Editors' Introduction

Elisa Magrì and Dermot Moran

Recent years have seen growing interest in the work of Edith Stein (1891–1942), particularly in her theory of empathy. This is due not only to the fact that Stein's work intersects significantly with contemporary research on empathy, but also because Stein's phenomenological writings shed new light on problems concerning the nature of self, affectivity, and sociality. In this *Introduction*, we aim at summarizing some important issues surrounding empathy before introducing Stein's work and the relevance of her philosophical contribution as developed in the original essays collected in this volume.[1]

1 What We Talk About When We Talk About Empathy

Over the last decades, the nature of empathy has been the focus of much of contemporary research in philosophy of mind, neurosciences, psychology, social philosophy, ethics, and education among other fields. However, despite the wide and increasing attention paid to this concept, there is no clear consensus yet as to what empathy means. Not by chance, Cuff et al. (2016) have identified 43 different definitions of empathy in the current literature! For this reason, it seems more fruitful to

[1] Most of the essays collected in this volume were originally presented at the conference *Edith Steinand Phenomenology* held at University College Dublin in May 2015. We are very grateful to all the participants in the conference and to all the authors of this volume for their engagement and interest in carrying out a philosophical exploration of Stein's phenomenology. We also wish to acknowledge and express our gratitude to the funding bodies that have supported the preparation of this volume: UCD Newman Fellowship, funded by the Catrechetics Trust, and the Irish Research Council Postdoctoral Fellowship.

E. Magrì (✉)
School of Philosophy, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland
e-mail: elisa.magri@ucd.ie

D. Moran
School of Philosophy, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland

Department of Philosophy, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Boston, MA 02467, USA
e-mail: morandg@bc.edu

E. Magrì, D. Moran (eds.), *Empathy, Sociality, and Personhood*, Contributions To Phenomenology 94, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71096-9_1

illuminate empathy from an interdisciplinary angle, as demonstrated by recent philosophical research (Ratcliffe 2007; Coplan and Goldie 2011; Maibom 2014, 2017; Zahavi 2014). In light of such works, it is safe to assume that empathy is a context-dependent concept that requires some preliminary clarifications.

An important cornerstone, in this regard, involves the famous and debated distinction between sympathy and empathy. While the term "sympathy" is older in the English language, the term "empathy" is a relatively recent neologism that was introduced in 1909. However, the history of empathy is closely related to the history of the term sympathy, as we shall see. Importantly, the relation between sympathy and empathy helps explain why the concept of empathy is in itself a complex phenomenon, involving sensory, affective, and kinaesthetic capacities.

As is well known, the notion of sympathy draws on the tradition initiated by David Hume (1711–1776) and Adam Smith (1723–1790), who speak always of sympathy and indeed it is from them that the term was taken up by Max Scheler in his *Wesen und Formen der Sympathie.* Nonetheless, Hume's and Smith's respective uses of this notion differ in important respects. As Fleischaker (2012) has pointed out, for both Hume and Smith sympathy is not the same as compassion in that it comprises a range of various feelings that form the emotional glue of sociality. Basically, sympathy is what leads us to take an interest in another's situation, although the link between sympathy and benevolence in Hume is more complex and less evident than in Smith (Debes 2007). By far, however, one of the most significant differences between Hume and Smith concerns the way in which sympathy is communicated to the beholder. While Hume holds that in sympathizing with another we immediately convert an impression into the idea of another's passion, a transfer that is more vivid the stronger the relation between ourselves and the other, Smith refers to a more sophisticate use of imagination on the part of the spectator.[2]

Being familiar with both Hume's and Smith's accounts of sympathy, Charles Darwin (1809–1882) suggests in *The Descent of Man* (1871) the attribution of sympathy to animals. As Darwin writes, "the social instincts lead an animal to take pleasure in the society of its fellows, to feel a certain amount of sympathy with them and to perform various services for them" (Darwin 1981: 72). For Darwin, sympathy is an emotion and a fundamental component of social instincts, which lead animals to defend each other and to enjoy each other's company. Yet Darwin is also very careful in addressing the limits of sympathy. For example, he notices that it is "more doubtful" how far animals actually sympathize with each other's pains and pleasures (Darwin 1981: 76), and that it is "often difficult to judge whether animals have any feeling for each other's sufferings" (*ibid.*). Moreover, Darwin argues that sympathy does not simply originate from association, for it is gained as an instinct and then strengthened by exercise and habit. It is also usually directed to the beloved one, and indeed Darwin insists that such feelings cannot be extended to all the individuals of the species, but only to those of the same community.[3]

[2] Cfr. Hume 1978: 318, Smith 2004: 15. See also Wispé 1991: 1–16 and Agosta 2014: 9–30. For the affinity and difference between Smith's and Husserl's use of imagination see Drummond 2012.

[3] "No doubt a tiger or lion feels sympathy for the sufferings of its own young, but not for any other

From the very beginning then, the notion of sympathy identifies an emotion that is directed toward the welfare of others. However, the complexity of its underlying process, including its intrinsic combination of bodily, affective, and cognitive elements, has always been a peculiar feature of sympathy and the reason why it found soon application in other fields such as aesthetics. In Germany, for instance, the intellectual father of the *Sturm und Drang*, Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), referred to the response of inner sympathy (*Sympathie*) awakened by the contemplation of artistic beauty.[4] For Herder, sympathy is an immediate feeling that involves a sensuous transposition into the subject portrayed by the work of art. Particularly in the case of sculpture, which Herder raised to a higher rank than painting, we find ourselves touched by the spirit that animates the statue, what Herder also calls the "truth of the physical body" (Herder 2002a: 81). Thanks to sympathy, we also feel connected to humankind as a whole and partake in others' situations. In this respect, Herder refers to *Einfühlung*, though not in a very systematic way, when discussing the problem of interpretation and his philosophy of history.[5]

While the notion of *Einfühlung* was taken up by Friedrich Theodor Vischer, Karl Köstlin, and Hermann Lotze, it was Robert Vischer (1847–1933) who systematized the use of *Einfühlung* in relation to the emotional symbolism of art. According to Vischer, empathy refers to the "wonderful ability" we have to project our own experience onto the form of the work of art just as we do with another person. In his 1873 thesis *Über das optische Formgefühl* (*On the optical sense of form*), he coined the term *Einfühlung* to comprise different forms of feelings, such as *Anfühlung, Nachfühlung*, and *Zufühlung* (Vischer 1994), which correspond to attentive feeling, responsive feeling, and immediate feeling respectively. In imagination, Vischer notices, there is an intensification of sensation that leads one to project her experience onto the work of art, which is then animated by the affective transposition of the spectator. First, there is attentive feeling (*Anfühlung*) that awakens an affective response on the part of the subject (*Nachfühlung*). This happens, in Vischer's example, when we look at undulations and curves in a road, and we mentally trace them in a form of imitation. The intensification of the experience brings forth an immediate feeling (*Zufühlung*) that leads us to approach closer the object either because we are charmed or because we are repulsed by it. Through such feelings, which are entwined and work together by means of association of ideas, empathy arises as a symbolizing activity that animates the object in virtue of imaginative transposition. There is then a movement *fromthe object*, which awakens sensations and feelings, that is counteracted by a movement *from the subject*, which is typical of empathy

animal" (Darwin 1981: 82). With strictly social animals (e.g. animals that associate together) – Darwin points out – the feeling will be more or less connected to all the associated members. See also Darwin 2009: 228. For an analysis of Darwin's account of sympathy see Wispé 1991: 31–42.

[4] "The more a part of the body signifies what it should signify, the more beautiful it is; inner sympathy alone, feeling and the transposition of our entire human self into the figure we touch, is the true teacher and instrument of beauty" (Herder 2002a: 78).

[5] See, for instance, *This Too a Philosophy of History for the Formation of Humankind* (1774) in Herder 2002b.

and occurs also, according to Vischer, in the religious personification of the divine. The final stage of *Einfühlung* implies, for Vischer, a "pantheistic urge with the world" or a "kinship directed towards the universe" that fosters kindred sensation (*Mitempfindung*) and sympathy (*Mitgefühl*) for human subjects.

It is worth noting that concepts like projection, association, animation, personification, and fusion are essential components of the early investigations on empathy and they are central in both psychology and philosophy. Alongside authors like Heinrich Wölfflin, Adolf von Hildebrand, and Johannes Volkelt, Moritz Geiger (1880–1937) and Theodor Lipps (1851–1914) played a key role in developing the concept of empathy from a philosophical point of view. In particular, Geiger differentiates empathy toward human beings from empathy toward nonhuman beings, but he also holds that the very factors that are operative in our psychic life must be found in the aesthetic field too. In relation to this, Geiger points out that there must be something common to both the object (e.g. the landscape we see in the painting) and the subject's state that cannot be reduced to an effect of the former upon the latter or to subjective projection. On Geiger's view, each subject exhibits an alternation of sentimental character and emotional states that influences our perception of the painting as being "sad", "joyful", etc. (Geiger 1976). In this sense, the objective character of the work of art, say the colour of the painting, shows an essential affinity with my mood (Pinotti 2009). This fundamental correlation between subject and object represents the basis for the empathic transposition into the work of art.

In light of such genealogy, it comes as no surprise that Theodor Lipps developed the notion of *Einfühlung* as a *sui generis* problem involving different forms. Lipps was acutely aware that the term "empathy" had become quite ambiguous and that various types of empathy obtain depending on whether we apperceive signs, sounds, or human expressions. In this sense, the perception of a sign, for example a line, which we animate with a tension toward extension or movement (hence, we say that "the line rises", as if it had its own force) is capable of producing *Einfühlung* just like the sensible expressions of human beings. Like Vischer, Lipps maintains that imitation and reproduction facilitate an empathic transposition toward human and nonhuman beings. Additionally, for Lipps, empathy can be positive or negative depending on whether our nature welcomes and accepts the force awakened by the object or not. In all these cases, Lipps argues, the specific object of *Einfühlung* is given thanks to various modalities of empathic apperception, including instinctive imitation, mental reproduction (e.g. representation), and identification. Particularly in the case of empathy toward human beings, Lipps argues that we find ourselves drawn to imitate or replicate certain movements or gestures we see in the other. Yet Lipps makes clear that we empathize only when we find ourselves transposed into the other, that is when the other's experience is felt from within. For this reason, Lipps rejects any explanation of empathy in terms of mental comparing or analogy, for there can be empathy only when something is immediately felt in one's own experience. Alongside these general distinctions, Lipps also holds that there exists a practical or ethical form of *Einfühlung*, which is the basis for every type of altruism and that leads individuals to create bonds and social organisms. This form of ethical empathy takes place when the empathizer feels the tendency to co-experience the

behaviour of another in terms of moral obligation (*Sollen*), which may acquire the character of duties (*Pflichten*) (Lipps 1909: 222–241).

