FILOZOFIA
Volume 80, Number 1, 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/filozofia.2025.80.1.4

Hegelianism, Theology and Politics in Karl Rosenkranz: Some Historical Remarks on a Still Relevant Question

NORBERT WASZEK, Department of German Studies, University Paris VIII, France

WASZEK, N.: Hegelianism, Theology and Politics in Karl Rosenkranz: Some Historical Remarks on a Still Relevant Question
FILOZOFIA, 80, 2025, No 1, pp. 52 – 66

Karl Rosenkranz (1805 – 1879) was a towering figure of German university life from the 1830s to the 1870s, but he is now mainly remembered for his *Aesthetics of Ugliness* (1853, English translation 2015). The present paper concentrates on Rosenkranz's theological (II) and political (III) thought, preceded by an examination of his relation to Hegel (I). The link between theology and politics is made by Rosenkranz when his "speculative theology" culminates in a section on freedom. In general terms it will be shown that Rosenkranz was inspired by Hegel, without becoming a simple "follower." He was an original mind who deserves to be explored further.

Keywords: Karl Rosenkranz – Hegel – Hegelianism – Protestant theology – political thought around 1848

Introduction

Karl Rosenkranz (1805 – 1879) is remembered today primarily for his *Aesthetics of Ugliness* (1853), an original and influential book, frequently reprinted and widely translated (e.g., Rosenkranz 2015). But the *Aesthetics* came relatively late in Rosenkranz's career and in a specific context, namely, his perception of the failure of the 1848 – 49 Revolution, which led him to turn away from political topics. While the originality of his *Aesthetics* is widely accepted, his many other achievements are often neglected, and he is sometimes treated as a mere follower of Hegel (Prantl 1889, 215; followed by many later critics). This view needs to be corrected. I shall concentrate here not on Rosenkranz's aesthetics

but rather on his theological (II) and political (III) thought, preceded by an examination of his relation to Hegel (I).

Although his is a much less familiar name today, Rosenkranz was among the towering figures of German university life between the 1830s and the 1870s. From the institutional perspective, his importance is underlined by the fact that he occupied Kant's former chair at the University of Königsberg, teaching for more than four decades in this role while serving also as the university's prorector. But his significance rested not merely on his institutional position and teaching but on his *oeuvre*. He was a prolific writer not only in terms of quantitative output – some 65 books and pamphlets and around 250 articles (Jacob 1959) – but also in the remarkable breath of their subject matter, from philosophy and theology, via literary history and the discipline of education, to the arts, urban topography and politics.

It is impossible to follow up each of these subjects in one article, but his work on Kant deserves some introductory remarks. Unlike his immediate predecessor in Kant's chair, J. F. Herbart (1776 – 1841), Rosenkranz honoured Kant and gave a number of public lectures, e.g., on Kant's birthday (April 22) 1836 (published in 1837; Runze 1905). In this lecture, he announced what would become the monument to his efforts on behalf of Kant: a ten-volume edition of Kant's works (1838 – 1842). Rosenkranz realized the project with the help of a colleague, F. W. Schubert (1799 – 1868); on their division of labor see Runze (1905, 550). Their edition remained the standard for decades and was only superseded by that of the Prussian Academy (beginning in 1900). The editors added two volumes: Schubert provided a selection of Kant's letters and his biography of Kant. Rosenkranz added a twelfth volume, a *History of Kant's Philosophy* (1840/1987). This book remained standard reading for many years, up to the richer presentation by Kuno Fischer (1898 – 99) and the more ambitious study by Ernst Cassirer (1918 – 1981). Karl Marx, for example, was a diligent reader of Rosenkranz's book on Kant, excerpting it in 1841 (Marx 1976). Among the strong points of Rosenkranz's book is that he used, long before Dilthey (1833 – 1911), the so-called developmental approach. He distinguishes between three stages of Kant's thought: the "heuristic," 1746 – 1770, the speculative-systematic, 1770 – 1790 and the practical epoch, 1790 – 1804. He also explores the thinkers who had an impact on Kant (e.g., Hume, Voltaire and Rousseau) and succeeded in showing how Kant's thought emerged from his own time. Last but not least, his study has a high literary quality. In his correspondence, Rosenkranz explains his literary ambition as follows: "I want to write in such a modern way that people will not associate

me with stuffy Königsberg, but as if I had just walked out of Véry [a fashionable restaurant in Paris] where I had lunch with Heine" (Rosenkranz 1994, 160).

