



PROJECT MUSE®

“Höhere Begattung,” “höhere Schönheit”: Goethe’s Homoerotic Poem “Selige Sehnsucht”

W. Daniel Wilson

Goethe Yearbook, Volume 20, 2013, pp. 117-132 (Article)

Published by North American Goethe Society

DOI: 10.1353/gyr.2013.0029



➔ For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/gyr/summary/v020/20.wilson.html>

W. DANIEL WILSON

“Höhere Begattung,” “höhere Schönheit”: Goethe’s Homoerotic Poem “Selige Sehnsucht”

THE MAIN PROBLEM IN WRITING ON GOETHE and “homosexuality” is that many readers will expect his own sexuality to be at the center, particularly since previous books have set the tone. This is particularly true of nonscholarly attempts, but scholars are not immune to the fascination with making Goethe “gay.”¹ It is time, I think, for us to question our methods and assumptions, which necessarily involves taking into account the historical distance between us and same-sex love in the eighteenth century.² The effect of ahistorical interpretations is not only that few scholars pay attention to them. For they ultimately detract from the literary texts and what they have to say to us. There has been little attempt to get to the bottom of what should be burning issues, given our own age’s conflicts over homosexuality and Goethe’s central role in German identity: What were Goethe’s *views* on same-sex love, how did he deal with power relations, the “problem of the boy” (Foucault), the closet, and other thorny issues? And an analysis of these works and his thoughts quickly leads into an area that is essentially ignored in almost all these treatments: Goethe grappled with the ancient Greek and Roman models of same-sex love, in which the desire is one-way, desire of an *erastēs* for a (usually younger) *erōmenos*, of a “lover” for a “beloved.” I have attempted to show elsewhere that in his works beginning with the poem “Ganymed” (1772?) and the play *Götter Helden und Wieland* (1773), right through to the penultimate scene of *Faust II* (completed in 1831), Goethe was intent on unsettling this unidirectional model of “Greek love,” giving a voice and subjectivity to the younger partner, making the beloved into a lover, paying attention to his feelings and desires. Despite his inspiration from dissident ancient texts that gave impetus to an alternative, egalitarian model (for Goethe’s early period, they are Pindar and Theocritus), this is a revolutionary moment in the European portrayal of same-sex male love, which had clung quite tenaciously to the usual ancient pattern. Goethe’s reversal presages in important ways the modern relationships between equals that dominates male-male desire.³

I am not suggesting that we cannot be bold in our interpretations—only that they be grounded in clear evidence, historical contextualization, and immersion in Goethe’s sources. But within those limitations, we find that Goethe’s approach to same-sex love is bound up in a web of subtle allusions, primarily to Greek and Roman texts, but also to his own works. One

of his major treatments of same-sex love is the *Schenkenbuch* of the *West-oestlicher Divan*, published in 1819. The love of the older poet for a young cupbearer—his age is indeterminate, but patterns of puberty and terminology would suggest that he may be as old as eighteen or nineteen⁴—is so obvious that commentaries gingerly point out “homoerotic” motifs in the poems, but steering clear of words like “homosexual.” In this, they follow Goethe, who suggested in the prose part of the *Divan* that the *Schenkenbuch* treats the love for a boy “unseren Sitten gemäß in aller Reinheit” (FA I, 3.1:224). Nevertheless, even in the prose section, the changes Goethe made to the anecdotes from Saadi (Sa’dī) smuggle sexuality into the depiction of pederasty in the “Schenkenbuch.” In the poems themselves, a plethora of imagery relating to Greek and Roman antiquity, but most particularly to Goethe’s medieval Persian sources, clearly suggest sexuality.⁵

The primary impact that gave rise to Goethe’s project was the Austrian diplomat and scholar Joseph von Hammer’s two-volume German translation of the poems of the medieval Persian poet Hāfiz, which happens to be one of the most openly homoerotic of any available translations from the Persian in Goethe’s day (other translations of Persian poetry generally bowdlerized the texts without comment).⁶ For it remains one of the big secrets of *Divan* scholarship that “das beherrschende Motiv” in medieval Persian literature is love for boys—it does not treat love of women at all.⁷ The misunderstanding arises partly because of a peculiar problem in Persian grammar: the lack of distinction between masculine and feminine for many words. Heinrich Friedrich von Diez, one of Goethe’s main Orientalist advisers, points out in a note, which Goethe read, that many passages of the *Qābūs Nāma* “zugleich auf die sogenannte griechische Liebe gedeutet werden können, welch in Asien besonders in Persien leider! niemals unbekannt gewesen, denn das Wort, Geliebte! im Original heisst auch Geliebter und kann folglich sowohl auf ein schönes Mädchen, als auf einen schönen Jüngling gezogen werden.”⁸ An English travel account that Goethe knew also mentioned “a strange confusion of gender”⁹ in Hāfiz, and then referred delicately to Greek love. This means that Goethe would have known that many of the Hāfiz poems that seem addressed to a feminine “Geliebte” might in fact be addressed to a boy. But even taking only the nouns and pronouns that Hammer uses (fairly arbitrarily) in his translation, poetry addressed to a boy or a “Freund” predominates.

In the strikingly modern poem “Unbegrenzt,” Goethe’s poetic persona calls “Hafis” “der Freuden ächte Dichterquelle.” Among the attributes that make up this fount of joys is “Zum Küssen stets bereiter Mund.” The poet continues:

Und mag die ganze Welt versinken,
 Hafis mit dir, mit dir allein
 Will ich wetteifern! Lust und Pein
 Sei uns den Zwillingen gemein!
 Wie du zu lieben und zu trinken
 Das soll mein Stolz, mein Leben seyn. (FA I, 3.1:31)

Would it not be absurd if Goethe’s poetic speaker is the “twin” of a pederast, and specifically wants to “love” like him, but somehow excludes sexual love?

Goethe's identification with Hāfiz is so close that he insisted in an advertisement that the poems are written "in stetem Bezug auf den Orient,"¹⁰ and just as in writing the poems he had "die von Hammersche Übersetzung täglich zur Hand,"¹¹ the reader who wishes to unravel Goethe's web of allusions has to do the same.