Today, Lipps' influence on the early phenomenology has received new consideration, also because of the affinity between his theory of imitation and contemporary psychological research on motor mimicry and simulation.[6] Eventually, it was the psychologist Edward B. Titchener (1867–1927), a former student of Wilhelm Wundt, who introduced the English term "empathy" arguably to translate Lipps' notion of *Einfühlung*.[7] Importantly, Lipps' theory played a fundamental role for authors like Husserl, Scheler, and Stein.[8] Indeed, Lipps was a member of the "Munich circle", which included Max Scheler among others, and Lipps' theory of *Einfühlung* attracted both Husserl's and Stein's interest, as we shall see.

From this brief reconstruction, it appears that definitions of empathy and sympathy tend to be stipulative in the history of these terms. An important aspect is that people can apprehend the emotions and feelings of another in empathy, and they can also join with the other in sympathy or in acts of caring and solicitude. These are all complex mental states that human persons can take toward each other (and indeed they extend also to animals). However, as the genealogy of the term shows, the problem of empathy primarily concerns the interplay of affective and sensory capacities that is required on the part of the empathizer in order to grasp another's state. While empathy may result in acts of sympathy and care, the latter are not necessary conditions of the former. In this respect, Darwall (1998) has proposed one way to understand the distinction between sympathy and empathy: sympathy for a person is felt from the third-person perspective of one-caring, whereas empathy implies sharing the other's mental state from her standpoint. Thus, while empathy can be consistent with lack of concern with the other's state, sympathy is felt from the perspective of caring. Darwall also admits that there can be a form of empathy that he calls "projective", which does not simply copy feelings and emotions as we imagine them. On the contrary, "we place ourselves in the other's situation and work out what to feel, as though we were they. This puts us into a position to second the other's feeling or dissent from it" (Darwall 1998: 268).

Darwall's notion of projective empathy is in line with contemporary accounts of empathy based on simulation processes. According to Goldman and Gallese, for example, a simulation routine takes place in the empathizer as an attempt to replicate, mimic or impersonate the state of the target (Goldman and Gallese 2013). In the simulation scenario, the empathizer does not draw on any causal/explanatory laws of prediction, for one relies on one's own mental mechanisms to feel a pretended state that matches the other's. In other versions of the simulation argument, it is possible to explain empathy as a multidimensional phenomenon involving the interrelation of affective and cognitive features of experience. This two-level model reflects the need to account for two different yet linked dimensions: a lower level, involving a sensorimotor activation, and a higher level, implying mind-reading and

[6] See Stueber 2006: 1–28. For a critical discussion, see Zahavi 2014: 95–111.

[7] See Titchener 1909 and, for the history of this translation, Debes 2015.

[8] See Moran 2004, Zahavi 2014, and Debes 2015.

enactive imagination.[9] However, with regard to this, a problem arises as to whether the "as if" phase that is crucial in the empathetic response effectively requires a functionalist model of explanation or whether perception is already capable of activating the response without any pretense (Jacob 2011; Dullstein 2013; Gallagher 2007).

Apparently, the phenomenological proposal privileges perception and the direct encounter with another. However, this is not meant to rule out the contribution of affectivity, imagination, and values. First of all, phenomenology does not dismiss but rather emphasizes the role of affectivity and emotions in enabling a sensual form of empathy that includes animals and that provides the ground for accessing another's state. The crucial aspect is that, in the phenomenological explanation, the empathizer is not a spectator, but rather an active subject partaking in a horizon that is considered from the first-person point of view (Zahavi 2005, 2014). In this sense, the encounter with the other is explored by taking into account the way in which one's own perspective can be varied and decentred without altering one's primary and fundamental form of self-acquaintance.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that the notion of "projection" or "putting oneself in the position of the other" (*hineinversetzen*) is used by both Husserl and Stein when it comes to explicating the empathic process; in this regard both are developing Theodor Lipps' account which placed a strong emphasis on projection or "introjection". However, in the phenomenological sense, projection does not lead to any pretended phenomenal state, but rather to a process of self-distantiation and perspective-shifting that presupposes neither inferential reasoning nor mental simulating. With regard to this, Stein highlights, in agreement with her mentor Husserl, that empathy is a *sui generis* perception, involving features of retention, expectation, and imagination, a set of mental acts that were gathered under the name *Vergegenwärtigung* (representation or presentification) by Husserl (Magrì 2015). This suggests that the phenomenological appraisal of empathy involves the interrelation of several capacities, which contribute to the understanding of another's sense of reality or existence (Ratcliffe 2012).

Indeed, an important aspect that is distinctive of empathy in the phenomenological sense concerns the appraisal of others not only as embodied beings but also as persons. Particularly in *Ideas II*, Husserl distinguishes two attitudes that characterize our relation to others: the naturalistic and the personalistic. While the former involves apprehending others as physical entities subjected to natural laws, such as time and gravity, and it is prevalent in natural sciences, the latter is the attitude that shapes our everyday encounters with others as subjects partaking in a common world. Interestingly, empathy is seen in this text as a way to access another's perspective on the world as well as to understand others as persons that are bearer of characters and value (Husserl 1989: 194 ff). In this respect, empathy is not exclusive of dual encounters with others, but it is crucial to also understand communal experi-

[9] Regarding the contribution of imagination, see de Vignemont and Jacob (2012) and Stueber (2006). For a detailed overview of current debates on empathy in philosophy of mind, see Maibom's Introduction in Maibom 2014.

ences and forms of shared life. It is precisely in relation to this set of problems, namely the multidimensional structure of empathy and its connection to affectivity, values, and sociality, that Stein initiates her philosophical work, which the essays collected in this volume have explored in its originality and fruitfulness.

2 Edith Stein on Empathy, Sociality, and Personhood

2.1 Edith Stein's Philosophical Background

Edith Stein entered the University of Breslau in 1911 to study Literature and Philosophy[10] after impressive success in the *Abitur*. As she recounts in her autobiographical *Life in a Jewish Family*, she spent four semesters (1911–1913) in Breslau, taking whatever courses she pleased, including ancient Greek (Stein 1986a: 185–222). One particularly significant lecture course was "Introduction to Psychology" given by William Stern (1871–1938), who had been a student of the psychologist Hermann Ebbinghaus in Berlin, and had done groundbreaking research on memory. Stein greatly appreciated Stern's clear and easy-to-understand lectures. Stern was also a pioneer in the psychology of personality and in child psychology (carrying out detailed observations on his own children), and, perhaps, nowadays most famous as the inventor of the first intelligence quotient (IQ) measure.[11] Stern rejected the separation of philosophy from psychology and, according to Stein, saw himself primarily as a philosopher, being the author of a monograph *Person und Sache* (*Person and Thing*, 1906),[12] that was a metaphysical defence of critical personalism – the claim that reality consists of a hierarchy of persons, teleologically oriented to values, and that all other things (ultimately atoms and molecules) are components of persons. In *Person und Sache,* Stern also argued that larger social groups can be regarded as persons – a position which Edith Stein would also later defend. Wilhelm Stern gave Stein her first introduction to personalism – a philosophical movement that she would later encounter also in Max Scheler's lectures and writings.

Stein also signed up for a philosophy course at Breslau with the Neo-Kantian Richard Hönigswald (1875–1947).[13] Both Stern and Hönigswald were Jews and both were impeded in their academic career as a result, as Stein records in her auto-

[10] Stein 1986: 172.

[11] Wilhelm (he used 'William' in the USA) Stern (1871–1938) taught in Breslau from 1897 to 1916. In 1916, he was appointed Professor of Psychology at the University of Hamburg, but, as a person of Jewish descent, he had to emigrate to the Netherlands, and then to the USA, after the National Socialists took power in Germany in 1933. Stern subsequently taught at Duke University and died there in 1938. He was, with Clara Stern, the author of *Psychologie der frühen Kindheit* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1914; reprinted and expanded in many editions). See J. T. Lamiell 2010.

[12] Cfr. Stern 1906. See Stein 1986a.

[13] Hönigswald was Jewish and was eventually dismissed from teaching by the Nazis in 1933. He was the teacher of Norbert Elias. He published primarily in the area of Neo-Kantian epistemology. Stein mentions his interest in the psychology of cognition, see his article, Hönigswald 1913.

biography – Hönigswald was an unsalaried lecturer, *Privatdozent*, and Stern was *Extraordinarius*. Stein was at that time an ardent young feminist and she signed up to the Prussian Society for Women's right to vote and threw herself into student debating societies and other activities.[14] Later, she petitioned the Prussian authorities to allow women to proceed to habilitation.[15]

One day in Göttingen, while preparing for William Stern's seminar, Stein was researching the Würzbrug school of psychologists (which included such figures as Oswald Külpe, Bühler, Messer),[16] and she came across references to Edmund Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen* (*Logical Investigations*).[17] One of the other members of Stern's seminar was Dr. Georg Moskiewicz (1878–1918), also a former student of Ebbinghaus, who knew Husserl personally having studied with him for a semester in Göttingen. Moskiewicz was one of the more senior members of the student group, since he already held a doctorate, which had been published as the short (only 96 pages) *Psychologie des Denkens*, in 1910 (Moskiewicz 1910). Moskiewicz gave Stein a copy of the second volume of Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen* (*Logical Investigations* 1901),[18] and remarked to her, as she later recounted, that in Göttingen the students "philosophize, day and night, at meals, in the street, everywhere, and talk only of the 'phenomena'" (*In Göttingen wird nur philosophiert – Tag und Nacht, beim Essen, auf der Straße, überall. Man spricht nur von ›Phänomenen‹*).[19] Fascinated, Stein began to study the *Logical Investigations* on her own and, indeed, soon gained a reputation for arguing in defence of Husserlian phenomenology in the seminars of Richard Hönigswald. Eventually, encouraged by Moskiewicz, she resolved to go to Göttingen to study with Husserl himself, which she eventually did for the summer semester of 1913. Her mother agreed to the move, on condition her sister went with her.

Stein and her sister Rosa arrived in Göttingen in April 1913 and immediately enrolled in Adolf Reinach's course "Introduction to Philosophy" (1913) and his seminar on "movement" or "motion" (*Bewegung*) in 1913. Reinach (1883–1917)

[14] See Stein 1986a. Stein wrote a great deal on feminism and especially advocated the participation of women in higher education. See Stein 1996; and Carey 1991.