Orthodox Kantians might say that Rosenkranz was too much of a Hegelian (see below) to deal with their master fairly. While it is true that Rosenkranz uses expressions such as "overcoming" (*Überwindung*; Rosenkranz, 1840, 438) and "looking beyond" (*hinausblicken*; Rosenkranz 1877, VIII), it is not so much his Hegelianism that prompted him to proceed in that manner as his conception of the history of philosophy: he also examined Fichte, Schopenhauer and Schelling as successors of Kant, and, when dealing with Hegel, he too is portrayed as trying to "reform" or "improve" Kant's thought (Rosenkranz 1852). Rosenkranz's contextual reading of Kant showed its strength when an unhistorical "return to Kant" became fashionable towards the end of the 19th century. His 1840 *Kant* is complemented by a string of articles, often first published in reviews, then assembled into collections (1839) and (1877).

Finally, to indicate the breadth of his scholarship, Rosenkranz's sustained and intensive work on Diderot should be mentioned. His earlier articles culminate in his two-volume *Diderot, His Life and Work* (1866). For the German National Biography, his book on Diderot is "perhaps his greatest achievement" (Prantl 1889, 214). It was not only the first book-length treatment of Diderot in German but also, beyond mere chronology, the foundation of modern Diderot research (Boddin 1981).

Either of the two books, on Kant and Diderot, should have guaranteed Rosenkranz a place in the collective memory, and yet, while he enjoyed a wide and international impact during his lifetime (with translations into English, e.g., Rosenkranz 1874), it took a long time before these books were reissued: his *Diderot* was reprinted in 1964, the book on Kant only in 1987.

I. Rosenkranz in Relation to Hegel

Among Hegel scholars, Rosenkranz is known and respected for his numerous studies of the philosopher, above all his intellectual biography (1844) of Hegel, frequently reprinted and translated into several languages (but not yet into English). This biography, a supplement to the first edition of Hegel's collected works, only 13 years after the philosopher's death, benefitted from this historical proximity to Hegel and to his still-living contemporaries. Hegel's family authorized the book and put many manuscripts and documents at Rosenkranz's disposal. Since he printed a number of unpublished materials as

an appendix (Rosenkranz 1844, 429 – 566), his biography remains an indispensable resource. Later, writing for Hegel's centenary (1870, V), Rosenkranz would reassert the authenticity of his biography and express the conviction that it would remain his lasting legacy.

But how did Rosenkranz find his way to Hegel? When he arrived as a student in Berlin, Hegel was at the pinnacle of his career. Such was his reputation that some students; for example, D. F. Strauß (1808 – 1874) would later come specially to Berlin to listen to his lectures. This was not the case for Rosenkranz – he was not a regular student of Hegel himself and attended only an introduction to Hegel's *Encyclopaedia*, taught by L. von Henning (1791 – 1866). In his autobiography, he felt the need to explain these circumstances (1873, 187). While also alluding to Hegel's unattractive lecturing style, Rosenkranz admits that, at the time, he was still under the "spell" (Rosenkranz 1873, 192) of Schleiermacher (1768 – 1834). Through the latter's teaching, sermons (1873, 162f.) and intellectual circle (including Friedrich Schlegel), Rosenkranz became a Romantic, and it took him a long time to leave this orientation behind. He underlined this detachment and the inner struggles it implied on several occasions (e.g., Rosenkranz 1873, VIII). Only after leaving Berlin, when he continued his studies at Halle, did Rosenkranz really study Hegel seriously, especially in the winter term 1826 – 27, when he came under the influence of H. F. W. Hinrichs (1794 – 1861). Hinrichs had been Hegel's student at Heidelberg, and the philosopher singled him out by writing a preface to Hinrichs' first publication (Hinrichs 1822). In Halle, Rosenkranz immersed himself in Hegel's Jena writings and the *Phenomenology of Spirit* in particular, a book which moved him to "intellectual ecstasy" and made a "new man" out of him (Rosenkranz 1873, 290f.). The crucial document that shows his liberation from Schleiermacher's intellectual sway is the critical review Rosenkranz published of the second edition of Schleiermacher's *Christian Faith* (Rosenkranz 1836).

While working on his biography of Hegel, Rosenkranz corresponded with Hegel's family, and his letters (Rosenkranz 1994; Waszek 1997) reveal his admiring attitude towards the philosopher, for example, a letter to Hegel's son Karl (1813 – 1901):

> I took it upon myself to write about the life of your father, to whom I owe my own spiritual [life], quite instinctively. I am the right person to do this. That's

> how it came to me…. I will…at the same time be Hegel's apologist, because the criticism of his philosophy is not my task (Rosenkranz 1994, 212).

