

Waltraud Maierhofer

**Angelica Kauffmann Reads Goethe:
Illustration and Symbolic Representation in the Göschen Edition**



Figure 1 *Goethe's Schriften*. Vol. 5 (Leipzig: Göschen, 1788), frontispiece and title page with vignette.

An important and neglected issue in the context of book illustrations is the use of engraved

images on title pages and as frontispieces. As investigated in detail in the recent volume on book illustration in the eighteenth century edited by Christina Ionescu, they literally form a “visual periphery of the text.”¹ With the expansion of literacy and the book market as well as improved printing techniques, these images were immensely popular in the eighteenth century. Questions that arise in reference to these images include: Can they be regarded as illustrations in the sense of establishing a relation to specific texts? Which ones were merely more or less randomly chosen images that added to the aesthetic appeal of a book? When does decor verge on parody? What characteristics made them likely to take on a life of their own?

This article discusses three illustrations of works by Johann Wolfgang Goethe by the pre-eminent eighteenth-century artist Angelica Kauffmann (1741–1807) before 1790. Two of them were published as frontispieces in the first edition of Goethe’s collected writings, the Göschen edition:

1. A scene from Goethe’s play *Iphigenie auf Tauris* (*Iphigenia in Tauris*), a drawing which Kauffmann gave to the author as a present. Today it is highly popular on the internet² and in editions of the play, in popular and scholarly publications alike. It was not published during Goethe’s lifetime. However, he strategically placed a description of it in his autobiographical account, *Italian Journey*, where Kauffman’s sympathetic way of reading not only underlines their friendship and the affinity of poetry and painting but serves as a model for reading *Iphigenia*.

2. A scene from Goethe’s play *Egmont* that conveys her interpretation of the main characters (see figure 1). Goethe, in letters and again in *Italian Journey*, recommends her view to the reader as a positive model—contrary to the play’s first reception in Germany. The drawing may also have contained a “message” to its author about their friendship. The drawing was

engraved by one of Goethe's artist-friends in Rome, Johann Heinrich Lips (1758–1817) and chosen as the frontispiece of volume 5 (1788) of his writings, *Goethe's Schriften*, containing that play.



Figure 2 *Goethe's Schriften*. Volume 8. Leipzig: Göschen, 1789. Frontispiece and title page with vignette engraved by Lips after Angelica Kauffmann.

3. The third one is not an illustration of a specific text, but of a relationship of artist and poet, an allegorical portrait of Goethe/a poet with the muses of tragedy and comedy. It appeared, also engraved by Lips, one year after Goethe's return to Weimar in volume 8 of his *Schriften* (1789) containing poems (see figure 2). It has traditionally been read as the muses paying

homage to Goethe.

Kauffmann's images assert a relationship between illustration and text that diverges from the marginal decoration still common in the eighteenth century.³ The two images of scenes in Goethe's plays *Egmont* and *Iphigenia* offer strong readings/ interpretations of Goethe's texts. The choice of pivotal scenes to portray and the particular presentation of these scenes direct reader attention to them and set the emotional frame for reading by doing the following. Kauffmann's designs for the *Egmont* volume and for *Iphigenie* are in the tradition of history painting, of selecting a "pregnant moment" in the narrative. They focus what has happened before and is about to happen into one composition. They translate the narrative's linearity into the visual's simultaneity and offer a specific "reading" of a literary work. The artist read and discussed the works in question (*Iphigenia*, *Egmont*) with the author who was in turn highly involved with questions of art and aesthetics. It is also important to note that Goethe discussed these two images in his autobiographical work *Italienische Reise (Italian Journey)*, published several decades later, publicly affirming and emphasizing the "correctness" of Kauffmann's reading of his literary works over criticism he encountered. He also pointed out that the drawings were presents to him based on the artist's own inventions, invaluable signs of her friendship and esteem for him, not orders for illustrations. The "message" of friendship and tender relations was already implicit in the drawings. These two illustrations thus achieve a level of interrelation between text and image that approached the kind of 'symbolic representation' Goethe advocated but after 1800 felt he could not realize any more with artists he knew then. The setting of an emotional stage would become even clearer when including and contrasting the frontispiece by Lips and vignettes by Adam Friedrich Oeser which goes beyond the scope of this article. With

regard to the allegorical portrait with the muses of tragedy and comedy, I suggest turning the interpretation around and viewing it as the writer seeking advice and inspiration from the painter. Kauffmann represented herself as Goethe's muse and problematized the act of creativity. She worked with and subtly reformed the common male projection of the muse. In a general sense the scene reflects the visual arts as inspiring poetry. With this composition, Kauffmann shares Goethe's concept of symbolism.

The terms of the visual as periphery of the text are useful in this context: the frontispiece allegory of Muses and poet or the visual arts and poetry is part of the peritext, of the material book, not a paratext.⁴ As coined by Gerard Genette, a paratext is part of the book that influences how we read and interpret the text although it is not part of the main narrative.

Illustration Practices and the Göschen Edition of *Goethe's Writings*

With the exception of the engraver Daniel Chodowiecki (1726–1801) who illustrated forty almanacs (*Taschenbücher*) and 55 novels between 1769 and 1799 (Geck 145, 147),⁵ book illustrations within the German-language eighteenth-century market remain remarkably understudied.⁶ Doris Schumacher in her recent monograph on illustration in German periodicals from 1790 to 1810 includes a chapter on Goethe illustrations (Schumacher 138-212). Before 1790, such illustrations—or better: images in books—were generally regarded as merely decorative. August Wilhelm Schlegel in his 1799 essay “Ueber Zeichnungen zu Gedichten und John Flaxman's Umriss” (“About Designs to Poems and John Flaxman's Outlines”) vehemently opposed the argument that viewing book illustrations could replace visiting art collections—which were accessible only to a very small part of the population. After Schlegel, several critics discussed book illustrations. Opinions ranged from disrespect as unoriginal “Fabrikware”

("mass-manufactured goods") to most positive evaluation as minute masterpieces, from demanding of the illustrator closeness to the illustrated text to artistic independence.

Scholarship on the primacy of visuality in Goethe's writings is extensive.⁷ According to his autobiographical account of his two-year sojourn in Italy, it was only during that period in his late thirties that Goethe became convinced that writing, not painting, was his greatest talent. While there is rich information and imagery available on artists who illustrated works by Goethe from the Romantics onwards, such as Peter Cornelius, Eugen Delacroix, Ernst Barlach, or Max Slevogt,⁸ the images that were included in editions of Goethe's works during his lifetime, have been largely omitted---with the exception of Doris Schumacher's selection mentioned above focusing on illustrations of *Werther*, *Hermann und Dorothea*, und *Faust*.

The offer to publish his writings (*Goethe's Schriften*) in eight volumes had come from the publisher Georg Joachim Göschen in Leipzig, though several of the works were still fragments. Goethe revised most of his works and also arranged for illustrations while he was in Italy and in an important phase of transition, if not crisis.⁹ At this time the visual arts and the "Kunstsinn" ("artistic sense") were extremely important for Goethe. They contributed decisively to his "Wiedergeburt" ("rebirth") not as a painter but as a writer as he noted in *Italienische Reise* (*Italian Journey*) already shortly after his arrival in Rome.¹⁰ The materials from his journey which he edited and published much later as part of his multi-volume autobiography (within the edition of his works published by Cotta 1816–17 and the *Ausgabe letzter Hand* 1829), became his most important work on the visual arts and his relation to them.

Illustration practices of the time and the role of the publisher are also important background for our topic. A detailed discussion, however, needs to be deferred to a study of all illustrations in *Goethe's Schriften* which were published by Göschen in Leipzig 1787 to 1790.