[15] Indeed, the eventual decree explicitly mentions Stein's efforts. See 'Erlaß des Preußischen Ministers für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Volksbildung vom 21. Februar 1920', *50 Jahre Habilitation von Frauen in Deutschland. Eine Dokumentation über den Zeitraum von 1920–1970*, ed. Elizabeth Boedeker (Göttingen: Schwartz 1974).

[16] The Psychological Institute of the University of Würzburg had been founded in 1896 by Oswald Külpe and in 1903 began publication of its journal, *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie*. The Würzburg school generally defended the cognitive nature of thinking and rejected its basis on sensation and association. Külpe was a student of Wilhelm Wundt and his students included Max Wertheimer, Kaspar Ach, and Henry Watt.

[17] Stein 1986a: 217.

[18] E. Husserl, *Logische Untersuchungen,* 2 Bande (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1900–1901). A critical edition, which includes Husserl's written emendations and additions to his own copies (*Handexemplar*), has appeared in the Husserliana series (Husserl 1975 and 1984). The only English translation is Husserl 2001.

[19] See Stein 1986a: 218.

had the job of preparing students for Husserl's more advanced seminars.[20] Furthermore, Moskiewicz had strongly recommended that Stein study first with Reinach, who was then *Privatdozent*, but had earned a reputation as a terrific teacher, and was more accessible than the somewhat austere Husserl. In fact, Moskiewicz had written a letter of introduction to Reinach on Stein's behalf. Reinach had originally studied with Theodor Lipps in Munich but he then wrote his *Habilitation* on the theory of judgement with Husserl in Göttingen in 1909 and thereafter became *Privatdozent*. He was considered a much clearer exponent of phenomenology than Husserl himself and was the rising star of the Göttingen circle. He assisted Husserl in the revising of the *Logical Investigations* which appeared in 1913.[21] He wrote several important articles, one on negative judgements for Lipps's *Festschrift*. His main contribution was in the study of social acts and the phenomenology of law.[22]

Following her initial meeting with Reinach, Stein was encouraged to attend Husserl's opening seminar, where she boldly told him she had read the whole of the Second Volume of the *Logical Investigations*! Husserl reportedly was impressed. Thereafter, she became an avid student of Husserl's phenomenology and attended his evening meetings with students in his home.[23]

In that first year in Göttingen, Stein also attended the lectures that the Munich philosopher Max Scheler (1874–1928) gave outside the university on the basis of an invitation from the Göttingen Philosophical Society. These extra-curricular lectures were given in cafes and guest houses in Göttingen over the years from 1911 to 1914, arranged by Scheler's friend, Dietrich von Hildebrand, after Scheler had ignominiously lost his job in Munich.[24] Scheler struck Stein as a fascinating character, with an air of genius, scattering brilliant remarks through his lively talks, but not at all systematic in the manner of Husserl (Stein 1986a: 259). Much of what he lectured on would later find its place in his *Formalism* book, the first part of which was pub-

[20] Reinach had completed his doctorate under Theodor Lipps at Munich before moving to Göttingen in 1909 to complete his *Habilitation* with Husserl. He was a brilliant exponent of phenomenology but sadly lost his life in Flanders in the Great War in 1917. His major work published in his lifetime was *Die Apriorischen Grundlagen des Bürgerlichen Rechtes*, published in Husserl's *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* in 1913, now in Reinach 1983. In April 1914, he participated with Husserl in the 6th Congress of Experimental Psychology in Göttingen. He gave an important lecture on phenomenology in Marburg in 1914, later published as *Über Phänomenologie,* now in Reinach 1989. He is renowned for his work on states of affairs (*Sachverhalte*), social acts and speech acts, as well as his account of the a priori. According to Stein, he was a brilliant teacher. Originally Jewish, he converted to Christianity shortly before his death on 16th November 1917. Stein assisted in editing Reinach's collected works.

[21] See Husserl's Foreword to the Second Edition of the *Logical Investigations*, in Husser 1975: Bxvii; Husserl 2001: 8.

[22] Reinach 1989b. See Loidolt 2010.

[23] See Bello 2008.

[24] See Bell 2011.

lished in Volume One of Husserl's *Jahrbuch* in 1913 and the second part in 1916.[25] Indeed, Scheler would feature prominently in Edith Stein's doctoral thesis on empathy.[26]

At Göttingen, Stein also attended psychology lectures with the renowned empirical psychologist, Georg Elias Müller (1850–1934), who was deeply opposed to phenomenology – and personally antipathetic to Husserl – and frequently criticised it in his own lectures.[27] Müller's lectures on the "psychophysics of visual perception" struck her as more scientifically exact than the lectures she had received from Stern in Breslau, but she was not attracted to empirical psychology (although she participated in some psychological experiments run by Müller's students) as she preferred to discuss "ideas" with the philosophy students, as she recounts. It is not fully appreciated now that Husserl's phenomenology at Göttingen was closely associated with the then current psychological explorations of perception, especially the senses of vision and touch and the constitution of space.[28] Indeed, Husserl's phenomenology appears to have anticipated and even influenced some of the later findings of Gestalt psychology (for instance in the work of Adhemar Gelb, 1887–1936).[29] Erich R. Jaensch (1883–1940),[30] Heinrich Hofmann (born 1883),[31] Wilhelm Schapp

[25] Scheler, *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik. Neuer Versuch der Grundlegung eines ethischen Personalismus*, *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* vol. 1 (1913); vol. 2 (1916), now in Scheler 1954.

[26] See especially Stein 2010: 42ff. English trans: 27–34.

[27] Georg Elias Müller (1850–1934) was born near Leipzig, where he studied from 1868–1869. He then moved to Berlin to continue his studies, but soon volunteered for the Prussian army. In 1871, he returned to his studies, moving in 1872 to work with Hermann Lotze (1817–1881) at Göttingen. He was appointed to a position in Göttingen in 1876, where he stayed, for the most part, for the next 40 years. Drawing on Hermann Ebbinghaus' techniques with nonsense syllables, he developed a theory of memory, in which forgetting is caused by interference from later-learned material, rather than from the "fading away" of an original memory trace. He also espoused a version of Heinrich Ewald Hering's (1866–1948) "opponent-process" theory of colour vision, the main rival to Hermann von Helmholtz's (1821–1894) "trichromatic" theory. Müller appears to have been quite hostile to Husserl and never mentions him in his publications, see Spiegelberg 1972: 34–35.

[28] Brentano and his students played an important role here. See Stumpf 1873.

[29] See especially Mulligan 1995: 225 n. 3.

[30] Erich R. Jaensch completed his doctorate with G. E. Müller (1850–1934) in 1908. He conducted research on visual acuity and eidetic imagery. He later became a defender of Nazi racial types in the study of personality and, on that basis, took over the editorship of the *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*. He died in 1940. He corresponded with Husserl and sent him his early studies on perception of faces.

[31] Hofmann 1913. Hofmann wrote his doctoral dissertation with Husserl and is mentioned by Husserl, see Spiegelberg 1972: 56. We have not been able to determine when Hofmann died.

(1884–1965),[32] Jean Héring (1890–1966),[33] and David Katz (1884–1953),[34] among others, studied perception both from the view of psychology and phenomenology with Husserl in Göttingen, often taking part as subjects in Müller's experiments. This annoyed Müller but certainly enriched phenomenology.

Stein was being drawn away from empirical psychology toward philosophy but throughout her life she retained a theoretical interest in psychology and anthropology. She soon began to attend the meetings of the Göttingen Philosophical Society, a circle that operated around Husserl and Reinach, and was known (and somewhat resented by some of the other women) for her active participation in discussion.[35] That semester Moskiewicz, who had joined her in Göttingen, was made chairperson of the Society and Edith Stein assumed the role of note-keeper at their meetings. Perhaps because of her interest in psychology, Husserl gave her the task of studying Theodor Lipps' works in detail – especially concerning the problem of *Einfühlung* – for her *Staatsexamen* which took place in late 1914. Husserl's notes on her examination have been preserved.[36]

2.2 Edith Stein's Philosophical Career

Early in her Göttingen sojourn, Stein approached Husserl to write her doctorate on some aspects of phenomenology and his reaction was more or less the same as it would later be in his relations with Gerda Walther: he recommended she sit the *Staatsexamen*, the state teaching examination, that would qualify her to be a second-level teacher, rather than attempt to pursue a doctorate in philosophy (Stein 1986a: 269). Husserl, by all accounts (and especially as recorded by Gerda Walther), was somewhat old fashioned and did not think that academic life was suitable for women. However, Stein persisted and even suggested the problem of empathy. In his *Nature and Spirit* (*Natur und Geist*) lectures, moreover, which Stein attended,

[32] See Schapp 1976. Schapp studied with Rickert in Freiburg and Dilthey and Simmel in Berlin before going in 1905 to Husserl at Göttingen where he completed his doctorate in 1909. He subsequently had a career in law and published on legal philosophy and the philosophy of history. His book on perception is quoted approvingly by Merleau-Ponty 1962: 229–230; Fr. 265.

[33] Jean Héring, born in Alsace, studied under Husserl at Göttingen, writing a dissertation on the a priori in Lotze, and later published an important essay on essence, *Bemerkungen über das Wesen, die Wesenheit und die Idee*, for the *Jahrbuch* in 1921. He later studied theology and Hering presented his pioneering thesis on phenomenology and religion, *Phénoménologie et philosophie religieuse*, for the licentiate degree at the Protestant Faculty of Theology in Strasbourg He wrote a number of texts on dreaming, see Héring 1946, 1947, and 1959. For a brief biography, see Ingarden 1967. See also Dupont 2015.

[34] See Katz 1911. A revised and expanded edition was published in 1930 as *Der Aufbau der Farbwelt* (*The Construction of the World of Colour*, 1930). In the Introduction to the English translation, Katz records that his empirical methods have now found general acceptance in psychology. He opposed an atomistic approach which was welcomed by Gestalt psychologists.

[35] See Salice 2015.

[36] See Schuhmann 1991.

Husserl was maintaining, as she recounts, that the objective world was the outcome of intersubjective agreement between communicating minds linked by "empathy" (Husserl 2002). She maintained that Husserl had not made clear what this empathy was – and it seemed a natural subject for her to choose. Husserl eventually agreed to her proposal and took her on as a doctoral candidate, but he wanted her to do a historical survey of previous conceptions of empathy, a standard part of doctoral dissertations of that time. This historical review (beginning from Herder) eventually became volume one of her thesis (which would not be collected in the published version); this part of her thesis was subsequently lost.