It is noteworthy that, next to the acknowledgement that he owed his spiritual/intellectual [*geistiges*] life to Hegel, is the term "apologist." It is often a distinctive feature of a philosophical school that its head, even after his death, is defended by former disciples. In Hegel's case there are numerous examples of such apologetics (Waszek 2020, 373). Rosenkranz fits well into this pattern: his early missive (1834) against Bachmann's (1785 – 1855) attacks on Hegel is clearly apologetic, and his pamphlet against Rudolf Haym (1821 – 1901) even carries the term "apology" proudly in its title (1858).

His biography and defences of Hegel as well as his role in publishing Hegel's collected works (Hegel 1840) distinguish Rosenkranz as a leading member of Hegel's school. He also contributed to the journals that were published by Hegel's disciples, in particular to the *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik* (Jamme 1994), later also to the *Hallische Jahrbücher* (Hundt 2010) and, at least in its beginnings, to the review *Der Gedanke* around Karl Ludwig Michelet (1801 – 1893). He also participated in the battles among Hegel's followers, for example, in his reviews of Daub, Feuerbach, Marheineke and Strauß. That Rosenkranz understood himself in the 1830s and '40s as a loyal follower of Hegel is beyond doubt. In 1834 he wrote to von Henning: "I want to live and die for Hegel and think I can still achieve a lot" (Rosenkranz 1994, 84).

And yet the conclusion that he was a staunch Hegelian needs to be nuanced not only, as already indicated, with regard to his early years, but also because of the "modifications" and "improvements" of Hegel's system he carried out, starting in (1846). In retrospect, Rosenkranz describes how he gradually arrived at his somewhat "revisionist" outlook (1862, 6 – 9). His intention to not only reproduce Hegel's philosophy but to renew it emerges most clearly in his publications of the 1850s (1850). But only when he published his *Wissenschaft der logischen Idee* (1858 – 59) did he receive strong and often hostile reactions, notably from the circle around Michelet and August von Cieszkowski (1814 – 1894). Although Rosenkranz was a corresponding member of Michelet's society (Rosenkranz 1862, 11f.) and, when in Berlin, he also presented papers in person (1861), Michelet gave two lectures attacking him (Michelet 1860). Rosenkranz may either have been genuinely embittered or he was reacting with subtle irony when he said that he was thus "solemnly dismissed as a Hegelian" (Rosenkranz 1862, 15). A little later, another critic, Ferdinand Lassalle (1825 – 1864) (see Bernstein 1893; Dawson 1899) joined

Michelet's attack. Lassalle was already a leading light of the Labour movement, but also, as can be seen from his paper, a fine connoisseur of Hegel (Lassalle 1861). While Michelet's petty vanities did not really call for a reply, the sincerity of Lassalle's criticism (and probably his reputation beyond the scholarly circles; Rosenkranz 1862, 11) induced Rosenkranz to react in 1862. Lassalle's main criticism is that Rosenkranz compromised the whole structure and architecture of Hegel's *Logic* (Lassalle 1861, 123 – 125). He condemns the fact that Rosenkranz removed the categories of mechanism and chemism completely and that he displaced the section on teleology in the part on "objective logic" (Lassalle 1861, 126). According to Lassalle, Rosenkranz was not only doing an injustice to Hegel but also harming his philosophy of history, which requires a decisive logical foundation (Lassalle 1861, 138f.; 1919, 43f.). It needs to be mentioned in this context that Lassalle understood his main work (1861a), published almost simultaneously, to be a Hegelian philosophy of history (Fetscher 1982, 666).

To what extent are these criticisms justified? From a strictly systematic perspective, Lassalle seems to have a point (Rinaldi 2021, 169). But personally, I would soften his verdict. There is a constant risk that a structure which Hegel was constantly working upon is petrified into a dogma, since Hegel, as Rosenkranz underlines, was attempting throughout his life to improve his system (Rosenkranz 1862, 13f.; cf. Strauß 1837, 3, 120). In this context, Rosenkranz is also referring to J. E. Erdmann (1805 – 1892) who documented all the differences in Hegel's versions of his *Logic* (Erdmann 1853, 731 – 766), an effort that revealed not only that Hegel was always prepared to revise, but also how far his modifications went (Rosenkranz 1862, 14). Considering Hegel's openness to innovation, Rosenkranz accuses Michelet of "dogmatism" (Rosenkranz 1862, 12). Another argument in defense of Rosenkranz – I owe this to an exchange with Dr. Martin Walter (Munich) – is that his detailed knowledge of Kant (see above) allowed him to detect more borrowings from Kant than Hegel explicitly acknowledged. This is highly relevant for Rosenkranz's restructuring of Hegel's *Logic*.

