

8 Phenomenological approaches to hatred

Scheler, Pfänder, and Kolnai

Íngrid Vendrell Ferran

Abstract: This chapter aims to reconstruct the phenomenological theories on hatred developed by Scheler, Pfänder and Kolnai and to reflect upon its anthropological implications. Four essential aspects of this phenomenon are analyzed, taking as point of departure the works of these authors: (1) its place in the taxonomy of the affective life; (2) the world of its objects; (3) its expression in the form of bodily manifestations and motivating force; and (4) the inherent possibilities for overcoming it. The chapter concludes that hatred is a key phenomenon for understanding aspects of human nature that we generally try to ignore or overlook.

Keywords: hatred, early phenomenology, intentionality, emotional act-experience, sentiment, emotive response

Introduction: hatred and its place at the core of human nature

In recent years, scholars working in phenomenology as well as in philosophy of mind have progressively acknowledged the philosophical importance of the work realized by Husserl's first students – the “early phenomenologists” – on the affective domain. Under Husserl's influence, a very heterogeneous group of thinkers developed accurate and inspiring accounts of the affective life.¹ Authors belonging to this group include Alexander Pfänder, Else Voigtländer, Willy Haas, Moritz Geiger, Max Scheler, Hedwig Conrad-Martius, Edith Stein, and Gerda Walther, to mention but a few. Even though the phenomenology of affectivity developed within this movement cannot be considered unitary, it is possible to identify some traits shared by all of these authors. These include a similar methodological orientation and a common interest in topics such as the embodied dimension of the emotions, their relation to perception, imagination, and judgment, or their cognitive capacity to grasp values. Also common to all is the anthropological postulate that love is a constitutive element of the human being.² Early phenomenologists were convinced that we are determined to love, i.e., to be open to the world and to establish positive bonds with ourselves and others. Some of these “philosophers of love,” however, were also attracted to the study of hatred.³ Max Scheler, Alexander Pfänder, and Aurel Kolnai in particular devoted space to this phenomenon. Despite the privileged place of love as an elemental force of human nature, the interpersonal nexus with others may take a negative form and hatred may overwhelm individuals and social collectives. This chapter aims to reconstruct early phenomenological theories on this powerful affective phenomenon, to illuminate its structure and to reflect upon its anthropological implications.

From the perspective of current philosophy of the emotions, there are at least two reasons for an analysis of hatred. First, against the widespread belief that hatred is the mere opposite of love, it is necessary to offer an approach to this phenomenon that considers it on its own. The nature of hatred cannot be fully explained if we conceive it to be just the emotional counterpart of love. Surely love and hatred are entangled in multiple ways, but they are – as the phenomenological view will reveal – not symmetrical opposites. Love and other pro-attitudes that dominate the interpersonal dimension of our experience are so variegated and richly nuanced that we do not possess proper names for each of them. We can love our country, our partner, our friends, and our pets: in all these cases we speak about love, despite the strong qualitative differences and the varieties of objects. On the contrary, negative modes of existence are more punctual, less nuanced, and their objects more clearly circumscribed. These differences are reflected in the fact that we possess more names for negative emotions than positive ones.⁴ Second, it has been common in the political, moral, psychological, and philosophical spheres to banish hatred from discourse or to reduce it to other negative but more politically correct emotions such as envy, contempt, or resentment.⁵ Against this tendency to vanquish hatred, however, it is necessary to incorporate hatred into current discussions and to accept its role as a strong motivational force that shapes our lives. In current debates on the philosophy of the emotions, a fully developed analysis that takes hatred as a more confined phenomenon than love and considers it in its individual and collective forms is missing, though it would illuminate the human experience from new angles.

Two important considerations guide the choice to focus on analyses offered by the early phenomenologists on this phenomenon.⁶ Both have to do with the *perspectival richness* of the phenomenological approaches. First, given its *complex and multilayered nature*, hatred is not easy to classify and seems to escape the boundaries of our current taxonomy of the affective realm. Is hatred a passion, an emotion, a sentiment, or an attitude?⁷ This question is not easy to elucidate, and the three phenomenological approaches to hatred differ considerably in their answers. Scheler conceives of hatred as an emotional act-experience, Pfänder takes it to be a paradigmatic case of sentiment, and Kolnai sees it as an emotive response. These differences are, on the one hand, an immediate result of the multifaceted structure of hatred and, on the other, a consequence of the freedom to apply the phenomenological attitude to its object of study in various ways. Behind these differences there is a common attempt to go back to the thing itself, to liberate the phenomenon from theoretical constructs and take as a point of departure only what is given in the experience. Thus, these three phenomenologists illuminate hatred from different angles, shedding light on different sides of human experience. Rather than competing with one another, they are complementary accounts that explain the richness of this phenomenon. Considered together, they offer a multi-perspectival view on hatred.

Second, the early phenomenological analyses have the virtue of understanding hatred in its *dynamic unity with other hostile passions, emotions, sentiments, and attitudes*. Early phenomenologists were aware that understanding hatred implies an explanation of how this affective phenomenon relates to other aversive states. In this regard, Scheler offers an analysis of the link between hatred and envy, revenge, and resentment; Pfänder claims that hatred shares a common essence with malevolence and hostility; and Kolnai claims that hatred, together with disgust and fear, is a standard mode of aversion.

Which is the anthropological significance of hatred? What does it reveal about us? The reconstruction and study of early phenomenological accounts is crucial for answering the central question of this chapter regarding hatred's place in the very core of human nature. A reasoned answer to this question presupposes an analysis of four essential aspects of hatred: (1) its place in the taxonomy of the affective life; (2) the world of its objects; (3) its expression in the form of bodily manifestations and motivating force; and (4) the inherent possibilities for overcoming it. These four aspects are interrelated in multiple ways, and they can be elucidated by investigating the specific ways in which hatred is directed towards the world, others, and ourselves, i.e., investigating its original "affective intentionality." In the next three sections, I will present the differential analysis of these four aspects in the approaches of Scheler, Pfänder, and Kolnai, consecutively. In the concluding remarks, I will focus on the heuristic value of this phenomenon, according to which hatred is a key phenomenon for understanding aspects of human nature that we generally try to ignore or overlook. By the end of this chapter, I hope to have shown that attempts to patiently understand this phenomenon in earlier periods of the phenomenological tradition are not only worthy from an historical point of view but also shed light on an unpleasant but undeniable aspect of our human reality.

§1. Max Scheler: hatred as a movement of the heart

§1.1. *Emotional act-experience: hatred's depth and its blinding force*

Max Scheler approached the issue of hatred in his main works – *Formalism in Ethics* (1913/1916) and *The Nature of Sympathy* (1913/1923) – as well as in minor essays, such as his essay on "Ressentiment" (1912), in his posthumous "Ordo Amoris" (1914–1916), and his published conference on the origins of hatred against Germans (1917). Focusing on the notion of the intentionality of hatred, in these works we find points on all four aspects mentioned above.

I shall start with the first question, regarding the place of hatred in Scheler's taxonomy. One of Scheler's most illuminating discoveries concerns the thesis of the stratification of the emotional life.⁸ Given that not all affective phenomena are of the same kind, it is possible to establish a taxonomy of the affective realm. In *Formalism in Ethics*, a central distinction is traced between "feeling states," such as moods and sensations (pleasure and pain) that are not intentional, on the one hand, and "intentional feelings," which are essentially related to their objects, on the other. Scheler regards intentional feelings as a kind of "organ" for comprehending values, and he speaks of an "original emotive intentionality," underscoring that the intentional "feeling of something" is responsible for grasping values.⁹

Intentional feelings can be divided in two main kinds: the "intentional functions of feelings" and "emotional act-experiences." "Intentional functions of feelings" can be of three different classes: (a) the feeling of feeling-states, such as when we feel pain; (b) the feeling of objective emotional characteristics of the atmosphere, such as when we feel the sadness of a landscape; (c) the feeling of values, which has the cognitive function of grasping values such as the agreeable or the beautiful.