One example from many is particularly relevant. In Hāfiz's own "Buch de[s] Schenken," the editor Joseph von Hammer comments on a line that refers to the cupbearer in a "Kloster": "*Deir moghan* das Wirthskloster, die Schenke, gewöhnlich auch ein Knabenbordell."¹² Hammer echoes this in his introduction, when he says that Hāfiz "preiset die Schenken und Häuser wüster Lust."¹³ These references are to a stylized and very widespread motif in Persian poetry, in which an illicit tavern with "libertine" drinkers is located in the ruins of a Zoroastrian or Christian monastery. There, men partake in the two vices that Goethe notes as having been condemned by Islam, wine drinking and pederasty.¹⁴ This background sheds light on some of the poems of Goethe's own "Schenkenbuch": in the poem that begins "Was, in der Schenke, waren heute / Am frühesten morgen für Tumulte?" (only in the *Neuer Divan*: FA I, 3.1:412-13), the "wüstes Leben" echoes Hammer's just-quoted characterization of "Häuser wüster Lust," complete with "Händel" and "Insulte." The conflicts revolved largely around disputes between beautiful boys and beautiful women, the twin objects of the patrons' lusts.¹⁵ And these disputes are quite evident in other poems of the "Schenkenbuch," particularly the first one in which—as the title has it—"Schenke spricht," to the man's female beloved: "Du, mit deinen braunen Locken, / Geh' mir weg verschmitzte Dirne!" (FA I, 3.1:107). The commentaries anxiously assure us: "Dirne bedeutete zu Goethes Lebzeiten noch ohne negative Konnotationen 'junges Mädchen' . . ." ¹⁶ However, two of Goethe's four meanings of "Dirne" listed in the meticulous *Goethe-Wörterbuch* are "liederliches, sittenloses Mädchen" and "Hure";¹⁷ in the clearly negative context of the adjective "verschmitzt" and the equation of the tavern with a "Knabenbordell" referred to by Hammer, this "Dirne" is doubtless a "Hure." Though the relationship between the poet (Hatem) and the boy (Saki) thus is at first dominated by mercantile imagery, it rapidly develops into a tender love story, one in which the "Schenke spricht" almost exactly as many lines as the supposed poet, turning the tables on the usual Greek, Roman, and indeed Persian pattern of older "lover" and younger "beloved": Saki expresses his love in superb lyric that adopts some of the central topoi of male-female love. As an "active" lover, this figure refers obliquely to the most famous "Schenke" of all, Ganymede; in his early poem of this name, one of the *Venezianische Epigramme*, and a piece in *Philostrats Gemälde* (published the same year as the *Divan*, 1819), Goethe breaks with tradition to give Ganymede a voice with which he expresses his desire—and in the latter two cases, the "boy" also expresses fear over rivalry from a woman.¹⁸ Saki, then, is a Persian Ganymede, a version of the patron saint of homoeroticism and the original "Schenke."

It has long since been noticed that the boundaries between the books of the *Divan* are permeable, and this is also the case for the theme of pederasty. The "Schenke," in fact, shows up in several poems outside the

“Schenkenbuch.”¹⁹ The competition between love for women and love for men, I would suggest, is also played out in Goethe’s most famous, most difficult, and most-interpreted *Divan* poem, from the *Buch des Sängers*.

SELIGE SEHNSUCHT

Sagt es niemand, nur den Weisen,
Weil die Menge gleich verhöhnet,
Das Lebend’ge will ich preisen,
Das nach Flammentod sich sehnet.

In der Liebesnächte Kühlung,
Die dich zeugte, wo du zeugtest,
Überfällt dich fremde Fühlung
Wenn die stille Kerze leuchtet.

Nicht mehr bleibest du umfängen
In der Finsterniß Beschattung,
Und dich reißet neu Verlangen
Auf zu höherer Begattung.

Keine Ferne macht dich schwierig,
Kommst geflogen und gebannt,
Und zuletzt, des Lichts begierig,
Bist du Schmetterling verbrannt,

Und solange du das nicht hast,
Dieses: “Stirb und werde!”
Bist du nur ein trüber Gast
Auf der dunklen Erde.²⁰

The poem’s message of rebirth after a symbolic immolation is clear enough—but the clarity ends there. Why should this rebirth follow an image of reproduction, and be opposed to it? For the second stanza clearly speaks of heterosexuality and the attendant reproduction. It reduces sex to reproduction, that is, and where we would expect markers of fiery passion, we get instead—as critics have pointed out—decidedly unpassionate “Kühlung” in the supposed nights of love.²¹ Some of these critics would reduce this “Kühlung” to postcoital *tristis*,²² but this interpretation runs against the text, which associates the coolness with reproductive lovemaking, not with its aftermath (“der Liebesnächte Kühlung, / Die dich zeugte”). The poem thus clearly contrasts the act of procreation—and thus heterosexuality—with the butterfly’s death in the flame of the candle. We are forced to conclude that the flaming death has something to do with sexuality that is not involved in reproduction.

Of course, we could follow the interpretive tradition for which the “higher” lovemaking is spiritual, the mystical sacrifice of the self in favor of a higher existence. Many critics have followed this line, suggesting, for example, that physical reality is metaphysically transfigured, as in all mystical religions.²³ However, this reading runs entirely counter to the erotic context

of the *Divan*—and to Goethe’s aversion to mystical interpretations of Hāfiz. This latter point was of some importance to Goethe. As we saw, he was dealing with medieval Persian love poetry, which almost entirely addressed love for boys. There, the “low” homoerotic literature merged imperceptibly with a more sublime variant, in which love for boys is viewed in a Platonic sense as love of beauty, and in which pederasty came to be interpreted within Islam as a metaphor for love of God or Mohammed.²⁴ This is the “official” Islamic interpretation of Hāfiz’s poetry, and the only one allowed in present-day Iran. However, this kind of interpretation runs all too obviously against Hāfiz’s texts, in which details of sexuality are impossible to reconcile with religion (symbolic Christian interpretations of the *Song of Songs* come to mind)—and in which religious orthodoxy itself is the subject of withering critique. Joseph von Hammer was clear on this point in his history of Persian literature, Goethe’s major source for his own depiction in the prose part of the *Divan*:

An dem Hofe des letzten [Timur] im glücklichen Schiras, unter Rosen und Nachtigallen, sang *Hafis* unsterbliche Lieder der Liebe, welche erst die spätere Zeit mystisch gedeutet, die aber wohl fast durchaus nur buchstäblich von Sinnengenuß und sorgenfreyer Gleichgültigkeit zu verstehen sind.²⁵

