



Abb. 2 Bild eines Mädchens in umgekehrten Farben. 1810. Bleistift und Aquarell auf weißem Papier, 158 X 146 mm. Weimar, SWK/GNM, Inv.Nr. 1615, Corpus V A, 153, Taf. LXXX (Maisak 1996, S. 228, Nr. 169)

Goethe war in mit seinen Kunstanstschauungen für das letzte Drittel des 18. Jh.s eine einflußreiche, doch keineswegs monolithische Größe. Der Wandel, dem sie unterlagen, findet unmittelbar seinen Niederschlag in der Ausführung seiner Zeichnungen, wie Petra Maisak veranschaulicht, wobei sie manche Widersprüchlichkeit zwischen Goethes wechselndem idealem theoretischen Wunschenken

und den realen Ausführungen seines künstlerischen Schaffens aufdeckt, wie z. B. das Weiche und Gefällige in seinen Arbeiten, das er von seinem Leipziger Zeichenlehrer Oeser übernahm. Diese für den Sentimentalismus typischen Merkmale, bezeichnete er nach der italienischen Reise bei seinen Zeitgenossen als »nebulistisch« und wollte sie bei seinen eigenen Arbeiten nicht mehr wahr haben. Obwohl Goethe sich als Theoretiker dem Klassizismus verpflichtet sah, sieht Petra Maisak die Bildersprache Goethes in manchem Blatt der Sprache der Romantiker näher, als es ihm selber lieb gewesen wäre; Gegensätze, die belegen, daß Goethe bisweilen in den Zeichnungen seiner Intuition mehr folgte als den von ihm propagierten klassischen Vorbildern.

Der Autorin ist es gelungen, vom Preis abgesehen, eine wissenschaftliche Arbeit einem breiten Publikum leicht zugänglich zu machen. Einmal mehr wird deutlich, daß die Zeichnungen Goethes, wie auch schon seine Zeitgenossen erkannten, oft erhebliche technische Mängel aufweisen. Petra Maisak veranschaulicht, daß Goethe als Zeichner den Konflikt zwischen subjektivem Eindruck und objektiver Gestaltung nicht lösen konnte. Es gelang ihm hier nicht, neue Formen zu entwickeln. Seine Arbeiten können lediglich als »skizzierte Ideen« einer inneren Befindlichkeit verstanden werden, dabei wird die zeichnerische Handschrift des Dichters zum Ausdruck seiner Phantasie und Individualität.

Timo John

Hajo Düchting

## Farbe am Bauhaus: Synthese und Synästhesie

Berlin, Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1996, 320 S., mit 74 Farbtafeln; 100 s/w Abb. DM 248,-. ISBN 3-7861-1667-9. Kart. Ausg.: DM 75,-. ISBN 3-910022-17-0

Heinrich Beberness, Helene Börner, Christian Dell, Josef Hartwig, Max Krehan, Emil Lange, Reinhold Weidensee, Carl Zaubitzer. This roll-call of *Werkmeister* stands at the head of the second major manifesto of the Bauhaus,

*Staatliches Bauhaus Weimar 1919-1923*; and yet these names are now likely to be familiar only to Bauhaus scholars, unlike those of at least the majority of the *Formmeister*, Feininger, Gropius, Gertrud Grunow, Itten, Kan-



dinsky, Klee, Marcks, Adolf Meyer, Moholy-Nagy, Muche, Oskar Schlemmer and Schreyer, who are also listed there. The *Werkmeister*, indeed, enjoyed from the beginning a far more limited role in the running of the Bauhaus than the *Formmeister* (Friedhelm Kröll, *Bauhaus 1919-1933: Künstler zwischen Isolation und kollektiver Praxis*, Düsseldorf, 1974, 41), and yet this manifesto-catalogue was published for the Bauhaus exhibition of 1923, which was launched by Gropius under the well-known banner, 'Kunst und Technik: eine neue Einheit'. The arthistorical displacement of the workshops in favour of a concentration on the work of the international stars of art and architecture is one of the more disappointing features of the extensive Bauhaus literature of the last forty years. Perhaps the old distinction between *Bildung* and *Ausbildung* is still very much alive among modern scholars. It is to the credit of Hajo Düchting that in his new book he gives at least a walk-on part to some of the *Werkmeister*, and devotes a number of chapters to the Bauhaus workshops – specifically those concerned with wall-painting, weaving, printing and theatre. But how does this common emphasis in the literature on *Kunst* rather than *Technik* affect the subject of colour?

