



Theodor Lipps

Philosopher, Psychologist,
Aesthetician, and Language
Theorist

DAVID ROMAND

palgrave
macmillan

Theodor Lipps

David Romand

Theodor Lipps

Philosopher, Psychologist,
Aesthetician, and Language Theorist

palgrave
macmillan

David Romand
Centre Gilles Gaston Granger
Aix-Marseille University
Aix-en-Provence, France

ISBN 978-3-031-87456-7 ISBN 978-3-031-87457-4 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-87457-4>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2025

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG. The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

If disposing of this product, please recycle the paper.



Theodor Lipps in his early fifties

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to Brendan George, series editor of the series “Humanities” at Palgrave Macmillan, who believed in my publication project and supported me throughout. For him to accept a project on an author as neglected in the mainstream scholarship as Lipps was certainly a bold choice for a series editor, and I thank Brendan for putting his trust in me to complete this monograph. I would also especially like to thank Antony Sami, production editor at Springer, for his tireless help and for the patience he demonstrated throughout the publication process, as well as Aashika Philomi, who supervised the book production. I am all the more grateful to both Brendan George and Antony Sami given that the process of writing the manuscript took much longer than expected and its delivery was delayed several times. I extend my thanks to the anonymous reviewer who positively evaluated the manuscript proposal and gave me helpful advice and encouragement in completing this project.

It would not have been possible to complete this project without the editorial efforts of William McJunkin and Mercedes Gilliom, with additional assistance from Georgia Froman. I offer them my sincere gratitude for their considerable in-depth and painstaking effort, which made it possible to significantly improve the quality of the text written by a non-native speaker of English. I am particularly grateful to William for

his availability at a later stage of the manuscript preparation. My thanks also go to my affiliated institution, the Centre Gilles Gaston Granger (UMR 7304, CNRS-Aix Marseille University), which agreed to defray part of the editing costs.

I would also like to thank Sven Kuttner and Julia Müller-Kittnau of The Munich University Library. In the fall of 2015, I spent a week at the library exploring the Lipps archives (*Nachlass Theodor Lipps*). Sven's and Julia's tireless efforts were a great help in gathering archival material, parts of which I reused in the preparation of the book.

Three scholars were particularly helpful to me in providing invaluable advice on translating Lipps into English, and I warmly thank them for their assistance: Thomas Petraschka, Karsten Stueber, and Shaun Gallagher—all three distinguished empathologists and careful readers of Lipps. I am also grateful to my colleagues from Aix-Marseille, Julien Bernard, Sylvie Pic, and Jean Arnaud, with whom I had many opportunities in the years ahead of the preparation of the book to discuss topics regarding Lipps, empathy, and aesthetics, as well as to Vittorio Gallese and Hannah Wojciehowski, who were always eager to discuss with me the significance of Lipps's ideas for current research during our ongoing collaboration on the question of empathy and the aesthetics of language.

Contents

1	Introduction: An Argument for Theodor Lipps as a Seminal Figure of German Thought in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries	1
1.1	Lipps's Critical Fortune: An Overview	3
1.1.1	The Lipps Reception Today: A Relatively Marginalized Figure in the History of Knowledge	3
1.1.2	A Famous and Influential Thinker of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries	4
1.1.3	The Fate of Lipps's Thought After His Death: A Lingering Semi-purgatory	8
1.2	A Critical Reassessment of the Lipps Scholarship	12
1.2.1	Toward a "Rediscovery" of Lippsian Thought	13
1.2.2	Problems Inherent in the Current Lipps Scholarship	18
1.2.3	"De-phenomenologizing" Lipps	21
1.3	Systematically Revisiting Lippsian Thought	25
1.3.1	A Prolific and Multifaceted Thinker	25
1.3.2	The Problem of the Evolution of Lippsian Thought and Its Periodization	28

1.3.3	How This Book Intends to Revisit Lipps's <i>Oeuvre</i>	30
	References	32
2	Psychology	39
2.1	Historical Background: The German-Language Psychological Research Tradition of Lipps's Time	42
2.2	Lipps's Reflections on the Foundations of Psychological Science: A Three-Stage Evolution	46
2.2.1	First Stage: Lipps as a Proponent of Post-Herbartian German-Language Psychology (c. 1877–1903)	46
2.2.2	Second Stage: Science of the Supra-Individual Ego Versus Science of the Individual Ego (1904–1906)	62
2.2.3	Third Stage: Psychology as a Unifying Disciplinary Field and Holistic Tendencies (1908–1912)	77
2.3	Lipps as a “Practitioner” of Psychology	84
2.4	Lipps as a Major Theorist of Affective Psychology	87
2.4.1	Historical Background: The Making of the Concept of Feeling and the Rise of Affective Psychology in German-Speaking Countries (Early Nineteenth to Early Twentieth Centuries)	87
2.4.2	Ambiguous Beginnings: Lipps's Early Investigations on Affective Psychology (c. 1877–1883)	92
2.4.3	Affectivity as a <i>Sui Generis</i> Psychological Category and the Question of the Dimensionality of Feelings (1889–1898)	96
2.4.4	Lippsian Affective Psychology at Its High Point (1901–1903)	102
2.4.5	Late Developments in Lipps's Affective Psychology: The Affirmation of Holistic Tendencies (1905–1912)	110
	References	114