In a later passage on Hāfiz, Hammer is even more emphatic:

Wenn in einigen seiner *Gaselen* mystischer Anstrich aufgetragen ist, wenn aus seinem *Buche des Schenken* wirklich mystischer Hauch weht; so ist doch die Gesamtheit seiner Gedichte nichts, als ein lauter Aufruf zu Liebe und Wein, und der höchste Ausbruch erotischer und bachantischer Begeisterung . . . Alles athmet bey diesem nur Wein und Liebe, und Liebe und Wein, vollkommene Gleichgültigkeit gegen alle äußern Religionspflichten, und offenen Hohn der Klosterdisciplin. . . .²⁶

Goethe’s assent to Hammer’s position is clear from the *Divan* poem “Offenbar Geheimniß” (FA I, 3.1:32–33), as scholarship unanimously recognizes. He expressed it with more punch in a letter to Zelter while working on the *Divan*: “Das Orientalisieren finde ich sehr gefährlich, denn eh man sich’s versieht, geht das derbste Gedicht, wie ein Luftballon für lauter rationellem und spirituellem Gas, womit es sich anfüllt, uns aus den Händen und in alle Lüfte.”²⁷ It would run entirely against Goethe’s understanding of medieval Persian literature and indeed against the sensuality of his own poetry, then, to assert that Goethe viewed the depiction of pederasty in Hāfiz mystically, in line with Islamic orthodoxy; he doubtless saw it for what it was, a reflection of a widespread Persian sexual practice. And in the case of “Selige Sehnsucht,” sexuality is very obviously at the center of the poem, where “Zeugen” and “Begattung” have to work literally at least on one level.

Of course, this is not to say that the poem’s imagery has to be taken entirely literally. But it is the Persian associations of the imagery from Hāfiz’s poetry that are most pertinent, as this poem, like the others in the *Divan*, works “in stetem Bezug auf den Orient” and in particular to Hāfiz’s poetry. Hāfiz uses the image of “burning up” in love homoerotically:

Morgenwind bist du im Stande
 Treu' und Liebe zu behalten,
 Bringe Kunde meinem Freunde,
 Daß dein heimlich Liebverbrennter
 Bloss aus Sehnsucht sterbend sagte:
 Ohne dich kann ich nicht leben.²⁸

The candle has similar associations. In Hāfiz, the slender flame of the still candle reminds the lover of his beloved's slender body (as does the cypress tree, or even a hair), and the beloved is predominantly a boy. The fiery death of the butterfly that is drawn into the flame, then, is already placed in opposition to a merely functional heterosexuality in the second stanza of the poem. The association of the butterfly and candle with same-sex love—the logical conclusion of the second stanza—is confirmed by recourse to Hāfiz. The commentaries point out the Hāfiz poems that presumably inspired Goethe, but do not hint at their homoerotic content. The motif matrix begins with Hāfiz's clear association of the image of the butterfly and candle with sexuality, present not only in the poem that Goethe explicitly named as his model,²⁹ but in others as well:

Den Schmetterling der Lust send' in die Nacht der Trennung,
 Sonst werde ich die Welt verbrennen wie die Kerze.³⁰

Hammer paraphrases this couplet: "Ich tappe herum in der finstern Nacht der Trennung: O sende mir doch den Schmetterling des Genußes um mich in dieser Finsterniß zu trösten, denn sonst zehre ich mich ab aus heißer Sehnsucht, wie die Kerze."³¹ The word "Sehnsucht" of course is echoed in the title of Goethe's poem, and the image of the butterfly immolated in the candle is a sign of passion. While in his history of Persian literature—published long after this poem was written—Hammer portrayed the love of the butterfly for the flame as "unglücklich," in contrast to the "genußreiche Liebe" of the nightingale for the rose,³² Hāfiz does not always conform to Hammer's prescription, using the butterfly's love rather to represent passion that is consummated:

Der Schmetterling brennet am Licht
 Im Genuße der Liebe. . . .

But whereas in Hāfiz's imagery cited thus far the imagery can refer to passion for a woman, this poem ends with reference to the beloved cupbearer:

Als Trunkener schlägt heute Hafis
 Seine Hände zusammen
 Denn gestern vernahm er vom Mund
 Des lieben Schenkens ein Geheimniß.³³

Here, too, we have the association of love for the cupbearer with a secret—and of course "Selige Sehnsucht" opens with the central theme of secrecy. The "Geheimnis" and the associated word "(ver)plaudern" appear elsewhere in the *Divan*;³⁴ in Hāfiz's poetry they have strong connotations of the secret of pederasty that must not be betrayed.³⁵ In this Hāfiz poem, "Geheimniß" is

associated with the butterfly/candle motif as well. It is no wonder, then, that a sort of “fremde Fühlung” comes over the poet in the midst of loveless mating: heterosexuality is not enough for him, and it is best not to speak about his desires too openly, for clerics are constantly on the watch—as indeed some of the poems in the expanded *Neuer Divan* version of the “Schenkenbuch” suggest.³⁶

In another Hāfiz poem, the connection between boy-love and the butterfly image is explicit.

Gestern begab sich Hafis in die Schenke,
 Ohne Besinnung verlangt er das Glas.
 Träumend erblickt er die *Göttin der Jugend*,
 Siehe, da ward er als Greis noch verliebt.
 Schnell gieng ein diebisches Knäblein vorüber,
 Dieses verlangte Hafis ganz allein;
 Gluthen der Rosen verbrennen *Bülbüle* [= Nachtigalle],
 Funken des Lichts sind des Schmetterlings Tod . . .
 Zaubерisch scheint die Narcisse des Schenken,
 Zauberei schleicht sich in unseren Kreis.
 Fürsten besuchen Hafisens Gemächer,
 Während die Seele bei'm Liebbling verweilt.³⁷

With the theme of the cupbearer sparking love in the drinker, we are back to the central pederastic theme of the “Schenkenbuch,” which Hāfiz’s poem combines with the image of the butterfly drawn into the flame—representing love for a “diebisches Knäblein” who robs Hafis of his heart.

