JOHANNES GRAVE

Ideal and History. Johann Wolfgang Goethe's Collection of Prints and Drawings[1]

In his literary works Goethe surprisingly often describes his protagonists as collectors. In his novella *The Collector and his Circle*, he mentions a physician whose collection of art is the focus of interest, and the two Wilhelm Meister novels deal repeatedly with collectors; in particular, Wilhelm's grandfather is characterized as having been the owner of an extensive collection which was later sold by his son.[2]

The description of another collection in the sixth book of the novel *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* seems unmotivated at first. The so-called "Schöne Seele" reports on a conversation which she had with her uncle while visiting him at his impressively furnished house, built by an Italian architect. While she talks with her uncle about his fruitless efforts in helping young people cultivate their minds, he provides an example of his educative influence:

> He directed my attention to the various paintings hanging on the wall. My eyes fixed on those which looked pleasant or had a notable subject. He waited a few moments, and then said: 'Now pay some attention to the spirit that produced these works. Noble souls like to see God's hand in His creation; but why shouldn't we give some consideration to the hands of His imitators?' He then drew my attention to some pictures that had not struck me particularly and tried to make me understand that only the study of the history of art can give us a proper sense of the value and distinction of a work of art. One must first appreciate the burdensome aspects of technical labour that gifted artists have perfected over the centuries in order for one to comprehend how it is possible for a creative genius to move freely and joyfully on a plane so high that it makes us dizzy.
> With this in mind, he had gathered a beautiful series of pictures [...].[3]

The "Schöne Seele" continues the conversation about education and claims she saw "symbols of moral education" in the pictures[4].

The short interchange concerning art seems an unimportant interlude; the serious conversation is interrupted for a short time by the pleasure of visiting the gallery before the central dialogue is continued. However, the development and formation of art in the course of history not only serves as a parallel to moral cultivation: the scene also demonstrates the uncle's pedagogic influence. By means of only a few sentences Goethe outlines the uncle's strategy to offer another view of art to the "Schöne Seele". Her first reaction is to regard only paintings which arouse interest because of their subject

or form. She selects intuitively and makes no reference to objective criteria. The uncle tries to impart such criteria, mentioning the importance of the artist and aspects of formal design. Because of his comments and the principle "that only the study of the history of art can give us a proper sense of the value and distinction of a work of art" the "Schöne Seele" directs her attention to more inconspicuous paintings. In her uncle's opinion, to appreciate art at its best, one must first have knowledge of the development of art from its very beginnings. Only a few words suggest that the "Schöne Seele" has grasped her uncle's meaning. Her judgement, that "he had gathered a beautiful series of pictures", demonstrates that she now understands the importance of the collection's coherence. She no longer concentrates solely on a few individual works of art.

In the short passage from Goethe's novel the act of viewing pieces of art in the context of a collection acquires a specific quality. Art history – Goethe obviously not meant the later established academic discipline, but the interpretation of art as a historically determined phenomenon[5] – art history and collections are closely tied, and the collection proves to be a corrective to purely emotional treatment and subjective concentration on few works of art. A central structural feature of this way of viewing works of art involves grouping them into series and establishing a succession of works in historical order.

Even if we cautiously draw a parallel between Goethe and the uncle, the latter's remark is astonishing, namely that only the study of art history can "give us a proper sense of the value and distinction of a work of art". This opinion is all the more remarkable as Goethe seems to contradict the uncle's statement in the introduction to *Propylaea* only a few years after writing *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*:

> A history of art can only be based on the highest and most precisely defined concept of art. Only when we know the best that man has been able to produce, can we describe the stages of his psychological development as reflected in art or in other areas.[6]