While trying to write her doctoral thesis with Husserl, Stein struggled with doubt and indecision and felt entirely overwhelmed at times. She was on the verge of abandoning it many times, as she reports in her autobiographical *Life in a Jewish Family*. She became very depressed and even plunged into "despair" especially in the winter semester of 1913–1914, her first winter in Göttingen (Stein 1986a: 277). Her depression was so deep that she wrote that she could not cross the street without wishing that a street car would knock her down or go for a walk without hoping to fall off a cliff (Stein 1986a: 278). She eventually sought assistance from Adolf Reinach who read her drafts and gave her the encouragement she needed. As she later wrote: "after two visits with Reinach I was like one reborn" (Stein 1986a: 284).

The outbreak of war in August 1914 interrupted her studies and she volunteered to work in a Red Cross nursing station. Nevertheless, Stein finally completed her dissertation in the summer of 1916, just as Husserl was making the move to his new professorship in the University of Freiburg. Husserl moved to Freiburg in April 1916, less than a month after the loss of his son. On 8th March 1916 his twenty-year old younger son Wolfgang, bearer of the Iron Cross, was killed at Verdun, and his eldest son Gerhart was badly wounded. Husserl was in deep mourning. The losses would not end – Adolf Reinach would himself be killed in action in 1917 and Husserl wrote several moving obituaries.[37]

Edith Stein and Roman Ingarden (who was Polish and hence not subject to military conscription) were the only two students to follow Husserl when he moved to Freiburg and the two became very close friends as is evident from their correspondence. Stein submitted her thesis to Freiburg University but she had difficulty getting Husserl to read it. When she arrived in July 1916, however, Husserl told Stein that he was preparing a new lecture course and would have no time to read her thesis. His wife Malvine, however – who was quite friendly with Stein – insisted that he make time to sort out Stein's doctorate. The *viva voce* examination was eventually arranged by the Dean (who was sympathetic) of Freiburg University, who decided that Husserl alone should judge the thesis and her other two examiners

[37] Husserl published an *In Memoriam* for Reinach in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* on 6th December 1917, and a second, "Adolf Reinach †," in *Kant-Studien* vol. 23 (1919), pp. 147–149, reprinted in Husserliana XXV, ed. Hans R. Sepp and Thomas Nenon (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1987), pp. 296–303; trans. Lucinda A. Vandervort Brettler, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 35 (1975), pp. 571–574.

would examine her minor subjects and not the main thesis itself. The *viva* took place on 3rd August 1916 and Stein received, most unusually, the grade of *summa cum laude*. Husserl judged it to be "very independent" (Stein 1986a: 408). Furthermore, he thought about publishing it in his J*ahrbuch* with Volume II of *Ideas*, which he was then preparing and which, in some respects, as he acknowledged, it anticipated. Soon after her *viva*, she met the young Heidegger, whom she liked very much. His wife Elfride Petri was a fellow philosophy student who, Stein had observed, asked lively questions in the seminars (Stein 1986a: 409).

Stein's dissertation, originally entitled *Das Einfühlungsproblem in seiner historischen Entwicklung und in phänomenologischer Betrachtung* (*The Problem of Empathy in its Historical Development and in its Phenomenological Treatment*), was published, with a dedication to her mother, as *Zum Problem der Einfühlung* (*On the Problem of Empathy*) in Halle in 1917, with the first historical chapter (Teil 1 of the original dissertation) omitted (Stein 2010). Although it was a doctoral dissertation, Stein actually made an early and original contribution to phenomenology, particularly in terms of her account of the role of the lived body in perception and on the nature of the person (especially in her "Intentionality, Value Disclosure, and Constitution: Stein's Model") and of the personalistic attitude. Furthermore, her discussion of empathy, and of the role of motivation in intentional acts, offered an insight into Husserl's thinking although the works from which she drew (now known as *Ideas* II) would not be published in his life-time.

It is also noteworthy that Edith Stein's published thesis had an immediate and significant influence on Max Scheler, who refers to it – and her critique of his own work – in the Second Edition of his *Sympathiegefühle* (1923).[38] Stein calls Scheler's account of sympathy (which she equates with her own concept of *Einfühlung*) a "bold theory […] [that] has something extremely seductive about it" (Stein 2010: 43/27). She is struck by Scheler's originality but she is not convinced by his attempt to distinguish between apprehension of one's own experiences and the apprehension of the other simply as a distinction between two modes of givenness of what Scheler calls "inner perception". Scheler includes empathy under inner perception and Stein rejects this. Furthermore she rejects Scheler's postulation of a neutral stream of experience prior to the ego. For her – as for Husserl – all streams of experiencing are necessarily egoic. Stein maintains that Scheler simply does not understand the pure ego in the phenomenological sense, as the pure ego that is revealed in reflection rather than in immediate experiencing in what is called "inner perception".

Stein's *On the Problem of Empathy* was also important because it provided the published evidence for the issues Husserl was exploring in his private research writings that would eventually be published only posthumously in 1952 as *Ideas* II. For instance, Merleau-Ponty would cite Stein's second publication, *Beiträge zur*

[38] Scheler had published the first edition in 1913 as *Zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Sympathiegefühle und von Liebe und Hass. Mit einem Anhang über den Grund zur Annahme der Existenz des fremden Ich* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1913). It was reprinted in an expanded edition in 1923. Stein had made use of the 1913 edition for her *Empathy* book.

philosophischen Begründung der Psychologie und der Geisteswissenschaften (published in Volume Five of Husserl's *Jahrbuch* in 1922)[39] in his *Phenomenology of Perception*[40] on the difference between cause and motivation (a topic also discussed by Husserl in *Ideas* II § 56).[41]

After Husserl approved her doctorate, he invited Stein to work as his private assistant for the modest fee of 100 marks per month (the same sum, *nota bene*, that he paid his male assistant). Husserl's deteriorating eyesight meant that he could not read the pencil manuscript of *Ideas* II that he had prepared in 1912. The shock of his son's death, moreover, combined with the upheaval of the move to Freiburg, had all contributed to disrupting his research. Husserl needed an assistant to sort out his manuscripts and to prepare them for publication (Stein 1986a: 409). Since he had been reading her thesis, and noticed the anticipation of his *Ideas* II manuscript, he felt she was an ideal candidate (Stein 1986a: 411). Stein, moreover, had volunteered to help, and Malvine Husserl cemented the agreement. Stein, however, had already moved back to Breslau to commence a teaching career, but once she agreed to become Husserl's assistant, she returned once more to Freiburg at the beginning of October 1916.

Stein worked as Husserl's salaried assistant from October 1916 until February 1918, when she eventually resigned in frustration (Stein 1986a: 495). She transcribed and edited Husserl's research manuscripts, including the manuscript of *Ideas* II, which shows considerable evidence of her editorial interventions as will be clearly demonstrated by the new edition.[42] She also laboured on Husserl's *Lectures on the Consciousness of Internal Time* (1905–1917), although these were eventually brought to press by Heidegger in 1928. She was actually present in Bernau in 1917 as Husserl was composing these manuscripts on time (the C-manuscripts). Ingarden says that probably her last acts as Assistant consisted of her "adjustment" of the Internal Time Lectures (Ingarden 1962: 161). Edith Stein worked on the time manuscripts which would be published a decade later by Martin Heidegger with scant acknowledgement of Stein's contribution.[43] Stein also worked on the manuscripts connected with Husserl's revision of the Sixth Logical Investigation, among many other tasks, including a defense of Husserl against Neo-Kantian critical epistemology planned for *Kant-Studien*.

In a later essay, Roman Ingarden, explains Stein's relationship with Husserl as follows: "[…] She had been appointed to set Husserl's manuscripts in order and to prepare them for publication. She was authorized to elaborate them, to introduce any changes into their content, or their internal structure, which she considered

[39] See Stein 2000.

[40] Cfr. Merleau-Ponty 1962: 31.

[41] Cfr. Husserl 1989.

[42] A new edition of the *Ideas* II and *Ideas* III manuscripts are in preparation by the Husserl Archives in Cologne, edited by Dirk Fonfara, as E. Husserl, *Urfassung der Ideen II und Ideen III*, Materialenband (Dordrecht: Springer, in press). See also Sawicki 1997.

[43] See Husserl 1964: 16. See also Kortooms 2002: 19–21.

necessary on account of the subject matter, or on purely formal and didactic grounds. Husserl was supposed to read them in due course" (Ingarden 1962: 157). But, as Ingarden confirms, whether because of his mental preoccupations or physical health (increasing blindness): "It was simply impossible to persuade Husserl to re-read, study and correct his old manuscripts. He was usually dissatisfied with what he had already accomplished. He always believed that he now knew the truth about things better than before. His old manuscripts bored him, and he usually gave the up after 1 or 2 days reading" (Ingarden 1962: 158).

According to Edith Stein's personal letter to Ingarden of 19th February 1918, Husserl was giving her "impossible" (*unmöglich*) instructions for arranging the manuscripts. She felt stifled because she had no time to carry out creative research on her own so she offered her resignation. She was not someone who could simply "obey" Husserl: "And if Husserl will not accustom himself once more to treat me as a collaborator in the work (*als Mitarbeiterin an der Sache*) – as I have always considered my situation to be and he, in theory, did likewise – then we shall have to part company" (Stein 1993: 22).

Ten days later, on 28th February 1918, Stein writes to Ingarden to inform him that «the Master has graciously accepted my resignation. His letter was most friendly—though not without a somewhat reproachful undertone» (Stein 1993: 23). A few weeks later, on 10th March 1918, Stein wrote to Kaufmann to say that "putting manuscripts in order, which was all my work consisted of for months, was gradually getting to be unbearable for me". She was not willing to be a mere scribe but wanted to be his co-worker in the cooperative task of doing phenomenology, *symphilosophein*. Roman Ingarden later records Stein as saying to Husserl: "Either we work together or you work alone, I am always ready to serve you, but you must release me from the position as Assistant (*Entweder arbeiten wir zusammen, oder Du arbeitest allein; ich bin immer dazu bereit, Dir zu dienen, aber Du mußt mich als Assistentin aus der Stelle entlassen*)" (Ingarden 1999: 232).[44]

Among the documents Stein prepared during her time as Husserl's assistant is the reply to the critiques of two Neo-Kantians, Theodor Elsenhans (1862–1918) and August Messer (1867–1937), on the nature of phenomenology in contrast to psychology and epistemology, now published as *Zur Kritik an Theodor Elsenhans und August Messer* (*Towards the Critique of Theodor Elsenhans and August Messer*).[45] Elsenhans had originally criticized phenomenology in two articles in *Kant-Studien* published in 1915 and 1917.[46]

Stein's reply is a defense of the phenomenological method of attending to "givenness" (*Gegebenheit*), whether in perception or fantasy, and using it as an

[44] I am grateful to Peter Andras Varga for drawing this essay to my attention in his lecture, "Edith Stein als Assistentin von Edmund Husserl: Versuch einer Bilanz im Spiegel von Husserls Verhältnis zu seinen Assistenten. Im Anhang mit einem unveröffentlichten Brief Edmund Husserls über Edith Stein" [DM].