Given all we have seen, it should also come as no surprise that the otherwise puzzling expression “höhere Begattung” should enter the poem: otherwise puzzling, because there is no immediately apparent reason why death in the flames should be described as a kind of *mating*.³⁸ It has been convincingly argued that there really is no death of the butterfly in the poem, but rather a transformation, and that the most general meaning of the symbol in the poem is “eine qualitative *Erweiterung* oder *Bereicherung* des Menschseins.”³⁹ That deepens the puzzle rather than solving it—unless we have recourse to a different kind of mating, a nonprocreative one. What fuller expression of this self-realization is there than what Goethe described in his 1805 essay on the “homosexual” Winckelmann as the need of “wahrhaft ganze Menschen . . . die Verbindungen menschlicher Wesen in ihrem ganzen Umfange kennen [zu] lernen,” in particular die “Verbindung ähnlicher Naturen,” or, as he goes on to say euphemistically, “die Freundschaft unter Personen männlichen Geschlechts,” or, less euphemistically, Winckelmann’s “Verhältnis mit schönen Jünglingen”?⁴⁰

The question arises, however: If love “in ihrem ganzen Umfange,” that is, if bisexual love affords a sort of ancient totality, how can either same-sex or opposite-sex love be “higher” than the other? Goethe’s response is set in motion by a conversation with Friedrich von Müller on April 7, 1830, when the poet was eighty years old. It is his most famous pronouncement on Greek love, and yet its full implications have never been explored. Müller’s account reads:

Nun fiel das Gespräch auf griechische Liebe, auf Johannes Müller p.

Er [=Goethe] entwickelte, wie diese Verirrung eigentlich daher komme, daß nach rein ästhetischem Maßstab der *Mann* immerhin weit schöner, vorzüglicher, vollendeter wie die Frau sei. Ein solches einmal entstandnes Gefühl schwenke dann leicht ins Tierische, grob Materielle hinüber. Die Knabenliebe sei so alt wie die Menschheit, und man könne daher sagen, sie liege *in* der Natur, ob sie gleich *gegen* die Natur sei.⁴¹

There is a great deal that could be said about this passage, in particular its apparent paradox about something “in” nature but “against” nature. In particular, an analysis of the passage about the sanctity of marriage that immediately follows in this conversation would show that Goethe deconstructs his whole argument, revealing the phrase “*gegen die Natur*” as a nod at conventional morality.⁴² But less noticed—and more relevant to our argument—is the claim about male beauty as the root of “Greek love.” Goethe’s explanation demands an explanation, since there seems to be no obvious reason to claim that men are far more beautiful than women.

The answer lies in the breast. Goethe airs his views on male and female beauty in two other places. The first of these is in his commentary on his 1798 translation of Diderot’s treatise on painting. Diderot had defined the appropriate age for portraying *male* beauty: “Nur in dem Zwischenraum der beiden Alter, vom Anfang der vollkommenen Jugend bis zum Ende der Mannheit.”⁴³ Goethe finds that definition too wide.

Nur äußerst kurze Zeit kann der menschliche Körper schön genannt werden, und wir würden, im strengen Sinne, die Epoche noch viel enger als unser Verfasser [i.e., Diderot] begrenzen. Der Augenblick der Pubertät ist für beide Geschlechter der Augenblick, in welchem die Gestalt der höchsten Schönheit fähig ist; aber man darf wohl sagen: es ist nur ein Augenblick! die Begattung und Fortpflanzung kostet dem Schmetterlinge das Leben, dem Menschen die Schönheit, und hier liegt einer der größten Vorteile der Kunst, daß sie dasjenige dichterisch bilden darf, was der Natur unmöglich ist, wirklich aufzustellen. So wie die Kunst Zentauren erschafft, so kann sie uns auch jungfräuliche Mütter vorlügen, ja es ist ihre Pflicht. Die Matrone Niobe, Mutter von vielen erwachsenen Kindern, ist mit dem ersten Reiz jungfräulicher Brüste gebildet. Ja in der weisen Vereinigung dieser Widersprüche, ruht die ewige Jugend, welche die Alten ihren Gottheiten zu geben wußten.⁴⁴

Consonant with the gender obsessions of his time, Goethe moves effortlessly from Diderot’s emphasis on *male* beauty to a discussion of idealised—that is, “jungfräulich” firm—female breasts. Goethe gives this notion more philosophical “depth” in a conversation with Riemer on November 20, 1806, most of which was suppressed until the mid-twentieth century, and for that reason it has remained little known:

Der Streit, ob die männliche Schönheit in ihrer Vollkommenheit, oder die weibliche in ihrer Art höher stehe, kann nur aus der größern oder geringern Annäherung der männlichen oder der weiblichen Form an die Idee geschlichtet werden. Nun reicht die männliche aber mehr an die Idee, denn in ihr hört

das Reale auf. Die Männerbrust ist keine Brust mehr. Des Weibes Brust ist ein Reales, denn sie säugt damit. Die Zeugungsteile des Mannes sind nicht so in die Organisation des übrigen integrierend als bei dem Weibe. Ihr Geschäft ist bloß begeisternd, denn was der Mann auch dabei tun mag—wir wissen's ja so nicht—, ist ja doch nicht so real wie des Weibes Anteil, das die Keime hergibt. Des Weibes innere Organisation ist zum Zeugen eingerichtet.—Des Mannes Bildung geht offenbar über die des Weibes hinaus und ist keineswegs die vorletzte Stufe. Des Mannes Brust ist nicht etwa die Andeutung zu der darauf folgenden Weiberbrust, sondern die Weiberbrust, die von den Zitzen der Tiere heraufgekommen ist, ob sie gleich in dieser Doppelgestalt ihre höchste Schönheit erreicht hat, geht im Manne über den Zweck hinaus (denn er säugt ja nicht), sondern ist mehr ein Schmuck und Hindeutung auf eine höhere Bedeutung. Das Weib ist ein organisiertes Gebären, das Organ des Gebärens. Des Mannes τέλος [telos] ist viel idealer und geistiger. Und sein Verdienst besteht im ideellen und geistigen Wirken.⁴⁵

Goethe attributes men's supposedly greater beauty to the allegedly greater functionality of women's bodies (primarily breasts) for the reproductive process—that is, to the greater approximation of the male body to ideal (functionless) forms. This is why Goethe focuses on sagging breasts, and from the Diderot essay it is clear that he means the breasts of a nursing mother, which ancient artists transformed back into “jungfräulich” firmness to satisfy the idealizing imperative. These (somewhat confused) comments are doubtless offensive to modern values with respect to gender difference. Though both men and women participate in reproduction, Goethe reduces only women to their reproductive function; though man's genitals obviously have a biological function in reproduction, Goethe manages to interpret the male reproductive organs as somehow less “real,” more “ideal” than the female breast, or, for that matter, than the female genitalia. From this questionable biology he derives the equally questionable cultural argument that men, unlike women, are born to intellectual activity.