The discrepancy of priorities between Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* and his *Propylaea* introduction reveals a fundamental problem, that is, how art history and "the highest concept" (*höchster Begriff*) of art can be mediated. The relationship between normativeness and historicity cannot be clearly determined, although, at first sight, the cited passages from *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* and *Propylaea* suggest a simple solution. This observation corresponds to the character of Goethe's writings on art following his return from Italy in 1788. In particular, his essays for the journal *Propylaea* (1798–1800)[7] and the "Weimarer Preisaufgaben" (an annual contest for young artists which was organized by Goethe and Heinrich Meyer from 1799 to 1805)[8] show that Goethe tried to consolidate a normative ideal of art. But at the same time, and especially from 1805 onwards, he made

1) Martin Schongauer, «The Death of the Virgin», engraving, first state, 25.7 × 17.1 cm, Weimar, SWKK, Goethe-Nationalmuseum.

2) Battista Franco, «The Adoration of the Shepherds», etching and engraving, fourth state, 39.1 × 51.9 cm (on an old sheet with notes by Goethe), Weimar, SWKK, Goethe-Nationalmuseum.

a habit of judging works of art only on the basis of their historical context.

The cited passages from *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* demonstrate that the collection is where the issue of the relationship between a concept of art and art history arises. The fundamental problem is reflected in the choice of a specific mode of perception. Does the connoisseur who concentrates on a series of paintings ignore the single masterpiece? Does the viewer, who is particularly interested in a small number of paintings, deprive himself of the possibility of judging the work in its historical context? Even if both modes of perception are combined, the question remains whether it is art history that sets the standards for judging works of art, or whether it are external conventions. As it is, the practical side

of collections has consequences for the relationship between an ideal concept of art and art history.

Set against this literary background, Goethe's practical experience as a collector of graphic works is of great interest. Among his collections, be it in the field of natural history or art, his approx. 11,500 prints and drawings comprise an important element.[9] Goethe established the basis of this collection through the influence of his friend Johann Heinrich Merck, who also played a significant role in establishing the private collection of Carl August, the young duke of Sachsen-Weimar-Eisenach.[10] Goethe's initial enthusiasm diminished in the course of his travels through Italy (1786–1788). After 1805, however, he showed new interest in prints and drawings. In 1809, his stock of graphic works gained a new quality when he acquired more than 100 Italian prints, mostly by Renaissance artists. These prints had belonged to the estate of Carl Ludwig Fernow, a theorist and art historian, who, after his return from Italy, had joined the circle of the "Weimarische Kunstfreunde". This sudden expansion of his stock of Italian prints caused Goethe to rearrange his collection, formerly ordered by subject matter. Now he classified the sheets by schools and artists in chronological order. Although it is not surprising that Goethe structured his collection according to principles already well-established at that time,[11] it is worth noting that he adopted them rather late. Remarks in his diary and in letters between 1809 and 1814 explain his deliberate decision to put the prints and drawings in historical order. The new structure not only followed a current convention but also corresponded to new demands placed by Goethe on the collection and its use. He quickly became aware of large gaps, and in order to close them he was obliged to contact art dealers in Leipzig, Frankfurt am Main and Mannheim. From 1817 onwards, Goethe acquired many prints and drawings in auctions and from dealers, some of whom became closely acquainted with the celebrated poet; in particular, he purchased hundreds of sheets from Johann August Gottlob Weigel and later, Carl Gustav Boerner.[12] With the help of dealers and friends, Goethe continued adding pieces to the collection until his death in 1832.

This respectable collection, which has formed part of the Goethe-Nationalmuseum in Weimar since 1885, is astonishing in scope. Large numbers of prints and drawings provide an overview of Italian, German, French, Dutch and Flemish art and are enriched by a selection of English works. Goethe's collection shows no categorical limitations. He neither concentrated on prints and drawings in connection to some classicist ideal, nor did he limit his acquisitions to sheets of the highest quality, best condition and early states. In this respect, the poet's collection is also heterogeneous: first-rate, early

3) Asmus Jakob Carstens, «Study of a Garment», c. 1794, red chalk, heightened with white, 39.5 × 33.3 cm, Weimar, SWKK, Goethe-Nationalmuseum.