"Emotional act-experiences" constitute a higher stage in our emotional and intentional life. Act-experiences can be divided in two classes: (a) acts of preferring and placing after, which are responsible for the apprehension of a hierarchy of values; and

(b) love and hate, which are not responses to values or their rank, but spontaneous acts responsible for discovering values.¹⁰ In this sense, Scheler writes in *Formalism in Ethics*,

In love and hate our spirit does much more than ‘respond’ to already felt and perhaps preferred values. Love and hate are acts in which the value-realm accessible to the feeling of a being [. . .] is either *extended* or *narrowed*.¹¹

The principal idea behind this description is that in love we are open to new values, while in hatred we not only remain closed to them but are in search of values of a lower rank. That is, love and hatred are movements of the heart towards higher and lower values, respectively.

In the case that we respond to the grasped value, we have a feeling. According to the level of depth of the grasped value, four main kinds of feelings may be distinguished: sense-feelings, vital feelings, psychological feelings, and feelings of personality. The last two classes include those feelings that, in contemporary vocabulary, we call “emotions.” Only after an intentional function of feeling or an intentional emotive act discovers and grasps a value and its hierarchical position can an emotional response arise.¹²

In a similar vein, in *The Nature of Sympathy* Scheler defends the claim that love and hatred are intentional act-experiences. This text was first published in 1913 as *Zur Phänomenologie der Sympatiegefühle und von Liebe und Hass*, and a revised and extended version appeared 1923 under the title *Wesen und Formen der Sympathie*. As he claims in this book, Scheler takes the idea that love and hate are “emotional acts” from Brentano. It is well known that Brentano distinguished three main mental acts according to their intentional directedness: presentations, judgments, and love and hatred. This last class includes all affective and conative phenomena, such as emotions, feelings, acts of the will, and desires, and it is rooted in presentations.¹³ Despite taking Brentano as a point of departure, Scheler modifies his claims in three respects. First, Scheler’s view on the class of love and hate is more nuanced than Brentano’s, since Scheler differentiates conative acts (such as preferring or willing) from affective ones (such as love and hate, but also joy, sadness, etc.).

Second, against Brentano Scheler rejects employing the expression “love and hate” to refer to all affective phenomena, reserving it for just one type of them. In this regard, he distinguishes different kinds of affective phenomena: feeling states, intentional functions of feelings, emotional responses, acts of preference, and love and hate in a proper sense. Thus, according to Scheler, love and hate have their own nature. Love and hate cannot be classified as intentional functions of feeling because it is possible to feel a positive value in an object and not love it and to feel a negative value and not hate it. In love we can feel the values of the things we love, their elegance or their beauty, but we can also feel these values without loving. In the same sense, we can also feel disvalue without hating things. Love and hate are not responses to values, since we can love someone who causes us pain and hate someone or something that gives us pleasure and joy.¹⁴ Love and hate are not acts of preference because they do not depend on the values given by the object or their rank.

Finally, while Brentano thinks the phenomena of love and hate are founded in cognitive acts (presentations), Scheler thinks they are founding for all cognitive, conative, and other affective phenomena.¹⁵ Our attitude of being open or closed to the

world determines what we can perceive or judge about it. A similar claim is defended in “Ordo Amoris”: “Man, before he is an *ens cogitans* or an *ens volens*, is an *ens amans*.”¹⁶ They are also founding for all acts of preference, all functions of feeling, and all emotional responses. The preference for a value is founded in love in the sense that love shows the higher value that is preferred.

The idea that love and hate are act-experiences, thus, should be understood in the following sense. Love does not create the discovered values but makes it possible for these values to appear, and it is the intention for the realization of higher values in its object. Hatred destroys higher values and blinkers acts of preference and functions of feeling.¹⁷ Love and hate are movements or intentions for the realization of higher and lower values in their objects, respectively.¹⁸

Taking this classification of the affective realm as a point of departure, it is possible to attempt an answer to the question about the place of hatred in the core of the human heart. Hatred is not a sensation, a response to a felt value, an intentional function, or an act of preference. Hatred is much more deeply rooted in our nature than all these phenomena. It is the condition that makes us closed to values, the deep movement of the heart that is directed towards lower values and destroys higher ones. As a movement of the heart it has its own epistemic value. This does not consist in reacting to values, in grasping them or their rank, but in being closed to the higher values of its objects and in closing down its possibilities. It is an initiatory act or movement of the heart oriented towards the world.

It is necessary to observe that hatred as a movement of the heart towards lower possibilities of being is different from the mere phenomenon of value-blindness. Hatred implies a closing down of possibilities of its object, and in this sense it is blinding *for* values but not blind *to* them.¹⁹ The phenomenon of value-blindness does not belong to the emotional act-experience, but to the function of feelings. It is a distortion of the feeling as function. Dietrich von Hildebrand differentiated three different possible forms of value-blindness as a preference for a lower over a higher value: total value-blindness (a person who does not understand the concepts of good and bad), partial value-blindness (a person who can understand some values but not others), and subsumption blindness (a person who can understand values but not the bearer of such values).²⁰ Given that we may hate something or someone whose value we recognize, the phenomenon of value-blindness should not be conflated with hatred (although both phenomena might be related).

§1.2. *Hatred's narrow scope*

A crucial second question concerns the world of objects of hatred. By developing some important features of the intentionality inherent to hatred introduced previously and showing its asymmetry in relation to love, an answer to this question may be attempted.

What are the objects of hatred? Hatred (and love) is directed towards objects that may be bearers of value.²¹ These objects are not primary persons but value-bearers in general.²² Persons insofar as they are bearers of value can be objects of love and hatred.²³ Thus, persons are possible objects of love and hatred, but they are not the only possible objects. Self-hate (and also self-love) is as primary as hate (and love) directed towards others. That said, Scheler elaborates a taxonomy of the forms, types, and modes of hatred (and love). He distinguishes three *forms* of hatred (and love):

spiritual, psychological, and vital hatred (and love). Body, I, and person are the three bearers of such forms, which are correlated to three different kinds of values: vital, psychological, and spiritual values.²⁴ According to the quality to which they are directed in their objects, it is also possible to distinguish *types* of hatred (and love): hatred against a country, culture, etc. The *modes* of hatred (and love) express the connection between hatred (and love) and social behaviors and experiences of malevolence, hostility, etc. Finally, Scheler distinguishes hatred (and love) from those affective phenomena of which these are part, such as envy or jealousy in the case of hatred.

Despite that in this book he elaborates a parallel analysis of hatred and love, Scheler is aware here as well as in his minor texts that regarding the world of their objects, they are not symmetric opposites.²⁵ The differences between the phenomena can be summarized in the following three claims. First, hatred is not just an absence of love. It is a positive act in which a disvalue is given, just as in love a positive value is given. Hatred cannot be explained just as being closed to values. It is open towards the lowest values and aims for the annihilation of the highest. Thus, in this sense, hatred is a movement of the heart on its own and shows its specific way of being oriented towards the world.

Second, the scope of hatred is much narrower than the scope of love. The ways in which each of us is directed towards the world are manifold and varied, but the ways in which our nexus with others and ourselves is broken is much more confined. Scheler's concept of an "order of love" as developed in his essay "Ordo Amoris" (1913) is revealing in this regard. There is, for each individual and collective, an "ordo amoris," that is, "a system of value-assessments and value-preference."²⁶ This system is the window through which the world is perceived, for which Scheler uses the Augustinian term "ordo amoris." This "order to love" is the

means whereby we can discover, behind the initially confusing facts of man's morally relevant actions, behind his expressions, his wishes, customs, needs and spiritual achievements, the simplest structure of the most fundamental goals of the goal-directed core of the person, the basic formula, so to speak, by which he exists and lives morally.²⁷

More than knowing and willing, it is the heart that characterizes the core of the human being, and the way in which it is directed towards the world, others, and itself, is characterized as openness. An "order to hate," however, is not given, such that hatred appears only when this openness towards the world and this order to love is broken.

Related to this second difference is a third. Hatred implies love, but love does not imply hatred. According to Scheler – and this point is shared by all early phenomenologists – the heart is determined to love and not to hate. Thus, the phenomenon of hatred appears only when the positive nexus of the world is broken. Hatred as a movement towards closing down possibilities of the other and ourselves presupposes that it is first able to see values in the other.