At any rate, even if Rosenkranz, in his efforts to "improve" Hegel's system, may have gone wrong here and there, he merits our recognition for overcoming a dogmatic attachment to a closed system and for making improvements to that system a topic of debate. His intention was not to overthrow Hegel's system, but to let its original intention come to the fore in a purer form (Rosenkranz 1862, 10). Writing in the year of Rosenkranz's death,

Quäbicker (1879, 5) called him the "most ingenious, most versatile and most productive" follower of Hegel.

II. Rosenkranz's Theology

Rosenkranz studied Protestant theology, next to philosophy and philology, at the three universities he attended (Berlin, Halle, and Heidelberg), and it remained one of his favourite subjects. It has to be recalled that religion and politics were the pathways that led Hegel himself to philosophy, and that they remained vital issues in the disputes among Hegel's school. When Strauß classified Hegel's disciples he put Rosenkranz neither on the left nor the right, but at the centre (Strauß 1837, 120).

Rosenkranz's first book in the field, his *Encyclopaedia of the Theological Sciences* (1831), was written when he was still lecturing at Halle. His recent reorientation, from Schleiermacher to Hegel, is a way to approach his text, for both men make remarkable appearances in it. Rosenkranz begins with the different appreciations of the relation between religion and philosophy. Why can philosophy no longer be the handmaid of theology? Why can the roles not simply be reversed? Rosenkranz rejects the opposition between religion and philosophy and is clearly adhering to Hegel's theorem of the identity of the content of religion and philosophy (Jaeschke 2016, 465), and he mentions Hegel explicitly and laudatorily in this context (Rosenkranz 1831, XXI). This, of course, implies a critical perspective on Schleiermacher, since theology, unlike religiosity, cannot remain within the spheres of feeling and representation (Rosenkranz 1831, X), but he does not mention Schleiermacher here explicitly, only later, when he is looking at previous encyclopaedias of theology. Most of them, Rosenkranz asserts, are an unorganized "aggregate" or amalgam of different disciplines (Rosenkranz 1831, XXIII). As examples of such an unsatisfactory procedure, he mentions J. F. Kleuker (1749 – 1827), J. A. H. Tittmann (1773 – 1831), J. F. W. Thym (1768 – 1803) and G. J. Planck (1751 – 1833). By contrast, Schleiermacher is praised (Rosenkranz 1831, XXIII). The second place where Rosenkranz refers to Schleiermacher is when he presents his account of dogmatics. After criticizing J. A. L. Wegscheider (1771 – 1849) and H. G. Tzschirner (1778 – 1828) – again for their indiscriminate mixture of biblical and church doctrines, the views of eminent theologians and philosophers, with their own reasoning – he singles out two contemporary theologians for their dogmatics: Schleiermacher and P. K. Marheineke (1780 – 1846). In spite of their differences, they were both distinguished by the originality of their thought and their perfect presentation (Rosenkranz 1831,

XXV). But bringing these two together is a far from obvious move. Marheineke was *the* Hegelian in the Theology Faculty of Berlin, whereas Schleiermacher, next to von Savigny, was Hegel's foremost enemy. An explanation might be that while Rosenkranz, by the time he wrote this, had made up his mind in favour of Hegel, he did not want to break completely with Schleiermacher, either out of nostalgia for his former hero or in order to win readers beyond the Hegelian circle. In one of his autobiographical texts, admittedly written much later, Rosenkranz claims that his *Encyclopaedia* was, even in its very title, his modest imitation of Hegel's *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences* (Rosenkranz 1873, 440).

Rosenkranz's main text, after the longish introduction, is divided into three principal parts. Firstly, there is the speculative theology which is supposed to develop the idea of the Christian religion as the absolute religion and show how its knowledge starts from this idea and is thus the absolute self-recognition of religion (Rosenkranz 1831, XXXIV). Secondly, the historical theology deals with the understanding of how the absolute religion expressed itself in space and time; its task is to comprehend the essence of absolute religion via its appearance in the empirical world with all its contingencies. Thirdly, practical theology is divided into what he calls 'church service' (*Kirchendienst*: catechetics, liturgics and homiletics) and 'church governance' (*Kirchenregiment*), where he deals, amongst other subjects, with ecclesiastical law.

This order is not the one Hegel followed in his *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion* since these only came out a year later (Hegel 1832). Unlike in the initial presentation, Hegel is rarely referred to in the main text (but see Rosenkranz 1831, 324), where there are few precise references at all. And yet, Rosenkranz's *Encyclopaedia* is in many ways distinctly Hegelian. While its internal structure does not correspond exactly to Hegel's *Philosophy of Religion*, there can be no doubt that he puts religion in the same place as Hegel: within the "philosophy of spirit," more precisely in its third section, the "absolute spirit" (Rosenkranz 1831, XXII).