It might have been expected that colour, which attracted the interest of so many Bauhaus Meister, would have been an important unifying element in their work. Yet the 1923 manifesto included the well-known circular diagram of the Bauhaus programme (Düchting Abb. 17) which presented colour in two quite distinct contexts. The first, *Farbenlehre*, was associated with *Raumlehre* and *Kompositionslehre*; the second ranked *Farbe* with *Stein, Holz, Metall, Ton, Glas* and *Gewebe* as a material. It is only the first of these aspects of 'colour', the very rich and various theoretical approaches of, for example, Itten, Klee and Kandinsky which have, for the most part, occupied those few scholars to have looked closely at Bauhaus colour; Düchting adds important material on Gertrud Grunow and Ludwig Hirschfeld-

Mack at Weimar and Hinnerk Scheper at Dessau where, with the first generation of graduates now available as teachers, the distinction between *Formmeister* and *Werkmeister* was removed. Nevertheless the accent here still falls substantially on the famous painters, whose role in relation to the workshops was not, in the event, clearly defined even as late as March 1921 (see Karl-Heinz Hüter, *Das Bauhaus in Weimar*, Berlin, 1982, 183), but whose many publications on colour are eminently quotable. Düchting does indeed quote them extensively, and allows much of his discussion to be conducted in their words.

But there is still much to be said about the role of *Farbe* as opposed to *Farbenlehre*, for it was of course one of the great innovations of the *Vorkurs* that it emphasised the comprehensive study of materials. Düchting mentions (135) the need for training in dyeing techniques in Helene Börner's weaving workshop, and the practical course which two students, Gunta Stölzl and Benita Otto took, early in 1922, at the Färberei-Fachschule in Krefeld. But he does not mention that this training was a prelude to the re-opening at the Bauhaus of the dyeshop which had been part of the former Weimar Kunstgewerbeschule. Stölzl recalled: 'Seit 1922 konnten wir in unserer Färberei die Färbungen selbst entwickeln. Wir färbten sowohl mit Naturfarbstoffen wie Catechu, Cochenille, Waid, Indigo, als auch mit Küpenfarbstoffen und anderen. Die eigene Färberei war eine große Hilfe zu Experimenten mit der Farbe...' (Bauhaus-Archiv, *Gunta Stölzl. Weberei am Bauhaus und aus eigener Werkstatt*, Berlin, Zürich, Bremen, 1987, 112).

It may well have been with this dyeing activity in mind that, early in 1923, Gropius proposed to replace Itten with a teacher of chemistry as well as one for mathematics and physics (Hüter, 199). More surprisingly perhaps Paul Klee, who had taught in Stölzl's weaving workshop at Dessau, later justified an eclectic approach to colour-theory partly on the grounds that his studio was 'weder eine Far-



benindustrie noch eine chemische Färberei' (P. Petitpierre, *Aus der Malklasse von Paul Klee*, Bern, 1957, 53).

Klee was speaking here in the context of colour-theories from the Renaissance to the early 20th century; but his disparaging reference to mere practicalities, to *Farbe*, was clearly a hit at the modern colour-theorist whose position at the Bauhaus had been most problematic, the Nobel-prize-winning chemist Wilhelm Ostwald. Ostwald was an energetic publicist for his theory, who seemed by 1920 to be making a bid to take over the whole province of colour, including education and the development of paints for teaching purposes; in the words of the critic Paul Ferdinand Schmidt, he seemed to be ushering in 'Der Militarismus in der Kunst' (P. F. Schmidt, 'Werkbund Krisis', *Der Cicerone*, XI, 1919, 704). The chemist had in a sense even established his authority over his greatest rivals as theorists at the Bauhaus, Goethe and the Hamburg Romantic painter Philipp Otto Runge, the chosen theorist of most of the Bauhaus painters, whose colour-system Ostwald had endorsed as early as 1918 (W. Ostwald, *Goethe, Schopenhauer und die Farbenlehre*, Leipzig, 1918, 55), at the same time as he was sharply critical of Goethe. In 1924 Ostwald reprinted Runge's *Farben-Kugel* (1810) in his series of texts, *Die Farbe*. Gropius had, of course, proposed to set Runge's and Ostwald's systems side-by-side at the Bauhaus exhibition of 1923.