§1.3. *Self-poisoning and destructive dynamics*

The expression of hatred is characterized by its aim of annihilating the values and the object towards which it is directed.²⁸ Two extreme possibilities for this movement are examined by Scheler: on the one hand, the repression of its expression, which may lead

to the phenomenon known as “ressentiment” and, on the other hand, its more radical and destructive execution in war.

When the psychic energy of hatred does not find an expression, it is sustained and repressed, such that it can intoxicate the inner life of individuals and collectives that facilitate the appearance of the emotional attitude of resentment. This happens, for example, when the subject of hatred is too weak to undertake destructive action or when there are social norms that forbid him from expressing it in an annihilating manner. This phenomenon was masterly analyzed by Scheler in his essay on resentment. A first version of the article appeared under the title “Über Ressentiment und moralisches Werturteil.” The extended version of the work – “Das Ressentiment im Aufbau der Moralen” – was finally published in 1915. At the individual level Scheler’s analysis offers a psychological explanation for the formation of resentment as a mental disposition. At the collective level, it develops a criticism of the main traits of modernity: moral subjectivism, egalitarianism, and the negation of high values, explaining how it creates an inversion of values in which the useful appears to be of more importance than the vital.²⁹

The term *ressentiment* was introduced as “terminus technicus” by Nietzsche in elaborating his criticism of Christianity. Taking Nietzsche’s term as point of departure and criticizing his interpretation of Christianity, Scheler develops his own analysis of this phenomenon and the way in which it molds the character of individuals and collectives. Resentiment in this sense is a hostile affective attitude rooted in the depths of our heart, which implies self-poisoning and is related to other negative attitudes, sentiments, and emotions. As such it should be distinguished from “resentment,” which is an emotional displeasure arising from a sense of injury, seen as a “legitimate form of anger [in] responding to moral wrongs” that plays an important role in our social world.³⁰

In Scheler’s view, resentment is a disposition of the soul that has its origins in an impotence regarding expressing negative feelings such as revenge, hatred, malice, envy, rancor, and spite. The corrosive psychic energy of these negative feelings when they do not find adequate expression and are sustained intoxicates individuals and collectives. As Scheler writes, resentment

is a lasting mental attitude, caused by the systematic repression of certain emotions and affects which, as such are normal components of human nature. Their repression leads to the constant tendency to indulge in certain kinds of value delusions and corresponding value judgments.³¹

The result of the poisoning action of these hostile feelings is a self-defeating turn of mind. When the subject feels impotence regarding achieving her desired goals, a distorted apprehension of values and the value-hierarchy takes place. Essential to this phenomenon is a value-delusion, which consists of reducing and degrading genuine values as well as their bearers. The person of resentment then becomes gradually blind to those values and replaces them with illusory negative ones. In this sense, she has a disordered heart: an inversion of values has taken place.

In current terminology, resentment emerges in order to reduce the dissonance experienced between the desired situation and the actual situation. It should not, however, be confused with a similar phenomenon called “sour grapes.” The phenomenon of “sour grapes” – as Jon Elster has pointed out – is an adaptive mechanism for

reducing dissonance: “Sour grapes is the adaptation of preferences to what is seen as possible.”³² In order to adapt to the given possibilities, we claim that the desired aims are not so worthy as they seemed in the beginning. In resentment, in contrast, there is a devaluation of the value of the thing we cannot achieve. In this case, there is no adaption to what is seen to be possible but a change of judgment regarding the value of the desired goals. In contrast, as described by Scheler, the phenomenon of resentment is far more radical than the phenomenon of sour grapes: the person of resentment does not simply consider that the sweet grapes are sour but that sweetness itself is bad. Thus, in resentment we speak about an inversion of values.

It is also important to underscore that resentment is an affective disposition rather than an emotion. While revenge and envy are directed towards specific objects and are bodily felt in a singular way, resentment is an attitude; it might become a personality trait that affects the way in which we perceive the world and are directed towards it. This much deeper nature is a common trait shared by both resentment and hatred. In addition, both are blinding forces of the mind. There is, however, an important difference between resentment and hatred. While the first presupposes a value-delusion, hatred does not necessarily imply the same. It is possible for the hater to be aware of the values of the hated object but still directed towards the realization of its lower values. The resentment-imbued person, on the contrary, is blind to those values he or she once desired to achieve. Scheler’s analysis shows that resentment can be contemplated as one possible consequence of hatred and its corrosive energy. When hatred is sustained, it may poison the soul and prepare the terrain for the emergence of resentment. Hatred fuels resentment.

A second, very different possibility inherent to hatred concerns how this affective attitude may lead to excessive violence and total destruction. War is hatred’s ultimate expression: it is the most extreme outbreak. In 1916, shortly after writing his essay on resentment, Scheler announced a conference on hatred that was published under the title “Die Ursachen des Deutschenhasses. Eine Nationalpädagogische Erörterung.” In this text he addresses some aspects of the phenomenon that had remained unexplored in his text on resentment. Here he observes that hatred may function as a dispositional background and adopt different manifestations. Focusing on the causes of the hatred against Germany, he elucidates its internal mechanisms that generate hostile and atrocious actions. The essay covers the question of whether the processes described in the essay on resentment are valid for all of Europe and considers the First World War as a case of hatred of the periphery against the center (understood not in a geographical but in a moral sense).³³ Hatred is depicted as a “toxic, corrosive, deadly wind”³⁴ and – as in his analysis of resentment – it is considered at the individual and the collective level. Thus, according to Scheler, the first collective experience of humankind was an experience of hatred, a hatred directed against Germany.³⁵

How does hatred develop?³⁶ In order to explain how hatred is possible, Scheler further elaborates some of his ideas about an “ordo amoris.” As mentioned previously, according to Scheler in his text “Ordo Amoris,” the heart, that is, the complex of preferences, interests, and order of discovery of what matters to us, reveals the world of values and is a counter-image of this world. There are, however, among individuals and collectives, differences in terms of what matters and what is preferable. These differences mean that values – despite their objectivity – are not grasped by each of us in the same way, because each has her own peculiar “logic of the heart” responsible for grasping and preferring some values over others. Scheler calls these different ways of

being directed towards the world, which reveal our preferences, interests, and orders of discovery, “ethos.” Each individual and collective is thus characterized by its own ethos, that is, by its specific way of preferring some values over others.³⁷ Differences in ethos are the cause of misunderstandings and explain how it is possible for hatred to emerge. Each collective may judge another collective according to its own ethos and not according to an objective value-system that is above national forms of ethos.

Is war the cause of hatred, or is hatred the cause of war? In Scheler’s view, war is not the cause of hatred; neither is hatred the cause of war. Nevertheless, two observations should be made: hatred grounds the disposition to make war possible, and the phenomenon of war may give hatred new impulses. These impulses can be summarized as follows. First, it is possible for hatred sustained in an initial moment to re-emerge later in a stronger form. The repressed affect then tends to express itself more strongly. The link between hatred and its expression, however, is very complex. Though in the initial moment the expression of hatred reinforces the affect, it is also likely that once it is expressed, the affect will diminish.³⁸ In consequence, action reduces hatred and impotence increases it.³⁹ This claim is consonant with Scheler’s analyses of resentment: as we have seen, when a group of negative affects are sustained, their psychic energy intoxicates the inner life of the subject. In virtue of its destructive force, hatred then plays a crucial role in this self-poisoning. Second, it is possible that as a result of war, hatred will progressively affect more and more individuals, social classes, and groups. Finally, it is also possible that hatred will expand to include new content. War, then, is responsible for the world of the objects of hatred expanding.