According to a draft of the contract, Goethe initially wanted to decide by himself which scenes Chodowiecki, the most famous illustrator of German literature in the second half of the eighteenth century, should illustrate. This was omitted in the final contract, and Göschen left the decision to the artist.¹¹ *Goethe's Schriften* were first advertised by Göschen as "geziert" ("decorated") with eight frontispieces by Daniel Chodowiecki.¹² The name was familiar, promised visual appeal, and helped to sell books. In the course of the eighteenth century, authors gained more voice in regard to the exterior of their books. In this case it appears that initially many decisions were made by the publisher. For example, Göschen suggested to Goethe certain drawings, or an artist contacted Göschen with suggestions specifically for the Goethe edition.¹³ Only occasionally did Goethe give instructions to the artist.¹⁴ Goethe did not meet the publisher before he left for Italy and Göschen had to work out the details with Goethe's administrative helper Philipp Friedrich Seidel and the printer. Due to this, misunderstandings arose including about the illustrations (Füssel 1999: 111). Göschen was disappointed with the quality of the first Chodowiecki print with a scene of *Werther* and exchanged it with a new one by Johann Heinrich Ramberg (Hanover, 1763–1840), delaying the distribution of the first volume.¹⁵

That is why not all frontispieces of the first four volumes were done by or even after Chodowiecki but by lesser-known engravers and why there was room and desire for new designs by Kauffmann exactly at the time when Goethe met her in Rome and socialized with her. On the German book market it was most exceptional to have a famous artist illustrate books. According to Doris Schumacher, the first initiative came neither from Goethe nor from Kauffmann herself but from Karl Reinhart who suggested her to Göschen who then instructed Goethe in Rome to approach the artist (Schumacher 144-45). When Goethe met and befriended Kauffmann and also Lips¹⁶ in Rome, he immediately sought to win them as artist-illustrators for his edition.

The contemporary audience appreciated seeing a variety of artists and styles in an edition (Kruse 146). After Goethe got involved in the decorative aspect, he was eager to avoid such a mix of quality and styles. When Göschen planned a reprint of volume one through four in 1789, he asked Lips, who was now professor of drawing in Weimar, for new engravings.¹⁷ A year earlier, he was still hoping for more original designs by Kauffmann.¹⁸

How did the “collaboration” between Kauffmann and Goethe come about? We only know the outcome. Goethe informed his publisher that he had asked her for a drawing for volume five, emphasizing it would be worth a mint but also cautioning that Kauffmann had too many patrons and would fulfill his request only as a personal favor, not for the money he was able to pay.¹⁹ Kauffmann was then, after the death of Pompeo Batoni, at the height of her success and regardless of her sex the most sought-after independent painter in Rome. Yet, as a surprise gift she gave him a drawing with her reading of a key scene from his play *Iphigenie auf Tauris*, as Goethe proudly reports in the same letter. This image is therefore the first to be examined in detail in this article. Not only does it depict the turning point in the drama, it also proved a turning point among the engravings in *Goethe's Schriften*.

Iphigenia: The Turning Point

Goethe applauded Kauffmann's drawing of Iphigenia, Orest and Pylades.²⁰ He wrote to his publisher Göschen: “Es ist vielleicht eine ihrer glücklichsten Compositionen. Und eben darum darf ich nicht zu dringlich sein.” (“It is possibly one of her most fortunate compositions. And that is exactly why I must not be too demanding.” Goethe to Göschen, 15 Aug. 1787; *Goethes Werke*. WA IV 8: 247). Maybe Goethe sensed that she did not like to be told what scenes and how to illustrate them but followed her own ideas.

In Goethe's *Iphigenia in Tauris*, his reworking of Euripides's Iphigenia tragedy, there is no intervening Goddess who orders the release of Iphigenia, her brother, and his friend from the barbarian Tauri at the last minute. The conflict is resolved by a strong belief in a non-bloody solution, realized by Iphigenia's power of words and civilizing appeal to the Tauri King in the name of humanity. This resolution does not come easily but rather after a hard inner battle. It is therefore very appropriate that Kauffmann depicts not swords and raised fists but the inner turn of belief that precedes the final actions, the healing from conflicting emotions and duties. As always with Kauffmann's composition, the persons in the scene are in many ways connected with each other through gestures, body movement, and glances, reflecting the relations and bonds between brother and sister and between the friends. A young wavy-haired Orestes dressed in loose classical garb²¹ is seated between Iphigenia and Pylades, grasping Pylades by the hand, gesticulating with the other and looking up at the woman. He is saying "Seyd ihr auch schon herabgekommen" ("You too have already come down [to the underworld]?") (*Iphigenie*, verse 1310) which the painter has inscribed under the drawing.

What has happened? Iphigenia is in Tauris as priestess of Artemis, homesick for Greece. She has been wooed by King Thoas and rejected him. She has to slay strangers on the altar, according to an ancient custom which she managed to halt for a while. Orestes, by Apollo's command, landed on the shore of Tauris to seize "the sister" and wants to return with her to Attica---meaning, so he believes, the image of Apollo's sister, Artemis, not knowing that his sister Iphigenia is on Tauris as well. Having not seen each other since their childhood, they do not recognize each other. Iphigenia hears from the stranger the fate of her parents and her brother and is so deeply moved that Orestes reveals his identity. However, he is still pursued by the furies and longs for death. After he faints he has a healing dream of being reunited with his

family in the underworld. When he awakes in this central scene (Act 3, scene 3), he believes himself still in the underworld and greets his sister and friend with the words quoted, wishing only for his other sister Electra to join them. Now Iphigenia and Pylades bend over him, pray for his healing and appeal to his rational powers, respectively. Profound change is about to occur in his “heart,” after which the furies leave him.

Kauffmann has located this scene in a garden landscape. Orestes, still imagining himself in the underworld, is greeting sister and friend and drawing them close. Iphigenia, one hand emphatically raised, is leaning over him with an inward expression representing the prayer she says in the play. Pylades also implores his friend, lowering himself almost to his height, with his right hand on his heart. In the text, the scene begins with the following lines by Orestes to which sister and friend respond with intense feeling:

OREST. Seid ihr auch schon herabgekommen?
Wohl Schwester dir! Noch fehlt Elektra:
Ein güt'ger Gott send' uns die eine
Mit sanften Pfeilen auch schnell herab.
Dich, armer Freund, muß ich bedauern!
Komm mit! Komm mit! zu Pluto's Thron,
Als neue Gäste den Wirth zu grüßen.

IPHIGENIE. [... Diane,]
O laß den einz'gen Spätgefundenen mir
Nicht in der Finsterniß des Wahnsinns rasen!
Und ist dein Wille, da du hier mich bargst,
Nunmehr vollendet, willst du mir durch ihn
Und ihm durch mich die sel'ge Hülfe geben,
So lös' ihn von den Banden jenes Fluchs,
Daß nicht die theure Zeit der Rettung schwinde.

PYLADES. Erkennst du uns und diesen heil'gen Hain
Und dieses Licht, das nicht den Todten leuchtet?
Fühlst du den Arm des Freundes und der Schwester,
Die dich noch fest, noch lebend halten? Faß
Uns kräftig an; wir sind nicht leere Schatten.
(*Iphigenie*, v. 1310-36; *Goethes Werke*. WA I.10: 56-57.)

(ORESTES How! are ye come already? Sister, welcome.

Electra still is missing: some kind god
With gentle arrow send her quickly hither.
Thee, my poor friend, I must compassionate!
Come with me, come to Pluto's gloomy throne.
There to salute our hosts like stranger guests.

IPHIGENIA [... Diana,]

Let not my only brother, found so late,
Rave in the darkness of insanity!
And is thy will, when thou didst here conceal me,
At length fulfill'd,—would'st thou to me through him,
To him through me, thy gracious aid extend,—
Oh, free him from the fetters of this curse,
Lest vainly pass the precious hours of safety.

PYLADES Dost thou not know us, and this sacred grove,
And this blest light, which shines not on the dead?
Dost thou not feel thy sister and thy friend,
Who hold thee living in their firm embrace?
Grasp us! we are not shadows. [...] [Goethe 1872, n. p.)]

It is the heart where Orestes will locate healing when he says later in the scene: "Es löset sich der Fluch, mir sagt's das Herz." ("My heart assures me that your [Ye Gods] curses cease." *Iphigenie*, verse 1358; *ibid.*, 58).

In his autobiography, in the entry dated 13 March 1787, Goethe acknowledges Kauffmann's drawing and her translation of the core dialogue into gestures simultaneously present in the image. He emphasizes that she had chosen not any dramatic or picturesque composition but the core of the play and its conflict, its very "axis":

Angelica hat aus meiner Iphigenie ein Bild zu mahlen unternommen; der Gedanke ist sehr glücklich und sie wird ihn trefflich ausführen. Den Moment, da sich Orest in der Nähe der Schwester und des Freundes wiederfindet. Das was die drei Personen hinter einander sprechen, hat sie in eine gleichzeitige Gruppe gebracht und jene Worte in Gebaerden verwandelt." (*Goethes Werke*. WA I.31: 46.)