[45] See Stein, 1986b: 226–248.

[46] See Elsenhans 1915and 1917. Elsenhans is in a debate with Paul Ferdinand Linke who defended phenomenology in articles in *Kant-Studien*.

exemplary instance in order to bring to clarity the essence of the phenomenon. Stein is replying to the standard Neo-Kantian criticism that phenomenology cannot be pure description in that it needs concepts which cannot be found in experience. Stein defends the view that, by their very nature, the concepts involved in the description of essences of experiences are necessarily inexact and vague, just as words cannot precisely describe colours. Furthermore, Stein defends imaginative variation as a way of modifying the essence to arrive at other essential types without reference to actuality. This eidetic procedure is different in principle from all empirical psychology. She further asserts that the real difference between Elsenhans and Husserl concerns the Kantian assumptions of Elsenhans regarding the difference between passive receptivity and spontaneity (Stein 1986b: 242). Husserl, in contrast to Elsehans, understands perceptual experience as directly yielding the object itself. Elsenhans, on the other hand, holds with Kant that givenness and spontaneity are to be distinguished as two separate processes in the act of understanding. Stein will continue in later writings to defend Husserl's conception of categorial intuition and direct seeing of essences (*Wesensschau*), which she says was the great breakthrough of Husserl's *Logical Investigations*.

In one of her letters, Stein indicates her departure from Husserl and her agreement with Conrad-Martius (whom Husserl appears to have frozen out after she had disagreed with him) on the proposition that there is a real or actual world independent of consciousness and, furthemore, that this real world is a necessary condition for consciousness. This is her blunt statement of realism in opposition to Husserl's idealism, according to which the world is the correlate of a possible consciousness, although Husserl, in fact, had always maintained that empirically consciousness depends on a material substrate, i.e. on embodiment. Husserl shows his own awareness of her position, for instance, when he adds a note to his edition of *Ideas* I, § 46 that it should be noted that the physical thing must exist for experience to continue harmoniously and adds: "Miss Stein believes this might become misunderstood" (*Fräulein Stein meint, daß das mißverstanden worden könne*) (Husserl 1977: 598). This section is one of the more Cartesian and idealist sections of *Ideas* I against which Conrad-Martius, Ingarden, and Stein all railed.

Her own interest at that time, as Stein attests, was in the "analysis of the person" (Stein 1993: 23). Indeed, it is clear that Stein is moving more toward an analysis of the person (in part inspired by Scheler) and she would later complete an important set of lectures on this topic, *Aufbau der menschlichen Person*, delivered in Münster in 1932/1933 (Stein 2015). In these lectures, she attests that she is using the Husserlian phenomenological method to explore human existence, however she departs from Husserl in finding at the centre of the person not the empty pure ego that Husserl spoke about but rather what the mystics called the "ground of the soul" (*Grund der Seele*).

Having left Husserl's employment, Stein was determined to complete her *Habilitation* in order to be qualified to become a university lecturer rather than a gymnasium teacher. She planned her *Habilitation* thesis to be a study of the nature of psychology as a science. She applied to the University of Göttingen in 1919, but her application was ignored for a long time and eventually rejected. Husserl's own

letter of recommendation of 6th February 1919 is brief and not particularly illuminating (Husserl 1994: 548–9). He acknowledges her doctoral dissertation, her year and a half served as his assistant, her work as a philosophy teacher, her "wide and deep formation" (*Bildung*) in philosophy, and her unquestionable great ability in philosophy, but the letter closes with a sting in the tail: "Were the academic career for women to be opened, I could recommend her in all places and in the warmest manner for the permission to habilitate".[47] This is in line with the reminiscences of Gerda Walther in her autobiographical reflection on her experiences with Husserl as her mentor (Walther 1960).

Stein also applied to Freiburg. In the years from 1917 to 1919, Stein completed this major study entitled *Beiträge zur philosophischen Begründung der Psychologie und der Wissenschaft* (*Contributions toward the Philosophical Foundation of Psychology and Science*) which she intended to submit for the *Habilitation*. This text, which she also referred to as *Psychische Kausalität* (*Mental Causation*) was published in Husserl's *Jahrbuch* Volume Five in 1922 (Stein 2010). She was already referring to it as her "*Habilitation* thesis", for example, in her letter to Felix Kaufmann of 31st May 1920 (Stein 1993: 43). She says that a circular sent to the universities (presumably to remind them not to discriminate against women) had been sent at her request (Stein 1993: 44). The text is made up of two treatises: one on "Sentient Causality" (more or less what is today discussed under the title "mental causation"), and the second on "Individual and Community".

Stein was determined to be an academic but various circumstances would continue to stand in her way, some external and some self-imposed. One of the more telling letters is one Husserl himself wrote to Georg Misch, explaining why he could not accept Stein in Freiburg. On 29 May 1919, Husserl wrote from Freiburg to Georg Misch in Göttingen recommending Stein for a *Habilitation* there.[48] He explains that she is a valuable researcher who has done good work for him but he writes that he could not take her himself in Freiburg as he already had three Jewish junior faculty (*3 Dozenten jüdischer Abstammung*) working with him and would not

[47] Husserl writes: "Sollte die akademische Laufbahn für Damen eröffnet werden, so konnte ich sie an allerester Stelle u. aufs Wärmste für die Zulassung zur Habilitation empfehlen". Husserl 1994: 549.

[48] The original document is archived in the Georg Misch Nachlass at the Niedersächsische Staats und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen (shelf mark: Cod. Ms. G. Misch 74); a copy of the letter can be found in the Husserl Archive in Leuven. Husserl writes: "Sehr geehrter Herr Kollege! Fraülein Dr. Stein, welche nach ihrem Doktorat fast 2 Jahre lang als meine wissenschaftliche Assistentin tätig war, wünscht sich Ihnen vorzustellen und in Betreff der Möglichkeiten einer Habilitation in Göttingen Ihren Rat zu erbitten. Gestatten Sie mir nur soviel zu sagen, dass es sich dabei um eine wertvolle Persönlichkeit handelt, die ein gütiges Entgegenkommen verdient. Dass ich ihr nicht eine Meldung zur Habilitation in Freiburg anraten konnte hat, im Vertrauen gesagt, darin seinen Grund, dass in unserer philosophischen Fakultät (die der Göttinger philologisch-historischen Abtheilung entspricht) bereits 3 Dozenten jüdischer Abstammung sind, und ich nicht erwarten kann, dass die Fakultät die Habilitation eines 4ten genehmigen würde. An sich hätte ich mir zur Unterstützung meiner Lehrtätigkeit eine so wertvolle phänomenologische Hilfskraft sehr gewunscht. Frl Stein hat sich auch als Leiterin eigener philosophischer Übungen sehr bewährt. […]. Ihr sehr ergebener E. Husserl".

be in a position to take a fourth! Husserl was at that point a convert to Christianity and, it seems, was at pains to distance himself from his Jewish heritage.

In her letter to Fritz Kaufmann of 8th November 1919 Stein complains that she had been rejected by Göttingen:

> For all of ten days, the rejection, in black and white, has been in my pocket, or, more exactly, the document is in our files, closing the matter. [The application] was not even taken up by the faculty, but was quietly dispatched.
>
> I received a letter from Hermann, the department head, that was meant to appear as an official notification, for a *pre-commission* had decided not even to judge my thesis since the *Habilitation* of women continues to create many difficulties. The following day, evidently after the irregularity of this procedure had been explained to him, he told me orally that the danger had existed of having the thesis rejected because Müller had asserted that it "would unseat psychology, as it is pursued here" (which is a slight error), and they had wished to spare me that [rejection] (Stein 1993: 35).

She was convinced that it was Georg Misch who had been behind the refusal. Stein could find no one to take her on despite her prodigious academic talent and her academic publishing output.

The early twenties was a turbulent but intellectually very productive time for Stein. She completed her *Eine Untersuchung über den Staat* (*On the State*) that eventually appeared in the *Jahrbuch* in 1925.[49] Perhaps the main event that changed her life was her conversion to Catholicism.[50] While visiting her friend and fellow philosopher, Hedwig Conrad-Martius, at her farm in Bergzabern in the summer of 1921, Stein came across St. Theresa of Avila's autobiography and reportedly spent the whole night reading it. She felt she had found the truth and she converted to Catholicism later that year and was baptised on the 1st January 1922, with Hedwig Conrad-Martius acting as her godmother. Her conversion deeply disappointed her mother and many of her friends. Fritz Kaufmann (1891–1958) broke off all relations with her at that time but she managed to convince him to renew their friendship. Having been initially denied permission to submit her *Habilitiation*, she taught at a Dominican school in Speyer from 1921 until 1932, when she moved to teach at the German Institute for Scientific Pedagogy in Münster. She continued to correspond with Husserl, Ingarden and others, and she contributed an article to Husserl's *Festschrift* (1929) on *Husserl's Phenomenology and the Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*. This article was cast in the form of a dialogue between Husserl and St. Thomas and demonstrated her new interest in Scholastic philosophy. Her mentor in this regard was the Polish Jesuit Erich Pryzwara (1889–1972) who was an advocate of Newman and who had written a study on Newman and Scheler.[51] She translated

[49] Cfr. Stein 2006. In this work, Stein Adolf Reinach's theory as found in his *The Apriori Foundations of the Civil Law* (Die *apriorischen Grundlagen des burgerlichen Rechts*, 1913), in order to account for the social ontology (*soziale Ontologie*) of the state, of law and of social acts (*soziale Akte*) generally. See De Vecchi 2015.

[50] See Gaboriau 2002.

[51] See Pryzwara 1923 and 1932. Pryzwara supported Scheler's rejection of Kant and his realism which he thought could be compared with that of Thomas and Newman.

