Hegel's Aesthetics of Painting –

The rediscovery of Dutch painting of the Golden Age

Klaus Vieweg (Jena)

What connects Hegel with Rembrandt and Co.? What are the important points of contact between the grand master of modern philosophy and Dutch painting, between the luminary of modern philosophy and the virtuosos of such painting? Why does the philosopher, as an outstanding representative of the school of German Idealism, the golden age of modern philosophy, recognize in the paintings of Rembrandt and the Dutch school of the Golden Age a greatness of spirit and freedom, a revolution in painting, the modernity of this art of painting? Why does Hegel oppose the discrediting of this school of painting, which was still common in the 19th century, as 'minor masters' who allegedly only practiced 'minor painting'? Why, instead, does he see them as the grand masters of color and light on canvas? Why does Hegel find such images of proud townsfolk, vegetable and herring sellers, the poor and beggars, landscapes and Dutch mills, farmers at harvest and in the inn, women playing the piano, canals with ice-skaters, bouquets of flowers and breakfast tables, a grubby mouse in a mousetrap (GW 28,1, 435) – these depictions of seemingly banal scenes of everyday life – so fascinating?
Here we find an impressive example of Hegel's preoccupation with the world of art, which "imbues the entire field of art with a peculiar spirit". This finally overturns the legend of Hegel as an 'arid abstract logician without a sense for the works of the imagination', which had already been dismissed by Karl Rosenkranz in 1844.[1] Hegel not only celebrated the 'grey-in-grey' of the logical concept, he saw art as one of the highest forms of humanity's self-affirmation and was fascinated by the magicians of color. "He was passionately focused on music; he had an innate eye for painting. In poetry he was at home everywhere and for architecture and sculpture he had the most open receptivity, which he constantly sought to develop."[2]

Paradigm shift in aesthetics and art history

At the center of the following reflections is a paradigm shift in the aesthetics and art history of painting, Hegel's overcoming of ancient classicism in the wake of Winckelmann and Christian romanticism of the Friedrich Schlegel type through contact "with people who knew about the practice of painting and restoring, about collecting paintings and about the history of painting" – Hegel's was, according to Stephen Houlgate, "a subtle account of the nature of painting as

such", a "philosophical account of the art of painting".[3] The main theoretical impetus for the rediscovery, re-evaluation or recovery of reputation of the Dutch painting school of the 17th century (the Dutch Golden Age) was provided by Hegel's philosophy of art, in which landscape and genre paintings in particular are regarded as models of modern art. The art of the 'later Dutch school' (Kehler, 152)[4] underwent a decisive philosophical-aesthetic rehabilitation and legitimization through Hegel, who emphasized "the freedom of the Dutch style" (Heimann 49). This pioneering aesthetic and art-historical recognition was followed by the theoretically powerful studies of the representatives of the Berlin School of art history, Gustav Friedrich Waagen, Franz Kugler, Carl Schnaase and Heinrich Gustav Hotho, precisely in the spirit of Hegel.[5] These Berlin art historians are regarded as the most important founders of art history as an academic discipline and have their background in Hegel's philosophy of art and his aesthetics of painting. It is in this sense that the renowned art historian Ernst Gombrich described Hegel as the "father of art history".

*

In his *Lectures on the Philosophy of Art* and in other documents, Hegel mentions several painters of the Golden Age by name: Rembrandt, Anthonis van Dyck, Adriaen van Ostade, Gerard (Gerrit) Dou, David Teniers, Gerrit van Honthorst, Jan Steen, Jan van Goyen, Aert van der Neer, Philips Wouwermann, Gerard ter Borch (Terborch), Paulus Potter and Nikolaes Berchem. Other artists and paintings are also implicitly alluded to via motifs and scenes, here just a very few examples: *Sea Storms* by Ludolf Backhuysen and Johann Peeters, *The Calm Sea* by Aelbert Cuyp, Jacob van Ruisdael's *Waterfall*, fruit and animal scenes by Johann Huysum, Davidz de Heem, Willem van de Velde, Jan Weenix, Abraham Mignon, Rahel Ruysch, tooth extraction by van Honthorst, Dou and Steen, harvest scenes by van Goyen and Breughel the Elder (*Hay Harvest*, *Grain Harvest*), peasant poverty by Ostade. With his profound appreciation of the Dutch school, Hegel was able to present weighty arguments against the then dominant disparagement of this school by classicists such as Winckelmann and romantics such as Friedrich Schlegel, and thus lay the building blocks for a modern aesthetic theory of painting, in the sense of a 'science that aims at the 'concept of things'' (GW 28, 1, 164), which is able to combine aesthetics and art history.

The foundation for this philosophy of art and thus also for the aesthetics of painting is the concept of beauty, the idea of the beautiful. In the context of clarifying the understanding of imitation (mimesis) and with explicit reference to Aristotle, Hegel initially aims to prove that

beauty is the object of a philosophy of art. “Every science has its object. That such an object exists must first be proved, then how it should be constituted, i.e. what it is.” In ‘*non-philosophical* sciences’ the general object is not proved, but only demonstrated, for example in mathematics or physics, where there is no doubt ‘whether a triangle is there’ or whether a physical body exists (Heimann 10). In *philosophical* sciences such as aesthetics, the whole ‘emerges from the concept’, and to this end the one-sidedness of the ‘abstract Platonic idea’, the abstract conceptions of the idea of beauty and the position of mere particularity, the ‘directionlessness of the empiricist’ must be overcome. The “actual concept, according to Hegel in recourse to Aristotle, must be the center, a *concrete* concept, connecting the knowledge of particular determinateness with the metaphysical-philosophical (Heimann 10). This is Hegel’s concept of a realistic constructionism or constructionist realism of painting, the synthesis of the realistic and constructionist dimensions of art, in which “finding and making, our discovery of the world and our processing of the world are one.”[6] The discovery of the world as a presupposed, independent nature and the positing of nature, the generation of this as a world posited by the subject, as the subject’s world, must be thought of as a unity, as “one and the same” – a fundamental idea of Hegel’s idealism. This is also valid in the field of aesthetics, especially in the treatment of works of art as forms of *second nature*, of *spirit*.[7] In Goethe’s notes on his translation of Denis Diderot’s *Treatise on Painting* (1799), a text with which Hegel was familiar, he uses the topos of second nature: the artist gives nature ‘a second nature, a felt, conceived, humanly perfect nature’. Goethe correlates this with talk of the spirit: art is ‘nourishing, educative and uplifting for the spirit’ – art’s next task is ‘to evoke spirit’.[8] Thus, nature and art cannot be completely amalgamated: while nature organizes a living, disinterested being, art constitutes meaningfulness, feeling and thought; it must ‘hold the outline of the maze of the natural before the soul of man’. Art fixes the ‘highest moments of natural phenomena’, thus creating a second nature which is no mere exact imitation of first nature.[9]

Christian-German mythomania in Romanticist aesthetics and Hegel’s conception of modern art as free art

Here, attention should first be drawn to the contrast between the positions of the Romantics Wackenroder, Tieck and Friedrich Schlegel on the one hand and Hegel and the protagonists of the Berlin School of art history on the other. This is highly relevant because Wackenroder was already able to view both the Pommersfelden Castle and Nuremberg collections (especially

those of Frauenholz) in the 1790s and these became key experiences for the early Romantic world view, the foundation for its new aesthetic model – Wackenroder's aforementioned travelogue with pictorial descriptions and the later heartfelt *Outpourings of an Art-Loving Monk*[10] as well as Tieck's novel *Franz Sternbald's Wanderungen* are relevant here.