proofs of rare prints, e.g., Schongauer's *Death of the Virgin* [Fig. 1][13], can be found next to heavily damaged sheets, for instance an engraving of Battista Franco with an original mounting from Goethe's times [Fig. 2]. Among the pieces acquired from Fernow's collection are studies of garments by the highly esteemed Asmus Jakob Carstens [Fig. 3][14]. But Goethe also possessed simple drawings by Johann Heinrich Roos [Fig. 4].[15] His collection includes about 250 prints and drawings based on inventions of Raphael. For a long time he tried – in the end successfully – to acquire a better copy of Marcantonio Raimondi's *Morbetto* [Fig. 5], a print which had been designed by Raphael.[16] These prints and drawings provided Goethe with an impressive panorama of works conceived by his favourite artist. But besides such works, which corresponded to his concept of ideal art, Goethe was also

4) Johann Heinrich Roos, «Sheep», chalk, 30 × 20.7 cm, Weimar, SWKK, Goethe-Nationalmuseum.

5) Marcantonio Raimondi, «The Plague in Phrygia (Morbetto)», after Raphael, engraving, second state, 19.8 × 25.1 cm, Weimar, SWKK, Goethe-Nationalmuseum.

interested in prints and drawings by Flemish, Dutch and Italian mannerists, e.g., a biblical composition by Abraham Bloemaert [Fig. 6] or Hendrick Goltzius' graphic masterpiece *Hercules*, which not only contradicts Goethe's concept of ideal art, but also his conception of man.[17]

Goethe's particular way of dealing with his prints and drawings can help explain why he collected so many sheets of varying quality. Many letters, bills, diaries, catalogues and essays provide an idea of how he handled prints and drawings. In the following, I have summarized some important methods:[18] During his Italian journey, Goethe emphasized the importance of a continuous, and, if possible, repeated examination of works of art in order to minimize the impact of disruptive, external influences or subjective predispositions. Goethe's desire to replace the first impression by a "pure impression"[19] is characteristic of his later practices as a collector. In addition to his intensive occupation with single works, he consulted comparable material. With his comparative view, Goethe aimed at discovering not differences, but rather affinities and relationships. He also compared different graphic reproductions of the same painting, or prints and their model drawings. Most of the drawings thought by Goethe to be models for engravings turned out, on closer examination, to be copies from prints themselves, but in at least one case the poet possessed an original: Maarten van Heemskerck's original design for *Daniel in the Lion's Den*, engraved by Philips Galle [Figs. 7, 8]. Whereas such comparisons of prints and drawings served to sharpen and cultivate Goethe's own perception, they also helped establish a historical-chronological series. Signalling a new direction, Goethe wrote in a letter to Heinrich Meyer, dated 5 September 1809: "If one also pro-

6) Abraham Bloemaert, «The Prodigal Son», chalk, pen and brush, heightened with white, 15 × 21.8 cm, Weimar, SWKK, Goethe-Nationalmuseum.

ceeds historically and gradually in this case, one will pleasantly attain the correct judgement".[20] Goethe's numerous acquisitions, culminating in number around 1820, represent the material for a close historical succession of prints and drawings. Goethe's interest in establishing such series is illustrated by his decision to disband volumes of facsimile editions, e.g., a volume of Andrea Scacciati's and Stefano Mulinari's aquatints based on drawings of the Florentine collections. Goethe separated these sheets and added them to the works of the artists who had drawn the originals. He dealt with the engravings of David Teniers the Younger's *Theatrum pictorium* in the same manner. In some cases he had to investigate when the artist lived and worked in order to find the right place for the print in the order. Sometimes he pencilled basic information on the margin of prints. On the reproduction of a sketch by Bartolomeo Ramenghi da Bagnacavallo, Goethe wrote the note "From Bologna and pupil of Raphael"[21]. In addition to these methods, Goethe kept contacts with other connoisseurs and art lovers. He regularly showed his prints and drawings to his close friends and guests. In conversations with those who

7) Maarten van Heemskerck, «Daniel in the Lion's Den», 1564, pen, 19.5 × 24.8 cm, Weimar, SWKK, Goethe-Nationalmuseum.

viewed works of his collection Goethe weighed their comments against his own ideas.