3	Theory of Empathy	121
3.1	Definition and General Features of Lippsian Empathy	123
3.2	The Evolution of Lipps’s Ideas on Empathy: A Fourfold Periodization (1880–1913)	130
3.2.1	The Origins of Lipps’s Empathology (1880–1899)	130
3.2.2	“Aesthetische Einfühlung” (1900) and the Making of Empathology as an Autonomous Field of Investigation	136
3.2.3	Lipps’s “Mature” Theory of Empathy	137
3.2.4	Lipps’s Final Contributions on Empathy and the Epistemological Turn in Lippsian Empathology	138
3.3	The Psychological Underpinnings of Empathy	140
3.3.1	Empathy as a Feeling-Based Phenomenon	140
3.3.2	Empathy and Sensory Contents	141
3.3.3	Empathetic Relation as a “Symbolic” Relation	143
3.3.4	Empathy as an “Instinct”	146
3.4	Three Basic Oppositions Inherent in the Empathetic Function	150
3.4.1	“Practical” Versus “Aesthetic” Empathy	151
3.4.2	“Basic” Versus “Full” Empathy	151
3.4.3	“Positive” Versus “Negative” Empathy	153
3.5	Functional Typology of Empathetic Processes	155
3.5.1	The Problem of Typological Analysis in Lipps’s Empathology	155
3.5.2	General Apperceptive Empathy	156
3.5.3	Natural Empathy	157
3.5.4	Mood Empathy	159
3.5.5	Empathy for the Human Being’s Sensory Manifestation	160
3.5.6	Intellectual Empathy	162
3.5.7	Ethical Empathy	163
3.5.8	Aesthetic Empathy	164
3.6	Empathy and the Question of the Foundations of Knowledge	165
	References	169

4	Epistemology and Logic	173
4.1	First Period: Lipps's Psychologistic Epistemology and Logic (c. 1877–1896)	179
4.1.1	“Die psychischen Grundthatsachen und die Erkenntniß” (2013a [1877–1880])	179
4.1.2	“Die Aufgabe der Erkenntnistheorie und die Wundt'sche Logik” (1880/1881)	183
4.1.3	<i>Grundtatsachen des Seelenlebens</i> (1883)	188
4.1.4	Review of Volkelt's <i>Erfahrung und Denken</i> (1886b)	193
4.1.5	<i>Grundzüge der Logik</i> (1893)	197
4.2	Second Period: Epistemology and Logic Between Psychologism and Antipsychologism (1902)	208
4.2.1	The First Edition of <i>Vom Fühlen, Wollen und Denken</i> (1902a)	208
4.2.2	<i>Einheiten und Relationen</i> (1902b)	212
4.3	Third Period: The Antipsychologistic Turn of Lippsian Thought and Lipps's New Theory of Object and Judgment (1903–1907)	218
4.3.1	The First Edition of the <i>Leitfaden der Psychologie</i> (1903a)	218
4.3.2	“Bewußtsein und Gegenstände” (1905a)	223
4.3.3	“Inhalt und Gegenstand; Psychologie und Logik” (1905c)	233
4.3.4	The Second Edition of the <i>Leitfaden der Psychologie</i> (1906b)	239
4.3.5	The Second Edition of <i>Vom Fühlen, Wollen und Denken</i> (1907a)	241
4.3.6	“Naturphilosophie” (1907b)	246
4.4	Fourth Period: The Ambiguities of Lipps's Late Epistemology and Logic (1908–1913)	248
4.4.1	<i>Psychologie und Wirklichkeit</i> (1908)	248
4.4.2	“Zur ‘Psychologie’ und ‘Philosophie’” (1912a)	250
4.4.3	“Worte” (1912b)	254
4.4.4	“Versuch einer Begründung des Bewußtseins-Monismus” (2013b)	255

4.4.5	“Forderung und Tatsache” (2013c)	256
4.4.6	“Zur Einfühlung” (1913)	257
4.5	Lipps’s Affective Epistemology	261
4.5.1	Lipps’s Early Affective Epistemology (c. 1877–1900)	263
4.5.2	The Culmination of Lippsonian Affective Epistemology: The First Edition of <i>Vom Fühlen, Wollen und Denken</i> (1902a)	271
4.5.3	A Turning Point in Lipps’s Affective Epistemology: The First Edition of the <i>Leitfaden der Psychologie</i> (1903a)	280
4.5.4	Lipps’s Late Affective Epistemology (1905–1913): A Survey	289
	References	299
5	Theory of Science	305
5.1	Lipps’s Early Contributions to the Theory of Science (c. 1877–1883)	308
5.1.1	“Die psychischen Grundthatsachen und die Erkenntniß” (2013 [1877–1880])	308
5.1.2	<i>Grundtatsachen des Seelenlebens</i> (1883)	312
5.2	The “Rationalistic Turn” in the Lippsonian Theory of Science (1886–1893)	313
5.2.1	“Review of Schubert-Soldern’s <i>Die Grundlagen einer Erkenntnistheorie</i> ” (1886)	313
5.2.2	<i>Grundzüge der Logik</i> (1893)	316
5.3	<i>Psychologie, Wissenschaft und Leben</i> (1901): A Reflection on the Nature and Status of the <i>Geisteswissenschaften</i> and Their Relation to Psychology at the Turn of the Twentieth Century	320
5.3.1	A Threefold Organization of Scientific Knowledge	320
5.3.2	Psychology and Its Relation to Other Disciplines	321
5.3.3	Nature, Status, and Typology of the <i>Geisteswissenschaften</i>	323