Taking center stage was the so-called *Pommersfelden Madonna* (actually painted by Cornelis van Cleve but in the 18th and 19th centuries attributed to Raphael). In his first descriptions of it, Wackenroder still speaks of the "goddess" and "original Greek beauty" in a classical tone, at the same time beginning to reinterpret the model of the ancient sea goddess Galatea (Villa Farnese) in Christian terms, as the Christian Mother of God.[11] For Wackenroder, Raphael is the 'most excellent, divine painter'; in a kind of religious or artistic piety, the Christian content then becomes decisive.[12] Heaven's grace illuminates man's inner being with a higher revelation, art becomes a revelation of the sacred.[13] The reception, the enjoyment of such works demanded religious devotion, silent humility; it resembles a religious prayer, divine worship.

The fundamental gulf, the fundamental discrepancy between the Romantic and Hegelian view is striking. The following well-known passage from Hegel's *Lectures on Aesthetics* seems to refer to Wackenroder's programme of a neo-Catholic religious art and the worship of the Pommersfelden Madonna: Even if God the Father, Christ or Mary 'are depicted with such dignity and perfection – it is no use, we no longer bend our knee' (TWA 13, 140). This contrast was already visualized by the Dutch artist Gerard Dou's *Mother Nursing Her Child*, Adriaen Ostade's *Mother and Child* and later in the 19th century by the French artist Auguste Renoir in his painting *Mother and Child*.

Art and religion are then regarded as two precisely distinguishable spheres of the absolute spirit; what for Wackenroder is the 'holy feast day'[14] becomes for Hegel the 'Sunday of life'. "It is one of our chief institutions that ordinary bourgeois life time is divided between the business of the working day, the interests of necessity, of external life [where] man is immersed in finite reality, – and a Sunday, when man puts aside this business, raises his eye from earth to heaven, becomes conscious of his eternity, the divinity of his being" (TWA 10, 412). According to Hegel, the silence of Sunday is opposed to the working day, the hustle and bustle and deafening chatter of everyday life. On the Sabbath, all the limited interests of finitude, all forms of this concern are left behind on the shore of temporality. Unbound from being immersed in the never-tiring finite activity, the spiritual eye is now freed from the harshness of the working day, a working day that is, however, by no means abandoned by the spirit and God, for the totality of spirit's actions constitutes the core of man and demands representation in the

works of art. (TWA 16, 12-16) Nor do people really abandon their activities on the day of rest, they only change the character of those activities, they now pursue a kind of business that is leisure, temporarily freed and unbound from mundane worries.

One strolls or saunters through the regions and spheres of the absolute spirit, above all in art, religion and philosophy, in the substantial forms of certainty in which people can be completely and utterly at one with themselves, in other words, be free. The world of worry is left aside - to trifle upon the road, as Laurence Sterne aptly describes it – or in Hegel's words, "a completely unbiased, easy, inconspicuous sauntering along, which in its [apparent and supposed] insignificance provides precisely the highest concept of depth". A "pure pleasure in objects, as an inexhaustible indulgence of the imagination, as harmless play, as a freedom in dalliances" (TWA 14, 231) – "to see the imagination in idle games of the imagination" (TWA 13, 71). This can also be applied to later Dutch painting, where the supposedly insignificant and seemingly trivial provides the greatest depth and pure pleasure in the object. An intimacy and cheerfulness of spirit is articulated, which through the cheerfulness of composition is able to lift us high above all entanglement in the limitations of reality,[15] thus celebrating the Sunday of life. "The 17th century, a Dutch author once wrote, appears in the paintings [...] like one long Sunday."[16] Here *The Avenue at Meerdervort* by the Dutchman Cuyp, Renoir's *The Promenade* and works by Monet such as *The Stroll* (*Argenteuil*) help visualize this 'easy strolling', which in its apparent marginality conveys the 'highest concept of depth'.

Hegel distinguished himself as a decisive intellectual opponent of Romanticism and its demand for a new mythology. He was resolutely opposed to any cult of the past and mythomania, but he by no means cultivates ignorance of, or contempt for, the past and indeed praises many past masterpieces. But he pleads against the mere preservation of the traditional and in favor of a free, open view of the spirit of modern times. His argument is for the consideration of a *new content*, for the sublation of the traditional in the unity of preservation and overcoming – this also applies to the art of painting. Hegel is opposed to merely preserving a supposedly 'authentic' past. His *criterion* is the positioning of Dutch painting of the Golden Age as a paradigm for the artistic expression of modern bourgeois self-understanding, a new content of art.

This is directed against Schlegel's accusation of degeneration and superficiality. Dutch genre painting had, according to Schlegel, "all the conceivable individual components of a complete work of painting, torn out of their living context, and then not just landscape and portrait, but kitchen and pantry paintings, hunting and dog hunts, fruit, flower and livestock pieces, still-lifes and church perspectives, domestic scenes and jocular caricatures, battle painting and semi-comic folk paintings, treated in isolation in a colorful variety, and [enhanced]

to the highest technical perfection, until finally, in this chaotic tangle of servile imitation of all kinds of raw objects of nature, art had sunk to mere technique and its original idea had been completely lost." Hegel alludes precisely to Schlegel's thesis that the Dutch visualized mere 'common objects'. He decidedly opposes the Romanticists' derogatory view by emphasizing that what the Dutch depicted was no mere 'common nature' or 'common material', but rather 'life and its activity on a small and large scale'. The '*freedom* of the Dutch style' (Heimann 48f., emphasis added) is paramount.

Hegel and the later Dutch school as modern art – second nature instead of shallow imitation

In Hegel's view, painting, music and poetry are the defining forms of romantic, modern art. The latter had "achieved the very highest", it was only inadequate because the limited nature of art made it so (Kehler 28). The famous and often unjustly criticized topos of the end of art is based on the world-historical triad of *natural spirituality – beautiful spirituality – free spirituality*.[17] Hegel refers to the 'underlying relationship between concept and reality': in the Symbolic as the first stage, it is characterized by the inadequacy of content and form, by the 'striving for appropriate form'; in the Classical, the second stage, it is characterized by the 'adequation of concept and reality'; and in the Romantic or final stage, by 'going beyond this classical unity to the 'disunion of concept and reality' (GW 28,1, 130f.), a new inadequacy in which the Symbolic and the Classical are combined in a tension-filled way. There can be no room for a qualitatively higher 'fourth' or further level in this systematic structure. The 'last stage is the spirit in and for itself, and this is the stage of modern art'. Hegel sees the paradigmatic example of the 'last starting point of art' 'in the latest art, in the Dutch school'. Here, as in other passages, he uses 'modern' and 'romantic' synonymously.