Close to Hegel is also Rosenkranz's conception of the growing unity of the divine and the human, an issue which he broaches with the concept of the *Gottmensch* (Rosenkranz 1831, 38 – 40). Jesus is the incarnation of the idea of this unity. Human nature is elevated by the identity with the divine. While, conversely, God might seem humbled by his unity with human nature, in reality it is the highest manifestation of its essence. Nature, including human nature, is

not too base for God, but part of his essence (Rosenkranz 1831, 38; Gans in Hegel 1833, XI; for a modern appreciation of the issue, see Vieweg 2023).

In a long section on the political history of the church (Rosenkranz 1831, 177 – 221) – "church" stands for the Christian church(es) – a transition is made from religion to politics. While Hegel had dealt with a multiplicity of religions (Chinese, Indian, Persian, Egyptian etc.) (Stewart 2018, 2022), Rosenkranz concentrates on the history of the Christian churches, from the early church's struggle for recognition by the Roman Empire, via the fight between Catholicism and Protestantism, to the conflicts between the two branches of Protestantism, Lutheran and Calvinist, and their resolution in the Prussian Church Union (cf. Clark 1996). He finds an interesting starting point by insisting on the right of existence of churches, a right that can be contested neither by the state nor by other churches (Rosenkranz 1831, 177f.). Is toleration the correct word to describe this attitude? Only if it is not mere acquiescence (*Duldung*) but the explicit recognition of the right of other religions to exist. The political realisation of such a tolerance comes at the end of the Thirty Years' War, with the treaties known under the collective name of the Peace of Westphalia (1648), an achievement that Rosenkranz celebrates as the Magna Charta of Europe (Rosenkranz 1831, 215): a mutual recognition of Catholicism and Protestantism. The principle of *cuius regio, eius religio* (literally, whose realm, their religion) established by the Peace of Augsburg (1555) meant that the religion of the ruler determines the religion of those who live in his territory. But considerable allowances were made in order to protect the religious freedom of minorities living in territories where another religion predominates (Duchhardt 2015). Like Hegel, Rosenkranz seems to privilege the Protestant churches for the advancement of political liberty.

III. Rosenkranz's Political Options and Activities

Rosenkranz played a prominent political role in the 1848 Revolution (Rosenkranz 1919). When he came to Königsberg in 1833, he found himself in an environment of political opposition to the Prussian status quo. He belonged to the circle around Theodor von Schön (1773 – 1856) (see Gray 1971), a political survivor of the Reform movement of 1807, who pleaded for a constitution when Friedrich Wilhelm IV became King of Prussia. In 1848, Schön (who had become a member of the parliament at St. Paul's in Frankfurt) seems to have helped Rosenkranz find a senior position in the ministry in Berlin, a position that he held from July 1848 to January 1849. That he accepted leaving his chair (for a while) is an indication that he was optimistic about the outcome of the

events. Yet the fact that he only held out a little more than six months suggests rapid disenchantment. The same holds true for his membership of the Prussian Upper House, from February to June 1849, only to return to his university chair later that year (Butzlaff 2005, 70). Rosenkranz's reaction to the failure of the 1848 – 49 Revolution is similar to other members of Hegel's school: a certain resignation and withdrawal from politics into academic research, primarily in the fields of aesthetics and the history of ideas. The book which Rosenkranz wrote next was the *Aesthetics of Ugliness* (*Ästhetik des Häßlichen*), a remarkable book in many respects, but not strictly Hegelian. It was also a way for him to retire to apolitical or at least less contentious subjects.

But Rosenkranz's political thought is not confined to 1848 – 49; it has to be viewed in a longer perspective. When we do so, the Hegelian heritage and strategy become more obvious. Like Hegel, Rosenkranz praised the achievements of the Prussian Reform movement – in this he must have been reinforced by his contact with von Schön. In particular, he appreciated the educational system associated with Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767 – 1835); the municipal system of 1808, further improved in the 1830s, a step towards modern local self-government; this involved the appointment of civil servants on the basis not of birth but of aptitude, established through examinations. But he also underlined in Hegelian manner what was in line with reason yet unrealized in Prussia, the founding of a constitutional order. The historical background of this is well-known (Waszek 2006, 42): Friedrich Wilhelm III had promised to give Prussia a constitution and thus turn it into a constitutional monarchy, but he never fulfilled that promise. Hegel's own response to this situation had been somewhat ambivalent: on the one hand, he considered constitutional monarchy to be in accordance with his time, in line with reason; yet, on the other hand, his attitude remained one of passive expectation. This ambivalence was rooted in Hegel's conviction that contemporary Prussia was close to reconciling the consciousness and the realization of freedom. He thought political freedom to be immanently given and its explicit realization, i.e., the fulfilment of the constitutional promise, to be near at hand. Hegel's attitude has been called a "relative political reconciliation" with the existing order (Lübbe 1974, 93). The longer the wait – when Friedrich Wilhelm III died and his son came to the throne (1840), he soon made clear that he had no intention of keeping his father's promise – the less his disciples could uphold Hegel's attitude. They became more outspoken and explicitly called for a constitution, though they rarely went beyond the demand for a constitutional monarchy, and for the most part they were not in favour of a republic (Michelet