5.4	<i>Inhalt und Gegenstand; Psychologie und Logik</i> (1905): A Turning Point in Lipps's Theory of Science	326
5.4.1	A Doubly Opposite Relationship to Experience	327
5.4.2	A Fourfold Division of Scientific Knowledge	329
5.4.3	The Place of Causality, Normativity, and Phenomenality in Scientific Knowledge	335
5.5	Lipps's Late Contributions to the Theory of Science (1906–1908)	342
5.5.1	<i>Naturwissenschaft und Weltanschauung</i> (1906)	342
5.5.2	"Naturphilosophie" (1907a)	348
5.5.3	<i>Philosophie und Wirklichkeit</i> (1908)	357
	References	360
6	Metaphysics	363
6.1	Lipps's Early Investigations on Metaphysics (c. 1877–1893)	366
6.1.1	"Die psychischen Grundthatsachen und die Erkenntniß" (2013a [1877–1880])	366
6.1.2	<i>Grundzüge der Logik</i> (1893)	368
6.1.3	Lipps's Early Metaphysics: An Idealistic or an Ideal-Realistic Worldview?	370
6.2	Lipps's Mature Metaphysics: An Attempt at Building a Metaphysical System (1903–1913)	374
6.2.1	First Edition of the <i>Leitfaden der Psychologie</i> (1903)	374
6.2.2	"Inhalt und Gegenstand; Psychologie und Logik" (1905b)	381
6.2.3	"Naturphilosophie" (1907a)	387
6.2.4	"Versuch einer Begründung des Bewußtseins- Monismus" (2013b)	395
	References	400
7	Ethics	403
7.1	Chief Characteristics of Lipps's Ethics	406
7.1.1	The Kantian Legacy	406

7.1.2	Ethics and Psychology	408
7.1.3	An Altruistic Aesthetics	412
7.2	Revisiting Ethics in Light of Affective Psychology: Lipps’s “Psychologistic” Reassessment of Kant in the First Edition of <i>Vom Fühlen, Wollen und Denken</i> (1902)	413
7.2.1	Feelings and the Objective Foundations of Ethical Experience	413
7.2.2	The Psychoaffective Analysis of the Oughts	415
7.3	Ethics and Empathy	418
7.3.1	“Practical,” “Ethical,” “Altruistic” Empathy: A Fluctuating Terminology	418
7.3.2	Practical Versus Aesthetic Empathy	419
7.3.3	Basic and Reflective Sympathy	420
7.4	The Antipsychologistic Turn in Lippsian Ethics: The Notion of “Ethical Demand” and the Foundations of Practical Reason	421
7.5	Beyond Ethics: Further Aspects of Lipps’s Practical Philosophy	425
7.5.1	Lipps as a Political Philosopher, Philosopher of Law, and Theorist of Sociology	425
7.5.2	Lipps and the Foundations of Sociology: An Analysis of “Die soziologische Grundfrage” (1907b)	427
	References	432
8	Aesthetics	435
8.1	Historical Background: Psychological Aesthetics in the German-Speaking World in Lipps’s Time	437
8.1.1	Rise and Fall of the Psychoaesthetic Paradigm in German-Speaking Countries	437
8.1.2	The Basic Tenets of German-Language Psychological Aesthetics	439
8.1.3	Two Lines of Research in Psychoaffective Aesthetics	442
8.2	Psychology in Lipps’s Aesthetics: A Reassessment	444
8.2.1	Aesthetics as a Psychological Discipline	444

8.2.2	The Antipsychologistic Turn in Lippsian Aesthetic Thought: Theory and Practice	445
8.3	The Evolution of Lippsian Aesthetic Thought: A Four-Step Periodization	447
8.3.1	First Period: Elementaristic Psychoaesthetics (1883–1890)	447
8.3.2	Second Period: Spatial Aesthetics, “Aesthetic Mechanics,” and Idealistic-Aesthetic Tendencies (1891–1898)	449
8.3.3	Third Period: The Rise of Empathological Concerns and Renewed Interest in Aesthetic Feelings (1898–1902)	456
8.3.4	Fourth Period: Empathy-Based Aesthetics and Holistic Tendencies (1903–1909)	457
8.4	Lipps’s Mature Aesthetic Thought: A Survey	459
8.4.1	The “General Formal Principles of Aesthetics” and Their Affective Correlates	459
8.4.2	The Notion of Aesthetic Empathy in Lipps’s Mature Aesthetics	461
8.4.3	Empathizing with Aesthetic Objects	466
8.4.4	The Issue of Aesthetic Contemplation	471
	References	473
9	Theory of Language	479
9.1	Lipps as a Major Contributor to Semiotics	483
9.1.1	Early Research on “the Judgment of Denomination”	483
9.1.2	Semiotic Investigations in the <i>Grundzüge der Logik</i> (1893): “Nominal Judgment” and Its Varieties	486
9.1.3	Semiotic Experience as a “Symbolic Relation”: Lipps’s Contribution to Semiotics in <i>Einheiten und Relationen</i> (1902)	489
9.1.4	Semiotics and Language Comprehension in the <i>Ästhetik</i> (1903a) and the <i>Leitfaden</i> (1903b)	491
9.2	Empathy and Language	494