In order to understand this last paradigm, modern art as *free* art, as the art of *freedom*, we should briefly consider Hegel's concept of artistic beauty, the ideal, the three connected dimensions of the ideal as such, the work of art and the artist's subjectivity in producing it. It is no coincidence that Hegel directly precedes these considerations with his new, innovative concept of freedom: 'The concept, and even more concretely the idea, is that which is *infinite and free* in itself', the concept that permeates its own reality completely, that has only itself in it [in the work of art] and allows nothing other than itself to emerge in it'. Then, as a work of art, it is 'the free, infinite individuality', the work of art as 'beautiful individuality', as an

expression and a form (TWA 13, 201). Spirit is other than itself in the work of art, yet still itself, thus free in the Hegelian sense. The human spirit can see 'thousand-eyed' the inexhaustible variety of the world and can shape it in an 'artistically beautiful' way; conversely, the artwork is a 'thousand-eyed Argus', a manifestation in which the free soul reveals itself (TWA 13, 203f.) With the artwork, spirit enters into externality, finiteness and limitation, and at the same time impresses upon it the stamp of its own freedom and the free return to itself' and is thereby free. Artistic creation demands 'not mere correctness, to which the so-called imitation of nature is limited, but the exterior must harmonize with an interior that harmonizes in itself and can thus reveal itself as itself in the exterior' (Ibid, 205). Referring to Schiller's trope of 'beauty in the silent land of shadows', Hegel compares the beauty of art, the ideal, with the realm of shadows: the artwork as this apparitional spirit is separated from 'immediate existence and from the neediness of natural existence, freed from the bonds of dependence on external influences and all distortions and deformations of finite phenomena; at the same time, the ideal thereby sets its foot in sensuality and its natural form and, draws this foot – and with it the external – back into itself. Art stands in the center, in which the merely external and the merely internal coincide' – this is how the beauty of art, the ideal, is constituted, which 'in the external is united with itself, freely based on itself'. The work of art can thus be regarded as a manifestation of spiritual freedom – the artwork manifests the "triumph of freedom that is concrete in itself" (TWA 206ff).

Painting ranges 'between the extremes of the ideal and that of common reality'; as an art of depicting the particular, it approaches immediate reality, but in such a way that it 'does not stoop to mere imitation' (Carové 396f). While on the one hand the ideal principle adheres to the form of beauty and color is a 'means' rather than an 'end in itself', on the other hand the mindless principle of merely imitating particularity threatens to lead to banality and platitude. The nature of painting is to 'unite both sides in itself' – painting must have this '*contrast in itself*' (ibid. 398).[18] The 'conflict between the particular and the ideal is to be settled in a true way', in modern-romantic art both the ideal and the particular are united and painting becomes authentic for the first time. In modern, romantic art, ideality has 'the particular in itself' - the spiritual in its *particularity* (Carové 398). With free spirituality – 'when thought strides in freely' (GW 28,1, 193) – a foundation is constituted from which modernity, i.e. actual human existence, first begins to unfold. The end of art in no way implies the demise or death of art, on the contrary: it is *the beginning of the unfolding of free art* – "*in its freedom, beautiful art first becomes truly art*". (Aesth vol 1, p. 7, trans. amended).[19]

In § 124 of his *Philosophy of Right*, the Romantic is explicitly regarded as the right of *particularity and free subjectivity* as the principle of the modern world. Instead of the struggle

with ‘external dragons and Lernaean serpents’, the struggle with the inner dragons and serpents of the subjective is presented; instead of classical-natural serenity, we have the freedom and serenity of the spirit, instead of classical quiet greatness, we have the soulful, inner, higher ideal (TWA 15, 41). The spiritual as spiritual becomes the meaning of the sensual, the supposedly accidental appearance is determined by the spiritual (Kehler 28), subjectivity becomes the master of the entire sensual world. In Romanticism, the entire content of the external world is given the right and freedom to be represented in its own right; it is expressed in its peculiarity and particularity. Inner spirituality finds its representation in *every* object – *all* spheres of life and phenomena, the greatest and the smallest, the immoral and the evil, the repulsive and the ugly are legitimate objects of art (TWA 14, 221) – ‘the human is brought before our eyes undistorted, unadorned.

Modern painting represents a model for the principle of *particularity* and *free subjectivity*, it shows a ‘completely different spirit, different ways of feeling and visualizing’, with which ‘full intimacy’ can be expressed ‘in the external’. This ‘*intimacy in the particular*’, the ‘deeply imprinted particularity of the character and the characteristic’ becomes the fundamental content, the particularization and isolation generates a ‘wide-ranging diversity’ in the art of painting (TWA 15, 33-40). The ideal is regarded here as “real and present” (TWA 15, 45). Hegel ascribes painting a great significance in terms of presence and liveliness, based on visualization and pictoriality,[20] surface contour, coloring and light, on ‘vivid particularity’ (TWA 13, 213).

With the transition to the second and third formations of Romantic painting, a kind of secularization, an abandonment of the explicitly religious, can be observed with regard to the subject matter, on the one hand nature and landscape painting, and on the other so-called genre painting as a pictorial representation of everyday life.[21] Hegel notes the ‘complete immersion in the mundane and the everyday’ and the associated ‘separation of painting into the most diverse forms of representation’ (TWA 15, 127). “A bouquet of flowers and the idea of the Last Judgement are great extremes,” (Kehler 186) he remarks, pointing to the difference between the earlier and later Dutch art. For the later Dutch school in particular, he uses superlatives, an almost unheard-of praise and particularly decisive aesthetic justification. The following passages epitomize this homage: The Dutch masters ‘extended the circle of art to infinity’ (Kehler 152), traversed the ‘great circle of diversity for painting most decisively, from religious representations to the great historical compositions, portraiture as well as landscape and genre painting, succeeding with virtuoso mastery of coloring’. Genre painting in particular receives exorbitant accolades: it is “led to the pinnacle of perfection by the Dutch”, the masterpieces

display “the highest power of attraction” (TWA 13, 222) – “if you want to know what painting is, you must look at this little picture,” Hegel say, then can only exclaim: “He can paint” (TWA 14, 226). Vermeer in particular succeeded in creating a brilliant, ingenious depiction of the ‘Sunday of Life’[22] –’a maid pouring out milk was motif enough’.[23] For the art historian Waagen, *The Milkmaid* was Vermeer’s most beautiful painting.[24]