(Angelica has set about painting a picture based on my *Iphigenia*; the conception is very felicitous, and she will carry it out excellently. The moment when Orestes comes to his senses again in the vicinity of his sister and his friend. She has combined what is spoken in succession by the three personages into a simultaneous group and transformed those words into gestures. [Goethe, *Italian Journey* 167-68])

Goethe follows here Lessing's essay on *Laokoön* (1766). Lessing persuasively developed a new understanding of the specificity of the sister arts of painting and poetry: the action time of painting became restricted to the "pregnant moment" in accordance with the "spatial" nature of the visual arts. In the pregnant moment, the past can be seen to give way to what will happen. According to Andreas Anglet, Goethe celebrated the pregnant moment ("prägnanter Augenblick") in his own writings. The writer and the painter shared their views of the sister arts, and it is possible that Kauffmann influenced Goethe's aesthetics more than is commonly known, as I will argue more in the last section of this article.

Goethe received Kauffmann's *Iphigenia* drawing too late to be included in volume three of the Göschen edition which had been published in 1787 with a frontispiece by Lips and a title vignette by the Leipzig painter Adam Friedrich Oeser. In 1790, Göschen republished the *Schriften* in eight volumes and could have included the new design instead. Nor was the drawing used for later illustrated editions (*Goethe's Schriften*, Mannheim: Renard, 1801; *Goethe's Sämmtliche Schriften*. 26 vols., Vienna: A. Straus, 1810–17). One simple explanation may be that they were done by publishers in other cities who employed their own artists.

Another explanation is that Kauffmann's format did not fit the portrait format of the frontispiece. However, other books of the time did in fact use landscape format. Did Goethe not like to see Kauffmann's *Iphigenia* composition in the small octave format where it would lose much of the details and sentiment? Did he venerate the drawing's nature as a present and want to keep it to himself? Did the painter ask that it not be published? These questions cannot be answered based on the extant materials. At any rate, Goethe's diplomatic request for designs by Kauffmann specifically for the remaining volumes of the Göschen edition was successful, and

the next two sections will investigate the outcome.

Clara Kneeling Before Egmont: Picture-Perfect Love

When Friedrich Schiller reviewed volume five of *Goethe's Schriften*, he opened with a simple remark about the frontispiece and title vignette, namely the fact that they were drawn by Kauffmann and engraved by Lips in Rome (mistaking the title vignette as also by these two instead of Oeser and Christian Gottlieb Geysler); he noted that they “verschönern” (added beauty to) the volume (Schiller Sp. 769). Schiller’s remark reflects the traditional notion that illustrations were mere décor. He did not address a particularly close relation between image and text nor a difference between the artistic styles. Both images illustrated scenes from the play *Egmont*, although the volume contained several other plays.

Kauffmann’s composition—it was published without a title inscription—is known as *Klärchen vor Egmont knieend* (*Clara Kneeling before Egmont*; detail figure 3).²² Goethe praised it in a letter to Göschen as “gar schön[]” (“very beautiful”), commending also the quality of the engraving (Goethe to Göschen, 27 Oct. 1787; *Goethes Werke*. WA IV.8: 279).



Figure 3 Lips after Kauffmann. Frontispiece “Egmont and Clara” (detail).

Would someone who did not know the play, get an accurate idea from the frontispiece of what the play is about? It shows a man and a woman in a high-ceilinged interior, the man sitting on a chair, the woman kneeling on a footrest by his side, leaning on him and looking up. Their hands are intertwined, their gazes locked, and he

has one arm around her shoulder. A scene of departure, by their sad and world-forlorn looks. The man is young and handsome and has androgynous features—as do many of Kauffmann’s heroes. A hat with feathers—Egmont’s hat, the only sign of the military officer in the picture, is lying on a table to the side. He is sitting on a chair with his coat thrown over its back. He is wearing an ornate outfit with a ruffle collar, and his *Imperial Order* of the Golden Fleece is clearly recognizable. The woman’s dress is in classicizing style, more late-eighteenth century than the fashion of Egmont’s time.

In his play, *Egmont*, which Goethe also revised in Italy, he narrates the fate of Egmont, the sixteenth-century Flemish warrior who held on to his ideals of liberty against the Spanish invader, Duke of Alba. The non-aristocratic *Klärchen* is his mistress. Egmont is sentenced to death and accepts it as part of his craving for justice. He commends his mistress to his friend but she chooses to end her life instead.

In Kauffmann’s illustration, their tender relationship is obvious; the play’s political manifesto for liberty and justice is not, nor is the class barrier between the two. On the contrary, they are just a man and woman in love, forming a visual unit as if drawn to each other—even upwards, towards heaven, as the triangle composition suggests. In scene 2 of Act III Egmont has come to the home of Klärchen’s mother, and now, after the mother has left the room, he takes off his coat and first reveals himself to his lover in his ornate Spanish-style aristocratic attire and high order. Her world is that of “Nähterinnen und Köchinnen” (“seamstresses and cooks”), she says. She has just declared that he is everything for her and asked him whether he really is Count Egmont. Act III concludes with the following dialogue during which the young woman holds the hand of the count as seen in the image:

CLÄRCHEN. Laß mich schweigen! Laß mich dich halten. Laß mich dir in die Augen sehen; alles drin finden, Trost und Hoffnung und Freude und Kummer. (*Sie umarmt ihn, und sieht ihn an.*) Sag' mir! Sage! ich begreife nicht! bist du Egmont? der Graf Egmont? der große Egmont, der so viel Aufsehn macht, von dem in den Zeitungen steht, an dem die Provinzen hängen?

EGMONT. Nein, Clärchen, das bin ich nicht.

CLÄRCHEN. Wie?

EGMONT. Siehst du, Clärchen!—Laß mich sitzen!—(*Er setzt sich, sie kniet sich vor ihm auf einen Schemel, legt ihre Arme auf seinen Schoos und sieht ihn an.*) Jener Egmont ist ein verdrießlicher, steifer, kalter Egmont, der an sich halten, bald dieses, bald jenes Gesicht machen muß; geplagt, verkannt, verwickelt ist, wenn ihn die Leute für froh und fröhlich halten; geliebt von einem Volke, das nicht weiß was es will; geehrt und in die Höhe getragen von einer Menge, mit der nichts anzufangen ist; umgeben von Freunden, denen er sich nicht überlassen darf; beobachtet von Menschen, die ihm auf alle Weise beikommen möchten; arbeitend und sich bemügend, oft ohne Zweck, meist ohne Lohn.—O laß mich schweigen wie es dem ergeht, wie es dem zu Muthe ist. Aber dieser, Clärchen, der ist ruhig, offen, glücklich, geliebt und gekannt von dem besten Herzen, das auch er ganz kennt und mit voller Liebe und Zutrauen an das seine drückt. (*Er umarmt sie.*) Das ist *dein* Egmont!

CLÄRCHEN. So laß mich sterben! Die Welt hat keine Freuden auf diese!
(*Goethes Werke. WA I.8: 242-43.*)

(CLARA Let me be silent! Let me embrace thee! Let me look into thine eyes, and find there everything—hope and comfort, joy and sorrow! [*She embraces and gazes on him.*] Tell me! Oh, tell me! It seems so strange—art thou indeed Egmont! Count Egmont! The great Egmont, who makes so much noise in the world, who figures in the newspapers, who is the support and stay of the provinces?

EGMONT No, Clara, I am not he.

CLARA How?

EGMONT Seest thou, Clara? Let me sit down! [*He seats himself, she kneels on a footstool before him, rests her arms on his knees and looks up in his face.*] That Egmont is a morose, cold, unbending Egmont, obliged to be upon his guard, to assume now this appearance and now that; harassed, misapprehended and perplexed, when the crowd esteem him light-hearted and gay; beloved by a people who do not know their own minds; honoured and extolled by the intractable multitude; surrounded by friends in whom he dares not confide; observed by men who are on the watch to supplant him; toiling and striving, often without an object, generally without a reward. O let me conceal how it fares with him, let me not speak of his feelings! But this Egmont, Clara, is calm, unreserved, happy, beloved and known by the best of hearts, which is also thoroughly known to him, and which he presses to his own with unbounded confidence and love. [*He embraces her.*] This is thy Egmont.