9.2.1	Language as an “Anthropomorphic” Experience	494
9.2.2	The Ubiquitousness of Empathy in Language and the Notion of Linguistic Symbolism	496
9.2.3	Empathy and Language Comprehension: Lipps as a Pioneering Theorist of “Enunciative Empathy”	500
9.2.4	Empathizing with the Object of Speech or Literature: Lipps as a Pioneering Theorist of “Narrative Empathy”	504
	References	509
10	By Way of Conclusion: The Significance of Lipps’s Thought for Current Philosophy and Science	513
10.1	Affective Science	515
10.1.1	A Central but Forgotten Figure of Affective Science	515
10.1.2	Ontology and Phenomenology of Affective States	517
10.1.3	Affective Epistemology	521
10.2	Social Cognition	525
10.2.1	Lipps’s Reception in Current Empathy Studies	525
10.2.2	Lipps’s Theory of Empathy in Light of Theoretical Debates in Current Empathology	528
10.2.3	The Lippsian Concept of Empathy and Social Cognition as a Unified Field of Investigation	533
10.3	Psychological Aesthetics, Experimental Aesthetics, Neuroaesthetics	537
10.3.1	The Revival of the Aesthetics of Empathy and Lipps’s Reception in the Current Aesthetic Context	537
10.3.2	Empathy and Visual Aesthetics	539

xviii Contents

10.3.3	Empathy and the Aesthetics of Language	542
10.3.4	Contemplative Neuroaesthetics	544
References		545
Timeline		553
Index		555

About the Author

David Romand is a philosopher, historian of knowledge, aesthetician, and language theorist who is currently an associate researcher at the Centre Gilles Gaston Granger, Aix-Marseille University, France. He has expertise in German-language psychology, philosophy, aesthetics, and language sciences from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with a special focus on how the thought of this period resonates with important currents in contemporary philosophical and scientific thought. Recently, in addition to his investigations on Lipps, his research interests have focused on two major topics: a study of the role of epistemic feelings in language, especially in semantic processes, and the question of the relationship between empathy and language. His recent publications include the volume *Emotions, Metacognition, and the Intuition of Language Normativity. Theoretical, Epistemological, and Historical Perspectives on Linguistic Feeling* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2023), co-edited with Michel Le Du, and the two special issues of the *Texas Studies in Language and Literature* (66, n. 4, 2024 and 67, n. 3, 2025) on “Empathy and the aesthetics of language,” co-edited with Vittorio Gallese.



1

Introduction: An Argument for Theodor Lipps as a Seminal Figure of German Thought in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

The present monograph undertakes to revisit the multifaceted *oeuvre* of Theodor Lipps (1851–1914) with the aim of restoring him to his rightful position as a major figure of German thought of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Here, for the first time, I present a systematic discussion of his contribution to the fields of psychology, philosophy, aesthetics, and the theory of language while highlighting the importance of his work both in the context of his own time and for current philosophical and scientific research. Today, Lipps is mostly remembered as a pioneering theorist of empathy (*Einfühlung*) and as a leading representative of the study of aesthetics of his time—two fields of investigation for which he became particularly famous during his lifetime. In the history of philosophy, his name is classically associated with the phenomenological movement, a view that, as we will see, has contributed to a blurring of the perception of his ideas and of their place in the history of knowledge. Compared with other major figures of German thought from the period, Lipps remains surprisingly understudied, his writings having only been discussed partially and incompletely. This does not mean, however, that Lipps is an unknown author; indeed, his ideas have recently seen a growing revival of interest. This renewed interest, in addition to giving rise to a specific Lipps scholarship, has become quite palpable in some quarters of

contemporary philosophy, psychology, neuroscience, aesthetics, art history, etc. Here scholars have pointed out the commonalities between Lipps's ideas and their own areas of interest, finding in them a more or less direct source of inspiration. Nevertheless, in most of cases, Lipps's reception in current philosophical and scientific research remains superficial and does not include an adequate understanding of his thought. In this respect, my book aims not only to fill a historiographical gap, but also to meet the raised expectations that have been expressed more or less explicitly by scholars in recent years at the prospect of a revival of Lipps's *oeuvre*. This monograph primarily focuses on the trajectory of Lippsian thought and its intellectual significance and is not directly concerned with biographical matters. (Biographical information is briefly alluded to where relevant in the various chapters, and a brief synopsis of key information on Lipps's life and career is provided in the timeline as an annex to the book.¹)

In this opening chapter, I argue for the necessity of reconsidering the theoretical and historical importance of Lipps's thought beyond the fluctuating reception of his ideas and the insufficiency of the scholarship. I propose to revisit his *oeuvre* in a systematic way and from a renewed methodological perspective. The analysis I propose is divided into three sections. In the first section, I discuss Lipps's critical fortune by contrasting his (relative) marginalization in the current historiography with the reputation and influence he enjoyed during his lifetime, especially at the beginning of the twentieth century. I also examine the rapid decline of interest in his *oeuvre* after his death, showing that it fell into a kind of semi-purgatory from which it has yet to emerge. In the second section, I propose a critical reassessment of the Lipps scholarship as it has developed in recent decades. In addition to briefly reviewing the relevant literature, I insist on the shortcomings of the historiography as it stands while highlighting the need to free it from the phenomenological line of interpretation that has predominated to date. In the third section, I