Regardless of its problematic argumentation, this kind of view was not unknown in Goethe's day. Goethe may have derived it from his authority on idealization in art, Winckelmann, who wrote in a letter that Goethe had read: “Was hat denn das Weib schönes, was wir nicht auch haben? denn eine schöne Brust ist von kurzer Dauer, und die Natur hat dieses Theil nicht zur Schönheit, sondern zur Erziehung der Kinder gemacht, und in dieser Absicht kan es nicht schön bleiben.”⁴⁶ In his letters, Winckelmann repeatedly challenged his male friends to come up with examples of female beauty that could match male ones, with the obvious expectation that they would fail.⁴⁷ Winckelmann's view was common coin, especially later. We find very similar arguments in Wilhelm von Humboldt's 1795 essay “Ueber die männliche und weibliche Form”; even the early romantic writer Friedrich Schlegel, who is generally represented as very progressive in gender matters, had written much the same in 1799.⁴⁸ Despite the striking similarity of these passages to Goethe's, there is no clear indication that he was directly inspired by Winckelmann, Humboldt, or Schlegel, since this notion was commonplace (as Schlegel points out). Regardless of its source, Goethe's

opinion is clear. More insistently than Winckelmann or Schlegel, his view is consistent with Platonic thinking, marshalling the supposed approximation of the male body to an “ideal” form as evidence of its superiority over a woman’s.

This analysis suggests an inconsistency in Goethe’s thinking. In the Winckelmann essay, he had posited love “in ihrem ganzen Umfange” as representing the highest achievement of ancient totality, and this would of course include love for women. But in his later conversation with Müller, and indeed in other places, he consistently suggests that men are naturally drawn to other men because men are “weit schöner” than women. His phrase in “Selige Sehnsucht,” “höhere Begattung,” corresponds perfectly to this suggestion that male-male love (“griechische Liebe”) results from the erotic power of “die männliche Schönheit,” which, he explicitly claims to Riemer, “in ihrer Vollkommenheit . . . höher stehe.” The “höhere Begattung,” then, doubtless refers to same-sex love between men.

The butterfly’s flame-out presents no little difficulty. But crucially, Hāfiz associates the butterfly’s immolation with passion. Here as in other poems in the *Divan*, Goethe takes motifs from Hāfiz but puts a decidedly more positive spin on them. Hāfiz is typically found pining away for a beloved boy who ignores him or makes him suffer (much like cold-hearted Greek and Roman boys, incidentally⁴⁹). This motif is expressed in the image of the poet burning up from love for the other male:

Abgebrannt ist Hafis, und Niemand sagt es dem Freunde,
Als der Ost, der um Gottes willen die Kunde davon trägt.⁵⁰

The news of a consuming passion is carried by the East wind (the traditional Persian bearer of messages between lovers⁵¹) to the beloved, but there is no response. However, if we recall Hāfiz’s image of the butterfly burning up in the candle as representing sexuality (“Genuß der Liebe”), then it is a figure of sexual fulfilment. Whichever way we take it in the case of Hāfiz, in Goethe the image is clearly a positive one, not of “Flammentod” in a literal sense, but rather in the figurative sense of the rebirth of a new self: “Stirb und werde!” The old self was tied to the perennial functionality of what Goethe saw as the inferior beauty of women. After all, in his Diderot commentary Goethe had written: “die Begattung und Fortpflanzung kostet dem Schmetterlinge das Leben, dem Menschen die Schönheit.” As the analysis has shown, Goethe clearly means that *female* beauty suffers from reproduction, so that the implication of this passage is that in a “*höbere* Begattung” with men, beauty will *not* suffer. Nor will the butterfly die in the imagery associated with this kind of “Begattung”—the butterfly in Goethe’s poem does not definitively die, but undergoes a metamorphosis.⁵² A “*neu* Verlangen” (my emphasis) emerges, consummated in the passionate union with the slender flame of the candle, the *higher* male beauty that in its idealization conforms to Goethe’s aesthetic ideals. Out of the flames emerges the phoenix of a new (but still male) self, which seeks men rather than women.

Goethe sketched out various versions of same-sex love in his works and other documents. In a letter to Carl August from Italy on December 29, 1787, he portrays it—at least superficially—as what is today called

“Nothomosexualität,” turning to men when no women are available (traditionally associated with sailors, prisoners, etc.). In more considered treatments—in the “Hercules und Hylas” section of *Philostrats Gemälde*, or in the Adolph episode of *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*—same-sex love is interpreted as a sort of original desire that is *betrayed* by love for a woman.⁵³ In the “Schenkenbuch,” the poet “wisely” divides his love between Saki and Suleika⁵⁴—that is, he embraces bisexuality; but the woman comes off rather badly in the “Schenkenbuch,” and the emphasis is clearly on pederasty, as it is in the Winckelmann essay and the conversation with Müller. “Selige Sehnsucht” is different. It suggests a conscious choice to embrace a “higher” form of love. In that respect, it is decidedly ancient, following Goethe’s own depiction of same-sex love in antiquity as paired with a notion that women are interesting only as breeders (in the Winckelmann essay).⁵⁵ It corresponds to the thoroughly romantic treatment of love for youths in both ancient Greece and in medieval Persia, particularly in Hāfiz. Goethe’s portrayal of same-sex love, then, is not dogmatic; it allows for all kinds of human experience. As Goethe put it, referring to his *Venezianische Epigramme*: his poems “[sollen] nach dem Leben schmecken.”⁵⁶

Royal Holloway, University of London

NOTES

1. The nonscholarly books that proceed with little historical perspective and declare Goethe to be a homosexual are Karl Hugo Pruys, *Die Liebkosungen des Tigers: Eine erotische Goethe-Biographie* (Berlin: edition q, 1997); Niels Höpfner, *Goethe und sein Blitz* page *Philipp Seidel: Zur Homosexualität des Dichturfürsten* (Düsseldorf: Eremiten-Presse, 2004). Höpfner at least gives sources, but he is not above including a bogus Goethe quotation from “einschlägigen Pornowebsites,” in which the writer supposedly called anal sex “die schönste aller männlichen Gelüste” (30). For all her theoretical sophistication, Susan E. Gustafson equates Goethe’s characters’ desires with his own: “My objective will be to examine how men who desired men in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Germany spoke about themselves.” *Men Desiring Men: The Poetry of Same-Sex Identity and Desire in German Classicism* (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2002) 12. And more recently, Katharina Mommsen, with no attempt at either historicizing or theoretical grounding, declares Goethe and Schiller to have been lovers who expressed their desires in coded poems that only superficially speak of love between man and woman; Mommsen takes the inflationary use of words like “Liebe” in sentimental epistolary culture rather too seriously: *Kein Rettungsmittel als die Liebe: Schillers und Goethes Bündnis im Spiegel ihrer Dichtungen* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2010). For a fundamental critique of such approaches, see W. Daniel Wilson, “But Is It Gay?: Kissing, Friendship, and ‘Pre-Homosexual’ Discourses in Eighteenth-Century Germany,” *Modern Language Review* 103 (2008): 767–83.

