie, Philosophie in Österreich 1920–1951*. Wien, Facultas.
- Benedikt, Michael et al. (eds.) 2010. *Verdrängter Humanismus – verzögerte Aufklärung. Philosophie in Österreich. Vol. 6. Auf der Suche nach authentischem Philosophieren, Philosophie in Österreich 1951–2000*. Wien, Facultas.
- Benetka, Gerhard 1990. *Zur Geschichte der Institutionalisierung der Psychologie in Österreich: die Errichtung des Wiener Psychologischen Instituts*. (Veröffentlichungen des Ludwig-Boltzmann-Institutes für Geschichte der Gesellschaftswissenschaften; 20.) Wien–Salzburg, Geyer.
- Benetka, Gerhard 1995. *Psychologie in Wien. Sozial- und Theoriegeschichte des Wiener Psychologischen Instituts*. Wien, Facultas.
- Benetka, Gerhard – Kienreich, Werner 1988. Hochschulpsychologie in der Ostmark: Das Wiener Psychologische Institut. In Karl Fallend et al. (eds.) *Der Einmarsch in die Psyche. Psychoanalyse, Psychologie und Psychiatrie im Nationalsozialismus und die Folgen*. Wien, Junius. 147–167.
- Brezinka, Wolfgang 2000. *Pädagogik in Österreich. Die Geschichte des Faches an den Universitäten vom 18. bis zum Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Vol. I–III. Wien, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Dahms, Hans-Joachim – Stadler, Friedrich 2015. Die Philosophie an der Universität Wien von 1848 bis zur Gegenwart. In Kniefacz–Nemeth–Posch–Stadler (eds.) 77–132.
- Diem-Wille, Gertraud – Nagl, Ludwig – Stadler, Friedrich (eds.) 2002. *Weltanschauungen des Wiener Fin de Siecle 1900–2000. Festgabe für Kurt Rudolf Fischer zum achtzigsten Geburtstag*. Frankfurt/M, Peter Lang.
- Eschbach, Achim – Willenberg, Gabi 2004. Karl Bühler. In Friedrich Stadler (eds.) *Vertriebene Vernunft. Emigration und Exil österreichischer Wissenschaft*. Vol. II. Münster, LIT Verlag. 297–305.
- Feyerabend, Paul – Maxwell, Grover (eds.) 1966. *Mind, Matter, Method. Essays in Philosophy and Science in Honor of Herbert Feigl*. Minneapolis, Minnesota University Press.

- Fischer, Kurt R. – Wimmer, Franz M. (eds.) 1993. *Der geistige Anschluß. Philosophie und Politik an der Universität Wien 1930–1950*. Wien, VUW Universitätsverlag.
- Fischer, Kurt R. (ed.) 1995. *Das goldene Zeitalter der Österreichischen Philosophie. Ein Lesebuch*. Wien, VUW Universitätsverlag.
- Fischer, Kurt R. – Stadler, Friedrich (eds.) 2006. *Paul K. Feyerabend – Ein Philosoph aus Wien*. Wien – New York, Springer.
- Fleck, Christian 1996. Autochthone Provinzialisierung. Universität und Wissenschaftspolitik nach dem Ende der nationalsozialistischen Herrschaft in Österreich. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*. 7. 67–92.
- Frauen im Exil. Die weibliche Perspektive*. 2005. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Wissenschaft und Kunst*. 60. 1–2.
- Fröschl, Karl Anton – Müller, Gerd B. – Olechowski, Thomas – Schmidt-Lauber, Brigitta (eds.) 2015. *Reflexive Innenansichten aus der Universität. Disziplinengeschichten zwischen Wissenschaft, Gesellschaft und Politik*. (50 Jahre Universität Wien – Aufbruch ins neue Jahrhundert, 4.) Göttingen, Vienna University Press.
- Gabriel, Leo (ed.) 1972. *Wiener Internationale Hochschulkurse, 1922–1972*. Wien, Selbstverlag.
- Gabriel, Leo – Mader, Johann (eds.) 1968. *Philosophie in Österreich*. Als Beitrag zum XIV. Internationalen Kongreß für Philosophie in Wien, 2–9. September 1968. *Wissenschaft und Weltbild*. 21/2–3.