§1.4. *Self-control and self-criticism*

It is in this last mentioned text that we also find an answer to the fourth question guiding this chapter, namely how it is possible to overcome hatred. In “Die Ursachen,” Scheler considers four possible ways to wrongly react to or interpret hatred. Despite the fact that Scheler’s analysis focusses on World War I, the ways he mentions are inspiring when it comes to understanding our possible attitudes towards this strong passion. They may be summarized as follows: (1) one possibility consists of reciprocating hatred with hatred; (2) a second option consists of letting the others hate as long as they fear (“oderint dum metuant”); (3) it is also possible to be infected by the hatred of others; (4) finally, it is also possible to interpret hatred as based on a lack of knowledge about the hated object. In contrast to these wrong attitudes towards hatred, Scheler suggests self-control of one’s own affects and a sober self-critical attitude towards oneself.⁴⁰ Hence, a cultivation of attitudes may lead to overcoming hatred as the most destructive passion of humankind.

§2. Alexander Pfänder: hatred as a sentiment

§2.1. *Hatred and its centrifugal stream*

In his book *Zur Psychologie der Gesinnungen* (1913/16), Alexander Pfänder offers an illuminating approach to the affective phenomenon of the sentiments (a phenomenon for which he uses the old German term “*Gesinnung*”), whose paradigmatic cases are love and hate. Pfänder’s tribute to phenomenology has unfortunately not received yet the attention it deserves. For the purposes of this chapter, however, his analysis is

highly interesting, since it contains insightful observations on hatred. In the book, hatred is always analyzed in parity with love (in this respect, Pfänder stands in contrast to Scheler and Kolnai, who devoted part of their works to an analysis of hatred as phenomenon of its own). The elaboration of Pfänder's idea of a specific intentionality for the class of the sentiments, in contrast to the feelings, will lead to a philosophical statement on the four aspects of hatred that guide this chapter.

I begin with the question of the place of hatred in Pfänder's taxonomy of the affective life. Hatred, according to him, is a sentiment ("*Gesinnung*"). Sentiments, in his view, possess a *sui generis* kind of intentionality that has to be differentiated from the intentionality of feelings. Not only love and hate, but also friendship and hostility and benevolence and malevolence are considered sentiments, and as such are differentiated from the class of feelings of sadness, joy, disgust, or envy. In order to elucidate the intentionality characteristic of hatred, it is necessary to explain a key concept in Pfänder's phenomenology of the affective life: the concept of "centrifugality." In his view, the psychic life is dominated by two main tendencies: on the one hand, there is a "centrifugal" tendency, which consists in being directed towards the world; on the other hand, when we feel affected by something in the world, we experience a "centripetal" tendency. Intentionality, as the tendency characterizing the direction from a subject to an object, is centrifugal. Centrifugal acts can have a variegated group of objects: persons, animals, inanimate objects, and cultural phenomena. According to Pfänder, these objects are given to us in cognitive acts such as perceptions, judgments, or fantasies.⁴¹ Sentiments are based on cognitions: loving, hating, and being friendly or hostile require that the object towards which these centrifugal streams of the mind are directed has been perceived, judged, or fantasized. In contrast to Scheler, who defended the primary structure of love and hatred in our being directed towards the world, Pfänder defends a form of cognitivism according to which love and hatred are founded in cognitions.

A further characteristic of the intentionality of the sentiments in Pfänder's view concerns the way in which they are related to their objects. In contrast to perception, thought, attention, fantasy, or volition, which Pfänder considers "cold," sentiments, feelings, and moods are "warm psychic acts."⁴² In my view, this metaphor expresses the degree of involvement of the subject. Despite their sharing this feature, warm psychic acts should be strictly distinguished from one another. On the basis of their "centrifugality," i.e., their intentional relation to objects, sentiments form a different class from feelings. They stream from the subject to the object and bridge the gap between both poles, i.e., they are essentially connected to their objects. By contrast, in Pfänder's view, feelings are mere states with no essential connection to their objects. In addition, whereas feelings oscillate between the poles of pleasure and pain, the polarity exhibited by sentiments cannot be explained in terms of hedonic valence. Love can be painful when, for instance, it is not reciprocated, and hatred can be experienced as pleasant. Happiness, however, is always felt as agreeable, while sorrow is always an unpleasant feeling. In this sense, sentiments resemble attitudes more than felt bodily states, while feelings are episodic bodily-bound states. Sentiments are also different from moods: moods are not centrifugal streams of the mind, and they are not object-directed.⁴³

These claims regarding the centrifugality of sentiments are revelatory for understanding the nature of hatred. Hatred exhibits a *sui generis* intentional relation to its objects: it is based on cognitions, it establishes a bridge between subject and object,

and it has the character of an attitude more than a bodily-bound feeling. In consonance with Scheler, then, it seems that for Pfänder, hatred also occupies deeper levels of the self than mere feelings.⁴⁴ But, in contrast to Scheler, Pfänder defends the claim that hatred is founded in cognitive acts, whereas Scheler sees hatred as a spontaneous and founding movement of the heart.⁴⁵

§2.2. *Object relation and mode of givenness*

According to Pfänder, it is possible to elaborate a taxonomy of sentiments regarding their polar structure, their relation to objects, the mode of givenness, and the forms they can adopt. The analysis of the second and third of these criteria is illuminating when it comes to answering the second question motivating this chapter, about the objects of hatred. Regarding the criteria of the relation to objects, it is possible to distinguish three kinds of sentiments. By virtue of the relation between subject and object, sentiments can adopt three different forms. They may be superordinated, at the same level, or subordinated to their object. The hatred of the slave for her master or hatred of the nobility is subordinated, hatred among mates is at the same level, and hatred of a disabled person or of animals is a superordinated hatred.⁴⁶

As far as the mode of givenness is concerned, sentiments may be actual, virtual, or habitual.⁴⁷ Actual sentiments are accompanied by awareness, virtual sentiments are potential sentiments of which we may still be aware, and habitual sentiments can be felt regularly but we are not necessarily aware of them. These habitual sentiments also configure the actual and virtual kernel of our personality.

§2.3. *Polarity: destructive quality, avoidance, and disapproval*

Analysis of the criteria of polarity will help us develop an answer to the question of the expression of hatred. According to this trait, sentiments can be classified as positive or negative in terms of three features. First of all, on the basis of their “intrinsic quality,” positive sentiments are “supporting” and “warming” and negative ones are “destructive” and “corrosive” regarding their objects. This intrinsic quality is not to be interpreted as a concomitant sensation that may appear to accompany the sentiment but as a kind of psychological quality resulting from their being intentionally directed towards their objects. Second, by virtue of an “act of position-taking” towards the intentional object, the subject can join or avoid contact with it. Love is a paradigmatic case of joining with the object towards which one is directed, and hatred is the paradigmatic case of separation. Joining and separating are conceived in this account of affective intentionality as two possible intentional relations between subject and object.⁴⁸ Third, sentiments appear to be accompanied by an attitude of approval or disapproval. This attitude has to be interpreted as a form of affirmation or disconformity with the existence of the object. While love affirms and approves the existence of its objects, hatred negates and disapproves it.

According to these different criteria, hatred can be classified as a negative sentiment that separates the subject from the object and is accompanied by an attitude of disapproval towards it. Despite this separation and disapproval, it is interesting that in hatred the intentional relation between subject and object is not nullified. On the contrary, in the inner essence of this phenomenon there is a bridge between subject and object – a bridge that consists of rejecting the object while being intentionally directed

towards it. Here, again, we find a feature of hatred already identified by Scheler that will be crucial in Kolnai's work: hatred is interested in its object, even though this interest has the aim of discovering in it further motives for its rejection.

It would be wrong to interpret this inner trait of hatred—the qualitative feeling of its corrosive energy—as a desire or a will to destroy its object. It is possible for a sentiment to appear together with a desire or an act of the will, but this is not always the case. The tendency to really or symbolically destroy its object is inherent in hatred, but this tendency to action does not always transform into a desire or an act of the will.⁴⁹ Thus, although there is a motivational connection between sentiments and desires and volitions, this connection is not a necessary one. In Pfänder's view—and this aspect is shared with Scheler—affective and conative phenomena may be strongly related to each other, but they should not be conflated.