What, according to Hegel, allowed the Dutch to achieve this mastery? The aim here is to outline the basic lines of reasoning, a genuine task for a *philosophy* of art. The keywords here are freedom, subjectivity, presence and vitality. The definition of painting lies in the abstract definition of particularity and the form of painting in the shape of vitality, the latter must not be taken superficially as mere naturalness. Natural objects are not necessarily alive, it is about spiritual liveliness, not about ‘petty imitation’. Pictorial works are aesthetic arrangements, Hegel uses the example of the visualization of grapes, in the artistic manifestation of which lies ‘the interest of the play of colors and light’, the effect of ‘colors and points of light’. The “magic of appearance”, which makes the objects appear natural to us, is particularly evident in the still lifes (GW 28,1 159ff.). The content of the depictions comes ‘from the presence of one’s own life’, in which they owe everything to one’s own activity, on the basis of self-achieved political and religious freedom (TWA 15, 222) – the spiritual serenity of a justified enjoyment, an awakened spiritual freedom and liveliness characterize the ‘higher soul of these paintings’ (ibid. 222).

Vitality and presence - the new landscape painting

With regard to the Dutch landscape paintings of Rembrandt’s time, we can speak of a “revolution in landscape painting”. For Hegel, this was about the significance of scenic beauty as an object of painting (Schnaase 34f), about the aesthetic legitimization of such objects. What is brought to the canvas is the harmonization of the vitality of nature with the human as living being, vitality as the intimacy of the human with the external. Motifs of natural landscapes, specific scenes of nature (landscape painting and views of towns) can correspond to particular states of mind, expressing a particular mood. “In the landscapes, it is always the tone of the mind, the mood, that appeals.” The soul perceives in the scenery of the landscape ‘a character that corresponds to it, what is depicted is ‘sympathetic to the tone of the soul’. A chord of the mind resounds (GW 28.1, 477), an impression is visualized.

In these works we have, according to Hegel, a harmonizing (in German *Zusammen-Stimmens*, that is, a ‘consonance’ or ‘attunement’), a possibility of harmonizing the inner and

outer, much like Impressionism, where ‘a meeting of the individual subjective with the objective outer world’ takes place.[25] Hegel mentions ‘mild serenity, the fragrant calm of spring freshness, winter torpor’ ## Rembrandt, Ruisdael, Stehen, Ostade, van Goyen, Teniers. Van der Neer ## This is not mere imitation, but the expression of certain moods, particular states of mind in the form of the vitality of the natural landscape (TWA 15, 60f.).[26] During his visit to The Hague[27] and its landscapes of ‘beautiful avenues of beeches and oaks’, the ‘high and leafy forest’, the views of the North Sea, Haarlem, Delft or Scheveningen, the ‘green meadows with cows’ – Hegel notes, alluding to the famous painters Nicolaes Berchem and Paulus Potter: ‘one travels among all the Potters and Berghems’ (Br. II, 361). Nature becomes the content of painting ‘not only as surroundings, but also in its own right’ (TWA 15, 61).

The mastery in Dutch genre painting – a highlight of modern Romantic art

Here, too, it is a question of aesthetic justification as the cornerstone of Hegel’s aesthetics of modernity. From the point of view of the core determinations of presence and particularity, a new formation of intimacy can be identified as the appearance or aspiration of a harmonization of the inner and outer, the ‘intimacy in the immediately present’ (Hotho 256), the ‘ideal is brought entirely to presence’ (Hotho 254). The objects, all particularities, are brought to the present, into the ‘perfection of worldly, earthly existence’ (Hotho 254) – a kind of secularisation of art, which nevertheless represents a form of the absolute spirit – ostensibly insignificant objects are given a ‘new worldly halo’ (Hotho 366). The present, the present moment of people’s lives, is re-presented in a higher way by means of these paintings. “One might pass by a woman sewing at a window, but if she is depicted by Gerard Dou, the appearance is interesting to us because of its excellent conception” (GW 28, 2, 822). Hegel speaks of the ‘satisfaction of mental production’ - ‘we delight in the manifestation, which appears as if nature itself had produced them, as if they had been made naturally thus. These objects are fixed in themselves, made into an end and legitimized in a special way; supposedly unimportant natural objects and seemingly random, everyday scenes of human life (TWA 13, 214ff.), objects of ‘prosaic life’ (Kehler 152) take center stage. Brouwer loved his drunkard in the pub, Ostade was the ‘king of painting peasant huts’, Huysum adored flowers – ‘for the prisoner, the little flower that breaks out between two paving stones in a dark courtyard replaces the whole world’.[28] Goethe takes the same position in his brilliant essay on flower painting: in ‘our great Dutch flower painters’, ‘no object, when it falls joyfully and freshly upon the eye, is denied the right to be depicted’. The beautiful is presented in and through the true and, with reference to the paintings of Jan

van Huysum and Rahel Ruysch exhibited in Pommersfelden, with ‘the fullest aesthetic splendor’. Whereas in older art flowers were mostly secondary, decorative or ornamental, and thus ‘subordinate objects’, they now became independent objects that ‘create the main interest of a picture’. Goethe recognizes a ‘turning point in painting’, a revolutionary change.

The present as momentariness, as an instant, finds expression, time is ‘frozen’ – what “in nature rushes by, art fixes into permanence”, art “snatches everything and anything from fleeting existence and in this sense overcomes nature” (TWA 13, 216). The three-dimensionality of space is represented on a two-dimensional surface – the painting thus “ranks higher than solid matter as a medium of artistic expression. It is the sign of spirit’s radical freedom to break with three-dimensional matter to create a new illusory space of its own.”[29] The terms fleetingness or the momentary, it should be noted in passing, can also be found in interpretations of Impressionism.[30] The ephemeral can become ‘detailed’, the concrete, diverse nature appears completely individualized, specific. The result is an ‘inexhaustible wealth’ - ‘hundreds of objects’, ‘thousands and thousands of effects’ to visualize (TWA 13, 214). The result is “a whole world of content, which man wrests from nature and heaps together in a comprehensive way to form a treasure of contemplation and imagination, which he now presents freely from within himself without elaborate conditions and formalities” (TWA 13, 215).[31]

This also applies to the visualization of everyday human activity – scenes of everyday life and day-to-day existence;[32] “*What a human does at every moment is a unique thing*, and the right thing is to fulfil *every* activity, *every* specific task, to be active in it, to be there with one’s *whole* spirit.”[33] This possibility, this opportunity to harmonize with the present, this intimacy characterizes modern art, the fascination of the works arises from this tension, the possibility of harmony and disharmony. The fleeting appearance is recreated, imaginatively re-presented as having been created anew by the artistically active human being, by his or her productive imagination. The “most striking effects produced by the magic of light and color now acquire an independent validity. Just as the mind, thinking and comprehending, reproduces the world in ideas and thoughts, so the main thing now becomes, independently of the object itself, the subjective re-creation of externality in the sensual element of color and illumination” (TWA 14, 228).