2. For an excellent account, see David M. Halperin, *How to Do the History of Homosexuality* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2002).

3. See W. Daniel Wilson, *Goethe Männer Knaben: Ansichten zur “Homosexualität”* (Berlin: Insel, 2012).

4. On the age of puberty in both antiquity and the German eighteenth century, see Herbert Moller, "The Accelerated Development of Youth: Beard Growth as a Biological Marker," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 29 (1987): 748–62.

5. For a detailed analysis, and for further background, see Wilson, *Goethe Männer Knaben*, chap. 5.

6. [Hāfiz, Khajeh Shams al-Dīn Muhammad:] *Der Diwan von Mobammed Schemseddin Hafis: Aus dem Persischen zum erstenmal ganz übersetzt von Joseph v. Hammer*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1812–1813).

7. "Daß Homoerotik in der mittelalterlichen islamischen Lyrik ein wichtiges und in der persisch-türkischen Lyrik das beherrschende Motiv darstellt, ist offenkundig." Johann Christoph Bürgel, "Abglanz Gottes oder Fallstrick Satans?: Zum homoerotischen Element in der Dichtung des islamischen Mittelalters," *Homoerotische Lyrik: 6. Kolloquium der Forschungsstelle für europäische Lyrik des Mittelalters*, ed. Theo Stemmler (Tübingen: Narr, 1992) 103–18; here 103. "Die Frau als geliebte Person spielt weder bei ihm [i.e., Rumi] noch bei Hafis, noch in der [mittelalterlichen] persischen Lyrik überhaupt eine Rolle." Christoph Bürgel, "Wie du zu lieben und zu trinken'— Zum Hafis-Verständnis Goethes," *J. W. Goethe—Fünf Studien zum Werk*, ed. Anselm Maler (Frankfurt/Main: P. Lang, 1983) 115–41; here 140. Bürgel is a prominent Islamist and Iranist.

8. [Kai Kā'ūs ibn Iskandar,] *Buch des Kabus oder Lehren des persischen Königs Kjekjawus für seinen Sohn Ghilan Schbach: Ein Werk für alle Zeitalter aus dem Türkisch-Persisch-Arabischen übersetzt und durch Abhandlungen und Anmerkungen erläutert von Heinrich Friedrich von Diez*. . . (Berlin: Nicolai, 1811) 461n.

9. Edward Scott Waring, *A Tour to Sheeraz, by the route of Kazroon and Feerozabad; with various remarks on the manners, customs, laws, language, and literature of the Persians*. . . (London: Bulmer, 1807) 207. Goethe may also have read the German translation, where this phrase appears as "eine sonderbare Verwirrung des Generis." Edward Scott Waring, *Reise nach Sheeraz auf dem Wege von Kazroon und Feerozabad, nebst mannichfaltigen Bemerkungen über die Lebensart, Sitten, Gewohnheiten, Gesetze, Sprache und Literatur der Perser und die Geschichte Persiens*. . . (Rudolstadt: Klüger, 1808) 2:73; in the same sentence, Waring remarks that "the verses of the Eastern poets are often as licentious as the poetry of Greece or Rome," and then in a footnote cites verses mentioning the love of both women and boys from Horace (*Odes*, 4.1.29–31) and Ovid (*Art of Love*, 2.682), remarking: "It would be endless and disgusting to notice the innumerable passages of the Roman Poets."

10. In Cotta's *Morgenblatt*, February 24, 1816, FA I, 3.1:549.

11. *Tag- und Jahres-Hefte* for 1815, MA 14:240.

12. Hāfiz 2:493; Hammer later corrected the misprint "Buch der Schenken": Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte der schönen Redekünste Persiens: Mit einer Blüthenlese aus zweyhundert persischen Dichtern* (Vienna: Heubner und Volke, 1818) 262.

13. Hāfiz 1:XL.

14. See Bürgel, "Abglanz," 110. I am grateful for clarification on this issue to the Iranist Dr. Nima Mina, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

15. See Bürgel, "Abglanz," 110; Robert Surieu, *Sarv-é Naz: An Essay on Love and the Representation of Erotic Themes in Ancient Iran*, trans. James Hogarth (Geneva: Nagel, 1967) 155; and, among Goethe's sources: *Voyages du Chevalier [Jean de]*

Chardin, en Perse, et autres lieux de l'Orient. . . . Nouvelle édition, . . . 4 vols. (Amsterdam: Aux dépens de la compagnie, 1735; 1st ed. 1711) 3:91.

16. FA I, 3.2:1326 (referring to *Faust I*, line 2619), followed by Richter, MA 11.1.2:664.

17. *Goethe-Wörterbuch* 2, col. 1217 (Horst Umbach).

18. See "Ganymed," FA I, 1.1:205; *Venezianische Epigramme* no. 38, FA I, 1.1:451; *Philostrats Gemälde*, "Prolog zur Argonautenfahrt," MA 11.2:468-69—in both of the latter two texts, we hear that Ganymede is "besorgt" over possible competition from a woman or girl, a clear case of self-reference.

19. The poems "An Hafis" (in the "Buch Hafis," FA I, 3.1:326-27), and in the "Buch Suleika" the poems "Locken! haltet mich gefangen," "Wie sollt' ich heiter bleiben," and "Wenn ich dein gedenke" (FA I, 3.1:87-88, 89); see MA 11.1.2:657.