§2.4. *Inauthentic sentiments and its transformative capacity*

A final question, which deserves special attention, concerns the possibility of cultivating the possibility of overcoming hatred. This idea may be explained using Pfänder's claims about one of the forms that sentiments may adopt: inauthenticity.⁵⁰ The use of the term “inauthentic” describes those sentiments that arise in jokes, make-believe, and pretending to be moved by a sentiment. Inauthenticity is characterized by three features. First, a sentiment is inauthentic when it is prompted by the demands of the cultural and social environment. Such sentiments originally prompted and motivated in this way may not be in tune with other sentiments, desires, and thoughts of the subject, so that the sentiment has its origins “outside” the self, in the social world. A further feature of inauthentic sentiments – which plays a crucial role in explaining how hatred may be overcome – concerns their capacity to transform into authentic ones. An originally inauthentic sentiment may change into an authentic one when the subject changes his or her general attitude, and the sentiment that was at first not in tune with the rest of the psychic life is now felt as spontaneously originating from the self. A third characteristic concerns their felt quality. In consonance with other phenomenologists, Pfänder speaks about sentiments as having “the character of schematic imitations” of authentic sentiments.⁵¹

The idea of an inauthentic sentiment that may transform into an authentic one when it is in tune with the rest of the psychic dispositions, thoughts, perceptions, and beliefs of the subject explains how a cultivation of sentiments is possible. This possibility highlights the social nature of our affects and a possible way of internalizing aspects of the social world. Thus, some of our more intimate sentiments in fact have a social nature. They are surrogates of authentic sentiments and may turn themselves into authentic ones when the general condition of the subject changes in a way that is favorable for them. Inauthentic sentiments lay the ground for authentic ones. And hatred may also be “cultivated” in this sense. When the environment suggests a sentiment of hatred against a specific person, group, community, cultural formation, etc., this hatred that at the beginning may be felt as inauthentic may commute into an authentic version, when the perceptions, beliefs, judgments, and convictions of the subject progressively change in a direction that supports that sentiment.⁵² Together with this negative possibility of cultivating hatred, there is also the opposite possibility: such is the case when an authentic hatred converts into inauthentic hatred, which can be seen as a first step in overcoming it. It is also possible for an inauthentic love to

transform into authentic love, such that it can be used as a counterforce against a given hatred. We might cultivate positive attitudes internalizing behaviors, for instance, imitating the ways in which significant others behave.

§3. Aurel Kolnai: hatred as a standard mode of aversion

§3.1. *Hatred's emotive response*

A third philosophically revealing analysis of hatred in the framework of early phenomenology was delivered by Aurel Kolnai. The topic was first treated in his “Versuch über den Hass,” a work published in 1935. This text is part of a trilogy on negative feelings that started with a study of disgust (“Der Ekel,” published in 1929) and pride (“Der Hochmut,” which appeared in 1931). Hatred is also a central topic of a later article entitled “The Standard Modes of Aversion,” published in the nineties but probably written at the end of the sixties in response to a request from David Wiggins to present to his seminar some of the ideas Kolnai had developed in his earlier article on disgust.⁵³

In *sensu stricto*, Kolnai was not an early phenomenologist in the same sense that Scheler and Pfänder were. The Hungarian philosopher was not part of any of the phenomenological circles of München, Göttingen, or Freiburg. In fact, he developed his work on the affective life at a time when the early phenomenologists no longer existed as a philosophical group. His work on the emotions, however, may be considered part of the early phenomenological corpus. At least three reasons support this claim. First, his approach echoes the main claims of early phenomenology. Kolnai inherited the early phenomenological view according to which emotions are characterized by an intentional directedness towards their objects and by a somatic reaction. He was chiefly influenced by Scheler and Pfänder, as well as by Meinong's philosophy of the emotions.⁵⁴ Second, Kolnai's analyses are a fruitful application of the phenomenological methodology. To understand the nature of specific emotions, he undertakes an “eidetic variation,” distinguishing the phenomenon in question from similar phenomena. In this regard, Kolnai differentiates hatred from similar hostile attitudes, describing its essential traits, elaborating its taxonomy, and analyzing it in great detail. This is precisely the *modus operandi* of early phenomenologists. Finally, Kolnai's analyses of the emotions can be understood in the framework of phenomenological ethics, which saw in the affective realm a way to access the world of values. Thereby, despite the fact that for obvious spatio-temporal reasons Kolnai was not one of Husserl's students, his work on the philosophy of affectivity can only be fully understood in the framework of early phenomenology.

To begin with, what is the role of hatred in Kolnai's philosophy of mind? Hatred is considered to be a “standard mode of aversion,” i.e., together with disgust and fear it is one of the hostile modes in which we may be directed towards the world. This idea can be clarified in two steps. First, a preliminary reflection on Kolnai's view of the affective intentionality of the emotions is needed. As mentioned above, Kolnai shared the early phenomenological claim that emotions are chiefly characterized by being intentional and bodily-bound. Kolnai, however, elaborates this claim in a peculiar way. Under the influence of Meinong, he describes affective phenomena as “emotive responses.” These are defined as follows:

something closely germane I think to Meinong's *emotionale Präsentation*, meaning thereby acts or attitudes or conative states of consciousness which on the one

hand are clearly governed by an intentional object, and on the other hand express something like a passion aroused in the self, an impact exercised upon it down to its somatic sounding-board; in other words intention (*Gegenständlichkeit*) as linked essentially, though not in a uniform or unequivocal or causally necessary fashion, to condition (*Zuständlichkeit*).⁵⁵

Two important peculiarities of this claim have to be underscored. Emotive responses, in Kolnai's sense, comprehend not only emotions but also acts, attitudes, and conative states. This brings Kolnai's view closer to the Brentanian idea of a third class of mental acts – the class of love and hate – that comprehends all emotive (emotions, interests) and conative phenomena (volitions, desires) than to the early phenomenological thesis that separates the two types of mental phenomena. In addition, emotive responses are intentionally directed towards their objects: values and their bearers. Thus, they fulfill the cognitive function of grasping values, i.e., they are responsible for their disclosure. In this respect, Kolnai followed the later Meinong's idea of an "emotional presentation," i.e., the claim that emotions disclose values.⁵⁶ As far as this function is concerned, we should note a crucial difference from Scheler. In Scheler's model, only the "feeling functions" grasps values; not the emotions, which are conceived as responses to values grasped by the function of feeling. Kolnai's claim about an epistemic achievement of the emotions is in line with the theses of other phenomenologists such as Edith Stein.⁵⁷ A similar claim can be found in current theories of the emotions. For instance, Mark Johnston claims that there is an "authority of affect" in expressing this strong cognitive function of the emotions, which consists in showing us what matters, while Christine Tappolet claims that emotions are perceptions of value.⁵⁸

Second, Kolnai's view on the emotions sheds light on the use of the term "mode." A mode is a peculiar form of directedness towards the world and of grasping information about it. A look into the current philosophy of the emotions will also be helpful for understanding the complexity of this term. Aaron Ben-ze'ev recently claimed that emotions are mental modes: "An emotion is a general mode (or style) of the mental system. A general mental mode includes various mental elements and expresses a dynamic functioning arrangement of the mental system."⁵⁹ Modes are dynamic forms that express how the mental experience is organized.⁶⁰ As well as perceptual, imaginative, and intellectual modes, there are also emotional modes. Ben-ze'ev's concept of emotions as mental modes is rich and complex and cannot be further elucidated here. Important for our understanding of Kolnai, however, is the idea that a mode expresses a specific dynamic of our mental system. In the case of the emotions, this dynamic presents what matters to us and involves us with the world in a different way from perceptions or judgments. Hatred, thus, as an emotive response is characterized by a peculiar way of being directed towards its objects and of being bodily felt (this peculiar way of being directed will be elucidated in the next sections). It shares basic traits with other negative modes of aversion, i.e., a common dynamic underlies them.

In Kolnai's view, hatred possesses depth and centrality.⁶¹ Taking Scheler's claim regarding the stratification of the affective life as a point of departure and developing it further, Kolnai also sees hatred as occupying the deeper layers of our personal structure. Thus, hatred involves the human being in a much stronger way than a sensation of displeasure, a mere dislike, or a discomfort. Affective phenomena, however, are not only rooted in different levels of the personality but also fill each one of the strata they occupy to a greater or lesser extent. In discussing this feature, Kolnai speaks of

“centrality.” A similar idea can be found in Scheler’s *Formalism*, but there Scheler only briefly refers to different meanings of the “depth” of the emotional life and leaves this idea unexplored.⁶² It was Edith Stein who considered the feature of centrality – in her terms, the “reach” of feelings – to be independent of the feature of depth.⁶³ Hatred is central in the sense that it occupies the deepest layers of our personality to a maximal extent, i.e., its influence is not peripheral but affects and mobilizes significant aspects of the human being.