CLARA So let me die! The world has no joy after this! [*Egmont 1872: Act III scene 2.*])

Kauffmann's reading emphasizes Egmont's insisting on their equality—a revolutionary statement in 1788. Weimar society's initial reception of *Egmont* found faults with its plot and logic, especially the apotheosis-like end of the bourgeois lover. In his *Italian Journey*, the discussion of *Egmont* forms the end of Goethe's report of December 1787: based on a letter originally addressed to his theologian friend Johann Gottfried Herder in Weimar, Goethe conveys how, after lengthy and fruitless deliberations about his Weimar friends' criticism of Egmont, his solution for Clara, and the dream scene, he turned to Kauffmann and how she responded. He reflects on how Kauffmann was his ideal reader by displaying sensibility and empathy with the characters and ignoring class barriers. He began by emphasizing that she had "das Stück studirt" ("studied the play") and analyzed the issues "weiblich zart" ("with what feminine delicacy;" *Goethes Werke*. WA I.32: 180; *Italian Journey* 368), arguing:

daß das, was ihr noch mündlich von dem Helden erklärt wünschtet, in der Erscheinung implicite enthalten sei. Angelika sagte: da die Erscheinung nur vorstelle, was in dem Gemüte des schlafenden Helden vorgehe, so könne er mit keinen Worten stärker ausdrücken, wie sehr er sie liebe und schätze, als es dieser Traum tue, der das liebenswürdige Geschöpf nicht zu ihm herauf, sondern über ihn hinauf hebe. Ja, es wolle ihr wohl gefallen, daß der, welcher durch sein ganzes Leben gleichsam wachend geträumt, Leben und Liebe mehr als geschätzt, oder vielmehr nur durch den Genuß geschätzt, daß dieser zuletzt noch gleichsam träumend wache und uns still gesagt werde, wie tief die Geliebte in seinem Herzen wohne und welche vornehme und hohe Stelle sie darin einnehme. – Es kamen noch mehr Betrachtungen dazu, daß in der Szene mit Ferdinand Klärchens nur auf eine subordinierte Weise gedacht werden konnte, um das Interesse des Abschieds von dem jungen Freunde nicht zu schmälern, der ohnehin in diesem Augenblicke nichts zu hören noch zu erkennen imstande war. (Ibid.)

(... that all of you wanted the hero also to explain orally what is implicitly contained in the apparition. Angelica said: since the apparition only represents what is happening in the mind of the sleeping hero, there are no words that could express more forcefully how much he loves and appreciates her than this dream does, which lifts the charming creature not merely up to him, but above him. Indeed, it pleases Angelica very much that this man, whose whole life has been, so to speak, a waking dream, who has more than appreciated life and love, or rather, has appreciated them only through gratification, that he at last, still in a

waking dream, as it were, quietly tells us how deeply in his heart his beloved dwells, and what a preeminent and important place she occupies within it.—She added still more observations, to the effect that, in the scene with Ferdinand, Clara could only be mentioned in a subordinate way, so as not to take away interest from his farewell to his young friend, who at this moment was in any case not capable of hearing or realizing anything. [*Italian Journey* 368])

According to Goethe's report, the painter insisted that even in the play, body language and expression can replace words. Therefore, what the Weimar critics wished to have explicated by the hero, was already implicit in the appearance—and possibly unspeakable. Egmont does not need to speak his love, because his dream says it all. In it, Clara appears as an angel and confers the wreath of honor to him. (This scene was depicted in Oeser's title vignette.) Thus, Egmont raises "the charming creature" Clara not merely to his own level, but beyond himself. The dream scene may be seen as the extension of Clara kneeling before Egmont: both constellations tell us without words how intensely his beloved lives in his heart and what a noble and high position she occupies in it.

It is not important whether the painter actually said these words. What is important is that Goethe quoted her as an authority on how to read the language of images. In Kauffmann's *Iphigenia* scene, he observed the painter simultaneously representing in pictorial language what the play explicates successively in dialogue. With regard to *Egmont*, he inverts this process: The play does not need dialogue in the dream scene because the body language conveys the unspeakable. Language, however, is in danger of sounding sentimental and on the verge of parody.

Scholarship has overlooked that Kauffmann's *Egmont* illustration was astonishingly influential on the performance of the play. The scene *Clara Kneeling before Egmont* came to be performed as a fashionable Tableau Vivant, acting imitating a painting. Actresses and actors

were judged by how they lived up to the standard set for its performance by the illustration. Nearly a decade after its publication, Karl August Böttiger, Weimar's tabloid reporter, in his chapter on the famous actor and dramatist August Wilhelm Iffland, "Iffland als Egmont" ("Iffland as Egmont"), referred to Kauffmann's gentle setting. He agreed with her interpretation and saw in the ideal actress a charming woman who "eine Welt voll Seligkeit aus seinen Blicken saugt" ("is sucking a world full of blessedness from Egmont's gaze;" Böttiger 354-55). It is obvious how such an attitude is dangerously close to parody. When Böttiger reminds the reader of Clara's status as a "gemeinen, aber durch Liebe veredelten und zu ihm herauf gehobenen Mädchen[]" ("ordinary [that is, non-aristocratic] girl, ennobled through her love and raised to his level;" *ibid.*), he is harmonizing the social dynamite in the plot. The critic and dramaturge Friedrich Gottlieb Zimmermann in his 1827 critique of a young actress—Therese Peche—, also referred to Kauffmann's "bekanntlich [...] ungemein zart angegebene[r] Situation" ("incredibly gently rendered scene as is well-known") and verbatim repeated Böttiger's phrase (Zimmermann 37-38). These examples show that the frontispiece definitely was remembered well even four decades later, at least in Weimar.

Kauffmann's design for the last volume is different from the previous two discussed, because it is not a reading of a particular text but on allegorical composition. It can be read as claiming painting and the visual arts as inspiration of writing, the opposite of illustration as mere decor in a book.

The Muses: Admiring or Inspiring?

The frontispiece to volume eight of *Goethe's Schriften* (see figure 2) shows a male bust on a shoulder-high pedestal with two female figures in classicist dress to its right side and in front of

it. Attributes of masks make them the Muses of Tragedy and Comedy (detail figure 4). One is standing looking at the bust, while the other is sitting and busy with a toddler-sized Cupid with wings. This image has in recent scholarship generally been referred to as *The Muses of Tragedy and Comedy at Goethe's Bust* or *The Muses ...*

Paying Homage to Goethe (Schuster 335). For the contemporary reception of the illustration, this description is problematic because there is no evidence that the bust was recognized as one of Goethe, nor that the attitude of the muses is one of obeisance or paying homage.²³ The sculpture could be a head of Apollo in the style of the



Figure 4 Lips after Kauffmann. Frontispiece "The Muse of Tragedy at the Goethe Bust" (detail).

Portalès bust (British Museum, London).²⁴ The image was not given a title by the painter, and the engraving was published without title or explanation.²⁵ Today, we know that the bust is that of Goethe made in Rome by Alexander Trippel, but it is highly idealized. At the time of the edition, the bust was hardly known outside of Weimar and besides Goethe's correspondents. Also, the format of the frontispiece was much smaller than we usually see photographs of Trippel's work today. Did eighteenth-century readers realize the bust as one of Goethe simply because it decorated writings by Goethe? Or was it seen as one of any poet?²⁶ So far, I have found no comments by contemporaries on the frontispiece. At any rate, homage looked different: For example, the *Seibersdorfer Tal* (*Seibersdorf Valley*) near Dresden, an English landscape garden with many staffage details had a "Temple of the Muses." A bust of the poet Christoph

Martin Wieland was placed in it after his visit to the place, with an inscription invoking the Muses to be venerate the poet by bringing him wreaths.²⁷