- Gedenkbuch für die Opfer des Nationalsozialismus an der Universität Wien 1938 | Memorial Book for the Victims of National Socialism at the University of Vienna in 1938*.
<https://gedenkbuch.univie.ac.at/index.php?id=435&no_cache=1&L=2> Last access 30-11-2018.
- Gelbmann, Gerhard 2004. *Sprachphilosophie und Sprachpsychologie. Der sprachkritische Ansatz von Friedrich Kainz*. Frankfurt/M – New York, Peter Lang.
- Gerhardt, Volker 2005. *Kant im Streit der Fakultäten*. Berlin, De Gruyter.
- Haller, Rudolf 2004. Die philosophische Entwicklung in Österreich am Beginn der Zweiten Republik. In Friedrich Stadler (ed.) *Kontinuität und Bruch*. 2nd edition. Münster, LIT Verlag. 157–180.
- Hanisch, Ernst 1994. *Der lange Schatten des Staates. Österreichische Gesellschaftsgeschichte im 20. Jahrhundert*. Wien, Überreuter.
- Heiss, Gernot 1993. „...wirkliche Möglichkeiten für eine nationalsozialistische Philosophie“? Die Reorganisation der Philosophie (Psychologie und Pädagogik) in Wien 1938 bis 1940. In Fischer–Wimmer (eds.) *Der geistige Anschluß*. Wien, Universitätsverlag. 130–169.
- Heiss, Gernot 2003. Philosophie an der Universität Wien von der Ersten zur Zweiten Republik. In Michael Heidelberger – Friedrich Stadler (eds.) *Wissenschaftsphilosophie und Politik. Philosophy of Science and Politics*. Wien – New York, Springer. 5–38.
- Huber, Andreas 2012. *Eliten/dis]kontinuitäten. Kollektivporträt der im Nationalsozialismus aus „politischen“ Gründen vertriebenen Hochschullehrer der Universität Wien*. (Unpublished thesis in philosophy, University of Vienna.)
- Huber, Andreas 2016. *Rückkehr erwünscht. Im Nationalsozialismus aus „politischen“ Gründen vertriebene Lehrende der Universität Wien*. Münster, LIT Verlag.
- Huber, Andreas – Posch, Herbert – Stadler, Friedrich 2011. *Eliten/dis]kontinuitäten im Wissenschaftsbereich in der Zweiten Republik. Zur Reintegration der im Nationalsozialismus aus »politischen« Gründen vertriebenen Lehrenden der Universität Wien nach 1945*. (Unpublished Final Project Report, Wien.)
- Ingrisch, Doris 2015. Gender-Dimensionen. In Kniefacz–Nemeth–Posch–Stadler (eds.) *Universität – Forschung – Lehre*. 337–362.
- Keupink, Alfons – Shieh, Sanford (eds.) 2006. *The Limits of Logical Empiricism. Selected Papers of Arthur Pap*. Dordrecht, Kluwer.

- Kant, Immanuel 1798/1968. *Der Streit der Fakultäten*. In *Gesammelte Werke*. Vol. 7. Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Kniefacz, Katharina – Nemeth, Elisabeth – Posch, Herbert – Stadler Friedrich (eds.) 2015. *Universität – Forschung – Lehre. Themen und Perspektiven im langen 20. Jahrhundert*. (650 Jahre Universität Wien – Aufbruch ins neue Jahrhundert, 1.) Göttingen, University of Vienna Press.
- Knoll, Reinold 1986. Die Entnazifizierung an der Universität Wien. In Sebastian Meissl et al. (eds.) *Verdrängte Schuld, verfehlte Sühne. Entnazifizierung in Österreich 1945–1955*. Wien, Böhlau. 270–280.
- König, Thomas 2013. *Heinrich Drimmel and the System of Containment. Shaping Higher Education in the Early Second Republic*. (Unpublished manuscript.)
- Korotin, Ilse 1993–1994. Deutsche Philosophen aus der Sicht des Sicherheitsdienstes des Reichsführers SS. *Jahrbuch für Soziologiegeschichte*. 1993. 323–344; 1994. 305–319; 325–326.
- Korotin, Ilse 1997. Auf eisigen Firnen – Zur intellektuellen Tradition von Frauen. In Friedrich Stadler (ed.) *Wissenschaft als Kultur. Österreichs Beitrag zur Moderne*. Wien – New York, Springer. 291–306.