§3.2. *Existential bond and biographical character*

Towards which objects is hatred directed? Hatred, in Kolnai’s view, is not merely a response to the quality of the “odious.” In this respect, it works differently from disgust and fear, which are directed towards the qualities of the disgusting and the dangerous, i.e., they disclose them. We feel hate towards what threatens and harms us and towards what we identify as evil, but hatred is neither a reaction to them nor discloses them. In tune with Scheler and Pfänder, in hatred Kolnai does not see a response to a perceived quality but a movement of the heart and a centrifugal stream of the mind that emanates from the subject towards its object, linking them in an essential way. The subject of hatred presents a strong interest in the hated object: it searches for its lower possibilities, and it is not interested in its improvement.

A remarkable trait of hatred concerns its historical character. Its objects are always dependent on the biography of the hating subject: between both there is an existential bond. It presupposes the experience of being personally affected by the presence of its object. In hatred there is a “*commitment* to hostility,” as Kolnai claims.⁶⁴ It is the will of the subject of hatred to hate its object. This personal implication is not found in other modes of aversion that are mere responses to qualities and features of their objects. Hatred reveals much more of the hater than disgust or fear.

In contrast to the preceding analyses, for Kolnai hatred is always directed towards a person or a collective of persons or towards something expressive of the attitudes or words of this person or collective.⁶⁵ This claim differs, on the one hand, from Scheler’s claim according to which hatred is not always directed towards others – self-hate, in his view, is as authentic as hate directed towards others – and, on the other hand, from Pfänder, for whom possible objects of hate are not only human beings but also animals, plants, cultural formations, etc.⁶⁶ Hatred, in Kolnai’s view, refers to an individual entity.

This bond between the subject and the object of hatred has important moral implications. As mentioned previously, hatred is directed towards what we identify as evil. Kolnai writes:

The intention of hatred is inquisitive, aggressive, propulsive. It impinges not only on the object as such but on its existential status in the world and thereby on the world itself, with an eye on its finiteness: the world is, as it were, “too narrow a place to hold us both.”⁶⁷

In this regard, hatred reveals the depths of our moral system. Kolnai coins the expression “worldview of hatred” (“*Weltbild des Hasses*”) to express this point.⁶⁸ The characterization of an object as “evil” is responsible for the subject’s wanting to annihilate or at least combat it. In consequence, the subject demands that the world in its totality

fight the hated object. Hatred implies a demonization of its object. Love, on the contrary, is radically different: it does not always imply reference to a good principle, such as God.

Regarding the world of its objects, a further aspect concerning the scope of hatred compared to love should be mentioned. Love and hatred are not, in Kolnai's view, symmetrical opposites. Though love is a positive and hatred a negative attitude towards an object, the scope of these affective phenomena differs considerably.⁶⁹ The word *love* embraces the entire conceptual field of pro responses, while *hatred* is confined to narrower limits. Two arguments support this claim. First, there are more objects that can be loved than objects that can be hated. According to Kolnai, hatred is only directed towards persons and spiritual entities, but not towards objects. In addition, we may dislike an object, but this dislike does not lead us to hate it; pleasure and affirmation, however, may lead to love more easily than dislike leads to hatred. Second, there are more forms of love than forms of hatred. There is *amor benevolentiae*, *concupiscentiae*, *intellectualis*, but none of these forms of love is possible in the inverse for hatred. Echoing a claim from Scheler, there is an order to love but not an "order to hate," or an "ordo odii" is not possible.⁷⁰ Hatred can only appear punctually, where the positive nexus with the world is broken, but it never affects the entire web of life. After an examination of fear, disgust, and hatred, Kolnai claims, "Any project of attempting an analogous description of the modes of attraction would tempt us into describing life itself."⁷¹ The ways in which we may positively engage with others are much richer and more manifold than the ways in which we are involved in malfunctioning interpersonal relationships.

§3.3. *Destruction for its own sake*

Like other aversive phenomena such as enmity, rejection, antipathy, disgust, and contempt, hatred is also characterized by its negative tone. In the case of hatred, this is a destructive force that aims at the annihilation of its objects. This annihilation can also be symbolic, as we see in humiliation, insult, expulsion, etc.⁷² Not all destructive intents, however, are motivated by hatred. In fear we may also aim to destroy the feared object in order to protect ourselves. What is characteristic of the destructive intention of hatred is that it is "for its own sake." This univocal destructive intention of hatred stands in contrast – according to Kolnai – to the varied forms of positive intentions towards its object that are characteristic of love: proximity, dedication, union, improvement, etc.

§3.4. *The habitus of love*

Regarding the question of the possibilities of overcoming hatred, Kolnai's reflection on the intertwinement of love and hatred are illuminating.⁷³ This intertwinement may be interpreted in two ways: it is possible for both passions to be present at the same time and to be directed towards the same object (ambivalence), but it is also possible for both to be present as complementary attitudes. Regarding the possibility of ambivalence, Kolnai recognizes the complexities of this phenomenon and tends to claim that it is not possible to simultaneously love and hate the same object.

A second and, for the purposes of this chapter, more interesting claim concerns the possibility of a habitus of love free of hatred, but not a habitus of hatred free of love.

This claim is directed against some psychoanalytic theories according to which in the roots of love we find hatred. It is formulated in consonance with Scheler's idea that love is a much more primary movement of the heart than hatred. The primacy of love over hatred points to possible ways of overcoming this passion. We can cultivate our love and try to reduce our hatred. The factual defeat of the adversary and putting him or her "hors de combat" may also be a possible way to overcome hatred.

Concluding remarks: hatred and its heuristic value

In conclusion, let's return briefly to the four questions that guided this chapter and whose answers have been sketched out by examining the concept of affective intentionality in Scheler, Pfänder, and Kolnai's works. What kind of phenomenon is hatred? The analyses of three early phenomenological responses to this question are not conclusive. Scheler considers hatred to be a movement of the heart, Pfänder thinks of it as a sentiment, and Kolnai as a mode of aversion. These three claims, however, do not have to be seen as competing. Each approach illuminates hatred from a different side and sheds light on a different facet. Common to all is the claim that hatred, when it appears, is deeply rooted in the core of the human being, bridging the gap between subject and object, and characterized by a search for disvalue in its object. Rather than an emotion, hatred has the character of an attitude towards the world. What is the world of its objects? Scheler and Pfänder consider the possibility that hatred is not only directed towards others but also to oneself, as well as towards non-personal beings. Kolnai, on the contrary, always supposes a personal entity as the object of this passion. Common to all is the claim that hatred is not just a mere response to a feature or quality of the object and that it has a biographical character. In addition, they consider the scope of hatred to be narrower than the scope of love. The corrosive force and deadly energy of this passion determines the different negative ways it may be expressed: annihilation, destruction, humiliation, extermination, and extinction in factual or symbolic terms. This aspect is shared by all three.

A morally perfect world would be a world free of hatred. We, however, live in a morally "imperfect" world in which the eradication of hatred can only be seen as a desideratum that is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. Marguerite La Caze has suggested that negative emotions such as envy and resentment play a valuable moral role in leading us to recognize and act against injustice. Thus, she claims, "It is true that in a perfect world, there may be no envy or resentment, but in this world we need them. We probably do not need to cultivate these emotions, yet we should find their absence disturbing."⁷⁴ A modified claim can be defended for the case of hatred. Hatred cannot lead us to recognize injustice or evil because hatred closes down possibilities: it is preoccupied with the lower possibilities of the hated object, it destroys interpersonal bonds with others and ourselves, and it tends towards the factual and symbolic annihilation of its object.⁷⁵ Hatred has value of a different kind: it can help us understand our human world and discover ugly and undesirable facets of the human being that we tend to overlook or disguise. Its heuristic value consists in showing us that, in our world, hatred is a possibility inherent to human nature. Its analysis reveals that it is possible to break the positive nexus with others and ourselves and move in the direction of lower values. It also shows that, like an antidote to hatred, the human heart has the means to overcome it. Hatred, then, is not like an illness that comes up suddenly.⁷⁶ It presupposes strong personal implications, and it has the character of a

personal choice. The three authors analyzed in this article reveal different aspects of this possibility: Scheler speaks of self-control and self-criticism, Pfänder of the cultivation of love,⁷⁷ and Kolnai of factual defeat of the hated object in order to overcome it.