Certainly, the Muses were among the favorite motives of illustrations, including for Goethe's later editions,²⁸ but usually there is no paratext that connects artist and writer. This section argues that the painter represents herself in the Muse of Tragedy, as her way of communicating with the distant poet after he had left Rome and returned to Weimar and representing their relationship. In an illustration of poems, the Apollonian bust may represent any poet. This may include Goethe or give him preference, even without particular knowledge of the actual bust. Goethe advertised Trippel's bust only decades later: in his essays on *Winckelmann und sein Jahrhundert* (*Winckelmann and his Century*, 1805), he listed it as one of this sculptor's best works (*Ästhetische Schriften* 150). Further, in his *Italian Journey* its discussion illustrated Goethe's turn to classicism.²⁹

As already mentioned, the bust is one that Alexander Trippel made of Goethe during his stay in Rome in 1787 for the Austrian military officer Christian von Waldeck (Arolsen, castle). It is in the classical style, that is the typical shape of a head of Apollo, with long, flowing hair, and an antique-style draped *chlamys* (coat) held by an ornate clasp on the right shoulder.³⁰ When Anna Amalia of Saxony-Weimar-Eisenach was in Rome, she also ordered a bust of Goethe for her son Duke Carl August, and Trippel made a replica with a slight variation in the clasp. The bust was much in demand as a plaster cast (for example in Frankfurt, Freies Deutsches Hochstift, Frankfurter Goethe-Museum) and one of the casts was given to Goethe himself.³¹

Kauffmann mentions her progress on the drawing and its completion in several of her letters to Goethe, further the fact that she—after consulting Goethe—gave it to Johann Heinrich Lips in Rome to be engraved. She then sent the copper plate to Goethe as a present, followed by

the original drawing which is still in the Weimar collections.³² Goethe praised the engraving for the frontispiece,³³ albeit only in private, not repeated in his autobiography.

The two muses with their attributes are easily recognizable. One might expect them grouped around *Apollo Musagetes*, the leader of the muses, as in the famous statue in the Vatican Museum's *sala del muse*. In such representations, Apollo is a full-body painting or statue, never reduced to a bust. Christian Bracht in the catalogue of the *Goethe-Nationalmuseum* describes the drawing as the muses' homage to Goethe and interprets it as Kauffmann's tribute from Rome to the poet in Weimar (Schuster 355).³⁴ I would argue that even if the portrait was recognized as Goethe, not Apollo, the factor of homage or tribute to Goethe in the image itself is questionable and ambiguous because of the following details. Melpomene, muse of tragedy signified by the tragic mask and a club, the ancient weapon at her feet, faces Apollo/Goethe who is placed just half a head above her and she gazes up at his eyes. In addition, her right elbow is placed on the pedestal, also establishing closeness and connection with the bust. She holds a scroll in her right hand. If Apollo/Goethe were a full-length sculpture she would be touching it with elbow and knee. Thalia, the muse of comedy, sitting in front of the pedestal and turned away from it, holds her mask in her right hand over her head. She is playing with or warding off Cupid who kneels at her side and whose hands reach towards the mask trying to grab a hold of it.

The painter may have represented herself in her relation to the bust/Goethe. Not only does the Muse of Tragedy share features of other allegorical self-portraits, such as the hair-do and dress in the Uffizi self-portrait (Baumgärtel 224). For my argument, it is important that Kauffmann is linked with the muses in several ways. She most productively and cleverly utilized the motive for herself as a female artist in an art market that appreciated mythological and feminine themes: as a frequent motive in her works, but also in her rare statements about art.³⁵

Richard Samuel's painting *Nine Living Muses of Great Britain* (c. 1779)³⁶—and the engravings made after it—celebrated her as one of the living muses in England, travelers to Rome described her home as a temple of the Muses, and she was even counted among Anna Amalia's Court of the Muses in Weimar. The title "Muse" is not unproblematic, though, because it suggests that women inspire creativity in men rather than themselves. Feminist research has criticized the inspirational function of the Muse as stimulus for male art from the Middle Ages until well into the twentieth century. Especially during and since Romanticism, the "dying or dead female lover became the artist's inspirational Muse" and this role "can be read as a taboo" on women's literary and artistic creativity (Boiter 337). It provided a frame for their accomplishments as exceptions and "safe channels to express their individual talents without threatening the existing social order" (McCreery 119). Yet, it proved a "milestone" in the wider recognition of women artists and writers. Even the biography of Kauffmann by Siegfried Obermeier (1987) refers to its subject as "the Muse of Rome," and the German title of the recent biographical novel about her by Simona Weller (translated from Italian) is "The Tenth Muse". Kauffmann often painted the muses, including in allegorical portraits such as *La Morghen and La Volpata as the Muses of Tragedy and Comedy* (1791) or *Lady Hamilton as Comedy* (1791).³⁷ It was a fashionable allegory during Classicism. Around the time when she designed the frontispiece, she heaped more Muses onto the distant friend: the vignette of a classically draped woman with a club which was engraved for the title page (see figure 2), may represent the Muse of Tragedy, Melpomene.³⁸ Another one was a woman playing an instrument carved in the gem of a cameo ring which she sent to the poet a few months after his departure, calling it "die Muse ... als ein kleines Zeichen meiner wahren und unveränderlichen Hochachtung gegen Ihnen" ("the Muse ... as a little

memento ... and a small sign of my true and unchangeable high esteem; Kauffmann in her letter to Goethe, 21 Sept. 1788; Kauffmann no. 72, emphasis underlined in the original).

These observations suggest that Kauffmann, in this drawing as in other works representing Muses, implied the original meaning of muse and problematized the act of creativity. She worked with and subtly reformed this male projection of a female image. Kauffmann knew classical literature very well. She painted many scenes from Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* that are very close to the text and document her familiarity with the text and with the tradition of painting scenes that taught values. Both epics begin with the invocation of the Muse and her song. The Muse is the creator of the text, Homer is her mouth. In the original Greek oral tradition, the Muse "used the poet as her medium and was considered the primary creator of art" (Boiter 337). She then judged the poet's imitation of her inspiration. Kauffmann's Muse of tragedy holds a scroll in her hand. She has authored the text and is willing to give it to the poet. Rather than paying homage, she is the source of his works and resulting fame.

The Muse of comedy is playing with Cupid who has dropped his arrows and reaches for her mask. This detail may contain another allusion: love does not inspire but distract. Love affairs cause a lack of creativity, may be another subtle message here. This part of her drawing may present a—ever so subtle—admonition to her friend Goethe that writing and any creative product requires full dedication.

In this reading, the frontispiece thematizes not Goethe admired by the Muses, but it reflects on authorship and creativity as provided by the Muses/the arts—and by extension the artist Kauffmann herself, from whom the poet is seeking inspiration.³⁹ After all, in 1788 Goethe was not popular with the reading audience. His sojourn in Italy had provided relief from a personal and creative crisis, but his return was to demonstrate his renewed creativity.⁴⁰ His

publisher Göschen waited a lot longer for the completion of *Tasso* than Goethe had promised, and the ambitious tragedy *Faust* was still a fragment when published as volume seven, the last in the edition. It is noteworthy that the publisher Göschen advertised *Goethe's Schriften* as “die Kinder seiner Muse” (“the children of his Muse;” “Avertissement,” as cited in Füssel 110), giving voice to the same image for the source of creativity.

Kauffmann has reduced Trippel's bust of Goethe to half its original size in proportion to the other figures. She also shortened the upper body, thus reducing its effect of acute self-awareness and high idealization. In addition, she made it more androgynous.⁴¹ The art historian Bernhard Maaz has pointed at a criticizing component of the drawing. He praises it as an attempt to remove the bust's high pathos and make it more immediate (Maaz 285). Kauffmann's bust of Goethe is close to life size and nearly at eye-level with Melpomene, the muse of tragedy, whose attention is totally directed at it. Goethe no longer gazes in a powerful and masculine attitude into the far distance, but looks at the Muse seeking immediacy and exchange. He even makes an inward impression. Thus, the bust appears feminized, less monumental. Its message becomes similar to Kauffmann's own earlier painting, *Self Portrait in the Character of Painting Embraced by Poetry* (1782, London, collection Lord Iveagh Bequest).⁴² Here she showed the allegory of design or painting as inspired by, listening to, and collaborating harmoniously with poetry. Likewise, the alliance between (classical) art and (modern) writing was most important for Goethe's re-invention or making of German classicism.⁴³ In this sense Kauffmann's design is symbolic, and she and Goethe appear to have a similar concept of symbolism for which visual perception and cognition (or, with Goethe's term, “Anschauung”) form the basis. Symbol is the most important term in Goethe's aesthetics: through symbolic representation, art reveals laws of nature. Art is not to imitate nature but nature's creative process. Perception of a more general

meaning enables the artist/poet to create a (literary) image in which specific appearance and general idea coincide (Krueger).