Ostwald had established his base in the Deutsche Werkbund as early as 1914, and from 1916 he began to flood the public arena with books, articles and lectures, including the famous lecture at the Werkbund Conference in Stuttgart in 1919, where he came into direct conflict with the painter Adolf Hoelzel, the teacher and father-figure of several of the Bauhaus *Meister*. This is not the place to examine Ostwald's reputation at the Bauhaus in any detail – and it is treated very cursorily by Düchting. Suffice it to say that the two most

vigorous opponents of the Ostwald theory among the *Meister*, Hoelzel's former pupil Johannes Itten, and Paul Klee, had very specific criticisms to make, but had themselves also been working on some of the colour problems Ostwald was particularly concerned to address, such as the establishment of the grey-scale and of the grey-content of hues. It seems to have been in the context of Ostwald that the *Formmeister* Oskar Schlemmer – another former Hoelzel pupil – first distinguished (in 1932) between 'eine wissenschaftliche und eine künstlerische Farbenlehre' (159), a distinction which, for all its implausibility, has now been taken into the art-historical literature. But colour is the preserve neither of science nor of art and, as I sought to show in *Kulturgeschichte der Farbe* (1994), this division scarcely pre-dates the end of the 19th century. It was for this reason that I spoke in my concluding chapter of 'Abstraktion und Enttheoretisierung'. It remains, however, that the Bauhaus opposition to Ostwald was strongest among painters, and that his supporters were usually designer-technologists such as Gropius himself (who particularly liked the chemist's frequent references to Goethe), Hinnerk Scheper, Joost Schmidt and Herbert Bayer.

Kandinsky sat on the fence, and although already in Weimar, as early as November 1924, he was considering a move to Dresden to teach 'Freie Kunst', and at the Dessau Bauhaus was able to persuade Gropius to allow the informal instruction in painting which he and Klee had been practicing for some time, to become institutional, if not obligatory (see his letters to W. Grohmann, *Jahrbuch Preussischer Kulturbesitz*, 1967, 1969, 97; *Lieber Freund: Künstler Schreiben an Will Grohmann*, Köln, 1968, 51-52), he was also the *Meister* most receptive to the methods of modern experimental psychology, including those of Ostwald. The occasional consideration of the role of experimental psychology at the Bauhaus by modern design-historians, including Düchting, has usually set off on the



wrong foot: it was less a question of the transmission and absorption of specific ideas than the adoption of the principle of experimentation, and research procedures which were clearly based on those of the psychological laboratory.

Perhaps Ostwald's chief handicaps were his dogmatism and his arrogance, attributes which were well matched among the Bauhaus Meister themselves. But there can be no doubt that his was the most important modern colour-theory with which the teachers – and students – at the Bauhaus had to come to terms.

Although he mentions a number of scientists in passing, Düchting does not spend long on the analysis of how their ideas might have impinged on Bauhaus work. Yet Kandinsky's well-known and somewhat bizarre attempt in 1923 to ground his colour-form correspondences in an empirical survey (97) was not the only Bauhaus enterprise to attempt the methods of experimental psychology. Rainer Wick has, for example, traced Laszlo Moholy-Nagy's touch-exercises, his development of the material-studies which Itten had developed in the *Vorlehre*, to the 1921 manifesto of *Präsentismus* by the Dadaist Raoul Hausmann, which urged: 'Laßt uns das Haptische ausdehnen und wissenschaftlich begründen über die bisherige blosse Zufälligkeit hinaus!!' (R. Wick, *Bauhaus-Pädagogik*, Köln, 1982, 135).

Hausmann may well have provided a stimulus to Moholy, but the 'Wissenschaft' which is so evident in his exercises, and abundantly illustrated in his Bauhausbuch, *Von Material zu Architektur* (1929; repr. 1968), is far closer to the work of the experimental psychologist David Katz, whose study, *Der Aufbau der Tastwelt*, was published at Leipzig in 1925. Katz's work on touch is particularly important in the context of colour since he, as a distinguished early phenomenologist of colour (see his *Die Erscheinungsweisen der Farben und ihre Beeinflussung durch die individuelle*

*Erfahrung* [1911]), sought to model the newly-investigated structures of touch-perception on those of colour-perception. It is striking that among the exercises in scaling sensations of touch, made in 1927 and 1928, which Moholy published in his book, one, by Walter Kaminski, a 'zweizeilige drehbare Tasttafel, mit nebeneinander liegenden kontrastierenden taktilischen Werten, von weich zu hart, von glatt zu rauh' (Düchting Abb. 19), is clearly based on the colour-circle. Josef Albers, the *Jungmeister* who shared the *Vorlehre* at Dessau with Moholy-Nagy, specifically linked the structures of colour and the taxonomy of touch-sensations in a lecture at Prague in 1928 (166). It is equally significant in the Bauhaus context that Moholy asserted in his book that 'mit Wissenschaftlichkeit oder praktischer Konstruktionsabsicht haben die Übungen nichts zu tun'.