¹The main sources of biographical information on Lipps are: Michael Kesselring's article "Theodor Lipps (1851–1914). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Psychologie" [Theodor Lipps (1851–1914). A Contribution to the History of Psychology] (1962), and Georg Anschütz's and Oswald Külpe's obituaries (Anschütz 1915; Külpe 1915), Wolfhart Henckmann's entry "Lipps, Theodor" of the *Neue Deutsche Biographie* (1985), and Niels W. Bokhove and Karl Schuhmann's introduction to their bibliography of Lipps's writings (Bokhove and Schuhmann 1991).

provide an overview of the nature of Lipps's thought, insisting on the need to systematically revisit it and showing how this can be best achieved. I address in succession the question of the quantitative importance and qualitative variety of his *oeuvre*, the evolution of his ideas and their periodization, and the manner in which I intend to discuss those ideas and their significance in the remaining nine chapters of the book.

1.1 Lipps's Critical Fortune: An Overview

1.1.1 The Lipps Reception Today: A Relatively Marginalized Figure in the History of Knowledge

Although his name is far from unknown today—indeed, certain aspects of his thought have increasingly become the subject of renewed interest in recent decades—the work of Theodor Lipps has yet to receive the kind of comprehensive treatment that it deserves given his importance in the history of knowledge. His work has been consigned to a sort of “purgatory,” a surprising state of affairs considering both his stature as a scholar—one who made major contributions to the fields of philosophy, psychology, aesthetics, and the theory of language—and the reputation he achieved during his career, especially during his years as a professor of philosophy in Munich. Beyond the question of the “rediscovery” of his ideas, this raises the question of the prevailing standards of taste in current historiography. Lipps has yet to be recognized as a “classic” figure of German thought of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, despite clearly deserving that status based on the significance and originality of his *oeuvre* and its value for modern philosophical and scientific research.

The propensity to play down his importance is particularly palpable in the mainstream history of philosophy. It is significant in this regard, for example, that none of the two standard online encyclopedias of philosophy, the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* and the *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, contains an entry on Lipps. This is all the more surprising given that both of these sources devote significant space to relatively

second-rank intellectual figures. It is noteworthy that, while neglecting Lipps, the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* devotes an entry (“The Phenomenology of the Munich and Göttingen Circles”) to the thought of some of Lipps’s students, such as Alexander Pfänder or Moritz Geiger, who were far less prominent and influential as scholars than Lipps. In the next section, I will return to the reasons for this paradoxical historiographical situation. The disinterest of mainstream historians of philosophy in Lipps is not restricted to the English-language world, but also holds for the German-language scholarship as well. For instance, volume 12 of Röd’s classic textbook *Geschichte der Philosophie, Die Philosophie des ausgehenden 19. und des 20. Jahrhunderts 2. Neukantianismus, Idealismus, Realismus, Phänomenologie* [The Philosophy of the Late Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries 2. Neo-Kantianism, Idealism, Realism, Phenomenology] devotes little more than a page to Lipps (Holzhey and Röd 2004, p. 259). Here again, we encounter a historiographical bias in favor of Lipps’s students: two and a half pages are devoted to Pfänder (Holzhey and Röd 2004, pp. 183–185).

Lipps suffers from a similar tendency to be marginalized in the mainstream history of aesthetics as well. As Gregory Currie has pointed out in his article “Empathy for objects”: “the otherwise extremely comprehensive *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics* (edited by Michael Kelly in four volumes, Oxford University Press, 1998) carries no account of his ideas” (Currie 2011, p. 83). Many other examples could be cited to show that, as a rule, Lipps fails to be regarded as a classic author in a discipline of which he was one of the most significant and acclaimed representatives during his lifetime.

1.1.2 A Famous and Influential Thinker of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

The reception of Lippsian thought in current historiography stands in sharp contrast to the regard in which Lipps was held during his lifetime, especially between the turn of the twentieth century and the start of World War I (WWI). The best testimony of Lipps’s prestige and influence during that period is offered by Eisler’s *Philosophen-Lexikon* [Encyclopedia

of Philosophers] (1912), which at that time was the standard reference in Germany in the field. Eisler devotes no fewer than five and a half pages to Lipps, the relevant entry being the third longest on a contemporary philosopher after the entries on Wundt (17 pages) and Nietzsche (8 pages). It is worth noting that Eisler was not known to be especially close to Lipps's ideas, and there is no reason to think that his decision to devote significant space to them would have been influenced by his personal choices. More generally speaking, one needs only look at the philosophical and, even more conspicuously, psychological and aesthetic literature published between the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, both inside and outside the German-speaking world, to get a feel for the wide dissemination of his thought and his central position in the intellectual debates of the time.² In terms of Lipps's psychological work, special mention should be made of his affective psychology, a key aspect of his *oeuvre* that has been almost completely forgotten today. His reputation as an affective psychologist extended well beyond the boundaries of Germany,³ as well as beyond the disciplinary boundaries of psychology—his theory of feeling being known, in particular, to have had a significant impact on language sciences in the first decade of the twentieth century (see Chap. 10, Sect. 10.1.1).