The contribution of the art historians and Hegel students Waagen, Hotho, Kugler and Schnaase to the re-recognition of Dutch painting

Alongside Waagen and his art historical studies, the three co-founders of the Berlin School of art history, who were also influenced by Hegel's aesthetics, played a pioneering role in the rediscovery of the later Dutch school of the 17th century, in various but clear forms within the space of a decade: Carl Schnaase with his publication *Niederländische Briefe* (1834), Franz Kugler with his *Handbuch der Geschichte der Malerei in Deutschland, den Niederlanden, Spanien, Frankreich und England* (1837) and Heinrich Gustav Hotho with his *Geschichte der deutschen und niederländischen Malerei* (1842). These studies demonstrate the impact of Hegel's philosophy of art in the 19th century. Hegel thereby fundamentally opposed the two prevailing paradigms for the evaluation of art: on the one hand Classicism, 'the canonisation of the art of classical antiquity and the Italian Cinquecento', and on the other hand the 'Christian-medieval countercanon' of German Romanticism.[34] Before the images of God the Father and Pallas Athena, according to Hegel, 'we no longer bow our knees, even though they may still be excellently depicted' (Heimann 26). The philosopher thus provides the initial spark for a new model for the philosophy of art and art history, the autonomy of modern art. Since the purpose of art is no longer a superficially religious one involving biblical imagery, paintings have begun to migrate to galleries and museums: 'The development of art also represents such a purpose with regard to the objects [landscapes, flowers, etc.]', and reflection 'enters into the work of art' (Carové), so that interpretation becomes a dimension of the work itself.

With reference to the major contribution of Hegel's aesthetics to art historiography, Hotho describes the Dutch school as a turning point in the history of painting – it took a 'completely different direction', 'a new artistic height was reached, which remained unrivalled in its sphere' (Hotho 25). Hegel's art history wanted to "contribute with philosophical sensibility and spirit to a scientific insight into the course and progress of the richest periods of art" and to convey "a vivid idea and feeling of the inner and outer greatness of the epochs, schools and famous masters" (Hotho 25). While in every genuine metaphysics reason thoughtfully recognises and proves this to be the truth, art offers the harmony of inner content and the individual, particular appearance, whereby the breath of that infinity or absoluteness is breathed into every work of art, so that the 'seemingly finite object and content find themselves inspired with a new *form and soul* to take on a new higher existence'. (Hotho 11). Despite this praise, the oeuvre of Rembrandt and the Dutch school was still discredited by classicists until the middle of the 19th century.

The question about the object of such art is answered with the title of a painting by Jan Steen: *Representation of Human Life*, the 'depiction of ordinary life in its workaday intercourse.' In Steen's work one can see the 'free, pleasurable conception of the common life' of the

townspeople. Steen's tavern scene with a brawl is 'full of the highest liveliness, a happy depiction of the momentary' (Kugler 187, 197, 199), the 'lively visualisation of the hustle and bustle of time' at the 'most everyday level' (Schnaase 30f.), it shows 'animated folk life' (Kugler 193) – from proud burghers in their parlours, to peasant weddings and marketplaces, flowers by Breughel and van Huysum, farm animals by Paul Potter.[35] Schnaase emphasizes the *intellectual freedom* (*geistige Freiheit*) with regard to the 'inexhaustible diversity of objects' (Schnaase 89), introducing a new nuance into the interpretation: the term 'domicile', which is linked to Hegel's idea of being-at-home, here with regard to the landscape and, in the case of domestic scenes, the familiar, the 'homely nature' (Hotho 25), bringing the 'human comedy' onto the canvas.[36]

Against the accusation of shallow imitation

Following Hegel, Hotho, Waagen, Schnaase and Kugler agree on one central point: the Dutch masters are 'no copyists of nature'. They are 'no protocolists in painting' (Goethe). On the contrary, the masterpieces of Johann Breughel, display 'the finest touch of spiritual expression' (Schnaase 27). This rejection of the accusation of flat imitation is vehemently and astutely substantiated, the topos of spiritual freedom, of the free and intellectual, once again comes to the fore.

In describing paintings, the three dominant modern-romantic art forms of music, painting and poetry are linked, according to Hegel – from the color image to the sound image to the poetic image, from the color tone to the musical tone to the poetic tones, to poetry as the most spiritual art, as Schnaase states, closely following Hegel (Schnaase 379). Painting is described with facets of the *musical* and the *poetic*. Hegel speaks of the musicality of painting, of the music of painting and the play of visible objects as the tone of the painting, of the purity of the color tone as similar to the pure tone of music, of striking musical effects in color,[37] of the 'tone of illumination' (Carové 394). At the same time, he talks of the poetic spirit of painting in the sense of a spiritual view of individuality.[38] As already mentioned, Waagen spoke of the tones of the soul and the sounding of the strings of the human mind in relation to the great colorists, and Kugler and Schnaase also use the expression 'musical element of painting' (Kugler 177, Schnaase 155) in the sense of the compositional, the harmonious arrangement of the depicted objects (S 154). Hotho recognises a 'melodic weaving of color tones' in which a basic key is further modulated, color tones as similar to the keys in music (Hotho 357, 361). The Dutch are regarded as ingenious composers of color tones.[39]

According to Goethe, these Dutch artists 'succeed in awakening a great, indeed greater pleasure in the imitation than the original could ever arouse'.[40] According to Hegel, spirit 're-produces itself' in the form of the re-creation of externality; Waagen speaks of 'free reproduction'.[41] An analogue is to be found in literature, when we think of Laurence Sterne, for whom all his stories are, in the end, only about himself; in the pattern of modern painting, the producing subject, the subjectivity of the artist, allows himself to be seen. Accordingly, in the Dutch masters we have a multitude of self-portraits, of paintings with artists at the easel or with a collection of pictures,[42] the painter's face can be found reflected in a mirror or in a silver wine jug.

The ingenious Dutch colorists painted 'the life of their countrymen': in the interiors of houses, in public squares, on canals and country roads, horsemen, hunters, sailors, fishermen, merchants, farmers and craftsmen, women and children, musicians, tramps, pubs, fairs, dignified gatherings – the painted history of activity and customs. 'It was painting that wrote Holland's history' (ibid. 27).

The landscapes are inventions of the masters, they 'represent a *second higher nature* that the genius dreams up after a glimpse of the real one'. As with Shakespeare, the 'marvellous ability to unite the ideal with the real' is evident. Rembrandt 'gives himself unreservedly to this flight of his imagination' - 'studies from nature, but interpreted with the clairvoyant power of genius' – bold naturalism and supreme idealism united – 'fidelity to nature combined with depth and originality, which evoke a world of thoughts in us'.[43] Schnaase also formulates this Hegelian idea of the second, higher nature, that nature is 'formed for a second time, as it were, with spiritual independence' (Schnaase 368).