To summarize, there are manifold relations between the design of the two muses and the bust of Apollo/Goethe indicating an inspirational relation between the Muses/creativity and writing, between the art of painting and writing, but also between the artist Kauffmann and Goethe. The frontispiece goes beyond pretty decor for a volume of poems and achieves symbolic representation of the creative process.

Conclusion

The publisher Göschen who successfully published several illustrated calendars and almanacs, counted on the popularity of illustrations as an additional selling point for his edition of Goethe's collected and revised works. He had several of the leading German engravers at his hand in Leipzig. The three illustrations discussed here mark an important change in book illustrations in the eighteenth century. Goethe and his publisher Göschen turned away from illustrations manufactured in series for the purpose of decor and good sales to illustrations where the author took an active role in the selection process and worked with the artist towards his—and her—ideal of symbolic representation. His “collaboration” with the celebrity artist Angelica Kauffmann in Rome coincided with the turning point of his experience and appreciation of art in Italy. To a lesser extent, this may apply to Lips who did the engravings and whose own designs for illustrations of the same edition deserve further attention, as do Oeser's title vignettes. This article could not analyze and compare them in detail.

The latter Goethe was skeptical of illustration and insisted on his drama *Faust* being published without any illustration. When he prepared another edition of collected works in 1805,

he wrote in a resigned tone to his publisher Cotta: “Es ist so schwer, daß etwas geleistet werde, was dem Sinne und dem Tone nach zu einem Gedicht passt. Kupfer und Poesie parodiren sich gewöhnlich wechselweise.” (“It is so difficult to achieve something that is in accordance with the meaning and tone of a [dramatic] poem. Engraving and poetry usually parody each other.” Goethe to Cotta, 25 Nov. 1805; *Goethes Werke*. WA IV.19: 77). I have argued that the design of the Goethe bust with the Muses achieves symbolic representation of the relationship of Goethe and Kauffmann or of literature and painting. It requires, however, a sympathetic reader, or it may be taken not for inspiration through friendship but for a parody. Kauffmann’s strength lays in capturing the emotions and the dialogue of “pregnant” moments in *Iphigenia* and *Egmont*. However, for those who do not see these, the figures are just sentimental characters lacking action. Therefore, they did not take on a life of their own but they became closer linked with the respective texts as illustrations in twentieth-century editions. Other designs by Kauffmann which were originally inspired by literature, such as the cycle of paintings with *Cupid and the Graces*, however, did take on such an independent life and became widely popular as prints and in the decorative arts.

Goethe continued to advocate an ideal of symbolic representation through illustration—but he was disappointed with his own attempts and that of other artists at the time. He accepted illustration only as independent publications, physically separated from his works.⁴⁴ Goethe’s twenty-volume edition of *Werke* (1815–19) and his *Ausgabe letzter Hand* (1827–30) both with Cotta in Stuttgart, the eminent publisher of the German classicists (Unselde), contained no images, but he could not or did not want to prohibit other publishers from printing his works with illustrations. In fact, among the editions of Goethe’s works after 1790 the majority *did* contain title vignettes, frontispieces, or both. They deserve a study of its own, and a few observations

may suffice here. An important difference is that Goethe was not actively involved in selecting these illustrations. It is puzzling that Goethe/his publishers during his lifetime never perused the *Iphigenia* design as an illustration or reproduced the frontispieces after Kauffmann, especially for the volume of *Italian Journey* where the *Iphigenie* and *Egmont* drawings are discussed. Several editions available today contain these illustrations.

Notably, Goethe published *Italian Journey* without illustrations, insisting on the creative imagination of the reader and the priority of the text, his autobiography. At the same time he singled out specific works for discussion, works that were of significance to him decades later. Although he does not mention that they illustrated his *Schriften* edition, his remembrance has implications for the illustrations. It may imply a certain degree of self-justification: Works that are important enough to fill pages in Goethe's autobiography were certainly well-selected for an edition at the time with its predilection for illustrations that were sentimental and based on ordinary situations in literary works. This indicates that Goethe first followed Göschen's concept about the visual appeal of the edition, including Chodowiecki fashion, but sought to raise its standard with his experiences in Rome and his friendship with the artist Kauffmann. He reached his ideal of interrelation between image and text with the illustrations designed by Kauffmann and discontinued when he could no longer obtain such quality—and his Olympian standing in German letters and culture afforded him to insist on editions without illustrations, setting an example for "classical editions."

List of illustrations

Figure 1. *Goethe's Schriften*. Volume 5 (Leipzig: Göschen, 1787), frontispiece (engraving by Lips after Angelica Kauffmann, 109 x 66 mm) and title page with vignette (engraved by Geysler after Oeser). Photograph: Walter Ziegler, University of Regensburg.

Figure 2. *Goethe's Schriften*. Volume 8 (Leipzig: Göschen, 1789), frontispiece (size 111 x 66 mm) engraved by Lips after Angelica Kauffmann (Photograph: Walter Ziegler, University of Regensburg).

Figure 3. Lips after Kauffmann, *Egmont and Clara*. Detail of fig. 1.

Figure 4. Lips after Kauffmann, *The Muse of Tragedy at the Goethe Bust*. Detail of fig. 2.

Works Cited

- Anglet, Andreas. *Der "ewige" Augenblick: Studien zur Struktur und Funktion eines Denkbildes bei Goethe*. Cologne: Böhlau, 1991. Print.
- Arbeitsstelle Achtzehntes Jahrhundert, ed. *Die Buchillustration im 18. Jahrhundert*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1980. Print. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Literatur und Kunst des 18. Jahrhunderts 4.
- Baumgärtel, Bettina. *Angelika Kauffmann 1741 – 1907 Retrospektive*. Exhibition catalogue. Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje, 1998. Print.
- Boiter, Vera. "Muse." *The Feminist Encyclopedia of German Literature*. Ed. Friederike Eigler and Susanne Kord. Westport: Greenwood P, 1997. 337. Print.
- Böttiger, Karl August. *Entwicklung des ippfandischen Spiels in vierzehn Darstellungen auf dem Weimarschen Hoftheater im Aprilmonat 1796*. Leipzig: Göschen, 1796. Print.
- Deseyve, Yvette. *Italiensehnsucht deutscher Künstler der Goethezeit*. *Goethezeitportal.de*. Goethezeitportal: Das Fach- und Kulturportal der Goethezeit, ed. Georg Jäger et al. Munich, 2002-11. Web. 2009.
- Ehler, Melanie. *Daniel Nikolaus Chodowiecki: "le petit maître" als großer Illustrator*. Berlin: Lukas, 2003. Print.
- Füssel, Stephan. *Studien zur Verlagsgeschichte und zur Verlegertypologie der Goethe-Zeit*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999. Print.
- Füssel, Stephan, and Sabine Doering. *Georg Joachim Göschen: ein Verleger der Spätaufklärung und der deutschen Klassik*. Vol. 2. *Verlagsbibliographie Göschen 1785 bis 1838*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998. Print.
- Füssel, Stephan, and Sabine Doering, eds. *Repertorium der Verlagskorrespondenz Göschen (1783 bis 1828)*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996. Print.
- Geck, Elisabeth. *Grundzüge der Geschichte der Buchillustration*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982. Print.

- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print. Literature, Culture, Theory 20.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. *Ästhetische Schriften 1806–1815*. Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1998. Print. Sämtliche Werke I.19.
- . *Die Leiden des jungen Werther*. Ed. Kurt Rothmann. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1995. Print.
- . *Egmont; A Tragedy in 5 Acts*. Trans. Anna Swanwick. 1872. Web. Digital edition on Gutenberg.org. 5 April 2010.
- . *Iphigenia in Tauris*. Trans. Anna Swanwick. 1872. Web. Digital edition on gutenberg.org. 6 April 2010.
- . *Italian Journey*. Ed. Thomas P. Saine and Jeffrey L. Sammons. Trans. Robert R. Heitne. New York: Suhrkamp, 1989.
- . *Neue Schriften*. 10 vols. Mannheim: Renard, 1801–03. Print.
- . *Theater von Goethe*. Vol. 1 *Faust*. Vienna: Bauer, 1816. Print.
- Goethe's Sämtliche Schriften*. 26 vols. Vienna: A. Straus, 1810–17. Print.
- Goethe's Schriften*. 8 vols. Leipzig: Göschen, 1786–90. Print.
- Goethe's Schriften*. 8 vols. Leipzig: Göschen, 1786–90. Web. *Google books*.
- Goethe's Schriften*. 8 vols. Mannheim: Renard, 1801. Print.
- Goethe's Werke*. Vienna: Carl Armbruster; and Stuttgart: Cotta, 1816–22. Print.
- Goethes Werke. Weimarer Ausgabe*. 133 vols. 1887–1919. Munich: DTV, 1987. Volumes from this edition are abbreviated as *Goethes Werke*. WA section vol.: pages.
- Günther, Harri, and Volkmar Herre, eds. *Gärten der Goethezeit*. Leipzig: Edition Leipzig, 1993. Print.
- Hagen, Waltraud. *Die Drucke von Goethes Werken*. Berlin: Akademie, 1971. Print.
- Hinrichs, Ernst and Klaus Zernack, eds. *Daniel Chodowiecki (1726–1801): Kupferstecher, Illustrator, Kaufmann*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1997. Print. Wolfenbütteler Studien zur Aufklärung 22.
- Ionescu, Christina, ed. *Book Illustration in the Long Eighteenth Century: Reconfiguring the Visual Periphery of the Text*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2011. Print.
- "Iphigenie auf Tauris." *De.Wikipedia.org*. Wikipedia: Die freie Enzyklopädie. Web. 13 Dec. 2011.
- Kauffmann, Angelika "Mir träumte vor ein paar Nächten, ich hätte Briefe von Ihnen empfangen". *Gesammelte Briefe in den Originalsprachen*. Ed. Waltraud Maierhofer. Lengwil: Libelle, 2001. Print.
- Krueger, S. Heidi. "Allegory and Symbol in the Goethezeit: A Critical Reassessment." *The Age of Goethe Today: Critical Reexamination and Literary Reflection*. Ed. Gertrud Bauer Pickar and Sabine Cramers. Munich: Fink, 1990. 50–68. Print.
- Kruse, Joachim. *Johann Heinrich Lips: 1758–1817: ein Zürcher Kupferstecher zwischen Lavater und Goethe*. Exhibition catalogue. Coburg: Kunstsammlungen, 1989. Print.
- Kunze, Horst. *Geschichte der Buchillustration in Deutschland*. 4 volumes. Leipzig: Insel, 1975–93. Print.
- MacLeod, Catriona. *Embodying Ambiguity: Androgyny and Aesthetics from Winckelmann to Keller*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1998. Print.
- . "Floating Heads: Weimar Portrait Busts." *Unwrapping Goethe's Weimar: Essays in Cultural Studies and Local Knowledge*. Ed. Burkhard Henke, Susanne Kord, and Simon Richter. Rochester: Camden House, 1999. 65–96. Print.

- Maierhofer, Waltraud. "The Death of the Immortal Hero: The Original Illustrations of Schiller's *History of the Thirty Years' War*." *Word And Image in the Eighteenth Century: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*. Ed. Renata Schellenberg and Christina Ionescu. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, 2008. 268-91. Print.
- . "Too Large for our Northern Homes: Self-Image and Portrait in Goethe's *Italian Journey*." *1650–1850. Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era* (2006): 120–56. Print.
- Maisak, Petra. "Illustrationen." *Goethe Handbuch*. Ed. Bernd Witte, Carina Janssen, Regine Otto. Vol. 1. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1999. 513-19. Print.
- Maaz, Bernhard. "'Dass die Idee, als hätte ich so ausgesehen, in der Welt bleibt': Alexander Trippels Goethe-Büste; Werk und Wirkung." *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte* 52 (1995): 281-92. Print.
- McCreery, Cindy. *The Satirical Gaze: Prints of Women in Late Eighteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Print.
- Moore, Evelyn K., and Patricia Anne Simpson, eds. *The Enlightened Eye: Goethe and Visual Culture*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007. Print.
- Müller, Rebecca, ed. "*Die Natur ist meine einzige Lehrerin, meine Wohltäterin*": *Zeichnungen von Daniel Nikolaus Chodowiecki (1726 – 1801) im Berliner Kupferstichkabinett*. Exhibition catalogue. Berlin: Mann, 2000. Print. Bilderheft der Staatlichen Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz 91/92.
- Naumann, Ursula. *Geträumtes Glück: Angelica Kauffmann und Goethe*. Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 2007. Print.
- Obermeier, Siegfried. *Die Muse von Rom: Angelika Kauffmann und ihre Zeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Oberon, 1987. Print.
- Richards, David B. *Goethe's Search for the Muse: Translation and Creativity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1979. Print.
- Roworth, Wendy. "Kauffman and the Art of Painting in England." *Angelica Kauffmann: A Continental Artist in Georgian England*. Exhibition catalogue. London: Reaktion, 1992. 24-37. Print.
- Sandart, Joachim von. *Joachim Sandrarts Teutsche Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste*. 1675. Munich: G. Hirth, 1925. Print.
- Schiller, Friedrich. "Leipzig, bey Göschen: Göthe's Schriften. Fünfter Band. 1787." Review. *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung (ALZ)* 227.3/4 (20. Sept. 1788): Sp. 769. Web. Digitized on zs.thulb.uni-jena.de. Journals@UrMEL: Das Internetportal der Thulb (Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Jena). 4 April 2010.
- Schumacher, Doris. *Kupfer und Poesie: Die Illustrationskunst um 1800 im Spiegel der zeitgenössischen deutschen Kritik*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2000. Print. *Pictura et poesis* 13.
- Schuster, Gerhard, and Caroline Gille, eds. *Wiederholte Spiegelungen. Weimarer Klassik 1759—1832*. Vol. 1. Munich: Hanser, 1999. Print.
- Seifersdorfer-tal.de*. Seifersdorfer Tal: Seifersdorf bei Dresden. Web. 7 April 2010.
- Taschenbuch von J. G. Jacobi und seinen Freunden für 1796*. Königsberg and Leipzig: Nicolovius, 1795. Print.
- Unsel, Siegfried. *Goethe und seine Verleger*. Frankfurt: Insel, 1998. Print.

- Utz, Peter. *Das Auge und das Ohr im Text: Literarische Sinneswahrnehmung in der Goethezeit*. Munich: Fink, 1990. Print.
- Vaget, Hans. "The *Augenmensch* and the Failure of Vision: Goethe and the Trauma of Dilettantism." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift* 75 (2001): 15-26. Print.
- Wellbery, David, and Dorothea von Mücke, eds. *Die Bedeutung des Sehens im Werk Goethes*. Special Issue of *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 75 (2001). Print.
- Weller, Simona. *Die zehnte Muse: Das Leben der Angelika Kauffmann*. Munich: Goldmann, 1999. Print.
- Zimmermann, Friedrich Gottlieb. "Egmont (Schluß)." *Neue dramaturgische Blätter* 5 (1827): 33-40. Print.

Notes

¹ Ionescu's detailed introduction includes an excellent survey of scholarship on this topic.

² For example in the entries on Goethe's *Iphigenie in Tauris* on en.wikipedia.org. Wikipedia: The Free Encyklopädie (Weimar version of the drawing) and de.wikipedia.org. Wikipedia: Die freie Enzyklopädie (Düsseldorf version). Last accessed May 2012; on many art and scholarship sites such as in the section on Angelica Kauffmann in the project by Yvette Desevye, *Italiensehnsucht deutscher Künstler der Goethezeit*.

³ This claim possibly extends to the illustration of his fragment *Faust* (see below). Only for this work Goethe chose to have a well-known work reproduced, namely Rembrandt's engraving, *Faust* (ca. 1652). It is therefore excluded from this study.

⁴ Cf. Genette 16. It is remarkable that with today's ready availability of digital images, Kauffmann's illustrations seem to be on the way to becoming part of the paratext, especially the *Iphigenie* drawing for those who seek information online.