Goethe's practice of collecting – his continuous and repeated viewing of prints and drawings, the comparison of similar and related works, the arrangement in series and discussions with others – corresponds remarkably with his methods in studying nature. His research in the fields of mineralogy, botany and osteology show strikingly similar procedures, which he developed to objectify his observations. In 1792 he wrote his essay *Experiment as Mediator between Subject and Object*, which summarized thoughts based on experiences from his Italian journey. In this text, Goethe explains how best

8) Philips Galle, «Daniel in the Lion's Den», 1565, engraving, first state, 20 × 24.4 cm, Weimar, SWKK, Goethe-Nationalmuseum.

to interpret experiments and recommends manifold variations of one experiment in order to build up a structured "collection of experiences".[22]

Goethe's letters from Italy and his *Italian Journey* (published much later) describe his studies in natural sciences and his intensive training in the viewing of art. Moreover, they claim

that there is a direct connection between the two fields of interest. Goethe repeatedly mentions, in slightly varied formulation, that he approaches art and nature in the same manner. In a letter to Charlotte von Stein, he writes explicitly about a methodical transfer: "I now look at art in the same way as I looked at nature [...]".[23] And a few days later he puts this transfer in more concrete form in a letter to Herder: "I am also aided tremendously by the ability to discover similar relationships, however far remote they may be, and the genesis of things – by this, I mean in the field of art [...]. Now, my dear old friend, architecture and sculpting and painting are the same to me as mineralogy, botany and zoology".[24] For both fields of study, nature and art, Goethe advocated an approach which he himself called the "genetic method".[25]

The close proximity of Goethe's perception of art and his study of nature suggests that the choice of the same methods for both fields is based on similar intentions. In several essays, Goethe wrote about his aims as a scientist. From these texts we get an idea of the relevance of his scientific methods for his treatment of works of art. His intensive visual examination of natural phenomena, his efforts to objectify empirical observations, to use comparisons, and to establish series of observations, formed the basis for his project of morphology.[26] Goethe defined morphology as "the science of form (*Gestalt*), formation (*Bildung*) and transformation (*Umbildung*) of organic bodies".[27] Morphology was based on careful examination of forms and their modifications under different external circumstances, as well as on intuition in order to find archetypes (*Typen*, *Urphänomene*) and fundamental rules of their (trans)formation. In his *Attempt to Explain the Metamorphosis of Plants* of 1790, Goethe proposed that the plant is formed by a progressive modification of one single organ, the *Urblatt*, a primordial leaf, from which each part of the organism (stem, leaves and blossom) originates. In contrast to artificial taxonomies like the *Systema* by Linnaeus, Goethe tried not to limit his study to only a few arbitrary perceptible parts of organisms, but rather to explore the inner coherence of the different parts. His intention was to grasp the "entirety of Nature" (*das Ganze der Natur*)[28], which only partially takes shape and becomes visible. The individual concretions only reveal a limited selection of the "entirety of Nature". These concretions have to be arranged by form into series which correspond to a gradual development. Such series allow one to perceive the dynamic character of the "entirety of Nature". Metamorphosis turns out to be "the real form of nature".[29] Understanding metamorphosis not only helps to put things in the right order, but enables one to portray the inner organization of nature itself. In his morphology, Goethe developed a concept to represent a relationship between concrete natural entities, processes of formation and transformation, as well as the "entirety of Nature".