The Dutch School and French Impressionism

Hegel's aesthetics of painting provides insights into later epochs of painting, not only because of his acceptance of the radicality of representing pure colors – according to Stephen Houlgate, Hegel's account "provides an important way of understanding – and of criticizing – certain developments that have been taken place in painting since his death".[44] In terms of content, motifs, subjects and favoured objects, a direct connection between the Impressionists and the late Dutch can be observed, while at the same time substantial changes in painting style and manner are evident.[45] With regard to landscape painting, Zola rightly notes that only the Dutch and Impressionist schools 'loved, explored and understood nature so much'. The landscape painting of the Impressionists in particular had clearly broken with the classicist tradition.[46]

Hegel's philosophy of art, particularly his conception of modern (Romantic) art and the aesthetics of painting with the rehabilitation of the Dutch Golden Age, the studies of his students from the Berlin School of art history, Bénard's powerful translation of Hegel's aesthetics, the French version of Waagen's work entitled *Manuel de Historie de la Peintre* (1863/1864) and fascinating studies by the French art expert Theophile Thoré on the rediscovery of Vermeer and Frans Hals contributed decisively to a revival of realism (by no means a shallow naturalism) in painting in France and paved the way for Impressionism, the path to the French revolution in painting. The height of Dutch mastery was 'only reached again in Impressionism'.[47] Through his acquaintance with Tenier's *Card Players* or Huysum's *Pieces of Fruit*, we can understand how 'Cezanne can paint a great picture of two men playing cards or a bowl of fruit and a bottle, or how Monet can paint a great picture of a few water lilies on a pond.'[48] This also applies to the windmills by Breughel and Monet, the winter paintings by Steen and van Goyen as well as by Pissarro and Monet, Terborch's *The Letter* and Monet's *Camille or the Woman in the Green Dress*, the latter admired by Emilé Zola as early as 1866 as a 'resolutely lively painting full of energy and truth'.[49] Monet's 42 paintings from his stays in Holland, where the painter was able to visit the Rijksmuseum and other galleries, are representative of these links.[50]

Both painting traditions, the Dutch Golden Age and the French Impressionists, were and are subject to similar criticism, rejection and denigration by aesthetes and art historians alike. With regard to the Dutch, the classicist and romantic devaluation has already been outlined; here we need only repeat the key words: Hegel positions himself directly against the classicist accusation of a naturalist tendency in the Dutch that supposedly does no more that copy or imitate.

'Liveliness in painting is – according to Hegel – not to be taken so superficially as mere naturalness', liveliness means the soulfulness, the most significant aspect of painting, especially Dutch painting (GW 28, 1, 159). This also applies to Impressionism. Following Aristotle, Hegel establishes the identity of receptivity and activity in human perception.[51] We are not dealing with a doubled gallery of views, but with the immediate unity of what is found existing and what has been made.[52] The statements 'my perception is blue' and 'there is a blue object' are to be combined, to be thought together. In perception, the effect of both sides is posited as one. This reveals the simple spiritual structure of perception, its *logos*-constitution.[53] Pure viewing or pure perception (as well as pure imagination) are appearances that proves to be such; viewing and perception are contaminated, infected, determined by thinking from the outset. The mind's knowledge is always already present in perceptual visualizations.[54] Viewing is sensual and

intellectual, natural and rational in one: 'Man is therefore always thinking, even if he only looks at something; if he looks at anything, he always looks at it as a universal, focused individual'.[55]

A further objection had already been raised against the genre and landscape painting of the Dutch: its style is no more than 'an expression of the liberal bourgeoisie withdrawing from public obligations and inventing an earthly paradise in its private world', while themes critical of this society are ignored in the form of a 'sensualist harmlessness'.[56] This fails to take account of Hegel's assessment of the connection between 'strolling' or sauntering along (which has substantial depth) and the new political self-awareness of the Dutch citizens. According to Hegel, it is not an earthly paradise that becomes the object, but the entire diversity of earthly life. French Impressionism follows in this tradition of the diverse visualization of human activities that we saw, for instance, in Breughel's *Hay Harvest*. From the Impressionist school, we need only mention Camille Pissarro's *Haymaking at Éragny*, Renoir's *Le Moissoneurs*, following Millet's realistic *Women Harvesters*, [57] as well as Pissarro's Woodcutters, Washerwomen, Cowherds, Gardeners, maids and butchers' wives; Monet's *Coal Workers*; Caillebotte's *Painters of the Façades* and *The Floor Scrapers*; Degas' *Woman Ironing*.[58]

Impressionist landscape painting resembles the Dutch tradition in many of its motifs and scenes, such as Rembrandt's *Landscape with Stone Bridge* or *Thunderstorm Landscape*,[59] Jacob van Ruisdael's *River Landscape with Ferry* or *Forest Landscape with Stream*, Adriaen van de Velde's *The Beach at Scheveningen* or Meindert Hobbema's *The Avenue of Middelharnis*, van Goyen's *Summer* and *Winter* (both pictures of unusual power of colour, broadly and wittily treated – as Waagen notes[60]), various river and sea pieces,[61] Vermeer's stroke of genius *The View of Delft*, Monet's *Poppy Field near Argenteuil* and similar paintings by Renoir and Pissarro. The latter is considered the father figure of Impressionism, was a close friend of Monet, then a discoverer and equal colleague of Cezanne. Further characteristic motifs of the Impressionists include: women by the river (Seine) and sea (Atlantic), a railway bridge near Pontoise, Sisley's flooding in Port-Marly, Caillebotte's sailing boats near Argenteuil, Monet's and Renoir's Sunrise.

Impressionism's connection to the Dutch school is also evident in the flower and fruit pieces: *Still Life With Vase of Flowers* by Renoir, *Still Life With Flowers and Fruit*, and *Fruits of the South* or *Still Life With Melon* by Monet. The Impressionists likewise drew on certain evening and night landscapes and the play of light and atmospheres of lighting. Sunrise, sunset, evening mood by Monet, Renoir's sunset, etc.

The historical arc of the revival of the late Netherlanders (which was also indebted to major exhibitions in the 19th century) can be traced through the works of John Constable,

influenced by von Ruysdael – ‘veritable meadows bathed in dew’, ‘a rushing river driving a mill’ – and William Turner – the latter ‘followed on from the great landscape painters such as Cuyp, Ruysdael, Wignants or van de Velde’ (Thoré 333) – to the French Realists and the emerging French Impressionism. The ‘young painter’ Claude Monet had delivered a marvelous landscape – *The Avenue of Barbizon* – an evening atmosphere among tall trees (224f.).