⁵ Among recent publications on Chodowiecki are especially important the monograph by Ehler, the exhibition catalogue by Müller, and the volume by Hinrichs and Zernack.

⁶ Horst Kunze's *History of Book Illustration in Germany* so far extends only to the seventeenth century. Ionescu's volume addresses a gap in illustration studies in the international eighteenth century.

⁷ Goethe's preoccupation with vision has been the focus of a special issue of *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* in 2001 and of an edited volume by Evelyn K. Moore and Patricia Anne Simpson (2007). In 1990, Peter Utz declared the often stated claim of Goethe as "Augenmensch" a "Klischee" that confines and limits his use of all senses (Utz 87). The primacy of visuality is not exclusive to Goethe but a trait of the Enlightenment in general.

⁸ Petra Maisak's entry on illustrations in the latest Goethe handbook provides an excellent overview.

⁹ In a letter to Goethe of 27 Nov. 1787, Göschen wrote about arrangements, especially decoration of the edition (Füssel and Doering 1996: no. 407).

¹⁰ Cf. the entry dated “Den 20. Dezember [1786]” in *Italienische Reise* (*Goethes Werke*. WA I. 30: 236-7; *Italian Journey* 123). Only where no printed translations are referenced following the German, translations are my own.

¹¹ For details see Schumacher 144.

¹² The advertisement appeared in the important magazin, *Teutscher Merkur*, in August 1786. In addition, Göschen promised eight title vignettes by Meil (Göschen, “Avertissement,” as cited in Füssel 1999: 111). This practice of over-advertising continues today: for digitized copies of *Goethe's Schriften* on *Google books* Chodowiecki and Kauffmann are descriptor terms for all eight volumes of the edition by Göschen, and they tend not to come up without them.

¹³ In his letter to Goethe of 27 July 1788, Göschen suggested drawings by Georg Michael Kraus for volume eight (Füssel and Doering 1996: no. 538).

¹⁴ For example Goethe in his letter to Göschen 27 Aug. 1789 (Füssel and Doering 1996: no. 763).

¹⁵ The misprinted engravings and their replacements are mentioned in the letters by Göschen to Bertuch, 23 May 1787 (Füssel and Doering 1996: no. 309), Bertuch's response, 8 June (no. 316), Göschen to Seidel, 14 July and 1 Aug. 1787 (no. 342, 349), as well as to Goethe, 15 Aug. 1787 (no. 359). Ramberg's *Werther* design is often incorrectly attributed to Angelica Kauffmann, for example in the note on the front cover in the Reclam edition of *Goethe's Werther* by Kurt Rothmann (Goethe 1995: 1).

¹⁶ There is only one major publication on Lips, namely the exhibition catalogue by Joachim Kruse of 1989.

¹⁷ According to the letter by Lips to Göschen, 10. Dec. 89 (Füssel and Doering 1996: no. 823), he had already sent the vignette for volume one and promised a frontispiece.

¹⁸ Letter Göschen to Goethe, 29 Sept. 1788 (Füssel and Doering 1996: no. 564). In the 1790 second edition (by Schaumburg in Vienna and Göschen in Leipzig) the illustrations of volumes one to four were replaced (according to Hagen 1971: 14). Originals of these volumes could not be located for this article.

¹⁹ Cf. Goethe to Göschen, 15 Aug. 1787 (*Goethes Werke*. WA IV.8: 247).

²⁰ The image is readily accessible on *Wikipedia* (see note 1); see also for example Baumgärtel 333. The author has not been granted permission to reproduce this image in a digital publication. An image search “Angelika Kauffmann Iphigenie” results in several more postings. It is remarkable that the drawing usually posted is that in the Goethemuseum Düsseldorf which is believed to have been a present from the painter to Louise von Göchhausen, lady-in-waiting of the Duchess of Weimar. The Weimar version which is likely the one given to Goethe, has a slightly different format: 315 x 375 mm instead of 290 x 360 mm and is missing a corner. Both are in black and white chalk on light-brown paper.

²¹ This makes him definitely appear more androgynous than the classical nudity in the frontispiece by Lips.

²² See Kauffmann's drawing in Baumgärtel 337 fig. 150. I am following the translation of the name used in the translation quoted below, although it is important that the German name is a diminutive of “Clara.”

²³ The homage factor is much more obvious, for example, in the frontispiece by Pentzel to *Taschenbuch von J. G. Jacobi und seinen Freunden für 1796*: it shows the Muses dancing around a full-body sculpture of Apollo with lyra, elevated on a pedestal above the dancers.

²⁴ The bust was fairly well-known through an engraving in Joachim von Sandrart's *Teutsche Akademie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste* I: plate 14.

²⁵ Most frontispieces referred to the contents of a book in an allegorical manner. However, some had titles and description; for example the *Historical Calendar for Women* (*Historischer Calender für Damen*, 1790–92) edited by Friedrich Schiller contained extensive descriptions of its illustrations; cf. Maierhofer 2008.

²⁶ Catriona MacLeod assumes “mass circulation” of the frontispiece (1999: 82) but does not provide proof. Göschen was disappointed with the sales; according to his overview of 20 Sept. 1798, there were only 603 subscribers to the whole edition, although Göschen had printed 3000 (Füssel 114). The second edition that he had anticipated, was not necessary.

²⁷ A contemporary engraving of the temple with Wieland's bust is viewable on the webpage for this region, *seifersdorfer-tal.de* under “Wieland.” Unlike in Kauffmann's design, its meaning of homage to the poet was explicated in an inscription: “Hier weihen sie (die Musen) ihrem Liebling unverwelkliche Kränze, von den Grazien gewunden.” (“Here they [the muses] dedicate never-fading wreaths, made by the graces, to their darling” (as cited in *ibid.*).

²⁸ Within the space available, I can only list them: In the Vienna edition of *Goethe's Sämmtliche Schriften* (1810–17) all by Vincenz Grüner: Artist in front of easel and Muse (volume 6), Muse with Lyra, levitating towards heaven (volume 7), Muse with lyra (volume 24); in *Theater von Goethe*, volume 1 (1816): Muses of Tragedy and Comedy, lying wreaths on an altar, by Blaschke. My descriptions follow Hagen 1971: 25, 50.

²⁹ This argument is presented in more detail in Maierhofer 2006; I argue that Goethe discussed this portrait last among three portraits in *Italian Journey*, because it is the most idealized, although chronologically it probably was not the last of the three that were made in Rome. The other two portraits are well-known paintings by Kauffmann and Tischbein.

³⁰ Cf. the description in the letter by Alexander Trippel to Christian August von Waldeck, 18 November 1788, cited in Schuster 395 note 45.

³¹ See illustration in Schuster 355.

³² See Kauffmann's letters to Goethe, 10 May 1788, 23 July 1788, and 21 Sept. 1788 (Kauffmann no. 62, 68, 72).

³³ According to Kauffmann's letter to Goethe of 1 Nov. 1788 (Kauffmann no. 73).

³⁴ Schuster 355. Similarly Baumgärtel 335.

³⁵ See the afterword in Kauffmann 302-304.

³⁶ Its composition shows the group of women with attributes of their artistic and literary creativity (Kauffmann is working at an easel), grouped before a full statue of Apollo.

³⁷ See Baumgärtel 263-65.

³⁸ Cf. Baumgärtel 336. Kauffmann modestly referred to it only as a “Simplen figur” (“simple figure;” Kauffmann to Goethe, letter of 1 Nov. 1788; Kauffmann no. 72).

³⁹ Such a need, “Goethe's Search for the Muse,” albeit especially for the years 1795 to 1805, provided the title for a study on translation by David Richards.

⁴⁰ In 1787 Göschen wrote about the reading audience and listed a few common complaints about Goethe's works as incomprehensible, boring, outdated, or dark; cf. Georg Joachim Göschen to Friedrich Justin Bertuch, 22 Sept. 1787 (Hagen 1966: 94)

⁴¹ An excellent study on androgyny, a very important aspect in Kauffmann's works in general, is Catriona MacLeod's *Embodying Ambiguity*.

⁴² See Baumgärtel 242.

⁴³ Ursula Naumann also reads Goethe's narration of his relationship to Kauffmann in the *Italian Journey* as a stylized "Romanze" ("romance;" 87) representing the alliance or romance between poetry and painting.

⁴⁴ See the Schumacher 198-204.