The aim of this chapter was not only to offer a historical reconstruction of Scheler, Pfänder, and Kolnai's claims about hatred but also to present their claims as a fruitful application of the phenomenological method towards an understanding of the human heart. I have not merely reported what early phenomenologists claimed about hatred; rather, I used some of their theses to elaborate a reasoned answer to four questions about the significance of hatred as a human passion. I hope to have shown that early phenomenological reflections, far from being obsolete, are highly relevant and lucid approaches worthy of debate even today. The studies undertaken in this chapter can be taken as inspirational points of departure for re-thinking this phenomenon and shaping future investigations into its nature.

Notes

- 1 Though a big part of the early phenomenological work in philosophy concerns their original investigations into the affective life, this group of thinkers did not only contribute to this field. Their interests covered multiple topics, such as perception, knowledge, and consciousness. For an overview of the different fields of interest of the early phenomenologists, see Parker and Moran (2015, pp. 11–24).
- 2 This anthropological claim can be found in Max Scheler and in those philosophers inspired by him (for example, Ortega y Gasset and von Hildebrand). Love is also a key concept for the understanding of the reception of Scheler's philosophy in other countries. Cf. for the case of Spain and France: Ramos, A. P. (1993). Schelers Einfluss auf das Denken der spanischsprachigen Welt, *Phänomenologische Forschungen* 28/29: 314–331, and Leroux, H. (1993). Sur quelques aspects de la réception de Max Scheler en France, *Phänomenologische Forschungen* 28/29: 332–356. Love was also an important topic of Husserl's late ethics. Cf. Melle, U. (2005). Edmund Husserl: From reason to love. In *Critical Assessments of Leading Philosophers*, Volume V, eds. Rudolf Bernet, Don Welton and Gina Zavota, 119–139 (here 128). London and New York: Routledge. Also: Walton, R. (2003). La razón y sus horizontes vitales en la fenomenología de Edmund Husserl. *Escritos de Filosofía* 2(1): 245–269.
- 3 I take this expression from Durán (1956, p. 114), who used it for Scheler and Ortega y Gasset, and I use it to indicate all thinkers belonging to this movement.
- 4 Wundt, for instance, observed that we possess more names for negative emotions than for positive ones. I take this explanation for the disparity between the short list of positive emotions and the longer list of negative ones from Kolnai. This author dedicates his later text, “The Standard Modes of Aversion: Fear, Disgust, and Hatred,” to develop a thesis of asymmetry between the fundamental types of emotional responses to objects, offering a differential analysis of the three mentioned modes of aversion (Kolnai 2004, pp. 93–109). In a less elaborate form, a similar claim can also be found in Scheler, who was aware that positive attitudes (love) have a wider range of objects than negative ones (Scheler 1973a).
- 5 This is now changing. However, for many years *Forgiveness and Mercy*, a book written by Murphy and Hampton and published in 1988, was the only account on hatred in contemporary philosophy
- 6 For a phenomenology of love and hatred based on Husserlian Phenomenology, see Hadreas (2007). Hadreas focuses on Husserl's middle and late research manuscripts and recent scholarship on these (he also discusses some of Scheler's claims).
- 7 Thomas Brudholm (2010, pp. 289–313) takes this question as a point of departure for his article on hatred and offers an analysis of hatred as retributive reactive attitude (using Strawson's concept of “reactive attitudes”).

- 8 For an overview of Scheler's philosophy of feelings, see Henckmann (1998) and Mulligan (2008).
- 9 Scheler (1973b, p. 256).
- 10 Ibid., p. 261.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 For a current version of this theory inspired in Scheler, see Mulligan (1998, pp. 89–105).
- 13 Brentano (1925).
- 14 Scheler (1973c, p. 150).
- 15 Ibid., p. 156.
- 16 Scheler (1973a, pp. 110–11).
- 17 Scheler (1973c, p. 157).
- 18 For a development of Scheler's claims on love and its intertwining with the phenomenon of humility, see Steinbock (2014, pp. 223–60).
- 19 Here I follow Steinbock 2014, p. 226.
- 20 Von Hildebrand (1982, p. 44).
- 21 Scheler (1973c, p. 151).
- 22 Ibid., p. 154.
- 23 Ibid., p. 157.
- 24 Ibid., p. 170.
- 25 Ibid., p. 155.
- 26 Scheler (1973a, p. 98).
- 27 Ibid., p. 102.
- 28 For an analysis of the action tendency inherent to hate in the framework of current philosophy of the emotions, see Elster (1999, pp. 194–5).
- 29 Scheler (1972, p. 149).
- 30 For an accurate differentiation of both phenomena, see Brudholm (2006, p. 12).
- 31 Scheler (1972, pp. 45–6).
- 32 Elster (2001, p. 110).
- 33 Scheler (1982, pp. 298, 300).
- 34 Ibid., p. 311.
- 35 Ibid., p. 286.
- 36 In what follows, I will focus on his analysis of hatred and leave aside his considerations about the particular case of hatred of Germany.
- 37 Scheler (1982, p. 343).
- 38 Ibid., p. 290.
- 39 Ibid., pp. 292–3.
- 40 Ibid., p. 371.
- 41 Pfänder (1913, p. 340).
- 42 Ibid., p. 362.
- 43 Ibid., p. 354.
- 44 Edith Stein (1989, p. 101) and Gerda Walther (1923, p. 60) established parallelisms between Scheler and Pfänder's models of the stratification of the affective life.
- 45 Phenomenologists were divided about the link between emotions, cognitions, and values. Scheler claimed that there is an original emotional intentionality through which values are given and that is founding for cognitions. Unlike him, Husserl, Stein, Pfänder, and Kolnai claimed that intentional feelings are founded and refer to objects that are given in founding objectifying acts (cognitions). Cf. Drummond, J. (2002). Introduction: The phenomenological tradition and moral philosophy. In *Phenomenological approaches to moral philosophy*, eds. John J. Drummond and Lester Embree, 1–13 (here 9). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- 46 Pfänder (1913, p. 379).
- 47 Ibid., p. 331. Developing Pfänder's claims further, Walther (1923, p. 48) elaborated a classification of sentiments in actual, unconscious, potential, and habitual forms.