Aesthetics is probably the field in which Lipps became best known during his lifetime (at least at a later stage of his career), and it is both the field where his writings proved most influential and the one where his influence has been the most widely recognized by historians. His aesthetic ideas became influential in the 1890s with the development of his interest in spatial aesthetics and “aesthetic mechanics” (see Chap. 8, Sect. 8.3.2) in the wake of the publication of “Ästhetische Faktoren der

²The reputation Lipps enjoyed during his lifetime is well highlighted by Bokhove and Schuhmann in the introduction to their bibliography of Lipps's writings, in which they report the words of praise of a number of prominent contemporary scholars from various intellectual horizons. See Bokhove and Schuhmann (1991, pp. 113–114). It is also worth highlighting that, especially in the twentieth century, Lipps was keen to disseminate his ideas to a broader audience by publishing a significant number of articles in the non-academic press.

³As Bokhove and Schuhmann remind us (Bokhove and Schuhmann 1991, p. 114), Lipps's *oeuvre* had a particularly strong impact in Russia, in which it was notably translated and popularized by Nikolay Lossky. The Russian reception of Lipps's ideas remain little known and would be worthy of being investigated in more depth, notably in the areas of art theory and literary theory.

Raumanschauung” [Aesthetic Factors of the Perceptual Experience of Space] (1891), and, above all, with his monograph *Raumästhetik und geometrisch-optische Täuschungen* [Spatial Aesthetics and Geometric-Optical Illusions] (1897). Published the following year, his other monograph *Komik und Humor. Eine psychologisch-ästhetische Untersuchung* [The Comic and Humor. A Psychoaesthetic Investigation] (1898) also probably did much to establish his reputation as an aesthetician. The reception of Lipps’s aesthetic ideas would culminate in the first decade of the twentieth century up to the start of WWI, following the theorization of his aesthetics of empathy, in particular as expounded in the two volumes of the *Ästhetik. Psychologie des Schönen und der Kunst* [Aesthetics. Psychology of the Beautiful and Art] (1903, 1906a). This book was his aesthetic *magnum opus* and was certainly the mostly famous aesthetic book of the time. As has been convincingly argued by Christian Allesch and other scholars (Allesch 2017; see also Lalo 1908; Listowel, 1967; Drüe 1983), Lipps was the central figure in the aesthetics of empathy (*Einfühlungsästhetik*), then the most influential research program in the field of psychological aesthetics (and aesthetics in general).

The question of the Anglo-Saxon, more particularly the British, reception of Lipps’s aesthetics, and notably of his aesthetics of empathy, has been addressed by Derek Matravers in his book *Empathy* (2017, pp. 8 and 124–128). As Matravers reminds us, in line with the analysis previously proposed by other scholars (Lanzoni 2009; Burdett 2011; see also Petraschka 2024), the writer and amateur aesthetician Vernon Lee (aka Violet Paget) was the chief representative of Lipps-styled aesthetics in the English-speaking world between the late 1890s and the early 1910s (Lee and Anstruther-Thomson 1912). In all likelihood, it was her theoretical and empirical psychoaesthetic studies that did much to acclimate to the Anglo-Saxon context to Lipps’s aesthetics of empathy and spatial aesthetics, as well as his concept of *Einfühlung*. Besides Lee, Matravers also mentions the case of T. E. Hulme, who intended to devote to Lipps “two and a half of the projected nine chapters” of his planned work on *Modern Theory of Art* (Matravers 2017, p. 8; see also Hulme 1924), and the Oxford philosopher E. F. Carritt, “who published a collection of writings in the history of aesthetics, which includes what is, to date, the most extensive translation of Lipps into English” (Matravers 2017, p. 125; see

also Carritt 1931). A further noteworthy early British commentator of Lipps is the Earl of Listowel (aka William Francis Hare), who, in the chapter of *A Critical History of Modern Aesthetics* devoted to “The Theory of *Einfühlung*” (Listowel 1933, pp. 65–73), proposes a detailed analysis of Lippsonian aesthetics. Along with Volkelt, Lipps is the aesthetician whose name is most frequently cited in the book—a revised version of which would be republished in the late 1960s under the title *Modern Aesthetics. An Historical Introduction* (1967). These few examples show that, inside the English-speaking world, Lipps’s aesthetic ideas had a much greater impact than has been suggested by standard textbooks on the history of aesthetics. Moreover, it is worth noting that, between the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, far from being limited to the field of aesthetics strictly speaking, Lipps’s aesthetic ideas also had a significant impact on German artistic circles. As highlighted by a growing number of publications (e.g., Hammacher 1967; Weiss 1979; Rinker 2001; Franz 2007; Afuhs and Strobl 2009; Bröcker et al. 2012; Kuenzli 2019; Rehm 2024), Lipps’s views on spatial aesthetics and aesthetic empathy were widely disseminated among the practitioners and theorists of *Art Nouveau/Jugendstil*, as well as among other exponents of modernism in visual arts in Germany. This reception assumes particular significance in Munich, the city where Lipps taught after 1894 and which at that time was one of the artistic capitals of Germany.