There are three reasons why Goethe's collection of graphic works and his use of prints and drawings should be interpreted against the background of his studies of nature: the methodical parallels between his scientific research and his study of art, his reflections on methodical transfer, and his concept of the "entirety of Art" (*das Ganze der Kunst*)[30], a term analogous to "entirety of Nature". From this point of view, the content of Goethe's extensive collection becomes understandable, and it becomes evident that his historical view on works of art should not be limited to a chronological arrangement of prints and drawings. However, his repeatedly applied method of looking at a large chronologically ordered series of prints and drawings enabled him systematically to observe formations and transformations in art. In this way, he developed an idea of creative potential as a characteristic of art itself. The structure of Goethe's collection not only helped solve historical-critical questions of connoisseurship but – in analogy to his morphological studies of nature – enabled him to grasp the "entirety of Art". A 'morphological' art history[31] should establish a link between the huge number of individual works of art and a general idea of art, the latter implying a plethora of possible formations and transformations which are only partially embodied by concrete works of art. Thus, the "entirety of Nature" or the highest concept of art obtained a transcendental status and it became understandable why it was impossible to realize the highest concept of art in one particular work of art.

The art collection assumes an essential function in the framework of these concepts. In *The Collector and His Circle*, Goethe demonstrates how attempts to define a concept of ideal art must fail.[32] The collector tries in vain to illustrate his ideal by referring to particular works; the guest labelled as the "Charakteristiker" and the young philosopher do not agree in their aesthetic concepts. In the end, the members of the collector's circle, however ironically, sketch a system which offers a definition *ex negativo* of ideal art as a mediator between contradictory extremes. An approach to the "entirety of Art" can prove successful only in conversations between several art lovers regarding a great number of contingent and restricted works of art. Since a single artist in his production cannot free himself of subjectivity and circumstantial limitations and, therefore, is not able to grasp the "whole", it is the task of the beholder to establish a higher, abstract unity. The collection replaces the hypothetical absolute masterpiece; the single works of art in the collection are imperfect, but a methodically consistent synopsis renders it possible to virtually balance their artistic imperfections.

By way of this concept, Goethe was able to avoid a relativistic stance without denying the historicity of art. While in

Italy, he had pondered the fact that works of art are fundamentally influenced by time. Palladio's buildings gave him the opportunity to acknowledge that the idea of a perfect work of art could not be realized by one single artist.[33] Although this insight initially let the idea of normative criteria based on the imitation of ancient art appear questionable[34], his 'morphological' art history enabled him to define a general idea of art which existed beyond individual – and thus historically determined – works. If we can ascribe such a concept to Goethe, it would mean that he found a personal, but consistent solution for the opposition between normativeness and historicity. This is art in an emphatic sense, an *ars una* which Goethe discovered beyond individual *artificialia* while studying the history of art.

In 1831, Goethe once more made arrangements concerning his legacy and dictated his will. In conversations with the Duke's Chancellor von Müller, among others, he mentioned his collections. Although he had accumulated in the end more than 50,000 objects, he asserted his life-long ambition by stating, "It was neither by whim nor accident, but rather every time with a plan and intention I collected for the purpose of my own consequential education, and I learned something from every piece of my property"[35]. Goethe's remark is understandable if we interpret his collection of graphic works as the material that enabled him to maintain the controversial highest concept of art by using a specific method of historicizing works of art. Goethe needed a substantial stock of graphic works to reconstruct the most important developments in the history of art. Only if his series became as dense as possible could they allow him to transfer methods he had previously developed for the study of nature into the field of art.

Even though Goethe's highest concept of art had to remain an abstract term, the immense stock of illustrative material at his disposal guaranteed that theoretical reflexion did not become philosophical speculation without regarding particular works of art. In 1788, returning from Rome, Goethe penned a witticism which can be taken as the guiding principle of the collector: "Do not go about Art abstractly"[36]. The highest concept of art should not be deduced from a philosophy of art, but rather developed on the basis of repeated inspection of prints and drawings.

Frequently cited sources

FA: J. W. Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke. Briefe, Tagebücher und Gespräche*, ed. by F. Apel et al., 40 in 45 vols., Frankfurt a. M., 1985–1999.