The importance of the ‘realist’ movement in France in the 19th century – Theodor Rousseau, Camille Corot, Gustav Courbet[62] – for the work of Eduard Manet[63] and for the emergence of French Impressionism is undisputed.[64] But realism is connected to the great Dutch painters too. It is well known that Gustave Courbet (at times a pupil of Hegel’s translator Charles Bénard) and Claude Monet spent extended periods of time studying in the Netherlands. Manet copied Dutch masters and orientated himself to portraits by Rembrandt and Frans Hals, the latter being regarded as models for the new art of painting right up to van Gogh.

With regard to the style and method of Impressionism, however, the difference, a revolution in form, is to be noted, such as the technique of applying paint, the background, new combinations of colour and light[65] or the Impressionists’ preference for painting in the open air in order to capture life in full intensity. Zola speaks of the ‘directness, coarseness of the brushstroke – he had seen “these raw colours, smelled the salty odours, heard the muffled, wheezing voice of the steamer” in one of Monet’s brilliant seascapes. The painters were ridiculed as charlatans because of the ‘blue grasses, purple stretches of land, red trees and water shimmering in all the colours of the prism’. But the result was ‘a more precise perception of the causes and effects of light, which inspired both the form and the colouring’.[66] Even in the canon of favored objects and subjects, the affinity between the two schools remains unmistakable – landscape, genre, portrait, still life, genres that were in the firing line of the painting establishment, including 19th century classicist academicism – insofar as this new art stood in opposition to the canon of the French Academie and the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. Zola fiercely attacked these ‘tyrannical intrigues of the jury’, who were ‘strict towards works that shook their artistic traditions, merciless towards views that were not their own’. For Zola, outdated academic painting resembled a sweet shop, where one found whipped cream human figures, the sea as rock candy and redcurrant jelly’, the salons mostly showed ‘wretched pieces of unspeakable triviality and shallowness’.[67] Zola was quick to see ‘the art of tomorrow’ in Manet and the Impressionists – ‘The revolutionary direction that is beginning will certainly have transformed our Ecole Française in twenty years.’ Monet’s works, Zola wrote in 1867, ‘will endure as one of the great monuments of our art, as a characteristic of the tendencies of the time.’ Zola enthusiastically praised the work of Monet, who was ‘indisputably the head of the

Impressionist group': 'outstanding talent, a keen and sure eye for the modernity of man-made nature, an incredible ease of execution, a flexible intelligence, a lively and quick understanding of any subject'.[68] And just 30 years later, the novelist wrote about his astonishment when visiting the new salons and seeing a dazzling miracle of life - 'what a harvest I have witnessed being sown: Lots of Manets, lots of Monets, lots of Pissarros!'[69] The Golden Dutch and the Impressionists can be regarded as the avant-garde, who in their time achieved an emancipation from the traditional, a true revolution in the history of art.

Brief Conclusion:

With his aesthetic assessment of Dutch portrait, landscape and genre painting of the later 17th century as the epitome of modern painting, Hegel himself, as well as through the mediation of his followers from the Berlin School of art history (Waagen, Schnaase, Hotho, Kugler) and together with Theophile Thoré-Bürger and Bénard - *peinture moderne*[70] - contributed significantly to the 'rediscovery' and renewed appreciation of the Dutch in the 19th century. This rehabilitation was then creatively continued by painters such as Constable, Turner, the French Realists (Barbizon School) and especially the French Impressionists. In his homage, Hegel aims to justify aesthetically the art of painting of the later Dutch school and to justify its modernity, its estimation as a revolution in art, which (as we have seen) was then continued in French Impressionism. Hegel's foundation of a modern aesthetic theory in his *Lectures on the Philosophy of Art* provides decisive arguments against classicist and romanticist devaluations of the Dutch. Grand masters of painting such as Vermeer and Hals were barely appreciated in the 19th century or were ignored by 'art judges'; this also applied to Rembrandt's first pupil, Gerard Dou, who was so highly esteemed by Hegel and whose reputation had largely disappeared.[71] Against the glorification of antiquity (classicism) and the Christian Middle Ages (late romanticism), his philosophy of art represents a paradigm shift towards the art of modernity as free art, an art of free spirituality - 'only in its freedom is beautiful art true art' (TWA 13, 13). Hegel can be regarded as the founder of a modern aesthetic of painting in the sense of the synthesis of philosophy and art history and, together with the art experts mentioned above, as a key pioneer of a new view of art history and of the revolution brought about by the later Dutch School.

---

[1] Karl Rosenkranz, *Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegels Leben*. Berlin 1844 (Nachdruck Darmstadt 1977), 348f.
[2] Ebd. 347f.

[3] Stephen Houlgate, 'Hegel and the Art of Painting' in *Hegel and Aesthetics*, ed. W. Maker (Albany: SUNY Press, 2000), 61-82. pp. 61, 63?
[4] Hegel, Kehler Nachschrift op. cit. 152. Auf die Differenzierungen innerhalb dieser Schule (Utrechter, Haarlemer, Leidener und Delfter Schule und andere Malergilden) kann hier nicht eingegangen werden.
[5] Aloys Hirt, Karl Friedrich von Rumohr, Johann Rösel, Christian Xeller, Jakob Schlesinger. – very knowledgeable about the theory, practice and history of painting" -contact with people who knew about the practice of painting and restoring, about collection paintings and about he history of painting – Houlgate 1f. Darin liegt eine fundamentaler Unterschied zu Kant. Zum Verhältnis Hegels zu den Malern vgl.: Otto Pöggeler, Der Philosoph und der Maler. Hegel und Christian Xeller, in Otto Pöggler/Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert, Kunsterfahrung und Kulturpolitik im Berlin Hegels, Hegel-Studien Beiheft 22, Bonn 1983. ##
[6] Alpers, *Kunst als Beschreibung*, 83.
[7] Hegel, *Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften*, §§ 384 und 386.
[8] Goethe, *Diderots Versuch über die Malerei. Übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen begleitet von Johann Wolfgang von Goethe*, # 1799 #
[9] Ebd.
[10] Braungart, *Literatur und Religion*, 223ff.
[11] Vgl. Lippuner spricht von romantischer Verfälschung, Lippuner, *Wackenroder/Tieck*, 102-105.
[12] Ebd. 2ff, 21ff, 45.
[13] Lippuner, *Wackenroder/Tieck*, 160; Braungart, *Literatur und Religion*, 227.
[14] Zit. nach Braungart, *Literatur und Religion*, 228.
[15] Vgl. 28,1, 477; 28,3, 961.
[16] Svetlana Alpers, *Kunst als Beschreibung. Holländische Malerei des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Köln 1995, 29.
[17] Dazu ausführlich: Klaus Vieweg, Die romantische Kunst als Anfang freier Kunst, op.cit.
[18] Hervorhebung K.V.
[19] Hervorhebung Klaus Vieweg. Schnaase sieht dies ähnlich, wenn er von der ‚reinen Anschauung des höchsten Geistes' und dem ‚freien Gestalten der Form' spricht (Schnaase 370).

