

Nevertheless he stimulated in his disciples a genuine interest in æsthetical problems from the psychological point of view, and this not only through his untiring and strenuous opposition to the metaphysical treatment, but quite as much by pointing out how æsthetical, as well as ethical, interests originate in and come under one and the same psychological principle. This is the principle of approval or disapproval with which we contemplate things as well as human actions. Thus Herbart puts at the entry of his practical philosophy the conception of value. Judgments or estimates as to the value of things, phenomena, events or actions, are termed by Herbart æsthetical, and are distinguished from those referring to truth or correctness. Æsthetical judgments, again, divide themselves into those which refer merely to the approval which we experience in contemplation—these are the æsthetical judgments in

stein; further, in the sixth and following chapters of the 'Encyclopædia' (1831), 'Works,' vol. ii. The best exposition of the whole of Herbart's philosophy, and also especially of his Æsthetics, will be found in Lotze's writings. That referring to the general principles and the originality of his position is given in the Lecture Syllabus on the 'History of German Philosophy since Kant' (1882), chap. 6; that on his Ontology in a long critical article (1843) reprinted in the first volume of the 'Kleine Schriften' (p. 109); that referring to his Æsthetics in the 'History of Æsthetics in Germany' (pp. 225-246). Considering that Lotze does not agree with Herbart in his fundamental treatment of Æsthetics, he is remarkably just and appreciative of Herbart's merit in having for

the first time clearly introduced into philosophical discussions the distinct idea and helpful term of Value or Worth, as more expressive and serviceable than the term Purpose used by Kant. Lotze's own position is best understood if we note how he from the beginning (cf. his 'Metaphysik,' 1841) introduces this term, and how he retains it and enlarges its meaning in all his subsequent writings. It is surprising that the philosopher who first, after Lotze, made this idea of Value one of the central points of his speculation, H. Höffding, has not referred on this point to Lotze in his somewhat unsympathetic account of the latter. (See 'History of Philosophy,' vol. ii. p. 508; see also a short Tract by Otto Ritschl, 'Ueber Werthurtheile,' 1895.)