WA: *Goethes Werke*, ed. by order of Großherzogin Sophie von Sachsen, Weimar, 1887–1919 (reprinted Munich, 1990, ed. by Paul Raabe).

Schuchardt: C. Schuchardt, *Goethe's Kunstsammlungen, Erster Theil: Kupferstiche, Holzschnitte, Radirungen, Schwarzkunstblätter, Lithographien und Stahlstiche, Handzeichnungen und Gemälde*, Jena, 1848.

[1] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Deutsche Kunsthistorikertag in Bonn (March 2005), in order to summarize some results of a more extensive project on which I worked as a member of the Collaborative Research Centre "Phenomenon Weimar – Jena. Culture around 1800" (Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena).

[2] See J. W. von Goethe, *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, ed. and trans. by E. A. Blackall, New York, 1989, pp. 36–38; FA I, 9, pp. 420–423 (*Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, book 1, ch. 17).

[3] Goethe, *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* (as in note 2), p. 248 (partly corrected); for the German text, see FA I, 9, p. 780 (*Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, book 6).

[4] Goethe, *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* (as in note 2), p. 248; see FA I, 9, p. 780.

[5] The German term "Geschichte der Kunst" was especially propagated by Johann Joachim Winckelmann and his *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (1764); see H. Locher, 'Kunstgeschichte', in G. Ueding (ed.) *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, vol. 4, Tübingen, 1998, col. 1452–1474. For German concepts of art history see H. Locher, *Kunstgeschichte als historische Theorie der Kunst 1750–1950*, München, 2001, or R. Prange, *Die Geburt der Kunstgeschichte. Philosophische Ästhetik und empirische Wissenschaft*, Köln, 2004. The first steps to the establishment of the discipline were taken by so-called "extraordinary" professors as Johann Dominicus Fiorillo and Carl Ludwig Fernow, see C. Schrapel, *Johann Dominicus Fiorillo. Grundlagen zur wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Beurteilung der „Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland und den vereinigten Niederlanden"* (Studien zur Kunstgeschichte, 155), Hildesheim, 2004, and R. Wegner (ed.), *Kunst als Wissenschaft. Carl Ludwig Fernow – ein Begründer der Kunstgeschichte* (Ästhetik um 1800, 2), Göttingen, 2005.

[6] J. W. von Goethe, *Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. by J. Gearey, trans. by E. and E. H. von Nardroff, New York, 1986, p. 88; for the German text, see FA I, 18, p. 472.

[7] See P. J. Burgard, *Idioms of Uncertainty. Goethe and the Essay*, University Park/Pennsylvania, 1992; M. Dönike, *Pathos, Ausdruck und Bewegung. Zur Ästhetik des Weimarer Klassizismus 1796–1806* (Quellen und Forschungen zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte, 34), Berlin, 2005.

[8] See W. Scheidig, *Goethes Preisaufgaben für bildende Künstler 1799–1805* (Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft, 57), Weimar, 1958; E. Osterkamp, '"Aus dem Gesichtspunkt reiner Menschlichkeit". Goethes Preisaufgaben für bildende Künstler 1799–1805', in S. Schulze (ed.), *Goethe und die Kunst*, exh. cat., Ostfildern, 1994, pp. 310–322.