1848). Constitutional monarchy is also Rosenkranz's option in 1849, when he pleads for a constitution in Prussia, in order to preserve the unity of the country, whereas republics would lead to conflicts and civil war (Rosenkranz 1875, 139 – 141). In general terms, Rosenkranz is playing off Hegel's theoretical progressivism against his practical prudence. An example is when, in his 1870 book, he insists that several crucial elements of the modern state – a constitution, the admittance of the general public to tribunals, freedom of the press, equality of citizens before the law, participation of citizens in legislation and in the approval of taxes – were missing in contemporary Prussia, but were shown to be necessary in Hegel's *Philosophy of Right* (Rosenkranz 1870, 152).

Rosenkranz did not stop calling for a constitution, and he also thought about how to shape a constitutional monarchy. Hegel's political philosophy, especially in his 1817 – 18 lectures, already contained hints of the role of a legitimate opposition (Hegel 1995, 276f., 290f.). But it was left to Hegel's disciples to elaborate this conception. When Gans lectured on Hegel's *Philosophy of Right* in 1828 – 29, and then in 1837 (Gans 1971, 135 – 137; Gans 1991, 155f.), he boldly integrated a theory of opposition into his course. Arnold Ruge and the Bauer brothers followed this up in texts from the early 1840s (Ruge 1842; Bauer 1843). But Rosenkranz was more decisive in turning these reflections into a full study of what is meant by a "political party" (Rosenkranz 1843), one of the earliest studies of the subject in Germany (Erbentraut 2009).

Finally, Rosenkranz also participated in another debate of the Hegel school, namely, the one on the "social question" (Waszek 2023, 85f.). While in this respect he falls short of Gans and Michelet (1849), who follow up and extend Hegel's excursions into political economy, Rosenkranz did study the condition of the poor at his local level (in Königsberg) and suggested ways to improve their situation (Rosenkranz 1919 [1848], 95 – 99).

Conclusion

Rosenkranz's encyclopaedic genius, inspired by Hegel, touched upon theology and politics in an original manner. While he remained a profound connoisseur of Hegel, he was more than a mere follower, frequently going beyond his master and proving to be a creative mind who deserves to be explored further.

Bibliography

BAUER, E. (1843): *Staat, Religion und Parthei*. Leipzig: Wigand.

BERNSTEIN, E. (1893): *Ferdinand Lassalle as a Social Reformer*. Trans. by Eleanor Marx Aveling. London: Swan Sonnenschein.

BODDIN, H. (1981): *Karl Rosenkranz als Literarhistoriker. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Goethe - und Diderotstudien*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
BUTZLAFF, J. (2005): Rosenkranz, Karl. In: *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vols. 1 – 27. Ed. by the Bavarian Academy of Sciences. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot 1953 – 2020, vol. 22, 70 – 71.
CASSIRER, E. (1981): *Kant's Life and Thought* [1918]. Trans. by James Haden with an Introduction by Stephan Korner. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
CLARK, C. (1996): Confessional Policy and the Limits of State Action: Frederick William III and the Prussian Church Union 1817 – 40. *The Historical Journal*, 39 (4), 985 – 1004. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2639865
DAWSON, W. H. (1899): *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle* [1888], 3rd ed. (revised and enlarged). London: Swan Sonnenschein.
DUCHHARDT, H. (2015): The Peace of Westphalia: A European Peace. In: Asbach, O. – Schröder, P. (eds.): *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Thirty Years' War*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 309 – 318.
ERBENTRAUT, P. (2009): Karl Rosenkranz als Parteienforscher. *Jahrbuch zur Liberalismus-Forschung*, 21, 121 – 142.
ERDMANN, J. E. (1853): *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Spekulation seit Kant*. Leipzig: Vogel.
FETSCHER, I. (1982): Lassalle, Ferdinand. *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 13 (1982), 661 – 669.
FISCHER, K. (1898 – 1899): *Immanuel Kant und seine Lehre*, vols. 1 – 2. Heidelberg: Winter.
GANS, E. (1971): Naturrechtsvorlesung des Wintersemesters 1828/29. *Eduard Gans: Philosophische Schriften*. Ed. by H. Schröder. Glashütten im Taunus: Auvermann.
GANS, E. (1991): Zur Theorie der Opposition [dated November 2, 1837]. In: Waszek, N. (ed.): *Eduard Gans (1797 – 1839): Hegelianer – Jude – Europäer*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 155 – 156.
GRAY, M. W. (1971): *Theodor von Schön and Prussian Reforms 1806 – 1808*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin-Madison.
HEGEL, G. W. F. (1832): *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion*, vols. 1 – 2. Ed. by Philipp Marheineke. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
HEGEL, G. W. F. (1833): *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts* [1821], 2nd ed. Ed. by E. Gans, Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
HEGEL, G. W. F. (1840): *Philosophische Propädeutik*. Ed. by K. Rosenkranz. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
HEGEL, G. W. F. (1995): *Lectures on Natural Right and Political Science* [1817/18]. Trans. by J. M. Stewart – P. C. Hodgson. Berkeley, California: California University Press.
HINRICHS, H. F. W. (1822): *Die Religion im inneren Verhältnis zur Wissenschaft*. Heidelberg: Karl Groos.
HUNDT, M. (2010), *Der Redaktionsbriefwechsel der Hallischen, Deutschen und der Deutsch - Französischen Jahrbücher (1837 – 1844)*, vols. 1 – 3. Berlin: Akademie.
JACOB, H. (1959): Karl Rosenkranz. *Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung aus den Quellen*, vol. 14. Berlin: Akademie, 909 – 937.
JAESCHKE, W. (2016): *Hegel-Handbuch. Leben – Werk – Schule* [2003], 3rd ed. Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler.