- 48 The significance of this act of position-taking in human sociality was analyzed and developed by Stein (2000) and Walther (1923). For an analysis of Walther's reception of Pfänder, see Caminada (2014, pp. 195–212).
- 49 Pfänder (1913, p. 352).
- 50 A complete theory of inauthentic feelings can be found in two disciples of Pfänder, whose Ph.D. theses he was supervising: Else Voigtländer (1910), who wrote on the types of self-feelings, and Willy Haas (1910), who wrote on inauthentic feelings.
- 51 Pfänder (1913, p. 383). Here Pfänder develops a claim that can also be found in the tradition of the Graz School. According to this claim, mental phenomena may adopt two forms: authentic and inauthentic. Cf. Meinong (1977, p. 112).
- 52 Pfänder (1913, p. 397).
- 53 David Wiggins affirms that the essay was probably written in 1969–70 on his request (Wiggins 2004, p. 108). In the Kolnai Archives, box 8, folder 6, I found a letter from Kolnai to Wiggins written on November 20, 1968, in which Kolnai affirms that the discussion was very useful to him: "I for once have certainly benefited from the discussion of the 14th, especially as regards the object-of-fear identification problem and, not quite unconnected with that, hints towards the task about horror. It must be hoped that Disgust and Hatred will at least not be wholly dull." This suggests that if the text was not presented in that seminar, there was at least a strong interest in the topic. See Vendrell Ferran (2013, p. 26).
- 54 For an overview of Kolnai's approach to emotions, see Korsmeyer and Smith (2004, pp. 9–14).
- 55 Kolnai (2004, p. 94).
- 56 Meinong's claim (1968, p. 114) can be found in his later work *Emotionale Präsentation* (1917). It is important to underscore that Meinong's earlier theories of value are closer to emotivism than value realism.
- 57 Stein (1989, pp. 98–9).
- 58 Johnston (2001, pp. 181–214); Tappolet (2000, pp. 8–9).
- 59 Ben-ze'ev (2013, p. 57).
- 60 According to Ben-ze'ev, the initial mental mode is perception (sensation and sense perception). The emotional mode, in his view, is the most complex and comprehensive of all and presupposes capacities that are constitutive of the other modes.
- 61 Kolnai (2007, p. 101).
- 62 Scheler (1973b, p. 328).
- 63 Stein (1989, p. 104). This feature is related, in Stein's view, to the mood-components that may be constitutive parts of feelings.
- 64 Kolnai (2004, p. 106).
- 65 *Ibid.*, p. 94.
- 66 Pfänder (1913, p. 13).
- 67 Kolnai (2004, p. 107).
- 68 Kolnai (2007, p. 132).
- 69 *Ibid.*, p. 105.
- 70 *Ibid.*, p. 119.
- 71 Kolnai (2004, p. 107). In a similar sense, see Kolnai (2007, p. 116).
- 72 *Ibid.*, p. 105; Kolnai (2007, p. 105).
- 73 Taking Kolnai's analysis as a point of departure, Dorschel (2004, pp. 299–311) tries to give an answer to the question of whether love is intertwined with hatred.
- 74 La Caze (2001, p. 44) reveals the moral value of envy and resentment, linking both to justice.
- 75 In this I follow Steinbock's view on the morality of the emotions. Steinbock claims, "the moral tenor of the emotion can be weighed according to how it opens up or closes down the interpersonal nexus" (2014, p. 14).
- 76 For this claim, see Kolnai (2004).
- 77 A fruitful development of Scheler and Pfänder's claims on love and hatred, but especially on love, can be found in the work of Ortega y Gasset (2004).

Works cited

- Ben-ze'ev, A. (2013). The thing called emotion. In *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Emotion*, ed. P. Goldie, 41–61. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brentano, F. (1925). *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt*. Leipzig: Meiner.
- Brudholm, T. (2006). Revisiting resentments: Jean Améry and the dark side of forgiveness and reconciliation. *Journal of Human Rights* 5(1): 7–26.
- . (2010). Hatred as an attitude. *Philosophical Papers* 39(3): 289–313.
- Caminada, E. (2014). Joining the background: Habitual sentiments behind we-intentionality. In *Institutions, Emotions, and Group Agents*, ed. A. Konzelmann-Ziv and H.-B. Schmid, 195–212. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Dorschel, A. (2004). Is love intertwined with hatred? In *Exploring the World of Human Practice. Readings in and about the philosophy of Aurel Kolnai*, ed. Z. Balázs and F. Dunlop, 299–312. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Drummond, J. (2002). Introduction: The phenomenological tradition and moral philosophy. In *Phenomenological approaches to moral philosophy*, eds. John J. Drummond and Lester Embree, 1–13. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Dunlop, F. (2004). *Exploring the world of human practice: Readings in and about the philosophy of Aurel Kolnai*. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Durán, M. (1956). Dos filósofos de la simpatía y el amor: Ortega y Max Scheler. In *Revista La Torre*. 103–18.
- Elster, Jon. (1999). *Alchemies of the Mind: Rationality and the Emotions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . (2001). *Sour Grapes: Studies in the Subversion of Rationality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haas, Willy. (1910). *Über Echtheit und Unechtheit von Gefühlen*. Nürnberg: Benedikt Hilz.
- Hadreas, P. (2007). *A Phenomenology of Love and Hate*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Henckmann, Wolfhart. (1998). *Max Scheler*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Hildebrand, D. von. (1982). *Sittlichkeit und ethische Werterkenntnis*. Vallendar-Schönstatt: Patris.
- Johnston, M. (2001). The authority of affect. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 63(1): 181–214.
- Kolnai, A. (2004). *On Disgust*. Chicago and La Salle: Open Court.
- . (2007). *Ekel, Hochmut, Hass: Zur Phänomenologie feindlicher Gefühle*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Korsmeyer, C., and Smith, B. (2004). Visceral values: Aurel Kolnai on disgust. In *On Disgust*, ed. A. Kolnai, 1–29. Chicago and La Salle: Open Court.
- La Caze, M. (2001). Envy and resentment. *Philosophical Explorations* 1: 31–45.
- Leroux, H. (1993). Sur quelques aspects de la réception de Max Scheler en France. *Phänomenologische Forschungen* 28/29: 332–356.
- Meinong, A. (1968). Über emotionale Präsentation. In *Gesamtausgabe, III*, 1–181. Graz: Akademisch Druck- und Verlagsanstalt.
- . (1977). Über Annahmen. In *Gesamtausgabe, IV*. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt.
- Melle, U. (2005). Edmund Husserl: From reason to love. In *Critical Assessments of Leading Philosophers*, Volume V, eds. Rudolf Bernet, Don Welton and Gina Zavota, 119–139. London and New York: Routledge.
- Moran, D., and Parker, R.K.B. (2015). Editors' introduction: Resurrecting the phenomenological movement. *Studia Phaenomenologica* 15: 11–24.
- Mulligan, K. (1998). The spectre of inverted emotions and the space of emotions. *Acta Analytica* 89–105.
- . (2008). Max Scheler. Die Anatomie des Herzens oder was man alles fühlen kann. In *Klassische Emotionstheorien von Platon bis Wittgenstein*, ed. H. Landweer and U. Renz, 587–612. Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter.

AuQ6

- Murphy, J. G., and Hampton, J. (1988). *Forgiveness and mercy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (2004). *Obras Completas, II (1916)*. Madrid: Taurus.
- Pfänder, A. (1913/16). Zur Psychologie der Gesinnungen/ In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung I*, 325–404 and *III*, 1–125. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Scheler, M. (1972). *Ressentiment*. New York: Schocken.
- . (1973a). *Ordo amoris. Selected Philosophical Essays*, 98–135. Evanston: Northwestern University Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy.
- . (1973b). *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values*. Evanston: Northwestern University Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy.
- . (1973c). Wesen und Formen der Sympathie. In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 7, 9–258. Bern and München: Francke.
- . (1982). Die Ursachen des Deutschen Hasses. In *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. 4, 283–372. Bern and München: Francke.
- Stein, E. (1989). *On the Problem of Empathy: The Collected Works of Edith Stein*. Washington: ICS Publications.
- Stein, E. (2000). *Philosophy of psychology and the humanities* (Trans. Mary Catharine Basehart and Marianne Sawicki). Washington: ICS Publications.
- Steinbock, A. (2014). *Moral Emotions. Reclaiming the Evidence of the Heart*. Evanston: Northwestern University Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy.
- Tappolet, C. (2000). *Émotions et Valeurs*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Vendrell Ferran, Í. (2008). *Die Emotionen. Gefühle in der realistischen Phänomenologie*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- . (2013). Aurel Kolnai: Fenomenología de los sentimientos hostiles. In *Asco, Soberbia, Odio. Fenomenología de los sentimientos hostiles*, ed. Aurel Kolnai, 7–32. Madrid: Encuentro.
- Voigtländer, Else. (1910). *Vom Selbstgefühl*. Leipzig: Voigtländers.
- Walther, Gerda. (1923). Zur Ontologie der sozialen Gemeinschaften. In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, Vol. VI, 1–158. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Walton, R. (2003). La razón y sus horizontes vitales en la fenomenología de Edmund Husserl. *Escritos de Filosofía* 2(1): 245–269.
- Wiggins, D. (2004). Afterword by David Wiggins. In *On Disgust*, ed. C. Korsmeyer, and B. Smith, 108–9. Chicago and La Salle: Open Court.