20. FA I, 3.1:24-25.

21. As Birus aptly points out, FA I, 3.2:968.

22. As Gert Ueding points out, "Selige Sehnsucht," *Goethe Handbuch*, ed. Bernd Witte et al., vol. 1, *Gedichte*, ed. Regine Otto and Bernd Witte (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1996) 377-80; here 379; Heinz Otto Burger interprets it similarly, saying that "Kühlung" represents "die Abkühlung der Leidenschaft gegen Ende der Liebesnächte"—but the text makes the connection with "Liebesnächte" much closer than this interpretation would suggest. Burger rescues this interpretation by distinguishing a "spirituelle" (?) from a "sexuelle" reproduction referred to in the second phrase, "wo du zeugtest." Burger, "Noten zu besserem Verständnis eines Gedichts im West-östlichen Divan ['Selige Sehnsucht']," *Literatur—Sprache—Unterricht: Festschrift für Jakob Lehmann*, . . . ed. Michael Krejci and Karl Schuster (Bamberg: Bayerische Verlagsanstalt, 1984) 12-17; here 15. Böhler and Schwieder empty the phrase of any sexuality: "Die doppelte Zeugung in Zeile 6 wird jetzt lesbar: In der Erschaffung seines Werks konstituiert sich der schöpferische Künstler selbst." Michael Böhler and Gabriele Schwieder, "Schöpferischer Augenblick," *Interpretationen: Gedichte von Johann Wolfgang Goethe*, ed. Bernd Witte (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1998) 202-16; here 213.

23. "Die Umkehrung natürlicher Verhältnisse in ihr Gegenteil ist in allen mystischen Religionen das Mittel, um die physische Wirklichkeit metaphysisch zu verklären." Hannelore Schlaffer, "Weisheit als Spiel: Zu Goethes Gedicht 'Selige Sehnsucht,'" *Gedichte und Interpretationen*, vol. 3, *Klassik und Romantik*, ed. Wulf Segebrecht (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1984) 335-41; here 339.

24. For this and the following, see the Islam scholar Bürgel, "Abglanz," 110; "Wie du" 122.

25. Hammer (n. 12) 221.

26. Hammer (n. 12) 262; see MA 11.1.2:778, and especially the *Buch Hafis* of the *Divan* and the commentaries on it, where Hammer's somewhat more conciliatory remarks in his introduction to the Häfiz edition are cited, along with anti-allegorical statements by William Jones and Johann Gottfried Eichhorn that have been seen as the inspiration for the poem "Offenbar Geheimniß" (FA 3.2:1012-17).

27. April 17, 1815, FA I, 3.1:785; see also the section "Dschami" of the prose *Divan*, with its ridicule of the "Thorheiten" of "Mystik" (FA I, 3.1:175; cf. Bürgel, "Wie du," 122).

28. Häfiz 2:573.

29. Häfiz 2:90-91, quoted in FA 3.2:964-65 (the erotic imagery is clear: "Liebesflammen," "Aus Begier verbrennest," "Gram der Liebe").

30. Häfiz 2:106.

31. Häfiz 2:106, referred to without quotation by Birus, FA I, 3.2:969.

32. Hammer (n. 12) 26.

33. Häfiz 2:37; the first couplet is quoted by Birus, but not the end of the poem: FA I, 3.2:970.

34. Most notably in the poem “Denck, o Herr!,” FA I, 3.1:416–17.

35. See Häfiz, 1:113 (“Geheimnisse des Klosters”—see above for Hammer on the “Kloster” as “Knabenbordell!”); 1:118 (“Seht die Kerze [!] möchte gern / Vom Geheimniß plaudern”); 1:148 (“Manches Geheimniß, das ich nie / Geplaudert, noch plaudere, / Vertraue ich dem Freund. . . .”); 1:164 (“Die Geheimniße der Liebe,” in a poem about the poet’s “Freund”); 1:278 (a poem cited by Goethe); 1:332 (“das Geheimniß . . . Unseres Schenken Gekos”); 1:381 (“Die Liebe eines Jünglings ist / In meinen greisen Kopf gefallen, / Das Heimliche, was ich verbarg, / Ist zu der Thür hinausgefallen”); 1:410, 412, 435, 449; 2:2, 73–74, 238, 251 (“Als insgeheim den Schenken ich geliebet”); 2:280, 302, 346–47, 382 (“Rausch und Liebegeheimniß,” cf. 2:471); 2:428–29, 429–31, 433, 445, 454–55 (“Keinem kann ich das Geheimniß anvertrau’n / . . . Seine Lippen küß’ ich. . . .”); 2:487, 526 (“Ich vermag nicht von diesem Tatarknaben zu sprechen, / . . . daß ich keinem vermag anzuvertrauen die Pein”).

36. See the poems “Denk, o Herr!” and “Was, in der Schenke” (FA I, 3.1:412, 416); the “Trommel” that appear in the latter were an attribute of dervishes, who condemned pederasty. In a poem that begins with yearning for his “Freund,” Häfiz portrays his heart in rebellion against the “Trommel und Kutten” of the dervishes, defiantly planting his battle flag at the door of the tavern; Hammer explains this as a revolt against “Mönchssitten” (Häfiz 2:411).

37. Häfiz 1:418–19.

38. The somewhat forced attempts to describe this phrase are legion; see the summary in MA 11.1.2:469–70.

39. Schmitt 183.

40. MA 6.2:353, 356. Gert Ueding’s suggestion, “Ein ferner Anklang an den Ganymed-Mythos wird spürbar” in this part of the poem (379) has unfortunately not led to a consistent exploration of this connection.

41. *Goethes Gespräche: Eine Sammlung zeitgenössischer Berichte aus seinem Umgang: Auf Grund der Ausgabe und des Nachlasses von Flodoard Freiherrn von Biedermann ergänzt*, ed. Wolfgang Herwig, 5 vols. (Zurich 1965–1987; rpt. Munich: dtv, 1998) 3.2:603–4.

42. See Wilson, *Goethe Männer Knaben*, 169–78.

43. MA 7:531.

44. *Diderots Versuch über die Malerei: Übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen begleitet*, chap. 1, MA 7:532.