- Korotin, Ilse (ed.) 1994. „Die besten Geister der Nation“. *Philosophie und Nationalsozialismus*. Wien, Picus.
- Leaman, George 1993. *Heidegger im Kontext. Gesamtüberblick zum NS-Engagement der Universitätsphilosophen*. Hamburg–Berlin, Argument.
- Leaman, George 1994. Die Universitätsphilosophen der ‘Ostmark’. *Forum*. 41/481–484, 25–32.
- Lehrer, Keith – Marek, Johann Christian (eds.) 1997. *Austrian Philosophy. Past and Present. Essays in Honor of Rudolf Haller*. Dordrecht–Boston–London, Kluwer.
- Leser, Norbert 1965/2004. *Österreich – Geistige Provinz?* In Paul Pasteur – Friedrich Stadler (eds.) *Exil et retours d'exil*. Rouen, Mont-Saint-Aignan – Université de Rouen.
- Levelt, Willem J.M. 2014. *A History of Psycholinguistics: The Pre-Chomskyan Era*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Lotz-Rimbach, Renate 2004. Zur Biografie Leo Gabriels. Revision und Ergänzung der Selbstdarstellung eines Philosophen und Rektors der Universität Wien. *Zeitgeschichte*. 6/31. 370–391.
- Lotz, Renate 2009. Mord verjährt nicht: Psychogramm eines politischen Mordes. In Friedrich Stadler – Hans-Jürgen Wendel (eds.) 2009. *Stationen. Dem Philosophen und Physiker Moritz Schlick zum 125. Geburtstag*. Wien, Springer. 81–106.
- McGuinness, Brian 1984. *Ludwig Wittgenstein und der Wiener Kreis. Gespräche*. (Ludwig Wittgenstein Werkausgabe; 3.) Frankfurt/M, Suhrkamp.
- Meister, Richard 1927. *Die Geschichte des Faches Philosophie an der Wiener Universität. Wissenschaftlicher Jahresbericht der Philosophischen Gesellschaft an der Universität Wien*. 1927/28.
- Meister, Richard 1937. Das Werden der Philosophischen Fakultät. In *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Almanach für 1936*.
- Meister, Richard 1958. *Geschichte des Doktorates der Philosophie an der Universität Wien*. Wien, Verlag der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Mohler, Armin 1972. *Die konservative Revolution in Deutschland bis 1932*. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Nagl-Docekal, Herta 1993. Das Institut für Philosophie der Universität Wien. Der Status quo und seine Genese. In Fischer–Wimmer (eds.) *Der geistige Anschluß*. Wien, VUW Universitätsverlag. 206–220.
- Nemeth, Elisabeth 1993. Zwischen Orthodoxie und gesellschaftlicher Sichtbarkeit. In Fischer–Wimmer (eds.) *Der geistige Anschluß*. Wien, VUW Universitätsverlag. 221–238.

- Olechowski, Richard 2015. Zwei Forschungsparadigmen in der Pädagogik: der 'transzendental-kritische' und der 'empirische' Ansatz. In Fröschl-Müller-Olechowski-Schmidt-Lauber (eds.) *Reflexive Innensichten*. 385–400.
- Pfefferle, Roman – Pfefferle, Hans 2014. *Glimpflich entnazifiziert. Die Professorenschaft der Universität Wien von 1944 in den Nachkriegsjahren*. Wien, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Preglau-Hämmerle, Susanne 1986. *Die politische und soziale Funktion der österreichischen Universität. Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. Innsbruck, Inn Verlag.
- Rathkolb, Oliver – Stadler, Friedrich (eds.) 2010. *Das Jahr 1968 – Ereignis, Symbol, Chiffre*. Göttingen, Vienna University Press.
- Reininger, Robert 1938. *50 Jahre Philosophische Gesellschaft an der Universität Wien*. Wien, Verlag der philosophischen Gesellschaft an der Universität Wien.
- Reiter, Wolfgang L. 2011. Wer war Béla Juhos? Eine biographische Annäherung. In Miklos Redei – Friedrich Stadler (eds.) *Der Wiener Kreis in Ungarn | The Vienna Circle in Hungary*. Wien, Springer. 65–98.