This brief discussion of Lipps’s place in the intellectual landscape of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries would not be complete without remarking on Lipps’s institutional status during this period. (The main stages of his career are shown in the Timeline at the end of the present volume, and those relating specifically to psychology are detailed in Chap. 2, Sect. 2.3.) Suffice it to recall here that, after being an assistant and associate professor in Bonn (1884–1890) and a full professor in Breslau (1890–1894), Lipps in 1894 took up the chair of philosophy of the University of Munich, which had been left vacant by Carl Stumpf following his appointment to the University of Berlin. Aged 43, Lipps thus became a full professor at one of the most prestigious universities in Germany, where he spent the rest of his career, remaining until his premature retirement in 1912 (Anschütz 1915; Külpe 1915; Kesselring 1962; Henckmann 1985). Lipps’s position in Munich did secure him a

particular standing, not only within the academic world, but also beyond it, with his lectures being attended and his ideas commented upon by a broad audience, coming notably from artistic *milieus* (see in particular Bröcker et al. 2012). Another noticeable indicator of his institutional status is his membership in the Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, to which he was elected as associate member in 1896 and full member in 1899 (Külpe 1915, p. 70). Lipps was also a founding member of the *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane* (renamed *Zeitschrift für Psychologie* in 1906) and the *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie*—thereby holding a strategic position in the two most influential German-language psychological journals of the time.

This brief review of Lipps's intellectual and institutional achievements clearly shows that, far from having been a secondary figure of the German academic world, he was a key actor in intellectual life as it developed in Germany between the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

1.1.3 The Fate of Lipps's Thought After His Death: A Lingerin Semi-purgatory

Despite the reputation and influence Lipps achieved during his lifetime, his star quickly faded after his death, which coincided with the outbreak of WWI. During the interwar period, his multifaceted thought gradually ceased to arouse interest, both on the national and on international scene, before finally falling into relative oblivion. The reasons of this loss of interest are, of course, complex, but they certainly have much to do with the general change in the intellectual context, resulting in his ideas being at odds with the trends of the time.

Aesthetics is a discipline in which the paradigm shift of the years 1910s–1930s and its direct impact on the reception of Lipps's way of thinking have been well highlighted and documented. As shown by Allesch (2006, pp. 38–39, 2017, pp. 235–236), in the early 1910s, the then hegemonic paradigm of psychological aesthetics came to be increasingly challenged, and notably the aesthetics of empathy which was its most famous expression. In the wake of the growing distrust toward psychological approaches in aesthetics, the aesthetics of empathy was put on

the defensive as early as the early 1920s, before quickly ebbing, ultimately ceasing to be a viable field of investigation by the early 1930s. This naturally had the effect that the aestheticians of the interwar period were led to turn away from the writings of its main exponents, meaning, first and foremost, Theodor Lipps.

Lipps's legacy within psychology was also negatively affected during the same period by the rise of Gestalt psychology and its related psychological schools, which, in all likelihood, tended to associate his *oeuvre*—like that of the other psychologists of his generation—with an “old-fashioned” way of practicing psychology. The fact that in many of his writings Lipps discussed the concept of Gestalt quality and that his late psychological thought was characterized by an increasingly “holistic” flavor (see Chap. 2, Sect. 2.2.3 and 2.4.4) was of little help in safeguarding his reputation among psychologists in the decades after his death.

Lipps's contribution to philosophy would be completely overshadowed by the new philosophical trends that established themselves in Germany in the first third of the twentieth century, above all phenomenology. The overshadowing of Lippsian philosophical thought by phenomenology has been so strong and so complete that, even today, Lipps continues to be largely viewed through the filter of Husserl's ideas, and his work is even commonly identified as a form of phenomenology—a major historiographical error that I will strive to challenge in the next section of the present chapter. This lumping together of Lipps with the phenomenological movement is partly due to the fact that, as early as 1902, and more conspicuously after 1905, many of his own students in Munich became infatuated with Husserl's ideas and departed for Göttingen to study under him. The migration reached such a point that the phenomenon has sometimes been described as “the Munich invasion” of Göttingen (Schapp 1959; Spiegelberg 1982, pp. 163–170; Salice 2020) and is considered to have given rise to “Munich phenomenology” (Smid 1982; Fidalgo 2011 [1991]), that is, “the phenomenology of the Munich Circle” (Spiegelberg 1982; Salice 2020), whose most famous exponents were Alexander Pfänder and Moritz Geiger, both of whom initially trained under Lipps. As a matter of fact, as a philosopher, Lipps had no direct posterity, even in Munich. Even though some of his ideas are found in the work of many of his students (see in particular Smid 1982,

pp. 123–140; Bokhove and Schuhmann 1991, pp. 115–116), he did not succeed in creating a school of his own, especially as he was not a systematic philosopher. Together with his theory of language, Lipps's contributions to philosophy (whether theoretical or practical) are the aspect of his *oeuvre* that was most thoroughly forgotten after his death and would only be partially rediscovered at the end of the twentieth century.

Beyond the contextual elements discussed above, the reason for the quick loss of interest in Lipps's thought after his death is likely also attributable to the very nature of his *oeuvre*. Lipps was a particularly prolific and multifaceted author who published an impressive number of texts over his 40-year-long career on a great variety of topics, often in the form of voluminous books and articles. Although in reality Lipps's *oeuvre* is highly coherent thematically, its wide-ranging nature (or scope) can give the impression of lacking focus, especially as his thought went through a continual evolution from the early 1870s to the early 1910s. In any event, the sheer scope and variegated natures of the work make it particularly difficult to grasp as a whole. Moreover, the size of some of Lipps's major works, such as his two-volume, 1246-page *Ästhetik*, may have significantly hindered their popularity. A further problem lies in Lipps's style itself, which, especially in his twentieth-century publications, often appears quite convoluted and repetitious. As a general rule, in his psychology-inspired writings, Lipps is painstakingly careful to expound all the contours of his thinking and to exhaust every detail of the most sophisticated analysis of facts of consciousness. This can no doubt be exhausting even for the most experienced reader.