[20] Dazu näher: Klaus Vieweg, Die sanfte Macht über die Bilder – Hegel philosophische Konzeption von Einbildungskraft. In: *Inventions of the Imagination*. Hg. v. R. T. Gray, K. Vieweg et al. Seattle 2010.

[21] Siehe auch: Christopher Brown, *Holländische Genremalerei im 17. Jahrhundert*, München 1985.
[22] Klaus Vieweg, „To trifle upon the road" Die Muße als „Sonntag des Lebens", in: Claudia Lillge, Thorsten Unger, Björn Weyand, *Arbeit und Müßiggang in der Romantik*, München 2017, ders: Entdeckungsreise und humoristische Roman – Hegel und Laurence Sterne, In: Klaus Vieweg: *Skepsis und Freiheit*, München 2007.
[23] Peter Hecht, Das Vergnügliche erkennt man leicht, aber nicht die Bedeutung. In: Jeroen Giltaij, *Der Zauber des Alltäglichen. Holländische Malerei von Adriaen Brouwer bis Johannes Vermeer*. Berlin 2005, 21.
[24] Waagen1, 109 (Sammlung Six Amsterdam).
[25] Dazu Norbert Wolf, *Impressionismus*. München, London, New York 2023, 44.
[26] Für Hegels ist diese Landschaftsmalerei ein Kernmoment modern-romantischer Kunst. Nicht haltbar ist die Einschätzung von Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert, dass die Landschaftsmalerei ‚das Ideal der Kunst verfehlt'. Diese Behauptung steht konträr Text von Hegels Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik. Diese Schule wird gar als ‚abgeleiteter Zweig der ohnehin sich auflösende Malerei' bezeichnet, an der nichts besonders Rühmenswertes entdeckt werden könne. Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert: Die wiederentdeckte Malerei. In: *Hegel in Berlin* (hrsg. Otto Pöggeler), Berlin 1981.
[27] „de heerlijke kabinetten heeft bezocht" – Antwerpen, Den Haag, Amsterdam. Hegel in Berichten seiner Zeitgenossen 510.
[28] Thoré-Bürger, *Kunstkritik III*, 82
[29] Houlgate 5f.
[30] Wolf, *Impressionismus*, 43f.
[31] Dazu auch Vieweg, Die sanfte Macht über die Bilder, op.cit.
[32] John Malcolm Nash, *The Age of Rembrandt and Vermeer: Dutch painting in the seventeenth century*. Oxford/New York 1979, 275. Houlgate „Painters should thus explore human character through portraite and present the wide array of feelings and moods that are to be encountered in the diverse situations of everyday life". The Dutch painters "are able to imbue the most significant scenes of domestic life with an irrestistible 'spiritual cheerfulness'… "the fullness of their life". Houlgate 11f.
[33] Hotho 256, emphasis KV.
[34] Henrik Karge, Karl Schnaase's Niederländische Briefe (1834): Early Netherlandish painting in european perspective, in: *Oud Holland. Journal of Art oft he Low Countries*. Vol. 133, Boston/Leiden 2020.
[35] Katalog Frimmel: Paul Potter: Tierstück, zwei Kühe.
[36] Thore, Un tour en Allemagne. In: Revue Germanique.# 216.
[37] GW 28, 3, 1130; GW 28, 1, 113, 161, GW 28, 2, 765.
[38] GW 28, 3, 1128

[39] Hotho 258.
[40] Goethe Blumen-Mahlerei #
[41] 14, 228; Woltmann/Waagen, Kleine Schriften, 58 #
[42] Kehler: Gerätschaften der Kunst 152.
[43] Theophile Thoré-Bürger, IX. Gewitterlandschaft. Oelgemälde von Rembrandt. In: *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, Leipzig 1866, 159f.
[44] Houlgate 1 und besonders 14ff.#
[45] U.a. die Verwendung reiner Spektralfarben, des komplementären Kontrasts (Gegenfarben) wie in Monets Mohnblumenfeldern, der Kommatechnik mit kurzen Pinselstrichen und Flimmern der Farben.
[46] Zola, *Salons*, 111ff.
[47] Vgl.: Lutz Hieber, *Holländische Landschaftsmalerei des 17. Jahrhunderts*, in, Lutz Hieber (Hg.), Gesellschaftsepochen und ihre Kunstwelten, Wiesbaden 2017.
[48] Alpers, *Kunst als Beschreibung*, 22
[49] Zola, *Salons*, 32.
[50] Louis van Tilborgh (Hrsg.), *Monet in Holland*, Zwolle 1986.
[51] Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*, TWA 19, 205.
[52] Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, TWA 3, 231-232
[53] Wolfgang Welsch, *Aisthesis. Grundzüge und Perspektiven der Aristotelischen Sinnenlehre*. Stuttgart 1987, bes. 140-152.
[54] Kuhl meint dagegen, dass bei den Impressionisten ‚nicht all das, was der Kopf weiß' Gegenstand würde.
[55] Hegel, Enzyklopädie, TWA 8, 83.
[56] Wolf, *Impressionismus*, 40f.
[57] Heller zufolge war ab auch ein Gemälde von Johann Franz Millet (Jean-Francois Millet) in der Sammlung, Felsengrotte mit Wasser, Diana mit Nymphen. Landschaft mit Gebäuden (Heller 45).
[58] Wolf, *Impressionismus.*
[59] Thoré-Bürger, *Gewitterlandschaft, Oelgemälde von Rembrandt*, op.cit.
[60] Waagen, Catalog Suermondt, 18.
[61] Haak, *Das goldene Zeitalter*, op.cit, 186, 242f., 336, 341, 467
[62] Peter Hecht zufolge sahen „die Realisten des 19. Jahrhunderts in den alten Holländern ein für ihr Programm brauchbares Präzedens: eine demokratische Alternative zur Kunst von Kirche und Staat". In: Hecht, *Der Zauber des Alltäglichen*, 20; Charles Rosen, *Romantism and Realism*. New York 1984.
[63] Vgl. Robert Pippin ##
[64] Vgl. Jowell Suzman Frances, Impressionism and the Golden Age of Dutch art. In: Ann Dumas (Hrsg.), *Inspiring Impressionism*, Denver 2007, 79-109.
[65] Ebd.
[66] Zola, *Salons* 245, 107.
[67] Ebd. IX, 108, 163.
[68] Ebd. 109.
[69] Ebd. 278.
[70] Claude Bénard, *Systemé des Beaux-Arts par Hegel*, Paris 1860, 246.
[71] Vgl. Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., Gerrit Dou 1613-1675. Master Painter in the Age of Rembrandt. Washington, New Haven, London 2000.