45. *Goethes Gespräche* 2:157. Horst Fleig refers to this conversation in this context (FA II, 11:733), but it is not included in FA. In earlier editions of Riemer and of Biedermann’s conversations the passages with detail about the body were omitted; for that reason, only the truncated form appears in the Chadwyck-Healey online database of Goethe’s works, where the conversations are based on the older Biedermann edition (goethe.chadwyck.com). There, the second and eighth sentences of this passage are combined, and the entry ends with a suggestion of something censored after that: “Nun reicht die männliche aber mehr an die Idee, denn in ihr hört das *Reale* auf; des Mannes Bildung geht offenbar über die des Weibes hinaus und ist keineswegs die vorletzte Stufe usw.” (*Anhang an Goethes Werke: Abtheilung für Gespräche*, ed. Woldemar Freiherr von Biedermann, vol. 2 [Leipzig 1889], 111).—In a conversation with Eckermann on April 18, 1827, too, Goethe emphasizes that it is the

“Naturbestimmung” of a woman, “Kinder zu gebären und Kinder zu säugen,” and associates her beauty with this function, mentioning the breadth of her hips and the fullness of her breasts (MA 19:557). However, in praising the poems of Amable Tastu later in the same conversation (S. 558), he contradicts his implied assertion in the conversation with Riemer cited here, that women’s nature makes them unsuited to intellectual pursuits.

46. To Paul Usteri, June 27, 1767, *Winckelmanns Briefe an seine Freunde in der Schweiz* (Zurich: Orell, Geßner, Füeßli, 1778) 183; cf. Paul Derks, *Die Schande der heiligen Päderastie: Homosexualität und Öffentlichkeit in der deutschen Literatur 1750–1850* (Berlin: Rosa Winkel, 1990) 207.

47. To Riedesel, January 29, 1767: “Schreiben Sie mir, ob Sie Schönheiten unter dem weiblichen Geschlechte entdecken. In unserm Geschlechte habe ich dieselben gefunden.” (*Winckelmanns Briefe an seine Freunde, Mit einigen Zusätzen und literarischen Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Karl Wilhelm Dajßdorf, Churfürstlichen Bibliothekar*, 2 vols. [Dresden: Walther, 1777, 1780], 1:265). In the essay written for Berg, *Abhandlung von der Empfindung des Schönen*, Winckelmann argues, “daß diejenigen, welche nur allein auf Schönheiten des Weiblichen Geschlechts aufmerksam sind, und durch Schönheiten in unserem Geschlechte wenig, oder gar nicht, gerührt werden, die Empfindung des Schönen nicht leicht eingebohren, allgemein und lebhaft haben.” Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Kleine Schriften—Vorreden—Entwürfe*, ed. Walther Rehm, introd. Hellmut Sichtermann, 2nd ed. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002) 216.

48. Humboldt: “[E]s ist den Weibern in einem hohen Grade ihrem Geschlecht nachzugeben verstattet, indeß der Mann das seinige fast überall der Menschheit zum Opfer bringen muß. Aber gerade dieß bestätigt aufs neue die große Freyheit seiner Gestalt von den Schranken des Geschlechts. Denn ohne an seine ursprüngliche Naturbestimmung zu erinnern, kann er die höchste Männlichkeit verrathen; da hingegen dem genauen Beobachter der weiblichen Schönheit jene allemal sichtbar seyn wird, wie fein auch übrigens die Weiblichkeit über das ganze Wesen mag verbreitet seyn” (“Ueber die männliche und weibliche Form,” *Die Horen* 1.3 (1795): 80–103; 2.4 (1795): 14–40; here 93). Schlegel: “Es bedarf gar nicht so vieler Umstände, um zu finden, daß die weibliche Organisation ganz auf den einen schönen Zweck der Mütterlichkeit gerichtet ist. Und eben darum müßt ihr es den Priestern der bildenden Kunst [Winckelmann!] verzeihen, wenn viele derselben der männlichen Gestalt den Preis der Schönheit zusprechen. . . .” *Über die Philosophie: An Dorothea* [1799], *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*, ed. Ernst Behler et al., 30 vols. to date (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1958–), 8:46. In his essay on Plato’s figure Diotima from the *Symposium*, Schlegel also points out that most would say that the Greeks, too, had no appreciation of female beauty (*Über die Diotima* [1795], Schlegel 1:100).

49. See the examples in Wilson, *Goethe Männer Knaben*, 225–26.

50. Häfiz, 1:332.

51. Goethe uses it in the poem “Berechtigte Männer”: “ein süßer Wind von Osten” (FA I, 3.1:128). Häfiz: “Ostwind bringst du mir von trunkenen Luliern Kunde?”; Hammer explains: “Lulier, tartarische Knaben mit schönen wollustrunkenen Augen” (Häfiz, 2:64). The (East) wind appears in a homoerotic context also at 1:213, 269–70, 2:127, 528.

52. See Schmitt, but she goes on to interpret the image of the butterfly in connection with the story of Psyche (the Greek word “psyche” means both “soul” and “butterfly”) and Amor. However, the analogy does not quite work, and in order to stress her interpretation, she suggests: “Hafis hatte Goethe gerade erst kennengelernt” when he

wrote “Selige Sehnsucht” (189). That relies not only on a wrong dating of Goethe’s diary entry of June 7, 1814 (Schmitt, June 17), but also ignores the fact that Goethe had received the Hafis edition by May 18 at the latest (FA I, 3.1, S. 765), in other words, more than ten weeks before writing “Selige Sehnsucht” on July 31—by which time he had written two dozen other poems and called them “Gedichte an Hafis” on July 30 (FA I, 3.1:765–67).

53. MA 11.2:487–88; MA 17:499–508; see Wilson, *Goethe Männer Knaben*, chap. 6.

54. In the often overlooked poem “Jene garstige Vettel” (FA I, 3.1:109), which Joachim Heimerl has rightly emphasized in his article “‘In aller Reinheit behandelt’: Das ‘Buch des Schenken’ aus Goethes ‘West-Östlichem Divan’ und die Polarität der Liebe,” *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 122 (2003): 200–217; here 210–16.

55. In connection with the “Verbindung ähnlicher Naturen” (“homosexuality”), Goethe writes: “Auch hier zeigt sich ein merkwürdiger Unterschied alter und neuer Zeit. Das Verhältnis zu den Frauen, das bei uns so zart und geistig geworden, erhob sich kaum über die Grenze des gemeinsten Bedürfnisses.” MA 6.2:353–54.

56. To Herder, April 3, 1790, WA IV, 9:199; taken from the Martial motto that Goethe took for the *Epiграмme*: “Hominem pagina nostra sapit,” FA I, 1:443, cf. 1133–34.