Finally, it is also worth mentioning that Lipps's texts are characterized by a near absence of textual references—an approach that can appear confusing, even in light of the publishing standards of the time. Independently of the intrinsic value of Lipps's ideas and their historical scope, we are dealing with a series of problems that, taken together, certainly did not work in favor of his critical fortunes in the medium and long term. On the other hand, it should be kept in mind that, from 1908 onward, Lipps developed the symptoms of a severe degenerative disease that would critically impair his intellectual and institutional activity in the following years, before prematurely claiming his life six years later (Anschütz 1915, pp. 1–2; Külpe 1915, p. 78; Kesselring 1962, p. 77).

This not only prevented him from bringing his work to some sort of completion, but also made it impossible for him to defend it in the future amid an increasingly hostile intellectual context.

Nevertheless, the previous discussion should not be taken to imply that Lipps's *oeuvre* and ideas became completely marginalized during the interwar period and beyond. The best testimony of his continuing reputation can be found in the active posthumous publication of his texts. Between 1914 (the year of his death) and 1929, no fewer than 13 of his writings were republished (Bokhove and Schuhmann 1991, pp. 129–130), notably his aesthetic writings, as well as his contributions to psychology and ethics. After this date, it would not be until 1966 that one of his texts would be published, which was his *Raumästhetik*, whose first edition dated back to 1897 (Bokhove and Schuhmann, 1991, p. 130). Moreover, it turns out that Lipps was far from being unknown and that his ideas were well established in the USA during the interwar period. As noted by Susan Lanzoni in her book *Empathy. A History* (2018, pp. 68–97, 133–143 and 216–231), Lipps was not only recognized but commented on as a theorist of empathy up until WWII and beyond in such varied fields as aesthetics, counseling, and social psychology. Here figures like Herbert Langfeld, Gordon Allport, and Otto Rank appear as proponents of aspects of Lippsian thought in the USA. Edward Bradford Titchener's posthumous book *Systematic Psychology: Prolegomena* (1929, pp. 206–212) offers a further example of Lipps's relative popularity in the American context of the interwar period. Titchener devotes around seven pages of his book to Lippsian psychology, his discussion being mainly based on an analysis of the third edition of the *Leitfaden der Psychologie* (1909). Moreover, up until the end of the 1930s, Lipps remained known as an affective psychologist in the USA, as shown by the few commentaries that Christian A. Ruckmick devotes to him in *The Psychology of Feeling and Emotion* (1936), a monograph in which he notably focuses on German psychology from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Nevertheless, it is probably Lipps's aesthetic *oeuvre* that ensured the durability of his popularity in the long term, that is, especially in the German-speaking world after World War II (WWII). For instance, in the part of the fourth volume of his *Psychologie der Sprache* [Psychology of Language] (1956, pp. 319–320) devoted to linguistic feeling, the Austrian psycholinguist Friedrich Kainz discussed in detail his

psychoaesthetic concept of “mechanical feeling” (*mechanisches Gefühl*). As noted above, Lipps’s *Raumästhetik* (in which he introduces his concept of *mechanisches Gefühl*⁴) was republished in 1966. Here it is also worth mentioning that Lipps’s aesthetics was the topic for at least two doctoral theses in East Germany from the late 1950s to the early 1970s (Hadler 1957; Beinroth 1970). After WWII, the memory of Lipps’s aesthetics had also remained alive in the English-speaking world. As highlighted in Sect. 1.1.2, in 1967, Listowel republished, under the title *Modern Aesthetics. An Historical Introduction*, his 1933 monograph in which he gives pride of place to Lipps’s aesthetic ideas (Listowel 1967). We can also mention the publication, ten years later, of the book *The Dynamics of Architectural Forms* (1977) by the German-born art and film theorist Rudolf Arnheim, which makes explicit mention of Lipps. Though Arnheim did not discuss his ideas in great detail, his book appears to have been largely inspired by the basic tenets of Lipps’s spatial aesthetics.

1.2 A Critical Reassessment of the Lipps Scholarship

Over the past three or four decades, Lipps has been the subject of a genuine revival of interest, as a growing number of research studies have been dedicated to specific aspects of his work, thereby rescuing his *oeuvre* from the relative oblivion into which it had fallen. In addition to an increasing number of historical studies that have been devoted to his work, the renewed interest in his thought is also reflected in the increasing popularity of his ideas in some quarters of contemporary philosophical and scientific research (see Chap. 10). Here I will not attempt an extensive review of the development of recent Lipps scholarship, but instead offer an overview of its most significant milestones and of the current state of knowledge concerning Lippsian thought by focusing on certain of its shortcomings. As we will see, as it stands, and despite some remarkable philological and theoretical advances and a number of valuable publications, the historiography remains far from satisfactory. Studies on Lipps

⁴On this crucial concept of Lipps’s spatial aesthetics, see Chap. 8, Sect. 8.3.2.