St. Thomas' *De Veritate* and several works by John Henry Newman (also a convert to Catholicism), and she would go on to write major books on metaphysics including *Potenz und Akt* (*Potency and Act*) and *Finite and Infinite Being* (Stein 2002). But it is clear that she also kept up with phenomenology and, for instance, mentions, in a letter of 16th February 1930 to Sr. Adelgundis Jaegerschmid, that she has read Husserl's *Formal and Transcendental Logic* (published in 1929) that Husserl himself had directed the publishers to send to her (Stein 1993: 60). She also read Heidegger's *Being and Time* (1927) and *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* (1929), when they were published and includes extensive discussions of Heidegger in her *Finite and Infinite Being*.[52] Stein praises Heidegger's turn toward Being, but denies that the apprehension of Being can be based on human finitude.

In 1930, Stein made another attempt to register for a *Habilitation* with her *Potenz und Akt* (completed around 1930)[53] this time getting in contact with Heidegger who was by then full professor in Freiburg, having replaced Husserl who retired in 1927. He was helpful and offered to inquire about getting her a *stipendium* but pointed out that if she planned to get a job in a Catholic university she might be better not working with him.[54] She also saw Professor Martin Honecker (1888–1941), who held a chair in Freiburg, who agreed to support her application,[55] and it appears Husserl and his wife Malvine (who remained supportive of Stein) were pleased at this. She was planning to begin the *Habilitation* in Autumn 1931. Her appointment to a teaching post at the German Institute for Scientific Pedagogy in Münster may have been the reason she abandoned plans to complete the *Habilitation*. Her new, proposed *Habilitation* thesis, *Potenz und Akt*, was later incorporated with changes into her posthumously published *Endliches und ewiges Sein* (*Finite and Eternal Being*).

When the National Socialists came to power in Germant in early 1933, as a non-Aryan, Stein was forced to resign her teaching position in Münster. She planned to travel to Rome to explain the Nazi's persecution of Jews but instead wrote a letter to Pope Pius XI which was delivered but never answered. In a letter to Elly Dursy, she reports that was not permitted to give lectures anymore «because of my Jewish descent» (Stein 1993: 141). In 1934, she entered the Carmelite convent at Cologne, taking the religious name Teresa Benedicta of the Cross, after the mystic who had inspired her conversion. There she completed her metaphysical work *Endliches und ewiges Sein* (*Finite and Eternal Being*), an attempt to synthetize the diverse philosophies of Aquinas and Husserl. Other philosophical and spiritual works followed, and she continued to read and review philosophy books, including Husserl's *Crisis*. In 1938, with the Nazi threat growing, she was transferred to the Carmelite convent at Echt in the Netherlands, where it was thought she would be safe from persecution. There she wrote her important treatise *Studie über Joannes a Cruce: Kreuzeswissenschaft* (1950; *The Science of the Cross*), a phenomenological study of St. John of the Cross.

[52] See Lebech 2015: 147–164.

[53] Stein 2009.

[54] Letter to Sr. Adelgundis Jaegerschmid 26th January 1931 in Stein 1993: 82.

[55] See Ott 1993.

Leaving Germany, however, did not ensure her safety. The condemnation, on 26th July 1942, of Nazi anti-Semitism by the Dutch bishops of occupied Holland provoked Hitler to order the arrest of all non-Aryan Roman Catholics. On 5th August 1942, Stein was interned at Westerbork. Two days later, she was deported to Auschwitz concentration camp in Poland, where she perished probably on 9thAugust 1942. Her sister Rosa, who had also become a Catholic, was arrested at the same time and died in Auschwitz also. Survivors of the death camp testified that she helped all other sufferers with great compassion.[56]

2.3 Edith Stein's Philosophical Contribution: The Purpose of this Volume

Stein's work is rich, complex, and multifaceted, and for this reason its philosophical relevance deserves further attention. In particular, this volume aims to consider Stein's contribution to phenomenology from a unified perspective that centers on the relation between the concepts of empathy, sociality, and personhood. While recent studies have already explored Stein's view of empathy and sociality (see the articles edited by Szanto and Moran 2015), this book aims to show in what sense these concepts are interlocked with subjectivity, affectivity, and communal experience, which represent significant cornerstones of phenomenological research.

On the one hand, as shown by Moran and Sepp in this volume, Stein's philosophical contribution appears in the way she critically responds to Husserl's phenomenology, while she takes up and develops her own phenomenology of the person. As the authors of this volume show, Stein's account of personhood is particularly relevant to understand the structure of the ego and the stratification of subjectivity in relation to the problems of constitution and embodiment. Generally speaking, the notion of personhood is connected to the realm of spirit (*Geist*) and involves questions concerning freedom, values, and morality. Stein argues that we become aware of our own values when we empathize with others, and that various depths of feelings and values lead to the acknowledgment of different personal types. With regard to this, it is noteworthy that Stein addresses the sphere of personhood already in her dissertation on empathy, which emphasizes the psychophysical constitution of the self and particularly the dimension of bodily experience.

[56] At an open-air ceremony in Cologne on 1stMay 1987, Pope John Paul II beatified Edith Stein, that is, he declared her worthy of public veneration as a genuinely holy, or blessed, person. In Rome on 11th October 1998 the Pope canonised her. In 1999, Stein was proclaimed one of the patron saints of Europe. The Pope wrote that the "proclamation of Edith Stein as a Co-Patroness of Europe is intended to raise on this Continent a banner of respect, tolerance and acceptance which invites all men and women to understand and appreciate each other, transcending their ethnic, cultural and religious differences in order to form a truly fraternal society".

In this sense, Stein's investigation of empathy concerns whether and how the empathic relationship is built up on a stratification of layers, including the spheres of affectivity and emotions, but also the appraisal of others as persons, that is as bearers of characters and values. While this aspect has been recently pointed out by contemporary literature, the specific functioning and interrelation of the various levels involved in empathy posit several questions, including the limits of empathy, the role of perception and imagining, as well as that of values. These are the questions addressed by Vendrell Ferran and Summa in this volume, offering original insights that bring to light similarities and differences between Stein and contemporary accounts of empathy and emotions. Due to her attention to the embodiment of the psyche, Stein's reflections solicit original parallels with contemporary investigations on mental illness as well as on medical ethics, which are taken up and developed in this book by Lebech and Svenaeus respectively.

On the other hand, Stein's account of empathy and subjectivity contributes to a better understanding of the concepts of sociality and collective intentionality. Indeed, Stein's phenomenology allows a comparison between the structure of individual experience and that of communal experience, but on condition that the former can never be reduced to the latter (see, respectively, Burns and Calcagno in this volume). Stein's appraisal of social life is then characterized by a distinct phenomenology, which is concerned not just with the origins of the State and communal life, but also – and more fundamentally – with the way in which a community manifests a form of we-intentionality that preserves personal agency and identity. From this point of view, it can be argued that the three concepts isolated in this volume – empathy, sociality, and personhood – are closely related and reciprocally dependent. It is in virtue of this conceptual and philosophical nexus that Stein's work resonates with that of other prominent, albeit less known, phenomenologists who contributed important studies to metaphysics and social ontology, such as Edwig Conrad-Martius and Kurt Stavenhagen (see Miron and Salice respectively).

In this light, this volume aims at reassessing and expanding current research on empathy in relation to Stein's phenomenology by developing four major areas of investigations: Stein's phenomenology of the person (**Part I**), the significance of empathy for subjectivity and affectivity (**Part II**), the relevance of Stein's thought for sociality, collective intentionality, and medical ethics (**Part III**), and finally, the philosophical resonances between Stein and her contemporaries, such as Edwig Conrad-Martius and Kurt Stavenhagen (**Part IV**). The central goal of this collection is to contextualize as well as to critically assess Stein's contribution to phenomenology, the philosophy of emotions, and social philosophy. The contributions collected in this book show that Stein's early phenomenology (*i*) provides the tools to reconsider the relation between empathy, contagion, and care, (*ii*) offers an original account of the relation between affectivity and values, (*iii*) proves to be fruitful when it comes to the relationship between empathy and sociality. We conclude by offering a brief summary of each chapter.

In "Edith Stein's Encounter with Edmund Husserl and her Phenomenology of the Person", Dermot Moran explores Stein's philosophical engagement with Husserl, setting the stage for the analysis of Stein's original phenomenology of the person. As Moran argues, Stein's philosophical approach began and remained distinctively phenomenological, even after she initiated to address specifically ontological and theological questions. In particular, Moran tackles the theoretical continuity between Stein's early investigations on empathy and her later philosophical production, showing that Stein's originality mainly resides in her extraordinary grasp of Husserlian phenomenology of embodiment, including her appraisal of the essential individuality and depth of the human person.

Hans Reiner Sepp continues this line of investigation in "Edith's Stein Conception of the Person Within the Context of the Phenomenological Movement", where he considers the two-fold stratification of the personal ego in Stein's phenomenology by critically comparing it with Scheler's. As Sepp notices, Stein radicalizes the intentional relation between subject and object in that she assigns special emphasis to the enactment of the act on the part of the self, while she differentiates between self, soul, and person. Sepp carefully details the stages of the constitution of the person, arguing that persohood includes the ego and the self, but in a way that, on the one hand, the I and the self do not totally coincide; and, on the other hand, personality develops only on the basis of a self-changing and self-transforming movement. By contrasting Stein's view of the person to Scheler's, Sepp points out that Stein's original perspective lies in the tension that has to be maintained between unity, depth, and breath of the self.

Having outlined in the first part of the book Stein's original approach to the stratification of the personal ego, the second part addresses more closely the psyschophysical constitution of the self. In "Intentionality, Value Disclosure, and Constitution: Stein's Model", Íngrid Vendrell Ferran considers Stein's account of emotions and moods both in relation to her phenomenology of feelings, aginst the background of Brentano's phenomenology, and in regard to meta-ethical debates on emotions and values. She argues that, while Stein follows Husserl's "a priori of correlation" between intentional objects (noema) and the modes in which they are manifested in consciousness (noesis), Stein develops an original version of axiological realism. As Vendrell Ferran shows, Stein's approach reveals that the nature of emotions cannot be fully understood without an account of the relation between emotions and moods. At the same time, the Steinian account suggests that moods are responsible for the significance of the world, and by constituting the background of our experience, they are deeper than emotions. Michela Summa in "Empathy and Anti-Empathy: Which are the Problems?" also engages with the analysis of the different layers of the self, taking into account the problem of empathy. In particular, Summa compares Stein's account of empathy with Peter Goldie's, arguing that empathy can be conceived of as a multidimensional phenomenon involving a specific use of imagination that is notably different from and not reducible to any "in-his-shoes-imagining". Summa holds that empathy, in its different layers, relies on a function of imagination that she describes as "central imagining". This is a form of

perspectival shift that takes place within a complex psychophysical process, wherein the perspective of the other is co-present and posited as co-present rather than being simulated.

