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TWO (OR THREE) CONCEPTIONS OF INTENTIONALITY*

by Jocelyn BENOIST (Paris)

Intentionality is an ancient theme that Franz Brentano revived at the end of the nineteenth century. Afterwards, that motif, thoroughly revised by Husserl, became the flag of the phenomenological movement. However, it remains not at all the exclusive property of the phenomenological philosophy. As a matter of fact, it is one of the most common themes of twentieth-century philosophy, on both sides of a philosophical landscape which so far has been deeply divided between the so-called Analytical and Continental side. One might say that, to some extent, except for some diehard eliminativists, intentionality was something like an unrestricted principle in the philosophy of mind of the twentieth century.

However, intentionality may encompass many diverse things and it is not sure at all that its mere label indicates any specific philosophy of mind by itself.

I am going here to pay attention to that diversity, and to compare two (or three, because one will see that some additional diversity will have to be acknowledged at last on one of the sides that we will define) possible conceptions of intentionality.

Jocelyn BENOIST (1968) is a Full Professor of Theory of Knowledge and Contemporary Philosophy at the University of Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne and a permanent member of the Husserl Archive of Paris (ENS – CNRS).

* I thank James Conant, John McDowell, and Jean-Philippe Narboux for their helpful comments.
The relationship between the conditional and the control function is a complex one. It is important to understand how these two functions interact and influence each other. This relationship is often referred to as the 'control-conditional relationship.'

In the context of logical reasoning, the control function is responsible for establishing the conditions under which a conditional statement holds true. On the other hand, the conditional function determines the consequence of the given conditions.

One of the key aspects of this relationship is the role of necessary and sufficient conditions. A necessary condition is one that must be true for the conditional to hold, whereas a sufficient condition is one that guarantees the truth of the conditional.

Understanding these concepts is crucial for grasping the nuances of logical arguments. It is important to be able to identify and apply these conditions correctly to ensure the validity of one's reasoning.
Two or Three Conceptions of Intentionality

What is the relation between intentionality and intention? How do we know that an act is intentional? What is the nature of the intentional structure of an act? These are some of the questions that arise in the study of intentionality. In this paper, I will attempt to address these questions by considering the relationship between intention and intentionality.

According to Beringer, intention is supposed to be the same in the case of a perception as it is in the case of a judgment. If I think of a cat, I do not really think of a cat, I think of cats. Only as

But in the case of a judgment, I think of a cat, I do not really think of a cat, I think of cats. Only as
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Two or three conceptions of interactionality

...
As different Sellar's position can be from the Brentanian the real horse as an object (the represented horse) but the thing itself (das Ding), it seems to me that to some extent it raises the same difficulties, because...
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Two For Three Connections of Intentionality - ... for as that
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There is something analogous in Husserlian phenomenology.

Husserlian reconstruction of the intentional object: Now, to some extent, I think that is something like this, to be found in the problem.

Experience of things and a diversity of views on the objects.

The intentional object: Now, to some extent, to be found in the problem.

More of a diversity of views on the objects.

The intentional object: Now, to some extent, to be found in the problem.

More of a diversity of views on the objects.
Two (or Three) Conceptions of Intentionality

The triangle of reference, as Gordon described it, is a central feature of the problem of intentionality. The triangle of reference is essentially rectangular. It consists of three main components:

1. The subject of the intention.
2. The object of the intention.
3. The mind of the subject.

These components interact in a way that gives rise to the phenomenon of intentionality. The triangle of reference is a useful tool for understanding the nature of intentionality. By examining the relationships between these components, we can gain insight into the ways in which we ascribe meanings to our experiences.

In conclusion, the triangle of reference provides a useful framework for thinking about the nature of intentionality. By understanding the relationships between the subject, object, and mind, we can gain a deeper appreciation for the complexities of human experience.
In the context of phenomenological theory, there is a focus on the experience of the individual. This is in contrast to the more objective and scientific approach of the scientific community. The phenomenological perspective emphasizes the subjective experience of the individual, whereas the scientific perspective is more concerned with objective data and empirical evidence. This difference in approach can lead to conflicting interpretations of the same phenomenon.

For example, in the field of psychology, the phenomenological approach might focus on the subjective experience of a person with a particular condition, such as depression. This approach might involve interviews with the individual to understand their subjective experience of the condition. In contrast, the scientific approach might focus on objective measures such as mood ratings or biological markers.

Another example is in the field of philosophy, where the phenomenological approach might focus on the subjective experience of consciousness, whereas the scientific approach might focus on the biological mechanisms that underlie consciousness.

In both cases, the phenomenological perspective emphasizes the subjective experience of the individual, while the scientific perspective is more concerned with objective data and empirical evidence. This difference in approach can lead to conflicting interpretations of the same phenomenon.