[9] For Goethe as a collector of prints and drawings see: H. Brandt, *Goethe und die graphischen Künste* (Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, 2), Heidelberg, 1913; C. Zigrosser, 'Goethe as a print collector', *Magazine of Art* 43 (1950), pp. 100–105 and p. 111; E. Trunz, *Weimarer Goethe-Studien* (Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft, 61), Weimar, 1980, esp. pp. 7–47; D. Eckardt and M. Oppel (eds), *Kostbarkeiten aus Goethes Kunstsammlung*, exh. cat., Duisburg, 1987; H. Apel, J. Klauß, M. Oppel and W. Schubert, *Goethe als Sammler. Kunst aus dem Haus am Frauenplan in Weimar*, exh. cat., Zürich, 1989; M. Oppel, 'Kunst-Ideal und Sammlungstätigkeit', in S. Schulze (ed.), *Goethe und die Kunst*, exh. cat., Ostfildern, 1994, pp. 60–61; G. Schuster (ed.), *Der Sammler und die Seinigen. Handzeichnungen aus Goethes Besitz*, exh. cat., Munich, 1999; R. Wegner, 'Schöne Natur und unbändige Kunst?', in K. Manger (ed.), *Goethe und die Weltkultur* (Ereignis Weimar–Jena. Kultur um 1800. Ästhetische Forschungen, 1), Heidelberg, 2003, pp. 271–277; and J. Grave, *Der "ideale Kunstkörper". Johann Wolfgang Goethe als Sammler von Druckgraphiken und Zeichnungen* (Ästhetik um 1800, 4), Göttingen, 2006 (forthcoming).

[10] See M. Bertsch, 'Die Zeichnungs- und Graphiksammlung Herzog Carl Augusts von Sachsen-Weimar-Eisenach', in K. Scheurmann and J. Frank (eds.), *Neu entdeckt. Thüringen – Land der Residenzen. Katalog*, exh. cat., Mainz, 2004, vol. II, pp. 112–120; M. Bertsch, 'Johann Heinrich Merck und die Anfänge der Graphiksammlung von Herzog Carl August', in M. Bertsch and J. Grave (eds.), *Räume der Kunst. Blicke auf Goethes Sammlungen* (Ästhetik um 1800, 3), Göttingen, 2005, pp. 47–75; M. Bertsch and J. Grave, '"Deine Albrecht Dürer sind nunmehr schön geordnet". Lavaters Dürer-Sammlung in Goethes Händen', in B. Schubiger et al. (eds.), *Sammeln und Sammlungen im 18. Jahrhundert in der Schweiz*, Geneva, 2006 (forthcoming).

[11] See S. Brakensiek, *Vom "Theatrum mundi" zum "Cabinet des Estampes". Das Sammeln von Druckgraphik in Deutschland 1565–1821* (Studien zur Kunstgeschichte, 150), Hildesheim 2003; C. Baker, C. Elam and G. Warwick (eds.), *Collecting Prints and Drawings in Europe, c. 1500–1750*, Aldershot, 2003.

[12] See *Goethe, Boerner und Künstler ihrer Zeit. Goethe, Boerner, and the Artists of Their Time*, ed. by C. G. Boerner, Düsseldorf 1999; D. Gleisberg, *"...im Zusammenhang wird jedes Blatt instructiv." Goethe und der Kunsthändler Carl Gustav Boerner. Ein illustriertes Verzeichnis der Druckgraphik*, Weimar, 2000.

[13] See Schuchardt, p. 140, no. 349. Goethe already possessed a print of the second state, when, in October of 1819, he bought a print of the first state, which in the auctioneer's catalogue had been described as "an excellent print of this extremely rare sheet, of the highest purity and power and which can only be found in the Imperial Cabinet in Vienna in such condition" (*Verzeichniss einer Sammlung von Kupferstichen und Original-Handzeichnungen des verstorbenen Herrn Wilhelm Gottlieb Becker*, Leipzig, 1819). Goethe had to pay more than 42 talers. The bill of the auctioneer Johann August Gottlob Weigel is preserved in the Goethe- und Schiller-Archiv Weimar (GSA 30/378, fol. 39).

[14] See Schuchardt, p. 261, no. 295/2; R. Barth et al., *Asmus Jakob Carstens. Goethes Erwerbungen für Weimar*, exh. cat., Schleswig, 1992.

[15] See Schuchardt, p. 282, no. 514; WA IV, 4, pp. 308–309 (Goethe to Merck, 11 October 1780).

[16] See Schuchardt, p. 68, no. 635; WA IV, 42, p. 49 (Goethe to Meyer, 9 February 1827).