It is in the course of his analysis of Moholy-Nagy's practice as an artist that Düchting (61-62) raises the question of the technique of spray-painting which, in the event, became as much a part of the Bauhaus repertory as Kandinsky's correspondences between colour and form. The always technically inventive Klee had experimented with this method as early as 1907 (*Tagebuch* No. 784); it was used by Hirschfeld-Mack in his early *Farbseminar* at the Bauhaus (see Düchting Abb. 72), and by 1923 seems to have been in general use there, both on the large scale of mural painting, where compressed-air brushes of the sort used in Albers' sand-blasted glass (112, 166) may already have been developed, and on the small and probably unmechanical scale of lithographs and watercolours (B. S. Tower, *Klee and Kandinsky in Munich and at the Bauhaus*, Ann Arbor, 1981, 189ff., 301 n. 17). Spray-painting offered both the impersonal uniformity of surface and the capacity for nuance and the subtle layering for which Schepers' wall-painting was particularly admired (122-3).

Düchting brings together far more on the enormously diverse dimensions of Bauhaus



colour than any scholar before him, and he does so largely on the basis of the extensive reminiscences and later publications of the chief actors in this gripping drama of modern art and design. He is aware that there is much that is puzzling in the current record (he is particularly good on the limitations of Itten's theory of harmony [37]), and his account is punctuated by vivid analyses of key works; and yet he does not seem to have had the inclination (or perhaps the space) to look very closely at how teachers and students in the Bauhaus came to terms with the rapidly developing science and technology of colour in their time. The Bauhaus was above all a teaching institution, yet DÜCHTING writes, 'Deutlich wurde, daß zu keiner Zeit innerhalb der Bauhaus-Geschichte eine gleichgerichtete Strategie und Konzeption der Farbe existiert hat, zu unterschiedlich waren die Ansätze, zu konträr die zwischen Kunst und Wissenschaft pendelnden Zielsetzungen der sich ständig modifizierenden Vor- und Grundlehre'. (109)

The colour-theories in circulation at the Bauhaus were indeed legion, from Leonardo and Dürer to Wundt and Ostwald; and DÜCHTING shows (50, 92) that both Hirschfeld-Mack and Kandinsky even used the scheme of tertiary colours, russet, olive and citrine, which had been devised by the English Romantic theorist George Field. Field's most important book was soon translated into German, when the links with Goethe's theory were pointed

out (G. Field, *Chromatographie*, Weimar, 1836, vi), but his tertiary scheme was almost certainly transmitted to the Bauhaus through Owen Jones (*Grammatik des Ornaments*, London, 1868) and Hoelzel, who numbered Jones among his more than fourteen (!) theoretical sources (36). Among the more familiar names of 19th-century colour-theory Hoelzel also mentions his 'praktisch durchgearbeitet und verwertet' study of Schreiber, Raehman, Burnet, Brand, Kreutzer and Kallab, whose work is still virtually unknown to modern scholars. How could Gropius have accepted these incompatibilities of outlook in his institution, and what effect did they have on the Bauhaus students? We know that at least one of them, Josef Albers, to whom DÜCHTING devotes his final chapter, took refuge in empiricism, and relegated theory (or rather theories, for he too recommended Goethe, Schopenhauer and Ostwald, as well as the Americans Munsell and Birren) to the end of his colour-course in the United States (*Interaction of Color*, New Haven 1963, Ch. XXIV). Perhaps the need for a unified theory of colour, such as that which Ostwald demanded so imperiously, was never really felt among artists, architects and designers; and if so, it is surely time to take a closer look at the apparently distinct spheres of early 20th-century art and science. 'Kunst und Technik – keine Einheit'.

John Gage

## BHA DIGITAL UND ONLINE. EIN NACHTRAG

Im November-Heft 1997, S. 642f. wurde die CD-ROM-Version der Datenbanken RAA (1973-1989), RILA (1975-1989) und BHA (1990ff.) vorgestellt. Dank digitaler Aufbereitung ist die bibliographische Recherche nicht nur sehr viel schneller geworden. Es ist nun auch möglich, unterschiedliche Suchkriterien zu verbinden und die Ergebnisse übersichtlich (am Bildschirm oder auf Papier) darzustellen.

Nachteil der BHA-CD ist jedoch ihre mangelhafte Aktualisierung. Die im Mai 1997 ausgelieferte Ausgabe enthält nur Daten bis zum gedruckten Heft 1996/1. Sie hatte im November 1997 einen Verzug von einem vollen Jahr gegenüber der Buchausgabe und wird voraussichtlich erst im Mai 1998 aktualisiert. Die *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* ist z. B. nur bis zum Heft Mai/Juni 1995, das *Burlington Magazine*