The complex relation between personal and psychophysical self is promiment in Mette Lebech's analysis in "Stein's Understanding of Mental Health and Mental Illness". Lebech considers Stein's account of the psyche within the context of mental health and mental illness, making a case for three functions that support mental health and that are affected in cases of mental illness: vitality, rationality, and trust. Lebech also considers the various ways in which psychic contagion can instigate and aggravate mental illness, identifying mental illness as the proper object of psychiatry. On Lebech's view, the Steinian psyche is a priori unified by the fact that it pertains to an I. This I, who in its relation to the spiritual world is a person, is influenced by the individual's response to higher values, and it can protect the individual from psychic contagion. Yet in psychic illness, it is the psyche that is crucially affected in its ability to support meaningful experience. Thus, Lebech argues that the relation between personal and psychophysical self rests on motivational nexuses that allow the conversion of psychic energy into physical energy, but this process is limited by disturbances affecting the causal mechanism of the psyche.

The third part of the volume concentrates on the relation between empathy, sociality, and care. In particular, in "From I to You to We: Empathy and Community in Edith Stein's Phenomenology", Timothy Burns takes into account the controversial relation between empathy and community in the context of recent debates on collective intentionality. Burns argues that empathy makes communal experience possible and meaningful, yet the fact that I empathize with another is not sufficient to constitute a community. Thus, Burns holds that empathy is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the subject of collective experience. This elicits, on Burn's view, a two-fold commitment, first to the ontological separateness of individual egos, and second to the non-independence of the communal subject. While individual egos are distinct from one another in terms of the inviolable separateness of their conscious lives, communal experiences possess an essential noetic sense implying ownership by several subjects. Thus, the communal subject is the subjective correlate of first-personal plural experiences. Antonio Calcagno further develops this line of reasoning in "The Role of Identification in Experiencing Community. Edith Stein, Empathy, and Max Scheler", which focuses on the difference between empathy and communal identification. Drawing on a comparison between Stein and Scheler, Calcagno argues that Stein, unlike Scheler, privileges the role of consciousness in her account of collective experience. For Calcagno, Stein rules out a view of community based on fusion or identification due to her analysis of selfhood. Indeed, Stein's analysis of the I and the lived body points to a sense of ipseity or ownness that can never be identical to that of another. As Calcagno argues, one may feel solidarity with another through the building up of a collective sense of a shared experience, but we can never have identification. While Scheler appears reluctant to treat the lived body and the individuation it presupposes, Stein acknowledges that the I serves as the foundation of all experiences, a foundation that continues to operate even though we may not be fully aware of it. Following out Stein's account of eth-

ics, Fredrik Svenaeus examines the relation between empathy and care from the point of view of medical ethics in "Edith Stein's Phenomenology of Empathy and Medical Ethics". Svenaeus argues that Stein's account is compatible with the dimension of care, but the former does not coincide with sympathy or compassion for the other. As Svenaeus shows, Stein's examples of empathy reflect the idea that empathy is typically elicited when we encounter persons expressing strong feelings, most often associated with suffering, and this is certainly the case in health care. This induces the urge to relieve the suffering of the other person, which turns into an experience of sympathy when we follow her suffering through and come to feel *for* the other person. However, while empathy represents the grounding phenomenon for feeling sympathy toward another, the concern developed through empathy ought to be taken as a duty only in specific contexts like health care. Thus, on Svenaeus' view, Stein's account of empathy is an apt starting point for medical ethics, for it proves the necessity of moral reflection in order to acknowledge both the suffering of a person, who is in need of help, as well as the capabilities (virtues) that health care professionals need to embody.

The fourth part of the book is dedicated to the exploration of the philosophical resonances of Stein's philosophy with her contemporaries who also engaged with the concepts of sociality and personhood. Taking a stance within current debates on collective intentionality, Alessandro Salice discusses in detail, in "Kurt Stavenhagen on the Phenomenology of the We", Kurt Stavenhagen's phenomenological contribution, which complements and enriches Stein's view of sociality. Salice shows that Stavenhagen offers a description of we-experiences that is unprecedented within phenomenology, and it also provides an explanation for individual choices in sharing preferences. As Salice shows, sharing preferences prompts a sense of togetherness or we-ness in that it facilitates the building of social relationships in general. This is a process that begins when one recognizes that one's preferences overlap with those of another, thereby enabling the individuals' understanding of oneself as a member of a group. In Stavenhagen's model, the mutual awareness of sharing certain preferences leads to a transformation of one's self-understanding that ends with the subject conceiving of him- or herself as a member of an "us". Finally, Ronny Miron, in "A Philosophical Resonance: Hedwig Conrad-Martius versus Edith Stein", compares Conrad-Martius' and Stein's metaphysics of the I, discussing the centrality of the being of consciousness (and its relation to nothingness) in both thinkers and making a case for their difference. In this regard, Miron argues that, from Conrad-Martius' point of view, the most problematic element in Husserl's transcendental approach lies in its guiding role for the study of being. While Stein partially shares Conrad-Martius' criticism of Husserl, she is however unwilling to give up the anchor that she finds in Husserl's thinking. According to Miron, the ontological common assumption of the I in Conrad-Martius and Stein indicates, in Stein's philosophy, a tendency to fill the gap between being and nothingness through the dimension of meaning.

References

Agosta, Lou. 2014. *A rumor of empathy. Rewriting empathy in the context of philosophy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bell, J.M. 2011. Max Scheler's secret Göttingen seminars. In *2011 annual conference on Christian philosophy in conjunction with the North American Society for Early Phenomenology and the Dietrich von Hildebrand legacy project*. Steubenville: Franciscan University of Steubenville.

Bello, A.A. 2008. Edmund Husserl and Edith Stein. *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 82 (1): 143–159.

Carey, M.A. 1991. *A feminist anthropology. Women in the thought of Edith Stein*. Washington, DC: S.T.L. Pontifical John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage and Family.

Coplan, A., and P. Goldie, eds. 2011. *Empathy. Philosophical and psychological perspectives*. Oxford: OUP.

Cuff, B.M.P., et al. 2016. Empathy. A review of the concept. *Emotion Review* 8 (2): 144–153.

Darwall, S. 1998. Empathy, sympathy, care. *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition* 89 (2/3): 261–282.

Darwin, C. 1981. *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 2009. *The expression of the emotions in man and animals*. Cambridge: CUP.

De Vecchi, F. 2015. Edith Stein's social ontology of the state, the law and social acts. An Eidetic approach. *Studia Phaenomenologica* 15: 303–330.

De Vignemont, F., and P. Jacob. 2012. What is it like to feel another's pain? *Philosophy of Science* 79 (2): 295–316.

Debes, R. 2007. Humanity, sympathy, and the puzzle of Hume's second enquiry. *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 15 (1): 27–57.

———. 2015. From *Einfühlung* to empathy. Sympathy in early phenomenology and psychology. In *Sympathy. A history*, ed. E. Schliesser, 286–322. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Drummond, J. 2012. Imagination and Appresentation. Sympathy and empathy in Smith and Husserl. In *Intersubjectivity and objectivity in Husserl and Adam Smith. A collection of essays*, ed. C. Fricke and D. Føllesdal, 117–138. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Dullstein, M. 2013. Direct perception and simulation. Stein's account of empathy. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* 4 (2013): 333–350.

Dupont, C.Y. 2015. Jean Hering and the introduction of Husserl's phenomenology to France. *Studia Phaenomenologica* 15: 129–153.

Elsenhans, T. 1915. Phänomenologie, Psychologie, Erkenntnistheorie. *Kant-Studien* 20: 224–275.

———. 1917. Phänomenologie und Empirie. *Kant-Studien* 21: 243–261.

Fleischaker, S. 2012. Sympathy in Hume and Smith: A contrast, critique, and reconstruction. In *Intersubjectivity and objectivity in Husserl and Adam Smith. A collection of essays*, ed. C. Fricke and D. Føllesdal, 273–311. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Gaboriau, F. 2002. *The conversion of Edith Stein*. South Bend: St. Augustine's Press.

Gallagher, S. 2007. Logical and phenomenological arguments against simulation theory. In *Folk psychology reassessed*, ed. D.D. Hutto and M. Ratcliffe, 63–78. Dordrecht: Springer.

Geiger, M. 1976. Zum Problem der Stimmungseinfühlung bei Landschaften. In *Die Bedeutung der Kunst. Zugänge zu einer materialen Wertästhetik*, ed. K. Berger and W. Henckmann. Munich: Fink.

Goldman, A.I., and V. Gallese. 2013. Mirror neurons and the simulation theory of mindreading. In *Joint ventures. Mindreading, mirroring, and embodied cognition*, ed. A.I. Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Herder, J.G. 2002a. *Sculpture. Some observations on shape and form from Pygmalion's creative dream.* Trans. J. Gaiger. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.

———. 2002b. *Philosophical writings*, ed. M.N. Forster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Héring, J. 1946. La répresentation et le rêve. *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse* 1946: 193–206.