- Schleichert, Hubert 1971. Denker ohne Wirkung. Béla Juhos – ein typisches Schicksal. *Conceptus*. 5–12.
- Siegel, Carl 1930. Philosophie. In Johann Willibald Nagl et al. (ed.) *Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte*. Vol. 3. Wien, Fromme. 17–48.
- Stadler, Friedrich 1979/1995. Aspekte des gesellschaftlichen Hintergrunds und Standorts des Wiener Kreises am Beispiel der Universität Wien. In Hal Berghele et al. (ed.) *Wittgenstein, der Wiener Kreis und der Kritische Rationalismus*. Wien, 41–59. Reprint in Kurt R. Fischer (ed.) *Das goldene Zeitalter der Philosophie*. Wien, Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky. 335–356.
- Stadler, Friedrich 1997. *Studien zum Wiener Kreis. Ursprung, Entwicklung und Wirkung des Logischen Empirismus im Kontext*. Frankfurt/M, Suhrkamp. English: *The Vienna Circle. Studies in the Origins, Development, and Influence of Logical Empiricism*. Wien–New York, Springer, 2001. Spanish edition: 2010.
- Stadler, Friedrich 1998. Der Wiener Kreis. In Claus-Dieter Krohn et al. (eds.) *Handbuch des deutschsprachigen Exils 1933–1945*. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. 813–824.
- Stadler, Friedrich 2005. Philosophie – Zwischen „Anschluss“ und Ausschluss, Restauration und Innovation. In Margaret Grandner et al. (eds.) *Zukunft mit Altlasten. Die Universität Wien 1945 bis 1955*. Wien, Studien. 121–136.
- Stadler, Friedrich 2012. Wissenschaftstheorie in Österreich seit den 1990er Jahren im internationalen Vergleich. *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*. 43. 137–185.
- Stadler, Friedrich 2015. Philosophie – Konturen eines Faches an der Universität Wien im 'langen 20. Jahrhundert'. In Fröschl-Müller-Olechowski-Schmidt-Lauber (eds.) 471–488.
- Stadler, Friedrich 2017. Exil als Lebensform – Der Emigrant und Remigrant Kurt Fischer (1922–2014). In Waldemar Zacharasiewicz – Manfred Prisching (eds.) *Return from Exile – Rückkehr aus dem Exil*. Wien, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. 331–346.
- Stadler, Friedrich 2018. Kant and Neo-Kantianism in Logical Empiricism. Elements of a Research Program. In Violetta Waibel – Margit Ruffing – David Wagner (eds.) *Natur und Freiheit. Akten des XII. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*. Berlin–Boston, De Gruyter. 763–790.
- Stadler, Friedrich – Weibel, Peter (eds.) 1995. *The Cultural Exodus from Austria*. Wien – New York, Springer.
- Stadler, Friedrich (ed.) 2004a. *Kontinuität und Bruch 1938–1945–1955. Beiträge zur österreichischen Kultur- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. 2nd edition. Münster, LIT Verlag.
- Stadler, Friedrich (ed.) 2004b. *Vertriebene Vernunft. Emigration und Exil österreichischer Wissenschaft*. Vol. 1–2. Münster, LIT Verlag.

- Stadler, Friedrich (ed.) 2010. *Vertreibung, Transformation und Rückkehr der Wissenschaftstheorie*. Münster, LIT Verlag.
- Tilitzki, Christian 2002. *Die deutsche Universitätsphilosophie in der Weimarer Republik und im Dritten Reich*. Vol. I–II. Berlin, Akademie Verlag.
- Topitsch, Ernst 1967. Österreichs Philosophie – zwischen totalitär und konservativ. In Heinz Fischer (ed.) *Versäumnisse und Chancen. Beiträge zur Hochschulfrage in Österreich*. Wien–Hannover, Forum. 29–52.
- Topitsch, Ernst (ed.) 1960. *Probleme der Wissenschaftstheorie. Festschrift für Victor Kraft*. Wien, Springer.
- Weisz, Franz 2009. *Der frühe Heintel. Leben, Werk und Lehre von 1912 bis 1949*. (Philosophy Thesis. Wien.)

THE INFLUENCE OF AUSTRIAN PHILOSOPHY IN HUNGARY