JAMME, C. (1994): *Die "Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik." Hegels Berliner Gegenakademie*, Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt: Frommann.
KANT, I. (1838 – 1842): *Immanuel Kants sämmtliche Werke*, vols. 1 – 10. Ed. by K. Rosenkranz – F. W. Schubert. Leipzig: Voss.
KANT, I. (1900 –): *Kants gesammelte Schriften*. Ed. by the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences. Berlin: Reimer (later De Gruyter), 1900ff. (not yet completed).
LASSALLE, F. (1861): Die Hegel'sche und die Rosenkranz'sche Logik, und die Grundlage der Hegel'schen Geschichtsphilosophie (presented on January 29, 1859). *Der Gedanke*. II (1861), 123 – 150. Now available in: Lassalle (1919), 15 – 60.
LASSALLE, F. (1861a): *Das System der erworbenen Rechte. Eine Versöhnung des positiven Rechts und der Rechtsphilosophie*, vols. 1 – 2. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
LASSALLE, F. (1919): *Gesammelte Reden und Schriften*, vols. 1 – 12. Ed. by E. Bernstein, Berlin: Paul Cassirer.
LÜBBE, H. (1974): *Politische Philosophie in Deutschland. Studien zu ihrer Geschichte*. 2nd ed. Munich: DTV.
MARX, K. (1976): Notizen zur Geschichte der kantischen Schule [1841]. In: Labuske, H. (ed): Marx, *Exzerpte und Notizen bis 1842* [MEGA, IV.1]. Berlin: Dietz, 277 – 288.
MICHELET, K. L. (1848): *Zur Verfassungsfrage*. Frankfurt an der Oder and Berlin: Trowitzsch.
MICHELET, K. L. (1849): *Die gesellschaftliche Frage in ihrem Verhältnis zum freien Handel*. Berlin: Friedrich Gerhard.
MICHELET, K. L. (1860): Rosenkranz' Wissenschaft der logischen Idee. *Der Gedanke*, I, 20 – 58; 81 – 111.
PRANTL, C. (1889): Rosenkranz, Joh. Karl Friedrich. In: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vols. 1 – 56. Ed. by the Bavarian Academy of Sciences. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot 1875-1912, vol. 29, 213 – 215.
QUÄBICKER, R. (1879): *Karl Rosenkranz. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Hegelschen Philosophie*. Leipzig: Koschny.
RINALDI, G. (2021): *The Philosophy of Art*. Oxford: Pertinent Press.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1831): *Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften*. Halle: Schwetschke.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1834): *Hegel. Sendschreiben an den Hofrath und Professor Carl Friedrich Bachmann in Jena*. Königsberg: Unzer.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1836): *Kritik der Schleiermacherschen Glaubenslehre*. Königsberg: Unzer.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1837): Die Gesamtausgabe der Kant'schen Schriften. *Dioskuren*. Vol. 2, 18 – 35, reprinted in his *Studien* (1839), 232 – 254.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1839): *Studien*. Vol. I. Berlin: Jonas.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1840): *Geschichte der Kant'schen Philosophie*. Leipzig: Voss. In 1987, Steffen Dietzsch prepared a new edition with an instructive presentation (417 – 431), Berlin: Akademie.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1843): *Über den Begriff der politischen Partei: Rede zum 18. Januar 1843*. Königsberg: Theile.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1844): *Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's Leben*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.