———. 1947. Concerning Image, Idea, and Dream. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 8 (2): 188–205.
———. 1959. Quelques thémes d'une phénoménologie du rêve. In *For Roman Ingarden. Nine Essays in Phenomenology*, ed. A.-T. Tymieniecka, 75–89. Nijhoff: The Hague.
Hofmann, H. 1913. Untersuchungen über den Empfindungsbegriff. *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie* XXVI: 1–136.
Hönigswald, R. 1913. Prinzipienfragen der Denkpsychologie. *Kant-Studien* 18: 205–245.
Hume, D. 1978. *A Treatise of Human Nature.* Second edition, with text revised and notes by P. H. Nidditch. Oxford: OUP.
Husserl, E. 1964. *Vorlesungen zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewußtseins*, ed. M. Heidegger (Tübingen: Max Nieymeyer, 1928). Trans. James Churchill as *The Phenomenology of Internal Time-Consciousness*, ed. Martin Heidegger. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
———. 1975. *Logische Untersuchungen. Erster Band: Prolegomena zur reinen Logik. Text der 1. und der 2. Auflage*. Husserliana, Volume XVIII, ed. Elmar Holenstein. The Hague: Nijhoff.
———. 1977. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch: Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie. 2. Halbband: Ergänzende Texte (1912–1929)*. Husserliana Volume III/1-2, ed. K. Schuhmann. The Hague: Nijhoff.
———. 1984. *Logische Untersuchungen. Zweiter Band: Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis, in zwei Bänden*. Volume XIX, ed. Ursula Panzer. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
———. 1989. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Zweites Buch: Phänomenologische Untersuchungen zur Konstitution*. Husserliana IV, ed. Marly Biemel (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1952). Trans. R. Rojcewicz and A. Schuwer as *Ideas pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy, Second Book*. Husserl Collected Works III. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
———. 1994. *Briefwechsel*, ed. Karl Schuhmann in collaboration with Elizabeth Schuhmann. Husserliana Dokumente. Vol. III. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
———. 2001. *Logical Investigations*, 2 Volumes. Trans. J.N. Findlay, with a new Introduction by Dermot Moran. London/New York: Routledge.
———. 2002. *Natur und Geist. Vorlesungen Sommersemester 1919*. Materialenbände Vol. 4, ed. M. Weiler. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Ingarden, R. 1962. Edith Stein on her activity as an assistant of Edmund Husserl. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* XXIII (2): 155–175.
———. 1967. Jean Hering 1890–1966. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 27 (1967): 308–309.
———. 1999. Über die philosophischen Forschungen Edith Steins. In *Schriften zur frühen Phänomenologie. Gesammelte Werke 3*, ed. R. Ingarden. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Jacob, P. 2011. The direct-perception model of empathy: A critique. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* 2: 519–540.
Katz, D. 1911. Die Erscheinungsweisen der Farben und ihre Beeinflussung durch die individuelle Erfahrung. In *Zeitschrift für Psychologie Ergängzungsband 7*. Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth. Trans. R. B. MacLeod, The World of Colour (London: Routledge, Trench, Trubner, 1935; reprinted Routledge, 1999).
Kortooms, T. 2002. *Phenomenology of Time. Edmund Husserl's Analysis of Time-Consciousness*, Phaenomenologica 16. Dordrecht: Springer.
Lamiell, J.T. 2010. *William Stern (1871–1938): A brief introduction to his life and works*. Lengerich/Berlin: Pabst Science Publishers.
Lebech, M. 2015. *The philosophy of Edith Stein. From phenomenology to metaphysics*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
Lipps, T. 1909. *Leitfaden der Psychologie*. Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann.
Loidolt, S. 2010. *Einführung in die Rechtsphänomenologie. Eine historisch-systematische Darstellung*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
Magrì, E. 2015. Subjectivity and Empathy. A Steinian Approach. *Discipline Filosofiche* 2: 129–148.

Maibom, H.L., ed. 2014. *Empathy and morality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———., ed. 2017. *The Routledge handbook of philosophy of empathy*. London/New York: Routledge.
Merleau-Ponty, M. 1962. *Phénoménologie de la perception* (Paris: Gallimard, 1945); Trans. C. Smith as *Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Moran, D. 2004. The problem of empathy: Lipps, Scheler, Husserl and Stein. In *Amor Amicitiae: On the love that is friendship. Essays in Medieval Thought and Beyond in Honor of the Rev. Professor James McEvoy*, ed. T.A.F. Kelly and P.W. Roseman. Leuven-Paris-Dudley, Peeters.
Moskiewicz, G. 1910. *Psychologie des Denkens*. Leipzig: Engelmann.
Mulligan, K. 1995. Perception. In *The Cambridge Companion to Husserl*, ed. B. Smith and D.W. Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ott, H. 1993. Die Randnotizen Martin Honeckers zur Habilitationsschrift Potenz und Akt. *Studien zur Philosophie von Edith Stein. International Edith Stein Symposium Eichstätt, 1991. Phänomenologische Forschungen* 26/27: 140–145.
Pinotti, A. 2009. Empathy. In *Handbook of phenomenological aesthetics*, ed. H.R. Sepp, 92–98. Dordrecht: Springer.
Pryzwara, E. 1923. Religionsbegründung. Max Scheler-J.H. Newman. Freiburg: Herder.
Pryzwara, E. 1932. *Analogia entis: Metaphysik*. München: Kösel und Pustet. Trans. John R. Betz. *Analogia Entis: Metaphysics: Original structure and universal rhythm* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans 2014).
Ratcliffe, M. 2007. *Rethinking commonsense psychology. A critique of folk psychology, theory of mind and simulation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
———. 2012. Phenomenology as a form of empathy. *Inquiry* 55 (5): 473–495.
Reinach, A. 1983. The a priori foundations of civil law (Trans. John Crosby). *Aletheia* 3 1–142.
———. 1989. Über Phänomenologie. In *Reinach, Sämtliche Werke. Textkritische Ausgabe in 2 Bänden*, 531–550. München: Philosophia Verlag. (Trans. D. Willard, *Concerning Phenomenology*, in *The phenomenology reader*, ed. D. Moran and T. Mooney. London/New York: Routledge 2002).
Salice, A. 2015. The phenomenology of the Munich and Göttingen Circles. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (online resource).
Sawicki, M. 1997. *Body, text, and science. The literacy of investigative practices and the phenomenology of Edith Stein*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Schapp, W. 1976. *Beiträge zur Phänomenologie der Wahrnehmung*. Halle, 1910; reprinted with a new Foreword by Carl Friedrich Graumann, Wiesbaden: B. Heymann.
Scheler, M. 1954. *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik. Neuer Versuch der Grundlegung eines ethischen Personalismus*. In *Gesammelte Werke*, ed. Maria Scheler, Band 2. Bern/München: Francke Verlag. Trans. Manfred S. Frings and Roger L. Funk, *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values. A New Attempt Toward a Foundation of An Ethical Personalism*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press
Schuhmann, K. 1991. Husserls Exzerpt aus der Staatsexamensarbeit von Edith Stein. *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie* 4 (53): 686–699.
Smith, A. 2004. In *A theory of moral sentiments*, ed. K. Haakonssen. Cambridge: CUP.
Spiegelberg, H. 1972. *Phenomenology in psychology and psychiatry: A historical introduction*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
Stein, E. 1986a. *Aus dem Leben einer Jüdischen Familie. Das Leben Edith Steins: Kindheit und Jugend* (Edith Stein Gesamtausgabe, Vol 1. Freiburg: Herder 2015). Trans. Josephine Koeppel, *Life in a Jewish Family 1891–1916. An Autobiography*. The Collected Works of Edith Stein Vol. 1. Washington, DC: ICS Publications.
———. 1986b. Zur Kritik an Theodor Elsenhans und August Messer. In *Aufsätze und Vorträge (1911–1921)*, 226–248. Husserliana XXV, ed. Tom Nenon and Hans Rainer Sepp. Dordrecht: Springer.

———. 1993. *Selbstbildnis in Briefen. Erster Teil 1916–1933* (Edith Stein Gesamtausgabe, Vol. 2. Freiburg: Herder, 2010). Trans. Josephine Koeppel, *Self-Portrait in Letters*, 1916–1942. The Collected Works of Edith Stein, Volume Five. Washington, DC: ICS Publications.
———. 1996. *Essays on Woman*. Washington, DC: ICS Publications.
———. 2000. Beiträge zur philosophischen Begründung der Psychologie und der Geisteswissenschaften. Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung. Vol. 5 (Edith Stein Gesamtausgabe, Vol. 6. Freiburg: Herder). Trans. *Philosophy of Psychology and the Humanities*. Washington, DC: ICS Publications.
———. 2002. *Endliches und Ewiges Sein. Versuch eines Aufstiegs zum Sinn des Seins* (Edith Stein Gesamtausgabe, Voll. 11–12. Herder, Freiburg, 1986). Trans. Kurt F. Reinhardt, *Finite and Eternal Being. An Attempt at an Ascent to the Meaning of Being*. The Collected Works of Edith Stein. Washington, DC: ICS Publications.
———. 2006. Eine Untersuchung über den Staat. *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung 7* (Edith Stein Gesamtausgabe, Vol. 7. Freiburg: Herder, 2006). Trans. Marianne Sawicki, *An Investigation Concerning the State*. Washington, DC: ICS Publications.
———. 2009. *Potenz und Akt. Studien zu einer Philosophie des Seins* (Edith Stein Gesamtausgabe, Vol. 10. Freiburg: Herder, 2010). Trans. L. Gelber and R. Leuven, *Potency and Act: Studies Towards a Philosophy of Being*. The Collected Works of Edith Stein. Washington, DC.: ICS Publications.
———. 2010. *Zum Problem der Einfühlung*. Edith Stein Gesamtausgabe, Vol. 5. Freiburg: Herder. Trans. W. Stein, *On the Problem of Empathy*. 3rd rev. ed. Dordrecht: Springer 1989.
———. 2015. *Der Aufbau der menschlichen Person. Vorlesungen zur philosophische Anthropologie. Münster 1932/1933*. Edith Stein Gesamtausgabe, vol. 14. Freiburg: Herder.
Stern, W. 1906. *Person und Sache: System der Philosophischen Weltanschauung*. Leipzig: Ambrosius Barth.
Stueber, K.R. 2006. *Rediscovering empathy. Agency, folk-psychology, and the human sciences*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
Stumpf, C. 1873. *Über den psychologischen Ursprung der Raumvorstellung*. Leipzig.
Szanto, T., and D. Moran. 2015. Special issue on Empathy and collective intentionality. The Social Philosophy of Edith Stein. *Human Studies.* 38 (4).
Titchener, E. 1909. *Lectures on the experimental psychology of thought-process*. New York: MacMillan.
Vischer, R. 1994. On the optical sense of form: A contribution to aesthetics. In *Empathy, form, and space. Problems in German aesthetics, 1873–1893*. Trans. H. F. Mallgrave and E. Ikonomou. Santa Monica CA: The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities.
Walther, G. 1960. *Zum Anderen Ufer. Vom Marxismus und Atheismus zum Christentum*. Remagen: Otto Reichl Verlag.
Wispé, L. 1991. *The psychology of sympathy*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Zahavi, D. 2005. *Subjectivity and selfhood. Investigating the first-person perspective*. Cambridge MA: MIT.
———. 2014. *Self and other. Exploring subjectivity, empathy, and shame*. Oxford: OUP.

Contents

Contributions To Phenomenology 94

Elisa Magrì
Dermot Moran *Editors*

Empathy, Sociality, and Personhood

Essays on Edith Stein's Phenomenological Investigations

Springer