[17] See E. Osterkamp, 'Manieristische Kunst in Goethes Sammlung', in M. Bertsch and J. Grave (eds.), *Räume der Kunst...* (as in note 10), pp. 216–254.

[18] See J. Grave, 'Einblicke in das "Ganze" der Kunst. Goethes graphische Sammlung', in *Räume der Kunst...* (as in note 10), pp. 255–288.

[19] FA I, 15.1, p. 666 (Goethe's diary, 24 September 1786); J. van Selm, 'Erfahrung und Theorie bei Goethe: der „erste" und der „reine" Eindruck. Von den italienischen Erfahrungen zu den Theorien in Natur und Kunst', *Goethe-Yearbook* 2 (1984), pp. 121–136.

[20] WA IV, 21, p. 52.

[21] See Schuchardt, p. 5, no. 28 ("Bologneser und Schüler von Raphael").

[22] FA I, 25, p. 36 ("Sammlung von Erfahrungen").

[23] WA IV, 8, p. 100 (Goethe to Charlotte von Stein, 20–23 December 1786).

[24] WA IV, 8, p. 108–110 (Goethe to Herder, 29 December 1786).

[25] FA I, 19, p. 652.

[26] See O. Breidbach, 'Transformation statt Reihung. Naturdetail und Naturganzes in Goethes Metamorphosenlehre', in O. Breidbach and P. Ziche (eds.), *Naturwissenschaften um 1800. Wissenschaftskultur in Jena–Weimar*, Weimar, 2001, pp. 46–64; J. Steigerwald, 'Goethe's morphology. Urphänomene and aesthetic appraisal', *Journal of the History of Biology* 35 (2002), pp. 291–328.

[27] FA I, 24, p. 365 (*Betrachtung über Morphologie*); see, e.g., D. Kuhn, *Typus und Metamorphose. Goethe-Studien*, ed. by R. Grumach (Marbacher Schriften, 30), Marbach a. N., 1988, esp. pp. 133–145 and 188–202.

[28] Goethe adopted this term from Karl Philipp Moritz; see FA I, 15.1, p. 574 and FA I, 18, p. 257.

[29] Breidbach (as in note 26), p. 52 ("die eigentliche Gestalt der Natur").

[30] See FA I, 18, p. 727 (*The Collector and His Circle*); WA IV, 13, p. 320 (Goethe to Meyer, 27 November 1798); FA I, 10, p. 527 (*Wilhelm Meister's Journeyman Years*).

[31] This 'morphological' art history is consequently restricted to Goethe's specific reception of art and, therefore, should not be identified with the questionable concept of morphological literary studies which was established by Günther Müller and Horst Oppel. For the ideological background of "morphological poetics", see J. Neubauer, 'Morphological poetics?', *Style* 22 (1988), no. 2, pp. 263–274.

[32] See Goethe, *Essays on Art and Literature* (as in note 6), pp. 121–159; for the German text, see FA I, 18, pp. 676–733.

[33] FA I, 15.1, p. 698 (Goethe's diary, 5 October 1786); see also WA IV, 8, pp. 97–98 (Goethe to the duchess Louise von Sachsen-Weimar-Eisenach, 12–23 December 1786).

[34] See, e.g., P. Szondi, 'Antike und Moderne in der Ästhetik der Goethezeit', in P. Szondi, *Poetik und Geschichtsphilosophie I. Studienausgabe der Vorlesungen 2*, ed. by S. Metz and H.-H. Hildebrandt, Frankfurt a. M., 1974, pp. 11–265, esp. pp. 26–28.

[35] FA I, 17, p. 785.

[36] FA I, 15.2, p. 831 ("Nicht von der Kunst in abstracto"); see E. Osterkamp, *Im Buchstabenbilde. Studien zum Verfahren Goethescher Bildbeschreibungen* (Germanistische Abhandlungen, 70), Stuttgart, 1991, pp. 53–54.