ROSENKRANZ, K. (1846): *Studien*, Part III *Die Modificationen der Logik*. Leipzig: Gustav Brauns.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1850): *System der Wissenschaft: ein philosophisches Encheiridion*. Königsberg: Bornträger.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1852): *Meine Reform der Hegelschen Philosophie*. Königsberg: Bornträger.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1853): *Ästhetik des Häßlichen*. Königsberg: Bornträger.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1854): *Aus einem Tagebuch: Königsberg Herbst 1833 bis Frühjahr 1846*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1858): *Apologie Hegels gegen Dr. R. Haym*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1858 – 59): *Wissenschaft der logischen Idee*, vols. 1 – 2. Königsberg: Bornträger.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1861): Hegels Ansichten über die Reform der Universitäten. *Der Gedanke*. I (1861), 244 – 247.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1862): *Epilegomena zu meiner Wissenschaft der logischen Idee: als Replik gegen die Kritik der Herren Michelet und Lassalle*. Königsberg: Bornträger.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1866): *Diderots Leben und Werke*. vols. 1 – 2. Leipzig: Brockhaus. Reprint: Aalen: Scientia, 1964.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1870): *Hegel als deutscher Nationalphilosoph*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1873): *Von Magdeburg nach Königsberg*. Berlin: Heimann.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1874): *Hegel as the National Philosopher of Germany*. Trans. by Granville Stanley Hall. St. Louis, Missouri: Gray, Baker & Co.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1875): Republik und konstitutionelle Monarchie [1849]. *Neue Studien*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Koschny, 1875, 136 – 157.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1877): *Neue Studien*. Vol. 3: *Studien zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte*. Leipzig: Koschny.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1919): *Politische Briefe und Aufsätze 1848 – 1856*. Ed. by P. Herre. Leipzig: Dieterich.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (1994): *Karl Rosenkranz: Briefe 1827 bis 1850*. Ed. by J. Butzlaff. Berlin: De Gruyter.
ROSENKRANZ, K. (2015): *Aesthetics of Ugliness*: *A Critical Edition*. Ed. and Trans. by A. Pop – M. Widrich. London and New York: Bloomsbury.
RUGE, A. (1842): Kritik und Partei. Der Vorwurf gegen die neueste Geistesentwicklung. *Deutsche Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Kunst*, 5, 1175 – 1182.
RUNZE, M. (1905): Karl Rosenkranz' Verdienste um die Kant-Forschung. *Kant-Studien*. X, 548 – 557.
SCHLEIERMACHER, F. (2016): *Christian Faith* [1821/22; 2nd ed. 1830/31]. A new translation and critical edition, vols. 1 – 2. Ed. by C. L. Kelsey – T. N. Tice. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press.
STEWART, J. (2018): *Hegel's Interpretation of the Religions of the World: The Logic of the Gods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

STEWART, J. (2022): *An Introduction to Hegel's Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion: The Issue of Religious Content in the Enlightenment and Romanticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

STRAUSS, D.F. (1837): *Streitschriften zur Verteidigung meiner Schrift über das Leben Jesu und zur Charakteristik der gegenwärtigen Theologie. 3, Die evangelische Kirchenzeitung, die Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik, und die theologischen Studien und Kritiken in ihrer Stellung zu meiner Kritik des Lebens Jesu*. Tübingen: Osiander.

VIEWEG, K. (2023): *Hegel: The Philosopher of Freedom*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

WASZEK, N. (1997): Karl Rosenkranz als Hegelianer – Im Lichte seiner Briefe. *Jahrbuch für Hegelforschung*, 3, 287 – 294.

WASZEK, N. (2006): Eduard Gans on "Poverty and on the Constitutional Debate." In: Moggach, D. (ed.): *The New Hegelians: Politics and Philosophy in the Hegelian School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 24 – 49.

WASZEK, N. (2020): Hegelsche Schule, Links- und Rechtshegelianer, Jung- und Althegelianer. In: Eke, N. O. (ed.): *Vormärz – Handbuch*. Bielefeld: Aisthesis, 372 – 380.

WASZEK, N. (2023): Die Hegel-Schule. In: Hartung, G. (ed.): *Die Philosophie des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Vol. I/2: *Deutschsprachiger Raum 1830 – 1870*. Basel: Schwabe, 59 – 93.

Norbert Waszek
University Paris VIII
Department of German Studies
128, rue de la Tombe Issoire
F-75014-Paris
France
e-mail: norbert.waszek@gmail.com
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0107-6029